experienced by one of his constituents in obtaining a title to land. No previous approach has been made to me or to the Law Department in the matter and I am not quite clear whether it is really a matter of Government administration or one for investigation by the Law Institute.

The honorable member will appreciate that it is not practicable for me to investigate this matter without having further details of the transaction and identification of the parties concerned. If the honorable member will furnish me with a letter setting out the details I shall have the matter investigated.

Mr. MEAGHER (Chief Secretary).—I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his kindly remarks. Today I asked the Chief Commissioner of Police to pay special attention to that part of the problem of the road toll which involves the drinking driver. The request was based on a report that I received from the consultant surgeon to the Coroner which indicated that in more than 50 per cent of the autopsies carried out, the dead drivers had blood alcohol levels in excess of 100 milligrams a millilitre, which is twice the upper limit permitted by the law of this State. Some had up to eight times the permissible limit.

In my opinion concentration on drinking drivers in an effort to prevent them from driving vehicles will be a major factor in reducing the road toll in this State. However, the newspaper report indicated that I had asked the police to stand outside various sporting club premises and homes where private parties were being held and so on. That is an exaggeration. I merely asked the police to concentrate on the prevention of accidents by using their power to take possession of keys from drinking drivers and thereby, I hope, reduce the appalling toll brought about by drinking drivers.

The honorable member for Portland is interested in the cell block at the Port Fairy police station and I am happy to inform him that it will not take as long to build as the Sydney Opera House. I also assure him that when it is completed it will not resemble the Opera House in Sydney. However, from memory I am unable to indicate the precise date on which the work is likely to be undertaken. I will make inquiries and inform the honorable member.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I thank the honorable member for Melbourne for raising with me the subject that he has. The activities of the organization referred to were not known to me and I will certainly have the matter examined. I also thank the honorable member for his legal advice.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.18 *p.m., until Tuesday, October* 10.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, October 10, 1972.

The PRESIDENT **(the Hon. R. W. Garrett)** took the chair at 4.48 p.m., and read the prayer.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND SOLICITOR-GENERAL 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.

SUPREME COURT (JUDGES) 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.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION 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.

VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

BENDIGO-COHUNA LINE.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province) asked the Minister for Local Government, for the Minister of Transport—

(*a*) What quantities of goods traffic have been carried on the Bendigo–Cohuna railway line in the past three years?

(*b*) What were the main items carried, and what were the quantities in each case?

(*c*) What revenue has been received from this line in the past three years, and which goods items have contributed the components of this revenue?

(*d*) What was the extent of passenger traffic on this line over the past three years?

(*e*) How many railway employees are engaged upon the running and maintenance of this line?

(*f*) What is the annual amount paid in salaries and wages to these employees?

(*g*) Where do these employees reside?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government):—The answer supplied by the Minister of Transport is detailed and includes a long schedule of statistics. I seek leave for its incorporation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

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

(*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) figures for 1971–72 are not yet available. The revenue quoted is the total received from both inward and outward goods for the whole journey. Details of the quantities, revenue and the main types of goods carried are set out in the attached statement.

(*d*) The number of journeys and revenue from tickets sold at stations from Hunter to Cohuna inclusive:—

Year	Journeys	Revenue
		$
1969–70	1,902	3,369
1970–71	1,217	2,783
1971–72	1,614	2,712

Statistics regarding inward passenger traffic could be obtained only by lengthy and costly research.

(*e*) Twenty-four.

(*f*) Approximately $90,000.

(*g*)

Elmore	4
Lockington	5
Gunbower	4
Leitchville	1
Cohuna	10

COHUNA LINE: GOODS TRAFFIC.

Section	Commodity	1969–70 Tons	1969–70 Revenue	1970–71 Tons	1970–71 Revenue
			$		$
Hunter (576)	Manures	590	2,104	472	1,716
	Wheat	3,815	24,730	3,756	24,392
	Other	4	56	7	79
Diggora West	Manures	354	1,290	217	806
	Wheat	5,837	37,942	5,519	35,877
	Wool	12	124	9	105
Sectional Total		10,612	66,246	9,980	62,975
Sockington (579)	Manures	6,806	26,727	7,363	29,339
	Wool	106	1,150	108	1,192
	Beer	156	1,352	142	1,238
	Other	629	5,177	553	4,466
Sectional Total		7,697	34,406	8,166	36,235
Kotta (580)	Manures	509	1,981	376	1,512
	Other	19	150	38	165
Roslymead (581)	Manures	204	801	169	682
	Other	..	..	321	2,356
Patho (583)	Manures	403	1,385	185	775
	Wool	6	59	2	25
	Other	1	11	1	28
Gunbower (585)	Manures	2,055	8,651	1,820	7,478
	Wool	44	515	57	523
	Livestock	211	1,562	369	2,008
	Other	277	3,956	198	2,701

Section	Commodity	1969–70 Tons	1969–70 Revenue	1970–71 Tons	1970–71 Revenue
			$		$
Leitchville (586)	Manures	5,557	21,533	5,696	22,336
	Beer	194	1,667	174	1,495
	Other	622	5,182	774	6,957
Cohuna (588)	Manures	3,712	16,536	3,803	17,130
	Briquettes	70	528	72	550
	Dairy produce	1,704	11,621	781	4,497
	Beer	546	4,287	181	1,384
	Cement (bag)	737	3,628	995	5,080
	Livestock	701	3,824	547	1,689
	Other	1,752	18,895	1,188	15,853
Sectional Total		19,324	106,572	17,747	95,224
LINE TOTAL		37,633	207,224	35,893	194,434

POLICE DEPARTMENT.

HORSHAM POLICE STATION.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province) asked the Minister for Local Government, for the Chief Secretary—

(*a*) When will a new police station be erected in Horsham?

(*b*) Is the Government aware of the appalling conditions under which police are presently working in Horsham?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer supplied by the Chief Secretary is—

(*a*) The erection of a new police station at Horsham has been included in the Police Department's "forward look" works programme for buildings to be commenced during the 1973–74 financial year. However, the date of commencement of work on this building will depend on the availability of the necessary finance.

(*b*) The Government is fully aware of the unsatisfactory condition of the police station.

DENTAL SERVICES.

DENTAL CLINICS AT TRARALGON AND BALLARAT.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister of Health—

Is it proposed to establish dental clinics in Traralgon and Ballarat; if so—(i) what will be their basis of operation; (ii) who will be eligible to receive treatment from these clinics; and (iii) when is it proposed such clinics will be operating?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Health is—

It is proposed to establish two dental clinics—one at Central Gippsland Hospital, Traralgon and one at Ballarat and District Base Hospital.

(i) They will be operating initially as pilot undertakings and will be staffed by dental surgeons on a sessional basis. After a trial period their operations will be reviewed.

(ii) Public and pensioner patients will be eligible to receive dental treatment at these clinics.

(iii) Both clinics should be operational within a few weeks.

CHAIN LETTERS.

AMERICAN ROULETTE SYSTEM.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Labour and Industry—

(*a*) What action (if any) has the Minister of Labour and Industry taken in respect of a matter raised by me in this House on 12th September (*Hansard*, page 141) dealing with a chain letter organization?

(*b*) Will he refer this matter to the Crown Law Department and the Consumer Protection Bureau for investigation?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Labour and Industry is—

(*a*) No action has been taken by the Minister of Labour and Industry with respect to the chain letter organization to which the honorable member referred.

(*b*) I am informed that the Minister does not intend to cause this matter to be investigated further, as there appears to be no breach of the law involved.

MOTOR VEHICLES.

ROADWORTHINESS.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Local Government, for the Chief Secretary—

(*a*) How many vehicles were checked for roadworthiness by members of the Police Force in the first six months of this year?

(*b*) How many of these vehicles were checked—(i) on highways; (ii) in car yards; and (iii) in parking areas—stating how many vehicles were found to be unroadworthy in each category, and how many were ordered to have repairs effected?

(*c*) How many motorists were required to present their vehicles for inspection, after being observed by members of the Police Force who were of the opinion that the vehicles were probably unroadworthy?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer supplied by the Chief Secretary is—

(*a*) 107,641.

(*b*) The information is not readily available in the categories requested. However, 6,347 motor vehicles were found to be unroadworthy and "notices to repair" were issued in respect of all these vehicles.

(*c*) Nil. Where a member of the force observes a vehicle which, in his opinion, may be unroadworthy, such vehicle is examined on the spot.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

TIMBOON HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

What action does the Government intend to take to provide private study facilities for senior students at the Timboon High School?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is—

It is not the practice of the department to provide special facilities for private study by senior students.

TEACHER TRAINING: SCHOLARSHIPS AND BURSARIES.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

(*a*) What number of scholarships and bursaries will be available for teacher training in 1973?

(*b*) With the intake of teachers from overseas, will there be any easing of scholarships and bursaries?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is—

(*a*) (*i*) Bursaries:

No bursaries will be available for teacher training in 1973. They have been replaced by a $10 book allowance for all non-scholarship holders in forms V. and VI.

(*ii*) Studentships:

Final decisions are being made at present. There will be an increase in studentship awards, particularly for primary teachers.

(*b*) No. Studentship awards being made for 1973 are not related to present overseas recruitment as they will not produce teachers until 1976–77 when a new increase in primary school populations will begin.

EDENHOPE HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

What action does the Government intend to take to appoint a typist to the staff of the Edenhope High School?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is—

Budget funds have been provided to appoint an additional part time typist to Edenhope High School from the beginning of the 1973 school year.

TEACHERS: RE-ENGAGEMENT AFTER RETIREMENT.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

In each of the years 1969, 1970 and 1971, how many retired teachers have been re-engaged to teach or carry out administrative

duties in—(i) primary schools; (ii) secondary schools; (iii) technical schools; and (iv) the Education Department?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is—

The numbers of retired teachers who have been re-engaged to teach or carry out administrative duties during years 1969–1971 with the three divisions are as follows :—

Primary Schools Division (*i*) and (*iv*)

Year	Teachers
1969	15
1970	11
1971	13
Total	39

Secondary Schools Division (*ii*) and (*iv*)

Year	Teachers
1969	29
1970	23
1971	22
Total	74

Technical Schools Division (*iii*) and (*iv*)

Year	Teachers
1969	6
1970	14
1971	9
Total	29

A significant proportion of these were employed on a part-time basis.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.

BROOKLYN PUMPING STATION: FAECAL SMELLS.

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

What actions are contemplated to stop the faecal smells emanating from the Brooklyn pumping station at night time?

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

The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works in not aware of faecal smells emanating from the Brooklyn pumping station nor has it had any complaints made to it in this regard.

The Brooklyn pumping station is in a noxious trade area and board's staff are aware from time to time of odours arising from nearby industry.

The station staff is arranging for the local health inspector to make further independent checks.

SUBDIVISION OF LAND.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

In respect of Barton Investments Pty. Ltd. —(i) over the past six years how many applications for subdivision of land have been referred to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works for approval, information or comment, by that company or by local authorities; (ii) what is the situation of the lands in question, and what municipal authorities are involved; and (iii) have any applications for other than subdivision of land been made by the company to the board; if so, what was the nature of these applications, and to what land or property did they appertain?

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

(i) Two applications—both of which were in accordance with the zoning which first appeared in the planning scheme in 1954, and which has at all times since remained unchanged—were referred by the City of Doncaster and Templestowe for comment by the board, which had no objection thereto. The first a 4-lot subdivision, the second a 2-lot subdivision involving one of those allotments.

(ii) Craig Road, Mitcham Hills, City of Doncaster and Templestowe.

(iii) No planning permits were required from the board in respect of either of the above-mentioned subdivisions as they complied with the zonings. As initially proposed, the 2-lot subdivision contained an additional area of 18.2 perches for carriage way and drainage purposes in respect of which a permit was required, but was refused by the board. The additional area was deleted from the plan as presented to the council for sealing and acquired by the board for public open space for the sum of $100 plus $50 legal costs. An application to tap a board's water main for a trunk service to the land referred to above was lodged and granted, as was a considerably earlier application by a nearby owner.

I am advised that all matters referred to were dealt with in accordance with the board's normal policies and that, except in respect of those matters, there have been no applications whatever to the board by or on behalf of the company.

CONSUMER PROTECTION BUREAU.

POWER TO INITIATE LEGAL ACTION.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Labour and Industry—

Will the Government consider giving the Consumer Protection Bureau power to initiate legal action on behalf of consumers, as is done in South Australia and Western Australia?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer is—

The Minister of Labour and Industry informs me that he is aware that consumer protection legislation in South Australia and Western Australia does confer such a power on the consumer protection authority. However, no such action has yet been taken under the Western Australian legislation and no successfully concluded action has yet been taken under the South Australian legislation.

The Victorian Government at present does not intend to introduce legislation to a similar effect in this State; however, the experience of the South Australian and Western Australian legislation will be kept under attention.

DECENTRALIZATION.

LOCATION OF POLICE DETECTION AID COMPUTER.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province) asked the Minister for Local Government, for the Chief Secretary—

Will the Government honour its promise concerning the establishment of Government institutions in country areas to boost development, by installing the proposed $1 million police detection aid computer at Warrnambool?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer supplied by the Chief Secretary is—

It would not be practical to install the proposed police computer at such a great distance from police headquarters.

The computer installation proposed for the Police Force is a real time "on line" inquiry system which will provide access to all types of police information in a matter of seconds.

Apart from the major problems of providing and maintaining the equipment and obtaining suitable accommodation and skilled staff at Warrnambool, the cost of P.M.G. communications facilities to the computer over such a distance would be prohibitive, and the large volume of inquiries on the system would delay response times.

STONY CREEK.

RECLAMATION OF BASIN.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister of Health—

(*a*) What progress has been made in reclaiming that area of the Stony Creek basin east of Hyde Street, Yarraville?

(*b*) When is it contemplated that the report on such reclamation will be available?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Health is—

(*a*) The joint committee comprising representatives of councils and other authorities with an interest in the area has furnished a report to the Government arising from the estimate submitted by a consultant as the cost of the detailed site investigation which would form the basis of the design for realignment of Stony Creek through its estuary, together with the cost of undertaking the work.

(*b*) An alternative procedure is now being examined and it is expected that a decision as to the method of site investigation to be used will be made within a few weeks.

LAND CONSERVATION COUNCIL.

STUDIES AND REPORTS.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister for Conservation—

(*a*) What areas of Victoria are to be studied and reported on by the Land Conservation Council?

(*b*) In what order of priorities will each area be studied?

(*c*) When is each individual area's report to be completed?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing).—The answer supplied by the Minister for Conservation is—

(*a*) The Land Conservation Council will eventually carry out investigations and make recommendations on all public land in Victoria with the exception of that land which is within a city, town or borough, or land vested in a municipality or a sewerage authority within the meaning of the Sewerage District Act 1958. The council has

divided the State into fourteen areas and many of these areas have been further divided into districts; for example the north-east area has been divided into five districts and the south-west area into two districts.

(*b*) Priorities have only been set for certain areas. The Governor in Council has approved of the following order of priority:—

1. South-West Area District 1.
2. North-East Area District 1 and 2.
3. South Gippsland Area District 1.
4. Melbourne Area.
5. Mallee Area.
6. East Gippsland Area District 1.
7. East Gippsland Area District 2.
8. North-East Area District 3, 4 and 5.
9. Alpine Area.

These areas were defined in the Victorian *Government Gazette* No. 61 dated 30th January, 1971. The council has not considered the order of priorities for the other areas of the State.

(*c*) It is expected that the studies of the North-East Area District 1 and the South Gippsland Area District 1 will be available by the end of this year. The study of the North-East Area District 2 will be completed early next year and the studies of the Melbourne Area and the Mallee Area in the second half of 1973. It should be noted that the council's five research officers will be involved in the drafting of recommendations as to land use as well as the preparation of study area reports.

COUNTRY ROADS BOARD.

PRINCES HIGHWAY: TRARALGON INTERSECTION.

The Hon. R. W. MAY (Gippsland Province) asked the Minister for Local Government, for the Chief Secretary—

(*a*) What number of accidents are known to have occurred at the intersection of Princes Highway and Breed Street, Traralgon, during each of the past three years?

(*b*) Is this intersection regarded by the Country Roads Board as being a danger to human life?

(*c*) Has the board carried out a survey; if not, will it do so, with a view to the installation of traffic lights as a means of reducing the number of accidents?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government). — The answer supplied by the Chief Secretary is—

(*a*) The numbers of accidents reported to the Police Department were:

1969	3
1970	2
1971	1

(*b*) No, except to the extent any intersection is a danger.

(*c*) In April, 1972, a traffic survey was carried out by the board but the volume of traffic then did not warrant the installation of traffic control lights.

STATE RIVERS AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION.

SWAN HILL RIVER FLATS DRAINAGE PROJECT.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Water Supply—

(*a*) Why have funds from the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission's works and services capital account for the Swan Hill river flats drainage project been reduced below the expected level this financial year?

(*b*) Were funds, which could have been used for rural water works, diverted to urban development or to the Westernport region?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization). — The answer supplied by the Minister of Water Supply is—

(*a*) Works and Services funds allocated in 1972–73 on the Swan Hill flats drainage scheme, compared with the expenditure for 1971–72 are as follows:—

Swan Hill Flats Drainage.

Works and services expenditure 1971–72—$61,000.

Works and services allocation 1972–73—$54,000.

It is hoped that the 1972–73 allocation will be substantially supplemented by Commonwealth rural employment grants.

(*b*) Expenditure during 1971–72 and allocations during 1972–73 from the Works and Services account are as follows:—

Irrigation Rural Domestic and Stock Supplies, Flood Protection and Drainage.

Works and services expenditure 1971–72—$7·969 million.

Works and services allocation 1972–73—$6·234 million.

Country Town Water Supplies including Westernport Development.

Works and services expenditure 1971–72—$9·65 million.

Works and services allocation 1972–73—$10·596 million.

RURAL FINANCE AND SETTLEMENT COMMISSION.

DEBT RECONSTRUCTION AND FARM BUILD-UP SCHEMES.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Bendigo Province) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Treasurer—

(*a*) How many applications have been received by the Rural Finance and Settlement Commission for rural reconstruction under debt reconstruction and farm build-up respectively?

(*b*) What amounts have been lent in each category?

(*c*) What are the total sums provided by the Commonwealth Government?

(*d*) Will further funds be made available by the Commonwealth Government in order that further applications may be processed?

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The answer supplied by the Premier and Treasurer is—

(*a*) The Rural Finance and Settlement Commission has received the following applications to date:—

(i) Debt reconstruction	2593
(ii) Farm build-up	594
	3187

(*b*) Loans approved to date total—

(i) Debt reconstruction	671 cases involving	$17,416,550
(ii) Farm build-up	224 cases involving	$5,248,200
	895 cases involving	$22,664,750

(*c*) $4·5 million has been expended from balances held in the Rural Rehabilitation Fund from the pre-war farmers debts adjustment scheme. The Commonwealth Government provided $8·5 million for the purposes of the rural reconstruction scheme in the 1971–72 financial year and this year it is estimated that a further $13·57 million will be provided. Victoria has been authorized to commit in 1972–73 for expenditure in 1973–74 an additional asset of $3·3 million.

(*d*) The scheme is to be reviewed by the Commonwealth and the States early in 1973 and the question of further funds will be an important part of the review.

POLLUTION.

ACTIVITIES OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province).—I wish to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the cynicism and hyprocrisy of the Government in that, whilst continuing to pay lip service to the cause of anti-pollution, it continues to permit its departments and instrumentalities to contaminate waters and endanger health in and around the State of Victoria.

Approval of the proposed discussion was indicated by the required number of members rising in their places, as specified in Standing Order No. 53.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province).—With great zeal the Government and its Ministers announced that the Yarra River had been saved, its beauty restored and its waters made clean. It is my sad duty to tell the House that these claims are false.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—Where was that said?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I will have the reference looked up. The memory of the Government concerning these matters is very short. I propose to show the House where that statement was made and to refresh the memory of honorable members on that proposition.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—It is a supposition.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The proposition which the honorable gentleman makes is a supposition. The people are being misled by false claims made by the Government on anti-pollution measures in Victoria. Just north of the Burke Road bridge beside Ivanhoe is the area of North Balwyn. There, adjacent to the Yarra River, the Government and its instrumentalities have created a vast scene of despoliation and destruction

which can never be effaced. More than 100 acres of natural area have been erased forever and the Yarra River has been fed with contaminated water from the garbage in nearby tips. No doubt the Minister will tell the House that the Government really did not appreciate what was going on; that it did not intend in the first place to put a freeway right up to the edge of the water or a garbage tip so close to the water. If that is the case the Government has been sleep-walking.

I shall give the House some facts which are relevant to the discussion. On 16th April, 1971, the State Development Committee presented to Parliament its progress report on the disposal of garbage. Honorable members should note the date—it was more than a year ago. The report contained a number of recommendations. Recommendation No. 24 is in the following terms:—

> That the practice of siting refuse disposal depots on flood plains,—

that includes the area I am speaking of—

> which are of significance in so far as flood control is concerned, be discontinued.

The Minister for Local Government and the honorable gentleman representing the Minister of Health should please take note. Recommendation No. 22 was in these terms—

> That legislation be enacted, requiring the Commission of Public Health to refer proposals to establish refuse disposal sites to the appropriate water supply authorities servicing the particular areas in which the proposed depots are to be established.

The committee recalled on page 11 of its report a growing realization of the mounting waste disposal problems, and of the need to evaluate present and future requirements on a State-wide basis, and that this had led to the former Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, referring the whole matter to the committee for investigation and report. I commend the committee for its report, but I shall deal only with certain aspects of it which are relevant to the matter now under discussion. Sub-section (1) of section 49A of the Health Act provides—

> The council of any municipality shall not establish any depot for the disposal of refuse rubbish or night-soil or for the changing of pans without the consent in writing of the commission.

Sub-section (2) describes the procedure for making an application in writing to the Commission of Public Health, so that the commission shall have all the necessary material before it either rejects or accepts the application. What did the Government do in the face of the recommendations contained in the progress report and an Act of Parliament? It was not slow to retaliate. In April of this year the Camberwell council was granted a permit to establish a garbage tip on a public open spaced reservation—that is how it is designated in the planning scheme—considerably less than 200 yards from the stream of the Yarra. The tip also adjoins residential zone "C", and is located between the residential area, bounded by the Boulevard and another street, on the one side, and the river on the other side. Soon the freeway will be running through the area.

Despite the fact that the land was zoned as reserved open space under the planning scheme, the Minister for Local Government, with a logic that ill-becomes him, granted the permit. The Camberwell council applied to the Commission of Public Health to operate a tip, which the report to Parliament states ought not to be sited near water. Two other obstacles exist—the residential area nearby, and the fact that the land was zoned as reserved open space. This anti-pollutant Government considers that it is a proper use of reserved open space to put a tip in Yarra Park, the Melbourne Cricket Ground, or anywhere for that matter, provided that the consent of the Minister of Health has been obtained. I know these facts will not be popular. I am stating only facts; I will comment on them later.

The tip and the stagnant pools of water have become a public nuisance. A foul mixture of decomposing household garbage, which includes drugs that are no longer used, all types of medicines, solvents and toxic materials, is being pumped from the tip into the adjacent Yarra River, less than 200 yards away, thereby causing pollution to the river.

Anticipating that there might be a temporary loss of memory on the part of the Government I have taken the precaution of bringing with me some photographs.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—Is there a photograph of the tip at the Melbourne Cricket Ground to which you referred?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Not yet. I am glad the honorable gentleman is taking the proposal seriously. I referred to a proposal to put a tip at the Melbourne Cricket Ground, and doubtless the Government would argue that it could be covered up later.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—Who has proposed a tip there?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—No one, but it would not be beyond the resources of the Government, having regard to what has happened to the Yarra River.

I produce a photograph taken on 7th September, 1972, showing the dumping of garbage into the water contrary to item 10 of regulation 36 in Schedule 4 of the General Sanitary Regulations under the Health Act proclaimed in 1950. For the information of honorable members, who may not be as familiar with these regulations as I have become in the past few days, I point out that regulation 10 provides—

Refuse shall not be deposited in water without special approval of the commission.

A number of other desirable regulations are prescribed to ensure that a tip shall be made as inoffensive as possible.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Does the regulation deal with rivers, pools and creeks, or does it deal with puddles that are 200 yards away?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—No, I see nothing in that regulation regarding the point raised by Mr. Campbell. I am sorry that I cannot be of assistance to his cause. The photograph taken on 7th September shows the garbage and the water.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—Where was it?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The photograph relates to the site in the Yarra River to which I have been referring.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—Who is the person in the photograph? It is a photograph of someone dumping something.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—In the photograph part of the rubbish tip and the refuse may be seen. The name of the gentleman who took the photograph, the date on which it was taken, and the name of the gentleman by whom it was sighted are endorsed on the back. He was a public servant and I do not propose to mention his name because he cannot answer for himself in this House.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER.—Are you referring to the Camberwell City Council's tip?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Did I not say that honorable members were sleep-walking?

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER.—Are you referring to a council tip or a legal or illegal tip?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The Camberwell council obtained a permit both from the Commission of Public Health and the Minister for Local Government to operate the tip in the Yarra Valley.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER.—Is that the tip to which you are referring?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Yes. I am sorry I cannot offer as a solution to the honorable member's problems that the photographs have been taken of the wrong tip. The photograph in question, taken on 7th September, 1972, shows rubbish being dumped into water contrary to regulation 10.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—How many yards from the river would this be?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—It is less than 300 yards.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Was it raining at the time?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I was not there at the time. The regulations under the Health Act provide that refuse may not be dumped into water, because the water which escapes is contaminated and is a hazard to health.

Another photograph which I display was taken on 14th September, 1972. Again it was sighted by the gentleman to whom I previously referred, and shows rubbish being dumped into water. The area in question, including the houses in the background, can be clearly seen. That is not all. A further photograph, taken on 11th September, 1972, shows the foul water from the decomposing garbage which is being pumped on to the open space reservation adjoining the River Yarra and then finding its way into the river. In the photograph can be seen the water and the side of the quarry. On close inspection the contaminated water can be seen coming out of the tip.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—Are you referring to a quarry?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I am sorry, it is a tip. It is like a big quarry hole, but it is not a quarry. It was made by excavation of the river soil. A further photograph, taken from a private property on the Boulevard, shows garbage being dumped within 10 yards of that property.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Do you have a photograph of the other Camberwell tip which was on the Yarra River? I refer to the one where the golf course is located.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The tip to which Mr. Campbell refers was filled in, but it has recently been excavated.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—But have you taken photographs of the golf course?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I have not taken any photographs. The photograph which I now display shows contaminated papers which have blown on to the fences of private residences. A further photograph shows how the tip was created by the removal of many thousands of yards of top soil. I hand the photographs to which I have referred to the Clerk for the information of honorable members.

In passing, I mention the daily noise, dust, flies and the stagnant disease-harbouring dams of contaminated water suffered by the persons who reside in adjoining properties. Before their privacy was invaded by the tip, these residents enjoyed pleasant outlooks over the natural beauty of the Yarra Valley. The householders were there before the tip was established. It cannot therefore be said that they bought the land and built their homes knowing that this unsightly tip was there. Of course, to the Government the rights of citizens are not important.

It is well known that contaminated water is a source of hepatitis, toxoplasmosis, gastric and other diseases, and that contaminated water from a garbage tip is a grave danger to health. In this area there have been a number of stagnant pools of contaminated water which has eventually found its way, of course, into the Yarra River. Naturally there have been complaints and also naturally they have been ignored. One can see the levity with which this subject has been greeted in the House tonight.

In short, despite the amusement that has been created, may I spare a thought for the citizen today in his efforts to come to terms with the vast bureaucracy that is known as the Government, and the men who sit behind the Government in this House. They have become reconciled to the individual becoming irrelevant to his surroundings, but I beg leave to mention his plight and pardon for so doing.

In view of the way that this matter has been received by the House, I realize that it would be a waste of time referring to breaches of the regulations under the Health Act. I have cited one of them, but I have them all here. The regulations prescribe stringent precautions, but I can see that the House is not interested in them.

I refer also to the covenant on the title itself. The land was acquired, I think in 1925, by the Camberwell City Council and it is subject to one of those well-known covenants forbidding the taking of soil from the land. I know that covenants of this nature are not enforced at law, but I pay tribute to the people who said they were not going to have this land torn up and scored. There was a covenant on the title but one could not expect the Government or any of its instrumentalities to feel bound by that.

At page 4 of the planning scheme ordinance, extractive industry, which requires a permit, is listed as including the extraction of sand, gravel, clay, turf, soil and so on from the land. Was a permit given for this? My question is met with silence. At page 8, an offensive industry is stated to mean any business or industry which by reason of the process involved or the method of manufacture and so on causes effluvia, fumes, and gases, or discharges dust, foul liquid and so on, so as to be injurious revolting or disgusting to persons on neighbouring land in other occupations.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I do not think the removal of the earth would come within the purview of the motion unless a permit for it had been granted by a Government department.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Thank you for your help, Sir. In my researches, I have seen no evidence of a permit having been granted.

The PRESIDENT.—I do not think that it is a matter of criticism of a Government.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—But it would seem to me that the operation is unlawful and the Government, as a Government of law and order, ought to enforce the law. The law makes no distinction between persons, so we are told, and it would seem, on the face of it anyhow, that the Camberwell council has no more right to break the law than anybody else in the community. I make that point.

The PRESIDENT.—It is a question of the council there and not a Government department; that is the point I make.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Of course, a Government department issues a permit but the Camberwell council is the applicant. Therefore, the responsibility is fairly and squarely upon the Government. What has been the result of all this? It is a refusal by the Government to accept the law of the land, because that is what has been broken. What was an area of natural beauty has been turned into a desert. The Yarra Valley is an area of natural beauty. Low-lying land is Nature's way of handling flooding. The build-up of the natural areas which were evolved by Nature for protection causes interference farther upstream with the result that there will be flooding at that place or farther downstream.

It may be said that the Board of Works will replace some holes that it took from a golf course. As I understand the law as expressed in the Cultural and Recreational Lands Act, the Board of Works has no power to take a golf course. I thought we resolved that last year with the Yarra Bend Park. Therefore, it is of no comfort to me and should not be to the House to learn that in doing what it is doing the board is now to make good the mischief by using some top soil from areas that might be expected to flood once or twice a year and turning them into a golf course. This does not apply to the Kew, Greenacres, or La

Trobe golf courses. None of them have had to resort to building up the land adjacent to the banks of the stream.

This land was intended under the planning scheme to remain as an area of natural beauty. Instead, it is acquiring a freeway and a garbage tip, the one to pollute the air and the other to pollute the water. Theodore Roosevelt was a magnificent conservationist. When he first saw the Grand Canyon in 1903 he said, "Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it". In my youth and yours, Mr. President, we saw the Yarra Valley perhaps not in its primeval beauty, but beautiful none the less and relatively undisturbed by man, environment's greatest marauder. Today much of the valley has been destroyed but some of it could still be saved.

I echo the words of Roosevelt, "Leave it as it is; not so much for ourselves but for generations yet unborn." What the Government is doing to the Yarra Valley is damnable. Furthermore, it is a dangerous thing which the Government is doing by allowing the pollution of our streams throughout Victoria contrary, I believe, to the law of the land. My colleagues will comment on these.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing).—Mr. Galbally concluded his remarks by saying that he would leave further comments on this motion to his colleagues. The motion is so wide in its terms that I will also have to leave much of what can be said to my learned colleagues. I intend to comment only on certain aspects of the motion, which reads—

> . . . the cynicism and hypocrisy of the Government in that, whilst continuing to pay lip service to the cause of anti-pollution, it continues to permit its departments and instrumentalities to contaminate waters and endanger health in and around the State of Victoria.

The two most important words in the motion are "endanger health". In addressing himself to the subject, Mr. Galbally has almost confined his remarks to one particular matter concerning a garbage tip in an area abutting the municipality of Camberwell where the run-off from garbage, when it is wetted, will find its way into the Yarra River and therefore contribute to the pollution that we already know exists in the area. It is unfortunate that this happens but I suppose all honorable members could relate innumerable instances where this type of thing is happening throughout the length and breadth of Victoria.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—That would not be hard.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—I agree.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—What is the Government doing about it?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—If Mr. Eddy will give me a few minutes, I shall let him know what we are doing about it.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—You have had seventeen years.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—No, we have not. In 1969, when I was Minister of Health, I was leaving to go overseas and the press asked me why was the Minister of Health going overseas when he had said that the health and hospital services in Victoria were so wonderful. I told the press that I was going to look into pollution measures that had been undertaken in other countries and to see how the Government could institute similar action in Victoria. In May, 1969, I said, as a Minister of the Crown, that I was going to look at these various things and my comments did not warrant one line in the newspapers because the problems of the environment and pollution prior to May, 1969 were not the in thing. The community was not giving them any thought whatsoever.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—That is wrong.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—It is not. In June, 1969, President Nixon made an announcement that he would make available many billions of dollars to local government in the

United States of America so that they could do something about treating the raw sewage that was flowing into the Missouri, the Mississippi and many other great river systems in that country. Suddenly, all nations started to look around and asked themselves if this situation existed in the United States of America what was happening in their own countries?

Admittedly, the Victorian Government had been giving this type of thing some consideration but, as recently as 1969, I do not think it really attracted the attention of the people and the Government to the extent that it should have.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I am glad that we have that admission.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—It is not an admission, it is an accepted fact. Throughout the length and breadth of Australia today, do not let us forget, there are State Governments of every political colour. Prior to 1969 and even up to now, none of them has done what has been done in Victoria on the problems of the environment and pollution control. The motion uses the words "the cynicism and hypocrisy of the Government, whilst continuing to pay lip service to the cause of anti-pollution". If ever a Government, not only within Australia, but anywhere in the world, has accepted its responsibilities in this field over the past three years, it is most certainly the Government of Victoria. In June of this year I was fortunate to attend a world conference on the environment, sponsored by the United Nations Organization, in Stockholm. One hundred and twenty-two countries were involved and I should say that Victoria has done more to control pollution than most of those 122 countries. Each one of the countries is interested in what Victoria is doing. That is a proud statement which I can make. Victoria was first into the arena for the control of the environment with its Environment Protection Act. That legislation has set the pattern for all other States of Australia.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The Act has not been proclaimed yet.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—Mr. Galbally spoke of the levity with which he suggested the Government regarded this motion. As yet, I have not noticed him stop laughing. Initially, it was necessary to set up the Environment Protection Authority. It must be remembered that this is something new in the world. It is extremely difficult to obtain the right type of men to administer this important legislation. They are just not about today. Let there be no doubt about that. Whereas the Government had hoped that it would have had the Environment Protection Act and all its provisions off the ground twelve months ago, that was not possible because of the need to obtain qualified officers to administer the various provisions of the Act relating to pollution of the atmosphere, of soil, of water, by noise, and all other forms of pollution. The Government advertised for these men throughout the world. Mr. Jack Fraser, who was the architect of that legislation, did a magnificent job. No one would have been more pleased than he to have seen all provisions of the Environment Protection Act proclaimed and in operation prior to his recent departure.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Why has the Act not been proclaimed?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—Of course the Government could have proclaimed the Act but it was first necessary to provide the machinery within the Environment Protection Authority to undertake the gigantic tasks necessary. The Government decided that, despite all the criticism that would be forthcoming, it would not proclaim the Act until the end of this year.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—What a Christmas present!

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—What is there about the Act which would make it a dreadful Christmas present? The Act will be proclaimed this year because the Environment Protection

Authority and the Environment Protection Council and the machinery for administering the Act have been established. One of the most important provisions of the Act states that policies will be enunciated for various parts of Victoria. Many of these policies have already been enunciated. For the control of pollution, the most important provision relates to the licensing of industry. This will require a large staff to assess what should be the entitlement of each industry to emit smoke from a chimney stack or to dispose of effluent through some unseen underground sewer. One of the problems with effluent is that it cannot be seen as smoke can be seen. An assessment of the allowable noise and allowable odours will be necessary. I repeat that there are gigantic tasks to be performed. Yet the Labor Party and the Country Party ask why the Act was not proclaimed twelve months ago. The worst thing which could have been done was to enter this field unprepared. Now, when it enters the field, the Government will have the machinery to make sure that all the provisions of the Act can be implemented.

Of course problems of pollution can be cited. They are everywhere, not only in Victoria and other States of Australia, but in every country of the world. Mr. Galbally stated that the Government was saying that the Yarra River is clean. I cannot recall anyone ever having said that or such a statement having been printed. I should like Mr. Galbally to produce a press statement from the Government or a statement by any person stating that it has been said.

Let it be clear that the Yarra River will not be cleaned up overnight. The Government has a most efficient officer working on this problem in the person of Mr. Colin Porter, who contributed much to what was done in the River Thames. We have heard it said, "If only they would do with the Yarra what was done with the Thames, that would do." I was in England this year and I made a personal inspection of the Thames. Enormous progress has been made and there is talk about fish being caught at the Tower of London. I have doubts about that because the Thames is still a sooty and messy old river.

All of these things will take time. It is hoped that within a decade the Yarra will flow much cleaner than it does today, that the smoke and pollution we see in the atmosphere over Melbourne will start to clear, and that noise and all other types of pollution will be reduced. But, if it has taken a century to create these pollution problems in our community, surely it is reasonable to give the Government at least a decade to clean them up. The machinery now exists for that to be done. The Government makes no apology for what it is doing. It has not paid "lip service" only to the anti-pollution cause. That is a lot of eyewash.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—What about the specific instances I gave?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—I agree with Mr. Galbally that there are many problems. The Environment Protection Authority will have the responsibility of administering the policies to control the disposal of garbage. Admittedly there was a report on garbage disposal by the State Development Committee. Admittedly there is a report on drainage problems by an all-party committee. These are the very reasons for the establishment of the Environment Protection Authority. Machinery had to be provided to control the disposal of garbage in municipalities not only in the metropolis but throughout Victoria. The problem is enormous.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The Government thinks there is no problem if it is put near a river.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—There is a problem wherever it is put because the health of the community can be affected. The most important words in the motion are "endanger health". All pollution may endanger the health of the community but there is a paradoxical position. We talk about

the pollution problems which have appeared on the horizon in the past couple of years and the hue and cry is that the health of the community will be endangered. People say that the position is becoming worse. The amazing thing to me, as a former Minister of Health, is that the expected life span of the community is becoming longer and longer as each decade goes by, despite all these problems. By the turn of the century it will almost be guaranteed that people will live for three score years and ten, and longer. Yet these pollution problems are supposedly a danger to the health of the community; that may be so, but it is a little paradoxical that people are living longer.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Are you saying that pollution is helping us live longer?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—All I am saying is that medical science, in all its magnificence, has increased the expectation of life. The infant mortality rate has been reduced from 42 infant deaths for each 1,000 births 25 years ago to about 11 now. Infant mortality has almost disappeared. Heart disease will be conquered and so will cancer, and by the turn of the century, the average person will look forward to his three score and ten years.

As a matter of interest, I shall throw into the ring another point. The two most important words in the motion are " endanger health ". What endangers the health of the community more than anything else has been given no consideration or publicity. That is the currency that we carry in our pockets—$1 notes, $5 notes and $10 notes are the greatest polluters in the community, but we all grab them. Currency moves about the community to and from people with the worst diseases.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—What should we do with it?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—I do not know what should be done but we should get the problems of the pollution of the atmosphere and so on into proper perspective. I point to what the Government has done in setting up the Environment Protection Authority and the Environment Protection Council and to the fact that the Act will be proclaimed by the end of this year when the machinery, policies, and manpower necessary to do all these things will be available.

All honorable members can point to dozens of instances of pollution. I hope, as everybody hopes, that within the next decade a real improvement will be obvious within Victoria, within the Commonwealth and in other countries. We are all in this together. People can talk about the tipping of garbage causing pollution, of industry causing pollution, or of motor cars causing pollution. But it is people who cause pollution and the quicker that we as a community are educated—and that will probably take a generation—the sooner there will be an improvement in conditions and the sooner the problems facing this and other countries will be overcome.

As I said in my introductory remarks, until recently pollution did not create a ripple on the surface in Australia or anywhere else in the world. I reject the motion. The Government of Victoria need make no apology for what it has done in this field over the past three years.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province). — This motion has a wide application and considerable ground could be covered if it were debated at length. Mr. Galbally restricted himself to a narrow ambit covering the Yarra Valley and a garbage tip at Camberwell. One has only to travel around Victoria to find many more examples of pollution. Honorable members have been vocal in their support of environment protection and they listened with interest to the Minister of Housing. I smiled, in fact I laughed on occasions, at his utterances because for some years the honorable gentleman was Minister of Health and in charge of the department prior to the establishment of the environment protection

body. Despite all his interest and enthusiasm for the subject, and the education which he received from all of the departments of which he was in charge, tonight the Minister of Housing indicated that he did not have even a fundamental knowledge of the history of the problem of pollution.

The motion before the House relates to pollution. I am surprised tonight to hear the Minister of Housing say that pollution has been with us for only the past three years. Three years ago the press did not even notice that the honorable gentleman went overseas and came back with all the knowledge he obtained at the pollution conference.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—The press did not report his return.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—That is so. If the then Minister of Health had known anything about this problem before he went overseas, he should have been aware of the sixth progress report of the Drainage Committee. In 1946, the year I entered this Chamber, an expert committee reported on measures needed for the better protection of rivers, streams and lakes from pollution. That committee comprised representatives of the Department of Health, the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, the Fisheries and Wildlife Branch, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Provincial Sewerage Authorities Association. The committee covered a wide ambit, recommended measures relating to stream pollution and suggested that the provisions relating to this matter in various Acts should be consolidated into one Act. It also suggested that a standing committee consisting of representatives of the Commission of Public Health, the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, the Fisheries and Wildlife Branch, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Provincial Sewerage Authorities Association prepare regulations to fix standards for effluents and wastes discharged into streams and that the Commission of Public Health should administer an Act to carry out pollution control measures throughout the whole State. If any honorable member is interested, the details can be found at page 13 of the committee's report.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—What did the ensuing Governments do to follow up the report?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Nothing. A Labor Government was in office at that time and apparently it did nothing. A Liberal Government followed and it did nothing. The next Government, a composite one, did nothing. Then a Country Party Government did nothing. The following Administration was a Labor Government and it did nothing. Victoria has now had seventeen years of Liberalism which has also done nothing. The former Minister of Health, the present Minister of Housing, did not know of the existence of the committee to which I referred. The honorable gentleman referred back only to 1969 when, as Minister of Health, he suddenly decided that he had a problem on his hands and went overseas to attend the meeting of the Environment Council.

The Government established the Select Committee on Drainage in 1964, of which Mr. Granter and I were members, with a former member for South-Eastern Province. This committee found, at page 8 of its sixth progress report, that pollution problems went back many years and that statutory controls such as regulatory powers or specific provisions were made to control, prevent, or minimize water pollution. I instance the Dandenong Valley Act 1963, the Fisheries Act 1958, the Health Act 1958, the Latrobe Valley Act, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works Act, the Sewerage Districts Act and the Water Act. Amazingly, the main provisions relating to pollution are contained in the Health Act. But the Minister of Housing, who was

formerly Minister of Health, went on this lovely trip overseas to attend a meeting to discuss the environment.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—That was not the occasion.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—The honorable gentleman went overseas on a secret mission to solve the problems of pollution.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—Did you also have a lovely trip overseas?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—I had a trip in 1961.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—Did you have a lovely trip?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Yes, and I hope to have another one.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—Order! Overseas trips are not referred to in the motion.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—I should not have mentioned it, Mr. President, but the Minister did so. I imagine that if the honorable gentleman went overseas, because of his wide interests in various matters other than pollution, he would have made it a lovely trip. The Health Act 1958 is the main enactment dealing with the problems of pollution. Mr. Galbally mentioned pollution of the Yarra River and the problems of garbage. However, for many years the Health Act has contained provisions to prevent offensive conditions dangerous to public health arising from pollution of inland waters.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—And they have been administered accordingly.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Apparently, the Minister did not think his own department had sufficient powers to do anything about it or his officers were not competent to carry out those provisions because the honorable gentleman said that that was the reason why the Environment Protection Authority got off the ground. Fourteen of the seventeen years elapsed before any action was taken. It also took a committee set up for this purpose to find out what was the problem. Mr. Granter and I, as members of the Drainage Committee, went around the various areas of Melbourne and it was not very long before we realized what was the cause of pollution. It would have taken little Government action to correct much of it. There seemed to be no will on the part of anyone to remedy pollution until it became a popular war cry that something had to be done about conservation and the environment.

The Government was forced to take action on conservation, but whether we agree with what has been done is another matter. At least the Government did something after the episodes of the Royal Botanic Gardens and the Little Desert. Why, after all these years, has it been realized that there is an environment problem? The report of the State Development Committee tabled in the House recently referred to the subject and the Minister for Local Government immediately said that something had to be done about it. That was because it had something to do with the metropolitan area.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—The whole of the State.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—I regret to say that if one reads the Ministerial statement of the Minister for Local Government one sees that during the next eight years Victorian authorities will require $1,250 million for work in connection with urban sewerage, drainage and water supply.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That does not mean for the metropolitan area.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—I am not naïve; I realize that most of this money will be spent in attempting to overcome the lag of 90,000 properties in the metropolitan area still requiring sewerage and other services.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—The statement refers to Victoria as a whole.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—The Minister for Local Government knows where the money will go. Despite the fact that the report covers all sorts of problems dealing with trade wastes, the Government seems

to be interested in only one problem. It has received many reports and it agreed that the Environment Protection Authority should be established. I fully agree. I hope that those who have been appointed to carry out the tasks of environment protection will quickly go into action and do what the various departments have had power to do over the years but have failed to do.

The Government has done nothing for the past seventeen years. The Minister for Local Government has said that it will cost $1,250 million to provide certain services in the outer areas of the State. Can the honorable gentleman, who is in charge of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, estimate what it will cost to service the inner areas of Melbourne and the industrial areas along the Yarra River and the Maribyrnong River? Can he tell me what it will cost to update the sewerage works to take the effluent and the trade wastes in the area? I well remember—as, I am sure, does Mr. Granter—visiting a factory in Collingwood. It was a wool scouring works in full operation and, when we introduced ourselves and asked to inspect the factory, there was a great scurry. We had to wait for half an hour until the general manager came out of the factory, but eventually we were admitted. We had no doubt that, as regards pollution of the Yarra River, this was probably the most damaging area in Melbourne.

The factory was well conducted, but the sewerage facilities were not adequate to dispose of effluent discharged from the plant. Over many years the factory had been enlarged, but there had not been a corresponding increase in facilities for the disposal of effluent. There was a sump at the back of the building to hold effluent, but this surged up and down according to the flow into it. When the level in the sump surged up, the effluent discharged into the Yarra River; when it dropped, the effluent discharged through the ordinary sewer mains.

I wonder what it would cost to provide facilities for the disposal of effluent which now enters the river in Collingwood and what it would cost to do the same to prevent effluent from entering the Maribyrnong River from industry which is situated near to it. I think it would cost a fortune; perhaps at least $1·25 million. It could be cheaper to shift industries from the area than to make available adequate facilities for waste disposal.

People speak of cleaning the Yarra River and ridding it of pollution, but where else can industrial wastes go? Many petroleum complexes have spent millions of dollars in an endeavour to meet the requirements which are laid down for the control of effluent, but already they are finding it difficult to comply. This is continuing, and will grow worse. In the Maribyrnong River area many drains have been corroded by chemicals which have discharged into the river, because that is where they must go.

A factory at Altona which is built on 200 acres of land has an admirable system of drainage—a big hole has been dug in the ground and a pipe has been installed in it. When the effluent rises above the outlet, it flows onto the paddocks. The factory is not required to obtain a permit from the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, and a similar situation exists in many areas of Melbourne.

It is all very well to say that the Environment Protection Act will be proclaimed by Christmas, and that the Environment Protection Authority will be staffed by competent officers —even though municipalities in the country do not wish to have anything to do with it—but the Government is faced with the problem of shifting factories in certain areas or providing an adequate sewerage system.

On a trip to New Zealand I observed at Christchurch what is probably one of the best sewerage systems in the southern hemisphere.

The sitting was suspended at 6.22 *p.m. until* 8.29 *p.m.*

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE—Prior to the suspension of the sitting I was referring to action taken in New Zealand to combat pollution. When members of the Drainage Committee visited New Zealand they inspected the sewerage treatment works at Christchurch, which are recognized throughout the world as one of the most efficient treatment works for a city of that size. The authorities in Christchurch had many problems before they instituted this system. Raw sewage was fed into the sea and as a result of the objections made by people in the area a massive treatment works was constructed on the edge of the city. After viewing this plant members of the committee realized that it was possible to overcome many of the problems which they had seen in other areas, especially in the larger cities. Although most of the problems in Christchurch have been overcome, there are still some difficulties, one of which is caused by effluent containing various types of household detergents. These detergents cause pollution to waters and streams.

Earlier in the debate the Minister of Housing referred to what was happening overseas, but it is well known that during the past 20 or 30 years nearly all the large streams in the United States of America, the Great Lakes and other waterways have been completely spoilt by detergents. Many reports are available in the Library on this subject and similar reports were submitted to the Drainage Committee. It is well known that the waters of the large rivers of Europe are treated at least 10 times and sometimes 20 and 30 times. In some cities the raw sewage is pumped into the river and the water is treated lower down the river and fed back into the system. For the Minister to say that this has been occurring only during the past three years is ridiculous. Members of the Drainage Committee saw this problem in many areas. They went to New Zealand to try to obtain the latest information on the subject and to submit a good report to the Government. It was only after the committee submitted its report that the Government started to take action about the environment and the control of pollution.

The Government has said a great deal about the work it is doing to combat pollution but it has never recognized the excellent report submitted by a committee of this Parliament which spent six years in an endeavour to find a solution to the problem. The Government did not accept all the findings of the committee, but it did accept some of them. In my opinion the report of the committee set the guidelines for the Government to follow.

There is no doubt that the Government has been found wanting in the actions it has taken to combat pollution. During the debate the Minister of Housing asked what Country Party and Labor Party Governments had done to alleviate pollution, but it is a well-known fact that those Governments were not in office long enough to get their teeth into the problem.

The Hon. H. R. WARD.—Excuses!

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Mr. Ward has been a member of this Parliament for only a short time and doubtless when he is defeated he will say he was not in Parliament long enough to do anything about this problem. The Government is fond of talking about the long period it has been in office and how it has introduced stable government into Victoria. The Government has been so stable that it has not touched a problem which existed when it came into office. The stage has now been reached where various authorities have been established and reports presented from which a large volume of knowledge can be obtained. However, much of this information was available twenty years ago.

The Minister also informed the House that the Government will have to spend $1,250 million over the next eight years to overcome problems

caused by the lack of sewerage facilities in Melbourne. The cost of overcoming problems associated with pollution in the inner-suburban areas will probably be double that amount. Little progress will be made because the problem has reached crisis proportions. This problem has arisen because the Government has allowed Melbourne to be developed without giving thought to the future. In the eastern suburbs there are thousands of septic tanks and the ground is seeping with effluent from these tanks. The seepage is bad enough during dry years, but the position will be even worse after a series of wet years.

Members of the Country Party have agreed to support the motion because we believe the Government stands condemned. It has stood aside and done nothing, except during the past few months when it established an authority to control pollution in Victoria.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province).—The motion before the House seeks the adjournment of the Council because of the cynicism and hypocrisy of the Government in that, whilst continuing to pay lip service to the cause of anti-pollution, it continues to permit its departments and instrumentalities to contaminate waters and endanger health in and around the State of Victoria. That is a damaging statement about any Government, but it is even more damaging when it is realized that the community is becoming aware of this danger being caused by the pollution of waters and the atmosphere. I have difficulty in understanding how the Minister of Housing is able to say that he has been aware of this problem only during the past three years.

The Hon. H. R. WARD.—The Minister did not say that.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—The Minister said that nothing had been done and that he had become aware of the problem only since 1969.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—The honorable gentleman said that the problem had received general recognition about that time.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Mr. Dickie was Minister of Health for a number of years and the Government has been in office for seventeen years, but now, as Minister of Housing, he is prepared to say that the Government has become aware of the problem only during the past three years. On a number of occasions dating back to the time when I first became a member of the House, this matter has been raised by members of the Labor Party and by members of the Country Party. Indeed, it has even been referred to by members of the Government party. All honorable members could foresee that pollution would become a major problem in the community.

On many occasions the late Honorable Buckley Machin tried to convince the Government that it should do something to alleviate pollution. He was responsible for introducing the Clean Air Bill which was eventually accepted by the Government. That Bill eventually received the support of all parties. During the debate on that measure the Minister of Housing said that pollution was a major problem, but fifteen years later he is saying that it has been brought to his attention only in the past three years.

Pollution was a problem in the United States of America many years ago and members of the Labor Party have referred to the problem in Victoria on many occasions. It is well known that raw sewage goes into small creeks and streams and eventually into the Yarra River, Merri Creek and Moonee Ponds Creek. During heavy storms sewerage mains overflow and raw sewage flows into the Yarra River and eventually into Port Phillip Bay. From there it goes to the open sea, with the result that all parts of Victoria are affected. At any part of the foreshore of Port Phillip Bay the amount of pollution is far in excess of the limit that is

accepted in other countries. Prince Charles was correct in his comment about swimming at Elwood. His comment could be applied equally to any other bayside beach because the pollution is far in excess of what would be accepted in any other part of the world.

The Hon. H. R. WARD.—Does that apply on every day?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Mr. Ward represents a bayside suburb and doubtless his constituents would have told him about the pollution that is occurring. I shall be interested to hear him tell the House about it on behalf of his constituents. Mr. Galbally referred to what is happening within the boundaries of the City of Camberwell where it was alleged that an eyesore would be developed into a golf links. The Yarra Valley, a place of natural beauty, has been dug up to a depth of 20 feet, filled with garbage and a skimming of soil placed over it. It has been said that some of the land has been replanted, but I inform the House that only about 100 square yards of land have been replanted and hundreds of acres have become desolate. The area looks like the battlefields of the Somme during the first world war. There is hardly a blade of grass on it. Large holes have been filled with rubbish which will eventually go into the Yarra River.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Has Mr. Walton seen this area?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—I have seen it and I should like to know whether the Minister has seen it.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Mr. Walton should give the House the address of the area.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—For the past half-an-hour the Minister has been studying photographs of the area, which is in North Balwyn. He could get into his car and be in the area in five minutes. Any member of the Government party could go out there and have a look at it if he desired to do so. I was there today.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—What is the address?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—I did not take a note of the names of the streets. The area is in the Yarra Valley in the vicinity of North Balwyn. It is around the Boulevard, if the honorable gentleman wants to see it, and whilst he is there he can take a look at the freeway construction which has cut a strip 300 yards wide right through the area. Not a blade of grass can be seen and the cliffs along the route appear to be 100 feet high. Motorists will be forced to look at this unsightly scenery as they drive along the freeway between their residences and their places of work.

Honorable members interjecting.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—It will be very interesting to hear honorable members who are interjecting putting a point of view on behalf of the Liberal Party. I am referring, not to a Labor electorate but to a Liberal electorate, and it will be interesting to hear the honorable members arguing that the Camberwell City Council is doing the right thing. It is significant that there is now deadly silence among Government supporters; obviously they know that what is going on is wrong.

In that area the beautiful Yarra River is constantly being filled with sewage and industrial wastes, which have been pouring into the river for centuries. Furthermore, as Mr. Swinburne pointed out, septic tank effluent overflow is also polluting the stream. When will the Government do something about it? Three years ago, in 1969, just before the State election this House passed a certain Bill and those who were members of this Chamber at the time know the Bill of which I am speaking.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—It was passed in December, 1970, after the last State election.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—The Environment Protection Act was introduced during the life of this Government.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—I shall correct myself by stating that the Government promised before the State election that it would introduce legislation, which it did immediately, but honorable members know that a Bill is not effective until it has been gazetted and that has not been done although three years have elapsed since the Bill was passed by Parliament. How foolish Government supporters must feel when they say that the Government has carried out its promise but at the same time they know that the Bill is not yet law. This is an example of the Government's thinking and hypocrisy on a matter of public importance. The Government simply pays lip service to the question of pollution in the community.

Concerning the area of which Mr. Galbally spoke, it is fairly obvious that although the Camberwell City Council says that it will plant grass and shrubs and then construct a golf course, the area will not remain open to the public as it is at present. The public has been accustomed to moving about freely in the area but if a golf course is established, particularly a private golf course, it will be available only to those who pay an annual subscription for club membership or to those who pay green fees. No other people will be allowed to make use of the area. The council is raising the level of this ground considerably, which means the water that used to inundate it in times of flood will no longer be able to do so. At a tip farther up the road, the Camberwell City Council took similar action. The action proposed by the council will mean that this part of the Yarra Valley will lose its fauna and the birds will be hunted out of the trees. I do not support the proposal; I believe the area should be left in its natural state. If anything in this State is worth protecting, it is the Yarra Valley. It was here that John Batman built his city and we should be looking after it today.

One of the problems about the tip is that the council has excavated the top soil to a depth of 20 feet, until it reached the clay. It has now started to back fill the area with garbage. The council says that it has kept a quantity of top soil to put over the top of the garbage, but members of the Labor Party consider that the whole venture has been completely unnecessary. It will mean that on the edge of the river there will be 20 feet of garbage that will remain there for the next 1,000 years. Any rain that falls will soak through the garbage into the river as there is no way of stopping it. Doubtless the Government will say that the problem will cease in ten years' time, but over many years, and even up to 100 years, the seepage from stinking garbage will be running into the river and mixing with other pollutants. Some of the garbage which will be used as filling is poisonous. As honorable members know, the wastes which come from industrial garbage bins can be quite poisonous. This will also seep into the river. Consequently much pollution will be caused as a result of the action of the Camberwell City Council. When the Minister of Housing received correspondence on the matter he passed the buck to another department.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—Did I? Was it passed to the Housing Commission?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—No, to the Minister for Local Government and other Ministers. The honorable gentleman got out of it very quickly by stating that it did not relate to the portfolio he held at the time. What will happen if there is a flood through this devastated area? I am sorry that very little rain has fallen in recent months but if heavy rain falls, thereby causing a flood, a lot of the garbage will flow down the river because there is nothing to stop it. Already pools of stagnant water are lying around. Honorable members have seen photographs of them

and several Liberal Party members have looked at the photographs for the first time.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—They show just a lot of garbage.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—If Mr. Houghton, who does not represent the area—he comes from the country—examines the photographs he will see the stagnant pools of water caused by seepage through the garbage. The honorable member is as quiet as a mouse.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Does the honorable member want me to make a noise?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—That is all he has done since he has been in this Chamber. The Minister said it was not a quarry.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—I did not mention a quarry; it was Mr. Galbally who spoke about a quarry.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—It may have been made by way of interjection from the Government side of the House, but if anybody excavates to a depth of 20 feet in a particular area, a quarry must inevitably remain. What is it if it is not a quarry? If some body excavates to a depth of 20 feet and intends to sell the top soil or stones or whatever it is, obviously a quarry will remain. That is what the Camberwell City Council has done. It has taken 20 feet of good top soil out of the area. No one can convince me that the council will put back an equivalent amount of soil because if it did it would be above the surrounding houses. The council is using the top soil somewhere else because there is insufficient room to allow it to be spread all over the garbage.

Devastation is evident along the Yarra Valley because the Camberwell City Council is bulldozing soil, putting it in other places, and replacing the area with garbage on top of which will be put a skin of sandy loam. Certainly, a lawn and a few trees will be planted but honorable members who have had municipal experience with tips will know that big trees will not grow on the top of garbage. Although the roots of trees spread through the top soil, they cannot penetrate the garbage. The area in question had a number of beautiful trees along its length, but in future there will only be a golf course with a few shrubs. The Local Government Department has informed me that the end result will be a pleasant area available for public use. I doubt very much whether the area will be available to the public because it will be a golf course. I know that the Minister for Local Government would like me to quote the letter I received from the secretary of his department, Mr. Inglis.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Yes.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—The letter is dated 24th July, 1972—I will make it available to the Minister—and states in part—

> The work as being carried out is a land reclamation scheme—

The land has been there for millions of years and yet it is claimed to be a land reclamation scheme. The letter continues—

> to raise the general level of the area which has previously been subjected to frequent flooding. The utilization of domestic garbage as a back filling material in this matter includes site works to be carried out.

Under the so-called land reclamation scheme, 20 feet of sandy loam will be taken out and replaced with 20 feet of garbage. Work of this type must inevitably destroy the natural habitat of the Yarra Valley. Mr. Galbally has quite properly raised this matter tonight. The fact that the motion refers to only one area is beside the point, as in many areas in the State similar acts of devastation are going on, but time does not permit me to go into them.

As I have pointed out the water from the Yarra River travels far and wide. It goes into Port Phillip Bay and may remain there for many months before flowing through the heads and into the ocean. It ebbs backwards and forwards and mixes with other pollution and may remain in the bay for a long period before

dispersing. Although pollution of this type is accumulating, the Government does little or nothing about it. Certainly, Parliament passed legislation three years ago but it has not even been gazetted; in other words, it is not yet law. I shall leave it to members of the House to decide whether the Government is paying only lip service to the cause of anti-pollution.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province).—This is one of the most extraordinary motions that have been moved in this House during the short time I have been a member. Doubtless many extraordinary motions were moved before my election to Parliament, but this motion suggests a grave and serious allegation against the Government which has not in the slightest been supported by members of the Labor Party tonight.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—You have not been listening.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—I have been listening, and if the honorable member had also been listening he would have heard little support for the motion under consideration. The motion refers to the cynicism and hypocrisy of the Government. The only evidence produced to support that statement refers to a tip conducted by the Camberwell City Council. The motion further refers to the Government continuing to pay lip service to the cause of anti-pollution, and yet at the same time members of the Labor Party have conceded that the Government has passed legislation which is far-reaching and forward-looking in its concept.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Only after seventeen years.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—Yes, but this legislation will ensure that in the future this State can deal with the problem of pollution in a way which will make honorable members proud. It is our duty to protect the future of the State for those who come after us. The motion also alleges that the Government permits its departments and instrumentalities to contaminate waters and endanger health. What evidence has been produced to substantiate that statement? Honorable members have heard repeated mention of the Camberwell City Council tip near the Yarra River and nothing else. Members of the Labor Party should realize that the Camberwell City Council is not a Government department or instrumentality.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—What about what Mr. Swinburne said?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—I am referring to the motion, but do I take it that Mr. Tripovich does not support his Leader and prefers to rely on what Mr. Swinburne says in support of the motion?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Is Mr. Storey defending the Camberwell City Council?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—I am defending the Government, although it does not need a defence against this motion because no supporting evidence has been presented. It is extraordinary that a motion can allege that a Government is cynical and hypocritical and yet of the vast range of things which happen in the community only one example of neglect has been alleged. What are the facts? One fact is that a municipality has performed work on a tip. Let us look at that for a moment.

Mr. Galbally has alleged that a permit was granted by the Minister for Local Government. I do not know to which permit the honorable member referred. Mr. Galbally did not tell us what the permit was, but spoke in general terms of some permit. The only tip near the Yarra in the municipality of Camberwell of which I am aware is an extension of something that has been going on for years in Camberwell. It is nothing new. It may have moved into a different area or been extended. I am aware of no permit which has been granted to allow this to be done.

In the course of many years the Camberwell council has reclaimed—I use that word despite what Mr. Walton said—waste land which was not being used for any useful purpose or availed of by the people of Camberwell. That land has been made into good parkland.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—That is cynical.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—What is cynical?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—What you have just said, that the land is not being put to any useful purpose—the beautiful Yarra Valley!

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—This is a typical example of the so-called evidence which has been advanced in support of the motion. Mr. Galbally and Mr. Walton talked at large about the beautiful Yarra Valley, but what they really referred to was one little area of the Yarra Valley which I suspect they had never seen before. They do not know what it was like before this tipping operation was commenced. They have no conception of the fine work that has been carried out to make this land something that the people can enjoy in the future—not just the residents of Camberwell but people generally.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—If one is a member of the golf club.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—I am not a member of the golf club, but I enjoy the facilities of the land in the City of Camberwell which has been reclaimed and made available for the people generally. I can take Mr. Walton to many places in the City of Camberwell, not only on the banks of the Yarra, where little athletics are conducted, sporting events take place, and the public can walk around or take their dogs for a walk, all on land that has been reclaimed and made useful for the people of Camberwell. I have tipped my garden rubbish on the tip to which I assume Mr. Galbally referred. I know that land. It was desolate waste land and was not any part of the glorious Yarra Valley which has been mentioned.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Did you tip your rubbish before the tip started there or after?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—I have done so over a period of years.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Illegally?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—If I have done it illegally then I will reclaim my tipping fee of 40 cents from the Camberwell council. I do not know whether it will be refunded.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—They are the very people whom the health inspectors are chasing.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—The health officers are from the City of Camberwell and they are the ones who over the years have claimed the fee. Of course, this is a legal operation, not an illegal operation. It is necessary to clarify the words I am using, because members of the Opposition tend to mis-hear what is being said tonight.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—You have been tipping rubbish there over many years and the tip has been there only for a short time.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—I have tipped on that area over many years. I tipped on the area to which Mr. Walton is referring about three weeks ago. I took some shrubbery and branches which I had cut off at home to the tip in that area but I still had to reach it through the same area as I had over the years. I know of no other area so I assume that is the one referred to by Mr. Galbally. If that is so, it is merely another step in the same tipping operation which has been going on for years.

This motion is directed to the Government and there is no evidence of any cynicism or hypocrisy on the part of the Government. There is no evidence that the Government has behaved other than lawfully. No evidence has been submitted that the

Government has permitted its departments or instrumentalities to contaminate water or endanger health.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The Government has the ultimate responsibility for the acts of the Department of Health and the Board of Works.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—The Government is ultimately responsible for everything that happens in the community, but under our sphere of operations we believe in the role of municipalities. I have often heard members of the Labor Party express this view.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The municipality had to get permission from the Commission of Public Health and there is a Minister of Health. Must not the Minister take the responsibility for that permission?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—Mr. Galbally is asking some obvious questions.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Blame everybody but the Government!

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—Mr. Galbally is making statements without allowing the witness to whom he is addressing the questions to answer. Of course, the Government accepts responsibility for its Commission of Public Health. If a permit was sought, as I assume it was since Mr. Galbally says so, I am sure that permit would have been considered, the correct proceedings followed, the proper considerations applied, and a decision made whether it should be granted. The permit was granted. Mr. Galbally is setting his judgment against the judgment of the competent and expert persons who form the Commission of Public Health.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—No. I am saying that the Government had no right to desecrate the Yarra Valley.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—He does not believe in reclamation.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—Mr. Galbally does not believe in reclamation and talks in airy terms of desecrating the Yarra Valley without referring to the specific piece of land with which he is concerned.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I told you it is an area of 100 acres.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—Mr. Galbally says the land is an area of 100 acres and attempts to speak of the Yarra Valley as a whole in one breath without looking at the 100 acres concerned. The danger to health, as suggested by Mr. Galbally, has not been established. If the commission considered that there was any danger to health obviously it would not issue a permit.

Honorable members interjecting.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—It is good to know that honorable members are listening to what I am saying and interesting to learn that members of the Opposition are prepared to quarrel with a decision of the competent, experienced and authoritative health commission which has been appointed to decide these matters. If evidence is presented which proves that the Commission of Public Health made a wrong decision, of course, it must be examined, but no such evidence has been presented tonight.

Mr. Galbally stated that it is important to remember individual citizens in the community. I am glad Mr. Galbally made that point because it is true. What Mr. Galbally is really saying is that greater and greater bureaucracies should be set up to prevent anything happening which may interfere with an individual citizen who wishes to exercise a right which may harm the community. Plainly a balance must be struck between the rights of the community and the rights of the individual citizen. Bodies have been established to do that. By means of the Environment Protection Act a significant step forward has been taken to ensure the protection of individuals in the future. It is remarkable that

within a motion framed in such extravagant and strong language the mover could not present any more than one piece of evidence relating not to a Government department or instrumentality but to a municipality, which once it is given a permit is lawfully entitled to do what it is doing. In those circumstances the motion should be thoroughly rejected.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province).—I deplore the ignorance of the last speaker about his province, the workings of government, the responsibility of the Government, and the disposal of municipal garbage. The State Development Committee carried out inquiries, assisted by the Government organization, the Commission of Public Health into the disposal and/or destruction of garbage and other rubbish.

I shall deal with some of the factors which have been blatantly forgotten such as the animal faeces coming out of the Royal Agricultural Showgrounds into the Maribyrnong River. The Minister of Health, who is responsible under the Act, should immediately resign his portfolio because he is not carrying out his duties in accordance with the oath he took. In April, 1971, the progress report of the State Development Committee was presented to His Excellency the Governor in Council. Last week I asked what the Government had done about the recommendations in the report. What has the Government done? It has made a great song and dance about an urgent matter—the danger of pollution in the western suburbs—that the committee brought to the attention of the former Premier, Sir Henry Bolte. The Government then appointed a committee to demonstrate how anxious it was. Last week I asked the following question on notice:—

(*a*) What sections of the progress report of the State Development Committee on the disposal and/or destruction of garbage and other rubbish have been put into effect?

(*b*) What further actions are proposed in respect of recommendations in the report?

The reply of the Minister of Agriculture was—

The recommendations of the committee concerning pollution of underground aquifers have been considered by an inter-departmental committee. The Government has acted on the proposal of that committee to initiate the installation by private enterprise of a liquid waste treatment plant at Brooklyn. It has also purchased land at Werribee as a future treatment site.

This is not contained in the report which demonstrates that the question cannot even be answered properly. The Minister continued—

After receiving a report from another inter-departmental committee, the Government has agreed to refer the remaining recommendations of the State Development Committee to the Environment Protection Authority for implementation through its Solid Wastes Management Branch.

Let us examine some of the recommendations. The previous speaker referred to evidence from the Board of Works, the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission and the Commission of Public Health. The committee unanimously came to its decision. On page 7 of the progress report of the State Development Committee, the following conclusions appeared:—

43. Proposals to conduct sanitary landfill projects in quarries and clay pits, etc., should be carefully examined in the light of all available geological data, with particular reference to the ability of the rock or clay to retard, or aid, the discharge of contaminants into aquifers.

44. Any proposal to use refuse to fill estuarine or other marine waters would require careful expert examination in the light of the hydraulic and ecological characteristics of the receiving waters in order to assess possible injurious effects on the environment, such as pollution or erosion.

45. The location of sanitary landfill sites near watercourses, other bodies of surface water, or sources of groundwater, is undesirable because of the attendant risk of pollutants harmful to the community, and the environment in general entering bodies of water used for domestic water supplies or other purposes.

The committee was not fully satisfied with the conclusions and went further in its report. I advise Mr. Storey that members of the Government party

on the committee unanimously supported the committee's findings. The following recommendations appear on page 9 of the committee's report:—

22. That legislation be enacted, requiring the Commission of Public Health to refer proposals to establish refuse disposal sites to the appropriate water supply authorities servicing the particular areas in which the proposed depots are to be established.

23. That, in cases where refuse disposal sites are located in close proximity to watercourses, bodies of surface water, or sources of groundwater, a monitoring programme be put in hand to ensure that contaminants injurious to public health, or the environment generally, do not inhibit water supplies.

24. That the practice of siting refuse disposal depots on flood plains, which are of significance in so far as flood control is concerned, be discontinued.

The committee received sworn evidence that the Camberwell area referred to by my Leader is a flood plain. On page 20, under the heading "Health Hazards Associated with Disposal of Garbage and other Domestic Refuse" the committee states—

In the opinion of the committee, the chief hazard to public health is posed by the siting of municipal tips adjacent to watercourses, bodies of surface water or sources of groundwater, with the attendant danger of pollution of water supplies.

I pay tribute to Mr. Swinburne and his colleagues on the Drainage Committee which produced an excellent report because the subject matter tied in with the investigations being undertaken by the State Development Committee on the disposal and/or destruction of garbage and other rubbish.

I shall now deal with the hotch potch of legislation relating to this matter. Although the Acts were consolidated in 1958, it is necessary to examine numerous Acts to find out where responsibility lies concerning the establishment of municipal tips. Even then a person can be easily misled. The table of amendments to the Health Act indicates that sub-sections (2A) and (2B) were inserted in section 49A by paragraph (*a*) of subsection (2) of section 3 of Act No. 7849, which is the Groundwater Act. That Act deals with the powers of the Commission of Public Health concerning the establishment of tips.

The Government's exercise of responsibility in the establishment of tips merits close examination and the State Development Committee was mindful of this when it prepared its report. The Government should not try to tell honorable members that it has not had ample warning of these dangers, because two Government party members of the State Development Committee were critical of the Government's refusal to meet its responsibilities.

Earlier, I mentioned the cesspool of matter flowing from the Royal Agricultural Showgrounds. This matter was highlighted in the *Herald* of 29th September last. The director of the Royal Agricultural Society denied that animal excreta was pouring into the Maribyrnong River as had been alleged by the chief health officer of the Essendon City Council. The article in the *Herald* states—

Storm water drains flowed bright green into the Maribyrnong River today.

The color came from a fluorescent indicator dye released at the showgrounds.

It was poured into about 20 drains in animal wash areas where large quantities of excreta are washed away with water hoses.

"I released it at areas which I suspected were not connected to sewerage," Essendon council chief health officer, Mr. Doug Brudenell, said.

"There are definitely some animal wash areas, including some cattle wash areas, that are not connected to sewerage."

The article continues in some detail but I shall not weary the House by reading further from it. However, I commend it to honorable members of the Government party to show that the Government is guilty of allowing contaminants to flow into the Maribyrnong River.

Contaminants are also flowing into the Maribyrnong River farther south because of effluent discharge from Government department establishments. I have raised this matter in

questions and when appropriate Bills have been before the House. The area concerned runs parallel to Dynon Road and New Footscray Road, and contains many Government buildings. The Government cannot even police its own departments. If this sort of thing existed in the salubrious suburbs it would be a different story. The Government is bent on making the western suburbs the backyard garbage tips of the metropolitan area. The people in the western suburbs will not stand for this situation any longer.

The *Sun News-Pictorial* of 28th September contains an article headed "Firms, Authorities say: Don't Blame Us. The city 'cesspool'—who is at fault?" The area referred to in the article embraces the wholesale fruit and vegetable market, the fish market and many firms which have been established on Crown land along New Footscray Road. The area is less than two miles from Melbourne and is not even sewered. Contaminants run into the Maribyrnong River and the Merri Creek, yet the Government has the audacity to claim that it has done something with respect to pollution. I invite members of the Government party to inspect the pollution in this area tomorrow morning. The article to which I refer states—

More than 2,000 people work daily in the Footscray Road "cesspool" district.

Thirty firms in the area use septic tanks and several others are spending thousands of dollars installing sewage treatment plants.

The firms, the Board of Works and the city council all agreed yesterday that the lack of sewerage in Footscray Road—less than 1½ miles from the city—was a problem.

But no one would accept responsibility.

A board official said the problem was caused by the council allowing development without ensuring that septic tanks were effective.

He said that despite talks with the council on financing a sewerage scheme, a compromise could not be arranged.

Only area unsewered.

It was the only "substantial" unsewered area near the city, the official said.

The chairman of the council's health committee. Mr. Maurice Ress, said the situation worried him.

"I will make it my business to approach the State Government and the board to see if money can be made available to sewer the area," he said.

I invite members of the Liberal Party and the former Minister of Health to inspect the area. Despite the Minister's claims tonight, the Government has done nothing to combat pollution in this area.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—How is it that the health inspector in your area is correct in what he does but in Camberwell the health inspector is not?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—When the Minister of Housing was Minister of Health he was responsible for allowing contaminants to enter Jackson's Creek, and the Minister of Public Works has done nothing about providing a proper sewerage system at the Sunbury Mental Hospital, from where effluent flows into Jackson's Creek.

I now refer to the report of the Senate Select Committee on Water Pollution, which was brought up and ordered to be printed on 10th June, 1970.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—Mr. President, could we have the document properly identified?

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I think it has been correctly identified, but Mr. Knight may indicate that it is the Australian Senate.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—For the benefit of Mr. Hamilton and for your guidance, Sir, it is the report from the Senate Select Committee on Water Pollution, which was brought up and ordered to be printed by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia on 10th June, 1970. On page 39 of the report, the committee deals with water pollution problems in Victoria and states—

Water pollution problems already exist in many parts of Victoria and they are increasing. The commissioner, State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, Mr. K. D. Green, said that, from a State point of view, he did not believe the situation was

serious but the potential for serious problems existed. A map supplied by the commission shows that the main areas affected are various rivers, reservoirs and large expanses of waters such as Port Phillip Bay, Westernport Bay, coastal waters adjacent to towns discharging sewage effluents or raw sewage into the sea, and the Gippsland lakes.

The main types of pollutants are effluents from sewage treatment plants, untreated sewage effluents, septic tank effluents, domestic sullage, treated and untreated trade wastes, milk wastes, thermal pollution, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, manure from feedlots, mining wastes, saline discharge from irrigation areas and groundwater, and heavy nutrient loadings.

The report then goes on to deal with other matters in that area. Even the Senate Select Committee has had a go at Victoria!

Less than one mile from where I reside is a tidal channel which flows from the Cherry Tree artificial lake in the City of Altona. The tidal area comes back to this artificial lake and the railway line runs across it. Approximately a fortnight ago the Board of Works decided to clean it out and brought trucks and a bulldozer to the area. The former Minister of Public Works knows a lot about the problems of pollution of Port Phillip Bay and surrounding areas. The contaminated silt was taken from the tidal channel and dumped on the banks of the Kororoit Creek, which is half a mile upstream from the discharge of this tidal area. The rain which fell last night and today has washed most of the silt back into the Kororoit Creek which, as the former Minister of Health knows, has been badly polluted for a long time and the Government has done nothing about it. In this instance, the Government allowed one of its authorities to put contaminated sludge on the banks of a creek where it was exposed to the atmosphere and as a result of rain was washed back into the creek.

I now relate my remarks to the discharge of effluent from the Sunbury Mental Hospital into Jackson's Creek. The situation there leaves a lot to be desired. The answer by the Government on this matter is that it has started to do something. Jackson's Creek is a tributary of the Maribynong River and pollutants are entering the creek from the mental hospital as well as from industries in the area. Complaints have been made by the municipalities on many occasions, but these complaints have been ignored. The Government has done nothing to stop the pollution.

If my colleague Mr. Elliot were not away on other Parliamentary duties, doubtless he would raise the matter of the Cowderoy Street drain at West St. Kilda. I remind honorable members who were not then members of this Chamber that the question of the Cowderoy Street drain was raised back in 1963 when I represented the area. However, my good friend and colleague, Mr. Trayling, informs me that the same situation prevails today as it did then.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—The problem also existed in 1954.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—Mr. Campbell fell for the trap! The Government was party to the construction of a groyne in the area which has caused this problem. Mr. Campbell was not a member at the time and does not know the full history of the matter.

The Government has attempted to say what it has done to improve the Elwood Canal—a stinking morass if ever there was one—which discharges effluent and contaminants into the bay. The former Minister of Health—now Minister of Housing—had the audacity to say that the Government has taken steps to improve the situation. The honorable gentleman also mentioned the Thames River in England. I was in London at the same time as the Minister. The Stockholm conference of the United Nations Organization was a political success, but it was a failure from the point of view of technical officers because they did not have many conferences.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE.—Was Mr. Knight present?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—No, but I have spoken to persons who were. Several days later I visited a company which helped to cleanse the Thames River. I was able to see fish in the river and wildlife along its banks. Naturally, a river becomes discoloured, but contaminants can be kept out of it. Man has set out to destroy himself by not ensuring that the rivers and streams are kept clean. After long discussions with technical men in England I returned to Australia happy with the state of the Thames River. I also saw the Danube and the Rhine which are now being treated along the same lines as the Thames.

Although the officers of the Environment Protection Authority have done a magnificent job, I advise the Government to get in touch with the provincial Government in Toronto. When I visited there I spoke with persons concerned with the protection of the environment and asked how they trained enforcement officers. I was informed that it was simply a matter of recruiting men from industry who were aware of the problem and who could talk to all the people associated with water, air, noise and other forms of pollution. The Government should send some men to Toronto to be trained. I think the Minister of Housing will agree that the men concerned have done a magnificent job in that city. I would class them with the world's leaders. When I spoke to environment protection officers there I had in mind that the former Minister of Health said that it is not easy to train pollution enforcement officers. However, I was told that it was simply a matter of recruiting furnace and boiler operators and various other men from the factory floor and training them to combat pollution. The stage has now been reached in Toronto where men are being trained in the more technical aspects of pollution abatement.

If one takes a ride in a canoe or a boat or walks along the banks of Kororoit Creek or Maribyrnong River one can see where Government departments discharge effluent into the water. The Government has taken no action to control pollution of the waterways in the metropolitan area or throughout Victoria. I invite members of the Government party to come with me tomorrow and inspect the areas to which I have referred. The existing situation has not developed overnight. On many occasions since I have been a member of this Chamber I have raised the question of pollution in the western suburbs. The Government has failed miserably in its task of pollution abatement. Its announcements are merely window dressing for the forthcoming Federal elections and the State elections to be held next year.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL (East Yarra Province).—The motion moved by Mr. Galbally contains the word "hypocrisy". It staggers me that Mr. Galbally should use that word against the Government when I recall that on 26th March, 1970, he refused leave for the Government to introduce into this Chamber the Water Pollution Control Bill. Mr. Galbally complained this evening that the Government was not taking action to control pollution in rivers and streams. What has happened since March, 1970? After a time, a general election was held and the Government was returned to office. In the interim, the Government decided that it should consider not only water pollution but every aspect of pollution control; therefore, instead of proceeding with the earlier Bill, which dealt purely with water control, it brought in a Bill later in 1970 to deal with the environment as a whole.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—That measure has still not been gazetted —two years later.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Walton's comment clearly indicates that no member of the Opposition has any idea of the work entailed in developing a department of this kind.

Any Government in Australia at present has difficulty in recruiting skilled staff in this profession. That is why the Government handled the legislation as it has. Endeavours have been made to recruit skilled persons from throughout the world, and the Government has been fortunate in obtaining persons with the required skills. It has laid the foundation on which is now being built the Environment Protection Authority which will secure for the people of Victoria a proper environment in which to live.

The other point made by Mr. Galbally in his speech related to the City of Camberwell, which is within the province that I represent. I support Mr. Storey's comments in this regard and point out that the area referred to by Mr. Galbally has been prone to flooding for many years. When a municipality is faced with a situation such as this, it must consider what is best in the interests of the residents of the area and of the community in general. People in the immediate vicinity of low-lying land may have to contend with continual stagnant pools of water. It cannot be denied that that situation has existed in this area in every year other than a drought year. What effect does this have on the health of the community?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—None.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Stagnant water can bring mosquitoes and flies, and can be injurious to health for another important reason —an aspect that has not been mentioned by any member of the Opposition—that is, the pollution brought about by the people themselves. People are responsible for the pollution of the streams—not only industry, but John Citizen who throws old bedsteads, gas stoves, dead dogs and so on into the streams. Mr. Knight mentioned the Elwood Canal. It is true that some time ago the Government had the canal cleaned out. What did John Citizen do? He filled it with rubbish again. Therefore, it is unfair to place the whole blame for the pollution that exists at the feet of the Government when John Citizen is contributing to it.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—John Citizen is not polluting the Yarra—it is the Government.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Galbally should be honest and admit that John Citizen is doing likewise.

Many parts of the area of land about which Mr. Galbally spoke are at the R.L. 32 level. The average annual flood level on that part of the Yarra is between 38 and 40 R.L. The Camberwell council is building up the land in accordance with Schedule 4 of the General Sanitary Regulations made under the Health Acts. Mr. Galbally did not read the provision in full. The land is being built up above the average R.L. flood level so that it can be better used for the purpose for which it has been set aside.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—For golf clubs!

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—No, it will be used for public recreation. I have been assured by the officers of the Camberwell City Council this evening that that area of land will not be used for a golf club. So that is on the record. The land will be filled in accordance with the regulations made under the Health Acts. When Mr. Galbally referred to item 10 of regulation 36 in Schedule 4 of the General Sanitary Regulations 1950 he said, "Refuse shall not be deposited in water", and there he stopped. In full, item 10 states—

> Refuse shall not be deposited in water without the special approval of the Commission.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Are you suggesting that the council received special permission?

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Of course the council has the permission of the Commission of Public Health.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Are you sure of that?

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Galbally reminds me of the lady who had her face lifted so often that

when she sat down her mouth flew open. He should give someone else a go. All honorable members will see that the photographs distributed in the House tonight by Mr. Galbally were taken when there were puddles of water in the area.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—They were taken within the past three days.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It rained like the devil today, and it rained like the devil last week. That is why there is the odd puddle of water in the area. It is obvious that the gentleman who took the photograph has been skulking around waiting for rain so that he could take these photographs with rain water lying on the ground. It is not water which is there under normal conditions. The Camberwell council is not tipping rubbish into water. The water has gathered as a result of overnight rain. The council has assured me that no rubbish is placed in that area until the water has drained away.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY.—The water came after the rubbish.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—That is true. The Camberwell City Council must adhere to the regulations made under the Health Act. I mention this because Mr. Galbally has said that there are flies and heaven knows what else around the tipping area of an evening. When one examines the regulations, one wonders how this situation referred to by Mr. Galbally can be created. Under the regulations, the council must completely cover the rubbish with soil every evening.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—That must be done at every tip.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—But the House was not told that this must be done at every tip every evening. The rubbish must be covered by some form of soil.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—You mean that it should be.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It is covered.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—What is the regulation?

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It is item 7 of regulation 36 in Schedule 4 of the General Sanitary Regulations 1950. It provides—

> The top, the face, and the exposed flank or flanks of the tip shall be covered at the end of each day's operation.

That is done at Camberwell.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—That is not done at Camberwell. I lived next to it and I know.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It is done at Camberwell. I know where Mr. Tripovich lived and it was nowhere near the area. Item 5 provides—

> The tip shall be properly consolidated by traffic or by mechanical plant.

That is also done by the Camberwell City Council. These regulations comprise the specifications laid down by the Department of Health to the Camberwell City Council. They operate in the interests of the community as a whole when an area is used as a tip and to safeguard the health of the people in the vicinity. These objectives are achieved by the garbage being covered with earth and consolidated each evening. The fears of which Mr. Galbally spoke, the risk of hepatitis and the like, are completely unwarranted in this situation.

I support the comments of the Minister of Housing and of Mr. Storey that the Opposition has not shown that the Government has failed the people of this State in respect of pollution.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—I support the motion and I refer particularly to the cynicism and hypocrisy of the Government. If ever one heard hypocrisy, it was heard tonight from the honorable members representing East Yarra Province. Their attitude was typical of the attitude of the Government to pollution. Some ten or twelve years ago, the Camberwell City Council faced the same problem as a number of other councils, including the

Melbourne City Council, in disposing of its garbage. It was not blessed, as the western suburbs are, with disused quarries which can be filled.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—It was fourteen years ago.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I accept that it was fourteeen years ago. The council then had to decide what to do with its garbage. Mr. Campbell said that I did not live alongside any of these places where the Camberwell City Council disposed of its garbage, but I did. The first fill and cover garbage tip used by the Camberwell City Council was along Gardiner's Creek, downstream from Warrigal Road. For eight years any person wanting to sell a home in the area faced great difficulty. There were mosquitoes in the summer and rats as big as rabbits. The kids enjoyed themselves chasing the rats.

I agree with Mr. Campbell that there are regulations on the use of this type of tip but I suggest to him that the council often found it difficult to comply with them because there was not enough earth available to cover the rubbish, and so it was not covered. When the rain came, the stench in the area was unbearable. This did not matter to the council because the people living in the area were only Housing Commission tenants and the attitude was, "What of them?".

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—That is not true.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Many protests were made by residents of the area. They were most unhappy about the garbage being tipped there. It was economic necessity which caused the council to decide to dispose of its garbage in this way. The next area which was used as a fill and cover tip was near the Burke Road Bridge.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I should point out, as I pointed out to Mr. Galbally earlier, that my interpretation of the motion is that it criticizes the Government for permitting its departments and instrumentalities to do certain things. Mr. Tripovich should not spend so much time debating what the Camberwell City Council has done unless it concerns the granting of permits by the Government to the council. The honorable member should relate his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I shall relate my remarks to the terms of the motion. Mr. Galbally has already pointed out that item 10 of regulation 36 in Schedule 4 of the General Sanitary Regulations provides that refuse shall not be deposited in water without the special approval of the Commission of Public Health. Mr. Campbell has been good enough to confirm that the Department of Health gave its permission, irrespective of the wishes of the people who live nearby.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—The council is not doing what you are saying it is.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—There is contaminated water and it stinks. I know that it stinks because I lived alongside. Some of the people who live near Burke Road have had to put up with this type of tip and with the stench, the rats, and the inconvenience, which reduced the values of their properties for a number of years and is possibly still doing so. The council was not using this method of garbage disposal to provide playing space; it was a matter of economics. The protests of the people nearby were disregarded because the attitude adopted was that inconvenience to a few people did not matter.

The speeches of the two honorable members representing the East Yarra Province and of the Minister of Housing have shown the hypocrisy of the Government on this subject. The Minister said that, if it had not been for President Nixon discovering that pollution was a good electoral issue in 1969, the people of the world would not be concerned and that President

Nixon could be blamed for introducing this controversial subject. That is not so, and I commend Mr. Swinburne for his speech, which was completely documented. Mr. Swinburne uncovered the hypocrisy of the Government on this issue.

This all goes back to 1946 and it could be asked why the Government of that day did not do something. At that time there was a Labor Government and prior to that there was a Country Party Government. Some honorable members might not be old enough to realize that those Governments existed when the country was fighting the second world war, or in years when there was a need to rehabilitate a million men and women who were discharged from the services, and no facilities to deal with matters of this type were available.

The late Buckley Machin, a former member of this House, who represented Melbourne West Province, found considerable support amongst not only members of the Labor Party but also members of the Country Party when he clamoured time and time again for the introduction of a Bill to deal with air pollution. I shall examine the attitude of the Government when our late colleague introduced a private member's Bill on 8th May, 1957. A former member for Gippsland Province, the late William MacAulay, voiced the common reaction of all Government supporters when he interjected, as reported at page 523 of volume 251 of *Hansard*—

> Where will the finance come from?

That was the attitude of the Government to projects such as this. The Minister of Housing, who was then a representative of Ballaarat Province, commended Mr. Machin and said, as reported at page 952 of volume 251 of *Hansard*—

> Over the years I have studied it closely and, as I am a fully qualified boiler attendant, possibly I am a proper person to speak on this subject.

He was referring to air pollution, and proceeded to point out to the House that if the boiler attendants were properly qualified and fired their fires properly, they would be able to control the smoke that came from the stacks and there would be no pollution. What a stupid argument and what hypocrisy! On 22nd May, 1957, Mr. Dickie, who was later to become Minister of Health, described the Bill as " like trying to cure cancer by legislation." Sir Ewan Cameron, the then Minister of Health, commented that " it was a complex subject and that as yet no satisfactory solution to the problem had been found." The late Sir Ronald Mack, who represented Western Province and later became Minister of Health, said that the only doubt he had was whether the Bill as it stood could achieve its purpose and he further stated that he was doubtful how efficient it would be. The Bill passed as a private member's Bill with the support of the Labor Party and the Country Party. When the measure was transmitted to another place the Government took it over because it was not game to defeat it. The Clean Air Bill was then enacted.

My Leader complained about the hypocrisy of this Government which accepted a Bill, was responsible for its enactment, and then did nothing about it. I remember the late Honorable Buckley Machin standing in the position now occupied by Mr. Knight and asking when committees would be established and what the Government was going to do about clean air. I remember Mr. Colin Willman, the clean air spokesman for the Melbourne Trades Hall Council, writing in the newspapers asking when the Government was going to do something about clean air and saying how the air was being polluted. I recall the Lux factory at Brunswick, in my province, emitting dirty yellow smoke all over the district. I also recall not only the late Mr. Machin but later Mr. Knight speaking about the Carbon Black factory at Altona. But the Government would do nothing positive about clean air legislation.

Time went on until the famous year of 1969 when President Nixon woke up Mr. Dickie, then Minister of

Health, to the subject of pollution. Until then it was something about which nothing could be done. But an election was in the offing; it was not a bad political issue to rush through a Bill in the closing stages of Parliament and for the Government to say, "This is what we are going to do about water pollution". When the Opposition said, "No, the Government is not going to get away with this" and my Leader refused leave, the Government was not game to continue Parliament for another day and bring back the Bill. It said, "This naughty Opposition has stopped us from bringing forward this Bill." That was after the Government had been in office for fourteen years.

Mr. Swinburne referred to the Ministerial statement of the Minister for Local Government in relation to sewerage, made in this House last month. Why did the honorable gentleman unexpectedly make this statement to the House? It was because of the report of the Environment Protection Authority entitled *Yarra River and Tributaries,* dated September, 1972, pursuant to sections 16 to 19 of the Environment Protection Act. The Bolte Government had been in office for fifteen years and if President Nixon had not woken it up to the fact that pollution was a good election issue, the Government would never have woken up.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—It took no notice of the Duke of Edinburgh.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Yes, and the Prince of Wales had a few words to say about swimming at Elwood. This is no laughing matter. The Minister for Local Government said that it would cost $1,250 million to deal with sewerage and drainage from septic tanks in unsewered areas, mainly in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I did not say mainly in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I do not want to correct the honorable gentleman but I shall read his statement as reported at page 493 of *Hansard* of 22nd September of this year. The Minister said—

> Over the next eight years, Victorian authorities, both metropolitan and country, will require some $1,250 million for capital expenditure on and in connection with urban sewerage and drainage water supply works.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Exactly.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I interpose my own comments to say that nearly 90 per cent of this will be spent in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That is not so.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—80 per cent?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That is not so.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Let me go a little lower. Is it 70 per cent?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That is a little closer.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I am not going to be jiggled around on this. I remind the Minister that nearly 70 per cent of the population live in the metropolitan area so the figure must be at least 70 per cent.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—You are getting closer to the mark now.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I suggest that is a pretty fair limit so not much is going into decentralized areas. I refer to page 4 of the report entitled *Yarra River and Tributaries* which states—

> The Melbourne urban area has some unsewered industrial areas and has only 85 per cent of domestic premises connected to sewers. The unsewered premises are mainly on the developing fringes of Melbourne and can be divided into two groups. In unsewered areas, householders must rely on septic tanks until sewerage is extended to them.
>
> In sewered areas, many householders chose not to connect their premises to the sewer and continue allowing septic tank overflow and sullage water to drain from their premises into the environment. A few municipalities contain most of these 21,000 premises. In Doncaster and Templestowe, 60 per cent of dwellings in sewered areas are not connected.

The tributaries in the western half of the catchment drain urban areas and carry their waste load to the Yarra.

This is why my Leader laid greater emphasis on the Yarra River. I shall not weary the House long but I wish to place on record what has happened during the seventeen years of neglect by the Government to the Yarra Valley despite the protestations of Sir Vernon Christie, the honorable member for Ivanhoe in another place, who represents part of this area. The Yarra River has a number of tributaries one of which is the Olinda Creek. The report also states—

Olinda Creek drains unsewered residential areas in Mount Evelyn, Lilydale and small townships in the Dandenongs. In Lilydale, 40 per cent. of premises in declared sewered areas are unconnected. A major source of pollution is a dairy factory.

The Lilydale sewage treatment plant contributes treated effluent to the creek . . . The creek has a milky appearance and a high bacterial count as it discharges into the Yarra. . . .

That was the Olinda Creek in 1972. The report later refers to the Woori Yallock Creek and says—

The headwaters of the creek and its tributary, Cockatoo Creek, drain several close settled and unsewered areas, including Olinda, Monbulk, Emerald, Cockatoo and Gembrook. High turbidity is caused by soil erosion.

A number of creeks are mentioned and I shall briefly comment on them. The authority reported as follows on the Diamond Creek:—

Diamond Creek becomes highly contaminated upon reaching Eltham, with a large waste loading from unsewered residential areas and some loading from the unsewered industrial areas. This is a turbid brown stream with high bacterial counts and low dissolved oxygen content.

Of the Plenty River, the report says, *inter alia*—

Upstream of Greensborough the stream is moderately polluted. However, at Greensborough and further downstream near Macleod, the waste load from unsewered residential areas increases the pollution level of the stream.

It refers to the Koonung Creek in these terms—

Upstream of Middleborough Road, the creek is in poor condition, grey and foaming with an upleasant odour.

The Hon. J. M. Tripovich.

These conditions exist after this Government has been in office for seventeen years. Did the honorable member for Ivanhoe, Sir Vernon Christie, tell the Government of these matters in the party room? If not, he told them through the Save The Yarra Valley Committee. Commenting further on the Koonung Creek, the authority said—

The creek receives its largest waste contribution from the unconnected dwellings in sewered areas.

The effect of household detergents is evident near the entrance to the Yarra River where the creek drops 1 metre and a foam bank forms, about 3 metres wide by 12 metres in length and up to 3 metres deep. There is also a very high bacterial count there.

I remind the House that this report was issued in 1972, seventeen years after this Government came into office.

Referring to Ruffeys Creek, the report states, *inter alia*—

Ruffeys Creek drains a small catchment area. An unsewered industrial area of less than 8 hectares (19 acres) and an unsewered residential area of 555 hectares (1,370 acres) contribute a total in excess of 157 kilograms (347 lbs.) of biological oxygen demand per day.

. . . . . .

Ruffeys Creek is a highly polluted stream. Extensive urbanization within this unsewered catchment is further increasing the pollution levels within this stream.

I remind the House that the Yarra River has many tributaries which are highly polluted. Of Fitzsimmons Lane drain, the report states—

This open channel drains the development immediately east of Ruffeys Creek catchment, and is also polluted by waste loading from residential unsewered development.

Of Mullum Mullum Creek, it states—

The creek is in a degenerated condition within the Croydon North-Ringwood urban unsewered area, carrying domestic and industrial waste but improves downstream as it traverses the woodland and orchard country towards the Yarra River.

All of these areas are represented by Liberal Parliamentarians. Apparently, the people in the area are conservative voters who are content to be represented by members whose representation is hypocritical.

The report also comments on Brushy Creek. It states, *inter alia*—

> The stream is of very poor quality and has the grey appearance typical of sullage waters.

Of Gardiner's Creek it states, *inter alia*—

> Drains in the east contain sullage flows with typical sullage fungus and algal growths . . . high bacterial counts occur at the outflow from the creek to the Yarra River.

I suggest that on the evidence which has been presented in this Chamber tonight by my Leader and by the Leader of the Country Party on pollution, the Government cannot deny that it has been hypocritical in its approach to this problem. I have pointed out already that this situation exists after the Government has been in office for seventeen years. Previously we had the "B" or "Bolte" era, and now that there is a new Premier, we are in the "AB" or "After-Bolte" era. The Government is turning over a new leaf, but that leaf ought to read "The end" for the Liberal Party Government, which for seventeen years has done little to combat pollution in Victoria except to introduce as a political gimmick a measure relating to the problem.

I have no doubt that Mr. J. H. Alder, who is now the Acting Chairman of the Environment Protection Authority, will do his utmost to achieve results, but I point out that there is not one expert of world renown now on that authority.

My party believes that the Government stands condemned for its cynicism and hypocrisy in that, whilst continuing to pay lip service to the cause of anti-pollution, it continues to permit its departments and instrumentalities to contaminate waters and endanger health in and around the State of Victoria and that, on the evidence that has been presented, the House should now adjourn.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—I have always found that those who cry "Cheat" most frequently are the biggest cheats of all, and that those who loudly accuse others of being liars are usually bigger liars.

Accusations of cynicism and hypocrisy on the part of the Government have been made, but when one looks at the facts of the matter one sees that cynicism and hypocrisy are in fact the attitudes which are adopted by honorable members on the other side of the House.

This motion has been based on a single issue, namely, the tip at Camberwell. Members of the Labor Party know that it is an issue on which they cannot lose, especially in the eyes of people who live near tips. People do not like living near tips, but I think everyone realizes that they are necessary and that councils are obliged by law to provide them and that their location is decided on a non-political basis in a way which provides a safeguard for everybody.

There are two requirements before a tip can be established. One is that a consent must be obtained from the Commission of Public Health which acts in an arbitrary capacity free from political influence. As all honorable members know, or should know, a proposal is advertised and public objections are invited. Objectors are entitled to be heard, if they wish, and the commission grants or refuses its consent after taking into account all of the factors involved. It looks at the issues of health and welfare.

A permit is also required in relation to planning for a tip. That is granted by a responsible authority—either a local council, or the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works—and it is subject to conditions which are designed to protect the public and to ensure that the area will be restored. The issue of the permit is again quite apart from any kind of political influence. There is a right of appeal by any person who feels aggrieved at the decision

to the Town Planning Appeals Tribunal, which also is absolutely free from political interference.

From my remarks, honorable members will realize that the statement that I granted a permit—

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I did not say that. You were not in the Parliament fourteen years ago.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Mr. Tripovich makes it clear that this was a decision made fourteen years ago, but he suddenly finds it urgent enough to support a motion for the adjournment of the House.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I informed the House how long this Camberwell order had been operating.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—In referring to me, Mr. Galbally said that the Minister for Local Government, with logic ill-becoming him, granted a permit. That is not true. It is not a fact. Mr. Galbally has again been careless with facts just as he was concerning the situation of this land.

Local members know the area well and know that it was of no value and that the purpose of having a tip operation there was not only to dispose of garbage but also to provide worth-while recreational land. Many people will disagree, as people will, but the Opposition is seeking to take up the case of a particular party to a dispute which has been considered by the proper planning authorities and which has been before the independent Commission of Public Health. The case has been argued before those bodies and decisions have been made and acted upon. The basis of the motion now before the House has been supplied by the party whose objections were not sustained.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—That has nothing to do with me.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I am speaking only of Camberwell. Information supplied by one party is the basis of this motion. The Labor Party has taken up this case knowing that it will be popular with people who live nearby. I believe the Labor Party should support the independent determinations which are made in these matters by bodies which are absolutely free of political influence. Even if I had the right to grant a permit, I have no view on the matter one way or another.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—It is an easy way out to have no view.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I do not form views on planning matters unless I know the full facts. This subject has been presented in a most partisan manner by honorable members from the other side of the House. The point is that this was not the prerogative of any Government Minister, and Mr. Tripovich admits——

Mr. TRIPOVICH.—I did not say that.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—With his usual candour, Mr. Tripovich admits that this is a situation which has obtained for many years and which has been the subject of local controversy. I point out that a most attractive golf course has been provided in an area of Camberwell which was once a tip area.

I now dismiss the red herring which was used as a basis for this debate and turn to the real issues. The real issue is the Government's record in pollution control.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—If the Government has any record in regard to pollution control, how did the tributaries of the Yarra River become polluted?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—It is strange that the Opposition should attack the Government just one sitting after proposals for a crash programme for sewering of unsewered properties and the provision of new sewerage and drainage facilities were announced in this House.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—The State Development Committee should receive credit for that.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Yes, and I do give credit to the committee. I gave credit to the committee at the time the report was presented. I congratulate its members, and I am

sure that they are delighted that the Government has adopted their recommendations without delay.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—What do the recommendations mean? The Government does not have $1,250 million. The conditions still exist.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Within the metropolitan area the prerequisite for a rapid plan of action for sewering premises is the completion of the south-eastern outfall sewer.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—That has been going on for years. You had nothing to do with that.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I, personally, had nothing to do with it, but the Government did.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—All the Minister can do is endorse principles. The Government does not have access to the amount of money that is required.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Mr. Tripovich regards the functions of the Government as vague and incapable of achievement. I make it clear that the vast bulk of the money is already earmarked. I mean that. The statement was not made without a thorough assessment by Treasury officials, in which I participated personally with the Premier and Treasurer. We knew where the vast bulk of the money was coming from. To obtain the balance will mean an upgrading of priorities.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Will it mean fewer schools, hospitals and roads and all the other things we used to hear about?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—No. It will also mean more assistance from the Commonwealth Government to meet the problem.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—The Commonwealth Government also intends to help the railways.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Certainly. It has also promised to help urban areas and to assist decentralization. The Government's policy was adopted promptly after an intensive study, after obtaining submissions on estimates of cost and after a detailed analysis by senior Treasury officials in conjunction with myself and the Premier and Treasurer. Nothing was said lightly in the statement that was made after the release of the report.

Attacks have been made on the Environment Protection Authority and the Act.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—They have not.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I am sorry, attacks have been made on the Act, and it has been said that the Act is not in full operation at this stage.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—The Government proclaims the Act.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—At the same time Mr. Tripovich reads from and relies upon the report of the Environment Protection Authority, a report which points the way. That surely was in fact the early task of the Environment Protection Authority. Its task was to undertake studies to ascertain what is needed to be done and how it should be undertaken. Its task was also to build up a staff of skilled personnel and an organization which could then carry out the task delineated by the report. That is precisely what has been done. The studies have been undertaken, the staff has been assembled, the objectives have been ascertained and a programme has been set down.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—How many staff have been engaged?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I find it difficult to continue over this barrage of shouting. Now the Act can be proclaimed and the policies implemented. That is precisely the course that the Government has adopted. I mentioned the south-eastern outfall sewer which is now under construction.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—The Government was pushed into that because of a by-election result.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—Order! Mr. Tripovich can make only one speech and I suggest that he has made that speech.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—It seems obvious that Mr. Tripovich is keen to use the phrase "with his customary candour" to the end of his life. I was sincere in using it because I have complete faith in the integrity and candour of Mr. Tripovich. It is just that I disagree with his arguments sometimes. The Government made its decision following a report from Mr. K. D. Green, now the Secretary of the Premier's Department and then a commissioner of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, that undue nutrient enrichment of Port Phillip Bay could be expected from the Carrum outlet, and to avoid pollution of the water a decision was made to take the outfall to Cape Schanck. That decision has meant that the south-eastern outfall sewer is not in operation as early as it otherwise would have been. It also meant that added funds were necessary and this resulted in some delay in the sewerage reticulation programme. That has been an inevitable concomitant and it is not possible to have both. The decision was made to spend the money on the outfall sewer. The completion of the project will pave the way for an assault on unsewered areas.

I do not know whether the Labor Party thinks it has discovered the word "pollution". Pollution has been bandied about as a good election issue and that is the real reason for this debate tonight, a fortnight after major announcements by the Government showing the direction in which Government policy is heading. I suggest that in those circumstances the real source of hypocrisy and cynicism is clear. It rests not with the Government but with the mover of the motion.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	17
Majority against the motion	1

AYES.

Mr. Bradbury	Mr. Swinburne
Mr. Clarke	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Eddy	Mr. Trayling
Mr. Galbally	Mr. Tripovich
Mr. Knight	Mr. Walton.
Mr. McDonald	
Mr. Mansell	*Tellers:*
Mr. May	Mr. Dunn
Mr. Mitchell.	Mr. Kent.

NOES.

Mr Byrne	Mr. Hunt
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Jenkins
Sir Gilbert Chandler	Mr. Nicol
Mr. Dickie	Mr. Storey
Mr. Granter	Mr. Ward.
Mr. Grimwade	
Mr. Gross	
Mr. Hamilton	*Tellers:*
Mr. Hider	Mr. Fry
Mr. Houghton	Mr. Gleeson.

PAIR.

Mr. Elliot	Mr. Hauser.

LAND (RESIDENCE AREAS) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture), was read a first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—No new business can now be conducted as it is past the hour of half-past Ten o'clock. However, one or two matters should be dealt with before the House adjourns tonight.

COMMAND PAPER.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture) presented, by command of His Excellency the Governor, the report of the State Electricity Commission on the proposed extension to the State generating system, Yallourn W power station units 3 and 4.

It was ordered that the report be laid on the table.

PAPERS.

The following papers, pursuant to the directions of several Acts of Parliament, were laid upon the table by the Clerk:—

Adoption of Children Act 1964—Adoption of Children (Guardianship) Regulations 1972 (S.R. No. 264).

Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958—Co-operative Housing Societies (General) Regulations 1972 (S.R. No. 262).

Environment Protection Authority—Report for the year 1971-72.

Grain Elevators Act 1958—Grain Elevators Board by-law (relating to the conditions of employment of staff) No. 47K (S.R. No. 265).

Grain Elevators Board—Report for the year ended 31st October, 1971.

Health Act 1958—Household Insecticides (Amendment No. 2) Regulations 1972 (S.R. No. 263).

La Trobe University—Report of the council, together with statutes approved by the Governor in Council, for the year 1971 (eight papers).

Local Government Act 1958—

Private Street Construction (Notices) Regulations 1972 (S.R. No. 269).

Scaffolding (Amendment) Regulations 1972 (Amendment No. 7) (S.R. No. 260).

Marine Act 1958—Proclamation—Amendment to Port Rule Applicable to Westernport Harbor Services (Rates and Charges) (S.R. No. 266).

Monash University—Report of the council, together with statutes approved by the Governor in Council, for the year 1971 (nine papers).

National Parks Advisory Committee—Report for the year 1971-72.

Police Service Board—Determination No. 195.

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—

Regulations amended (Nos. 293 to 297) (five papers).

Science Museum—Report for the year 1971-72.

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—

Planning schemes—

Lara Planning Scheme 1961—amendment No. 5, 1970.

Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme—amendments No. 12, with maps, and No. 33, with map (sixty-two papers).

Shire of Mornington Planning Scheme 1959—amendments No. 56, 1970, and No. 66, 1971 (two papers).

Town and Country Planning Regulations 1962 Amending Regulations No. 11 (S.R. No. 261).

Water Act 1958—Granting of Certificates of Qualification as Engineers of Water Supply (Amendment) Regulations 1972 (S.R. No. 268).

West Moorabool Water Board Act 1968—West Moorabool Water Board (Members' Fees and Travelling Expenses) (Amendment) Regulations 1972 (S.R. No. 267).

The House adjourned at 10.48 *p.m.*

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, October 10, 1972.

The SPEAKER **(Sir Vernon Christie)** took the chair at 4.5 p.m., and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated:—

POLICE DEPARTMENT.

PERSONS WOUNDED BY SMALL ARMS FIRE.

(Question No. 12)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many cases have been reported of persons being wounded by small arms fire of police officers in the years 1970, 1971 and to 5th September, 1972?

2. What was the outcome of the inquiry ordered by the Chief Secretary in each case?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1 and 2. In the period referred to by the honorable member, there have been a total of eighteen instances where a person was wounded as a result of the discharge of a firearm by a member of the Police Force during the course of his duty. Each of these woundings has been the subject of a full police investigation, and in the case of fatal woundings, a brief has been submitted to the Coroner.

Four of the woundings occurred in 1970, and in three of these cases, investigations established that the members of the force concerned were justified in the use of a firearm. Indeed, in one instance, the members were awarded a Chief Commissioner's certificate for the apprehension of a dangerous armed offender and his accomplices, and

in another, the members were commended for their courage and devotion to duty in apprehending an armed offender.

The fourth wounding was a fatal one and at the inquest the Coroner returned a verdict of justifiable homicide. The two members involved were each awarded the Victoria Police valour award for outstanding courage, devotion to duty, tenacity and a disregard for their personal safety in overcoming a dangerous and armed criminal.

In the four cases of woundings in 1971, investigations indicated that the members were justified in the use of a firearm and consequently no further action was taken. The members concerned in two instances were commended for their devotion to duty and actions which led to the arrest of offenders.

Ten cases of wounding as a result of police small arms fire have occurred this year to date. In six cases, investigations have confirmed that the use of a firearm was justified and no further action has been taken. The seventh case was caused by the accidental discharge of a weapon when the member tripped on cobblestones. The shot passed through a galvanized iron fence before hitting the offender.

Persons were fatally injured in the remaining three instances. In one case the Coroner found that the bullet wound was inflicted in self-defence and the homicide resulting therefrom was excusable and in another the Coroner recorded a finding of death by misadventure. The inquest into the third fatality has yet to be held.

CRIME IN MARYBOROUGH.

(Question No. 325)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What offences have been reported in Maryborough in the past twelve months?

2. How many of these cases have been solved?

3. How many persons under the age of seventeen years were apprehended in respect of offences, giving the number of boys and girls, respectively?

4. How many persons over seventeen years were apprehended for these offences?

5. How many times policewomen were required to attend Maryborough in the past twelve months including attendances in connection with court appearances and in respect of domestic problems?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1 and 2. The following table shows the number of offences, in each category, reported to the Maryborough police during the twelve months ended 28th September, 1972, and the number of such offences which have been cleared:—

Nature of offences	Number reported	Number cleared
Armed with offensive weapon ..	2	2
Assault..	3	3
Assault with weapon	2	2
Breach of the Liquor Control Act	4	4
Breaking offences	35	11
Carnal knowledge	1	1
Driving in manner dangerous ..	10	10
Driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor	4	4
Driving whilst disqualified ..	5	5
Driving with blood alcohol content in excess of ·05 per centum ..	31	31
Escaping from legal custody ..	3	3
False declaration	5	5
False pretences	5	5
Harbouring felon	1	1
Indecent assault..	1	1
Indecent exposure	1	1
Insufficient means	1	1
Larceny	44	21
Larceny from motor car.. ..	17	15
Larceny of motor car	12	4
Offensive behaviour	21	21
Protection application	1	1
Receiving	2	2
Refusing breath test	1	1
Resisting arrest	2	2
Tampering with motor car ..	1	1
Unlawfully on premises	7	5
Wilful damage	14	3
Total	236	166

An offence is regarded as "cleared" if—

(*a*) there was no offence disclosed; or

(*b*) a person has been charged with the offence; or

(*c*) a person, against whom proceedings are being taken on some other matter, admits to committing the offence.)

3. Twenty (seventeen boys and three girls).

4. One hundred and twenty-six.

5. During the twelve months ended 28th September, 1972, policewomen visited Maryborough on nineteen occasions for the following purposes:—

(*a*) Court appearances—5.

(*b*) Domestic problems—12.

(*c*) General duty on New Year's Day and at the Wattle Festival—2.

INSPECTORS.

(Question No. 342)

Mr. TURNBULL (Brunswick West) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What is the present rank of detective inspectors and uniformed inspectors at the respective headquarters of each police district, and whether it is proposed to fill such positions with chief inspectors in the future?

2. Whether it is proposed that the inspectors in each position will remain there until retirement; if not, in which districts

it is proposed to transfer the present occupant, to which districts these inspectors will be transferred, and why the transfers are being made?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1 and 2. It is presumed that this question relates to the policy adopted of up-grading the positions of all uniform divisional inspectors and district detective inspectors in the metropolitan police districts to chief inspector with the object of ensuring that appropriate levels and spans of command are maintained.

The policy regarding the upgrading of these positions was that it would occur as each position became vacant. Insofar as the 25 uniform divisional inspector positions are concerned, no great difficulty has been experienced in progressively implementing the scheme and the up-gradings are almost complete. In the case of the eight district detective inspector positions in the metropolitan police districts, three positions have not yet been filled by chief inspectors. These positions are at Flemington, Frankston and Heidelberg.

The district detective inspector at Flemington, who is ineligible for promotion on account of his age, is not due to retire until 25th February, 1974. If he had been permitted to remain at Flemington as an inspector, it would have unduly delayed the upgrading of the position to chief inspector and would have brought about an imbalance in the levels of command. It would have delayed some promotions and as a result, some eligible members could be denied the opportunity of promotion. As the efficiency of the force could suffer, the district detective inspector was transferred to Russell Street Criminal Investigation Branch to perform the duties of a detective inspector. The position at Flemington has been advertised in the *Police Gazette* at the rank of chief inspector and is expected to be filled in the very near future. The other positions will be upgraded when the district detective inspectors, who are eligible for promotion to the rank of chief inspector, are transferred to other positions. It is not possible at this stage to forecast when these transfers may take place, but a close watch is being kept on the situation as it is essential that the policy of upgrading the positions is not unduly delayed.

PRISONS DIVISION.

PRISON FARMS.

(Question No. 60)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

In respect of Victorian prison farms—

1. How many—(*a*) prisoners; (*b*) full-time staff; and (*c*) outside or part-time employees, are at each farm?

2. What agricultural projects are carried out at each farm?

3. On what basis prisoners are selected for prison farms?

4. What is the annual running cost of each farm?

5. What is the annual value of the produce from each farm?

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

1. The following table provides the information sought in relation to prisons where farming is conducted:—

Prison	Number of prisoners	Number of full-time staff	Number of outside or part-time employees
Ararat	179	37	Nil
Beechworth	113	22	Nil
Cooriemungle.. ..	57	11	Nil
Dhurringile	58	11	Nil
McLeod	88	19	Nil

2. These prisons *inter alia* produce beef, mutton, milk, butter, eggs, fruit and vegetables. Vegetables are also produced in quantity at Pentridge and Fairlea prisons.

3. Selection is decided by the classification committee in regard for factors including reasons for imprisonment, length of sentence, vocational history, health and psychiatric aspects, likely response to trust, and voluntary or reactive interest in being so placed.

4. The total running costs of these prisons over the year 1971-72 are as follows. It is not possible to dissect from these the actual costs of the farming projects.

	$
Ararat	293,435
Beechworth	165,852
Cooriemungle	95,568
Dhurringile	104,393
McLeod	148,332

5. Figures are not available to show such annual values, as much of the produce is consumed internally as rations for prisoners and staff, and surplus vegetables are donated to hospitals and other charitable organizations.

IMPRISONMENT OF PERSONS FOUND NOT GUILTY OF MURDER ON GROUND OF INSANITY.

(Question No. 61)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

1. How many persons found not guilty of murder on the ground of insanity are presently held in Victorian penal institutions pending the Governor's pleasure being known?

2. For what period each person has been held in custody?

3. Whether any of these persons are actually undergoing some form of psychiatric treatment; if so, which persons?

4. Whether any of these persons are being treated as if they had been convicted in the ordinary course of trial; if so, which persons?

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

1. Thirty persons.

2. Four held for one year.
Six held for two years.
Four held for three years.
Two held for four years.
Two held for five years.
Five held for six years.
Three held for seven years.
One held for nine years.
One held for ten years.
Two held for thirteen years.

3. Nine are currently undergoing psychiatric treatment.

4. All of these persons, except one temporarily in hospital, have been put to the same range of varying occupations as are convicted persons, with provision made for the application of psychiatric treatment as prescribed including attendances for group therapy.

PENTRIDGE GAOL: MAGAZINE "STOCKADE": "H" DIVISION.

(Question No. 90)

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

1. Whether the magazine *Stockade* produced by prisoners at Pentridge prison has ceased publication; if so—(*a*) when; and (*b*) why?

2. What was the annual cost of production during the magazine's existence?

3. Whether instructions were given at any time to the effect that a limit would be placed on the number of copies that could be produced; if so—(*a*) when such instruction was given; (*b*) by whom; (*c*) why; and (*d*) what were the terms of such directive?

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

1. Yes.
(*a*) Approximately five years ago.
(*b*) Due to the fall-off of interest.

2. Approximately $450 per year.

3. Yes.
(*a*) On 19th February, 1965.
(*b*) The Director of Prisons.
(*c*) Due to the high cost of production and distribution.
(*d*) The directive required following production to be limited to 500 copies, and drew attention to a prior instruction limiting size to six sheets including cover, i.e. 24 pages.

(Question No. 91)

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

1. What is the accommodation capacity of "H" division at Pentridge prison?

2. How many prisoners were accommodated in "H" division on each day of this year to date, specifying the reasons for such measures being taken?

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

1. Thirty-nine prisoners.

2. The extraction of this information would require a number of officers to be diverted from pressing work for a considerable period of time, and I regret that such attention cannot be spared for the purpose.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.

OFF-COURSE TOTALIZATOR: OPERATION ON GREYHOUND AND TROTTING MEETINGS.

(Question No. 163)

Mr. A. T. EVANS (Ballaarat North) asked the Minister for Youth and Recreation—

1. Whether the Totalizator Agency Board has reduced the number of greyhound and trotting meetings operating on the off-course totalizator; if so—(*a*) to what extent; (*b*) why; and (*c*) what estimated amount of revenue will be lost by—(i) the State Treasury; and (ii) racing clubs?

2. Whether he will take action to prevent a repetition of such action by the board?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Youth and Recreation).—The answer is—

No.

In the 1971–72 season, the Totalizator Agency Board provided an off-course coverage for eleven country greyhound meetings and 168 country trotting meetings.

I am informed that, for the current season, the board proposes providing a coverage for 39 country greyhound meetings and 188 country trotting meetings.

SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT.

HAMILTON OFFICE: PROBATION OFFICER.

(Question No. 173)

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

Whether the Hamilton office of the Social Welfare Department is without the services of a probation officer; if so—(*a*) for what period; and (*b*) whether a probation officer will be appointed and, in that event, when, or if not, why?

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

Yes.

(*a*) Since 9th June, 1972, when the previous officer was promoted elsewhere.

(*b*) Yes, as soon as current action to appoint a successor is effective. Advertisements to fill the position have so far attracted no applicants, and are now being repeated in all States.

ABATTOIRS.

KILLING CAPACITY: THROUGHPUT: LAND AREAS.

(Question No. 213)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Minister of Health—

1. What is the killing capacity of each export abattoirs and each non-export abattoirs, in Victoria?

2. What was the actual throughput at each abattoirs in each of the past five years?

3. What is the area of land on which each abattoirs is established in the metropolitan area and what amount of land is used for holding paddocks?

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

1. This department does not establish such a figure for each abattoir registered.

2. The Commission of Public Health receives monthly returns from municipal councils in respect of each of the 128 abattoirs in meat areas throughout Victoria. There are a number of small abattoirs outside meat areas where private killing is carried on and for which no returns are submitted. Officers of the department are concerned with health aspects of the operation of abattoirs—proper sanitation, disposal of waste, the health of staff and the standards of cleanliness for and the freedom from disease of meat—and do not keep statistical information such as that sought.

Collation of these figures would occupy a considerable number of man hours and could only be carried out by taking officers away from regular duties which must also be carried out. The files in relation to any particular municipal area could be made available to the honorable member should he so desire.

3. This information could not be supplied without a survey of all abattoirs in the metropolitan area being conducted. In any case, holding areas are not necessarily portion of an abattoir coming under the jurisdiction of the Commission of Public Health.

VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

ACQUISITION BY COMMONWEALTH: CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PREMIER AND PRIME MINISTER.

(Question No. 238)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier—

Whether he will make available all the correspondence between the former Premier of Victoria, Sir Henry Bolte, and the Prime Minister of Australia concerning the acquisition of the Victorian Railways by the Commonwealth and in particular the letter from the Premier to the Prime Minister dated 2nd September, 1970, and the Prime Minister's reply dated 30th April, 1971?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The answer is—

Yes. I will be happy to make the correspondence available to the Leader of the Opposition.

GIPPSLAND LINE: REVENUE: COSTS: SPEED LIMITS: GOODS TRAFFIC.

(Question No. 270)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister of Transport—

In respect of each of the past five financial years—

1. What revenue was derived from the Gippsland railway line showing revenue earned from passenger and goods traffic, respectively?

2. What was the operating cost for this railway line?

3. What duplication costs and maintenance costs, respectively, were incurred on this line?

4. What speed limits, if any, are placed on this line and why?

5. What tonnage of goods was carried by this line to and from Melbourne, respectively?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1.

—	Outward passengers	Outward parcels	Outward goods	Inward goods
	$	$	$	$
1967–68 ..	454,139	67,748	8,916,100	3,002,285
1968–69 ..	444,488	66,623	7,446,824	3,229,858
1969–70 ..	443,976	64,879	8,090,590	2,935,125
1970–71 ..	441,260	70,687	7,107,086	2,805 987

Notes

(i) For the purposes of this and the other answers which follow, the Gippsland railway line has been interpreted to mean the line from Dandenong (exclusive) to Orbost via Sale, plus Yallourn.

(ii) Revenue figures for 1971-72 are not yet available.

(iii) Outward passenger and parcels revenue is received at stations defined in (i).

(iv) Inward passenger and parcels figures could be supplied only as the result of very long and costly research.

2. The operating cost for this line has not been separately recorded.

3. Maintenance costs have not been separately recorded for this line. The following estimates have been made from available records:—

	$
1967-68	904,000
1968-69	873,000
1969-70	906,000
1970-71	1,293,000
1971-72	1,204,000

No duplication costs were incurred during the five-year period referred to.

4. The present permitted maximum speeds are as follows:—

Section	Passenger trains	Goods trains without any 4-wheeled vehicles attached	Goods trains with 4-wheeled vehicles attached
	m.p.h.	m.p.h.	m.p.h.
Dandenong–Moe	70	60	45
Moe–Kilmany	60	50	40
Kilmany–Bairnsdale	50	50	40
Bairnsdale–Orbost	35	35	35
Moe–Yallourn	40	40	40

5. This information is available only for 1969-70 and 1970-71 (figures for 1971-72 are not yet complete).

Details are as follows:—

	To Melbourne *Tons*	*From Melbourne* *Tons*
1969-70	1,285,584	196,930
1970-71	1,119,243	195,262

In this context "Melbourne" includes Melbourne freight terminal and all stations within the suburban (32 miles) radius.

JOLIMONT WORKSHOPS: HALF-STAFF LEAVE FOR EMPLOYEES.

(Question No. 327)

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

1. What are the half-staff leave entitlements for the December, 1972 to January, 1973 holiday period for employees of the Jolimont railway workshops?

2. When these employees will be advised of—(*a*) their entitlement; and (*b*) the dates of such holiday leave?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

I am advised by the commissioners that this matter was the subject of discussions between them and the appropriate unions. The necessary applications are being submitted to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

SIDINGS ON PORTLAND AND HORSHAM LINES.

(Question No. 331)

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

Whether all railway sidings between Portland and Melbourne and Horsham and Melbourne, respectively, are long enough to cater for normal size freight trains without the train having to be broken; if not, which sidings do not meet this requirement?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

No.

Between Melbourne and Horsham, Melton, Ballan, Gordon, Burrumbeet, Beaufort, Middle Creek, Deep Lead and Wal Wal.

In the case of the Ararat-Portland line, sidings at Willaura, Glen Thompson and Dunkeld are not adequate for the handling of maximum length trains during the superphosphate and grain seasons.

DIMBOOLA – MELBOURNE PASSENGER SERVICE.

(Question No. 346)

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

Whether it is intended to introduce a day return rail service from Dimboola to Melbourne using a new air-conditioned train, if so—(*a*) when; (*b*) whether it will link up with the new Portland train; (*c*) what is the seating capacity and proposed time for the journey; and (*d*) whether qualified workmen will be available to service this train in Melbourne?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

Yes.

(*a*) No time has been set for its introduction.

(*b*) Yes. It is intended that subject to maintenance requirements each of the modern air-conditioned railcars will operate daily between Horsham and Melbourne and Portland and Melbourne, travelling coupled together for the common Ararat-Melbourne portion of the journeys.

(*c*) One hundred and twenty between Ararat and Melbourne and 60 between Ararat and Portland and Ararat and Horsham. This accommodation can be augmented by attaching one or two additional carriages. Detailed schedules have not yet been settled.

(*d*) Yes.

ST. KILDA AND PORT MELBOURNE LINES: PASSENGERS: REVENUE.

(Question No. 353)

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park) asked the Minister of Transport—

1. How many passengers were carried on the Flinders Street–St. Kilda rail service in each of the years 1961 to 1971 inclusive and what amount of revenue was received from these passengers in each year?

2. How many passengers were carried on the Flinders Street–Port Melbourne rail service in each of the years 1961 to 1971 inclusive and what amount of revenue was received from these passengers in each year?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

The number of journeys and the revenue from tickets sold at stations on the St. Kilda and Port Melbourne lines for the ten years to 30th June, 1970, were—

PASSENGER JOURNEYS AND REVENUE.

Year	St. Kilda line		Port Melbourne line	
	No of journeys	Revenue	No of journeys	Revenue
		$		$
1961–62	3,916,639	391,380	1,056,942	114,242
1962–63	3,931,858	395,107	1,028,683	110,395
1963–64	3,899,786	391,322	1,068,525	111,136
1964–65	3,879,313	433,493	1,041,578	122,127
1965–66	3,876,695	446,870	1,170,739	145,713
1966–67	3,889,541	500,715	1,073,193	147,426
1967–68	3,804,305	492,582	1,032,504	148,474
1968–69	3,681,620	491,466	972,479	135,706
1969–70	3,818,563	540,601	957,682	143,858
1970–71	3,729,849	545,337	909,302	134,692

ROSANNA LEVEL CROSSING.

(Question No. 361)

Mr. FELL (Greensborough) asked the Minister of Transport—

1. What action is proposed to widen the railway level crossing in Lower Plenty Road adjacent to Rosanna railway station, to the same width as the road, in order that the obstruction presently being caused to road traffic may be relieved?

2. What action is proposed to provide boom barriers at this crossing?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1. In accordance with the Government's policy of financing boom barrier installations, the City of Heidelberg has made its contribution of one-third of the cost of installing boom barriers at the Lower Plenty Road level crossing, Rosanna, and work has begun. In conjunction with the installation the roadway will be widened from 28 feet to 40 feet.

2. It is expected that the boom barriers will come into operation during November this year.

MELBOURNE UNDERGROUND RAIL LOOP.

(Question No. 365)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister of Transport—

Whether, in view of the increased estimate of the cost of the Melbourne underground rail loop project above the original estimate, any approach has been made to him by the Melbourne City Council regarding its increased financial obligation; if so, what were the relevant details of such submission?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

The Melbourne City Council has not made a submission to me concerning its financial obligations toward the loop since the revised estimate was available.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS: EMPLOYEES.

(Question No. 368)

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

1. How many industrial accidents occurred to employees of the Railway Department during each of the past five years?

2. How many employees were injured as a result of these accidents?

3. How many persons were in the employ of the department during each of those years?

4. What total man-hours was lost due to industrial accidents during each of those years?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1. The number of incidents are not separately recorded and statistics are only available for the number of staff involved.

2.	1967–68	7,822
	1968–69	7,409
	1969–70	6,651
	1970–71	6,337
	1971–72	6,262
3.	1967–68	26,823
	1968–69	26,963
	1969–70	26,297
	1970–71	25,878
	1971–72	25,715
4.	1967–68	406,050
	1968–69	414,900
	1969–70	384,000
	1970–71	344,800
	1971–72	297,500

MINERAL SPA WATER.

STATE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT ON RESOURCES.

(Question No. 240)

Mr. A. T. EVANS (Ballaarat North) asked the Premier—

Whether the relevant departments have finalized their examination of the State Development Committee report on the mineral spa water resources of Victoria; if so, whether it is proposed to introduce legislation resulting from this examination and, in that event, when?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The answer is—

The relevant departments have completed their examination of the State Development Committee's report on the mineral spa waters resources of Victoria. The departmental submissions will be considered shortly by a Cabinet sub-committee, when the need for any legislation will be decided.

HIGHWAYS AND FREEWAYS.

TENDERS.

(Question No. 244)

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

In respect of the Country Roads Board and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, respectively—

1. What was the total value of the tenders let in each of the past three financial years for freeway and highway construction?

2. How many tenders of $250,000 and over were let in each of the past three financial years indicating—(*a*) who was the successful tenderer; (*b*) what were the particular jobs; and (*c*) where works were located, in each case?

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

In respect of the Country Roads Board—

1. The total value of tenders accepted by the Country Roads Board for construction and reconstruction works and the supply of materials for such works on State highways, main roads, tourists' roads, forest roads and freeways declared or proclaimed under the provisions of the Country Roads Act was—

	$
1969-70	21,375,470
1970-71	22,860,610
1971-72	12,494,571

2. The Country Roads Board accepted the following number of tenders each having a value over $250,000 for works on State highways, main roads, tourists' roads, forest roads and freeways:—

Name of successful tenderer	Description of work	Location
1969–70—		
Lewis Construction Co. Pty. Ltd.	5-span underpass structure	Lower Yarra Freeway at Princes Highway West
Standard Roads Pty. Ltd.	18,470 lin. ft. roadworks	Nepean Highway, Mornington
Galli Bros. Constructions Pty. Ltd.	4,600 lin. ft. roadworks	Boundary, Brady and Montague streets, South Melbourne
Janus Construction Pty. Ltd.	11,329 lin. ft. reconstruction	Maroondah Highway, Lilydale
Wither Constructions Pty. Ltd.	Western interchange with Princes Highway West	Lower Yarra Freeway
Mecho Constructions Pty. Ltd.	12,131 lin. ft. of dual carriageway	Frankston Freeway between Williams Street and the Cranbourne–Frankston road, Frankston
Mecho Constructions Pty. Ltd.	20,100 lin. ft. roadworks	Mulgrave Freeway
Wal Henning Earthworks	31,004 lin. ft. roadworks	Western Freeway, Bacchus Marsh section
Guss Carter	Supply of 320,000 cubic yards of crushed rock	Western Freeway between Bacchus Marsh and Ballarat
Mobil Oil (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
Shell (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
Esso (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
B.P. Australia Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
1970–71—		
Mecho Constructions Pty. Ltd.	4-span overpass structure 4-cell RC box culvert	Mulgrave Freeway
P. Kennedy Pty. Ltd.	7,230 lin. ft. of dual carriageway	Western Highway, Rockbank
Galli Bros. Constructions Pty. Ltd.	8,500 lin. ft. roadworks	Calder Freeway, Niddrie
Standard Roads Pty. Ltd.	Reconstruction of 8,245 lin. ft. dual carriageway	Princes Highway East between Grange Road and Chadstone Road, Carnegie
Morgan Drainage Pty. Ltd.	1,835 lin. ft. roadworks	Princes Highway West between Williamson and Wake streets, Footscray
Mecho Constructions Pty. Ltd.	24,500 lin. ft. roadworks	Mulgrave Freeway
Norman Hewitt Contracting Co. Pty. Ltd.	6,800 lin. ft. roadworks	Nepean Highway between Lower Dandenong Road and White Street, Mentone
Citra Constructions Pty. Ltd.	8,720 lin. ft. roadworks	Western Highway, Sunshine
Geelong Quarries Pty. Ltd.	Supply of crushed rock products	Geelong area
Mobil Oil (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
Shell (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
Esso (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
B.P. Australia Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
Mobil Oil (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of bitumen primers	Throughout the State

Name of successful tenderer	Description of work	Location
1971–72—		
Keathson Earthmoving Pty. Ltd.	21,100 lin. ft. dual carriageway	Western Freeway (Pentland Hills section)
Galli Bros. Constructions Pty. Ltd.	37,574 lin. ft. roadworks	Hume Freeway (Wallan–Broadford section)
Jack Legge Contractors Pty. Ltd.	13,838 lin. ft. roadworks	Mornington Peninsula Freeway, Rosebud
John W. Hewitt and Son Pty. Ltd.	8,800 lin. ft. dual carriageway	Frankston Freeway between Armstrong and Klauer roads, Seaford
Mobil Oil (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
Shell (Aust.) Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State
B.P. Australia Ltd.	Supply of class R.90 residual bitumen	Throughout the State

In respect of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works—

1.

	Amount $
1969-70	2·42 million
1970-71	Nil
1971-72	15·73 million

2. (i) 1969-70 Leighton Contractors Ltd. 1,982,491

St. Kilda Road underpass (Melbourne and South Melbourne)

1971-72 Roche Bros. Pty. Ltd. 11,347,370

Eastern Freeway—roadworks (Collingwood to Bulleen)

McDougall Ireland Pty. Ltd. 2,045,857

Eastern Freeway—Willsmere underpass and Burke Road overpass.

(ii) In addition to the above, programmed contracts for 1972-73 are as follows:—

Eastern Freeway (including some works for eastern railway):—

Hoddle Street overpass.
Belford Road overpass.
Chandler interchange structures.
Clifton Hill railway bridge.
Railway underpass.
Yarra River bridge.
Boulevard overpass.
Merri Creek bridge.
National park road overpass.

Hoddle Street, Collingwood—Reconstruction from Eastern Freeway to Hoddle Street.

High Street, St. Kilda—Reconstruction.

The total value of these works will exceed $10 million.

WORKS UNDER CONSTRUCTION: VALUE: LOCATION.

(Question No. 245)

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

1. What is the value of all work on highways and freeways at present under construction by—(*a*) the Country Roads Board; and (*b*) the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works?

2. Where the works are located?

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

In respect of Country Roads Board:—

1. (*a*) The estimated cost of all construction and reconstruction works being carried out by the Country Roads Board at 20th September, 1972, on State highways, main roads, tourists' roads, forest roads and freeways declared or proclaimed under the provisions of the Country Roads Act is $63 million.

2. The location of the construction and reconstruction works being carried out by the Country Roads Board as at 20th September, 1972, is set out hereunder—

Freeways	*Location*
Calder	The Avenue to Erebus Street, Niddrie.
Calder	Realignment at Porcupine Hill, North Harcourt.
Eumemmerring	Princes Highway East to Mulgrave Freeway, east of Dandenong.
Frankston	Armstrongs Road to Klauer Street, Frankston.
Hume	Wallan–Broadford section.
Mornington Peninsula	Dromana section.
Mulgrave	Stud Road to Eumemmerring Freeway.

Freeways	*Location*
Mulgrave	Springvale Road to Stud Road.
Princes	Avalon interchange. Alternative access roads—Lara.
Western	Pentland Hills section.
State highways—	
Bellarine	Duplication from Twitts Road to west of Whitehorse Road, Geelong.
Burwood	Duplication at Fern Tree Gully.

State highways	*Location*
Calder	Construction of climbing lanes at Gap Hill, north of Diggers Rest.
Calder	Reconstruction of weak sections of pavement south of Glenalbyn.
Cann Valley	Realignment at Kates Creek.
Cann Valley	Construction of new bridge at Weeragua.
Glenelg	Construction of new bridge at Streatham.
Glenelg	Reconstruction of 4·6 miles between Bochara and Wannon.
Hamilton	Reconstruction of 3·4 miles between Duverney-Gnarkeet Creek.
Henty	Reconstruction south of Beulah.
Hume	Construction of climbing lanes at Teneriffe and Tubbs Hill.
Hume	Construction of turning lanes, Oxley Road intersection, south of Wangaratta
Hume	Widening of Wodonga Creek bridge, Wodonga.
Midland	Approaches to new bridge at Creswick.
Midland	Construction of major deviation between Morwell and Yinnar.
Midland	Reconstruction at junction with Morwell-Mirboo Road.
Murray Valley	Duplication of 0·6 miles at Bandiana.
Nepean	Widening of 2·9 miles at Seaford.
Omeo	Construction of new bridge and approaches at Ramrod Creek.
Omeo	Replacement of two bridges near Bruthen.
Omeo	Construction of new bridge at Little Scrubby Creek, north of Eskdale.

State highways	*Location*
Princes East	Reconstruction east of Nicholson River at Nicholson.
Princes West	West Footscray overpass.
Princes West	Margaret Street overpass project, Geelong.
Princes West	Construction of deviation and rail overpass at Allansford.
Princes West	Completion of 4·0 miles of duplication between Allansford and Warrnambool.
Princes West	New bridge over Eumeralla River, Codrington.
Pyrenees	Reconstruction of 2·1 miles between Carisbrook and Maryborough.
Pyrenees	Reconstruction of 5·5 miles at Bung Bong.
South Gippsland	Resheeting at Gelliondale.
South Gippsland	Widening and strengthening of weak sections between Woodside and Gifford West.
Warburton	Killara Hill deviation, east of Seville.
Western	Widening at Churchill Avenue, Maidstone.
Western	Erection of new guardrail at Djerriwarrh Creek and Anthonys cutting.
Western	Reconstruction of 2·2 miles west of Dimboola.
Wimmera	Widening of bridge over Wooranyook Creek west of Apsley.

Tourists' roads	*Location*
Great Ocean Road	Reconstruction and bridge widening at Spring Creek, Torquay.
	Pavement strengthening at Aireys Inlet.
	Pavement strengthening west of Calder River, west of Apollo Bay.
	Construction of new bridge over Port Campbell Creek.
Mount Buffalo Road	Reconstruction between Cathedral and Cresta.

Main roads	*Location*
Heidelberg–Eltham road	Reconstruction at Chandler Highway intersection.
Mansfield–Woods Point Road	Widening of formation between Kevington and Knockwood.
Millers Road	Paisley Rail overpass, Altona.

Forest road	*Location*
Walhalla Road	Widening between Erica and Thompson River.

In respect of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works—

1. (*b*) Total estimated costs of all work including property acquisition are:—

	Estimated cost
	$
Eastern Freeway (Collingwood to Bulleen) ..	40 million
Hoddle Street (Eastern Freeway to Victoria Parade)	7 million
High Street, St. Kilda ..	8 million
Yarra River bridge, Johnson Street, South Melbourne	14 million

2. Works are located as shown above.

FREEWAY CONSTRUCTION PLANS.

(Question No. 304)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

Whether the over-all plan for future freeway construction throughout the metropolitan area is at present under review; if so, why, and when the plan will be made final and released to the public?

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

Following a request from the Government in October, 1971, the Metropolitan Transportation Committee is now reviewing the freeway network proposed by the metropolitan transportation study, with a view to its modification in terms of sociological impact and over-all costs. The review is being carried out jointly by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the Country Roads Board and the metropolitan transportation study group for and on behalf of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee.

The review is still proceeding and no date can yet be given when such modifications can be made available for public consideration.

METRIC SYSTEM.

AMENDMENT OF ACTS OF PARLIAMENT.

(Question No. 262)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Premier—

What plans, if any, the Government has to introduce legislation during this session to amend various Acts to accord with metric conversion?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The answer is—

A Weights and Measures Bill is being prepared for presentation to Parliament this session and will contain such amendments as are required to the principal Act for metric conversion purposes. Bills are similarly being prepared to amend various other Acts in respect of which large numbers of metric conversions are necessary. A proposal that amendments of a minor nature required in many different Acts be incorporated into one "omnibus" type of Bill is now being examined, but it is doubtful whether the resultant Bill or Bills will be ready before the Christmas vacation.

RURAL EMPLOYMENT SCHEME.

GRANTS TO MUNICIPALITIES AND GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

(Question No. 265)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Treasurer—

1. What municipalities have received rural employment grants, indicating—(*a*) the amount each municipality has received to date; and (*b*) the number of men each municipality is employing?

2. What Government departments have received rural employment grants, indicating—(*a*) the amounts each department has received to date; and (*b*) the number of men each department is employing and the towns where the men are employed?

3. Whether rural employment grants are allocated under various categories, such as painting and building; if so, what are the total amounts paid out under these categories?

4. What is the total amount of rural employment grants granted to Victoria by the Commonwealth Government to date; how much has been used and what amounts have been promised for the future?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The answer is—

1. Municipalities which have had rural employment grants approved and the number of men currently authorized to be employed are as follows:—

Commonwealth Employment Service district	Grants approved	Number of men currently authorized to be employed
	$	
Ararat—		
Ararat City	20,000	12
Ararat Shire	41,650	15
Avoca Shire	19,900	6
Kara Kara Shire	11,390	5
Stawell Town	41,550	5
Stawell Shire	23,000	5
St. Arnaud Town ..	86 600	10

Commonwealth Employment Service district	Grants approved	Number of men currently authorized to be employed
	$	
Ballarat—		
Ballan Shire	7,000	3
Ballarat City	65,000	24
Ballarat Shire	34,134	12
Bungaree Shire	22,700	5
Buninyong Shire	13,268	5
Creswick Shire	28,600	8
Daylesford and Glenlyon Shire	24,200	5
Grenville Shire	27,100	10
Lexton Shire	23,555	5
Maryborough City	50,350	12
Ripon Shire	32,252	5
Sebastopol Borough	18,900	5
Talbot and Clunes Shire	32,299	8
Tullaroop Shire	30,325	8
Bendigo—		
Bendigo City	127,600	30
Bet Bet Shire	33,515	10
Castlemaine City	36,870	16
Charlton Shire	32,200	10
Eaglehawk Borough	22,847	8
East Loddon Shire	9,500	4
Gisborne Shire	14,300	5
Huntly Shire	14,200	4
Korong Shire	27,500	6
Kyneton Shire	28,900	8
Maldon Shire	18,250	8
Marong Shire	22,025	8
McIvor Shire	34,527	16
Metcalfe Shire	18,150	7
Newham and Woodend Shire	14,535	4
Newstead Shire	30,000	10
Rochester Shire	18,100	7
Romsey Shire	12,925	6
Strathfieldsaye Shire	49,160	10
Geelong—		
Bannockburn Shire	35,700	14
Barrabool Shire	47,870	10
Bellarine Shire	37,200	12
Colac City	48,550	16
Colac Shire	69,800	12
Corio Shire	83,800	22
Geelong City	156,150	45
Geelong West City	89,000	20
Leigh Shire	66,850	13
Newtown City	75,680	14
Otway Shire	28,800	11
Queenscliffe Borough	20,510	7
South Barwon Shire	96,540	20
Winchelsea Shire	70,960	20
Hamilton—		
Dundas Shire	45,750	12
Glenelg Shire	49,360	12
Hamilton City	65,350	11
Mount Rouse Shire	42,185	13
Portland Town	20,850	9
Portland Shire	33,050	7
Wannon Shire	67,475	20
Horsham—		
Arapiles Shire	23,500	5
Dimboola Shire	13,200	4
Donald Shire	21,800	6
Dunmunkle Shire	20,000	5
Horsham City	58,563	22
Kaniva Shire	11,000	5
Kowree Shire	23,300	10
Lowan Shire	20,130	5
Warracknabeal Shire	14,734	7
Wimmera Shire	26,620	10
Kerang—		
Cohuna Shire	3,650	2
Gordon Shire	14,200	4
Kerang Borough	43,700	7
Kerang Shire	21,750	8
Melbourne—		
Bacchus Marsh Shire	21,320	6
Bulla Shire	3,970	3
Cranbourne Shire	12,050	
Flinders Shire	33,700	
Hastings Shire	19,500	8
Healesville Shire	8,000	7
Lillydale Shire	2,944	
Melton Shire	13,000	4
Mornington Shire	11,900	7
Sherbrooke Shire	15,570	6
Upper Yarra Shire	6,410	4
Werribee Shire	11,900	5
Whittlesea Shire	4,650	3
Berwick Shire	6,000	6
Mildura—		
Birchip Shire	15 220	9
Karkarooc Shire	20,000	6
Mildura City	81,000	23
Mildura Shire	32,050	16
Walpeup Shire	13,365	4
Morwell and Warragul—		
Alberton Shire	14,500	4
Bass Shire	19,510	4
Buln Buln Shire	51,208	16
Korumburra Shire	25,100	5
Mirboo Shire	26,160	8
Moe City	28,280	6
Morwell Shire	74,900	12
Narracan Shire	17,300	4
Phillip Island Shire	21,100	6
South Gippsland Shire	12,000	6
Traralgon City	42,500	..
Traralgon Shire	11,170	..
Warragul Shire	45,470	12
Wonthaggi Borough	34,605	10
Woorayl Shire	51,435	8
Sale—		
Avon Shire	23,900	5
Bairnsdale Town	15,320	8
Bairnsdale Shire	26,900	4
Maffra Shire	11,000	4
Omeo Shire	36,800	14
Orbost Shire	16,500	10
Rosedale Shire	27,900	10
Sale City	38,150	12
Tambo Shire	22,500	6
Seymour—		
Alexandra Shire	17,700	9
Broadford Shire	18,850	5
Euroa Shire	17,960	4
Goulburn Shire	14,630	5
Kilmore Shire	8,160	5
Mansfield Shire	12,400	5
Pyalong Shire	11,000	4
Seymour Shire	32,890	8
Yea Shire	15,600	6
Shepparton—		
Cobram Shire	10,642	6
Deakin Shire	18,390	6
Echuca City	62,650	15
Kyabram Borough	11,750	4
Nathalia Shire	10,381	4
Numurkah Shire	11,140	6
Rodney Shire	18,550	10
Shepparton City	39,750	16
Shepparton Shire	27,800	10
Tungamah Shire	11,050	6
Waranga Shire	19,650	7
Swan Hill—		
Swan Hill City	149,725	18
Swan Hill Shire	130,530	30
Wycheproof Shire	28,300	9
Wangaratta—		
Beechworth Shire	12,549	5
Benalla City	67,840	19
Benalla Shire	25,935	6
Bright Shire	29,550	8
Chiltern Shire	32,396	10
Myrtleford Shire	34,600	13
Oxley Shire	22,784	8
Rutherglen Shire	3,400	4
Towong Shire	11,700	4
Upper Murray Shire	12,930	4
Violet Town Shire	16,200	4
Wangaratta City	130,450	40
Wangaratta Shire	26,400	7
Yackandandah Shire	24,600	6
Yarrawonga Shire	24,100	8
Wodonga Shire	33,800	16
Warrnambool—		
Belfast Shire	23,500	8
Camperdown Town	25,400	9
Hampden Shire	46,885	12
Heytesbury Shire	43,100	10
Koroit Borough	22,033	4
Minhamite Shire	15,260	7
Mortlake Shire	22,940	10
Port Fairy Borough	23,900	9
Warrnambool City	83,978	22
Warrnambool Shire	30,500	10

2. The Government departments which have had rural employment grants approved and the number of men currently authorized to be employed and the towns where the men are employed are as follows:—

NUMBER OF MEN CURRENTLY AUTHORIZED TO BE EMPLOYED.

Commonwealth Employment Service district	Forests Commission	Public Works Department	Victorian Railways	State Rivers and Water Supply Commission	Lands Department	National Parks Service	Department of Agriculture	Soil Conservation Authority	Fisheries and Wildlife Department
Ararat	14	..	20	2	1	..	..	..	..
Ballarat	42	42	9	2	5	..	..	..	..
Bendigo	25	36	20	101	7	..	..	1	..
Geelong	33	..	22	7	3	..	..	11	2
Hamilton	27	10	5	2	6	..	12	..	..
Horsham	14	10	6	16	..	8	7	..	..
Kerang	4	8	..	29	2	..	..	..	..
Mildura	9	6	..	40	11	..	..	..	..
Morwell/Warragul ..	41	8	32	..	7	6	..	..	6
Sale	93	15	3	1	8	2	..	6	..
Seymour	4	5	..	4	4	6	..	..	..
Shepparton ..	7	15	8	24	3	..	..	..	..
Swan Hill ..	..	5	..	18	13	..	..	..	..
Wangaratta ..	35	27	12	3	8	..	5	..	..
Warrnambool ..	13	33	5	..	..	..	8	..	9
Outer metropolitan..	27	30	..	46	2	14	5	..	..
Totals ..	388	250	142	295	80	33	37	18	17

3. Employment grants are allocated according to the numbers of unemployed in various areas and the jobs which can be carried out by municipalities and departments. In many cases those employed are given a variety of work to carry out and detailed records of the expenditure in various categories are not available.

4. The total amount granted to Victoria by the Commonwealth Government amounts to $10·25 million including the month of September. For the remainder of 1972 an amount of $4·05 million has been promised by the Commonwealth.

The rate of expenditure of Commonwealth grants has been planned so that expenditure in the field parallels grants received by the State.

GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

PRINTING OF FORMS REQUIRED BY COMPANIES.

(Question No. 267)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Treasurer—

Whether the Government Printer is some months in arrears with some forms needed by companies; if so, whether some of this printing could be let to small printing businesses in country areas to overcome the back-lag?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The answer is—

I am informed by the Government Printer that there is no undue delay in the production of forms in the Government Printing Office and that he has ample capacity to cope with the work load in that field.

COUNTRY ROADS BOARD.

HENTY HIGHWAY.

(Question No. 268)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

1. When funds will be made available to the Country Roads Board to carry out the widening and straightening of the Henty Highway near Portland?

2. Whether plans were drawn up for these works at least five years ago?

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

1 and 2. In 1962 the Country Roads Board fixed an alignment for the future deviation of the highway to improved standards between Garden Street and the north end of Richardson Street, Portland. The alignment was fixed to reserve the land for road purposes. Construction plans are in the course of preparation but it is not expected that funds will be allocated to permit work to commence before financial year 1975-76.

PEDESTRIAN OVERHEAD CROSSING AT ROSANNA EAST.

(Question No. 362)

Mr. FELL (Greensborough) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

1. What was the cost of the pedestrian overhead crossing provided by the Country Roads Board in Lower Plenty Road in the vicinity of St. Martins Roman Catholic Church, Rosanna East?

2. What were the pedestrian and vehicle traffic counts at the time the project was approved for construction?

3. Whether the structure was constructed by sub-contract or by the board?

4. What financial contribution was made to the board for the project and by whom?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Transport is—

1. $53,938 including the purchase of the necessary land.

2. A count taken between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. on 25th October, 1967, was—

Vehicles	1,695
Pedestrians	182

The priority of this project was also influenced by high traffic speeds, steep road grade and the proximity of adjacent channelized intersections.

3. The major portion of the construction was carried out by direct labour under the supervision of the board's staff. The fabrication of the beam formwork and post tensioning of the beam were carried out by sub-contractors.

4. The cost was shared equally by the State Government, the Country Roads Board and the Heidelberg City Council.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

GOVERNMENT TESTING OF DAIRY COWS.

(Question No. 288)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power, for the Minister of Agriculture—

1. Whether Government testing of dairy cows is free; if so, whether there are any occasions when a fee is charged, and, in that event, under what circumstances?

2. Whether an owner of a dairy herd at Penshurst in the Mount Rouse shire has been charged a fee for testing; if so, why?

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

1. If the question refers to the testing of dairy cows for tuberculosis under the department's bovine tuberculosis eradication scheme, the actual work of testing is carried out by private practitioners working under contract to the Minister of Agriculture. The cost of this service is paid for by the Government.

Under the eradication scheme there are no occasions on which a fee is charged.

2. The member is probably referring to a dairy herd in the Mount Rouse shire which is an accredited tuberculosis free herd. The tuberculosis accreditation scheme has been in operation in this department for many years. It is a voluntary scheme and provides that herds must have two negative tests twelve months apart before accreditation is granted, that a further negative test is achieved twelve months later and thereafter for testing to be done at two-yearly intervals. The cost of this testing is borne by the owner.

Recently the two-yearly testing of this particular herd was carried out according to the requirements of the scheme, and as is customary the owner was required to meet the cost.

Where testing of an accredited herd falls due at the same time as allocation of herds are being made to practitioners in the particular shire for testing under the tuberculosis eradication scheme, the department accepts this testing for purposes of accreditation and in these cases pays for the testing. All accredited dairy herds in this State have benefited from this ruling at some time during the progress of the eradication scheme, in common with owners of dairy herds not accredited.

TRANSPORT.

REGIONAL AREAS: ROAD AND RAIL COMMUNICATIONS WITH MELBOURNE.

(Question No. 295)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister of Transport—

1. Whether discussions have taken place between the Minister for Local Government, the Minister of Transport and the Treasurer on the matter of improving road and rail communications linking regional areas of the State with Melbourne; if so, what discussions?

2. Whether, in view of the importance of regional development and the bearing that improved communications between regions has on the promotion of this type of development, additional funds will be allocated for this purpose; if so, what funds?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1. Yes.

2. The Government is well aware that adequate communications are of considerable importance in any regional development; so far as the transport aspect of communications is concerned, the objective is to make the best use of our total transport resources and by this means give the best facilities to all regions of the State.

COST OF INQUIRIES.

(Question No. 366)

Mr. WHITING (Mildura) asked the Minister of Transport—

1. What was the total cost of the Board of Inquiry into the Victorian Land Transport System?

2. What is the estimated cost of the investigations at present being carried out by Sir Henry Bland into the carriage of wool, bulk grains and petroleum and when they are expected to be completed?

3. What was the cost of examination of the Commercial Branch of the Railways Department recently conducted by management consultants, and which firm of consultants was engaged for this purpose?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1. $31,394.

2. $1,500.

3. The examination of the Railways Commercial Branch was conducted by W. D. Scott & Co. Pty Ltd. at a cost of $5,100.

MOTOR CYCLES.

FATAL ACCIDENTS.

(Question No. 301)

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many fatal accidents have occurred during the past five years involving motor cycles with an engine capacity in excess of 500 c.c., indicating the number of motor cyclists involved who had held their licences for a period of less than one year?

2. How many deaths involving motor cycles during the past five years involved motor cyclists who held licences for a period of less than one year?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

I regret that no statistics are available in the form requested by the honorable member.

In the five-year period to 1971, a total of 129 motor cycle drivers have been killed in Victoria. These fatalities have occurred as follows:—

1967	14
1968	24
1969	22
1970	24
1971	45

As indicated, 22 motor cycle drivers were killed in 1969 and, in addition, one pillion passenger and one pedestrian were killed as a result of motor cycle accidents. A detailed survey which has been made of these accidents shows the experience of the drivers to have been—

(*a*) Less than one year—		
(i) Unlicensed	1	
(ii) Learner	4	
(iii) Licensed	6	
	—	11
(*b*) One–two years—		
Licensed	1	
	—	1
(*c*) Two–ten years—		
Unlicensed	1	
Licensed*	7	
	—	8
(*d*) More than ten years—		
Licensed	2	
	—	2
(*e*) Not known—		
Unlicensed	2	
	—	2
		24

*Includes one interstate licence holder.

CLEAN AIR.

POLLUTION IN NEWTOWN NORTH.

(Question No. 307)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister of Health—

1. What were the fallout figures recorded in air measurement gauges in Newtown North in each of the past ten years?

2. What action has been taken in that period to reduce the incidence of fallout?

3. What procedures have been adopted to monitor the discharge of pollutants at night and whether these measures are wholly effective; if not, why?

4. Whether fallout in the area will be reduced in the future?

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

1. Water insoluble matter

Long tons/sq mile/month.

1962	12·3	1967	23·3
1963	38·4	1968	46·6
1964	48·2	1969	17·9
1965	36·0	1970	12·9
1966	30·1	1971	9·1

2. Alterations have been made to methods of transferring cement at a nearby loading point, and in addition, electrostatic precipitators have been upgraded and other collection equipment has been installed with a view to reducing the incidence of fallout in the area.

3. The air measurement gauge at Newtown North monitors the dustfall for 24 hours per day.

4. Yes.

POLLUTION IN NORLANE AND CORIO.

(Question No. 312)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister of Health—

1. What steps, if any, have been taken in the Norlane–Corio areas for measuring and pin-pointing air pollution and odour pollution and what action has been taken to reduce such pollution in each case?

2. Whether these forms of pollution have been recorded during the past three years; if so, what were the levels in each year; if not, why?

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

1. Wind speed and direction instruments have been installed in the Norlane area together with instruments for measuring sulphur dioxide concentrations and smoke density but not odour. Odour control equipment has been fitted and is being fitted, to tallow rendering works in the area and equipment has been installed at other works to prevent the emission of dust.

2. The concentration of sulphur dioxide at Corio was 0·98 parts per hundred million parts of air in 1971 and 1·20 parts per hundred million parts of air for the last 7 months of 1970, the gauge being installed in May, 1970. The corresponding smoke density values are 0·1 and 0·2 COH units.

MUNICIPALITIES.

PERMITS FOR ERECTION OF FLATS: APPEALS.

(Question No. 308)

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

1. How many appeals were launched by persons against decisions of municipal councils to grant permits to erect flats in the years 1970, 1971 and to 31st August, 1972, indicating which municipalities?

2. How many of these appeals have been upheld and how many have been dismissed?

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

APPEALS AGAINST COUNCIL DETERMINATIONS TO GRANT PERMITS FOR FLATS.

Municipality	Year	Appeals lodged	Withdrawn invalid etc.	Heard	Upheld	Disallowed	Awaiting decision	Awaiting hearing
Box Hill	1970	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
	1972	2	..	..	..	..	..	2
Brunswick ..	1970	4	1	3	1	2	..	..
	1971	2	1	1	1	..	..	..
	1972	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Camberwell ..	1970	1	..	1	1	..	..	..
	1971	3	1	2	..	2	..	..
	1972	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
Caulfield ..	1970	4	..	4	..	4	..	..
	1971	4	..	4	..	4	..	..
	1972	4	..	2	1	1	..	2
Coburg	1972	1	1	..	..	..	..	..
Croydon	1970	2	..	2	1	1	..	..
	1972	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
Dandenong ..	1970	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
	1972	3	1	1	..	1	..	1
Doncaster ..	1971	1	1	..	..	..	..	..
	1972	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Frankston ..	1970	1	..	1	1	..	..	..
Hawthorn ..	1972	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Heidelberg ..	1970	2	..	2	1	1	..	..
	1971	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
	1972	2	..	2	..	2	..	..
Kew	1971	1	1	..	..	..	..	..
	1972	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Malvern	1970	1	1	..	..	..	..	..
	1971	2	..	2	2	..	..	..
	1972	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Melbourne ..	1971	3	1	2	1	1	..	..
	1972	2	..	1	1	..	..	1
Moorabbin ..	1970	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
	1972	4	..	1	..	1	..	3
Mordialloc ..	1970	2	..	2	..	2	..	..
	1972	2	..	..	..	..	..	2
Northcote ..	1970	2	1	1	..	1	..	..
	1971	11	..	11	4	7	..	..
	1972	16	..	3	2	..	1	13
Nunawading ..	1970	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
	1971	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
	1972	1	1	..	..	..	..	..
Oakleigh	1970	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
	1971	2	..	2	..	2	..	..

Municipality	Year	Appeals lodged	Withdrawn invalid etc.	Heard	Upheld	Disallowed	Awaiting decision	Awaiting hearing
Prahran	1971	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
Sandringham ..	1970	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
	1972	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Sunshine	1970	2	2	..	..	..	..	..
	1971	1	..	1	..	1	..	..
Waverley	1972	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Total	1970	27	5	22	5	17	..	..
	1971	33	5	27	8	19	..	1
	1972	46	3	12	4	7	1	31
Grand Total		106	13	61	17	43	1	32

MOTOR VEHICLES: PERSONAL USE BY OFFICERS.

(Question No. 316)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

If he will ascertain and inform the House, whether it is permissible for municipal officers to operate for personal use after hours and for holidays vehicles bought by municipalities free of sales tax; if so, under what authority?

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

In applying for an exemption from sales tax for the purchase of a motor vehicle the municipality must certify that the vehicle is solely for municipal purposes and it is the responsibility of the council to ensure that this undertaking is observed. In the event of this undertaking not being honoured the Commonwealth Government could demand payment of sales tax but as any such action would arise under Commonwealth legislation it is not a matter on which I can give the honorable member any further information.

GRANTS FOR SWIMMING POOLS: APPLICATIONS FROM DUNDAS ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 318)

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

What towns in the electoral district of Dundas have applied for grants for the construction of swimming pools, indicating the size of the proposed pools, the estimated cost, and when the applications were lodged?

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

Current applications for swimming pools in the Dundas electoral district are as follows:—

Dunmunkle shire:

Learners pool 32 feet x 20 feet and supplementary buildings at Minyip. Applications lodged 18th August, 1972. Estimated cost, $24,000.

Hamilton city:

Learners pool at Hamilton, 25 metres. Application lodged 17th February, 1972. Estimated cost, $34,000.

Kowree shire:

Swimming pool at Goroke, 82·1 feet x 35 feet. Application lodged 28th June, 1971. Estimated cost, $45,000.

MUNICIPAL ELECTRICAL UNDERTAKINGS.

(Question No. 345)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power—

1. What is the present approximate value of the electrical undertakings of each of the councils which operate as retailers of electricity by purchasing electricity in bulk from the State Electricity Commission?

2. What was the trading profit or loss of each of these undertakings last financial year?

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

1. The latest available figures are for the municipal year ended 30th September, 1971. These are—

Undertaking	Fixed assets less depreciation	Other assets	Loan liability	Other liabilities	Municipal equity
	$	$	$	$	$
Box Hill	7,246,489	2,099,276	5,492,193	1,023,843	2,829,729
Brunswick	1,430,783	177,005	..	343,027	1,264,761
Coburg	1,904,721	843,927	1,315,098	398,379	1,035,171
Doncaster and Templestowe	3,936,156	393,503	1,495,402	566,422	2,267,835
Footscray	4,141,839	2,250,072	1,502,978	1,151,063	3,737,870
Heidelberg	3,109,766	724,657	1,357,196	838,518	1,638,689
Melbourne	23,589,745	9,054,075	11,330,120	2,278,627	19,035,075
Northcote	1,862,357	536,471	963,124	345,041	1,088,863
Port Melbourne	719,862	398,747	159,958	241,959	716,692
Preston	3,484,875	789,072	1,220,096	904,504	2,149,347
Williamstown	1,602,687	429,294	200,360	393,661	1,437,960

2. Trading profit for year ended 30th September, 1971—

Council	Operating surplus
	$
Box Hill	243,036
Brunswick	134,501
Coburg	106,157
Doncaster and Templestowe	129,996
Footscray	184,162
Heidelberg	25,647
Melbourne	125,778
Northcote	113,379
Port Melbourne	42,638
Preston	269,050
Williamstown	98,257
Total	1,472,601

Notes:

1. "Trading profit" is the operating surplus as defined in the Municipal Accounting Regulations 1968.

2. The results quoted are taken from the municipal statements of accounts for the 1970–71 year.

MOTOR REGISTRATION BRANCH.

DRIVING LICENCE TESTS.

(Question No. 309)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What is the delay in testing of persons for a driving licence at each of the licence testing stations?

2. Whether it is now possible for telephone bookings to be made by persons wishing to be tested for a driving licence; is so, what is the delay in respect of such bookings?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1.

Licence testing station	*Approximate number of days delay*
Central Licence and Registration Office, Carlton ..	7
Fishermen's Bend	8
Brunswick West	13
Maidstone	16
*Williamstown	50
Oakleigh	13
Gardenvale	6
Box Hill	13
Ivanhoe	9
Springvale	9
Mordialloc	12
Fern Tree Gully	5
Frankston	7
Mornington	12
Dandenong	5
Ringwood	10

* The Maidstone licence testing station will also accept applications for driving licence tests from persons residing in the Williamstown area—in these cases the waiting period for the applicants to undergo the driving test is the same as that for other persons applying to Maidstone.

2. No. However, bookings for a driving licence test may be made by post, provided the appointment fee is enclosed with the relevant letter.

PRIVATE FLAT DEVELOPMENT.

CONTROL.

(Question No. 310)

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

1. What controls are exercised on private flat development in areas under the control of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board

of Works by—(a) local councils; (b) the board; and (c) the Local Government Department?

2. Where controls have been delegated to local councils in respect of private flat development, how this control is exercised?

3. Whether there is any conflict of control between authorities; if so, what action the Local Government Department has taken in these areas of conflict?

4. What by-law control is exercised by local councils over private flat development?

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

1. (a) Municipal councils exercise control over private flat development—

(i) As to constructional aspects—pursuant to the Uniform Building Regulations and by-laws made thereunder; and

(ii) As to planning aspects—pursuant to the Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme to the extent that the administration of the scheme in specified zones has been delegated to them by the Board of Works. Some councils furthermore have their own approved planning schemes which contain provisions relating to flats.

(b) The Board of Works controls the planning aspects of flat development to the extent that it has not delegated the administration of its planning scheme to municipal councils. The aspects of control specifically regulated by its scheme cover open area and car parking requirements, and conditions covering other matters may be inserted in planning permits in zones where application to the board is required.

(c) The Local Government Department has no initial role in the control of flat development.

2. Parliament has itself delegated control of constructional aspects to municipalities. The control is exercised by municipal building surveyors and inspectors, who are in turn subject to the control of the council. With the approval of council, application may be made to the Building Regulations Committee sitting as referees for a modification of any regulation which appears reasonable and necessary to meet the special circumstances of a particular case. Application may also be made to the Minister to direct an inquiry by the same committee in respect of supported and signed allegations in writing of substantial breaches or failures of enforcement.

For the purpose of administering the approved Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has delegated to all municipalities all the powers, authorities and responsibilities of the planning scheme where the land is situated in the following zones:—

Village, residential "A", residential "A1", residential "A2", residential B, residential C, residential D, central business, restricted business, local business, commercial and industrial, special use 3, 5 and 10.

As far as the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is aware, all councils exercise their delegation within the provisions of the Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme and in accordance with the requirement of the Town and Country Planning Act and the regulations made thereunder.

A number of councils have prepared codes as a general basis for the consideration of applications.

3. In general, no. In most cases, the municipality has responsibility on both constructional and planning aspects. In the remaining cases where a planning permit is required from the board, it seeks and takes into account the views of the council and information as to by-laws applying. Several cases did however come to the notice of the Minister last year where there was some point of conflict between a planning requirement and a local by-law, which the municipality refused to permit to be resolved by the referees. An amendment to the Local Government Act was therefore presented to and passed by Parliament last session to enable the referees to intervene as of right to resolve any such conflicts.

4. A municipal council may make by-laws—

(a) adopting a column (other than column 1) of table 804 of the Uniform Building Regulations prescribing minimum site requirements for houses and flats;

(b) prescribing a set back from frontage greater than in the relevant column of table 804;

(c) limiting the number of flats in a building;

(d) limiting the number of flats on a site;

(e) prescribing car parking space requirements;

(f) dispensing with normal site requirements for flats in business areas.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

EXPENDITURE ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN DUNDAS ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 319)

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

What amount of money was spent on each high and technical school in the electoral district of Dundas in each of the past five years?

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

The following amounts were spent at schools in the electoral district of Dundas over the last five financial years :—

	1967–68	1968–69	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72
High School, Hamilton ..	213,670	2,152	1,752	4,220	3,220
High School, Stawell ..	2,498	2,708	11,487	1,320	118,320
High School, Murtoa ..	9,980	152,101	3,941	3,975	10,475
High School, Edenhope ..	402	1,527	1,886	51,620	3,020
High School, Balmoral ..	..	31,375	1,463	975	975
Technical School, Hamilton ..	2,270	4,400	..	8,600	1,300
Technical School, Stawell ..	750,000	250,000	6,500	10,000	4,000

GEELONG TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

(Question No. 354)

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

1. When it is estimated that tenders will be called for stage one of a new technical school at Belmont to replace Geelong Technical School?

2. Whether this new school will be all male or co-educational, either at stage one or at a later stage of completion?

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

1. It is not possible at this time to estimate exactly when tenders will be called for stage I of the new technical school at Belmont. It is the department's practice, in March of each year, to assess accommodation needs of various areas throughout the State with a view to formulating a building programme for the ensuing financial year.

2. The Technical Schools Division has decided that it must first relieve the conditions for boys at Moorabool Street before it can provide further facilities for girls in the Geelong area where ample places exist for those girls opting for junior technical education.

The department will promote the redevelopment of the school as rapidly as resources will allow and co-educational facilities will be introduced as soon as possible.

SCHOOL FACILITIES: COST-SHARING BY MUNICIPALITIES.

(Question No. 360)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Education—

1. Which municipalities have entered into cost-sharing with the Education Department in providing school facilities?

2. What amount each municipality has paid or proposes to pay?

3. Who will be responsible for arrangements to enable community use of these facilities, and what are the terms and conditions laid down by the Education Department and the municipalities regarding these facilities?

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

1. City of Oakleigh—(Waverley High School).

2. City of Oakleigh paid $8,000.

3. Where the municipality contributes finance an agreement is entered into with the Minister guaranteeing the use of the facilities outside of school hours.

There have been a number of cases where in return for the use of a school's oval the municipal council maintains the area. Such arrangements are made at a local level.

At the Moorabbin, Oakleigh and Geelong West technical schools the municipal councils have constructed certain facilities at their own expense. In return the sports ovals can be used by local bodies approved by the municipality for organized sport outside school hours and during school holidays.

JOINT MUNICIPAL AND STATE SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

(Question No. 370)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether it is the Government's policy to establish joint municipal and State school library complexes; if so—(*a*) what are the details of such scheme; and (*b*) whether the proposed new school at Casterton will have library services established under this policy and, in that event, what subsidies will be available; if not, what are the plans for its library services?

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

It is the Government's policy to encourage the establishment of joint municipal and State school library complexes. My department is at present engaged in negotiations with the City of Knox for the construction of a joint school/municipal library at the Boronia High School.

The outcome of this specific venture will influence the department's thinking on other proposals for joint development of library facilities.

(*a*) It is proposed that in return for a contribution from the municipality towards the capital cost of the building, the proposed library will be available for public use outside of school hours. Details have not been finalized, however.

(*b*) The proposed alterations and extensions to the existing Casterton High School will include extension of the school's library facilities. I have no knowledge of any municipal involvement in this project.

DISMISSAL OF TEACHER.

(Question No. 377)

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park) asked the Minister of Education—

If he will lay on the table of the Library the Teachers Tribunal-Education Department file relating to the dismissal of a teacher named Barry Johnston?

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

Yes.

SUSPENSION OF STUDENT.

(Question No. 378)

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park) asked the Minister of Education—

If he will lay on the table of the Library the Education Department file relating to the suspension of Shane Massey from Koonung High School?

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

Yes.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES.

WORKERS COMPENSATION AND INSURANCE COVER FOR STUDENTS.

(Question No. 322)

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

Whether, students at agricultural colleges in Victoria are covered by workers compensation or accident policies; if not, why?

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

All students at State agricultural colleges in Victoria who are employed as cadets pursuant to the Agricultural Colleges Act 1958 are covered by workers compensation. Other students are not so covered because they are not employees.

With regard to accident insurance, parents and students are strongly advised in the college prospectus to take out privately some form of accident insurance. Joining instructions issued to students on entering a State agricultural college reiterate this advice. Inquiries have shown that, with few exceptions, students are covered by some form of accident insurance.

LANDS DEPARTMENT.

BIG DESERT: TRACKS TO BEE SITES.

(Question No. 324)

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

1. Whether he will give permission to construct tracks east and west of the Yanac–Murrayville track to open up further bee sites in the Big Desert; if so, which authority will construct such tracks?

2. How many bee sites are currently leased in the Big Desert area?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The answer is—

1. The area known as the Big Desert, with a north-south distance of about 40 miles, is unsurveyed Crown land through which no formally proclaimed roads exist. It is not the practice and there is no appropriate statutory provision to "give permission" for the construction of tracks or roadways over Crown lands although the Crown generally has not denied the traversing of any such lands by the public, including persons having local occupational rights. The construction of tracks etc. comes about by road reserves being located by survey, proclaimed as public highways and thereby placed under the care and management of the appropriate road authority, usually the municipal council. Such action would appear to be unlikely in this region until the amount of traffic warrants it.

2. As at 30th September, 1972, there were twelve bee farm and range annual licences issued under sections 146–148 of the Land Act and sixteen three-monthly apiary rights issued under section 149.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.

VACANT ALLOTMENTS: RELEASE FOR SUBDIVISION: WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICES.

(Question No. 326)

Mr. WHEELER (Essendon) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

If he will ascertain and inform the House—

1. How many vacant allotments there are within areas released for subdivision and controlled by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works?

2. How many vacant allotments are provided with water and sewerage services in subdivided areas under the control of the board?

3. How many properties where sewerage services are available have not been connected to the sewerage system?

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

1. In regard to the area for which the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is the responsible sewerage authority the total number of existing vacant allotments is approximately 85,000, of which 30,000 were added to the board's area in 1970–71 and are primarily located in the Dandenong Creek valley.

2. The number of vacant allotments provided with sewerage service and declared to be sewered areas under the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works control as at 30th June, 1972, was 13,710.

There are 51,902 vacant allotments in the area for which the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is the responsible water supply authority which are provided with a water main from which a regular service could be obtained.

3. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works statistics on this matter are in the course of revision and updating which has not yet been fully completed. However, reconciliation with council records to date indicates that the number of properties which have not been connected to available sewers is approximately 22,500.

EMPLOYMENT OF OWNER-DRIVERS.

(Question No. 338)

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

If he will ascertain and inform the House, whether the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works employs owner-drivers; if so, whether such drivers' rates of pay are determined by a committee known as the Transport Hiring Committee and, in that event—(*a*) how often the committee meets; and (*b*) whether this committee has approved increased rates for owner-drivers of the board and, if so—(i) when; and (ii) when the new rates will be paid to such owner-drivers?

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

1. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works does employ owner-drivers of trucks.

2. (*a*) The Transport Hiring Committee does not approve rates; it makes recommendations of a suggested rate which each Government department or instrumentality has to modify according to their particular circumstances.

(*b*) Recommendations resulting from this year's review were made on 15th June, 1972.

(*c*) The board's Finance Committee on 19th September, 1972, recommended an increase in the board's rate to be retrospective to 1st July, 1972.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN PASCOE VALE SOUTH.

(Question No. 344)

Mr. TURNBULL (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

If he will ascertain and inform the House, whether the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works acquired the property at 383 Reynard Street, Pascoe Vale South, for road construction purposes; if so—(*a*) who owned the property previously; (*b*) under what authority such premises were acquired; and (*c*) whether such premises are to be demolished and in that event—(i) when; and (ii) for what purposes the premises will be used in the interim?

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

The property No. 383 Reynard Street, Pascoe Vale South, is partly reserved for proposed secondary road widening under the Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme and has been so reserved for a number of years. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works purchased the property at the request of the then owner on the grounds of hardship and not for the purpose of immediate road construction.

The answers to the sub-questions are—

(*a*) The estate of Albert George Tuckerman, deceased.

(*b*) Under the provisions of section 41 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1961.

(*c*) In the event of road construction works taking place in accordance with the reservation, it would be necessary to demolish at least part of the house building, but no decision has yet been taken with regard to the extent of demolition or when this is likely to be undertaken and meanwhile the property is occupied under a weekly tenancy.

PROPOSED TREATMENT PLANT FOR INDUSTRIAL WASTES.

(Question No. 349)

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

Whether a treatment plant planned for industrial wastes referred to in the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works newsletter of 22nd September instant, to be constructed, operated and maintained by private enterprise is the policy of the Government; if so, when this decision was made; if not, whether a statement will be made to this House before the board proceeds with this project?

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

The land at Brooklyn referred to in the board's newsletter has been made available at the request of the Government by the board for leasing as a site for a treatment plant to handle liquid industrial wastes.

Applications for registration of prospective tenderers have been received by the board as a result of public advertisement and these are now being analysed. Selected applicants will be invited to submit formal tenders in the near future.

PLANNING POLICIES: COMMITTEE: MARIBYRNONG VALLEY.

(Question No. 356)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

Whether the Minister is aware of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works proposal regarding the formation of a committee to deal with planning policies for the Melbourne metropolitan region and, in particular, the Maribyrnong valley; if so, in relation to the Maribyrnong valley—(*a*) who will be appointed to this committee; (*b*) what guide-lines will be set; (*c*) what details the committee will investigate; and (*d*) whether the public will be asked to submit proposals for the development of this valley?

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

Yes. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works called a preliminary meeting of representatives of municipalities in the Maribyrnong valley to consider the possibility of setting up an advisory committee to assist the board in planning in this area. A further meeting of representatives has been arranged and to date no decisions have been made regarding (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) or (*d*).

BIRMID AUTO CASTINGS PTY. LTD., GEELONG.

OBSERVANCE OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY ACT.

(Question No. 328)

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

If he will lay on the table of the Library the file relating to the failure of Birmid Auto Castings Pty. Ltd., Geelong, to observe the provisions of the Labour and Industry Act 1958?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The answer is—

The file concerned has been forwarded to the Parliamentary Librarian for laying on the table of the Library.

FRANKLIN INDUSTRIES, BALLARAT.

BREACH OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY ACT.

(Question No. 329)

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

If he will lay on the table of the Library the file relating to the breach of the Labour and Industry Act 1958 by Franklin Industries, Ballarat?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The answer is—

The file concerned has been forwarded to the Parliamentary Librarian for laying on the table of the Library.

PRINCES HIGHWAY.

TRAFFIC DENSITY BETWEEN MORWELL AND TRARALGON.

(Question No. 332)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister of Transport—

1. What is the traffic density of the Princes Highway between Morwell and Traralgon?

2. When the last traffic count was taken?

3. What was the traffic count on this section of the highway for each of the past five years and how this compares with—(*a*) the Moe–Morwell highway; (*b*) the Melbourne–Geelong highway; and (*c*) the Melbourne–Bendigo highway?

4. What is considered to be maximum traffic capacity of the highway?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

1 and 2. The average number of vehicles counted during the twelve-hour period between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on 23rd to 29th July, 1972, at the municipal boundary between the shires of Morwell and Traralgon at mileage 95·6 was 6,445.

3. The number of vehicles counted during the twelve-hour period between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. at the annual one-day census in March are set out hereunder—

Year	Princes Highway—West of Traralgon, mileage 95.6	Princes Highway—Moe-Morwell at 90 c.m. railway	Princes Highway East of Geelong. 41 miles	Calder Highway, mileage 93.7
1968 ..	4,943	6,421	12,768	2,303
1969 ..	5,663	7,196	10,971	2,347
1970 ..	5,566	7,238	11,618	2,707
1971 ..	5,254	8,245	10,675	2,771
1972 ..	6,840	9,000 (estimated)	13,518	2,748

4. The maximum capacity of the two-lane section of the Princes Highway East between Morwell and Traralgon is assessed at 2,300 vehicles per hour. The average number of vehicles counted at the peak hour is between 800 and 900 vehicles per hour with a maximum number of 1,360 vehicles counted at the peak hour on Good Friday, 31st March, 1972.

ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC AUTHORITY.

TRAFFIC CONTROL LIGHTS FOR RESERVOIR INTERSECTION.

(Question No. 336)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Chief Secretary—

Whether plans have been approved for traffic control lights at the intersection of Broadway and High Street, Reservoir; if so—(*a*) when; and (*b*) whether finance has been approved and, in that event, when, and when such funds will be available for this work?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport)—The answer is—

The Road Safety and Traffic Authority is now preparing the plans and specifications which it is anticipated will be forwarded to Preston City Council in approximately one month's time. The Government has approved of the payment of a subsidy towards the cost of installation of these signals and the subsidy will be paid to council when an inspection of the signals shows that they have been satisfactorily installed.

STATE SAVINGS BANK.

HOUSING LOANS.

(Question No. 337)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Treasurer—

1. What qualifications are required of potential State Savings Bank of Victoria housing loan borrowers?

2. Whether consideration has been given to reducing the minimum monthly bank balances; if not, why?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The answer is—

1. The bank has advised me that normally, an applicant for a home loan from the State Savings Bank should have maintained and operated an account or accounts with the bank for a period of at least eighteen months and the average monthly balance of such account or accounts should be at least:

For a loan up to	$8,000	$1,000
For a loan from	$8,001 to $10,000	$1,500
For a loan over	$10,000	$2,500

2. The account qualification is kept constantly under review, having regard to the funds available for home loans and the demand for such loans. I might add that the Government regards matters such as these to be matters which the bank itself must be left to determine having regard to the best interests of all its customers.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

FATALITIES AND INJURIES INVOLVING LIFTS, CRANES AND HOISTS.

(Question No. 339)

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

Further to his answer to question No. 133 asked on 19th September instant, in respect of each of the 421 accidents involving lifts, cranes and hoists, reported to the Chief Inspector of Lifts and Cranes since 1st January, 1971—

1. In whose employ was each of the persons concerned at the time of the accident?

2. Where each accident occurred?

3. What type of lift or crane or other device was involved in each of these accidents?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The answer is—

To provide the answer to the question asked by the honorable member would require a great amount of time and labour and I do not feel justified in diverting staff from their normal pursuits in order to provide this information. If the honorable member wants information about specific cases, I will endeavour to provide it.

POLICE SERVICE BOARD.

PROMOTION APPEALS.

(Question No. 343)

Mr. TURNBULL (Brunswick West) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many appeals are pending before the Police Service Board in respect of officer promotion in the Police Force?

2. In addition to the appellant and the selectee, how many officers are required to be present in any capacity at each appeal?

3. How long such appeals are likely to take before final determination and what is the estimated loss of officer working hours involved in the hearing of the appeals?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary, Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport)—The answer is—

For the purpose of this answer, the term "officer" has been taken to include all members of the Police Force.

1.	Number of appellants.	Number of appeals.
Appeals by senior sergeants against their non-selection for promotion to rank of inspector	4	4
Appeals by senior constables against their non-selection for promotion to rank of sergeant ..	50	56

2. An officer is detailed to appear on behalf of the Chief Commissioner to support the selection for promotion. A member of the rank of sergeant is detailed to assist the officer. A constable is also detailed to act as a court orderly. Two members of the force are usually called to give evidence in support of each selectee and an appellant may call as many members as he desires to support his case.

3. It is not possible to state when the Police Service Board will finally determine the appeals, but it is estimated that it may take up to six weeks before all appeals currently awaiting determination are disposed of.

As is customary, a timetable has been prepared in order to control the attendance before the board of selectees and their witnesses. It is estimated that 8,000 man hours will be involved in the attendance of members at the hearing of these appeals.

TOWNSHIP OF HARROW.

BORE WATER SUPPLY.

(Question No. 347)

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

What was the flow of each bore put down at Harrow for the proposed water supply, what was the quality of water flowing from each bore, whether there was sufficient water for domestic use, and whether it is proposed to undertake further drilling; if not, why?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—The answer is—

Since 1970 the Mines Department has drilled six bores in the vicinity of Harrow. The water in five of these bores was either too saline or insufficient in quantity to be considered as a basis for town supply. One of these bores has been retained for observation purposes.

The bore that is proposed as the production bore for town supply purposes yielded flow rates during testing that varied from 6,300 to 8,000 gallons per hour. The pump test indicated that the amount of water which could be pumped safely per day is 33,000 gallons, with a total dissolved solids content of 726—832 parts per million. This water would be suitable for human consumption and domestic use including gardening although it would benefit by treatment to reduce hardness.

The feasibility of utilizing groundwater for the Harrow town supply is at present being considered by the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission. In these circumstances no further drilling is contemplated at this stage.

MINISTRY OF YOUTH AND RECREATION.

FUNCTIONS: STAFF: EFFECT ON YOUTH WELFARE DIVISION.

(Question No. 348)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister for Youth and Recreation—

1. What will be the functions of the new Ministry of Youth and Recreation?

2. What new positions will be created in the Ministry?

3. How the Ministry will be staffed?

4. Whether creation of the Ministry will affect the operations of the Social Welfare Department's Youth Welfare Division; if so, in what way?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Youth and Recreation).—The answer is—

Questions of this nature will be answered after legislation to establish a Department of Youth and Recreation is introduced.

FREE KINDERGARTEN UNION OF VICTORIA.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

(Question No. 355)

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

1. What monetary assistance has been given to the Free Kindergarten Union of Victoria in the past five financial years?

2. What amount of assistance will be given during this financial year?

3. Whether the activities of the union provide a service so resulting in a saving of money by the Government; if so, what is the annual saving?

4. Whether an emergency grant will be made to the union to cover needs pending the completion of the current enquiry into pre-school education?

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

1 and 2. No monetary assistance is given through the Department of Health to the Free Kindergarten Union of Victoria although payments to kindergartens affiliated with the union are paid by the department through the union.

3. The Free Kindergarten Union of Victoria employs a staff of one part-time and three full-time pre-school advisers to supervise the 89 centres affiliated with it. These centres are still subject to annual inspection by officers of the Department of Health.

It is probable that, if the Free Kindergarten Union ceased to employ pre-school advisers, it would be necessary for the Department of Health to increase its kindergarten supervisory staff. At the existing ratio of departmental staff to kindergartens, the increase would be one full-time and one half-time pre-school adviser, the cost of employing whom would be approximately $12,000 in a full year.

4. No provision has been made in the Budget for the payment of any emergency grant.

LAW DEPARTMENT.

CLAIMS AGAINST FORMER PUBLIC SOLICITOR.

(Question No. 357)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Attorney-General—

1. Whether the sum of $14,000 has been paid out in claims against the former Public Solicitor, Mr. Douglas?

2. What was the basis of claims made against Mr. Douglas and what payment was made in each case?

3. If he will lay the files dealing with this matter on the table of the Library?

Sir GEORGE REID (Attorney-General).—The answer is—

1. I assume that the honorable member is referring to an item appearing in the published Estimates of the Receipts and payments of the Consolidated Fund for the Year Ending 30th June, 1973. In the schedule—"Expenditure from Advance to Treasurer, 1971-72"—under Division No. 39—Attorney-General—item 2 reference is made to "*Ex gratia* payments in settlement of claims against the former Public Solicitor, G.W.A. Douglas" amounting to $14,691.

The amount was made up of damages of $12,500 paid to the plaintiff in the Supreme Court action *Annie Clissold* v. *State of Victoria, G.W.A. Douglas and Michael O'Brien* (No. 1013 of 1969) and a sum of $2,190.72 being taxed costs in respect of the Supreme Court action *Keith James Carrick* v. *Allan Douglas* (No. 1297 of 1968).

2. The claim in the matter *Annie Clissold* v. *State of Victoria, G.W.A. Douglas and Michael O'Brien* was that a writ prepared in the office of the Public Solicitor was not served within twelve months from the date of issue. In consequence, a claim for damages by Mrs. Clissold against a hospital for negligence in treatment became statute barred. The claim against the State of Victoria, G.W.A. Douglas and Michael O'Brien was settled and, as I have mentioned in my answer to part 1. of the question, damages of $12,500 were paid to Mrs. Clissold. The matter of costs has not yet been settled between the parties.

The matter *Keith James Carrick* v. *Allan Douglas* arose from failure to serve a writ issued by the Public Solicitor in pursuance of a claim by Mr. Carrick for damages for injuries suffered in a motor vehicle accident. The claim became statute barred. Damages amounting to $9,223.81 were paid to solicitors acting for Mr. Carrick in June, 1970 and, as I have stated, taxed costs amounted to $2,190.72.

3. The file relating to the matter *Keith James Carrick* v. *Allan Douglas* has been laid on the table of the Library. The file in respect of the matter *Annie Clissold* v. *State of Victoria, G. W. A. Douglas and Michael O'Brien* is required by my department and I am not prepared to lay the file on the table of the Library at this time. However, if the honorable member contacts me I shall be happy to make the file available at my office for his perusal.

UNIVERSITIES.

PERSONS QUALIFIED FOR ENTRY.

(Question No. 358)

Mr. TURNBULL (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Education—

How many persons qualified for entry into universities in Victoria for 1972 and how many of such persons were educated at State high schools?

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

We have requested the Chairman of the Victorian Universities Admissions Committee to supply the required information.

The honorable member will be advised by letter as soon as a reply comes to hand.

SHIRE OF FLINDERS.

CAMP AND BOAT-SHED FEES.

(Question No. 364)

Mr. LIND (Dandenong) asked the Minister of Lands—

1. What revenue has been collected as foreshore camping fees on—(*a*) public lands under the control of the Council of the Shire of Flinders, acting as a committee of management; and (*b*) other public lands under the control of other committees of management within that municipality, during each of the past three financial years?

2. Whether the financial statements related thereto are—(*a*) audited according to the relevant Acts of Parliament; and (*b*) published?

3. Where, and for what purposes revenue may be spent?

4. Whether fees collected over the past three financial years have been fully expended according to the relevant Acts of Parliament?

5. Whether the Council of the Shire of Flinders has recently increased boat-shed fees by almost 400 per cent in some instances?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The answer is—

		$
1. (*a*) Year ended		
30th September, 1969	..	41,804
30th September, 1970	..	42,948
30th September, 1971	..	35,988
(*b*) 30th June, 1970 ..	..	112,472
30th June, 1971 ..	..	120,273
30th June, 1972 ..	..	124,851

Note—(i) The difference in periods is due to the municipal year ending on 30th September. (ii) The answer to (*b*) does not include amounts relating to Tootgarook foreshore reserve, full details of which are not yet available.

2. The financial statements are subject to section 221 (2) (*g*) of the Land Act which provides that a committee of management shall keep a full and particular account of all sums of moneys received and expended by it and shall furnish annually to the Secretary for Lands a statement of its receipts and expenditure and of the balance in hand and (if so requested by the Secretary for Lands) full particulars of any or all of its receipts and expenditure.

Statements which comply with these requirements have been received, subject to note (ii) in the foregoing answer.

3. Section 221 (2) (*f*) provides that a committee of management may expend any tolls, fees charges or other moneys received by it—

(i) in the management improvement and maintenance of the land under its control;

(ii) in employing officers, servants and workmen; and

(iii) for such other purposes as the Minister in any particular case approves.

4. Expenditure as stated in the statements received complies with the requirements given in the answer to part 2 of the question.

5. Yes.

ROAD TRAFFIC CODE.

VEHICLES PASSING STATIONARY SCHOOL BUSES.

(Question No. 369)

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

Whether the Government will provide that it be an offence for motor vehicles to pass a stationary school bus where school children are boarding or alighting from such buses?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport)—The answer is—

There is no provision in the national traffic code imposing such a requirement on motorists and, indeed, there would be many practical difficulties in implementing the suggestion of the honorable member.

However, to provide a better warning to motorists, the Road Safety and Traffic Authority and the Ministry of Transport are currently designing a new and more effective "school bus" sign.

LABOUR AND INDUSTRY ACT.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY PROVISIONS: APPLICATION TO STATE INSTRUMENTALITIES.

(Question No. 371)

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

What provisions of the Labour and Industry Act 1958 with respect to industrial safety apply to each of the State instrumentalities?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry). The answer is—

If by the term "State instrumentalities" the honorable member means public statutory corporations, the answer is that all the provisions of the Act to which he refers apply to the activities of these bodies when

they are not the Crown. The only basis on which it could be claimed that these provisions did not apply would be that the undertaking was under the shield of the Crown. There may be some undertakings that may be so characterized, but I am not in a position to advise on this.

ABORTION.

CHARGES NOT PROCEEDED WITH.

(Question No. 380)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Attorney-General—

In respect of medically qualified practitioners charged with illegally using an instrument to procure a miscarriage, or with conspiracy to procure an illegal abortion, how many charges have not been proceeded with during 1972 as a result of a *nolle prosequi* being entered, specifying the number of doctors involved?

Sir GEORGE REID (Attorney-General).—The answer is—

After investigation by the Solicitor-General and by a Crown prosecutor, and on their recommendation, there have been entered during 1972 *nolle prosequis* in respect of sixteen charges involving three medical practitioners.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

ABSENCE OF MINISTERS.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—The Attorney-General has been kind enough to tell me that he regrets that he is detained today on urgent State business.

I had a call just now from the Minister for Social Welfare, who will be detained for about ten minutes.

KIDNAPPING AT FARADAY.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Can the Treasurer inform the House what the Government intends to do in recognition of the great courage and devotion to duty displayed by Miss Mary Gibbs in the recent kidnapping?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The whole community would want some appropriate recognition to be given to the tremendous courage and presence of mind of this young teacher. The proper course to follow is for the Government to make a recommendation to His Excellency the Governor. All I can tell the House at present is that this is what the Government would like to do, and it will be taking the appropriate steps.

MOE SPECIAL SCHOOL.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—Can the Minister of Public Works explain the circumstances under which the Melbourne based firm of E. A. Watts Pty. Ltd. was awarded the $500,000 contract for a special school at Moe? Were tenders called and why were Latrobe Valley contractors, notably one who has completed the $1 million contract for the Gippsland Institute of Advanced Education, not invited to tender for this work?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works).—Off the cuff, I cannot give a full answer to this question. I might add that, because of the amount of money available for the building of schools this financial year, there is pre-selected tendering in some cases. In other cases, contracts are negotiated without tendering. This is done by Order in Council. If this was not acceptable to the Government or the Parliament, the building of the schools which can be built because of the amount of money available would be slowed down. I will give the specific details asked for to the honorable member as soon as possible.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS FOR COUNTRY.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—Would the Minister of Health be prepared to confer with the Federal Minister for Immigration to try to ensure that some of the medical men among the Ugandan Asians coming to Australia might be placed in country centres of Victoria where there are no doctors or there is a shortage of doctors?

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—Did the honorable member say " medical men? "

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS.—Yes.

Mr. ROSSITER.—General practitioners?

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS.—Yes.

Mr. ROSSITER.—I would be delighted to take up the matter.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

Mr. McLAREN (Bennettswood).—Can the Premier inform the House of the results of discussions which took place last week on the proposed constitutional convention?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—A conference was held in Adelaide on Thursday and Friday of last week. The Leader of the Opposition and I represented this Parliament. All States were represented by either the Premier, the Deputy Premier or a senior Minister. The Commonwealth had four representatives, representing each party in the Federal Parliament—the Attorney-General, Senator Greenwood; the Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Sinclair; the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, Senator Murphy; and Senator Gair, of the Democratic Labor Party.

The purpose of the conference was to make administrative arrangements for the holding of a constitutional convention as early as practicable next year. Everybody present was impressed by the spirit of co-operation that was evident and by a real feeling that the constitutional convention was not only feasible but necessary. Arrangements were made, as has been publicized in the press, for the first meeting of the constitutional convention to be held in Sydney on 28th May next year.

Mr. WILKES.—Will that be before or after the election?

Mr. HAMER.—Who knows? The first session of the convention is programmed to last a week. Everybody who was present was impressed by the great spirit of amity that prevailed, and people who were not there were similarly impressed. Admittedly only administrative arrangements were being made at that stage but there were good, strong indications that everybody present felt that the present situation was intolerable and that some over-all review and overhaul of the Constitution was absolutely essential.

The conference appointed Mr. John Finemore, Victoria's Chief Parliamentary Counsel, as chief executive officer for the convention. It appointed as clerk of the convention meetings Mr. Combe, of South Australia, and Mr. Bruce McDonnell, Clerk of the Parliaments in Victoria, as second clerk. The convention looked like assuming a wholly Victorian character and it was even suggested by New South Wales that the convention itself should be held in Melbourne. For the sake of appearances and because it seemed appropriate, I proposed, and the Leader of the Opposition seconded, that the first meeting be held in the senior city of Australia — Sydney — and that was decided by the conference. That is how it was decided, and that is a further illustration of the amiability which prevailed throughout.

At present the signs are most favourable. Every Parliament in Australia was represented and every party was unanimous in what it was hoped would be achieved. The next step before this convention is held is for each State delegation to propose the agenda items, which will relate to the parts of the Constitution they think should be overhauled.

The Victorian delegation has already met and decided to seek the views of and submissions from a wide range of bodies interested in the Constitution. Letters have gone to more than 30 organizations asking for their ideas on what parts of the Constitution should be reviewed in this way. Some replies have already been received. The Victorian delegation will have its submissions completed by the end of November and will put them before the chief executive officer by the end of January in preparation for the convention.

COMMONWEALTH FUNDS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT.

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg).—Is the Minister of Transport aware of the statement which recently appeared in the press reporting a statement made by Mr. McMahon that the Federal Government is likely to assist in financing the construction of the Melbourne underground rail loop and, if so, what progress has been made in regard to that statement?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I am aware of the statement, which was reported in the newspapers this morning as having been made by the Prime Minister in a television interview yesterday, that the Commonwealth Government would be taking some initiative not only in relation to the Melbourne underground rail loop but also on the general question of urban public transport and railways generally. Those two matters — urban public transport and railways generally — have been the subject of meetings of transport Ministers from the States and the Commonwealth, and many recommendations have gone forward to the Commonwealth Government through the Commonwealth Minister present. The Premier and Treasurer has also discussed Victoria's problems with the Prime Minister. I had the good fortune to be invited to the opening of the new Whyalla-Port Augusta railway, last Friday, and I had the opportunity there of meeting with the Prime Minister and further discussing the matter with him. I am delighted with the progress that is apparently being made, and I hope everybody tackles the matter and is of the same mind as honorable members on the Government side of the Chamber.

RAILWAY PROJECTS.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Can the Minister of Transport inform me whether, at any stage, he has expressed to the Commonwealth Government a view on the actual amount of money that Victoria needs to carry out some of the railway projects which the honorable gentleman has from time to time mentioned in this House?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The matter has been approached on a general basis.

Mr. HOLDING.—What was the sum?

Mr. WILCOX.—Studies have been made by the Bureau of Transport Economics at Canberra. That bureau has been put in possession of all the information that has been asked for, including the facts and figures of the many matters which require attention in the transport scene in Victoria, not just in Melbourne. In relation to the Melbourne underground rail loop, the Premier has requested the Commonwealth to participate by providing half the funds that are required. That is a specific instance.

KIDNAPPING AT FARADAY.

Mr. CRELLIN (Sandringham).—In view of the recent harrowing experiences at Faraday, where a teacher and six children were kidnapped, can the Minister representing the Chief Secretary inform the House of some of the circumstances which resulted in the excellent police work in apprehending the alleged kidnappers so quickly after the event?

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—I suggest the question be not asked.

Mr. CRELLIN.—On a point of order, with respect, Mr. Speaker, could you give your reasons?

The SPEAKER.—Order! On the view that the *sub judice* rule could well apply to this, I suggest to the House that the question be not asked.

GORDON BYPASS FREEWAY.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government. Is the honorable gentleman aware that a large section of the new Gordon Bypass Freeway is disintegrating and is open to only one lane of traffic? If he is aware of

this situation, will he inform the House of the reasons for the failure of this section of the freeway?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I am not aware of the situation to which the honorable member refers, but I will direct it to the attention of the Minister for Local Government and seek a reply from him.

MELBOURNE UNDERGROUND RAIL LOOP.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—In view of the statement of the Minister of Transport that the Premier and Treasurer has asked the Federal Treasurer for half the funds required for the building of the Melbourne underground rail loop, can the Premier and Treasurer inform the House of the actual figures involved and the actual sum requested?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—When the letter was written to the Prime Minister, the estimate of the cost of the Melbourne underground rail loop—so far as I am aware it still stands—including tracks and all associated works, was $117 million.

Mr. HOLDING.—Does that estimate include rolling-stock?

Mr. HAMER.—No. The request I made to the Prime Minister was for the Commonwealth to find half of that cost.

RAILWAY COSTS.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—Is the Premier and Treasurer, like his predecessor, prepared to hand control of the costs of the Victorian Railways to any Federal Government which is prepared to accept them?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—This is a matter of Government policy. So far as I am aware, no proposal of this nature has been made to the State Government. The Government would be prepared to discuss the takeover of the capital debt attributed to the railways on the ground that it is a development cost which may well be shouldered by the Federal Government.

HORSHAM AND HAMILTON DOG RACING CLUBS.

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland).—In view of the fact that the Horsham Greyhound Club has not raced yet, will the Minister for Youth and Recreation consider introducing immediate legislation to enable a joint licence to be held by the Horsham and Hamilton dog racing clubs to race on alternate weeks? If not, why not?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Youth and Recreation).—I will give consideration to this matter and advise the honorable member accordingly.

BASS STRAIT OIL AND GAS RIGHTS.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—I direct a question to the Minister for Fuel and Power. In view of the new agreement on boundaries that has been negotiated with other countries by the Federal Government, will further negotiations be necessary with Esso-B.H.P. regarding oil and gas rights and the boundaries in Bass Strait for the exploration of oil or gas?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—No. The decisions which I understand were made recently by Australia and Indonesia do not affect the Bass Strait areas in any way.

WEARING OF HELMETS BY CHILD CYCLISTS.

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas).—I ask the Minister representing the Chief Secretary whether legislation will be introduced in this session of Parliament for the compulsory wearing of helmets by children riding bicycles.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I am not aware of any proposed legislation to this effect. The Chief Secretary is currently overseas. He may have something in mind but I am certainly not aware of it.

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETIES.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I direct a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Housing. Further to the answer received last week to a question confirming the practice of co-operative housing societies requiring persons taking out finance to insure their homes with the lending authority, what action is proposed to be taken to prevent this requirement?

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member is making a speech. The question should be asked.

Mr. FELL.—What action is proposed to discontinue the requirement that the financier should also be the insurer of the property?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—In the absence overseas of the Minister representing the Minister of Housing, I shall be grateful if the honorable member will put his question on the Notice Paper.

RAILWAY WORK AT FOOTSCRAY.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—Can the Minister of Transport explain what are the major railway undertakings being carried on at present in the electorate of Footscray, particularly relating to the widening of tracks? Can the honorable gentleman also explain whether it is general policy not to inform the members concerned of the nature of these undertakings before the work is commenced?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I am not sure what the honorable member is referring to, but if it is the provision of additional tracks in the Footscray area, I can inform him — and I am glad to do so — that work is being carried out there. The area is a bottleneck which affects many lines, including the Geelong line, and the work is being done as a part of the ordinary Victorian Railways' programme.

If the honorable member was not informed of this, I am sorry, but it is something which proceeds in the ordinary course of business, and it has not been the practice to inform honorable members of activities of this kind. When the Victorian Railways next carry out a project in the Footscray area, I will inform the honorable member.

MELBOURNE UNDERGROUND RAIL LOOP.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—In view of the answer given by the Minister of Transport last week concerning funds for the provision of new rolling-stock for the underground rail loop, and his view that there ought to be Commonwealth involvement, is the honorable gentleman in a position to inform the House about the cost of providing this new rolling-stock? Can the honorable gentleman also inform the House whether he has put any —and, if so, what—propositions to the Federal Treasurer on Commonwealth involvement in the provision of the necessary funds?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I can only enlarge on an answer I gave to an honorable member earlier this afternoon by saying that the Bureau of Transport Economics conducted a study of the whole question of urban transport needs in the large cities of Australia. Victoria provided a great deal of information, concerning replacement of rolling-stock in the Victorian Railways and relating to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board. The information provided covered the whole question of urban public transport. I cannot remember the precise figures involved, but if the honorable member wishes to know them I suggest that he should place his question on notice.

I also inform the House that the Bureau of Transport Economics did a wider study of railways generally, and that that study was directed to

the whole question of finance required for new rolling-stock and tracks.

Mr. HOLDING.—Will the Minister lay on the table of the Library the documents that were supplied to the Federal Bureau of Transport Economics?

Mr. WILCOX.—I ask the honorable member to place that question on the Notice Paper.

STAFF FOR SPECIAL SCHOOLS.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—Will the Minister of Education inform the House what provision there is for the training of teachers for special schools throughout Victoria? Can the honorable gentleman also inform the House whether sufficient and adequate staff will be available for the Moe Special School when it is completed?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The Education Department is currently conducting an examination into the training of special teachers for schools in Victoria. It is true that the department is erecting schools at Burwood, Watsonia, Moe and Dandenong, and work on another for physically handicapped children will commence at Mount Waverley. Because there is a high ratio of teachers to pupils — for example, one teacher to eight pupils — there is a need for a larger number of staff than for ordinary primary schools. At present the training of specialist teachers is carried out at the Melbourne Teachers College and Glendonald but, because of our policy of placing increased emphasis on the Special Division and of catering for an expanding number of people in this area, the department is currently studying the provision of increased training facilities.

AMALGAMATION OF MUNICIPALITIES.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—I have twice asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government when the report of the inquiry into the amalgamation of municipalities will be made available or be completed. The Minister has promised to obtain the answer from the Minister in another place, but so far it has not been furnished. I ask the Minister when the report will be available?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—At no stage have I said that I would obtain an answer from the Minister for Local Government. I have said that I would direct the honorable member's question to the attention of my colleague, and I have done so. I will do so again, and I will encourage my colleague to inform me when an answer might be forthcoming.

LEAD-FREE PETROL.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—During the last sitting of the House, I directed the attention of the Minister for Conservation to an article in the daily press concerning lead-free petrol. The honorable gentleman indicated that he would examine the article and refer it to the Environment Protection Authority for report. Can the Minister advise me whether the authority is investigating the matter at this moment, and is the honorable gentleman prepared to make a copy of the report available when it comes to hand?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—As I indicated I would when the honorable member raised the matter previously, I have referred the article to the Environment Protection Authority for comment. At this stage, I would not invite the authority to examine the question in depth because, as all honorable members will be aware, the authority is involved in establishing licensing procedures which will be required for the Act to be proclaimed by the end of December. Therefore, I should not like to divert specialist officers from that job to this type of investigation. As soon as I have the comments of the authority on the article, I will be delighted to make them available to the honorable member.

MAXIMUM SECURITY PRISON.

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg).—In view of the continued unrest at Pentridge Gaol, can the Minister for Social Welfare inform the House what progress has been made by the Government in developing a new maximum security prison?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—In prison systems around the world, from time to time there is unrest. Never will we have a situation in Victoria, and particularly in our major prison, where we can say that there will never be unrest. In Pentridge, where the toughest of our criminals are housed, there would be 50 people who would be best suited to a maximum security institution. There would also be 200 people who perhaps ought to be in a maximum security prison.

With this knowledge the Government is planning, in what we call the schematic design stage, in this financial year the construction of a new maximum security prison. This was suggested by me about three or four months ago and further elaborated on recently by, I think, the Premier and myself through the media as well as in answer to questions in the House. There are three stages in the development of the new maximum security prison, of which the schematic design stage is the first. We will be aiming, towards the end of this financial year, at taking options on a site and next financial year commencing the laying of the proverbial bricks and mortar with a view to completion of the maximum security prison in the following financial year.

In the interim, from time to time we can expect some unrest. There is an undoubted need for a maximum security prison apart from a large institution such as Pentridge. The Government is planning for it, and is committed to building it, and the project certainly is in train now. I am hopeful that it will be built in a country area and because of this possibility I have received representations from a large number of country municipalities seeking the establishment of the institution in their areas.

MOE SPECIAL SCHOOL.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—Whilst I appreciate that the Government is moving in the training of teachers for special schools, the Minister of Education did not answer the second part of my earlier question.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—The honorable member should ask a further question.

Mr. AMOS.—The second part of the question was whether sufficient and adequate staff will be available for the commencement of the Moe Special School when that project is completed.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—At this stage, I have no reason to believe that there will not be sufficient and adequate staff at the Moe Special School when it is completed.

PAPERS.

The following papers, pursuant to the directions of several Acts of Parliament, were laid upon the table by the Clerk:—

Environment Protection Authority—Report for the year 1971–72—Ordered to be printed.

Grain Elevators Board—Report and statement of accounts for the year ended 31st October, 1971.

La Trobe University—Report of the council for the year 1971–72.—Ordered to be approved by the Governor in Council during 1971.

Monash University—Report of the council for the year 1971; together with statutes approved by the Governor in Council during 1971.

National Parks Advisory Committee—Report for the year 1971–72.

Police Regulation Act 1958—Determination No. 195 of the Police Service Board.

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended Nos. 293 to 297 (five papers).

Science Museum of Victoria—Report for the year 1971–72.

Statutory Rules under the following Acts :—
Adoption of Children Act 1964—No.264.
Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958—No. 262.
Grain Elevators Act 1958—No. 265.
Health Act 1958—No. 263.
Local Government Act 1958—Nos. 260 No. 269.
Marine Act 1958—No. 266.
Town and Country Planning Act 1961—No. 261.
Water Act 1958—No. 268.
West Moorabool Water Board Act 1968—No. 267.

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—Lara Planning Scheme, 1961, Amendment No. 5, 1970

Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 12 and 33 (two papers).
Shire of Mornington Planning Scheme, 1959, Amendment No. 56, 1970.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.

INDUSTRIAL WASTES DISPOSAL PLANT.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—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 Local Government to request the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works to prepare a scheme for the board to establish, operate, and maintain a treatment plant for the disposal of liquid industrial wastes from within the board's area.

Approval of the proposed discussion was indicated by the required numbers of members rising in their places, as specified in Standing Order No. 8B.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—At long last the Government is prepared to recognize that there is a serious pollution problem in the metropolitan area, particularly with underground water resources in the north-western suburbs. It is common knowledge that the Government has agreed to a proposal that the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works should release an area of land which is in the ownership of and under the control of the board and that tenders will be invited from private enterprise for the establishment and operation of a liquid trade waste disposal plant. The Premier, in a letter to me dated 7th September of this year in reply to correspondence I had with the honorable gentleman on 10th August seeking information concerning the establishment of this plant, indicated that this land is in Brooklyn and is to be made available under leasehold for the construction of an appropriate treatment plant for handling liquid trade waste.

However, the Opposition is concerned that if this proposal comes to fruition the company which lodges the successful tender will be in a very strong position concerning the disposal of liquid trade waste. Any private enterprise organization embarking on a project of this sort will do so purely as a business proposition. Its only concern will be the profit margin it will be able to establish in operating this plant. I would not expect any large private enterprise organization to embark on this type of project for the sole purpose of assisting the Government to overcome the pollution problem because private enterprise generally has shown no inclination until now to be concerned about the pollution problems that have existed in the north-western suburbs for a long time.

The establishment of a liquid industrial waste disposal plant was brought to a head when the municipalities in the area became so concerned about the disposal of industrial wastes that they were forced to deny access to property under their control where pollutants of this sort could be dumped. The disposal of these pollutants has caused problems for a long time and many people have had to put up with all sorts of inconvenience. As a result of the dumping of pollutants the underground water supply has become contaminated to such a degree that it now constitutes a danger to the health of the community. No matter what company is successful in tendering for this plant, it will be in a strong position.

The House also knows, or should know because the Minister for Conservation and other Ministers have referred to it often, that it is the Government's intention to proclaim the Environment Protection Act in its entirety by the end of this year. Under that Act the Environment Protection Authority will have the responsibility of introducing a licensing system for the disposal of industrial waste, and all industrial organizations will have to obtain a licence before they can dispose of these wastes. Members of the Opposition do not disagree with that system. For the protection of the environment, the licence will be endorsed with a variety of restrictions on the methods to be used to dispose of liquid trade waste and any other form of waste that the industry may produce. It will not be difficult for any honorable member to reach the conclusion that the only centre which will be available for the disposal of liquid trade waste in the metropolitan area will be the plant established at Brooklyn and operated by private enterprise.

The Opposition agrees that a plant ought to be established as quickly as possible, but it takes issue with the Government on whether it should be operated by private enterprise. The plant should be operated by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. I do not want to go into the details of the financial difficulties of the board, the percentage of the board's income which is used to service existing loans, and the restriction this places on its operations. If any profits are to be made from the disposal of liquid trade waste, they ought to be made by the board to assist in solving of its financial problems. For too long ratepayers in the metropolitan area have been providing funds to be used by the board on projects from which certain ratepayers receive no benefit. The Opposition has always been opposed to that, as the records of Parliament clearly show.

I reaffirm the attitude of the Labor Party. The plant should be established as quickly as possible and it should be established by the Board of Works and be completely under its control. By ensuring that that happens, the Government will achieve two objectives. It will provide industry with the means by which this highly dangerous and highly polluting form of trade waste can be dealt with efficiently and capably.

Mr. STEPHEN.—Who said efficiently?

Mr. WILTON.—The honorable member for Ballaarat South wants to claim that the Board of Works is not efficient. That is his prerogative. I invite the honorable member to inform the House in what way the board is not efficient and how he comes to that conclusion.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I think he might be ruled out of order.

Mr. WILTON.—Mr. Speaker, I assume from the interjection of the honorable member that he will base his opposition to this motion on the allegation that the board is inefficient.

If the Government changed its attitude on this matter to that suggested by the Labor Party, this plant would be established by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works as quickly as possible and it would be operated and controlled by the board. Then industries in the metropolitan area—the free enterprise friends of the honorable member for Ballaarat South—would be protected from exploitation. The Premier must agree that any company which is given the sole franchise to operate a plant of this type in the metropolitan area will be in a very strong position, particularly in view of the licensing system which will require industry to dispose of its trade waste at that plant. That cannot be denied. It is the responsibility of the Government to ensure that the disposal centre is controlled by a statutory authority.

Private enterprise has been found wanting on many occasions. Many honorable members on the Government side of the House will want to argue that private enterprise is efficient. It is not; it is inefficient because its sole objective is profit. The criterion by which it operates is the profit which it can earn; that is the law by which it lives. Therefore, it is not efficient. Private enterprise would be prepared to do something less than is necessary to efficiently dispose of trade waste in a manner which is not offensive to the community at large and which does not constitute a danger to the health of the community.

No honorable member would deny that in the north-western suburbs of Melbourne the underground water system is badly polluted. The major cause of the pollution is the manner in which private industry has been disposing of its liquid trade waste. The underground water in this area may become a major source of supply in the coming months as it is possible that there will be another extremely dry period. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is already sounding warnings that the metropolis might experience another water shortage. Bores for underground water were established in parts of the metropolitan area during the last extremely dry period. The use of underground water was the salvation of some areas. It has been established that if this water was purified and protected it could be used by certain industries and in many other ways. I understand that tests have been taken and that it has been reliably stated that the aquifers to the west of Melbourne can yield 1 million gallons of water an hour. This is an asset which the Parliament is obliged to protect.

The actions of private enterprise to the present give me no confidence in its being able to do the job which must be done. Not only has there been serious contamination of the atmosphere. Last January, right opposite Melbourne's international airport, a private company was disposing of liquid trade waste in a manner which created a highly offensive odour and caused serious inconvenience and irritation to a large section of the community who live in the proximity of the Melbourne Airport at Tullamarine. I discussed this matter with the Bulla Shire Council. The permit had been issued by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works but the prescriptions were to be set by the health officer of the shire. However, the method of disposing of the liquid trade waste was quite impractical. Under the system used it was not possible to dispose of the waste without its becoming offensive or endangering the underground water supply.

In addition, the tributaries of the Maribyrnong River, such as Deep Creek and Jackson Creek, were in danger of becoming even more polluted than they were. The whole Maribyrnong Valley could be affected. People in the area have been concerned about the condition of the Maribyrnong Valley for many years. The first need is for a suitable plant to be established, and to be in operation as soon as possible so that the stringent laws which will be required can be applied and so that the industries of the metropolis can be forced to observe them. The disposal of this waste must be handled in a manner which will stop this continual pollution. That is the first step needed in cleaning up the Maribyrnong Valley to enable some of the characteristics which it had in the early years of the settlement of Melbourne to be re-established. The Maribyrnong Valley is as important to the metropolitan area as the Yarra Valley and it is possible to develop it so that it will become as attractive as the Yarra Valley is today.

The Opposition takes issue with the Government on whether private enterprise should provide the plant which is needed to control the serious pollution problem. The plant should be provided by a statutory authority. I tend to the view that

the reason the Government is prepared to leave this to private enterprise is that it will act only when it is forced to do so. Its members will not take off their coats and undertake long-range planning to overcome the problems of the environment. The Government drifts along until a crisis develops and it is only then that it will act. Then it always attempt to act in the cheapest possible way. The Government will allow private enterprise to undertake projects of this type so that it will not have to find the necessary funds. Of course, private enterprise will provide the money on the clear understanding that there will be a profit. The rest of industry in the metropolitan area will have to meet the cost of providing that profit. I do not know whether the Government will take steps to ensure that industry is not exploited.

Mr. STEPHEN.—You are crying crocodile tears. Tell us more about how concerned you are for private industry.

Mr. WILTON.—I shall not concern myself with the interjection of the honorable member for Ballaarat South. He has already established his credibility in this Parliament and there is no need for me to deal with that.

For some time municipalities in the north-western suburbs have been concerned about this problem. I have received numerous letters from various municipalities, particularly from the City of Keilor, which has played a prominent role in endeavouring to force Government action. The body known as the North-west Metropolitan Municipalities, which consists of the City of Broadmeadows, the City of Essendon, the City of Keilor and the Shire of Bulla and Melton, has had several meetings on this subject.

Over the years, the disused quarry holes located in the north-western areas have become targets of companies which pick up trade wastes at various factories at contract prices. A variety of liquid trade wastes, many of them highly contaminated, have been dumped in these quarry holes and have polluted the underground water supplies. The Mines Department has been concerned about this matter for some time and I am grateful to the Minister of Mines for making available to me reports on this subject which were prepared by officers of his department. They make interesting reading and clearly show that the situation is far more serious than the honorable member for Ballaarat South will acknowledge. However, honorable members have become accustomed to his attitude.

The contamination of the aquifers is a danger to the health of the community. The people have been denied the use of considerable quantities of water. It has been estimated that an aquifer west of Melbourne could yield 1 million gallons of water an hour, which would be of considerable value in times of water shortage. There is every indication of drought conditions occurring in the next four or five months. The motion is reasonable. It would be far more satisfactory for the Board of Works to receive this material from industry, treat it, and set a standard for its reception and discharge into the sewerage system.

I discussed this subject with senior officers of the Board of Works and other people who had some knowledge of the matter. They all freely admitted that in the process of treatment it is practicable to recover certain chemicals which could be marketed, and this would be a potential income for the people operating the plant. If industry had to pay for the treatment of this effluent and the solving of the problem, no argument could be raised. It would be reasonable to expect industry to pay a fair and just price, but the Board of Works should be permitted to make a small monetary gain for the benefit of the community as a whole.

Many Government instrumentalities operate on a business basis. The State Electricity Commission

makes a profit on its electricity supply and the railways make a profit from its freight operations. The Minister of Transport will agree that the volume of freight handled by the Victorian Railways shows that instrumentality to be one of the most efficient transport organizations in Australia. I challenge any private enterprise organization to surpass the efforts of the railways. At the drop of a hat, members of the Government party will eulogize the qualities of private enterprise — they are its mouthpiece. It is interesting to note the history of the various State instrumentalities which operate efficiently and profitably. The State Electricity Commission came into being in the early days of Melbourne because private enterprise failed to make a "go" of the supply of electricity. The Government ought to expand this type of operation.

This is an example of where the Government could show some initiative and clearly establish a direct link between the Environment Protection Authority and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and evolve an operations programme embodying both authorities to serve industry. Effluent is a problem which cannot be swept under the carpet. If industry is to operate, it must be accepted that liquid trade wastes must be disposed of. A plant should be established quickly under the control of the Board of Works and in that way a clear link could be established between the Environment Protection Authority and the board. The necessary standard could be clearly set. Industry generally would receive some protection and would avoid any possibility of being exploited by one organization which controlled a plant to deal with liquid wastes that industry must dispose of. The Government may want to argue that industry could build its own plant. That would not happen except on rare occasions under the control of, perhaps, an oil company which would have the financial capacity to install one where it was needed. For the reasons I have given, the motion should be supported.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The motion concerns the alleged failure of the Minister for Local Government to request the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works to prepare a scheme to establish a treatment plant for the disposal of liquid industrial wastes. At the outset, I make it clear that I am happy to represent the Minister for Local Government on this matter and to say that there has been no failure whatsoever by the Minister within the terms of the motion. Indeed I propose to make clear to the House that the Minister for Local Government and the Government have been most active in this matter.

The Government is fully involved in the subject of liquid industrial wastes and is taking positive action on what is recognized to be a growing problem in the metropolitan area. Only last month the Premier announced that land owned by the Board of Works at Brooklyn had been set aside for a metropolitan treatment plant to handle all types of liquid industrial wastes. The honorable member for Broadmeadows did not worry about sheeting home any alleged failure on the part of the Minister for Local Government to do anything about that matter.

Mr. STEPHEN.—He commended the Government.

Mr. WILCOX.—That is so. He made what can be called a normal attack on private enterprise.

Mr. WILKES.—What do you mean by a "normal attack"?

Mr. WILCOX.—A normal attack by the Opposition and particularly a normal attack by the honorable member for Broadmeadows.

Mr. GINIFER.—It was a pat on the back for statutory authorities.

Mr. WILCOX.—Statutory authorities are very good in their right place. I do not believe there is need

for a statutory authority to be involved in operating a project such as this.

Mr. WILKES.—Of course you do not because your Government has compromised itself with Brambles.

Mr. WILCOX.—If members of the Opposition will be patient I shall endeavour to explain, although it is difficult to get the message over to them! Members of the Government party can see everything much more readily, and they can also see that the motion is no more than a normal attack by members of the Opposition on private enterprise. Members of the Opposition did not attack the Minister for Local Government because it was not open to them to do so. They descended to their usual level and made their usual attack on private enterprise.

Mr. GINIFER.—Tell us why the Board of Works cannot do this satisfactorily.

Mr. WILCOX.—I should like to tell honorable members what the Government has done. As I have said, it was announced last month that positive action was being taken and that the plant envisaged at Brooklyn would be constructed, operated and maintained by private enterprise under conditions laid down by the Environment Protection Authority. To revert to an earlier interjection, I believe the Environment Protection Authority is the proper statutory authority to be established just now.

Mr. WILKES.—It should have been established years ago.

Mr. WILCOX.—Yes, and the Government has now done it. Many aspects of operation of the plant by private enterprise need to be examined. I suppose the motion before the House implies an attack upon the Board of Works and is a direct attack upon the Minister for failing to initiate action—but, because of its keen interest, the board has cooperated fully in the matter. The board is making available land which has been in its possession for years, and has advertised for interested firms to apply for registration as prospective tenderers for the plant which, it is estimated, will cost approximately $3 million.

Perhaps I should recall to honorable members the history of this matter, which goes back——

Mr. WILKES.—To a Cabinet decision.

Mr. WILCOX.—In its general study of waste disposal, the State Development Committee recommended that another committee should be established to report specifically on the subject. The Government accepted that recommendation and established another committee, and subsequently accepted its recommendations, which I have already outlined. They were announced by the Premier last month. In view of that it is clear that neither the Government nor the Minister for Local Government has failed to tackle this problem.

The Government believes private industry should deal with the disposal of liquid wastes. That belief is based on the concept that industry should be responsible for the disposal of wastes which are generated by it. I do not think any member of the Opposition would challenge that concept.

Mr. GINIFER.—That is a furphy.

Mr. WILCOX.—What is a furphy?

Mr. GINIFER.—Saying that the Board of Works should not do the job.

Mr. WILCOX.—The honorable member for Deer Park has not heard what I have said, so I shall repeat it: This proposal is based on the concept that industry is responsible for the disposal of wastes which are generated by it. I add that the cost involved is part of manufacturing costs.

I am informed by the Chairman of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works that the attitude adopted by the Government is consistent with the policy which is followed in England, the United

States of America and Europe. I am also informed that for years many industries have carried out partial liquid waste treatment on their premises to bring the waste to a standard which is acceptable for it to be disposed of through the normal sewerage system. There is no reason why the practice should not be continued. Private industry provides tankers and trucks for the collection, transport and disposal of liquid wastes by private agreement, and this proposal will simply extend that practice.

In many cases it would be more economical for industry to continue the practice of collection and transfer of waste to the Brooklyn depot than to carry out on-site disposal or partial disposal. In any case, the choice remains with the industry. It is well known that there is keen competition by private enterprise to provide this plant.

Mr. WILTON.—Of course there would be.

Mr. WILKES.—How does Brambles Industries twist the arm of this Government? Will they get the tender?

Mr. WILCOX.—I understand the problem of members of the Opposition. They hate private enterprise, and consequently are completely biased and have an unreal approach to this matter.

Mr. WILKES.—Will the Government give the tender to Brambles?

Mr. WILCOX.—I know nothing about the tenders.

Mr. WILKES.—It will be scandalous if Brambles gets it.

Mr. WILCOX.—If members of the Opposition have direct allegations to make concerning Brambles, they should have put them in the motion. I propose to deal with the motion before the House. If members of the Opposition wish to make allegations, let them do so. I now refer to doubts which may be held by members of the Opposition concerning the adequacy of the area of the site of this plant.

Mr. WILTON.—We have never expressed concern about it.

Mr. WILCOX.—But one has to anticipate a bright thought coming from a member of the Opposition at some time. As it is conceivable that the area could prove to be inadequate, the Government has taken action by examining other suitable locations for a plant, and land which could be suitable has been purchased.

I am glad that honorable members may feel that they have stirred me a little on this subject. I make no bones about the fact that this is not a valid attack on the Minister for Local Government; it is a straight-out attack on private enterprise. I am not concerned to hedge or to consider allegations about a company which is not mentioned in the motion with which the House is now dealing, and I have no hesitation in asserting that there has been no failure by the Minister for Local Government in this matter. Indeed, I state categorically that the Government would be acting unwisely if it were to ignore the possibility of inviting private enterprise to accept, at its own cost, the responsibility of disposing of waste which it has produced.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The reply of the Minister of Transport is in keeping with most of the replies that he gives in the branch office in this House on behalf of the Minister for Local Government. He is only the office boy who represents that Minister. The Opposition is tired of the way in which matters of local government are dealt with in this House.

The Minister of Transport has overlooked several important matters, the first of which is that at no time did the State Development Committee recommend in its report that a departmental committee should be established to investigate the disposal of industrial and com-

mercial wastes. The report of the State Development Committee stated—

> The disposal of industrial and commercial waste, some of what may be offensive, or even dangerous, in character is presenting particular problems, and such matters will be the subject of detailed comment in the Committee's final report.

The committee has not yet presented its final report and the project should not be proceeded with until then. I suggest that this has been a matter of decision by the Cabinet, as has been the decision to prevent the Board of Works from conducting the disposal plant.

The Board of Works is not opposed to handling this plant. In fact, members of the board feel that it is their responsibility, and that they should be responsible for the control and disposal of industrial wastes in Victoria. Any private enterprise can establish disposal plants if it can obtain a licence from the Environment Protection Council and if it complies with the conditions of that licence. Many industries will do this rather than transport waste to Brooklyn.

The House has not been provided with details of the plant at Brooklyn. The Government has acted behind closed doors and treated this as a butter-and-egg job for private enterprise. The board issued a newsletter on 23rd September saying what it had been instructed to say by the Government.

The Board of Works should have been given an opportunity of establishing the plant but not from loan moneys which have been appropriated to it, because any further call on those funds would result in fewer sewerage connections. The Treasury should allocate additional loan funds to the board from its undistributed funds of approximately $14 million for the establishment of this plant because the board is the proper authority for this work. But what does the Government do? It saddles the board with many functions that it should not have. The Board of Works is a freeway constructing authority, and instead of being responsible for the disposal of industrial wastes it competes with the Country Roads Board. Yet the Government maintains that there is no waste of money and manpower or duplication of planning between the two bodies.

The Board of Works should be responsible for the operation of this plant. Final responsibility for disposal of industrial wastes rests with the board, and it should be its complete responsibility. The people of Altona will be incensed when the facts on this proposal are made known. Up until now those facts have not been made clear. It appears that it is the intention of the Government to allocate this project to private enterprise and I suggest, and make no apology for doing so, that Brambles Industries Ltd. will be the successful tenderer.

Mr. STEPHEN.—Will Brambles Industries Ltd. be the best company to do the job?

Mr. WILKES.—Brambles Industries Ltd. will get the job whether or not it is the best company to do the job. I understand that the project is to be built in two stages but I am not clear on who will be the controlling authority. I am also led to believe that the first stage of the project will not be capable of handling the disposal of all industrial wastes and it could be two or three years before an adequate plant is in operation to deal with this urgent problem. If there is any urgency about the construction of the plant the Board of Works should be the responsible authority for it.

Apparently the Government is now tending to move away from its original intention because it realizes that the area available at Brooklyn might not be large enough to cope with all the industrial waste from the metropolitan area. The Government has apparently now taken an option over or bought another site for this purpose. Why does the Government not give the Board of Works control of this project? The reason for this is obvious. The

Government has no intention of trying to get the board out of its financial quagmire. An industrial waste disposal plant would be a lucrative operation which could be amortized by the Board of Works over ten or fifteen years. Industrial organizations will have no alternative but to dispose of their waste materials at this plant. At present the Board of Works is paying more than 60 cents in the $1 in interest and redemption charges and if it were given the opportunity of operating a waste disposal plant it could reduce its loan commitments over the years by utilizing the revenue that would be obtained from operating a waste disposal plant.

Instead of examining the financial situation of the board and coming to the conclusion that the board could obtain a large amount of revenue by operating a disposal plant, the Government has decided to hand the operation over to private enterprise. However, it intends to ask the board to call for tenders for the construction of the plant and to supervise the construction. After it has done the job the Government will forget about the board and will hand the project over to private enterprise. The only control the Government will have over the other plant will be that the land will be owned by the Board of Works. It is not known whether the plant will eventually revert to the people of Victoria or to the Government but presumably it will not.

The State Development Committee went into considerable detail when it undertook an inquiry into the need for a plant to handle liquid industrial waste, and I compliment the committee on the job it did.

Mr. WILTSHIRE.—That inquiry related only to the disposal of domestic waste.

Mr. WILKES.—If the honorable member for Syndal will wait for a moment I shall advise him that on 21st June, 1971, the State Development Committee took evidence from Mr. Wilks from the Board of Works who advised the committee that a problem concerning the disposal of industrial waste existed in the metropolitan area. Mr. Wilks advised the committee that at present the board was receiving a good deal of untreated substances into its sewers. These substances include cyanide solutions, tannery wastes, sulphate of lime, oils, kerosene, detergents and bio-degradable materials, many of which had not been treated as they should be. When the plant is completed industries will have somewhere to dispose of their liquid industrial wastes which at present are going into council depots or into the streams and watercourses in and around Melbourne.

The point I am making is that the Board of Works has to cope with these materials at present and therefore has some technical knowledge on how to dispose of them. The board certainly would have more technical knowledge on this subject than would Brambles Industries Ltd. or any other company. However, the attitude of the Government is that it will not even consider giving the board this responsibility. Did Cabinet call before it the chairman of the board or its senior engineers and ask them whether in their opinion the board would be capable of running and maintaining this plant?

Mr. WILTON.—The Labor Party asked them and they said they could.

Mr. WILKES.—They were not called before Cabinet to express their opinions but the Labor Party asked them if they would be prepared to run this plant and they said that they would be because it is a natural corollary to their existing work. At present the Board of Works disposes of sewage and industrial wastes and it would be quite capable of extending its facilities. The Government will not give this task to the board because it is a lucrative project for private enterprise and the Government is committed to assisting private enterprise.

If the Minister of Transport has any idea that the motion seeks to achieve any more than to give the

Board of Works this responsibility, he has been misinformed. The Government will not be in office long enough to regret the action that it is taking on this occasion.

Another important feature of this project is that it has never been referred directly to Parliament. The only reference to it is in a newsletter circulated by the Board of Works to municipalities and members of Parliament. That indicates the cavalier way in which the Government treats this Parliament. If it were not for the information that was provided in the newsletter circulated by the Board of Works, honorable members would have no information on what the Government intends to do about this project. Tenders for the plant were called before the State Development Committee presented its final report to Parliament despite the fact that the committee said that the disposal of industrial wastes would be the subject of detailed comment in its final report. Private enterprise organizations are getting itchy feet; they want to get in on the ground floor of this project before there is a change of Government or before, by some remote chance, the Government changes its attitude and decides that this lucrative enterprise should be controlled by the Board of Works and not by private enterprise. The Government should re-appraise the situation and the Minister should not dabble in something that he knows very little about. Instead of talking about branch offices the Minister should give reasons why the Government would not give this job to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. He should not be giving the House for the first time details that have already been contained in a newsletter circulated by the Board of Works.

I commend the motion to the House and demand that the Government reassess its policy on this matter in the interests of the Board of Works and of the people of Victoria.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—If there is a branch office in this House it is a branch office of Socialism, because the main point of the Opposition's argument is not whether a centralized industrial waste disposal plant is needed but whether it should be provided at the expense of the taxpayer or by private enterprise. The Government's policy on the ultimate policing of the Environment Protection Act is that the polluter will pay for the disposal of industrial waste, which is primarily a private enterprise problem. There is no suggestion that within the establishment of a centralized industrial disposals treatment centre private enterprise anywhere in Victoria will have to use it. Once private enterprise organizations are licensed under the Environment Protection Act they will be required to assess their own economic situation and determine whether it is preferable to build their own treatment works or to continue to utilize services established by private enterprise as they have in the past. The establishment of a disposal plant by private enterprise is not new and it is proper that private enterprise should be involved in the disposal of industrial waste because many companies have in some way or another utilized private enterprise operations in the past for the discharge of their industrial wastes.

It is the view of the Government that in the proper policing of the Environment Protection Act private enterprise should be encouraged in some way to establish centralized industrial waste disposal treatment plants so that those companies which, for economic reasons or because of limitations of sites, cannot establish their own plants to meet the requirements of the licensing provisions, should have other treatment plants available to them.

Mr. EDMUNDS.—That was never envisaged in the original legislation.

Mr. BORTHWICK.—If it was never envisaged, how was it proposed to bring about a tightening in the standards for the disposal of waste? The whole basis of the philosophy behind the Environment Protection Act is a licensing system for the discharge of wastes with the polluter paying the cost. This is fundamentally a private enterprise problem and there is no reason why the State as a whole should have to pay for these facilities. It is ridiculous to suggest that all that is needed is the transfer of $5 million or $6 million of loan funds from the public sector to the Board of Works to finance this project when in fact private enterprise can raise this money from within its own resources. Surely when there is a large backlog in sewerage works in Victoria it is much better to allocate an additional $5 million or $6 million from loan funds to the Board of Works to enable that backlog to be reduced. Certainly, the money should not be used to help private enterprise.

Honorable members should examine what is happening in other parts of the world to meet the requirements that the public puts on private enterprise in the disposal of industrial waste. At Sarnia in Ontario, Canada, private enterprise has established a plant to help cope with the environmental problems similar to those being encountered in Victoria. In England, at Ranham on the Thames Estuary, the industrial waste treatment plant is operated by private enterprise. The plant proposed to be established outside Johannesburg will be operated by private enterprise. In fact, I do not know of any sophisticated industrial waste treatment plant of the type envisaged that has ever been established by a public authority to assist private enterprise; to my knowledge, such plants have always been established by private enterprise because they are part of the over-all problem of private enterprise.

Mr. HOLDING.—Is it not also the Government's problem?

Mr. BORTHWICK.—It is the Government's problem to the extent that it will, through the Environment Protection Authority, set standards which industry must meet. Industry has the alternative of meeting those standards on their own sites or establishing private enterprise treatment plants.

Certain factors have not been considered. The first is that the technology required to neutralize industrial waste of the type involved is relatively new; few people and few groups in public authorities or outside public authorities have the expertize, knowledge and background to do it efficiently. Secondly, in the kind of financial arrangement which exists in the Federation of Australia—where it is imperative to attract as much outside capital for these kinds of works as possible — why should the Government divert millions of dollars of public funds into this type of scheme when finance is urgently required elsewhere? I have mentioned examples in Canada, England and South Africa, where private enterprise is operating such schemes.

The Socialist members of the Opposition believe that in all instances all operations of this type can be performed only by some form of State authority. It is suggested that industry will have to pay through the nose for this service. Members of the Opposition overlook the fact that the Board of Works will enter into a lease of the land and can write into the terms of the lease any form of restriction on the operation of the plant. That will prevent the exploitation of the public or of private industry. There is no difficulty about writing into a lease conditions which will protect the public interest.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Is the Minister referring to the subject before the Chair?

Mr. BORTHWICK.—Very much so, Sir. The honorable member for Broadmeadows suggested that private enterprise would not be efficient

in operating such a plant. The efficiency of private enterprise or of the Board of Works will be governed by the Environment Protection Authority which will lay down standards. If the Board of Works takes liquid waste into its sewerage system, it will do so on the standards laid down by the board. Where incineration and scrubbing of toxic emissions are necessary, these activities will be licensed by the Environment Protection Authority just as private enterprise will be licensed in any other area of emission control.

The honorable member for Broadmeadows suggested that a plant operated by private enterprise would not be efficient. Nothing could be further from the truth, because the operators, in the same way as anybody else, will have to meet standards laid down by the Environment Protection Authority. I am not critical of the Board of Works or suggest that there is any inefficiency in its operations, but any person who is conversant with the problems of the environment must realize that the tasks which face the board in the next eight or ten years are enormous. The Government freely admits that backlogs exists in the fields of environment protection in which the Board of Works is involved. This has been stated publicly. To saddle the Board of Works with a highly specialized and technical problem, as well as an additional financial burden, would have the effect of slowing down the provision of a treatment plant, operated by specialist staff, which is urgently required now.

The Board of Works freely acknowledges that it has not the chemical engineering skills needed to operate this specialized and sophisticated treatment plant. This facility is required if the Environment Protection Act is to be implemented in an efficient manner. Furthermore, private enterprise needs such a plant available to it with the least possible delay. I reiterate that this problem is essentially one for private enterprise. The individual factory operator will be required under the Act to meet certain standards. Although the community as a whole will benefit, it is a private enterprise cost which should be borne by private enterprise investment.

An expenditure of some millions of dollars will be involved. At this stage it is considered that about two million gallons a month — or 24 million gallons a year — of industrial waste requires some form of treatment by neutralization, oxygenation or in some instances incineration to dispose of toxic waste. Nobody is absolutely certain at this stage what the total quantity to be treated is, but if private enterprise establishes a treatment plant on land leased by the Board of Works the Government considers that the people will get the best of two worlds — private capital investment, under standards laid down by public authorities, and assistance as a whole in the general environmental programme of the Environment Protection Authority.

It is sad when members of the Opposition base an argument on a Socialist philosophy which would divert urgently required public borrowing funds into fields where private capital could be invested to assist private enterprise to solve its own problems. The philosophy and thinking are wrong, as they are on so many occasions when the business of the House is delayed by adjournment motions which frequently have little strength. I support the Minister for Local Government. I consider that the motion moved by the Opposition has no substance whatever. Through its expert committee, the Government is at present considering applications from persons who wish to be registered for this proposal and who have lodged tenders for the design, operation and management of a private enterprise, centralized waste disposal

treatment plant. This procedure follows the pattern already set in at least three other countries. The result will be of great value to private enterprise and will serve and benefit the people of Victoria.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—The Minister for Conservation has expressed concern at the motion moved by the honorable member for Broadmeadows. I point out that members of this House would not have had the opportunity of discussing this important subject if the honorable member had not moved his motion. The honorable gentleman also expressed concern at the concept of public enterprise serving the needs of private enterprise. His assertion must fall a little short of fact because if any Government has used the resources of public enterprise in the interests of private enterprise this Government has done so more than most others.

To discuss this motion and the contention that the Board of Works should be the authority to operate the proposed treatment plant requires some understanding of the extent of the problem. The Minister for Conservation indicated that about two million gallons a month is the quantity of liquid trade waste. This is the quantity which has already been collected by four private contractors, and does not account for probably double that quantity which has not been collected and treated. It is a fact that, because there is no facility to handle liquid trade waste, industry virtually came to a standstill recently. I shall not go into that question because most honorable members will be aware of the difficulty through publicity given to it in the media.

The question is: Who is going to treat industrial waste, and how is the plant to be financed? The question of finance is not quite relevant to the motion because, if the Board of Works operated the treatment plant, undoubtedly persons who handle liquid industrial waste would be obliged to pay in the same way as everybody else in the community for other services. This is an industrial problem. It is only coincidental that industry in this State is operated largely by private enterprise and by multi-national monopolies. The likely successful tenderer in this case would be in that category. These days there is a new enterprise in industry, a new commodity in the Capitalist system—technology, which is being sold.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I invite the honorable member to consider the motion, which has to do with the Board of Works.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—The Board of Works is considering the problem of liquid trade wastes, and the motion asserts that the board should operate the treatment plant. I am simply pointing out that there are now new forms of technology, one of which is the handling of industrial waste from the processes of other forms of technology, and that this is an increasing problem.

It is a fact that the persons who are marketing this commodity and who, in this instance, would be selling it to the Board of Works are already in the field. As an example, I quote an extract from *Chemical Engineering* of 17th November, 1969. The article stated that it was estimated that by the end of January, two more treatment plants would be operative in the United States of America and that at least twenty other plants were in various stages of design. It pointed out that four companies headed the current contract-waste-disposal activity and that about $U.S. 10 million in potential plant investments was involved. Among these companies was Rollins-Purle, Inc., whose activities in Australia are carried on by Brambles Industries Ltd. through Purle Waste Disposals Aust. Pty. Ltd.

I mention this to indicate that in other Capitalist countries the problems of production have to be dealt with by private enterprise. Private enterprise production is playing

havoc with the environment. The method advanced by the Opposition of coming to grips with the problem is for it to be dealt with by a responsible authority—the responsibility coming back to Parliament—carrying out the work and being in a position to determine not only standards but also cost, because whether an industry is owned by public enterprise or private enterprise the cost of dealing with effuent from the industrial processes is a prime criterion. If the proposed treatment unit is to be used to maximize profit, no doubt the question of cost will be fundamental. Doubtless after ten years this plant would have secured a monopoly on the disposal of liquid trade wastes, and nobody in his right mind would undertake a similar operation that would not survive after ten years' operation. So it comes back to the price of the product. If there is no competition with only one owner, and if the State has no say in its operation because the matter is not referred to Parliament, the price will be based on the maximization of profit, not on the basis of service to industry or of dealing with the ecological problem.

Built into this is the concept of what resources or materials are used in industry. If it is made easier to use materials that produce pollutants, it may be that industrial processes will have a more significant effect on the ecology, and even if the present situation continued the utilization of this plant could affect the ecology without adequate supervision and price fixation. In other countries pollution from local trade wastes is enormous. For instance, in 1970 the Rhine River carried some 8,500 kilos of mercury, 1 million kilos of arsenic and 200,000 tons of cadmium. Towards the end of last year the pollution of this river, aggravated by the lowering of the waters because of an exceptional drought, endangered the supply of drinking water, particularly that of Rotterdam. Pure water was imported from Norway and sold in the city at 1.12 florins a 2-litre bottle. This is an instance of the capacity of private enterprise to capitalize on pollution. It is of no concern to private enterprise that it should be a service to the community.

Private enterprise is concerned only to maximize profits, and profits will be necessary to enable it to reinvest in this type of plant. If a private company constructs this plant in one State of the Commonwealth it will eventually extend to other States and establish similar plants and, as in the United States of America, there will be a chain of plants with varying capacities. One can assume that if a company is allowed to establish a plant in Victoria the same company will ultimately move its operations to other States, using Victoria as a base for its operations.

The honorable member for Broadmeadows and other Opposition speakers have established a strong case to answer, but the Minister for Conservation has not answered the fundamental question, which is that of the ultimate control in the interests of the community. It is not answering the question to say that there is control by virtue of the conditions of the lease. The conditions of operation of the plant are critical, and it is the responsibility of this Parliament to ensure that the plant operates in a manner which provides for economic production in industry and for necessary safeguards to ensure that there is no discrimination in industry generally. Honorable members would have to be completely naïve to believe that a plant of this description could not discriminate against industry. It can be done in the form of charges. The present system of collection of trade wastes by a number of individual contractors operating tankers could be superseded by the company which operates the waste treatment plant having a fleet of tankers to collect the trade wastes.

The situation in other States is no better than in Victoria. It has only been with the co-operation of industry that consideration of this subject, together with the setting aside

of a site to deal with a large quantity of trade wastes, has been undertaken and has reached the present position. During the past six months there has been adequate ventilation of this matter through the media. There is the additional evidence that municipal tips in this State will not receive liquid trade wastes.

There is a privately operated tip at Tullamarine which is at present overloaded. This fact has also affected the over-all situation.

Mr. STEPHEN.—What has this to do with the motion?

Mr. SIMMONDS.—It refers to the fact that the Board of Works should provide the capacity to deal with liquid trade wastes and should have authority over the terms and conditions laid down to control a privately-operated company erecting a liquid trade waste plant and to ensure that the company will not discriminate against persons who seek to use the plant. At present with the Tullamarine plant overloaded it is difficult to get access to the plant. One can imagine people having to pay—perhaps not in a normal business sense but engaging in some sort of deal around the corner—to ensure that the waste is accepted when in certain circumstances it should not be.

Adequate control of the types and quantity of wastes which go into this sort of waste disposal plant is needed. The Environment Protection Authority will have control over the standards, but the Board of Works has the responsibility of dealing with the effluent which finally leaves the plant. I believe it is logical that the Board of Works should have this responsibility but it should also have the responsibility of considering what goes into the plant, how it is treated and how it is dispersed so that the output does not endanger the system or the environment.

Finally, this plant will probably not have sufficient capacity to accommodate all the needs of the metropolitan area. It may be that pipelines will be introduced into the plant to take away the effluent after bringing the product or liquid trade waste into it. The question to be asked of the Government is: How much further damage can be done by this activity if this concept is developed? A complete investigation of all aspects of the proposal should have taken place long before tenders were called. The motion ably moved by the honorable member for Broadmeadows is allowing public debate at least to some extent on an issue which should have been discussed some time ago. I support the motion.

Mr. WILTSHIRE (Syndal).—For the past two or three years the State Development Committee has been investigating the disposal of wastes generally. The report referred to by honorable members earlier in the debate related merely to domestic wastes. It was an interim report presented because the domestic scene was becoming disturbed as the result of no areas being made available for the disposal of waste. The report has nothing to do with the motion before the Chair. It is somewhat misleading to quote from a document which merely refers to something in passing and states that later there will be a full report.

The debate has centred on whether private enterprise or the Board of Works should be the operating authority. Only four firms in the world are capable of handling the liquid trade wastes that industry puts out and it is unreasonable to expect the Board of Works, without any experience, to handle a plant like this. Melbourne is far ahead of Sydney in this aspect of planning. Sydney has not even set aside land on which to put a plant, and with the numerous queries that have been raised, the matter has become bogged down. The committee investigating the problem in Sydney has published two questionnaires which need to be answered, together with a lot of other things, before tenders can be called.

Victoria set up a high-level committee comprising heads of departments and representatives of the Board of Works and industry generally. That committee recommended as a suitable site an old sanitary depot situated at Brooklyn, comprising about 100 acres of which 25 acres could be used for the plant. It is adjacent to the sewer to take the liquid wastes. The site is ideally situated and will not be used for a number of years for any other purpose. The committee allowed tenders to be called on the basis of the site being provided. Classified information, which should not have been used, has been used in this debate. Although an honorable member has said that a monopoly will be set up, between 40 and 50 different firms are looking at the possibility of tendering.

Mr. HOLDING.—I thought the honorable member said that only four companies in the world would be capable of operating a plant.

Mr. WILTSHIRE.—I did say four, but there are affiliations of various sorts, and the fact remains that between 40 and 50 firms are now interested in tendering. The honorable member for Reservoir stated that the plant at Tullamarine was overloaded. That is not true, because the committee——

Mr. WILTON.—It stinks.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member for Broadmeadows has taken part in the debate, which is not the question of disposal but the question of the Board of Works.

Mr. WILTSHIRE.—I was leading up to the reasons why there is a need to decide now who is to work it. The plant at Tullamarine is not affecting anybody. Monitoring has been carried out by means of bores put down around the perimeter of the area. Because of the precautions taken, the site can be used for a considerable time yet. The statement by the honorable member for Broadmeadows about flooding is partly true; somebody dug a channel from a flooded roadway and allowed a lot of water to run into the tip. This is the only occasion on which there has been trouble in the area. The water has taken some time to evaporate. It cannot be pumped out because it is contaminated and therefore must be evaporated.

As soon as this area is full, a plant should be working somewhere, and the high-level committee comprising the top officers of the Public Service decided to call tenders. However industry itself does have a responsibility. Industries licensed by the Environment Protection Authority should be responsible for the final dispersal of all wastes that will be created. Up to a year ago most municipal councils accepted liquid trade wastes but one council after another has refused to take these wastes with the result that there is now only the one tip available, that at Tullamarine.

Action must be taken quickly, because with new environment standards and no municipalities accepting this noxious waste some provision must be made. New standards have to be determined and it is realized that private enterprise will have to run the plant. Another plant will be needed on the southern side of Melbourne and possibly a further installation will be required on the northern side. One honorable member mentioned the possibility of a pipeline. This may be needed because the wastes that cannot be treated in the plant at Brooklyn may be piped and further treated. Therefore, another larger and more comprehensive treatment plant will be needed.

The honorable member for Reservoir should know a lot about this matter because he is a member of the State Development Committee, but he confined himself to saying what should be done by private enterprise. A reading of the relevant legislation reveals that the council has the responsibility of removing all trade wastes. The liquid

waste has been picked up by private enterprise and paid for by industry, because the council failed to do it. Private enterprise now continues to use the sewers to dispose of acceptable waste.

Probably the major income of the Board of Works is derived from industry. Every day some industries discharge large quantities of wastes into the sewerage system, and this is monitored and policed regularly to ensure that no damage is caused to the pipes and that nothing is done to inhibit the effectiveness of the bacteria which break down the effluent. This will be done at Brooklyn. The sewerage line will be set on Board of Works property and will be monitored and policed. Anything harmful can be referred to the board. Safeguards will be written into the agreement. There will be a standard charge for everybody, and no private or public enterprise may vary the charge. I cannot understand the argument of the Opposition in that regard because at present nobody in the Board of Works has the required knowledge. That knowledge is obtainable only from private enterprise. It has never been shown in any part of the world that public enterprise is as cheap and efficient as private enterprise.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura).—Members of the Country Party have taken considerable interest in the debate on the motion moved by the honorable member for Broadmeadows. The major point in the motion is that the Minister for Local Government failed to request the Board of Works to prepare a scheme to establish, operate, and maintain a treatment plant for the disposal of liquid industrial wastes. It would be unthinkable that the Government has not explored every possible avenue of disposal. If that had been done, a scheme could have been prepared by the Board of Works.

Members of the Country Party intend to support the motion solely on the basis that the Board of Works has a responsibility to dispose of all wastes and should enter into the field of the treatment and disposal of industrial wastes. The suggestion by the honorable member for Syndal that this must be done immediately appears to be a panic move. Surely for the past five years the Government would have been aware that this problem would arise. If something has not been done in that time I believe the planners of the Board of Works and the Local Government Department have fallen down on the job.

Some of the problems referred to by members of the Opposition indicate that serious dangers could be involved in the refusal to receive wastes unless it is made obligatory on the company which sets up the treatment works to receive them. The honorable member for Syndal said that conditions could be written into the leasing agreements, but in view of the fact that at this stage there are no similar leasing agreements in Victoria one would be drawing a long bow to hope that all the dangers that could exist would be covered by leasing agreements. These agreements would still have to be enforced if the company concerned decided that it did not want to receive a particular type of waste.

The other matter concerning the Country Party is that although the State Development Committee — and my colleagues and I regret that a member of the Country Party in this House is not on that committee — is at present conducting an inquiry into the disposal of industrial commercial waste, the committee has not yet presented a report to Parliament.

Mr. WILKES.—The Government has acted in indecent haste.

Mr. WHITING.—This would appear to be so. The Government has allowed the Board of Works to call tenders without inquiring about the contents of the final report and recommendations of one of its committees. If the committee system is

to continue, it should operate properly. The Country Party supports the motion.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park).—I support the motion and commend the honorable member for Broadmeadows on his initiative. In a question on notice by myself today relating to this project, I asked the responsible Minister to make a statement to the House before the proposition was proceeded with. In answering the question the Minister did not comment on the prospect of a statement being made. The House is indebted to the honorable member for Broadmeadows, because without his initiative members would not have had the opportunity of discussing the matter today.

At present in the western suburbs of Melbourne five chemical industries in five separate locations are pouring liquid effluent into the aquifers in such significant quantities that the groundwater is being severely polluted. The pollution is so bad that the aquifers have become clogged. At this juncture I do not intend to canvass the problems because it is expected that they will be solved when the waste disposal unit which has been discussed is established in Brooklyn.

I take issue with the suggestion of the honorable member for Syndal that the Board of Works is too inadequate in its structure, in its engineering staff, and in its qualified personnel, to make a worthwhile contribution to the plant. To a large extent the Board of Works has been the responsible agent when new chemical industries have been established, particularly in the western suburbs of Melbourne. In conjunction with the Department of Health the board has been responsible for policing the pollution controls and the effluent which is being discharged from plants into the Kororoit Creek and other streams.

It is the contention of the Opposition that, given the opportunity, the Board of Works could match any form of private enterprise in building and operating a unit for the disposal of liquid wastes. The Opposition contends also that private enterprise is primarily interested in this venture as an opportunity of maximizing its returns on invested capital. On many occasions the proposition has been put to the House that the Government is becoming bankrupt, and that it is unable to raise revenues locally because of Australia's taxation system. If private enterprise is interested in establishing this type of undertaking, surely public enterprise, backed and supported by the Government, could satisfactorily conduct a liquid waste disposal unit. Any profits which would normally accrue to private enterprise could accrue to public enterprise and be used for the general welfare of the State.

Accordingly, members of the Opposition commend the motion of the honorable member for Broadmeadows. We believe that the Board of Works is ideally suited to call tenders and have the disposal unit built, and that it has the capacity to conduct the unit to the satisfaction of all sections of the metropolitan area.

The House divided on the motion for the adjournment of the House (Sir Vernon Christie in the chair)—

Ayes	26
Noes	38
Majority against the motion	12

AYES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Lind
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Lovegrove
Mr. Broad	Mr. McDonald (*Rodney*)
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Doube	Mr. Shilton
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Floyd	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Turnbull
Mr. Ginifer	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Holding	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Wilton.
Mr. Lewis (*Dundas*)	*Tellers*:
Mr. Lewis (*Portland*)	Mr. Fell
	Mr. Jones.

NOES.

Mr. Balfour	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Billing	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Burgin	Mr. Stokes
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Dunstan	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Taylor (*Balwyn*)
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Taylor (*Gippsland South*)
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Jona	Mr. Trethewey
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Wheeler
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. MacDonald (*Glen Iris*)	Mr. Wiltshire.
Mr. McLaren	
Mr. Maclellan	
Mr. Manson	
Mr. Reese	*Tellers*:
Sir George Reid	Mr. Crellin
Mr. Rossiter	Mr. Guy.

PAIRS.

Mr. Mutton	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Trezise	Mr. Meagher.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—I remind honorable members that the annual meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association will be held at 8 p.m. in the Legislative Council committee room. I shall resume the chair shortly after that meeting finishes.

The sitting was suspended at 6.34 *p.m. until* 8.42 *p.m.*

HEALTH (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Health Act 1958, the Medical Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS (REGISTRATION) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1970.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

HEALTH (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This measure is one of the Bills to amend the Health Act which from time to time are presented to Parliament to overcome difficulties which have become apparent in the operation of the Act. The Act deals with a large number of subjects which in the aggregate affect the lives and welfare of every member of the community. The Bill deals with twelve of these subjects. The only method whereby the measure can be explained is for each of the operative clauses numbered from 2 to 13 inclusive, to be dealt with separately.

Clause 2 is introduced to make it legally possible for the Mental Health Authority established under the Mental Health Act 1959 to assume control of a branch of the Department of Health set up to provide services for alcoholics and drug-dependent persons. On 18th December, 1968, the Alcoholics and Drug-dependent Persons Act 1968—No. 7772—received the assent of the Governor in Council.

Under that Act, a comprehensive service was to be set up within the Department of Health for the treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts, and the provisions of the Act were to take the place of those of the Inebriates Act 1958. The new Act envisaged the establishment of a variety of institutions.

On 3rd June, 1970, a submission was made to the Public Service Board detailing a proposed staff establishment for the new Alcoholics and Drug-dependent Persons Services Branch. The proposal was that the staff would be appointed pursuant to the Public Service Act and that the Mental Health Authority would be in charge of the new branch and responsible to the Minister of Health and to the permanent head of the department.

Subsequently, the Public Service Board expressed reservations about the legality of the Mental Health

Authority assuming control of any branch other than the Mental Hygiene Branch. Discussions have been held with the Crown Solicitor and the Deputy Crown Solicitor, both of whom have indicated that it would be desirable to remove all doubt in the matter by making provision in the Health Act, under which the new branch was created, for the Mental Health Authority to take control of that new branch.

The clause will amend section 6 of the Health Act to permit the Mental Health Authority to assume control of the Alcoholics and Drug-dependent Persons Services Branch by Order in Council and will also make provision to revoke or vary any such order. In addition, by paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of the clause, opportunity is being taken to correct section 8 of the Health Act by substituting the title "Mental Health Authority" for the former one "Mental Hygiene Authority".

Clause 3 deals with the provisions of Division 2 of Part V. of the Act, which are concerned with the maintenance of the health of persons employed in dangerous trades. The Department of Health recently sought to consolidate and bring up to date the Lead Workers (Medical Examination) Regulations 1953. However, Parliamentary Counsel pointed out that the regulation-making powers dealing with compulsory medical examinations of workers at risk contained in section 108 of the Health Act are restricted to workers where there is a radiation hazard although these regulations, even before the amendment of the Health Act in 1961 to cover the possible effects of radiation, have always provided for compulsory medical examinations on entry into and when leaving the industry and from time to time when employed in it.

To regularize this situation, the clause will amend section 108 to extend the regulation-making powers of paragraphs (*ec*) and (*ed*) of subsection (1) to apply to exposure to dangerous substances in the course of employment. This amendment, if approved, will allow consolidation of the Lead Workers Regulations.

Clause 4 deals extensively with Division 3 of Part X. of the Health Act. This division provides for the registration of private hospitals by the Hospitals and Charities Commission and the supervision of the operation of such hospitals. The Commonwealth Department of Health, because of the introduction of nursing home benefits payable in respect of elderly persons receiving care in homes where they require only occasional medical attention, has sought the co-operation of State authorities in adopting some form of classification of private hospitals which will enable this type of home for the elderly to be readily separated from hospitals for medical, surgical, and maternity cases.

At the present time the Hospitals and Charities Commission has no power to register an establishment providing nursing care for the aged and infirm as anything but a private hospital. Public confusion has arisen in this and other States as to what constitutes a private hospital for the purpose of refunds from the Hospital Benefits Association and similar funds. Quite often persons have entered an establishment registered as a private hospital by the State only to find that it is approved by the Commonwealth Department of Health as a nursing home only and that there is no entitlement to a refund.

The clause will substantially amend Division 3 of Part X.—Hospitals—of the Health Act and provide for the Hospitals and Charities Commission to register private hospitals and class them either as hospitals providing treatment for short-term and acutely ill patients or as nursing homes providing care and some treatment for long-term aged or infirm patients. The new section 186 proposed by the Bill will provide regulation-making powers to control the use of the

words "nursing home" and will prevent the use of the words "private hospital" or "hospital" by a nursing home. It is not intended that there should be any lowering of existing standards in nursing homes.

The clause will also extend and clarify the regulation-making powers in respect of private hospitals, whether hospitals or nursing homes. This will enable clear regulations to be made covering the requirements for privately owned private hospitals of all types. The existing regulation-making powers have not been varied for many years, during which time the requirements for hospitals, in the light of modern medicine, have increased tremendously. The approval of these new provisions will enable the present Private Hospital Regulations, which were made in 1931, to be brought up to date.

Clause 5 deals with variations in the provisions relating to temporary public buildings which were introduced into the Health Act in 1954. Temporary public buildings, in the main, comprise tents and marquees used for public purposes. Difficulties have arisen in administering sections 194 to 197 of the Act as it has proved difficult to decide when a tent or marquee comes within the exemption included in the definition of a temporary public building, that is, where accommodation is provided for fewer than 50 persons. Because council officers have to approve the erection of any temporary public building, there is a tendency to treat as temporary public buildings even relatively small tents and marquees which really involve little or no public health risk.

The proposed amendment aims to continue to control the use of tents and marquees of a specified size which need some control because of the number of people who may gather therein, and to exempt small tents and marquees from these controls where any substantial risk to members of the public gathering in them is not involved.

Mr. Rossiter.

Clause 6 of the Bill deals with the somewhat vexed question of amusement structures. Until the present, certain amusement structures have been supervised by the department by regarding them as temporary public buildings in the broadest meaning of the term.

Consolidation of the Public Building (Amusement Park Structures, Travelling Shows, etc.) Regulations 1955 was recently proposed but advice was received from Parliamentary Counsel, and later confirmed by the Crown Solicitor, that amendment of the Health Act appears to be necessary to enable many of these structures to be supervised and reviewed periodically. The Commission of Public Health has considered the remarks made by Parliamentary Counsel and the Crown Solicitor and has recommended that in the public interest these structures should be kept under regular supervision.

This is a complex field to administer and the type of structures involved ranges from large ferris wheels with comparatively complex machinery to small rides, sometimes involving no machinery at all. These structures are frequently run by itinerant showmen. Although the existing staff of the department is at present insufficient to cope with the proposed registration of the structures, it is felt that in the public interest proper controls should be provided over these structures, particularly in view of the increasing trend towards the use of mechanized rides of one sort or another at school fetes and so on, and the use of very large structures for amusement.

The clause proposes that amusement structures shall be registered and that the proprietor shall have an inspection of the structure by a qualified engineer when necessary and when required by the Commission of Public Health. A procedure for the notification of accidents involving these structures is also included. Because of the necessity to

treat amusement structures separately from temporary public buildings, a whole new division—Division 1A of Part XI.—of the Health Act consisting of twelve sections, numbered 200A to 200L, has now had to be drafted. Basically, these new sections will deal with amusement structures in much the same way as has been done for some years past when they have been treated as public buildings.

Clause 7 will amend the provisions of Part XIA., sections 208A to 208I of the Act, relating to child-minding centres. In 1964, a new Part was inserted in the Health Act, which established stringent conditions on any premises which were to be used to conduct the business of child minding. Control of these premises and of the type of care that children would receive whilst being cared for in them was imposed following a tragedy in which a number of children perished in a fire whilst they were being minded.

Since that time a number of persons have been convicted of conducting premises for child-minding purposes in contravention of the Health Act. However, when a prosecution was recently proposed against a person allegedly conducting a place where child minding was carried out but which was not registered, advice was received from the office of the Crown Solicitor criticizing the drafting of the definitions contained in the Health Act of the terms "child-minding centre" and "business of child minding". The advice also stated the success of future actions against persons considered to be conducting unregistered premises for child-minding purposes could be in doubt for a variety of reasons and particularly in respect of proving that the children being minded were under six years of age.

The matter was examined by the Commission of Public Health which considered the practical difficulties of proving that the children were under six years of age, unless the mother of each child was subpoenaed to give evidence as to the exact age of the child whom she had placed at the centre. The commission recommended that the provisions of the Health Act be suitably amended to enable the department properly to enforce the provisions of the Act. As a result of discussions with Parliamentary Counsel to enable this to be done, this clause contains certain proposals to amend Part XIA. of the Health Act by adding certain provisions setting out what will constitute prima facie evidence of child minding for fee or reward and the age of the children concerned. These are contained in new section 208FA. to be added to Part XIA.

Clause 8 is introduced as a serious attempt to restrain certain boarding house and lodging house proprietors from misleading the public by improperly advertising that the house concerned is particularly fitted out to care for aged persons. To some extent this provision is a corollary to the provision of clause 4 relating to the separation of nursing homes and hospitals operated privately.

Some boarding houses by the use of terms such as matron in attendance, nursing sister available and a variety of others are implying that they are providing nursing home accommodation when, in fact, they are not recognized by the Commonwealth Department of Health as such. The new provisions, new sections 211A and 215A, will make it an offence for any person to advertise a boarding house or a common lodging house in any way which implies that nursing care is available or that it is a nursing home.

Clause 9 will introduce a new provision into the Health Act to enable premises used for the storage and sale of food to be closed temporarily when they are found to be in an unclean or insanitary condition. The Health Act contains a number of effective provisions to enable premises to be closed in the event of danger to the community. Part IV. of the Act deals with infectious

diseases and provides strong powers to close premises in this connection —section 133 in particular.

Part XIX. of the Health Act provides that the registration of premises may be suspended or revoked on the second or any subsequent conviction of every person for an offence against the Act. However, what seems to be lacking in the Act is a provision to require a proprietor to remedy unclean or insanitary conditions existing in premises handling food for human consumption and if necessary to close the premises until this is done. This position was highlighted recently when an inspection of the Prince Mark Hotel at Doveton was undertaken by a local health inspector in company with a licensing supervisor of the Liquor Control Commission. This inspection disclosed that the premises were in a most unsatisfactory and dirty condition and could be regarded as constituting a danger to health. Under section 85 of the Liquor Control Act 1968 the licensing supervisor was able to issue an immediate closing order on the premises until the unsatisfactory conditions were rectified. The closing order was issued under the Liquor Control Act on health grounds even though the licensing supervisor concerned had neither the training nor the experience to be able to make such a decision.

The Commission of Public Health has recommended that the Health Act should be amended to allow the Chief Health Officer, upon the certification of a district health officer of the department, to order the closure of premises.

Clause 10 will vary the legal machinery by which new editions of the *British Pharmacopoeia* may be adopted for use in Victoria by the medical, dental, veterinary and pharmacy professions. The legislative machinery for the adoption in Victoria of the *British Pharmacopoeia* is at present contained in sections 118 and 119 of the Medical Act 1958. The wording of these sections is now obsolete and up-to-date wording is now being included in the Health Act, with consequential repeal of the existing Part IV. of the Medical Act. It is proposed that in future the adoption of amendments to the *British Pharmacopoeia* will be approved by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Commission of Public Health.

Clause 11 will repeal the existing section 291 of the Health Act 1958. This section provides for a defence of "reasonable precautions". This provision was introduced many years ago to protect small storekeepers who did everything they could reasonably be expected to do to ensure that foodstuffs sold by them were not contaminated.

The Commission of Public Health recently considered representations from the City of Melbourne to the effect that the defence provided by section 291 allows an escape route for a defendant who is able to present a certain amount of evidence that reasonable precautions were taken against contravening the Health Act in respect of food, drugs, substances and articles. It was further submitted by the council that this escape is more readily available to large companies by virtue of their large operating techniques and sheer volume of output than to small shopkeepers.

The City of Melbourne submitted details of a recent prosecution against a leading retailer for alleged contravention of sections 231 and 238 of the Health Act in regard to the sale of a nut loaf in which a nail was embedded. The loaf was actually baked by the bakery division of the retailer. In this prosecution the magistrate accepted the defendant's claim that it had exercised "all reasonable precautions". Subsequently the council appealed to the full Supreme Court and the magistrate's decision was upheld involving the council in costs estimated to be in the vicinity of $10,000.

The removal of the exculpatory provisions of section 291 of the Health Act has been the subject of similar representations to the Commission of Public Health by a number of councils over the past ten years. However, on previous occasions advice has been received from the Crown Solicitor that the evidence submitted would not justify a recommendation for amendment or deletion of the provisions in relation to "all reasonable precautions" as the Crown Solicitor at that time considered that the courts had either ignored certain of the provisions of the section or had failed to give each provision its proper meaning and in these circumstances the Crown Solicitor had advised that if properly applied it would be very rare for a defendant to be able to show that he had acted innocently.

This situation has changed in the light of the case now referred to by the City of Melbourne and the present Crown Solicitor, Mr. Downey, has reviewed all of the previous correspondence and representations in relation to the defence provided under section 291. The Crown Solicitor has now advised the Commission of Public Health that the Supreme Court judgment has clearly interpreted the provisions of section 291 and he is of the opinion that the difficulties encountered by informants in obtaining convictions against defendants for offences in contravention of Part XIV. of the Health Act, when exculpatory provisions of section 291 are invoked, are likely to remain.

The Crown Solicitor has stated that whether or not in the field of public health legislation, there should be exculpatory provisions of general application for a variety of offences in contravention of the Health Act such as are contained in section 291 and which may be availed of by defendants is really a question of Government policy. The Crown Solicitor goes on to say that in the field of public health, and especially in relation to the sale of adulterated food, it is not uncommon to find that legislatures have created offences of strict liability without any exculpatory provisions such as are found in various parts of the Victorian Health Act.

Inquiries by the Commission of Public Health have disclosed that there are no similar exculpatory provisions contained in the health legislation of other States. It would appear that in other States the view has been taken that the imposition of strict liability is required in the public interest. The Commission of Public Health supports the representations by the City of Melbourne that the Health Act be appropriately amended to remove the difficulties being encountered with section 291 of the Health Act. The Bill seeks to do this by the repeal of the section.

Clause 12 seeks to correct what might be termed an improper use by a council of the powers of section 383 of the Health Act whereby a council may increase rates by 2·5 cents in the $1 above the statutory limitation on rates fixed by the Local Government Act. This was a provision to enable councils to obtain sufficient funds from rates to provide health services. Under sections 60 and 61 of the Health Act, councils have power either to make and levy a rate or make a charge for the collection of garbage, rubbish, nightsoil and so on, but in the case of the special health rate under section 383, it may only be levied on the value of the whole of the rateable property. Consequently, where urban land is concerned, even though the health services benefited only one family, the charge for those services could be quite high.

The Doncaster, Templestowe and Warrandyte Primary Producers Association has made representations concerning the action of the City of Doncaster and Templestowe in exercising its powers in the terms of section 383 of the Health Act 1958 and thereby increasing the general rate of the municipality by an amount

of 2·5 cents in the $1 on the unimproved capital value of properties in the area as a health rate. The Local Government Act was amended in 1969 to allow a differential general rate to be charged in respect of general rates for urban farm land. The Health Act does not at present allow a differential health rate to be charged for urban farm land.

A detailed submission from the Primary Producers Association together with comments on the matter by the City of Doncaster and Templestowe were considered by the Commission of Public Health. The commission recommended that the Health Act be amended to provide that a municipal council may have a similar discretion in relation to the fixing of rates for urban farm land as now applies under the Local Government Act.

The final matter which will be dealt with in this amending Bill relates to the present necessity for officers of the Liquor Control Commission to attend court to prove that a particular person is the holder of a licence to sell or dispose of liquor even though this point is not in dispute. Clause 13 has been included in the Bill at the request of the Liquor Control Commission to relieve officers of the commission from having personally to produce the appropriate register in court to prove the defendant holds a licence to sell and dispose of alcoholic liquor. Actions involving this procedure usually relate to contraventions of the Cleanliness (Food, Drugs and Substances) Regulations, that is, dirty glasses in hotels or failure to supply a clean glass with each serve or to contravention of the Goods Act 1958, for example, "watering the whisky". 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 Tuesday, October 31.

Mr. Rossiter.

ANSETT TRANSPORT INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE.

REPORT: IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATION.

The debate (adjourned from September 20) was resumed on the motion of Mr. Wilton (Broadmeadows)—

That this House concurs with the recommendation of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the takeover scheme proposed by Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. in relation to Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. that an examination of the relationship of Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. to the transport industry in Victoria should be undertaken by a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. A. W. TAYLOR (Balwyn).—A Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly was originally established to examine the proposed takeover of Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. by Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. and it proposed a temporary restriction on the exercise of voting rights. However, on 26th May, Sir Peter Abeles, the chairman of directors of Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. indicated by letter that no proposed offer existed.

The committee considered these aspects of the matter and felt that if there was no proposed takeover then, within the wording of the resolution of the House, it was very doubtful whether the committee could proceed with an inquiry. At that stage Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. asked for permission to make a submission to the committee. Representatives appeared before the committee and presented the report which is now in the hands of honorable members. Meanwhile, an agreement was reached between the boards of Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. and Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. on a restriction of voting rights between the companies, more or less on the basis that for 23·4 per cent of the shares the total voting rights of Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. would be restricted to 10 per cent.

The matter was referred to the Stock Exchange of Melbourne for consideration, and it would not affirm its approval of the arrangement. The report to which I have referred was submitted to Parliament. Last week Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. advised Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. that it would agree to a new agreement concerning a restriction of voting rights, the only difference being that although there was a limit of 10 per cent of shares to be used for voting rights, if there was any other shareholder with a holding of 10 per cent, Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. would be allowed to use the same percentage as that shareholder.

The Stock Exchange of Melbourne has indicated that approval of this proposal may be forthcoming. The proposal is before the committee of the stock exchange tonight. I believe that if the exchange agrees to the proposal, it will be only a matter of submitting the proposals to the shareholders, particularly to the shareholders of Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. I do not know where, beyond that issue, the interest of Parliament lies. However, I indicate that, as chairman of the original committee, I support the committee's report. I suggest that a Select Committee should be re-established but that it should have a broader basis. I consider that the committee should be enabled to investigate all factors relating to shares in Ansett Transport Industries Ltd., that there should be an extension of the date affecting the restrictions of voting rights which was laid down originally, and that it should be extended beyond 30th November.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I desire to propose an amendment to the motion before the House to give effect to the recommendations contained in the report of the committee to which reference has been made. I particularly draw the attention of honorable members to clauses 9 and 10 of the report, which is dated 16th August, 1972. Clause 9 reads—

> Committee is of the opinion that an examination of the principles proposed by A.T.I. in its submission and embodied in the agreement between the companies would extend the nature of the inquiry considerably beyond the terms of reference given to it by the House.

Clause 10 reads—

> A further written submission dated 3rd August, 1972, was received from A.T.I. requesting that the Parliament enact legislation to ensure a restriction on voting rights of shareholders in A.T.I. (see Appendix B). However, this matter appeared to be outside the terms of reference of your committee and evidence was not called on this aspect.

To accord with the recommendations of the committee, I move—

> That all the words after "Ansett Transport Industries Ltd " (where first appearing in the motion) be omitted with a view to inserting in place thereof the words, " and considers that a Select Committee of this House should inquire as to whether or not the agreement made or proposed to be made between Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. and Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. is in the public interest and whether or not any legislation is required to facilitate the operation of any such agreement ".

There is mention in the report of an agreement, but I see no reason for going into details about it. The honorable member for Balwyn has referred to consideration of this matter by the Stock Exchange of Melbourne, and I think it is a subject which should be considered by the committee if, after this motion has been dealt with, a committee is appointed. If a committee is appointed, it will be necessary for the House to enact legislation, since the previous committee does not now exist.

On the motion of Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds), the debate was adjourned.

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

LAND (RESIDENCE AREAS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 27) on the motion of Mr. Borthwick (Minister of Lands) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—The purpose of this Bill is to effect a change to a situation which has existed for more than 100 years and which concerns the holders of a miner's right who are also eligible to be granted a miner's residence area. That is an area of Crown land which is made available to the holder of the miner's right so that he can establish premises on it. I understand that the cities of Bendigo and Ballarat were established to a large extent under this system of land tenure.

On the advice of the Lands Department, the Government has decided that this method of dealing with areas of land of the size required to accommodate a private residence is archaic. It has also been established that many of the original grants, permits or residence rights which were issued are not now in the hands of the original receivers. Properties have been sold or transferred to other owners, and as the Minister indicated in his second-reading speech many owners of residences established on this type of land would not now have had any direct connection with the mining industry.

The Government has taken the view that it is desirable to ensure that no further residence area titles are granted, and this is provided for in the Bill. The measure also provides that until 1983 people living in these residences will be able to carry on in the same way as they have in the past. They will be able to sell their properties or mortgage them. From January, 1983, onwards if a resident wishes to dispose of his property or mortgage it, it will be necessary for him to have the property declared freehold. A system is provided in the Bill to assist him to do this.

I understand that a system of doing this is now in operation and many people have exercised their rights under this provision, but from 1983 onwards there will be some compulsion on the residents to freehold their properties, particularly if they want to sell or mortgage them. Although the legislation proposes a form of compulsion it also provides a system under which assistance will be given to a resident to make his land freehold. A valuation of the property will be made by an assessor from the Lands Department and the occupier will receive a 50 per cent equity in that valuation. The remaining 50 per cent will become the purchase price of the area and terms of purchase will be worked out on the basis of the valuation. The Bill provides a formula to enable this to be carried out.

Members of the Opposition offer no objection to the Bill. We accept the fact that the need to continue this type of residence area no longer exists because many of the present residents would have purchased their homes from other people and they would have had no direct connection with the mining industry.

The honorable member for Midlands has taken a personal interest in this Bill because a significant portion of the City of Bendigo is within his electorate. He has had some discussions with his constituents who were seeking an opinion on how they would be affected by the Bill. In view of the discussions I have had with the honorable member for Midlands and with Mr. Lepp, of the Lands Department, on behalf of the Opposition I support the Bill.

However, there is one point to which I direct the attention of the Minister. It relates to the clause which deals with the establishment of the purchase price. This is to be based on the valuation determined by an assessor from the Lands Department. I thought the Government would have taken the opportunity of bringing about uniformity of valuations by providing that the valuation shall be made by the Valuer-General. The Government appointed the Valuer-General with a view to bringing about uniformity of valuations and I thought the Government

would have had valuations made by the Valuer-General to obtain uniform valuations for residence area titles. I offer that comment as a mild form of criticism but I do not propose to submit an amendment along those lines. Perhaps the Minister might give the proposal some consideration before the Bill is dealt with in another place. The Labor Party has no other objection to the Bill.

Mr. A. T. EVANS (Ballaarat North).—I hope that tonight the House will pass legislation on which representations were made by residents of Ballarat in 1935. On that occasion a former Premier of Victoria, the Honorable T. T. Hollway, together with a well known and leading citizen of Ballarat, Mr. Edgar Bartrop, put forward several proposals that would have resulted in legislation similar to that now being considered.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—That shows how slow the Government is.

Mr. A. T. EVANS.—It was the predecessor of the honorable member for Gippsland East, the late Sir Albert Lind, who, as Minister of Lands at the time, did not accept the proposals put forward by the residents of Ballarat. This Bill will remove a number of anomalies and relieve several inconveniences which have been experienced in some of the former mining areas of Victoria. Many difficulties and problems arose when people in those areas wished to freehold their land to subdivide it.

Perhaps the House should first examine the interesting history of residence areas because possibly there is no other part of Victoria's legislative history which is so closely related to the colourful goldmining era in Victoria. I have some copies of the Victorian *Gazette* back to 1851. These papers contain the first references to miners' rights. Residence areas were known as miners' rights until legislation was passed in 1935. In the Victorian *Gazette* of 16th August, 1851, it is stated that a licence would be issued to people who were to dig for and disturb the soil in search of gold, metal or ore. They would be permitted to do this on the payment of a reasonable fee, which at that time was one pound ten shillings a month to be paid in advance. Another interesting point is that on 3rd December, 1851, the licence fee for one month was increased to three pounds.

Mr. TREWIN.—That resulted in the Eureka Stockade.

Mr. A. T. EVANS.—That is so. It led to the Eureka affair. Honorable members know that this legislation was being enforced by Governor Charles Joseph La Trobe. In order to collect this revenue for the State the police went out on what were known as "joey" raids on the miners to determine whether they had licences. In 1853 the first reference is made to residences on miners' rights. In that year in a copy of the *Gazette* there is a reference to one of the penalties for mining or residing on goldfields without authority. It states —

> Any person not being the holder of a lease or licence under this Act who shall mine or employ any other person to mine or who be in a mining partnership with any person who shall mine for gold in any land whatsoever in the Colony of Victoria and any person not being the holder of a lease or licence duly empowering him in that behalf and not being an authorized person within the meaning of this Act who shall follow any business or become resident upon or at any of the mines or goldfields on waste lands of the Crown shall be liable to conviction before any two justices of the peace to the penalties following . . .

That is the first reference to the fact that miners were residing on the fields.

In an Act to amend the laws relating to goldfields which was passed in 1855 — this was the first legislation relating to the goldfields following the Eureka Stockade affair of 3rd December, 1854—the following provision appears: —

> The miners' right shall be in force for the period of twelve months from the date thereof and shall during the said period authorize the holder to mine for gold upon any of the waste lands of the Crown and to occupy (except against Her Majesty) for the purpose of residence in connection with the object of mining so much of the said lands as may be prescribed under the rules and regulations . . .

This indicates that a picture is emerging whereby miners were being accepted as residents on their own areas.

In 1865 there was an inquiry during the terms of office as Attorney-General of Mr. H. S. Chapman and the Honorable G. Higinbotham, and apparently there was some difference of opinion. This emphasizes the point that throughout the 120 years in which miners' rights have existed there has been dissatisfaction over landholding by miners. Like the previous speaker, I agree that the provision should have been amended many years ago. Mr. Chapman ruled—

> I think under the 7th section of the Gold Fields Act, the holder of a miner's right who has put up buildings is entitled to have them valued, if it be of a "substantial and permanent character." The 3rd section authorizes the holders of the miners' rights to erect buildings for "either of the purposes" named in the clause, *i.e.* for "mining purposes" or for "residence," but not any other purposes.

Mr. Higinbotham ruled—

> I am of opinion that a miner's right does not authorize a person not engaged in mining to hold land for residency only.

Mr. WILTON.—Does that rule still stand?

Mr. A. T. EVANS.—Not since 1935, as the honorable member would be aware. Legislation introduced in 1935—this will be of interest to the honorable member for Midlands—remedied a defect which had persisted since 1898. It had been discovered that some people who held residence areas were not the holders of miners' rights. In one case three people held residence rights to the one block of land. That is an example of the confusion that existed at that time. *Hansard* of August, 1935, reports this statement—

> In 1898, for example, there was passed an amending Mines Act which secured occupants of residence areas in their area—that is, secured to them such title as they possessed for occupation, and provided also that those areas could not be resumed without compensation. It was regarded by those who took up residence areas after the passing of the Act that they were covered by it, but when, in 1928, certain areas in the City of Bendigo, the Borough of Eaglehawk, and the Parish of Sandhurst, were exempted from being taken up as residence areas, a certain dispute arose between, I understand, two rivals for an area, and the matter went to the Warden's Court. The warden decided that nobody had a title to this area, and that areas taken up since 1898 had no legal title. Although I understand that the Order in Council which had been passed in 1928 to exempt areas in those districts was recalled, the decision of the warden, which was upheld by higher authorities, was that all residence areas which had been secured since 1898 had no title. This legislation will remedy that position as far as the City of Bendigo, the Borough of Eaglehawk, and the Parish of Sandhurst are concerned.

The honorable member for Broadmeadows has mentioned his interest in this legislation. From research I carried out two weeks ago I learnt that there were 2,879 residence areas in the City of Ballarat and the Borough of Sebastopol, 50 in Creswick, 22 in Blackwood and 13 each in Clunes, Beaufort and Egerton while 10 remained at Gordon.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—What about other parts of the State?

Mr. A. T. EVANS.—I am sure the honorable member for Gippsland East will be able to speak for himself on these matters unless he takes the same indifferent attitude to this as he does to other matters in his electorate. In 1963 inquiries were made to me by people who were endeavouring, even at that time, to get away from the pollution and growing social problems of Melbourne for building blocks at Trentham and Blackwood. Inquiries were made for residence areas to enable "week-enders" to be erected but these applications were not being granted because one of the qualifications to obtain a residence area was that the person must live on the area full time. This Bill will now allow these areas to be available for freeholding at a reasonable price assessed by the Lands Department assessor. These people will now contribute to the development of these small picturesque former mining areas.

Recently publicity has been given to actions taken by the Torrens League. For more than 30 years the Torrens League has been pressing for this type of legislation. I mention a letter that I received in December, 1969, from the then Minister of Lands, Sir William McDonald. I had made representations on behalf of the Brown Hill Progress Association and the City of Ballarat for legislation of this nature and I had asked the Minister what steps had been taken to proceed with the earlier representations. The reply I received stated, in part—

> This matter has been under examination by the department for some time. As far back as 25th August, 1967, in response to representations made on behalf of an organization calling itself the Torrens League, I suggested to the Honorable Murray Byrne, M.L.C., that a fully documented submission setting out the aims of the rightholders concerned and those of the Torrens League be submitted to me. However, this information has never been received.

It was at that stage that I took up the matter on behalf of Ballarat City Council and Brown Hill Progress Association and sought the advice of a highly respected citizen of Ballarat, Mr. Titheridge. He and I compiled a submission to the Minister and it is on that submission that the present legislation has been framed. These propositions were far-reaching but the present Minister of Lands, in his wisdom and with the help of Mr. Lepp and Mr. Ken McAllister, has produced wider legislation than my original proposals. I pay a tribute to Mr. McAllister because for many years during his time with the department he has handled intricate legislation which has enabled the Lands Department to function properly. I pay tribute to the talents of Mr. McAllister and the conscientious way in which he carried out his duties on behalf of the Lands Department, particularly in regard to Bills which have been presented to this House in the past.

In March, 1971, I received a letter from Mr. Edgar Bartrop proposing certain amendments and I am pleased to note that one of the most important clauses incorporated in the Bill is based on his recommendation. This clause removes the concern of many people and safeguards the rights of pensioners. In Ballarat some pensioners live in old cottages on residence areas. They are unable to maintain these old cottages and if they were forced to apply to have them made freehold it would be impossible for them to bear the cost. The legislation will now permit them to remain in the cottages on the residence area, and they will not need to be freeholded while they occupy the premises. This overcomes a problem which was causing concern to pensioners.

This housing problem of pensioners will eventually be handled by another method. There is a strong move in Ballarat for more low-rental elderly citizen units to be constructed. Pensioners living on residence areas in old homes are unable or find it difficult to maintain them. It is pleasing to learn that the new Minister of Housing is making moves for more low-rental elderly citizen residences to be constructed, and I hope that in the next few years more pensioners will move out of these old homes. However, enactment of the Bill will mean that a number of people will be able to stay in their present accommodation on residence areas by paying only 50 cents a year. In the past it has been a satisfactory arrangement.

These areas have also been transferred to other members of the family without paying any legal costs or stamp duty. However, it has been a burden and inconvenience to the department. The department could not keep up with the modern trends of land tenure without changing the system, and this Bill will overcome that aspect alone. As I mentioned earlier, when one looks at the available land in Ballarat, one finds that there are many vacant blocks close to shopping centres and in valuable residential areas. Those blocks cannot readily be made freehold because of the law in its present form. Many new Australians have paid nearly

as much for a residence area as they would for a freehold block. I believe the Minister is showing understanding in providing that the blocks can be freeholded on a value of 50 per cent of the municipal valuation. But I would seek his assurance on another point. I draw his attention to sub-section (6) of proposed section 174, which provides—

> The lessee shall not assign or mortgage his interest in the land without the consent of the Secretary for Lands.

I trust the Minister will give sympathetic consideration to any such application. Some widows hold considerable areas of land which could be subdivided into three or four building blocks but they are not in a financial position to arrange a subdivision. If these people present a case to the Minister that this land should be subdivided, I hope the honorable gentleman will consider assigning that land so that it can be subdivided and they can then receive some benefit from the land which perhaps has been in the family for upwards of 100 years. I should also like to see the assignment of the lease permitted before the full purchase price has been paid. If provision is not made for this, there will be many blocks of land in the City of Ballarat which cannot be subdivided and made available for housing. Because of this anomaly the land will have to remain as it is until it has been fully paid for, and only then will subdivision be possible. I commend the Minister for taking the initiative to clear up this matter after so many years.

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—The history behind this legislation has been thoroughly covered by the Minister of Lands and by the honorable member for Ballaarat North. It has been stated by the honorable member for Broadmeadows that Opposition members support the Bill. We do so because we believe it brings up to date something which should have been brought up to date at least eighteen years ago. That is a condemnation of the Government of the day. I am concerned because, although provision has been made for the occupants of residence areas to purchase the land at a set value at a particular time on very generous terms, over periods ranging from 10 years to 40 years and with repayments of about $50 per annum, many of the residents in the Bendigo area are pensioners. Although $50 is a small amount to honorable members it is a lot of money for a pensioner to find in a year.

Mr. BORTHWICK.—They can remain as they are.

Mr. SHILTON.—By interjection the Minister suggests pensioners can remain as they are, but like everyone else they wish to leave what they have to their families. This is what I am asking the Minister to clarify, although I understand from the Lands Department that pensioners will be able to will or deed land to a beneficiary.

Mr. BORTHWICK.—That is correct.

Mr. SHILTON.—That is not spelled out in the measure, and it was not stated in the second-reading speech. However, if the honorable gentleman gives that assurance I shall be delighted and I am sure there will be no objections from the Bendigo electorate or the members who represent part or all of it.

Mr. TRETHEWEY (Bendigo).—I have listened with considerable interest to the history of residence areas as enunciated by the honorable member for Ballaarat North. Bendigo owes its existence to the discovery of gold in 1851, as a result of which people went to Bendigo and Crown lands were made available to the miners on which to erect their residences. These Crown lands were known as miners' rights for which in those days the miners paid five shillings a year. This enabled them to remain on the premises and to carry on their work as miners in the area. Later the name "miner's right" was changed to "residence area", still with the same payment of five shillings or 50 cents which has continued up to the present.

It is interesting to read in the second-reading notes circulated by the Minister that previously when miners died or transferred to other locations they left their old dwellings on these miners' rights and they deteriorated. It became no one's obligation to ensure that the land was properly cleared. Provision will now be made to ensure that it is the responsibility of the people who leave these areas to remove all buildings and improvements at their own expense. Should they fail to do so, the Lands Department can carry out the work and charge the people for the cost of the removal of the buildings and other improvements.

It is pleasing to note that it is now possible for a residence area to be converted into freehold at an appraised value less 50 per cent. This is to the benefit of holders of residence areas, and the fact that the land has been made freehold will enable owners to arrange mortgages and otherwise encumber the land. At present, as is stated in the second-reading notes, the State Savings Bank and one or two other institutions lend money on residence area properties, but other financial institutions, such as building societies, are diffident about granting mortgage rights to residence area holders. The financial position of holders of residence areas will now be greatly improved.

It is good to hear from the Minister that the rights of pensioners will be preserved if they are unable to meet the cost of freeholding their property. Although it was not written into the Bill this matter is cleared up following the statement made by the honorable member for Midlands that pensioners can remain in residence areas for as long as they wish.

As at 1st July, 1972, there were 1,537 residence area rights in Bendigo, 3,045 in Ballarat, and 213 in other former mining districts. Many people will benefit from the passing of the legislation. They will have the opportunity of freeholding their residence areas, and this will be of considerable advantage not only to the people who desire to obtain finance from the lending institutions but also to the owners of residence areas when they decide to sell them. It is easier to sell property on freehold land.

I commend the Bill and thank the Minister for introducing it and bringing the Act up to date. Residence areas have proved of advantage to the past generation but in the present day of progress a change in this form of tenure is desirable. I wish the Bill a speedy passage and trust that the people concerned will be pleased with the result.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South).—As a member representing a large, former mining area on which many residence areas abound, it is incumbent on me to speak on this measure. I support the Bill, as have honorable members who have already spoken. When speaking of residence areas, one is automatically dealing with history. In the Mines Act of 1884 the opportunity was given to holders of residence areas to freehold their holdings. In 1865 the cost of a miner's right, as it was called at that time, was reduced to five shillings. In 1892 it was reduced to two shillings and sixpence.

With the transfer of residence areas or miners' rights to within the provisions of the Land Act, the price returned to five shillings. In 1935 they became residence areas. In the past there has not been much incentive for many of the holders of residence areas to freehold. I welcome the provision that a 50 per cent reduction will be made in the appraisal price as an added incentive to clean up the problem in the former goldmining districts. Problems are involved because some of the residence areas cut across town planning schemes and the obvious desire for subdivision in some areas. Most lending institutions now accept residence areas as security for a mortgage. From my research I discovered that only the War Service

Homes Division is reluctant to lend money on residence areas. Nevertheless, the proposal to freehold residence areas is a major improvement.

Plenty of safeguards are contained in the measure. One or two matters that have been raised during the debate may cause concern, but I am sure the measure is a genuine endeavour to overcome any problems which may exist and that almost everything has been covered. As all members representing Ballarat and its surrounding districts are in favour of the measure and have been working closely with the Minister over the past few years on the matter, and as members representing the Bendigo district have indicated their approval of the proposed legislation, I am sure it will meet with the general approval of the community and will be recognized as an effort by the Government to obviate some of the anomalies and drawbacks which have existed with residence areas in Victoria.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla).—Members of the Country Party support the measure. This evening honorable members have had the opportunity of listening to experienced members from the areas where residence areas exist. I am sure that when this measure is written into the annals of Parliament it will be recorded as an indication that the Lands Department of the day, headed by the worthy Minister, met the needs of the residents of the old mining areas. Many amendments have been made to the Land Act to enable people to become squatters, to obtain miners' rights and then to become selectors. It is recognized that the Lands Department has always been progressive in its thinking to enable the State to develop to a reasonable degree so that a person can earn a living as a miner, from agricultural pursuits or even from urban development. As a result of progress being made in Bendigo and Ballarat, where most residence areas exist, it is necessary that areas of land which could not be utilized to their fullest under the present tenure should now be available for further development. As was explained by other honorable members, the measure has been so worded and defined that the tenants of the residence areas will receive just consideration.

Members of the Country Party support the Bill. We believe many other small townships throughout Victoria, especially in central Victoria, where most of the residence areas exist, will also gain some benefit from the proposed legislation.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and committed, *pro forma.*

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of this Bill.

A resolution in accordance with the recommendation was passed in Committee and adopted by the House.

The House went into Committee for the consideration of this Bill.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2, relating to the insertion of a new Division 11.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—I thank honorable members for their worth-while contributions to the second-reading debate. I particularly appreciate, and I am sure the Lands Departments does also, the very kind references to Mr. Ken McAllister, who recently retired from the department, and Mr. Stan. Lepp. Mr. McAllister literally gave a lifetime of service to the Lands Department and was one of the few senior public servants in this State who had a complete in depth historical understanding of intricate Acts which can be described almost as the original Acts upon the change of Victoria from a Colony to a State. This officer will be sadly missed in public

administration. I appreciate the remarks made by honorable members about these two fine officers.

The honorable members for Midlands and Bendigo referred to the retention of residence area rights by pensioners. Under this measure, the existing situation will continue until 1983, after which time any person, in effect, will be able to retain a residence area right. This will include pensioners although categories of persons are not referred to. If such persons want to encumber their interest or sell or transfer their interest, after 1983, regardless of whether they are pensioners, the land will have to become freehold land. However, they can continue in residence and pay the 50 cents per annum as pensioners or, for that matter, any other category, without any problem arising.

So long as the residence area remains within the estate, there will be no problem. However, on the transfer from the executor to the beneficiary, the land will have to become freehold land. I reassure honorable members that the rights of pensioners will be protected. I have no doubt that it would be difficult for a pensioner to move into a new type of tenure, even though it might only require the payment of $50 per annum, and most pensioners would prefer the change in land tenure to occur after their death.

Mr. CURNOW.—What about surveys?

Mr. BORTHWICK.—In many instances surveys will be very difficult and will in fact cause a great deal of work for the department in some areas. I recognize the problems involved.

The honorable member for Ballaarat North referred to assignments of interest. In most circumstances, the department will not withhold consent to assignments or to mortgages. The provision is retained in the measure to enable the department to keep its records clear on the relative interests.

The honorable member for Broadmeadows suggested using the Valuer-General for the original appraisals. The Land Act gives the Minister of Lands the right to appoint appraisers and the honorable member suggests that the existing provision should be amended to nominate the Valuer-General. The Government seriously considered this matter. In this instance, we are dealing with 4,800 odd areas of land which are valued under local government valuations and which, since the establishment of the Valuer-General's Office, have become uniform throughout the State subject to revaluation every few years.

If the legislation were to nominate the Valuer-General, because of the generous terms involved, a tremendous amount of work would be placed on the shoulders of that officer, who already has sufficient work to do. As Minister of Lands, whenever a dispute has arisen concerning the sale or exchange of land in country areas and a person has claimed the appraisal by the appraiser appointed by the Minister to be inaccurate, I have invariably requested the Valuer-General, as an appraiser for me, to determine the price. In some cases the price has been higher than the one objected to and in some it has been lower. I give an undertaking that if a dispute occurs over appraisals, as a matter of practice—I believe this is a uniform approach by all Government departments in this type of situation—I will be guided by the Valuer-General.

In fixing these prices as required under the Land Act, because of the uniform approach in valuations through the Valuer-General's Office, the appraisers will base their appraisals on municipal valuations. Whilst I appreciate the reasoning behind the suggestion, to write it into the Act could well create a tremendous amount of work for the

Valuer-General, especially as in many instances the land has a very low valuation. I am not speaking now of areas within the cities of Bendigo and Ballarat, but more particularly of land around the hamlets referred to by the honorable member for Ballaarat North, where a minimal sum of money is involved. It hardly seems appropriate to request the Valuer-General to handle cases of this sort. If a dispute arose, I would appoint him as an appraiser to arbitrate for me.

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.

LAND (JETTIES AND MARINAS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 27) on the motion of Mr. Borthwick (Minister of Lands) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—This Bill contains two major amendments to the Land Act. The provisions contained in clause 2 will insert eight new sections into the Act to allow for the licensing of landing stages, jetties and boat-launching ramps in the Gippsland lakes area. The other major amendment is contained in clause 3 and will allow for the construction and management of marinas in the area. The reasons for the introduction of the Bill and the proposed amendments to the Land Act were adequately explained by the Minister in his second-reading speech. The honorable gentleman pointed out that at present there is no way in which licences can be granted for launching ramps and jetties within the Gippsland lakes area and that in the past permissive occupancy has been given for this purpose. This has been a clumsy method of handling the procedure, and it is some time since any new permissive occupancies were granted.

In regard to the need to construct and manage marinas within the Gippsland lakes area, I point out that the fourth progress report of the State Development Committee in 1967-68 on the economic development of Gippsland, with particular reference to the control, maintenance, promotion and development of the Gippsland lakes, recommended a number of changes which should be made to the statutes for the control of the Gippsland lakes area. I compliment the committee on that portion of its report. I am grateful that at least this measure dealing with boating facilities on the Gippsland lakes has been introduced into the House by the Minister for Conservation.

Paragraph 28, which appears on page 6 of the report of the State Development Committee, states that the Gippsland lakes have some 250 square miles of navigable waters and have truly unlimited potential for boating and other aquatic sports. That is a true statement of the position. As most honorable members are aware, the Gippsland lakes are the "Gold Coast" not only for Gippsland residents but for many other people. It is an excellent holiday spot and a beautiful area for people seeking to enjoy the sport of boating, and many hundreds of thousands of persons have visited the lakes since they were discovered by Angus McMillan in 1839. The realization that more and more people are turning to boating as a pleasure sport and that more provision must be made for launching ramps and jetties in the Gippsland lakes area led to the introduction of this Bill.

Although one may congratulate the Minister on bringing forward the measure at this time, one cannot congratulate the Government on its tardiness in not implementing some of the other major recommendations contained in the report of the State Development Committee, one of which was that certain measures should be introduced so that the

full economic development and promotion of the Gippsland lakes can take place.

In handling this Bill on behalf of the Opposition, I took it upon myself to write to some of the municipalities in the Gippsland lakes region to seek their comments on the measure. The Shire of Bairnsdale replied to my letter, stating, *inter alia* —

The council has discussed the proposed legislation with our local member, Mr. Bruce Evans, M P. Mr. Evans has been requested to seek an addition to the legislation of a clause whereby provision is made for payment to the municipal council of an inspection fee on the lodging of an application for a jetty, landing stage, etc. It is felt that the council should be entitled to some recompense for the time spent by council staff in investigating and reporting on applications for these licences.

Any assistance you may be able to give towards this end would be appreciated.

There is no need for me to detail the reasons why Bairnsdale Shire Council felt it necessary to request this addition to the Bill. Suffice for me to say that I support this principle, and I am sure the honorable member for Gippsland East will go into more detail on this point.

I consider that two provisions in the Bill require further clarification. Proposed new section 140B, which is contained in clause 2, deals with the notice of intention to apply for a licence setting out the purpose for which and the land in respect of which such licence is sought. It provides that the notice shall be published by the applicant in a newspaper circulating in the district in which the land is situated and be posted by the applicant in a conspicuous place on the land for fourteen days after the publication. This procedure will enable the general public to be made fully aware of the person's intentions and is necessary because the land concerned is Crown land or public land.

I foreshadow an amendment relating to any objection which may be made by an opponent to an applicant being granted a licence to construct and operate a private jetty or launching ramp on Crown land. I shall deal with the amendment in greater detail when the appropriate clause is reached in Committee.

Another point relates to clause 3, which provides for the construction and control of marinas. Sub-section (3) of proposed new section 222c provides that before constructing a marina a municipality shall enter into an agreement with the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Lands. Sub-section (4) provides—

Such an agreement may provide for *inter alia*—

(i) the control care and management of the marina;

I do not suppose anybody would object to that provision—

(ii) the construction operation and maintenance of the facilities to be provided;

Again, I do not think anyone would raise any major objection—

(iii) the granting of concessions to operate facilities for and consistent with the purposes of the marina;

I understand that under this provision it is envisaged that the management committee, which in effect will be the municipality concerned, would be looking to perhaps an oil company to supply petrol bowsers or petrol and oil for boats, or to someone to start a kiosk to provide facilities for the general public. The remaining paragraphs provide—

(iv) the granting of permits for the use of the facilities of the marina; and

(v) the maintenance of structures and facilities within the marina.

I seek an assurance from the Minister on these provisions. I trust that the person or organization granted a concession to operate certain facilities at a marina will not also be the authority which will grant the permits. I do not believe that is the intention, but I seek an assurance from the Minister on that point.

A further major provision in the Bill relates to the establishment of the Aquatic Clearance Fund to be derived from licence fees. I understand that the purpose of the fund is to make moneys available for the

removal of obstructions in the Gippsland lakes area, and I further understand that by "obstructions" is meant the decaying and rotting jetty structures already in the area. I should like some additional information from the Minister on the estimated amount which will be available in the fund in a two-year period and whether or not the fund could be used for the removal not only of obstructions such as old jetties or launching ramps but also of weed and so on.

Members of the Opposition have no major objection to the Bill. However, we seek an assurance from the Minister on the construction and management of marinas and the honorable gentleman's comments on the amendment I have foreshadowed to the proposed new section 140B.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East).—I must confess that I was slightly disappointed when in his explanatory second-reading speech the Minister chose not to dilate, as he put it, upon the beauty and attraction of the Gippsland lakes. I know that the honorable gentleman, together with many of our colleagues in this Chamber, is well aware of the wonderful tourist attraction of the Gippsland lakes system, how vital it is to the proper development of the region which surrounds it and to the recreation facilities not only for the whole of Victoria but also for many other parts of the Commonwealth. Naturally, those of us who are resident within the surrounds of the Gippsland lakes have been looking to the Government for many years to give a lead in assisting the development of this wonderful asset. We realize that it is a fairly delicate sort of an asset which must be developed with great thought and common sense or it can be destroyed.

It is unfortunate that in some respects the Gippsland lakes system has deteriorated over recent years. To some extent the deterioration is due to the absence of any system of collection and disposal of rubbish dumped by boat owners at various picnic spots and the like around the lake. Unfortunately, in the absence of any proper rubbish disposal system, boat owners are inclined to drop their rubbish into the water, and this constitutes a serious form of pollution. It is hoped that in the not-too-distant future the Government will appreciate that this problem is beyond the resources of the municipalities which bound the Gippsland lakes, of which there are several, and that there is a need for co-ordination in patrolling the area and the collection of rubbish around the lakes. That subject is a little outside the scope of the Bill, which I welcome because it has been urgently needed for some considerable time since somebody determined that permits for the permissive occupancies for the construction of jetties would no longer be issued. I confess that since that time the Minister has handled this difficult situation with a degree of understanding and common sense which I have not always found amongst Ministers.

The proposed legislation will overcome the need to look at things diplomatically. The Minister will have the necessary legislative authority to issue licences in the first instance for the construction of jetties, landing stages, and similar structures. For people resident on the islands in the Gippsland lakes, for example at Mosquito Point which is across the lake from Metung, jetties are a necessity. They are needed for travel to and from work and to and from entertainments in the evening. There is no other adequate access. At Mosquito Point there is no other access at all. There is access to Raymond Island by ferry, but the hours of operation of the ferry are not always suitable to the residents. When the ferry is not operating, rowing boats or motor boats are used and jetties are essential.

The proposed legislation will be welcomed and I cannot see many problems attaching to it. As was indicated by the honorable member for Morwell, I discussed this question with the Shire of Bairnsdale. I also discussed it with the Shire of Tambo, another municipality which is keenly interested in the measure. As was indicated in the letter referred to by the honorable member, the Shire of Bairnsdale wants provision made for an inspection fee. It believes that if it is required to report on a proposal for the construction of a jetty, it should be recompensed for the cost involved. It relates the proposed fee to one imposed for inspections under the Uniform Building Regulations. I have discussed this matter with the Minister and, no doubt, in due course the honorable gentleman will indicate his attitude to the suggestion. Depending on that, I will determine whether there is any point in putting forward an amendment during the Committee stage.

I am also concerned with proposed section 140D to be inserted in the principal Act by clause 2 of the Bill. The proposed section has an open-ended provision for the determination of a fee to be charged for the issue of a licence. It provides—

> Every licence shall specify the purpose for which it is granted and shall be subject to such covenants conditions reservations and restrictions and to the payment of such rent as is specified in the licence and to the payment of a contribution to the Aquatic Clearance Fund.

In years gone by, there have been some discussions within the Public Works Department on the levying of some form of fee for mooring facilities at public jetties. I appreciate that this provision has a slightly different context. There has been some argument on the proposal for a charge to be made for a jetty, particularly on whether the charge should relate to the actual length or the effective length of the jetty. In some cases, a jetty may have to be 100 yards long to reach water deep enough for a boat to be moored. In another case, it may need to be only 6 feet long. I hope that when the department is determining the charge to be made it will relate it to the effective and not the actual length of a jetty. The owners of jetties in the Gippsland lakes are concerned with this point. The matter was raised with the Minister when he visited the area shortly after taking up his new portfolio. The Minister indicates to me that a charge of 50 cents an effective foot length will be considered under the legislation.

Mr. BORTHWICK.—I will review that figure.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—Now the Minister has me worried. I sincerely hope that the honorable gentleman will listen to representations on this point in the way he has heard representations in the past and will make a reasonable decision. I am sure that he realizes how important it is. Portion of the fee is to be allocated to the Aquatic Clearance Fund. I support this as a desirable proposal but, like the honorable member for Morwell, I query the wording of the provision. I am concerned about the purposes for which the money in the fund will be used. The Bill simply states that the levy will be used for the clearing of obstructions in the streams and lakes referred to in the 17th Schedule. In effect, they constitute the Gippsland lakes area.

Obstructions can take many different forms. I wonder whether the reference is meant to cover trees which have drifted down the river and are blocking it. Many obstructions of that type could properly be dealt with by river improvement trusts. There could be some conflict of interests. I first thought the reference to obstructions meant derelict piers and jetties which are eyesores, are dangerous, and which should be removed. Their removal would be a desirable use of the money in the fund. If the money is to be used to remove trees which have lodged in a river, and which present a

problem to certain bodies, the money will not go far. I should like some clarification on this point.

A tree may lodge on the bed of the Mitchell River between the silt jetties. The Mitchell River Improvement Trust may not be particularly concerned even though the area is within its boundaries because not much in the way of rates is payable to the trust from the extremities of the silt jetties. In this situation it might be proper for the Ports and Harbors Branch to clear the obstruction. This highlights another issue which was raised by the honorable member for Morwell.

The measure is a small step in solving the problems of the Gippsland lakes. I support the honorable member for Morwell in urging the Government to resolve quickly the problem of the proper management and control of the Gippsland lakes area. It cannot be managed effectively with the division of responsibility, as I have indicated in a small way, in relation to the removal of an obstruction in streams and lakes.

The provisions of the Bill deal with the construction of a marina. That is a modern word which is defined in the measure. An urgent need exists for this type of structure. I envisage some problem in years to come for future Ministers of Lands in determining where demand exists, the capabilities of private jetties and where a marina is needed properly to cope with the number of boats to be moored. I can think of a number of places around the Gippsland lakes where a jetty could be constructed for every block of a frontage of 50 feet. I see the Minister of Lands shaking his head; he implies that this would not occur. He may not be Minister in twelve months' time, and who is to know what sort of control may be imposed by a future Government? This power is to be given not only to the present Minister but to future Ministers. It would be possible for a future Minister to grant permission for jetties to be constructed by two adjoining owners. I concede that a problem could exist.

The Bill provides for administrative power. I hope future Ministers will have the common sense to implement the legislation and say that the stage has been reached where private jetties can no longer cope with the demand and that it will be necessary to construct a marina or community jetty facilities. The Bill is deliberately drafted widely to give the flexibility needed for any Minister or Administration to be able to determine what is best in particular circumstances. It is not possible to draft a Bill to cover all eventualities. The provision of a marina will be welcome in areas such as Metung. which has been striving for this facility for a long time.

Chinaman's Creek, an attractive arm of the lakes near Metung, has been despoiled in recent years by the number of boats moored near the small inlet, and much of the vegetation has been destroyed by people constructing small jetties to gain access to their boats. When Sir Horace Petty was Minister of Public Works, the trust at Metung had a considerable amount of money for a proposed boat harbor but there was no means by which the Government could agree to its construction. That is an indication of the length of time that this facility has been needed at Metung.

I am pleased that the provisions of the Bill cover the needs of Lake Tyers. Although strictly not part of the Gippsland lakes system, Lake Tyers is one of the Gippsland lakes. Recently I have spoken on a number of occasions to owners of a commercial launch on Lake Tyers who are placed in an impossible position because they are required by the Ports and Harbors Branch of the Public Works Department to have the boat inspected for safety purposes every twelve months. These people have repeatedly applied to the Public Works Department for the construction of a slipway so that the boat can be inspected. It is due for inspection on the 25th of this month. The owners are in an invidious position because one branch of

the department requires an inspection of the boat and the department cannot provide a slipway on which the boat can be slipped for inspection. These people will be grateful for this Bill, and I hope the department concerned will be forebearing enough not to insist on the inspection or deregister the boat under the Ports and Harbors Regulations until a slipway is completed. It is impossible to take the boat from Lake Tyers to Lakes Entrance because only occasionally is Lake Tyers open to the sea. I am anxious for this legislation to be enacted because it will be of immense benefit to all people in the Gippsland lakes area.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Progress was reported.

ADJOURNMENT,

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION: PROPOSED NEWPORT POWER STATION — QUADRAPLEGICS: ISSUE OF PARKING PERMITS—STATE SAVINGS BANK: HOUSING LOANS TO SINGLE WOMEN — EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: GARAGE FOR SPECIAL SCHOOL AT BROADMEADOWS—STATE MOTOR CAR INSURANCE OFFICE: INSURANCE OF MOTOR CYCLES — DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: LABELLING OF CLOTHING.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until tomorrow, at half-past Three o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—I raise a matter of concern to myself and to many persons in the community involving the siting of the proposed power station at Newport. Last September Parliament received a report from the State Electricity Commission concerning the construction of a power station at Newport of 1,000 megawatts. After discussion Parliament passed legislation authorizing the State Electricity Commission to construct the power station. At that time there was no public response to the matter and no further investigations. It appeared to be a fairly simple proposition. Since then investigations have been carried out into the effects of the proposed power station on the local environment of Williamstown and on the wider environment of the metropolis. These investigations were initially undertaken by conservation groups centred in the Williamstown district and were carried out by highly qualified people. The results of the investigations suggest atmospheric pollution of the area by nitrogen oxide, and the further problems of steam fogs, and water and noise pollution.

This highly technical material has been forwarded to me, as has the detailed material that the State Electricity Commission has submitted. I make it plain that at all times the State Electricity Commission has been most helpful and understanding, but there is this conflicting technical material on the effects of the Newport power station on the environment. The material has been examined by the Clean Air Society and the Town and Country Planning Association, both of which have voiced their great concern. Local feeling is a matter of contention but it was certainly a major issue in the last council elections in Williamstown. Originally the Williamstown City Council did not voice concern on the issue, but it has reconsidered its stance. On 4th September, 1972, the council passed the following resolution:—

That this council inform the Minister for Fuel and Power that this council calls on the Victorian State Government to conduct an investigation through the aid of the all-party Parliamentary Public Works Committee as to the siting of the proposed new Newport power station.

On 2nd October, 1972, this resolution was reiterated at a further meeting. Since then numerous trade unions which will be involved in the construction and operation of the

power station have considered the material put forward by the various parties and have also come to the view that the Public Works Committee would be the appropriate body to assess the situation.

Some time ago the Williamstown City Council asked the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization to examine various aspects, particularly the effects of steam fogs. Although the organization has had an officer working full time on the project for some months, it has been unable to complete its report because of the lack of material and evidence. It is in this context that I am putting forward this proposition.

The Labor Party has reconsidered its stance on the matter following the submission of this material. It has decided not to pre-judge the issue but to ask the Government to refer the matter to the Public Works Committee. As a matter of principle an independent body should examine the matter, and the Public Works Committee has been considered as the most appropriate. I hope the Minister will reconsider the issue because of its ramifications on the wider question of pollution throughout Melbourne and because of the concern of many people.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne).—I raise the case of an individual, Mr. Bernie Smallacombe, of Glenroy, aged 26 and a quadraplegic. He works at Ascot Vale and drives a specially fitted motor car which he parks next to his place of employment in Baroda Street, Flemington. He parks on a nature strip, although he was careful to point out that he does not park on Mr. Arthur Calwell's nature strip. Mr. Smallacombe was charged with thirteen parking offences and was proceeded against by the Melbourne City Council. He intimates that the Melbourne City Council could not have been more courteous or helpful and at the prosecution yesterday in court—he says he was unrepresented—the Melbourne City Council did all it could to help him and indicated it did not wish to press for a penalty or for costs. In fact he was convicted and discharged without penalty or an order for costs.

There is an international sticker for quadraplegics which is recognized in most parts of the world, but I understand it has not yet in a sense been officially recognized in this country. The quadraplegic sticker is a yellow car sticker, not unlike the car stickers used by members of Parliament, with the outline of a wheelchair in black and two black dots. The reason I raise this matter on the adjournment is to suggest that the Government might seriously consider having the Motor Registration Branch issue such stickers when a proper submission is made to it, with perhaps an affidavit with supporting evidence from the appropriate medical practitioners. Although parking is not within the ordinary jurisdiction of the State Government, it might be prepared to make representations to city councils not to prosecute people when these stickers are present.

Mr. Smallacombe, in common with many other quadraplegics—I should not say many because there are comparatively few—has to drive a specially fitted motor car. Owing to the nature of their affliction, it is not possible for quadraplegics to park far away from where they work. Obviously one would like to see steps taken by the employers to assist them. The primary responsibility ought to be left with the employer to find parking spaces. But in Ascot Vale or Flemington there are no such spaces. Therefore, I ask the Government to seriously consider letting the Motor Registration Branch issue an officially recognized quadraplegic sticker and to make representations to municipal councils that persons having these stickers should not be charged with parking offences. It seems to me that this is a matter of genuine public concern, and that

with a small amount of effort by the Government a considerable social benefit could be achieved.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I bring a matter to the attention of the Treasurer. Although it should not be the function of the Government to interfere in the internal day-to-day running of the State Savings Bank, this week it was brought to my attention that a customer of the bank, a single woman who holds a prominent position in public life in her local community, approached the State Savings Bank with a view to obtaining a housing loan. She was informed by the local manager, presumably in accordance with the State Savings Bank policy, that single women were regarded as a poor risk and accordingly she could not be granted a loan. Subsequently she approached the Commonwealth Bank where she received quite different treatment. She was given a loan and told it was not even necessary to provide a male guarantor provided that she had proper letters of reference. It appears that an important matter of public policy is involved.

I believe the Treasurer should indicate to the bank that it is the Government's view that in respect of advances for the purchase of homes single women should not be regarded as second-rate citizens. They should be treated on exactly the same basis as anybody else who wishes to purchase a house, and there should be no presumptions against them. It would also be in the interests of what is, after all, the Victorian people's own bank. It seems singularly unfortunate that in this instance the woman concerned had to transfer her business to the Commonwealth Savings Bank.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister of Education. On 30th September, 1971, the honorable gentleman advised by letter that he had approved of a special grant being made on a $1 for $1 basis towards the cost of the erection of a garage to house a bus which had been donated by a local organization to transport children to and from the special school at Broadmeadows. The original estimate of the cost of this work was $1,500 for which the school was to pay $750. Since that time, the cost has escalated to $3,000 and the school has had to find $1,500.

The Public Works Department has advised that the contractor has been allowed to withdraw from the project and that new tenders are to be called. This is a matter of concern to the people connected with the special school, because they are fearful that the cost will be greater, and they are incapable of raising more than the $1,500 which has been sent to the Education Department. I ask the Minister to examine this situation urgently in an endeavour to ensure that the contribution of the school will not exceed $1,500.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—I bring a matter to the attention of the Treasurer. I was advised today that the State Motor Car Insurance Office does not insure motor cycles under any circumstances, either comprehensively, against third-party property damage or general third-party risks. Having regard to the present boom in motor cycling, it seems to me that the insurance office could conduct extensive business in this field. From my investigations, it would appear to be a matter of departmental rather than Government policy.

I believe this is a matter which falls within the jurisdiction of the Treasurer, and I ask the honorable gentleman to examine it. The State Motor Car Insurance Office covers all fields of motor car insurance, but the only motor bicycles that it insures are those which belong to the Victoria Police. If the office can cover those machines, I cannot see any reason for its being unable to cover all motor cycles. I ask the Treasurer to examine the matter and to issue a direction to ensure that the State Motor Car Insurance Office will provide this service to the

public — a service which is not being provided by many companies concerned with general vehicle insurance.

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland).—On 19th September, I drew the attention of the House to incorrect labelling of garments. The matter was referred to the Minister of Health who, in turn, referred it to the Minister of Labour and Industry. I was told that I would be notified of the Minister's investigations into the matter, but that has not yet been done. I ask the Minister of Health whether in fact the matter has been referred to the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—The matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition came as a surprise to me. I am not aware that single women are discriminated against by the State Savings Bank of Victoria in the matter of housing loans. The Government does not direct the bank on how to conduct its business, but I shall be glad to discuss the matter with the management of the bank, because I do not think that such an attitude is justifiable. I shall be glad to discuss details with the Leader of the Opposition.

The State Motor Car Insurance Office is within the jurisdiction of the Chief Secretary, and I will discuss the question of comprehensive and third-party insurance of motor cycles with the honorable gentleman. I would be surprised if proposals for third-party insurance were rejected.

Mr. EDMUNDS.—Perhaps they were for comprehensive insurance.

Mr. HAMER.—I will discuss the matter. It is the intention of the legislation that third-party insurance should be available for motor cycles as well as motor cars.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The honorable member for Melbourne made a reasonable suggestion in relation to the provision of a badge for quadraplegics who drive motor cars. I will draw the matter to the attention of the Acting Chief Secretary. I might add that the Minister of Water Supply and Public Works pointed out that a badge of this type is already issued to limbless soldiers.

The honorable member for Broadmeadows raised the question of the erection of a garage to house a bus for the transport of students to a special school. The department will maintain the school's contribution at $1,500.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The honorable member for Footscray raised the matter of the Public Works Committee holding an inquiry into the building of the Newport power station. Some five or six years ago the State Electricity Commission investigated a proposal to build a power station there and took into account information which was available from overseas. Last September the commission presented a report which received considerable publicity and, finally, the Parliament enacted legislation which authorized the project. Since then certain commitments have been entered into and further investigations have been made. I believe that the commission can answer all of the doubts which have been expressed in relation to the effect that this station may have on the Williamstown and metropolitan areas.

Honorable members will understand that the station cannot be built and cannot operate unless the necessary permits and licences are given by the Environment Protection Authority. The proper place for these people to express their doubts about the project is before that authority. Certainly, the commission will have to convince the authority that it can carry out the work according to the authority's specifications.

As I understand the Act, it is open for people who object to things taking place to go before the authority and put their case. That being so,

this may be a more expert way of handling the matter than referring it to a Parliamentary committee.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—Off hand, I cannot recall whether the matter referred to by the honorable member for Portland came before the department. Possibly it did, and I will certainly have investigations made tomorrow and ensure that the honorable member receives an answer.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.26 *p.m.*

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, October 11, 1972.

The PRESIDENT **(the Hon. R. W. Garrett)** took the chair at 4.25 p.m., and read the prayer.

AQUIFERS.

POLLUTION IN WESTERN SUBURBS.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Mines—

(*a*) Will the Minister of Mines provide details of the areas of underground aquifers in the western suburbs which are polluted, giving details of the pollutants' characteristics and their chemical names?

(*b*) How much further testing by drilling has to be done to complete the tests, and when is it contemplated the work will be completed?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Mines is detailed and technical and, with the approval of the House, I should like it incorporated in *Hansard* without being read.

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

(*a*) The continuing detailed study of groundwater contamination in the western suburbs has so far revealed the following areas of aquifer pollution:—

Parish of Cut-Paw-Paw: The central, central west, and south-western portions.

Parish of Deutgam: The central portion.

Parish of Truganina: The central, and central east portions.

Parish of Derrimut: The eastern and north-eastern portions.

Parish of Doutta Galla: The southern portion.

The main pollutants so far determined together with a brief description of characteristics are—

Phenolics (C_6H_5OH)

A colourless crystalline substance with a characteristic odour and which is readily soluble in water. As determined in the laboratory phenol covers a whole series of organic compounds which can be grouped as phenolic substances.

Fluoride (F^1)

The element fluorine is a gas but it occurs in nature in the form of inorganic salts such as calcium fluoride. It is also widely used in industry in organic combinations.

Sulphate (SO^{11}_4)

The sulphate radicle, a combined form of sulphur and oxygen, occurs naturally in groundwaters but it is also present in the waste discharge of numerous industries.

Cadmium (Cd)

In the elemental form cadmium is insoluble in water but many cadmium salts are readily soluble.

Lead (Pb)

As a metal lead is slightly soluble in water and the amount of metal dissolved depends very much upon the characteristics of the water. Lead forms a series of salts of which the solubility ranges from readily to sparingly.

(*b*) The time required to complete the current programmes of test drilling is estimated at three years but it may be necessary to extend the work beyond this period should further centres of pollution be detected.

During and subsequent to the test drilling monitoring of water levels and the concentration and movement of pollutants will be carried out on a continuing basis.

MALDON CROWN LAND.

APPLICATION FOR ALIENATION.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister of Lands—

With regard to Crown land, for which application for alienation has been made by Mr. N. Wilson for the establishment of a pottery at Maldon—

(*a*) Has this land ever been formally reserved for public purposes as parkland; if not, has such reservation ever been considered?

(*b*) Has an application for alienation by Mr. Wilson been properly made?

(*c*) Have all the necessary procedures been followed by the Department of Crown Lands and Survey in arriving at a decision in this matter?

(*d*) Will this land be submitted at auction if this alienation is to proceed; if not, why?

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Lands is—

(*a*) No. The land has been withheld from sale in the past in case it was required for public purposes.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) No. The land will be sold by private treaty to assist in the establishment of a rural industry, pursuant to section 12 of the Land Act.

SUNBURY MENTAL HOSPITAL.

SEWAGE TREATMENT.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister of Health—

Is it proposed to install a total sewerage treatment plant at the Sunbury Mental Hospital; if so—(i) when will tenders be called; and (ii) when is work likely to begin?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Health is—

It is not proposed to provide a total sewerage treatment plant at the mental hospital, Sunbury. At the present time, the hospital is served by two Imhoff tanks with filter units and holding dams.

A scheme is being prepared for the connection of the hospital to the proposed Sunbury Sewerage Authority plant, which according to information available will be operating during 1973.

Taking into consideration finances available and the time to construct a branch sewer, it is anticipated that all sullage from the hospital will be discharged to this source in approximately two years' time.

EDUCATION.

TOILETS AT SCHOOLS.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

(*a*) What are the ratios fixed for school pupils per toilet at State and registered schools for male and female pupils, respectively?

(*b*) Are these ratios supervised; if so, by whom?

(*c*) Are pupils at any schools now in excess of the ratio; if so—(i) at what schools; and (ii) what action is being taken to overcome the shortage of toilets?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is—

(*a*) At registered schools the facilities are supervised by the Department of Health. Requirements on toilet facilities are set out in Regulation 35 of School Regulations 1943 under the Health Act.

(*b*) and (*c*) In schools under the control of the Education Department the Public Works Department provides additional toilet accommodation in conjunction with class-room additions to cater for anticipated increases in enrolments.

Any deficiency in toilet accommodation brought to the department's attention is referred to the Public Works Department for immediate investigation. Expenditure of funds for any works recommended by that department is promptly authorized.

It is not possible to advise which schools are currently in need of extra toilets, but as outlined above, cases brought to the department's attention will have been referred to the Public Works Department for investigation. However, if the honorable member is aware of any particular schools under the control of the Education Department which are in need of extra toilet facilities the Minister of Education would be pleased to arrange for an investigation of such schools by appropriate officers of the Public Works Department.

COBRAM HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

When is it anticipated tenders will be called for a Commonwealth science wing for the Cobram High School?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is—

A physics room was provided at Cobram High School in 1966-67 financial year from Commonwealth funds. The school is listed for one additional room to Commonwealth standards but it does not have a high priority.

ASSEMBLY HALLS.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

(*a*) What are the subsidy arrangements for the construction of school assembly halls?

(*b*) What is the current priority list for Victorian secondary schools?

(*c*) In the past five years, have there been any cases where schools have moved up the priority list, except when a new hall has been constructed, or when a school has been removed from the list because of a decision not to proceed; if so, what are the details?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is detailed, and I seek leave for its inclusion in *Hansard* without my reading it.

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

(*a*) The present arrangement is that a special grant of up to a maximum of $108,000 on a $3 for $1 basis is available for the erection of assembly halls at secondary and technical schools. The availability of the grant is subject to a school attaining a priority on the department's waiting list.

(*b*) In addition to the schools where construction is under way or negotiations are proceeding the priority list of schools on the waiting list for grants to erect halls is as follows:—

Technical School, Colac.
Technical School, Kangaroo Flat.
High School, Foster.
High School, Kyabram.
High School, Cobram.
High School, Maffra.
High School, Altona.
High School, Parkdale.
High School, Monbulk.
High School, Mortlake.
High School, Oak Park.
High School, Bell Park.
High School, Maroondah.
Technical School, Preston East.
High School, Buckley Park.
High School, Red Cliffs.
Technical School, Watsonia.
High School, Sunbury.
Technical School, MacLeod.
High School, Wattle Park.
High School, Templestowe.
High School, Beaufort.
High School, Casterton.
High School, Bayswater.
High School, Oberon.
High School, Nathalia.
High School, Castlemaine.
High School, Braybrook.
High School, Sunshine West.
High School, Werribee.
Technical School, Jordanville.
Girls High School, Preston.
Technical School, Horsham.
High School, Myrtleford.
High School, Upper Yarra.
High School, Wonthaggi.
Technical School, Hamilton.
High School, Benalla.
High School, Belmont.
High School, Watsonia.
High School, Golden Square.
High School, Westall.
High School, Trafalgar.
Technical School, Broadmeadows.
Technical School, Keon Park.
Technical School, Mooroolbark.
High School, Monterey.
High School, Cohuna.
Girls High School, Ballarat.
Technical School, Clayton.
High School, Lalor.
High School, Flemington.
Technical School, St. Albans.
Technical School, Kingsbury.
High School, Echuca.
High School, Broadmeadows.
Technical School, Niddrie.
High School, Geelong North.
Technical School, Mitcham.
High School, Prahran.
High School, Moorleigh.
High School, Moe.
High School, Moorabbin.
High School, Eaglehawk.
Technical School, Portland.
High School, Thornbury.

High School, Hurstbridge.
High School, Korumburra.
High School, Koo-Wee-Rup.
High School, Mirboo North.
Technical School, Northcote.
Technical School, Knox.
Technical School, Warrnambool North.
High School, Blackburn South.
Technical School, Collingwood.
High School, Donvale.
High School, Lake Bolac.
High School, Upfield.
High School, Yarrawonga.
High School, Euroa.
Technical School, Dromana.
High School, Newlands.

(*c*) Three schools, Macleod High School, Watsonia Technical School and Preston East Technical School, had their priorities slightly advanced to honour undertakings given by the department regarding the date by which a special grant could be expected.

HOUSING COMMISSION.

HOMES IN BROADMEADOWS.

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

(*a*) How many homes does the Housing Commission intend to build north of Broadmeadows Town Hall, in the area known as area K?

(*b*) Are these homes to be built east and west of Pascoe Vale Road, or only west of Pascoe Vale Road?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing).—The answer is—

(*a*) The area known as Broadmeadows section K is bounded by railway line, Johnstone Street, Moonee Ponds Creek and Otway Street main drain to Barry Road. It will yield approximately 1,100 villa allotments.

(*b*) The only portion of section K east of Pascoe Vale Road is a small area adjacent to Barry Road overpass. Use of this area has not been determined.

VACANT HOMES: APPLICATIONS FOR PURCHASE AND RENTAL.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS (South-Western Province) asked the Minister of Housing—

(*a*) What are the numbers and locations of vacant Housing Commission homes in Victoria, and have any of these homes been vacant for a period in excess of six months?

(*b*) In respect of Ballarat, Bendigo, Geelong, Hamilton, Horsham, Mildura, Portland, Shepparton and Warrnambool, what are the numbers of applicants for purchase and rental, respectively, of commission homes, and what is the average waiting time?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing).—The answer is statistical, and with the leave of the House and the approval of Mr. Jenkins I ask that it be incorporated in *Hansard* without being read.

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

(*a*) The following is a list of all home units vacant for a period in excess of fourteen days as at 6th October, 1972. This information is compiled from a return presented to the commission at its weekly meeting. Of the units listed there are five at Penshurst and one each respectively at Benalla, Myrtleford and Horsham which have been vacant for a period in excess of six months.

VACANT UNITS (METROPOLITAN).

Location.	*Number.*
Flemington	1
Port Melbourne	1
Reservoir	1
Williamstown	1

VACANT UNITS (COUNTRY).

Location.	*Number.*
Anglesea	1
Ballarat West	2
Beaufort	1
Benalla	3
Camperdown	3
Castlemaine	1
Charlton	1
Churchill	6
Colac	1
Coleraine	1
Corryong	1
Echuca	4
Geelong North	1
Girgarre	1
Heyfield	1
Horsham	5
Kerang	2
Korumburra	1
Kyneton	1
Merrigum	1
Moe	1
Mooroopna	1
Murtoa	1
Morwell	2
Myrtleford	1
Norlane	1
Numurkah	2
Orbost	1
Penshurst	6
Portland	1
Seymour	2
Swan Hill	1
Tongala	1
Traralgon	1
Traralgon East	1
Warracknabeal	2
Warragul	2
Wodonga	1

In addition to those listed above there is a considerable number of units throughout the State currently undergoing maintenance prior to reallocation which have been vacant for a period less than fourteen days.

(*b*) Applications for purchase and rental are held on one list until allocation is about to be made. Consequently it is not possible to segregate tenant and purchase applications.

The number of applications, excluding pensioner applications, together with waiting time for rental is as follows:—

Ballarat—37—4 months.
Bendigo—127—6 months.
Geelong—476—18 months.
Hamilton—11—3 months.
Horsham—15—3 months.
Mildura—42—12 months.
Portland—13—9 months.
Shepparton—176—24 months.
Warrnambool—40—12 months.

The waiting time for purchase can vary considerably on each particular estate having regard to type and location of units acceptable to applicants approved for purchase.

RURAL RELIEF.

GRANTS IN BENDIGO PROVINCE.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Bendigo Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

(*a*) What funds have been allocated for rural relief in each municipality in the Bendigo Province?

(*b*) What is the total amount allocated to this State to date?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer contains detailed statistics, and I seek leave for it to be incorporated in *Hansard* without being read.

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

(*a*) Municipalities in the Bendigo Province which have been allocated rural employment grants are as follows:—

Municipality	*Grants approved*
	$
Bendigo city	127,600
Broadford shire	18,850
Castlemaine city	36,870
Daylesford and Glenlyon shire	24,200
Eaglehawk borough ..	22,847
Euroa shire	17,960
Gisborne shire	14,300
Goulburn shire	14,630
Kilmore shire	8,160
Kyneton shire	28,900
Maldon shire	18,250
Marong shire	22,025
Maryborough city ..	50,350
Metcalfe shire	18,150
McIvor shire	34,527
Newham and Woodend shire	14,535
Newstead shire	30,000
Pyalong shire	11,000
Romsey shire	12,925
Seymour shire	32,890
Strathfieldsaye shire ..	49,610
Talbot and Clunes shire ..	32,299
Tullaroop shire	30,325

(*b*) The total amount granted to Victoria by the Commonwealth Government amounts to $10·125 million including the month of September.

STATE RIVERS AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION.

GOULBURN–MURRAY IRRIGATION DISTRICT: WATER SALES.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Water Supply—

Is it anticipated that the recently-announced 30 per cent water sales allocation in the Goulburn–Murray Irrigation District will be increased; if so, when?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Water Supply is—

Because of the prolonged dry conditions no decision to increase the allocation has yet been made. The situation is being kept under review but any change in the allocation will be influenced by any significant rainfall.

PAPERS.

The following papers, pursuant to the directions of several Acts of Parliament, were laid upon the table by the Clerk:—

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended (No. 298).

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—Eildon Sub-Regional Planning Scheme 1951—Amendment No. 9, 1971.

Victorian Arts Centre—Report of the Building Committee for the year 1971–72.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 20) on the motion of the Hon. J. W. Galbally (Melbourne North Province) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL (Monash Province).—I listened with great interest to and respect for the case put forward by Mr. Galbally in support of this Bill. I think Mr. Galbally will agree that the field for argument on this subject is considerably restricted, and probably all of the ground—certainly most of it—which can be covered has been covered on a number of previous occasions. I still find myself in a position similar to that on which I have expressed my views previously, and I cannot quite go along with the Bill. I must admit that Mr. Galbally was getting much closer to convincing me that perhaps I ought to support it.

I have always held the view that capital punishment should be retained in a reserve capacity, and I believe this is the position in which it exists at present. I certainly do not advocate free and general use of it, but I have always believed that occasions may arise which call for and justify the capital sentence being carried out.

I am afraid that, since a similar Bill was debated previously, and indeed since Mr. Galbally made his second-reading speech on this measure, certain incidents have occurred which have most decidedly strengthened my view—not only for the retention of capital punishment as it is at present but indeed for its extension. I should prefer to be debating the extension of capital punishment rather than its abolition. I do not think anybody could with any reasoned argument disagree that the only fit and suitable punishment for people who commit a crime like the recent kidnapping is capital punishment. The utter and complete inhumanity of this action, its callousness, the intent with which it was done, leave in my mind no doubts that persons who commit these offences would be far better out of society completely and irrevocably.

There are also other persons whose lives I would have no hesitation in extinguishing as one would snuff out a candle if I were in a position to do so. I refer to people who deliberately and knowingly for profit push drugs—on young people in particular. I can see absolutely no ground for condonation of this offence, no ground for excusing it in any way. This class of person is committing an offence worse than murder; he is destroying the minds, the lives and indeed, if one admits to their existence, the very souls of young children and also of adults. To my mind there can be no conceivable crime worse than this. Therefore, I should certainly prefer to be debating a Bill to extend capital punishment to such offenders. Despite Mr. Galbally's eloquence and obviously genuine feeling on this subject, I regret that I cannot support the Bill.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province).—Once again, honorable members have to pass judgment on a Bill introduced by Mr. Galbally to abolish capital punishment. For many years, members of the Country Party have dealt with this subject on a certain basis. We do not seem to be taking any tricks either way. We do not go along with the complete abolition of capital punishment as advocated by Mr. Galbally. Previously, we asked the Government to consider the establishment of a committee to review some crimes which might be said to be on the fringe, but the Government has not seen fit to do so. I am not sure whether Mr. Nicol spoke on behalf of the Liberal Party or on his own behalf.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL.—On my own behalf.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Mr. Nicol commenced by saying that Mr. Galbally had almost convinced him that capital punishment should be abolished, but later he became possibly even more vicious than any other speakers on this subject previously, and with some justification.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL.—I was not vicious.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—I think what Mr. Nicol said almost amounted to that. At any rate, there has been no change in the views of members of the Country Party and we do not consider that any evidence has been advanced that the abolition of capital punishment would prove beneficial. It still remains in the hands of the Government of the day to decide whether the penalty is carried out. The death penalty should exist as a deterrent. This penalty cannot be a deterrent if it is allowed to lapse. The decision remains with the Government whether to impose capital punishment in severe cases or whether it by-passes the Act and commutes the death sentence.

Members of the Country Party have decided to oppose the Bill once again because conditions have not changed. We do not intend to press the Government again to establish a committee to review the situation because it has ignored our requests over the past few years. When one is refused on many occasions, one ceases to seek the assistance of the Government.

I conclude by repeating that members of the Country Party still oppose the abolition of capital punishment. We consider that it should be carried out in extreme cases when certain types of crime which are a shock to the community are committed. These cases should be dealt with in the normal manner, the Government having the final say through the Executive Council. In those circumstances, members of the Country Party intend to vote against the Bill.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	23
Majority against the motion ..	15

AYES.

Mr. Eddy	Mr. Walton.
Mr. Galbally	
Mr. Kent	*Tellers*:
Mr. Knight	Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Tripovich	Mr. Trayling

NOES.

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

PAIR.

Mr. Elliot	Mr. Hauser.

YARRA VALLEY (PROHIBITION OF HIGHWAYS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 19) 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 is a simple Bill, the purpose of and the motivation for which are crystal clear. It springs from the well-known and sincere desire of Mr. Galbally to protect the Yarra Valley. I commend the honorable member's motives. The Government shares his concern to ensure that the Yarra Valley is, in fact, preserved. The House will be well aware of the statement of planning policy adopted for the Yarra Valley last year. It was Statement of Planning Policy No. 4, which was confirmed by the Governor in Council on 7th September, 1971. To those who have not read the document, I commend it, for it deals at great length with the measures necessary to protect the Yarra Valley. An explanatory statement accompanies the document and deals at even greater length with the type of measures necessary and the reasons why they are necessary.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—We have read the document; could you repeat some of the arguments?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I can do that. It is set out in the statement that the planning policy for the area is that the Yarra River and its environs shall be identified through appropriate planning measures as one of the most significant physical features in the metropolitan area. It states that the Yarra River and its immediate environs shall be planned primarily as an open space system with nature conservation and recreation, and that provision, where appropriate, shall be made for primary production and forestry. It provides that the planning of areas within the catchment of the Yarra River east of Warrandyte shall take account of the potential of area for water catchment purposes.

Those are the basic tenets of the policy which goes on to provide that the major factors influencing the planning policy were that the natural resources of the Yarra River, because of their great value and diversity, were a social and economic asset of State significance and that the intensification and expansion of urban development in the metropolitan area were likely, without adequate safeguards, to cause further deterioration in conditions which have resulted from ill-considered, adverse or excessive exploitation of the river and its environs.

Undoubtedly Mr. Galbally would agree with the comment I have read, that there have in the past been ill-considered diversions or excessive exploitation of the environs of the river. I share his belief. That is the reason the policy was adopted. The policy statement referred to the fact that the area in the environs of the river was vulnerable to alienation for purposes which would be out of character with a high-quality landscape. It also referred to the fact that the Yarra Valley from the city eastwards was a landscape feature capable of providing a tourist attraction of State significance.

Any statement of planning goes on to deal with its implementation and to mention the factors which must be taken into cosideration in implementing the policy. This statement specifically referred to thoroughfares. It stated that implementation of planning policy for the Yarra River required that special attention be given to the most careful location, design and construction of any essential thoroughfares having regard to the special characteristics of the area and its potential and the regulation of land use adjoining river frontages with particular emphasis on visual harmony. All honorable members, regardless of party, would share those objectives and would believe that the policy ought to be implemented in accordance with both its spirit and its letter.

Mr. Galbally's Bill relates to the whole of the Yarra Valley east of Princes Bridge. In moving the second-reading motion, Mr. Galbally referred to the beautiful Alexandra Avenue and the need to preserve its charm and character. What honorable member could conceivably disagree with that sentiment? There would be none, I hope. Mr. Galbally will recall that a year ago last week the Government rejected the eastern leg of the then proposed inner-city ring road. One of the major factors influencing that rejection was that the construction of the freeway and bridge would have brought a blight to this beautiful area of Alexandra Avenue to which Mr. Galbally referred; another was the desire to ensure the preservation of that area.

Farther east, I suppose most honorable members know and have enjoyed the Boulevard. However, I must point out that, had Mr. Galbally's Bill existed as legislation before Alexandra Avenue was built, it never would have been built. That beautiful sector of the river which gives pleasure to many, which is perhaps the most photographed segment of the river, that enjoyed most frequently, and that most often enjoyed by tourists, would never have existed had this measure been in force. That beautiful

segment of Alexandra Avenue arose from the deviation of the Yarra River which ran through what is now the Royal Botanic Gardens where the lake is situated. There was a deviation and a straightening of the river, and the building of a road has made it a magnificent area. It is an attractive place where many people, including myself, have rested and gained refreshment of the spirit.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—It would have been more beautiful if it had been left alone.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—No one would deny that it is a beautiful stretch of river and Mr. Galbally has referred to its attraction. Here is the particular objection to Mr. Galbally's Bill. We all share his objective, the preservation of the beautiful valley, its enhancement by restoration and the removal of past damage. However, the honorable member's Bill is an example of instant planning. Previously, I referred in this House to the dangers of instant planning, of adopting an easy solution which sounds all right in principle without working out the detailed application and without studying the factors involved in every case and in every proposal. Such a Bill means the adoption of a theoretical solution without regard to the issues which would arise in practice.

I assume that the Bill is also designed to repeal by the back door the Eastern Freeway Bill. There, the route was chosen after many years of public discussion. The proposal first appeared on the planning scheme in 1954. A more detailed and much improved route was published in June, 1969. During the following months 54 press articles about it were published in the metropolitan dailies, many of which appeared on page 1 and others on pages 3 and 5. Widespread publicity was given to the proposals. A total of 270 objections and suggestions for improvements or variations were received and after a considerable time the vastly improved route was so located as to minimize any possible damage and to enable restoration and beautification of a kind that has taken place in Alexandra Avenue. The route ultimately chosen was approved by the Governor in Council and the proposals laid on the table of this House were not objected to by any honorable member or any party in either House of this Parliament. It would be unthinkable that this measure should be utilized to repeal an Act passed after such an extensive planning investigation.

I also find some internal inconsistency within the Bill. Clause 2 purports to prohibit any roads within 400 metres of the river. Yet it is found that in reality this relates only to public roads. Clause 3 purports specifically not to interfere with private subdivision of land and exempts from its operation private streets created by subdivision where these are necessary to serve future subdivisions. Surely this is inconsistent. It allows private developers to subdivide and construct roads, yet it denies the public the opportunity of putting in roads—that means any bridge also—regardless of circumstances and needs.

I have indicated that the Government and I reject the principle of instant planning. The proper way of dealing with these matters is as set out in the statement of planning policy which was welcomed by the public at the time and which I believe would be endorsed unanimously by all honorable members. The proper way of dealing with this matter is in accordance with planning procedures which enables each case to be treated on its merits. Therefore, the Government cannot support the Bill. It does, however, share Mr. Galbally's intense desire to ensure that the character and charm of this beautiful valley is maintained.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province).—This measure, although small, is nevertheless an important one because its principles are supported by all honorable members. The objective of Mr. Galbally's measure is to preserve the environment of the Yarra River. Last night

honorable members heard a great deal about pollution, particularly of this river and of how it is being ruined. One could say that the Bill, to some extent, tries to preserve the Yarra River in its original environment. Again, to a point, all honorable members subscribe to conservation. They are gravely concerned that the open spaces and beautiful valleys are to be used for public transport.

During his second-reading speech, Mr. Galbally was asked several times what were the alternatives but he failed to give one. No one doubts that in a rapidly growing metropolis like Melbourne, roads and expressways must be provided to allow people to enter and leave the city. The only alternative to the proposed freeway through the Yarra Valley is to put a freeway through already developed and thickly populated areas. It cannot be disputed that today, and with particular consideration for the future, these expressways are necessary. Because it has great merit, members of the Country Party support the principle enunciated by Mr. Galbally, but they cannot support his Bill because expressways are necessary. The freeway and also the construction of an adjacent railway line will provide a service to the eastern areas of Melbourne.

If we are all sincere and honest in our attempts to overcome the vast problems which have developed and will continue to develop in Melbourne, let us use some of the huge amounts necessary for these freeways as an incentive for many of the large industries to move out of the metropolitan area and establish themselves in country centres. I regret that it is necessary to encroach upon the beautiful Yarra Valley, but I know of no alternative to the need for speedy transport into the city. The project will serve two purposes; it will provide a freeway from Victoria Park to Thompsons Road and a railway extension to give urgently needed public transport to those people living in Doncaster and Templestowe. For those reasons, members of the Country Party cannot support the Bill.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province).—No matter how hard man has tried he has never been able to improve on Nature's achievements. No matter how sincere he is in his attempts, man can never come up with something better than Nature's efforts. The Minister for Local Government has said that the Yarra River along Alexandra Avenue is a beautiful stretch of water and that it is admired by all. It is admired by all but not as a beautiful river. At present it is a muddy drain with brick sides and an orderly park with a line of trees on either side of the road. Is that what the Minister wants to do with the Yarra Valley?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Mr. Walton does not like Alexandra Avenue?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—I think it is beautiful, but I should not like all of the Yarra Valley to be like Alexandra Avenue.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I agree with you.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—A start must be made somewhere. It just cannot be said, "We will keep doing this, bit by bit." That is what is happening, and the purpose of this measure is to halt it so that the Yarra Valley, or what is left of it, will be preserved for our children who, in years to come, will be able to enjoy its beauty as did many members of this House in their childhood. Mr. Galbally pointed out to me some of the beautiful stretches of the Yarra River where once it was possible to swim for mile after mile.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I swam there myself.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Yes, and I also did. At that time one could also swim in the Merri Creek and in the Moonee Ponds Creek.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—One would not do that now.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—No one would dare. The Government is replacing what was once a beautiful river which supplied water for Melbourne; and as far back as 1850 the first Act of Parliament concerning pollution of the Yarra River was passed. I shall not read it, but it is an Act to prevent further pollution of the waters of the Yarra River above the City of Melbourne, and it was assented to on 1st January, 1855.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—Perhaps Mr. Walton will advise the Chamber of the source of that comment.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Yes, Mr. President. It is an Act of Parliament which appears in *Acts and Ordinances 15 to 19, 1851 to 1856.*

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—It has not yet been repealed.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—So far as I am aware, that is so; but it is obsolete in the sense that no longer would anybody dare to drink water from the Yarra River or swim in it because of the many deadly waterborne diseases which it could contain.

The councils of the City of Doncaster and Templestowe found it necessary to place warning signs on the bank of the river to alert people to the risks involved in swimming in the river because the bacterial count of the water was so high that there was a danger of infection.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Have you read the environment protection document?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—The Minister can produce whatever documents he wishes, but while the Government continues to destroy wide stretches of timber and grasses along the banks of the Yarra River, the Minister is not being fair to the community or himself. At the present time bulldozers are tearing the valley to pieces.

The Minister has said that it is a joy to walk along Alexandra Avenue, and that many people do this every day because it is beautiful to behold.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—It is.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Yes, if one has time to stop. One can stop in Alexandra Avenue, but one will not be able to do so on the freeway. In fact, motorists will be encouraged to travel at speeds as high as 60 miles an hour, and people who stop will create traffic hazards.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Why did you not object to the plans in 1969?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—I remind the Minister that this Government has been in office for seventeen years. The Minister says that he is interested in preserving the Yarra Valley, but he permits this desecration to proceed. The Government which is in power is allowing this destruction to take place. The members of my party are trying to prevent the Government from doing so. It is of no use asking us why we did nothing. It is more to the point to ask why the Government did nothing in 1969.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The Cultural and Recreational Lands Act forbade this.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That is a complete misinterpretation.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—The provisions of this Bill will not affect anything which already exists. Alexandra Avenue will still be there to be enjoyed if people wish to see that stretch of the Yarra River. Nothing in this Bill will stop them from doing so. The measure does not stop people from constructing access roads if they have a subdivision or houses in the area—although I think we should go further and at some time in the future stop subdivision of land along the banks of the river. The Environment Protection Authority ought to be prepared to buy this land and preserve it forever. At one time people owned private property on the shores of Port Phillip Bay, and I believe there are still one or two areas which are still privately owned.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Statement of Planning Policy No. 4 covers that.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—It is one thing to have a statement of policy, but it is quite another for that policy to be carried out.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Have you read the Master Plan for Melbourne? That is now being implemented.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—What I see is what matters to me, and yesterday I saw what was happening to the Yarra River.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—The honorable member's head is under such a heap of sand he would not be able to see anything.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—That is the kind of intelligent remark that I expect from Mr. Hamilton.

The construction of the Tullamarine Freeway required certain modifications to be made to the Moonee Ponds Creek, a creek which was not in good condition when the freeway was built because it had been allowed to become polluted. Much of the creek was straightened, as was part of the Yarra River where it flowed alongside Alexandra Avenue, and now it is nothing but a big concrete drain along which people can drive for miles. Does the Government believe that that does anything to preserve the creeks and rivers which added beauty to this city in the days of its founders?

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—But one still gets from point A to point B more speedily.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Yes, but one could enjoy that just as much if the road did not run over river and creek banks.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Do you suggest that the freeway should run through homes?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—As I understand it, homes are acquired and property is resumed in the United States of America for that purpose, but in that country people are paid prices which are so high that the people concerned are happy to leave their homes. When this Government acquires property for freeways it merely pays the owners $200 or $300 as disturbance money. This is paid for forcing the people concerned to leave their homes and their circle of friends, and to transfer their goods to a new house where they have to build new gardens, and so on. It is little wonder that people object to freeways passing through residential areas in this State. If the Government adopted a more generous policy, probably there would be no objection to the acquisition of property for the construction of freeways; however, there is strong objection to the construction of freeways through parklands.

Once upon a time, along the course of what is now the Tullamarine Freeway, there was a beautiful park called Holbrook Park. A few days ago I was a passenger in a car travelling along the freeway, and that park was not to be seen; the freeway was constructed over the middle of it. So far as I am aware, no area of land has been given to enable it to be replaced, but even if it had, it could never have been as naturally beautiful as was Holbrook Park, which was located around a bend of the Moonee Ponds Creek. In my opinion, removing bends in a river or creek for the purpose of constructing straight highways detracts from their natural beauty.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—No one wishes to remove the bends.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—No, but if the Government needed to do so to provide for a freeway, it would. My party seeks support for this Bill because, like many others in the community, we believe the Yarra Valley must be preserved. Many people, most of whom have nothing to gain but believe in the preservation of this area, have held meetings in connection with the preservation of this land for our children. It is worth keeping and there is still time for the Government to act in the matter.

To achieve this end, I suggest that the Government must enact legislation. It is of no use leaving a

discretion with the authorities concerned, because they will always seek to obtain the cheapest land possible and the obvious way in which to do that is to acquire parks and river valleys.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—All parklands acquired for freeways or any other projects must now be replaced.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Then I suggest that the Minister should support the Bill. The honorable gentleman said earlier that he opposed the Bill but he agreed with the principles behind it.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I said " the motive behind it ".

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Yes. I would expect a courageous Minister to try to convince the Government to support this Bill. It is a simple measure, and it does nothing more than prevent encroachment of concrete and asphalt freeways on areas which are within 400 yards of the banks of the Yarra River. I strongly support the measure.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Templestowe Province).—At the outset, I should like to establish my bona fides to speak to this measure. Yesterday, honorable members on the other side of the House spoke of the problems of pollution in Victoria, but all that most of them could find to speak about was a small area containing a tip at Camberwell on the banks of the Yarra River. They related that matter to the whole problem of pollution in this State. One honorable member was notably ignorant of the Yarra River and its environs, but I shall not name him, for Mr. Galbally has often said that there should be no rudeness in this House.

I believe that some members of the Labor Party have spoken following a very brief visit to the river and that, in reality, they have no true feeling for the conservation and preservation of it.

I have lived on the Yarra River for 27 years and I have worked on it for 27 years.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—How far away?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—The honorable member should not ask questions which may bring answers which will embarrass him. I have crossed the Yarra River daily for at least the past five years and I have drunk water from it for years. I stop every night in the vicinity of the Yarra Valley to contemplate its magnificent beauty, especially in areas near to where I live, such as Mount St. Leonards, Mount Don Valley, Mount Juliet and Ben Cairn.

This Bill has been introduced purely as a political expedient. The Minister for Local Government has said that it is instant planning, which is a most undesirable form of planning. The only thing which gives me comfort about the Bill is the obvious fact that if the Labor Party were to become the Government after the next election it could not possibly hope to carry out the proposals contained in the Bill. So it is obvious that the Labor Party has given up hope of winning the reins of power at the next election. This Bill would have no chance of being passed if the Labor Party had the responsibility of making decisions and carrying out planning for the future.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Which is the greater asset, the Yarra Valley or the freeway? That is the issue.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—It is not necessary to destroy the Yarra Valley to provide facilities in that valley to enable people to move about the metropolis. It is all very well to say that a freeway should be located somewhere else. Everybody says that. Many of my constituents believe the Yarra Valley should not be used for freeways or for the routes for power lines and I have much sympathy for their views, but there must be a proper balance of planning between the need to provide facilities to enable people to move about the metropolis and the conservation of areas of land. If these people were faced with the proposal that the freeway should go through their properties, the outcry

which would be evident to me and to other people would be much greater.

I respect many of the opinions held by the Leader of the Labor Party, but I point out that a couple of sessions ago he rejected the idea that the Government should acquire houses in the Merri Creek area in order to construct a freeway along the valley of the creek. However, when the Yarra Valley is involved Mr. Galbally adopts a different approach. He says the freeway should not go up the Yarra Valley but should go through existing properties. If the present site for the freeway is not to be used, the freeway must go through residential areas. Therefore, the arguments which Mr. Galbally put forward are specious.

A good deal of comment has been made about the removal of trees and the carving of scars on the landscape. I agree with those comments. It is a terrible thing to remove a tree. I have chopped down hundreds of trees, but I have planted thousands in their place. For every tree that is chopped down at least two should be planted. Native eucalypts will grow into beautiful trees within twenty years or less. The yellow box, which abounds in the Yarra Valley, will grow into a beautiful tree in about 25 years.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Does Mr. Houghton know that older civilizations have said that there should be 300 trees for every person?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—I would go much further than that; for every citizen in the metropolitan area there should be many more trees and I suggest that there are more than 300 trees for every citizen in Melbourne and that the over-all ratio for Victoria is even higher. If honorable members studied the work that is being done by the Country Roads Board and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works in the construction of freeways they would realize that when a freeway is completed many trees are planted and large areas are sown to grass. The way in which drainage work is carried out by the Country Roads Board and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works must impress honorable members. These roads and freeways have an extremely fine appearance.

Having regard to the size of Melbourne and the need to plan for freeways, public transport and recreation, I know of no reason why the present policies of the Government should be changed. In introducing planning policies the Government has regard for the needs of everyone. If honorable members examine the statements of planning policy that have been made by the Government they will realize that the Government is adopting the correct attitude in developing the Yarra Valley and it is putting the valley to the best possible balanced use. Of course, I sympathize with those people who believe that the Yarra Valley should remain in its natural state, but I emphasize that the policies which are being implemented by the Government will ensure that the Yarra Valley remains a place of great beauty.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—I support the Bill. In view of the apparent support that has emanated from Government supporters for the principles contained in the Bill, why can they not suggest amendments to improve the Bill? Let us get away from these nice sounding but worthless statements of principle about which we have heard so much from the Government and its predecessors. In the early planning of Melbourne vast areas of land were made available for parks but over the years those parks have been gradually alienated and hospitals, nurses' homes, freeways and roads have been built on them. If a council got into financial difficulties it merely sold some of these parklands to obtain money. The Government acted in a similar manner. The result was that the Labor Party was impelled to introduce a Bill to prevent cultural and recreational lands from being alienated for any purpose without the authority of Parliament. It took

a long time to convince the Government that it should accept that measure.

The Minister has rightly said that a planning scheme has been put into operation. Under that scheme the Lower Yarra Crossing will provide an access road from the western suburbs. There has never been such an access road. The Tullamarine Freeway was the first proper access road from the north-west of the city; it is not really a freeway. The Moonee Ponds Creek, which the freeway follows, was just a dirty, filthy drain. Even turning it into a concrete gutter was an improvement. Undoubtedly the access road from the northern suburbs via Sydney Road will be through the Tullamarine Freeway, but I am sure the next access road in the development of the north-eastern areas of Melbourne will go along valleys and the Yarra Valley will be used for this purpose.

All my Leader wants to ensure is that an access road is not built within 400 metres of the Yarra River. Of course, that may mean that an access road will be built down the next valley, but if Melbourne is to be developed to a stage where everyone can bring his car into the city, that will have to happen. Mr. Houghton lives a long way from the city outside the metropolitan sprawl. Undoubtedly he, like many other people who live a long way from the city, appreciates the fact that he will be able to drive along a freeway or an arterial road at a steady speed of 60 miles an hour and arrive in the city fifteen or twenty minutes earlier than he would if he had to drive along the present roads. During the debate my Leader and Mr. Walton have indicated that they are concerned to save the Yarra Valley. My province covers the inner-metropolitan areas and my constituents do not want homes to be destroyed and the inner suburbs to become 14-lane concrete freeways so that people who live in the outer areas can get to Melbourne twenty minutes quicker than they can at present.

At present it is proposed that the Eastern Freeway will finish at a T-junction and the residents of Carlton and Princes Hill are most disturbed because they know that the time will come, as it will in the Yarra Valley, when a freeway will go through their properties.

Members of the Labor Party do not want instant planning and I point out that in Los Angeles, where it was proposed to build 1,500 miles of concrete freeways and 900 miles had been built, it was decided to pause for a while and examine the situation. I remind the Government that ten years ago the emphasis overseas was on the quantity of freeways whereas now it is on the quality of freeways. If a railway line is constructed from Victoria Park to Thompsons Road, and it will be possible to maintain by means of fixed rail transport the necessary and essential connections, there will be no need to build a freeway. That is the trend in transport planning in overseas countries. Fixed rail transport is being used in conjunction with freeways and so long as fixed rail transport can maintain the flow of traffic there is no need to build more freeways.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That is why last year the Government gave an instruction that there should be a modification of the freeway network. It wanted to minimize the social conflicts and to upgrade public transport.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—There has already been an indication that the Government is not prepared to accept the Bill or to offer any suggestions in place of it. The Government is prepared to do nothing other than to make statements of principle in the House. I do not make that accusation against members of the Country Party because they are not interested in legislation of this type.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—Why not?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—If I interpret the attitude of members of the Country Party rightly they do not believe in the construction of freeways in Melbourne. They want to get industries into the country. At one time the accepted concept of decentralization was to put one or two industries into a country town, but that concept is no longer acceptable. After twenty years it has been realized that industries will not go to country towns. Surely today decentralization means the movement of population to country regions. With a properly operated commuter service people living where Mr. Houghton resides, or in areas 40 or 50 miles out of this city, will be able to travel to their place of work within half an hour or perhaps a little more.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—Has Mr. Tripovich any knowledge of the planning schemes and the restrictions thereon which are operating up the valley beyond Lilydale and other places.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—It does not appear to make much difference. There have been planning schemes for Melbourne and I propose to refer to my electorate. Just as the Yarra Valley is a beautiful valley, there are beautiful old homes in Carlton which have been there for many years and could be there for many more years, but is the Government concerned with the retention of those residences? No, the Government in fact planned to clear 200 acres by agreement with the Melbourne City Council with no consideration being shown for the people who live in the area.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I find it difficult to relate this to the Bill.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I was trying to make a comparison between what is happening in my electorate and what could happen if this Bill is not passed. The Government has already decided that when the time comes to put a freeway through the Yarra Valley, it will go there irrespective of what happens. The Labor Party is endeavouring to ensure that when the Government puts the freeway through the Yarra Valley there will be certain things that it will not be permitted to do. I support the Bill and the arguments advanced by Mr. Galbally.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL (East Yarra Province).—I support the comments of the Minister for Local Government. When honorable members consider the proposition put by Mr. Galbally they must go back to the inception of the Master Plan, which was released in 1954, when the Labor Party occupied the Government benches. I refer honorable members to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works report on the 1954 Master Plan. The report is generally known as the Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme, 1954 report.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—When was that report authorized? The Labor Government did not authorize the report; it merely came down in our time. It was authorized by a previous Government.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—The Labor Party was in office in 1954 and 1955 and it is of no use Mr. Tripovich trying to tell me that a Labor Government would sit on a report for two years!

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—Mr. President, I wish to make a personal explanation. The report referred to, which was ordered by a previous Government, was presented in 1954 when the Labor Party was in office. The report was not approved; it was merely released to the people so that they could lodge objections to it. The objections were not heard by that Government. In fact they were heard by a subsequent Government.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL (East Yarra Province).—The point I am trying to make is that the report was presented to the Government of the day and I have not seen any objections to it in any article or publication. If objections had been published

I would have remembered them because I am personally affected. No objections were put forward by any political party.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Thousands of objections were lodged.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Not by political parties. On page 97 of the report there is a map of the proposed arterial roads system. If honorable members look at that map they will find marked quite clearly route 19 which eventually connects with the inner ring road, which is route 1. Route 19 is the existing Eastern Freeway route. It will be seen that the route goes through the very places that Mr. Galbally is now complaining about. If the Labor Government in 1954 had a plan of this nature laid before it and if that Government was so hotly opposed to roads of this nature passing through the areas of land to which Mr. Galbally referred, surely it would be fair to say that it would not sit on its tail for two years without doing anything about the plan.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—The Government has not yet heard the objections.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—I can only say that the Labor Government in fact approved the principle involved. Looking at the map further, one sees that route 22, which is the South-Eastern Freeway, also connects with the ring road. On page 98 there is a map showing the South-Eastern Freeway route situated on the side of the Yarra River where it has since been constructed. However, the map also shows that on the other side of the river there is an additional road which is marked route 32.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—The Government of the day never approved that.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—As I said earlier, one can only assume that as the Labor Government was in office for approximately two years after the report was received, it must have accepted the principles laid down in the Master Plan.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—That is not true, and the Minister knows it.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Can Mr. Tripovich show me an extract from *Hansard* or any other statement which indicates that the Labor Government opposed the scheme at that time? If Mr. Tripovich can obtain this information, one of his colleagues can supply it to the House.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I am trying to tell you that what you are saying is not true, and the Minister knows it.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Honorable members should look at the alternatives. If the Government does not construct these freeways in the areas mentioned, and this relates particularly to the Eastern Freeway, whereabouts does it put them? Every honorable member in this House agrees with the principle that because of the growth in population in a number of areas it is essential to have major roads of this type leading into the city. It is also fair to say that the population is demanding roads of this nature. Over a long period there have been many discussions on freeways. I have frequently heard Mr. Tripovich say that freeways should not come within 5 miles of the centre of the city area.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Ten miles.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—About two years ago it was 5 miles, but now it has changed to 10 miles. It would be fair to ask: Why was 5 miles chosen, and why is 10 miles now chosen? Is it because there would not be one Labor member of this House whose area would be affected if the Government adopted the 10-mile limit? If the Government stops the freeways 10 miles from the city centre, as has been suggested by Mr. Tripovich, the only Labor area affected would be in the outer suburbs where few residents would be involved.

If Mr. Tripovich looks at the map he will agree that my comment is fair and reasonable.

In considering the alternatives, if we are to have freeways, like Mr. Galbally and Mr. Tripovich I hope the Government does not build them indiscriminately all over the metropolitan area. I agree with that concept. However, the Government must find an alternative location for these freeways. If the freeways are to lead into the centre of the city, I suggest that the only alternative would be to construct them through residential areas. The metropolis consists of parklands, residential areas and factory areas. If the freeways are not located in parklands or near the river areas, the only alternative is that they will go through residential or factory areas. As honorable members know, the factory areas are situated in restricted parts of the city, and therefore it would be fair to say that the majority of areas that would be affected by freeways would be residential. I hope Labor Party members are not saying they would prefer homes to be knocked down as an alternative.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—I rise to a point of order. Earlier, Mr. President, I was called to order because I was not dealing with the Bill. Mr. Campbell, who has been speaking for ten minutes, has not once referred to the Yarra Valley.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I was under the impression that he was speaking about the freeway that is situated in the Yarra Valley.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—With respect, Mr. President, his remarks were related to almost everything but the Yarra Valley.

The PRESIDENT.—I do not uphold the point of order, as I understand that Mr. Campbell was speaking on the Yarra Valley and places in that valley.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL (East Yarra Province).—I was dealing with an alternative route for the freeway if the Yarra Valley is not used. That alternative would involve the use of residential areas. I hope members of the Labor Party are not saying, "Look, there is an alternative; it is the residential areas. We should prefer the Government to be planning to build these major freeways which are necessary within the metropolitan area, and we should like to see these in residential areas as opposed to areas like the Yarra Valley."

In the past after the construction work on freeways has been completed the areas have been restored to such a condition that no honorable member could raise any objection. In fact, in some areas more beauty exists after the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has carried out its beautification work than existed before the freeway was constructed. The South-Eastern Freeway was built along Gardiner's Creek and part of the Yarra River. Prior to the construction of that section of the freeway—it is known as the south-eastern extension—it was apparent that certain areas of parklands would be seriously affected, but since the extension has been completed, honorable members cannot deny that there are now more playing fields and recreation areas within the area originally affected by the South-Eastern Freeway. The reclamation work carried out by the Board of Works was responsible for this situation. What I have said is factual, irrespective of whether Mr. Galbally believes it or not.

From an examination of the work carried out by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works on both sides of the South-Eastern Freeway, it is obvious that the restored areas are better than they were originally. Some areas were formerly bare pieces of land, but they have now been

planted with hundreds of shrubs and trees. The reclamation work has not simply restored the area, but has provided a beauty which I suggest did not exist before. I know quite well that freeways cause problems. I recall when the extension to the South-Eastern Freeway was first mooted. At that time I had two sons attending Scotch College. As the local member of Parliament, I was placed in the unsavoury position of having to speak to the parents after the principal. I stated then, and I repeat now, that irrespective of the location of a freeway, some group will raise objection to it. If a freeway were placed on a sky hook there would be an objection to it from the Department of Air. Therefore, in the interests of the community as a whole, the Government must decide what is the best avenue to adopt. In the circumstances, the Government will select an area of land which is not utilized to its fullest capacity, and this policy was adopted with certain parts of the South-Eastern Freeway.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Why does the beautiful Yarra River and its environs have to be utilized for freeway purposes?

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It is a matter of utilizing that area or knocking down residential properties. The Government has weighed all the pros and cons of the available alternatives. It has been forced to select some residential areas and to route the freeway through some factory areas, to feed the Doncaster and Templestowe districts. It has been necessary for the section of the freeway between Collingwood and Kilby Road, Kew, to traverse part of the Yarra Bend Park reserve. The Government was confronted with certain problems with the freeway. The alternatives were placed before the Government and this is the action it is taking.

Mr. Galbally has stated that England is concentrating not on motorways, but on rail transport.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—There is not a single freeway in London. When the authorities wanted to build a road through Hyde Park they had to put it under the park.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It will be seen from the *Hansard* report that Mr. Galbally said that England was really concentrating on rail transport throughout the whole country; he did not refer only to the city of London. Only three months ago, I had the pleasure of travelling for sixteen days in England where there are many miles of motorways running in every direction. In addition, the secondary roads are, in the main, also divided highways and other roads—they are termed "B" roads—are reasonable to travel on. These roads would be similar to the major roads but not the divided highways in some of the country areas of Victoria. They could be classified much the same as the road between Fern Tree Gully and Olinda.

It would be unfair to say that England is now concentrating on rail transport. At present a greater emphasis may be placed on railways, but that is because there is already a complete network of motorways, divided highways, and "B" grade roads throughout the country. The only additions that are needed to England's motorways are small areas of 1, 2, or 3 miles in close proximity to some of the major towns. Many of these additions are now being constructed. It is incorrect to say that England has reverted to concentrating on rail transport as opposed to the construction of freeways. However, it would be fair to say that England has a wonderful railway system. My trip from London to Dover was a happy event.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—At this juncture I invite Mr. Campbell to return to the Bill.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—I was reminiscing, Sir. I have touched on all the points I wish to mention: Firstly, that the 1954 Master Plan

was released during the régime of the Labor Government; secondly, that when freeway schemes are undertaken they are not ventured on lightly by the Government; and thirdly, there are alternative places on which the freeways can be built and it is the Government's responsibility, in its wide wisdom, to select the best places, bearing in mind the community as a whole.

In conclusion, I propose to quote from a report entitled, "Town and Country Planning Act 1961: Statement of Planning Policy No. 4 (River Yarra)." The report states, *inter alia*—

Implementation of the planning policy for the Yarra River requires that special attention be given to the following:—

4.1 An efficient system of management designed to ensure co-ordination of land use planning and all forms of development on private and public land.

4.2 Assessment of the future demand for outdoor recreation opportunities.

This was done with the extension of the South-Eastern Freeway—

4.3 Location and planning of recreation centres together with the associated services.

This has also received attention in the area, as Richmond council is well aware. The report continues—

4.4 Preservation of the plant community and native fauna by reservation or regulation of the use of land.

4.5 Preservation and enhancement of landscape by reservation or regulation of the use of land; selection of landscape areas and vantage points of high quality for special treatment.

This criterion is laid down when work of this nature is to be carried out in an area such as the Yarra Valley. Clearly, like the Labor Party, the Government is mindful of the beauty of the Yarra Valley. However, freeways must go somewhere. Hence, not only these areas, but also residential and industrial areas, will be affected to a minimum degree. The over-all policy of the Government is to build these roads with as little interference as possible to the community. Accordingly, I do not support Mr. Galbally's motion.

The Hon. W. M. Campbell.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province).—The history of the Liberal Government reveals that it has been famous for the destruction of natural parks, gardens and river valleys.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—That is not so.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—History clearly supports my assertion. In this regard, I remind honorable members of the Little Desert, the Royal Botanic Gardens and the Tullamarine Freeway. History is repeating itself and the beauty of Victoria is being destroyed.

I refute Mr. Campbell's statement that not one area represented by a member of the Labor Party would be affected if the Government adopted a policy of prohibiting freeways within 10 miles of the centre of Melbourne. During another debate in this House last night, members of the Government party were invited to visit certain areas to which reference had been made but they did not accept the invitation. I invite the honorable member to visit the fast-developing areas in the western suburbs.

The Hon. H. R. WARD.—Are you referring to Jackson's Creek.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—I have in mind an area past Jackson's Creek, which has developed rapidly. My Leader's proposal is correct. The Government, which has planned badly, should have looked to the foreseeable future before it acted. A planning report was prepared in 1952-54.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Not one member of the Labor Party opposed the plan.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—The Minister for Local Government is responsible for planning at present. He should have considered the future and routed the freeways across agricultural lands instead of through high density areas. The Government has not heeded the reports.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—How many of the Labor commissioners on the Board of Works objected to the plan?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—The Board of Works is full of Tory Liberalism.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Why did you not object to the plan that was tabled in the House?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—I was not a member of Parliament when the report was tabled. The Government has planned badly.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—The plan was laid on the table of the House on 2nd March of last year.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—What has the Government done by way of planning for the future? I have been up the Yarra Valley.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER. — You should ask the landowners there.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—The rail transport system from Warburton to Lilydale was discontinued. The Government stands condemned for its actions in this regard.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—The people are pleased about it.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—The Government wants to build freeways, which will spoil nature, and encourage the use of fast, modern motor cars that add to the road toll. Only last week at a seminar that was held here reference was made to the insufferable road toll and the action that can be taken to deal with it. The Government is encouraging this with high-speed freeways and highways. The Bill should have the full support of all honorable members to stop the destruction of the beautiful Yarra Valley.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province).—It was necessary for an Act to be passed by Parliament to permit the construction of the Eastern Freeway through the parklands of the Yarra Valley. Before the Bill was introduced, the Government permitted the Board of Works to commence work, not in the open, but in the depths of Yarra Bend Park. It was only following action by certain members of the Labor Party that the Minister decided that a Bill should be rushed through the House to permit the work to proceed.

The subject of freeways has been widely discussed in this House and in another place. It has received considerable publicity from Government sources and from various other organizations interested in the development of freeways and their effect on the community.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Why did Mr. Eddy not object to the amendments to the planning scheme when they were laid on the table of this House in March last year?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—It would not have been much use my objecting because the Government has the numbers. It has been established that the F19 route will severely affect Yarra Bend Park and those members of the community who use the park. Numerous objections were lodged and, indeed, Sir Arthur Rylah, who was a member of the Yarra Bend Park Trust, was an objector when the freeway proposal was submitted to the trust.

Several proposals were placed before the Government, one of which was to route the freeway along the northern side of Alexandra Parade. If that scheme had been proceeded with, a number of Housing Commission dwellings would have been demolished. The route was changed to the south side of Alexandra Parade, causing a loss of many thousands of dollars because new buildings had been constructed in the area. The firm of Permewan Wright Ltd. had occupied a new building for approximately twelve months, and it had received permission from the Board of Works to construct it. Then it was necessary for the company to move its premises and for the building to be demolished at great cost to the taxpayers.

Yarra Bend Park is one of the finest parks in the State and is equal to the Royal Botanic Gardens, Albert Park and Royal Park. The Government has permitted this park to be ruined

and people who once participated in sporting activities in the area can no longer do so. The Government has said that it is opposed to the alienation of parklands.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—That is not true.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—It is true. When the local community at Clifton Hill desired to construct a swimming pool, the Minister of Lands said he would not agree to the proposal because it meant the alienation of parkland. Two months later the Government destroyed 36 acres of parkland at the Yarra Bend Park.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—And you did not object.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—I did object. An area of 36 acres of parkland has been destroyed by the Government. It has been suggested that the area lost will be replaced in other municipalities, but this will not be to the advantage to those who have been using the park for many years and would have continued to use it in the future.

The La Trobe golf course will have 5½ acres replaced, and 9 or 10 acres of the Kew golf course will also be replaced. I do not know how the Government is to replace half a golf course when the freeway will run partly through the course. It is ridiculous for the Government to suppose that it will be able to replace golf courses when there is no other parkland. Furthermore, 200 trees have been destroyed. Mr. Houghton has said that he loves trees but he was not concerned about the 200 trees which were destroyed in Yarra Bend Park.

Many private homes have been destroyed in the Kew electorate, but that does not worry the Government because it is not interested in this destruction.

My colleagues have said everything that is necessary to be said concerning the destruction of the Yarra Valley. Accordingly, I support the Bill.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	25
Majority against the motion	17

AYES.

Mr. Galbally	Mr. Tripovich.
Mr. Kent	
Mr. Knight	*Tellers:*
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Trayling	Mr. Walton.

NOES.

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

PAIR.

Mr. Elliot	Mr. Hauser.

The sitting was suspended at 6.27 *p.m. until* 8.3 *p.m.*

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

For **the Hon. A. J. HUNT** (Minister for Local Government), Sir Gilbert Chandler (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Weights and Measures Act 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MARKETING OF PRIMARY PRODUCTS (CITRUS FRUIT) BILL.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Marketing of Primary Products Act 1958 with respect to the marketing of citrus fruit, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION (BORROWING POWERS) BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to increase the State Electricity Commission's borrowing authority from $975 million to $1,125 million. At present the commission's power to borrow money is limited by the State Electricity Commission Act 1958 No. 6377 as amended by Act No. 6724 of 1960, Act No. 7087 of 1963, Act No. 7421 of 1966 and Act No. 7838 of 1969.

Prior to 1932 the commission's construction programme had been financed by Treasury advances but in that year the commission was given authority by Act No. 4087 to borrow money on the loan market. However, Parliament set an upper limit on the amount which the commission could borrow and this limit has been progressively raised by Parliament and now stands at $975 million.

It is now necessary to seek the approval of Parliament to increase the commission's borrowing authority to enable it to finance its continuing capital works programme. The borrowing authority was last increased three years ago in 1969 by $125 million to $975 million, and this limit will be reached during the present quarter of this financial year. It is important, therefore, that the limit be raised without delay and the proposed increase of $150 million should cover the commission's loan requirements for the next three years.

Briefly, I should like to summarize the capital works expenditure financed in the past three financial years from the $125 million authorized in 1969 and the works programme for the next three years for which the $150 million additional borrowing authority will be authorized by the passage of this Bill.

The main headings under which capital expenditure was incurred in the past three years were—

	$ million
Power stations construction	103
Coal winning plant and open cut development ..	11
Transmission lines and terminal stations	70
Expansion of the distribution system	71
General equipment, stores, workshops, offices, motor vehicles, construction plant, etc.	23
	278

Of this expenditure $128 million was financed by borrowings on the loan market and Treasury advances out of the Works and Services Account. The remainder was financed from the commission's internal resources principally by retaining depreciation provisions within the business and from self-help contributions by prospective customers, and other advances for capital expenditure.

At 30th June, 1972, the commission was supplying electricity to 1·077 million consumers, an increase of more than 95,000 during the past three years. In addition, more than 247,000 consumers are supplied by the eleven metropolitan municipal electricity supply undertakings which purchase electricity in bulk from the commission.

Electrification of the State is now virtually completed and the last independent electricity supply undertaking outside the metropolitan area, at Mallacoota, was acquired by the commission when transmitted supply was extended to that township in July of this year. There are now only relatively few homes in remote and isolated areas which do not have a supply of electricity available to them. There will, of course, be a continuing task for the commission to provide

supply to new farms being established and the thousands of new homes being built in Victoria each year.

The commission's capital expenditure over the next three years is expected to be $293 million, allocated as follows:—

	$ million
Power stations construction	105
Coal winning plant and open cut development ..	26
Transmission lines and terminal stations	44
Expansion of the distribution system	88
General equipment, stores, workshops, offices, motor vehicles and construction plant, etc.	30

Of the $293 million required, it is expected that approximately $150 million can be provided from the commission's own resources. The balance of some $143 million will have to be financed by public loan flotations, private loans from savings banks, superannuation funds and other financial institutions, and by Treasury advances.

The Bill is quite simple. It provides that wherever the amount of $975 million appears in sections 87, 88 and 98 of the State Electricity Commission Act there shall be substituted the amount $1,125 million. Section 87 prescribes the upper limit to the over-all borrowings of the commission. Section 88 specifies the same limit in respect of various provisions which authorize the commission to borrow and re-borrow by means of debentures and inscribed stock. Section 98 sets the same limit also in respect of the authority of the Treasurer of Victoria to make advances out of the Works and Services Account for the benefit of the commission. 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 17.

MARKETING OF PRIMARY PRODUCTS (CITRUS FRUIT) BILL.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Following representations from the major citrus grower organizations in Victoria—Sunraysia District Citrus Co-operative Society Ltd.; Victorian Central Citrus Association Pty. Ltd.; and the Victorian Farmers Union—the Governor in Council has, by proclamation, declared citrus fruit other than lemons a product for the purposes of the Marketing of Primary Products Act 1958 and has made regulations entitled the Citrus Marketing (Polls and Elections) (Eligibility for Enrolment) Regulations 1972.

Industry organizations are now moving towards a petition of producers to seek the declaration of the orange, mandarin and grapefruit varieties of the product as a commodity for the purposes of the Act with a view to the conduct of a poll on whether a marketing board shall be constituted in relation to the commodity.

Lemons have been excluded by the organizations because the proposed board would need to co-operate closely with the existing New South Wales area board which does not handle lemons, and because most of the lemons grown in Victoria are produced in the Melbourne metropolitan area where growers have not expressed an interest in the creation of a board to control the marketing of lemons. Other varieties of citrus fruit apart from oranges, mandarins and grapefruit are not produced in Victoria in quantities sufficiently large to warrant bringing them under a marketing board at this stage.

Because of special circumstances in the marketing of citrus fruits the industry organizations have sought an amendment to the Act to insert a separate Division relating to the operation of a citrus fruit marketing board, this being the proposed name for a board covering oranges, mandarins and grapefruit. Such an

amendment should not be made effective until a board has been constituted, but it is important that producers have a clear idea of the full powers the board might have when they come to vote on whether a board should be constituted. The Government has therefore agreed to introduce the amending Bill so that its contents can be made public. The Bill will remain on the Notice Paper and will be proceeded with if a board is constituted. For the same reason, draft regulations pertaining to the board will be available to producers before they vote.

It is the view of the industry organizations that a citrus fruit marketing board would operate most effectively by permitting distribution to continue as far as possible through existing channels but under the control of the board. They propose that a board would achieve this by first having citrus fruits vested in the board under section 17 of the Act, then exempting under paragraph (*d*) of section 21 as many producers as would contract with the board to observe its marketing instructions and contribute to its administrative expenses.

If such a scheme were adopted by the board, the industry believes the majority of producers would seek exemption so that they could continue selling to their traditional outlets, and only small quantities would be delivered to the board for it to market, except where it required supplies for export markets. In such case, the board would not need to establish an extensive marketing organization.

The draft regulations to which I referred earlier embody the industry views on the conditions under which exemptions might be granted by the board. The Act requires that these conditions must be prescribed. The general provisions of the Marketing of Primary Products Act 1958, which were originally enacted in 1935, do not adequately provide for the orderly marketing of citrus fruits, where the avenues of distribution are manifold and small differences in external and internal quality have significant effects on prices.

The amending Bill in clause 2 provides for—

(1) The interpretation of "grade" to include such items as district of origin, time of harvesting and other factors affecting market acceptability.

(2) The naming of a new board, if constituted, as the "Citrus Fruit Marketing Board".

(3) The application to the Citrus Fruit Marketing Board, if constituted, of—

(*a*) the provisions of section 43 of the Act relating to the powers of inspection, sampling and inquiry for inspectors of the Egg and Egg Pulp Marketing Board; and

(*b*) the provisions of section 48 of the Act relating to progress, premium and final payments by the Egg and Egg Pulp Marketing Board to producers and related matters modified in the case of citrus fruit delivered to the board—but not to exempted fruit—

(i) to provide for a final payment according to grade—instead of uniform final payments irrespective of grade—and other considerations the board thinks relevant;

(ii) to take into account marketing and treatment costs of individual deliveries, costs which vary considerably according to the care taken in producing and delivering the fruit; and

(iii) to allow a price stabilization scheme suited to citrus fruits.

(4) The extension of the provisions of section 49 of the Act relating to the collection of information concerning any commodity in relation to which a board is constituted to cover the following items peculiar to citrus fruits:—

(*a*) numbers, ages and varieties of trees;

(*b*) expected maturity and harvesting dates; and

(*c*) crop estimates by grade and time of harvest.

(5) The Citrus Fruit Marketing Board, if constituted, to make contracts and arrangements relating to the handling, packing, marketing or processing of oranges, mandarins and grapefruit produced both in and out of Victoria and to matters incidental thereto whether or not those varieties of citrus fruit are, or have at any time, been vested in or required to be delivered to the board.

In commending the Bill to the House, I indicate that it has been prepared over quite a number of years. There has been much discussion between senior departmental officers and representatives of the industry. It was the Government's belief that, whilst a petition was being prepared for a vote to be taken on whether or not a board should be established, it would be desirable for the industry to know the contents of the Division which it was proposed should be inserted in the Act in relation to the particular product. If any honorable member wishes to discuss the Bill, that would not be undesirable but, from the Government's point of view, it would be better if the Bill did not pass the second-reading stage. If the poll was to go against the establishment of the board, it would not be necessary to insert the provision in the principal Act.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—It might have been a good idea to follow this method with the Oats Marketing Board legislation.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—This course was probably devised because of experience with the Oats Marketing Board measure. The industry understands and, I believe, supports what is being done. At this stage I commend the Bill to the House on the basis that it gives the guidelines for the principles on which the industry will vote. As I have said, a petition is being prepared now.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province).—I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

I suggest that the debate be adjourned for one month.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—It might be better if the debate were adjourned until next week. I may be able to have discussions with the industry and the party Leaders on how far it is desirable that the Bill should be taken in this House. It might be preferable for a debate on the motion for the second reading of the Bill to take place so that the views of the Labor Party and the Country Party may be known to the industry. I am open on the question of the length of the adjournment, but I think an adjournment of one week might be preferable to an adjournment of one month.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 18.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND SOLICITOR-GENERAL BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a simple Bill, the main purpose of which is to clarify the duties and powers of a Minister acting for the Attorney-General and, at the same time, to remove ambiguities about the position of the Solicitor-General and to re-enact the Solicitor-General Act. The Bill makes only two substantive amendments, one of which is of substance, the other being more illusory than real.

The first amendment is made by clause 3 of the Bill. Sections 19 and 17 of the Acts Interpretation Act make it plain that one Minister may act for another in his absence whether or not the duty is required to be performed by a named Minister or merely in the execution of his office. Those sections are quite clear in their operation in relation to statute law but

some of the duties of the Attorney-General are conferred not by statute but by common law. These include, for example, the issuing of a fiat in what is known as a relator action, certain prerogatives of mercv and recommendations to the Governor in Council—a few on his own motion—and many duties which relate to charitable trusts. All of these derive from common law. There is grave doubt whether a Minister acting for the Attorney-General can, in fact, perform these duties on his behalf. Clearly, an acting Attorney-General has been intended by Parliament to be able to perform the duties of the Attorney-General. The clause makes it plain that this will be so.

Paragraph (*a*) of sub-clause (3) of clause 4 contains a minor amendment, that which I referred to as illusory, in respect of the salary of the Solicitor-General. In practice, the salary of the Solicitor-General has always been the same as that of a puisne judge of the Supreme Court. Incidentally, "puisne" means any judge before the rank of the Chief Justice. The Bill makes it plain that this system will continue. The salary of the Solicitor-General, as of course, will be the same as that of a puisne judge. So, although the amendment effected by this clause makes a substantive amendment to the law, it makes no amendment whatsoever to practice.

I mention clause 7 in passing although it is primarily a re-enactment. Honorable members will recall that originally the office of Solicitor-General was a Ministerial appointment. It ceased to be so in 1951 and various amendments to the law were then made. At the time, some minor amendments were apparently overlooked and it needs to be made quite clear that the Solicitor-General cannot carry out duties which by law have always been the prerogative of the Minister. For that purpose and to accord with the earlier principle which I mentioned of one Minister acting for another in all matters during the absence of the incumbent, clause 7 contains minor clarifications. Apart from the matters I have specifically mentioned, the Bill constitutes entirely a re-enactment of the law. I commend it to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. J. M. Tripovich, for the Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 17.

SUPREME COURT (JUDGES) BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honorable members will be able to judge the purpose and the content of this Bill by a simple reading of clause 2. Its purpose is merely to increase the number of judges of the Supreme Court from 17 to 21. The number was last increased in 1967 from 15 to the present 17. Honorable members will appreciate that with an affluent society there has been a growth in litigation and increasing congestion in the courts.

Mr. Galbally, who has repeatedly urged an increase in the number of judges, will welcome this Bill. It is worthy of note that, in New South Wales, the number of Supreme Court judges is 34, so by comparison it could be argued that Victoria is still a little short. Nevertheless, a measure recommending an increase in the number to 21 is a constructive step. I commend it to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. J. M. Tripovich, for the Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 17.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The contents of this Bill will be pleasing to honorable members chosen by this Parliament to represent it at

the forthcoming Constitutional Convention. I can find only one phrase in the measure to which any honorable member might object. Mr. Houghton is bound to take issue over the resolution *nemine contradicente* of Parliament.

The Bill provides for the delegates to the Constitutional Convention to be paid attendance fees and appropriate travelling expenses at the same rate as those payable to other Parliamentary committees. Honorable members will doubtless be glad to learn that acceptance of these fees will not disqualify them from membership of the House.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—That would be a little difficult.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Mr. Swinburne knows that if an honorable member accepted payment from the Crown, unless specifically authorized by Act of Parliament, he would incur disqualification. This Bill ensures that that will not occur. Briefly, I shall report to the House the stage at which arrangements for the convention have reached. Firstly, honorable members will be glad to know that the Commonwealth Government has agreed to bear one-half of the cost of the Constitutional Convention. The States bear the remainder between them in proportion to population. Those who are quick mathematicians may have been able to work out that Victoria will have to meet approximately 14 per cent of the total cost of the convention.

Secondly, the Victorian delegation, consisting of representatives of all parties, has met and reviewed preparations for the convention. As a result, submissions were sought from local government and other interested bodies to enable the delegation to be fully briefed on the views put to it. Thirdly, at that meeting the Victorian delegation selected the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to represent it as a steering committee making the final arrangements for the conference which was held in Adelaide last week.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—They transferred the convention from Albury to Sydney, which was a mammoth decision.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That is so. Honorable members may have read an announcement in the press following the meeting of the steering committee. They will agree that the task ahead of the Constitutional Convention is a mammoth one. It holds the only hope for the survival of the Federal system as we know it and for the effective working of State government with increased autonomy and real hopes for increased autonomy for local government. Regardless of their party affiliations, honorable members will support this Bill. I am pleased to say that throughout the Commonwealth there appears to be a genuine desire to make the convention work well for the long-term interests of the citizens of Australia. Therefore, I have great pleasure in commending the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. J. M. Tripovich, for the Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 17.

LAND (RESIDENCE AREAS) BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the House for the tolerance it has accorded me over many years, particularly as a back-bench member of the Government party, when annually for fourteen years I raised the problems associated with this form of title which was peculiar to my city, where approximately one quarter of the household titles are in this form. I hope the provisions of the Bill will do away with most of the seven disabilities associated with this form of title.

Rights to occupy residence areas have had only a comparatively short association with the Land Act but for many years prior to 1936 were

associated with the Mines Act as miners' rights to occupy residence areas. The basis for the Eureka Stockade rising was associated with the rights of miners to occupy land and the question of payment.

Honorable members whose constituencies include the former goldfields of the State will be more familiar than others with residence areas and how they are accepted by the community. They are little known outside the former goldfields and it is desirable to give a brief account of events which have made the introduction of the Bill necessary.

Provision for holders of miners' rights to occupy Crown lands for residence purposes originated in the Goldfields Act of 1857 and the dimensions and extent of the early residence areas were fixed under the by-laws of the various mining districts. The mining by-laws were first consolidated in 1908. An amendment to the Mines Act in 1884 provided for conversion of residence areas to freehold at an appraised price if certain conditions had been fulfilled. The annual fee for a miner's right was originally 20 shillings; it was reduced to five shillings in 1865 and to two shillings and sixpence in 1892.

The miner's right to occupy a residence area was devised as a quick and ready means of providing a miner with a small area of land on which to build a home while he was mining in the locality. It was intended as a temporary measure during the gold rush days when the ordinary methods of obtaining land under the then existing land laws could not keep pace with the demand.

From this original objective, the issue of miners' rights developed into a system of land tenure and registration with registration of liens on improvements without the statutory safeguards of the Transfer of Land Act. Little regard was paid to public requirements, particularly as to access, and no plan records whatever were kept. The result of this was that rights were at times registered over public reserves, roads, land excepted from occupation, in fact any open land remotely connected with a goldfield. Descriptions were vague and little attempt was made to conform to any subdivision. With the gradual decline in gold mining operations, occupation by miners was much reduced but occupation by persons with no connection with mining greatly increased.

The position regarding the occupation of Crown lands under miner's right for residence purposes had become so confused in the Bendigo district that, in 1928, all Crown lands in the City of Bendigo, the Borough of Eaglehawk and the Parish of Sandhurst were excepted under the provisions of the Land Act from occupation for residence under a miner's right. The intention was to enable the Department of Crown Lands and Survey to exercise control of future occupations.

The situation became chaotic, however, when in 1934 the Mining Warden at Bendigo gave a decision that the 1928 exception had rendered invalid every registration of a residence area made in his district since October, 1892. It was then decided to bring the control of the occupations under the Land Act. To do this, the Land (Residence Areas) Act 1935 was passed and came into operation on 20th January, 1936.

On and after that date, as miners' rights for residence became due for renewal, each holder had to apply to the Department of Crown Lands and Survey under the new legislation for what was called a right to occupy a residence area or, as it was usually called, a residence area right. The new Act also provided for the granting of new rights and gave power for the right-holder to encumber his interest as well as conferring an exclusive right to purchase the freehold at an appraised price subject to certain conditions being complied with. The annual fee for renewal was fixed at five shillings.

It is not known how many miners' rights for purposes of residence were in existence as at 20th January,

1936, but as each case was investigated, it was later found that some thousands were invalidly held, the most common reasons being an excess in area or sites not being used for residence purposes.

It took some years to investigate all applications to be brought under the 1935 Act and to deal with the problem cases by using other appropriate provisions of the Land Act. By 1939 the number of rights to occupy issued by the Lands Department totalled 8,279, by far the majority of which were situated in the Ballarat and Bendigo districts.

The department endeavoured to make each right to occupy as secure as possible by identifying it on the ground and recording its location on plans so far as was possible without a precise survey.

The indiscriminate granting of residence areas and the abuses which had occurred under the Mines Act over a period of nearly 80 years were halted. However, it must be kept in mind that the State was beginning to recover from the effects of the economic depression and that few people could afford to convert their residence areas to freehold, even at the depressed prices of the times.

This was aggravated by the fact that for many years a miner's right for residence would be sold by a vendor to a purchaser at the same price as if the land were freehold. It is not known when this practice commenced but the 1935 legislation did not succeed in doing away with it and it still obtains today.

In some ways the new system proved little better than the old as it is perpetuating an archaic system of land registration that was originally devised to tide the State through a difficult period when mining was paramount. Under modern conditions, the present system is an anachronism and the drawbacks to it are many. It is not based on survey, and until actual dimensions and extent of a residence area are established by a proper survey there must always be some element of doubt between occupation and what can be made freehold.

A right to occupy a residence area is in force for a period not exceeding one year and shall be renewable from time to time for a further period not exceeding one year. Many institutions, including the State Savings Bank, will lend money on the security of a lien on improvements but others, including the War Service Homes Division, will not. These liens are registered in the department by authority of the Land Act and regulations thereunder but neither the lienor nor the lienee has the benefit of the protection afforded a mortgagor or mortgagee under the Transfer of Land Act or the Property Law Act.

In a small way, the system of residence areas is a third system of land registration, outside the scope of the Torrens system or the original general law system. One of its adverse effects is to hold up development which it does in two ways. Firstly, a residence area may be suitable for subdivision into two or more residential blocks, with all or some services available, but few holders are prepared to exercise their right to freehold the land merely to subdivide when there is little or no profit in it for them.

Secondly, the system can operate to the detriment of planning and zoning under the Town and Country Planning Act. If land is rezoned under that Act so that residence becomes a non-conforming use, a planning authority could do little about it because technically a residence area is still Crown land. One of the conditions of a right to occupy a residence area is that the site shall be used bona fide for residence and the holder is subject to a penalty for carrying on any business.

The cost to the State of administering the system is out of all proportion to the renewal and other fees charged, and there is also considerable loss of revenue by virtue of the

fact that the sale of a residence area by transfer is not subject to duty under the Stamps Act.

The residence area system has served its purpose, and the intention behind this Bill is to do away with it so that ultimately the lands held under residence area rights will be brought under the operation of the Transfer of Land Act. It is not proposed to do this in one intensive operation but over a long period. As ultimately it will be incumbent upon all right-holders to freehold their occupations, some inducement or allowance will be granted.

The Bill is therefore a composite one. Some of it re-enacts much of the existing legislation and some of it is new. The new provisions make it clear that no new rights will be granted after the legislation comes into operation, and this only confirms departmental policy as no new rights have been granted for the past twenty years. At 1st July, 1972, there were 4,795 residence area rights in existence, 1,537 in the Bendigo district, 3,045 in the Ballarat district and the remaining 213 in other former mining districts.

It is proposed that, during the period of approximately ten years before 1st January, 1983, a holder of a residence area right may continue to encumber, sell or transfer his interest, but not on or after that date. This will mean that, if a right-holder wishes to dispose of or encumber his interest after that date, it will be necessary for him first to convert the right to a Crown grant or to a purchase lease, either of which will be registered under the Transfer of Land Act. Any further dealings involving a transfer or mortgage would be effected under that Act.

These proposals would restrict the life of a residence area, albeit over a long period. Because of the element of compulsion involved, and having regard to the history of residence areas, of which a brief account has been given earlier, the Government considers it reasonable to recognize that each right-holder is entitled to a substantial allowance or interest in the land. This has been recognized to some extent in the past because of undertakings given by the Minister of Lands in 1935 when introducing the original legislation. In the first few decades of the operation of the existing legislation, the allowance was substantial, but in later years, as there was no statutory provision for such an allowance, there has been a tendency to be more realistic in fixing the purchase price. The measure contains a number of Committee provisions. I 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 17.

STATE RIVERS AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION (SPECIAL PROJECTS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 19) on the motion of the Hon. Murray Byrne (Minister for State Development and Decentralization) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province).—This measure makes provision for the staff of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission to be used to assist in projects which are being undertaken by development bodies in other countries. This represents a forward move. Many times I have deplored the parochial outlook of the Government of Victoria, but this measure will enable technical staff of the commission to work outside of that organization and to assist in many developmental projects at a time when the conscience of Australians is being slowly stirred to the realities of life and the fact that our greatest contribution to the development of peace

and goodwill is to render assistance in the development of countries near to us.

This is a commendable move by the Government, and it could result in benefits to those who participate from Victoria as well as to those to whom assistance will be rendered. If the hopes of good Australians are realized, and a more enlightened Federal Government is elected in December, this process of assisting development in other countries will accelerate. The Labor Party supports the measure.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province).—The Country Party supports this proposed legislation which amends the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission (Special Projects) Act 1969. Members who are sufficiently interested or well informed will remember that in 1969 when the Act was passed it authorized the appropriate Government department—in this case the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission—to carry out works outside of Victoria. On that occasion the commission was involved in development projects in Ethiopia, and since then its officers have carried out valuable work in that country. However, in recent months a proposal was advanced which was not covered by the original Act. As the Minister explained in his second-reading speech, the principal Act does not provide for the commission to make arrangements to assist in maintaining or servicing development works which are undertaken by any other body, although it enables the commission to carry out development works. There is little difference between the two concepts, but the amendments contained in clauses 2 and 3 of this measure give wider authority to the commission to participate in projects outside Victoria.

The Country Party is pleased to support this proposed legislation and hopes that some other countries will receive as valuable assistance as that which has been rendered by the Victorian Water Commission in Ethiopia.

The motion was agreed to.

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

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (PERSONAL INJURIES) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 19) 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. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province).—The Bill comes before the House as a result of recommendations made by the Chief Justice's Law Reform Committee. That is a committee consisting of representatives of the judiciary and the legal profession. They work hard and in the public interest. It is a labour of love. The House is grateful for the time that they give to legal problems and it goes without saying that the Labor Party does not oppose the Bill.

It was not so long ago that the time in which a person could bring an action for personal injury was within a period of six years. The Government reduced that period to three years—on balance I think unwisely. It was said that most of the defendants in these cases are insurance companies because nearly all actions for personal injury arise as a result of industrial or motor car accidents. It was said that if insurance companies had to wait for up to six years for actions to be brought this was not only an inconvenience but an injustice to them. Some English cases support my view that a greater injustice has been caused to the plaintiff as a result of the curtailing of the time limit to three years.

This Bill provides a measure of relief. If a plaintiff is out of time he can make an application to the court. If he can give good and sufficient reasons similar to those which are enumerated in the Bill, the judge will

allow him to proceed. I have read the recommendations of the Chief Justice's Law Reform Committee and I am convinced that they are reasoned recommendations. It must not be thought that any observations of mine reflect in any way on the work of the committee. Members of the committee have been generous in their talents, but I prefer a different approach. I should prefer to see the time limit lifted to six years. True it is that in some instances in Great Britain industrial diseases have not emerged even within that time, but six years seems to me to be reasonable to both the plaintiff and the defendant. Those remarks of mine may or may not meet with the approval of the House, but the Labor Party at least approves of this measure.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL (North-Western Province).—The Country Party supports the Bill. It is time something was done about this time limit and the action proposed will give relief in certain directions. The Bill is complementary to another measure which is on the Notice Paper.

The motion was agreed to.

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

WRONGS BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 19) 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. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province).—This Bill extends the period within which actions for wrongful acts or neglect causing death may be brought. It is a companion Bill to the previous measure and there is no need for me to say anything further upon it. However, I do not want the House to think that although the Labor Party agrees to the measure the suggestions I made about the companion Bill do not apply with equal force to this measure.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL (North-Western Province).—If Mr. Galbally cannot find fault with the Bill, I do not think I should try. The Country Party supports the measure.

The motion was agreed to.

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

MONTROSE LAND BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 19) on the motion of Sir Gilbert Chandler (Minister of Agriculture) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. H. A. THOMAS (Melbourne West Province).—This Bill relates to the closing of that part of Henry Street, Montrose, which abuts the Montrose Primary School site. It is proposed that the land and improvements thereon be reserved as an addition to the existing State school reserve. This reserve, which is situated on the south-east corner of the part of Henry Street which is to be closed, consists of an area of two acres and has been temporarily reserved since 1879.

Because of the dangers to children who attend the school, it is undesirable to have a road running between the two areas of land. When the road is closed the area will become part of the total area under the control of the Education Department. The council of the Shire of Lillydale has agreed to the closing of the road provided that pedestrians have access to the road. The Education Department has agreed to the council's condition and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the Country Roads Board, the Gas and Fuel Corporation and the State Electricity Commission have all agreed to the closing of the road. The State Electricity Commission has services running through the road and its right of entry will be preserved for maintenance reasons.

Although the Labor Party appreciates the graveness of closing roads, the proposition seems to be reason-

able. In this case, the future interest of the community, especially the children who attend the school, will be protected. The Labor Party does not oppose the Bill.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province).—This simple Bill relates to the closure of part of a road at Montrose. The Country Party, which sees wisdom in the proposal, supports the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Closure of part of Henry Street).

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—It is rather monotonous when Bills are passed with little debate. This Bill has been considered for many years and certainly its passage will improve the set-up at the Montrose Primary School. I know the area and have been personally involved in the representations to other Ministers concerning the closure of the road. The pressure for action to be taken has become greater in the past few years. As was indicated earlier, there is wisdom in the Bill, and both the Labor Party and the Country Party have intimated that they will support it. I am certain that people in the district will agree with the proposal.

The requirements of pedestrians, who will be allowed to continue to go through the area, have been met. The closure of the road will mean a lot to the children who attend the Montrose Primary School and to the district in general. The school lands will be enclosed in one area which will be controlled by the school and, instead of the children having to cross the road, they will be able to move from one area to the other without hindrance or danger.

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

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

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS DEATHS AND MARRIAGES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 20) 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. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—This Bill was described by the Minister for Local Government as an amendment to the Registration of Births Deaths and Marriages Act 1959 to provide for the surname to be registered in the case of legitimate or illegitimate children; to enable the legal guardian of a child to be registered with a first or Christian name when such name had been omitted in the original registration of the birth of the child; to permit the Government Statist to put the father's name and particulars in the entry of the registration of birth of an illegitimate child at any time after the original registration was made, and to make a slight alteration to the particulars required in item 11 of the Third Schedule. The Labor Party has examined the Bill and can find no objection to it.

It is interesting to note that in referring to the registration of birth of an illegitimate child, the Government Statist refrains from using the expression " illegitimate " and instead adopts the expression " ex-nuptial ". Illegitimacy casts some reflection on a child, and undoubtedly many people have been most concerned to remove the reflection and what is called the stigma of illegitimacy. Certain reforms have been achieved over the years and this measure represents a further attempt to provide for the registration in a proper manner of these children. What is remarkable is that between 1967 and 1971 the percentage of ex-nuptial children of the total births in New South Wales has increased by approximately 2 per cent. The actual percentage

rose from 7·99 per cent to 9·82 per cent. In Victoria, possibly because of our conservative outlook or our better morals—I should not like to make a judgment on this—it has increased by only 1 per cent, from 5·65 per cent to 6·64 per cent; in Queensland, it has risen from 10·16 per cent to 12·16 per cent; in South Australia it has risen from 6·74 per cent to 7·75 per cent; in Western Australia it has risen from 10·79 per cent to 11·22 per cent, and in Tasmania it has risen from 7·45 per cent to 8·68 per cent. The over-all Australian figure has risen from 7·73 per cent to 9·27 per cent.

The problem confronting the Registrar today is children being born ex-nuptial not by accident but because of the belief of people that marriage has become an out-of-date institution. Many young people have no intention of entering the institution of marriage. The child is born, not by a mistake, but as a desired infant and therefore the community must adopt a different attitude to the registration of these children. This amending Bill makes provision for that.

By an amendment to section 13 of the principal Act, clause 2 makes it compulsory for the father or mother, or in their absence the person in charge of the house, of every child or still-born child born in Victoria to register the birth. A new sub-section is also inserted providing—

> Nothing in sub-section (1) shall be taken as requiring the father of an illegitimate child to give any information concerning the birth of the illegitimate child.

This provision brings the legislation up to date with modern thinking and into line with modern practices of registration.

Clause 3 inserts a new section 16A in the principal Act. Section 16 provides that after seven days have elapsed and a birth has not been registered, it can then be registered only on the authority of a judge of the Supreme Court. However, the section does not provide in whose name the birth shall be registered. Proposed new section 16A provides—

> (1) Where a person is registered as the father of a child the surname of the child in the register of births shall be the same as the surname of the father.
>
> (2) Where no person is registered as the father of the child the surname of the child in the register of births shall be the same as the surname of the mother.

Clause 4 contains an excellent provision. It makes an amendment whereby the Christian names of a child who has been adopted and registered with a surname only can be added to the registration on the application of the legal guardian or adoptive parents. At present the Act provides that such an application can be made only by the parents of the child.

Clauses 5 and 6 make amendments in terms of the modern acceptance of registration for ex-nuptial children. Clause 5 provides that for section 25 of the principal Act there shall be substituted the following section:—

> (1) No person shall be registered as the father of an illegitimate child unless the several particulars required by section 13 to be given are given by—
>
> (*a*) both the mother and the father; or
>
> (*b*) the father with the consent in writing of the mother.

Sub-section (2) of proposed new section 25A, as contained in clause 5, makes provision for four difficulties which may arise, two of which are where the mother of the child is dead, or after reasonable inquiry the mother of the child cannot be found. Clause 6 contains a provision whereby the names may be added in the margin of the register on application.

Clause 7 is merely a re-arrangement of the Third Schedule. The information previously required is now superfluous and all that is needed to be known on the death certificate is the period of residence in Australia.

Undoubtedly these amendments are consequential, but I should like to see the word "illegitimate" removed from the Act and suggest the word "ex-nuptial" as a replacement. This would mean removal of a word which carries a stigma for the chil-

dren of deserted wives and single mothers. No one can be more cruel than other children at school when the circumstances are known. Anything that can be done to give these children a start in life without the disadvantages which at present apply should be done.

Members of the Labor Party support the Bill, but ask the Government to re-examine the legislation at a later stage with a view to substituting a better word for the word "illegitimate". If the Government Statist has found such a word, I commend it to the Government for consideration.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL (North-Western Province).—Members of the Country Party support the Bill. I have often wondered why some action along these lines has not been taken in the past. I speak now as an old man. In the past a child born out of wedlock was called a bastard. This was considered not as a slur on the child but as an insult to its mother. To call a man a bastard was to invite him to give one a hiding in defence of his mother. Nowadays the word bastard is almost a term of endearment when used in a greeting of friendship, "Hello, you old bastard".

A child born out of wedlock is ridiculed by other children at school, and children can be very cruel. They soon single out such a child and are aware by listening to their parents that the child is illegitimate or a bastard. They promptly tell him what he is. Many people do not realize the effect this has on a child's life.

I agree with Mr. Tripovich that a substitute expression should be found for the word "illegitimate". The word "illegal" is applied to an action which breaks the law, a criminal offence. An illegitimate child has not committed a criminal offence, so why brand him as illegal? I ask the Minister to consider the matter seriously. No slur should be cast on the child. The mother has paid the penalty. In my opinion a father who is not prepared to marry the mother of his child is a bastard. I do not know why honorable members are laughing as this is a serious matter. I appeal to the Minister to give serious consideration to this point.

Members of the Country Party will support the Bill even if the Minister does not agree to this proposal, but I urge him to remove this slur on an innocent child.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 6564 s.13).

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—I thank the members of all parties for their reception of the Bill. I agree with Mr. Tripovich without reservation on the desirability of getting rid of the term, "illegitimate child", which, as Mr. Mansell has rightly pointed out, casts a slur on the child for something which is not of his making. If any unlawfulness has taken place it was certainly not on the part of the child. I would propose an amendment to the Bill now if it were possible to do so effectively, but in clauses 2, 5 and 6 there is reference to the nomenclature "illegitimate child", which has been used for a long time. No doubt there are many other similar references in the principal Act and it would be quite wrong to prematurely accept a hasty amendment without checking on the over-all implications. Obviously, there should be consistency in all sections. However, I shall draw the matter to the attention of the Attorney-General in the hope that in the next Bill amending the principal Act, the change sought by the Country Party and the Labor Party will be made.

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.

MINES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 5) on the motion of the Hon. Murray Byrne (Minister for State Development and Decentralization) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province).—Without going into the legal ramifications which motivated the repeal of section 412 of the principal Act, the Labor Party does not oppose the measure.

In view of the remarks made by my Leader on a previous measure on the statute of limitation affecting certain members of the public, it is worth recording that the Law Institute and the Crown Solicitor recommended this amendment to the Act. I refer to the *Victorian Law Reports* of 1971 concerning the case of *Fonteio* v. *Morando Bros. Pty. Ltd.* in the Full Court. The judgment was given on 30th October, 1970, by Chief Justice Winneke, Mr. Justice Little and Mr. Justice Gowans. No doubt members of the legal profession have read the judgment but I recommend its perusal to members of the House so that they may see how the law can impair the rights of certain people. The impediment which occurred in this case will no longer exist. Members of the Labor Party do not oppose the measure.

The Hon. R. W. MAY (Gippsland Province).—This simple Bill provides for the repeal of one section of the Mines Act. That section contains three sub-sections. In his explanatory second-reading speech the Minister stated that the amendment to section 412 was with the full concurrence of the Law Institute of Victoria.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Did the institute know anything about it?

The Hon. R. W. MAY.—Yes. The institute advised that the section was not consistent with the best interests of its clients. Section 412 of the Mines Act, which will be repealed by this Bill, is somewhat ambiguous. Sub-section (1) provides that action to recover damages shall be brought in the County Court, whatever amount is claimed, and shall not be brought in the Supreme Court, whereas sub-section (2) provides—

> If it appears to any judge of the Supreme Court on the application of either party that such action ought more properly to be brought in the Supreme Court such judge may order that such action be brought in the Supreme Court or if it is already commenced be transferred to the Supreme Court.

That appears to be where the confusion has arisen. It is interesting to note that the corresponding section in the Local Government Act—section 882—was repealed some time ago, and the confusion has been added to by the provisions of the Mines (Explosives) Act 1961 and the definition of a quarry in that Act.

I am concerned with people who have carried out extensive sewerage works throughout the State such as Morando Bros. Pty. Ltd., a firm which was involved in a case which brought this matter to light. I know of no reason why time should be lost or why parties should have to pay costs. I have no doubt that members of the legal profession, when faced with the high ethical standards of the Law Institute of Victoria, will feel precluded from imposing any charges. Accordingly the Country Party gives the measure its blessing.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Proceedings against owner or employer in respect of accident in a mine).

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization).—I thank honorable members for their support of the Bill and also Mr. May for his suggestion to the Law Institute of Victoria. I am sure that the institute will give the suggestion the consideration that it deserves.

The Bill simply removes disabilities associated with people claiming damages for injuries sustained in a mine so that they will have the same

rights as anyone else in the community to take action in the court that they desire. A person suffers a grave disability if he is compelled to take action in the County Court because, as honorable members will know, that court can grant only limited damages, whereas unlimited damages can be awarded in the Supreme Court. The Government concedes that people should have the right to go before the Supreme Court to obtain judgment. I do not see why a workman who is injured should suffer this disability. I again thank Mr. May for his suggestion concerning the Law Institute of Victoria.

The clause was agreed to.

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

RIVER IMPROVEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 5) on the motion of Sir Gilbert Chandler (Minister of Agriculture) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province).—This simple Bill will bring the provisions of the River Improvment Act relating to the election of commissioners of river improvement trusts into line with the provisions of the Local Government Act. These changes have been sought by the Association of River Improvement Trusts in the interests of uniformity and better administration.

Paragraph (*b*) of clause 2 amends section 13 of the Act to bring it into conformity with the Local Government Act. This means that a ratepayer who owns property within the municipal district commands only one vote in the election of a commissioner of a river improvement trust. All honorable members know that the Local Government Act has abolished plural voting in municipal elections and this amendment is consequential upon that fact.

Paragraph (c) of clause 2 is designed to ensure that officers can compile a list of voters at any time for the election of a commissioner. The new subsection (2), as proposed by paragraph (c), requires a municipal clerk to provide a river improvement trust with a certified copy of the municipal roll within a month of receiving a request for that copy.

An eighteen-year-old person who is on the municipal roll is entitled to vote in a municipal election, and I ask the Minister whether the same person will be entitled to vote in the election of a commissioner of a river improvement trust.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province). — The Country Party supports this minor Bill, which will have some consequential advantages. Hitherto, the proper officer of the river improvement trust has had to make up a roll of those eligible to vote in elections of commissioners of river improvement trusts. As has been stated by the Minister and Mr. Eddy, this Bill provides that those persons who are enrolled on the municipal roll—I take it irrespective of their age—provided that they live within the river improvement district, will be enrolled as voters at elections for commissioners of the river improvement trust.

An anomalous situation has prevailed for many years in that some river improvement trusts have elected commissioners and other trusts have purely nominated commissioners. I wonder whether the Minister can advise honorable members how many river improvement trusts have provisions for elected members and how many have straight-out nominated members. In some instances, at the inception of a river improvement trust, provision is made for a certain number of elected members. It is anomalous that some trusts have elected members whereas others have all nominated members.

For those trusts which have elected members, this measure will facilitate the preparation of the roll of voters and will reduce the time taken to prepare the roll for an election. Unfortunately, in many areas too few people take much interest in the work of river improvement trusts. Even a trust with elected members rarely has an election. Only a few people are sufficiently interested to nominate for election as a commissioner of a river improvement trust.

Where an election is held, the Bill will facilitate the work of the proper officer and he will be able to obtain from the municipal clerk, within a month of making application, an up-to-date roll of those ratepayers who are within the river improvement district. The Country Party supports the Bill. I should like the Minister to provide the information that I have sought.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2, relating to voting rights.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—Two points were raised in the second-reading debate by Mr. Eddy and Mr. Bradbury. Mr. Eddy referred to the age and qualifications of voters. Mr. Eddy has had some experience in municipal affairs. As I understand the position, a person who is entitled to be on a municipal roll is entitled to vote in elections relating to a river improvement trust. The question of age does not arise. Mr. Eddy is probably more up to date with the Local Government Act than I am because it is a few years since I was involved in local government affairs. That is the position as I understand it.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY.—That is the position according to clause 2. A person on the municipal roll, irrespective of age, qualifies to vote.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—That is so. I thank Mr. Bradbury for answering Mr. Eddy on my behalf.

Mr. Bradbury asked the number of river improvement trusts which are composed of elected members and the number constituted by nominated members. I have not that information readily at hand. If he wishes it to appear in *Hansard*, he may feel inclined to ask a question on the subject. However, I will get the information and forward it to him.

The clause was agreed to.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: ORDER OF BUSINESS—MINISTRY: ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—By leave, I move—

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday, October 17.

I hope the debate on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply will be continued next week, and probably completed. Generally, many members are not ready to proceed and the debate is continued until late in the sessional period. It is not desirable that the debate should drag on for too long.

The motion was agreed to.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province).—I wish to refer to a matter of Government administration. In explanation, I have been involved for a number of weeks in making representations on behalf of Echuca Primary School No. 208 concerning a new project to provide the school with a library. I have sent several letters to the Minister and have had discussions with the honorable gentleman and departmental officers. Today I received a letter from the Assistant Minister of Education, Mr. A. H. Scanlan, advising me that plans and specifications are expected to be prepared for this

project in the near future and indicating that a contract is likely to be let before Christmas. When I informed the persons associated with the project of that information today, I was rather surprised to find that they had already received the information from a person who is a Liberal Party candidate in northern Victoria. I know from a discussion I had with Mr. Scanlan last week that he has had some discussions previously with this candidate on this subject, and I can only assume that the candidate was advised at the same time or before I was.

It does not concern me greatly from an electoral point of view because I think it is a fair comment that, as the Liberal Party is having difficulty in obtaining candidates in my province, its stocks are not very high. However, I am concerned that party politics have been allowed to intrude into the efforts of a member on behalf of his electorate. I suppose I could be generous and put it down to inexperience on the part of the new Minister, but I raise this matter to ensure that if it is due to inexperience it does not develop into a bad habit. I take the strongest objection to this sort of thing. I bring it to the notice of the Leader of the House and ask whether it is the accepted practice to advise Liberal Party candidates of administrative decisions; if not, will the honorable gentleman take steps to ensure that this rather undesirable practice does not occur in the future?

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I do not know anything of the incident or of the information that has been conveyed to a candidate. It is outside my field at this stage. However, Mr. McDonald has asked me as Leader of the House to examine the position. I can only say that for my part and as a Minister I have not sought to take advantage of my position and play politics either in visiting areas or in leaking information.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—I quite agree.

Sir GILBERT CHANDLER.—Mr. McDonald's remarks will be conveyed to the appropriate quarter. Although I cannot account for all Ministers, I do not become involved in this practice.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.8 *p.m., until Tuesday, October* 17.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, October 11, 1972.

The SPEAKER **(Sir 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:—

MUNICIPALITIES.

CITIES OF BRUNSWICK AND COBURG: COMMUNITY SERVICES.

(Question No. 111)

Mr. TURNBULL (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

If he will ascertain and inform the House—

1. What amounts were paid out in the last financial year by the cities of Brunswick and Coburg, respectively, for immunization, pre-school centres, dental clinics, health centres, infant welfare centres, elderly citizens' centres, traffic lights, meals on wheels, and home-help services, respectively?

2. What subsidies were available in respect of payments made by each municipality for such services?

3. Where pre-school, infant welfare, and elderly citizens' centres are located in each such municipality?

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

1. These figures can be obtained only from the records of the cities of Brunswick and Coburg. The Local Government Department will obtain the figures and forward them to the honorable member.

2. It should be noted that the local government financial year covers a different period to that of the State Government.

Subsidies paid by the Department of Health in respect of payments made by the cities of Brunswick and Coburg during the State financial year ended on 30th June, 1972, are as follows:—

	Brunswick	*Coburg*
	$	$
Immunization	1,689	2,918
Pre-school centres ..	581	30,695
Dental clinics	1,982	—
Health centres (cleansing)	2,240	2,198
(chest clinic)	—	60
Infant welfare centres ..	9,500	12,189
Elderly citizens' centres including meals on wheels)	5,889	4,054
Home helps	17,928	16,645
Subsidies in respect of traffic lights paid through the Chief Secretary's Department were	1,174	—
In addition sums approved but not paid were ..	6,667	3,667

3. Location of pre-school centres—

Brunswick

Brunswick Pre-school Play Centre, 1 Glenlyon Road, Brunswick.

Brunswick Free Kindergarten, 61 Glenlyon Road, Brunswick.

North West Brunswick Kindergarten, 34 Rose Street, Brunswick.

East Brunswick Pre-school Play Centre, 320 Lygon Street, Brunswick East.

East Brunswick Free Kindergarten, 2 Noel Street, Brunswick East.

St Margaret Mary's Kindergarten, 54 Mitchell Street, Brunswick North.

Denzil Don Free Kindergarten, Wylie Park, South Daly Street, Brunswick West.

West Brunswick Pre-school Play Centre, 482 Victoria Street, Brunswick.

Infant Welfare Centre, 1 Glenlyon Road, Brunswick.

Infant Welfare Centre, 320 Lygon Street, Brunswick East.

Infant Welfare Centre, 75 Albion Street, Brunswick North.

Infant Welfare Centre, 482 Victoria Street, Brunswick West.

Coburg

Church of Christ Kindergarten, Bell Street, Coburg.

Newlands Kindergarten, cnr. of Elizabeth Street and Murray Road, Coburg.

Lake Park Kindergarten, Carr Street, Coburg North.

St. Linus Kindergarten, cnr. of Glyndon and Delta avenues, Merlynston.

Derby Street Kindergarten, 122 Derby Street, Pascoe Vale.

Pascoe Vale Methodist Kindergarten, cnr. of Cornwall Street and Kent Road, Pascoe Vale.

Brentwood Kindergarten, 36 Brentwood Avenue, Pascoe Vale South.

Doris Blackburn Pre-school Centre, 3 McKeon Avenue, Pascoe Vale South.

St. Andrew's Presbyterian Kindergarten, cnr. of Cumberland Road and Westgate Street, Pascoe Vale South.

Turner Street Pre-school Centre, 38 Turner Street, Pascoe Vale South.

Infant Welfare Centre, Civic Centre, Elm Grove, Coburg.

Infant Welfare Centre, 32 Woodlands Avenue, Coburg South.

Infant Welfare Centre, Bain Reserve, Merlyn Street, Merlynston.

Infant Welfare Centre, Medical Centre Building, 105 Elizabeth Street, East Coburg.

Infant Welfare Centre, Cumberland Road, Pascoe Vale.

Infant Welfare Centre, 43 Turner Street, Pascoe Vale South.

Location of elderly citizens' clubs—

Brunswick

Brunswick Elderly Citizens Club, Dawson Street, Brunswick.

East Brunswick Elderly Citizens Club, cnr. of Cross and Albert streets, East Brunswick.

North West Brunswick Elderly Citizens Club, McColl Street, Brunswick West.

Old Pioneers Elderly Citizens Club, Temple Park, South Brunswick.

Coburg

Coburg Elderly Citizens Club, Harding Street, Coburg.

Newlands Elderly Citizens Club, Murray Road, East Coburg.

HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES: SUBSIDIES.

(Question No. 162)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister for Local Government—

What proportion Government subsidies represented in the total cost to all municipalities of health and welfare services in the last year for which records are available?

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

Figures of a nature which would enable this question to be answered are not kept by any State Government department.

However the Commonwealth Government Statist publishes statistics which include local government revenue and expenditure. The latest figures published in the *Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia* for 1972 cover the period 1968–69.

UNIVERSITIES.

STUDENTS QUALIFIED FOR ENTRY.

(Question No. 382)

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

In respect of students who qualified to enter universities in Victoria in the past three years, how many were educated at State, independent Catholic, and independent non-Catholic secondary schools, respectively?

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

We have requested the Chairman of the Victorian Universities Admissions Committee to supply the required information. The honorable member will be advised by letter as soon as a reply comes to hand.

WHEAT INDUSTRY.

QUOTAS.

(Question No. 383)

Mr. MOSS (Murray Valley) asked the Minister for Conservation, for the Minister of Agriculture—

Whether, in view of the current world wheat situation and the inability of the Australian Wheat Board to meet export demands, the Minister will take the initiative in bringing about the abolition of wheat quotas; if not, why?

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

The continuance or abolition of the wheat delivery quota scheme on an Australia-wide basis is a matter for determination by Commonwealth and State Governments through the Australian Agricultural Council.

The scheme was implemented at the specific request of, and in accordance with the principles agreed upon by, the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation. The continuance or abolition of the scheme is therefore a matter for consideration and recommendation initially by that body.

I understand that the general question of wheat delivery quotas is currently under consideration by the federation, and will be discussed at a meeting of the federation to be held next week. Any recommendation in the matter by the federation will be considered at the Commonwealth-State level.

So far as Victoria is concerned any action in relation to wheat delivery quotas will be taken after consultation with and having regard to the views expressed by the federation's affiliated body in this State, the Victorian Farmers Union.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

REGIONAL DIRECTORATES.

(Question No. 384)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Education—

1. In what parts of the State regional directorates have been established?

2. What is the extent and area covered by the directorates and which schools are located within each directorate?

3. Who are the regional directors and what are their educational qualifications?

4. In what areas of education policy formulation regional directors are—(*a*) subordinate to other officers of the Education Department, specifying in each case the officer concerned; and (*b*) autonomous?

5. What was the cost, excluding the director's salary, of establishing each regional directorate and what is the present annual cost, indicating the nature of such costs?

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

1. Regions have been established for Ballarat, Bendigo, and Gippsland; with regional offices at Ballarat, Bendigo and Moe respectively.

2. The areas included in each region were set out in my answer to question No. 162 in this House on Tuesday, 14th September,

1971. Since then there has been one amendment—the Shire of Daylesford and Glenlyon is now included in the Ballarat region instead of the Bendigo one.

3. The three regional directors of education and their educational qualifications are—

Ballarat region—Mr. R. J. Dobell, B.A., Dip.Ed., T.P.T.C., M.A.C.E.;
Bendigo region—Mr. C. R. Moyle, B.A., Dip.Ed., T.P.T.C., M.A.C.E.;
Gippsland region—Mr. L. A. Falk, B.A., Dip.Ed., T.P.T.C.

4. In all matters the regional directors are responsible to the Director-General, but in matters of State-wide policy affecting the operation of a particular division and where policy has been established by the division they are subordinate to the director of the division concerned. The regional directors are given freedom to represent the department within the framework outlined above and to communicate with schools and the general public on issues relating to the local area. Autonomy in matters of school maintenance will be effective from 1st January, 1973, and additional areas of responsibility will be added from time to time.

The regional directors have made a significant impact on community involvement in education in their respective regions.

5. It will take some time to compile this information, and I will advise the honorable member by letter when it has been prepared.

BOOK ALLOWANCES.

(Question No. 385)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Education—

1. What is the scope and amount of existing book allowances made by the Education Department?

2. Whether it is intended to extend the scope of these allowances this financial year?

3. What was the total cost of this scheme in 1970–71, 1971–72, and in this financial year?

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

1. Free requisites allowances are granted on behalf of pupils whose parents gross income does not exceed $46.30, plus $1.50 for the third and each successive dependent child, and the amounts payable are as follows:—

Primary schools

Grades 1 and 2 ..	$2.50 per annum
Grades 3 and 4 ..	$4.50 per annum
Grades 5 and 6 ..	$6 per annum

Secondary and technical schools

Forms I. and II. ..	$14 per annum
Forms III. and IV. ..	$16 per annum
Form V.	$18 per annum
Form VI.	$34 per annum

All pupils in form VI. who do not hold any scholarship or do not receive any assistance receive a book allowance of $20 per annum.

2. In 1973 the permissible income for the granting of free requisites and book allowances will be increased from $46.30 to $51, plus $1.50 for the third and each successive dependent child.

Amounts payable in primary schools will be as follows:—

Grades 1 and 2 ..	$2.75 per annum
Grades 3 and 4 ..	$5 per annum
Grades 5 and 6 ..	$6.50 per annum.

In 1973 all pupils in form V. who do not hold any scholarship or do not receive any assistance will receive a book allowance of $10 per annum.

3. 1970-71—$368,760.
1971-72—$386,467.
1972-73—$697,000 (estimated).

REMEDIAL EDUCATION TRAINING SESSIONS.

(Question No. 388)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether the Director of Special Services has granted permission to special schoolteachers to attend training sessions conducted by Dr. Carl Delacato on 30th and 31st October, but has refused permission for remedial teachers to attend who also use the Delacato method of remedial education; if so, why?

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

A limited number of teachers in special schools, at the discretion of the principals of those schools, have been granted permission to attend seminar sessions conducted by Dr. Delacato on 30th and 31st October. Permission has also been granted to teachers in charge of special education units.

It was not deemed advisable to grant blanket permission to teachers in opportunity/remedial centres or remedial centres as these teachers do not have direct supervision and would therefore not be in a position to evaluate Dr. Delacato's methods and their possible application to their centres.

It is proposed that at the conclusion of Dr. Delacato's seminar the Special Services Division representatives who attended the seminars will be asked to evaluate the methods and in the light of this evaluation consideration will be given to incorporating this evaluation in future in-service education programmes conducted by the Special Services Division for teachers in the remedial field.

MELBOURNE ELECTORATE: TRANSPORT AND ENROLMENTS OF SCHOLARS.

(Question No. 392)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Minister of Education—

1. How many State school children, resident within the electoral district of Melbourne, are transported by bus on a daily basis to schools or school sites outside that district?

2. What schools normally located within that district have class-rooms or other facilities outside the district?

3. How many pupils are enrolled in—(*a*) primary; and (*b*) secondary State schools, within the district?

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

1. 480 children from the Boundary Road, North Melbourne, Primary School are transported by bus on a daily basis to the school's temporary site at Fisherman's Bend.

2. Boundary Road, North Melbourne, is the only primary school within the district which has class-rooms or other facilities outside the electoral district of Melbourne. No high school has class-rooms or facilities outside the district.

3. Enrolments.

(*a*)	3552 Baltara	81/65
	112 Carlton	176
	2605 Carlton	328
	250 Flemington	872
	2374 Kensington	926
	1402 North Melbourne ..	297
	2566 North Melbourne ..	491
	5023 Royal Children's Hospital	34
	4609 Royal Park Special	41/50
	4465 Travancore ..	33
	1689 West Melbourne ..	150
	1406 Yarra Park ..	379
	4599 Yooralla, Carlton ..	87/35
(*b*)	H.S. Flemington.. ..	1862
	G.H.S. Flemington ..	369
	University H.S.	999

HIGH SCHOOL COMPOSITE FEES.

(Question No. 407)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether discussions have been held with the Victorian High School Principals Association concerning the phasing out of composite fees in 1973; if so, what were the results of these discussions?

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

Discussions have been held between representatives of the Education Department, principals of primary, secondary and technical schools, the Victorian Council of School Organizations, and the Victorian Federation of Mothers Clubs.

Following these discussions recommendations concerning rate of payment per pupil in primary and post-primary schools for the first six months of 1973 are being considered and information will be circulated to schools shortly.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOOLS IN BUNDOORA AREA: PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS.

(Question No. 419)

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

What action has been taken, or is proposed for acquisition of property in the Bundoora area for the establishment of additional secondary and primary schools, what are the areas and locations of such sites and when it is proposed to erect buildings on these sites?

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

Three sites in the Bundoora area, two post-primary and one primary, are currently being considered by the departmental sites committee. It is not known at this stage when building operations on any of these sites could commence.

SPECIAL SCHOOL FOR LOWER PLENTY: PROPERTY ACQUISITION.

(Question No. 420)

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

Whether any land has been acquired in Old Eltham Road, Lower Plenty, for the establishment of a special school; if so, what is the area and location, what type of facility is proposed, and when it will be ready for occupancy?

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

The department has not acquired any land in Old Eltham Road, Lower Plenty, for special school purposes.

POLLUTION.

DISPOSAL OF MERCURY INTO STREAMS.

(Question No. 387)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Health—

Whether producers of chlorine and caustic soda in Victoria are disposing of mercury into streams adjacent to their factories; if so, whether any attempt has been made by the Department of Health to test the sediment downstream from such factories?

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

Producers of these chemicals are disposing of industrial effluents into streams adjacent to their factories and these effluents do contain traces of mercury.

In the over-all mercury survey plan, potentially contaminated sediments will be tested after the current fish and shell fish survey is completed.

TOURISM.

FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS FOR PROJECTS.

(Question No. 391)

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas) asked the Minister without Portfolio, for the Minister for Tourism—

What amount of money has been allocated to tourist projects in the electoral district of Dundas in each of the past five years, stating the nature of the work and the cost?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister without Portfolio).—The answer supplied by the Minister for Tourism is—

—	*Tourist developmental works	Motor boating facilities	Short lengths of tourist access road	Loans for tourist works
	$	$	$	$
1967–68 ..	1,980	2,960	28,000	17,500
1968–69 ..	24,256	..	22,400	..
1969–70 ..	30,020	240	15,150	..
1970–71 ..	8,820	1,360	..	..
1971–72 ..	34,300	18,400	..	..
Totals ..	99,376	22,960	65,550	17,500

* These works are principally caravan park facilities.

(Question No. 405)

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg) asked the Minister without Portfolio, for the Minister for Tourism—

How many municipalities in the metropolitan area have received financial assistance from the Tourist Fund, indicating which municipalities, for what projects, and the amount in each case?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister without Portfolio).—The answer supplied by the Minister for Tourism is—

No subsidies from the Tourist Fund have been approved for tourist developmental works at locations within the Melbourne metropolitan area as recognized in 1961.

Financial assistance has been provided from the Tourist Fund (Boating) for motor boating facilities within this area as follows:—

Municipality or authority	Project	Amount
		$
Chelsea	Patterson River, Carrum	19,200
Dandenong Valley Authority	Patterson River recreation area	14,058
Frankston ..	Oliver's Hill reserve ..	3,200
	Kananook Creek foreshore	1,600
	Frankston foreshore ..	9,000
St. Kilda.. ..	St. Kilda foreshore (loan for launching facilities at marina)	56,480

STATE RIVERS AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION.

WATER SUPPLY FOR REDBANK.

(Question No. 396)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Water Supply—

1. When it is expected that works for the water supply to Redbank will be completed?

2. What work has been finalized and what is the cost to date?

3. What amount has been allocated this financial year for further works on this supply?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—The answers are—

1. Works for the supply of water to Redbank have been completed by the Redbank Waterworks Trust.

2. The cost of the works to date totals $24,940.

3. An amount of $7,000 has been allocated this financial year to finalize all payments associated with the installation of the scheme.

WATER SUPPLY FOR NAVARRE.

(Question No. 397)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Water Supply—

1. When it is expected that works for the water supply to Navarre will be completed?

2. What work has been finalized and what is the cost to date?

3. What amount has been allocated this financial year for further works on this supply?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—The answers are—

1. Proposals for a town water supply to Navarre have been submitted by the Avoca Shire Council to the Water Commission for examination.

The most practicable means of providing such a supply appears to be as an extension from the existing Landsborough Waterworks Trust's system at an estimated cost of some $80,000.

Although the technical aspects of the proposal are considered to be generally satisfactory there are certain financial considerations which have yet to be finalized. It is understood a report on this matter will be forwarded to the commission in the near future.

2. See answer to part 1 of the question.

3. No loan funds have been provided for the construction of any of these works during the current financial year.

APPRENTICES.

(Question No. 426)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Minister of Water Supply—

1. How many apprenticeships have been commenced with the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission during each of the past five years?

2. How many applications were received in respect of each of these apprenticeships in each of those years?

3. What is the proposed intake of apprentices for 1973 and whether these positions have been advertised; if so, with what result?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—The answers are—

1. 1968—Two
   1969—Four
   1970—Two
   1971—One
   1972—Seven.

2. The detailed information in regard to numbers of applications is not available. However, in 1972 two positions were filled by the appointment of already indentured apprentices and there were 57 applications for the remaining five positions, 33 of which were for two positions at Frankston.

3. The commission proposed to offer either nine or ten apprenticeships for 1973, applications for which will be called for in the near future.

CEMETERIES.

LAWN SECTIONS: BRONZE PLAQUES.

(Question No. 403)

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg) asked the Minister of Health—

1. Whether the lawn sections of Castlemaine; Horsham; Fern Tree Gully; New Melbourne, Fawkner; Pine Ridge, Coburg; Memorial Park, Altona; and Williamstown cemeteries, respectively, accept the standard bronze plaque supplied for deceased ex-servicemen by the Australian War Graves Commission; if not, why?

2. Whether an entitlement exists for the supply of a bronze plaque from the Australian War Graves Commission in respect of all deceased ex-servicemen?

3. What is the dimension of the bronze plaque supplied by the commission?

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

1. Inquiries will be made from the trusts of the cemeteries named and the honorable member will be advised.

2 and 3. These matters are not determined by any State authority. The information sought by the honorable member could probably be obtained from the War Graves Commission established by the Commonwealth Government.

DECENTRALIZATION.

COMMONWEALTH AND STATE OFFICERS COMMITTEE.

(Question No. 404)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister without Portfolio, for the Minister for State Development and Decentralization—

1. Who was the Victorian officer representing this State on the Commonwealth–State Officers Committee on decentralization?

2. Whether that officer was present at meetings of the committee on the 4th and 5th March, 1965, 30th November, 1966, 7th February, 1969, 12th October, 1971, and 27th April, 1972, respectively?

3. Whether a report of this committee was forwarded to the Victorian Government on or about 16th June, 1972; if so, whether the Minister will lay the report on the table of the Library?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister without Portfolio).—The answer supplied by the Minister for State Development and Decentralization is—

1. The Director of Industrial Development (formerly, the Director of State Development), Mr. N. T. Howard.

2. Yes.

3. Yes; yes.

COMMONWEALTH ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE METROPOLIS.

(Question No. 409)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister without Portfolio, for the Minister for Development and Decentralization—

If he will lay on the table of the Library all correspondence, files or submissions made by or on behalf of his department, seeking Commonwealth assistance for the implementation of the Government's policy of decentralization following the Government's adoption of the recommendations of the Decentralization Advisory Committee in its report on Selection of Places Outside the Metropolis of Melbourne for Accelerated Development of 26th September, 1967?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister without Portfolio).—The answer supplied by the Minister for State Development and Decentralization is—

Yes.

LAND CONSERVATION COUNCIL.

SURVEY OF NORTH-EASTERN VICTORIA.

(Question No. 406)

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla) asked the Minister for Conservation—

1. When the Land Conservation Council will complete its survey of north-eastern Victoria and when the report will be available?

2. When it is expected that Crown land in the area will be available for selection?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—The answer is—

1. The Governor in Council has approved a division of the Land Conservation Council's north-eastern area into five districts. A study of district 1 (Corryong–Tallangatta area) will be published by the end of this year.

It is likely that the investigation of district 2 (Benalla–Mansfield area) will be completed early next year and it is expected that the report will be available by June, 1973.

No date can be given at this stage concerning the reports of the north-eastern area districts 3, 4 and 5. Investigations will be carried out in the Melbourne area, the Mallee area and the East Gippsland area, districts 1 and 2, before a study is made of the remaining districts of the north-eastern area.

2. The Government will consider selection of Crown land and all other forms of public land use after it has received the recommendations of the Land Conservation Council.

KINDERGARTENS AND PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES.

NUMBER ERECTED AND PROPOSED: FURNISHINGS.

(Question No. 408)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Minister of Health—

1. How many kindergartens have been erected in Victoria over the past three years?

2. What plans are in hand to build further kindergartens and pre-school centres in the next three years?

3. What are the furnishing needs of these institutions?

4. Which firm or firms are the suppliers of this furniture and whether tenders are called for its supply?

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

1. Ninety-three.

2, 3 and 4. It is not possible to forecast the erection of pre-school centres with any certainty. The Government made available this year a sum of $400,000 from which capital grants towards the cost of erection of infant welfare and pre-school centres are made and it is reasonable to assume that further sums will be made available in future years. Local committees are required to find all other costs and these bodies enter into arrangements for the supply of centre furnishings.

The Department of Health sets out, as a condition of maintenance subsidy, minimum requirement as to furnishings etc., for pre-school centres. A copy of these requirements has been forwarded to the honorable member.

MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN.

DAY TRAINING CENTRES: FUNDS: EDUCATION.

(Question No. 415)

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

Whether any day training centres for the mentally retarded have made requests for building funds; if so—(*a*) which organizations; (*b*) what was the nature of each application; (*c*) when each application was made; and (*d*) whether any such organization is currently operating or is awaiting funds before it is able to commence operations?

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

(*a*)-(*c*) The following committees are awaiting approval of capital grants:—

Name of centre	Details of project	Cost	Date of application
		$	
Warragul	Construction of sheltered workshop..	80,000	6th October, 1972
Ballarat	Sheltered workshop extensions ..	10,000	Pending
Wodonga	Erection of new centre	100,000	28th July, 1971
Echuca	Erection of new centre	120,000	5th March, 1972
Portland	Construction of garage	500	Pending
Berwick	Erection of new centre	144,000	30th September, 1971
Bairnsdale.. ..	Erection of new centre	88,000	25th February, 1972
Springvale.. ..	Erection of centre	124,883	3rd September, 1971
Brighton	Rebuilding of centre	121,400	6th August, 1971
Ivanhoe	New centre at Macleod	155,688	11th August, 1972
Traralgon	Sheltered workshop extensions ..	11,800	19th July, 1972
Fern Tree Gully ..	Stage 3, sheltered workshop ..	101,600	13th December, 1971
Maffra	Construction of sheltered workshop	60,000	Pending
Croydon	Sheltered workshop extensions ..	75,000	Pending
Ivanhoe	Alterations and extensions ..	10,000	11th August, 1972
Maryborough ..	New centre	60,000	5th March, 1972
Whittlesea.. ..	New centre at Epping	70,000	Pending
Doncaster ..	Purchase of land	10,000	Pending
Ivanhoe	Stage 2 of new centre	116,630	Pending
Oakleigh	Training and special care centre—increased costs	6,068	20th August, 1972
Corio	Garage construction	1,944.80	21st September, 1972

(*d*) The only centres in the preceding list which are not currently operating are Berwick, Springvale, Whittlesea and Doncaster. Negotiations are in course for the use of temporary premises at Whittlesea and Doncaster pending approval of grants and erection of new centres.

(Question No. 417)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Health—

1. Whether there was a reduction in funds allocated for construction of day training centres in 1971–72 as compared with 1970–71; if so, why and what were the amounts involved?

2. Whether education through such day training centres is now available to all children eligible to attend; if not, what efforts are being made to provide such an education?

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

1. There was no reduction in funds allocated for construction of day training centres in 1971–72 as compared with 1970–71. Expenditure in 1970–71 was $127,175, and in 1971–72, $586,041.

2. Training through day centres is not available to all children eligible to attend. The construction of a number of new centres is being planned as well as extensions to existing centres and negotiations are in progress for the opening of centres in temporary premises. This additional accommodation will reduce waiting lists at existing centres, and will provide accommodation in areas where none is currently available but it is likely that there will always be areas where, because of insufficient suitable children in the area, it will not be possible to establish training facilities.

HOUSING COMMISSION AND CONCRETE HOUSE PROJECT.

APPRENTICES.

(Question No. 423)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Chief Secretary, for the Minister of Housing—

1. How many apprenticeships have been commenced during each of the past five years with the Housing Commission and the Concrete House Project, respectively?

2. How many applications were received in respect of these apprenticeships in each of those years?

3. What is the proposed intake of apprentices for 1973?

For **Mr. MEAGHER** (Chief Secretary), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

1. (*a*) The Housing Commission does not employ apprentices.

(b) Concrete House Project.

1968	4
1969	4
1970	4
1971	4
1972	3

2. Apprenticeships are not advertised by the Concrete House Project; recruitment is through personal recommendation or by the Commonwealth Employment Bureau.

3. The proposed intake of apprentices at the Concrete House Project for 1973 is one.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

TRADESMEN: APPRENTICES.

(Question No. 425)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Minister for Conservation, for the Minister of Agriculture—

1. How many tradesmen in apprenticeship trades are employed by the Department of Agriculture?

2. How many apprenticeships have been commenced with the department during each of the past five years?

3. What is the proposed intake of apprentices for 1973?

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

1. Fifty.

2. Nil.

3. Nil.

COLLEGE OF SPEECH THERAPY.

APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION: GRADUATES: FUTURE EXPANSION.

(Question No. 434)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Education—

1. How many students applied for admission to the College of Speech Therapy for 1972, indicating how many—(a) were Victorians; (b) were accepted; and (c) accepted students were Victorians?

2. Why suitable Victorian applicants are denied entry to the college in favour of interstate applicants?

3. How many speech therapy graduates entered the profession in 1971-72 and whether graduates experience difficulty in obtaining a position in Victoria?

4. Whether the college intends to expand in the near future?

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

1. (a) 250.

(b) 31.

(c) 29.

2. Interstate and Victorian students were in open competition for selection. As the college enjoys Commonwealth funds as well as State funds it is the policy to accept a maximum of three students from the following States:—Tasmania, South Australia and Western Australia; however, only two Western Australian students fulfilled requirements for 1972 admission.

3. Twenty-seven graduated. All Victorian graduates are in positions.

4. The school will expand according to the availability of clinical training facilities. At present this is the largest impediment to expansion.

MENTAL HEALTH AUTHORITY.

INSTITUTIONS: PATIENTS: VACANCIES.

(Question No. 435)

Mr. TURNBULL (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Health—

1. How many persons are—(a) in-patients; and (b) out-patients of the Mental Health Authority, indicating the names of each hospital or clinic and the number of patients at each such institution?

2. How many persons are awaiting treatment or admission to such institutions?

3. How many vacancies there are in each institution and for what positions?

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

1 and 3.

Name of hospital	In-patients	Vacancies
Psychiatric hospitals—		
Ballarat	26	22
Bendigo	24	24
Dandenong	33	15
Larundel	221	11
Mont Park	41	12
Plenty	65	4
Royal Park	189	21
Traralgon	31	7
Ambermere	17	3
Malvern	19	..
Mont Park N.P.C.	32	..
Novar (Ballarat)	8	19
Parkville	28	8
Mental hospitals—		
Ararat	343	..
Ballarat	866	..
Beechworth	513	..
Bendigo	40	8
Bundoora	246	13
Larundel	425	26
Kew	762	..
Mont Park	698	69
Plenty	372	24
Traralgon	120	14
Warrnambool	120	13
Training centres—		
Ararat	373	..
Beechworth	246	..
Janefield	500	..
Kew	854	..
Sandhurst	69	15
Stawell	203	..
St. Nicholas	193	..
Sunbury	863	..
Warrnambool	119	4
Travancore	36	..

Clinics	Number of out-patients
Alexandra Parade, Fitzroy	2,117
Ambermere (Shepparton)	617
Ararat District and Mental Hospital	162
Bairnsdale	31
Ballarat (Norwood)	1,585
Ballarat (children)	128
Benalla	103
Bendigo	953
Bouverie Street, Carlton	845
Castlemaine	51
Charlton	10
Children's Clinic (including Turana, Winlaton)	1,850
Clarendon, East Melbourne	1,143
Dandenong	2,390
Dandenong—child guidance	82
Echuca	77
Fern Tree Gully	103
Hamilton	99
Gresswell	71
Kerang	54
Kew, children's cottages	52
Malvern	1,975
Leongatha	32
Maryborough	215
Mildura	338
Myrtleford	2
Observatory, South Yarra	1,540
Parkville	2,201
Pentridge	503
Ernest Jones, Preston	2,002
Royal Park	1,531
St. Nicholas	979
Sale	38
Shepparton G.V. Hospital	59
Stawell	65
Swan Hill	118
Traralgon	424
Travancore	518
Wangaratta	289
Warragul	82
Warrnambool Base Hospital	879
Wimmera Base Hospital, Horsham	148

2. Persons awaiting treatment—

Geriatrics	180
Brain damaged patients	21
Mentally retarded—	
Most urgent	273
Urgent	213
Pending	804

There are no persons waiting for treatment in psychiatric hospitals.

BIRMID AUTO CASTINGS PTY. LTD.

INSPECTIONS BY INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE SECTION.

(Question No. 437)

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

1. On what occasions Birmid Auto Castings Pty. Ltd., Geelong, have been subject to inspection by the Industrial Hygiene Section of the Department of Health since 1st January, 1960?

2. Whether an inspection was made during May of 1962; if so—(*a*) what sections were inspected; (*b*) what tests were made; (*c*) what were the results of such tests; (*d*) whether the subsequent report on these tests indicated a high level of industrial noise and dust; (*e*) how many million particles of dust per cubic ft were recorded at each of the test sites and what was the silica content of the dust measured; (*f*) whether these tests revealed that dust levels exceeded the maximum permissible; if so—(i) whether this was reported to the appropriate officer of the department; (ii) to what extent the dust level exceeded regulations or standards adopted by the department; and (iii) what were the average number of hours per week worked by company employees in these condition at this time?

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

In my reply to question No. 330 on 27th September, 1972, which was asked by the honorable member, I advised him that conditions at the premises of this firm were at the present time the subject of inquiry by a local industrial board and that the honorable member could peruse the file on the matter in my office if he wished to do so.

The conditions are unchanged but the honorable member may again peruse the file should he so wish.

INSPECTIONS OF NOISE AND DUST HAZARDS.

(Question No. 438)

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

In respect of inspections of Birmid Auto Castings Pty. Ltd., Geelong—

1. Whether a report on noise levels was submitted to an officer of the Department of Health during 1963; if so—(*a*) by whom and when; (*b*) whether the report indicated noise levels of between 95 and 115 decibels; (*c*) whether these levels are dangerous to the hearing of persons working in noise of this level; (*d*) what period is determined by standards used by the department to be the maximum exposure per day to noise levels of 95–115 decibels before damage to hearing takes place; and (*e*) for what period per day employees concerned were exposed to noise at the time of the report?

2. Whether any further inspection of noise and dust hazards occurred between 1963 and December, 1971; if so—(*a*) when; (*b*) by whom; (*c*) at whose request; and (*d*) with what result?

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

In my reply to question No. 330 on 27th September, 1972, which was asked by the honorable member, I advised him that conditions at the premises of this firm were at the present time the subject of inquiry by a local industrial board and that the honorable member could peruse the file on the matter in my office if he wished to do so.

The conditions are unchanged but the honorable member may again peruse the file should he so wish.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

PORT PHILLIP BAY.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—Can the Minister of Mines inform the House whether any drilling is taking place in any part of Port Phillip Bay? If so, what is its purpose, and are the drilling operations being carried out under the written authority of the Minister?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—No drilling operations are being carried out in Port Phillip Bay. If I may, I shall enlarge on that, because of articles I have read in the daily newspapers in which it has been suggested that drilling would take place in the bay. Certainly, there are two petroleum exploration permits which cover portion of Port Phillip Bay. The first is P.E.P. 6, which was originally issued in 1956. The second is P.E.P. 67, which was issued in 1969.

Applications have previously been made to carry out seismic work in the bay and there has also been one application for a well. Both applications were refused.

This matter has been under consideration by me as the Minister and by the Government for some time. Normally, it is not the practice to announce something which will be done in a few months' time in relation to exploration permits, but because of the press publicity, I have announced that if applications are received to renew these permits the area which covers Port Phillip Bay will be excised from the permit area. I trust that this will stop any further confusion on whether drills will be put into Port Phillip Bay.

UNCLAIMED TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD DIVIDENDS.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—What decision has the Minister for Youth and Recreation made on distributing the unclaimed Totalizator Agency Board dividends which run to about $1·3 million a year? To what purpose does the Minister intend to direct that these dividends be applied?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Youth and Recreation).—When the Act to establish the new Ministry is passed by Parliament and any necessary supplementary measures to finance the duties and responsibilities under the Act are enacted, all these matters will be resolved. Apart from that, no decision has been made on the matter raised by the honorable member for Northcote.

CLOUD SEEDING.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—I address a question to the Minister for Conservation as the representative of the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the intention of the Government to use aircraft to seed clouds in an effort to bring rain to the drought-affected areas of Victoria?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has this matter under constant review. I should point out to the House that the best scientific evaluation of the seeding of clouds during the 1967–68 drought suggests that there was very little if any recognizable advantage anywhere in this State. On the best information which is before the Minister, I feel that he and the Government are reluctant to proceed with such a venture. From the statistical point of view there is even some suggestion that where cloud seeding took place there could have been a reduction in the amount of rain which fell.

CHILD-CARE CENTRES.

Mr. A. T. EVANS (Ballaarat North).—Can the Minister of Health inform the House what part his department will play in the scheme announced by the Commonwealth Government to help child-care centres, and whether the State Government will have to make matching contributions?

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—The part played by the Victorian Department of Health in the scheme announced in the Federal Parliament last night will be minimal. If

the honorable member for Broadmeadows, who is interjecting, had been reading his paper with the same care as he reads the Notice Paper he would realize that the Federal Government has dramatically entered into the child-care field rather coincidentally. In its care for children attending child-minding centres and crèches, the State Government subsidizes the organizations running the crèches or day nurseries to the extent of paying $6,000 for capital expenditure and providing finance for 80 per cent. of the staff requirements. The Commonwealth Government has indicated that there will be no assistance given to child-minding centres run by the State and that assistance will be given only to centres controlled by voluntary organizations.

Mr. WILTON.—They must hate you!

Mr. ROSSITER.—Not as much as I hate you.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I ask honorable members to consider that this is question time and interjections only prolong each question. The Minister of Health.

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—What about the kindergartens run by the Presbyterian Church?

The SPEAKER.—Order! There will be no further interjections. The Minister of Health.

Mr. ROSSITER.—I am sorry I provoked that interjection. The Commonwealth Government is in this field now by virtue of the fact that there will be a Commonwealth Act. The State Government will examine the proposition very closely to see how it further affects the Government's responsibilities in child minding.

RAILWAY COSTS.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—As a result of the answer given by the Premier and Treasurer yesterday to a question without notice concerning the Commonwealth Government's being prepared to take over the Victorian Railways, and following the refusal of the present Prime Minister to accept the offer made by the former Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, can it be assumed that the Victorian Government has now withdrawn that offer and will not consider remaking it to any future Commonwealth Government?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—What I said yesterday was that no proposition of that nature had been made by the State Government. As the Leader of the Opposition has rightly pointed out, an offer was made by the former Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, and it was refused by the Prime Minister last year. What I said yesterday, and I repeat it, was that the State Government would be interested in any proposition which involved a takeover by the Commonwealth Government of the debt on the railways because the State Government regards that as developmental costs in line with numerous other developmental costs throughout Australia which have been incurred by the Federal Government before and especially since.

Mr. HOLDING.—That is withdrawing the offer?

Mr. HAMER.—No, it is not withdrawing the offer. It is making a different offer that if the Commonwealth Government is interested in acquiring the sizeable debt and the debt charges that go with it, the State Government will be interested.

FISHING INDUSTRY.

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong).—Concerning the recently announced assistance to the fishing industry on the promotional side, has the Premier either directly or indirectly been in touch with the new Victorian promotion body set up by the fishermen and, if so, have steps been taken to ensure that promotional money is being made available through that organization?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—I will endeavour to answer the question so far as I am aware of the situation. I had discussions with the industry and the Commercial Fisheries Council some weeks ago. Since then a public relations firm has written to me announcing that it has been appointed by the fishing industry to undertake a promotion programme. The firm has not yet submitted the programme and I have not had an opportunity of seeing what it has in mind.

I indicated that, in all the circumstances, the Government would be ready to consider participating in and supporting such a scheme so that the sale of fish can be promoted and to help the fishing industry. I am now awaiting details of the formulation of the plan.

FOURTH UNIVERSITY.

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—Can the Minister of Education inform me whether he has received submissions from Geelong, Ballarat and Bendigo in respect of the fourth university? Has he received any approaches from the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science on that matter and is an announcement likely to be made within the next two weeks on where the site will be?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I understand that one of the reports has arrived in the office. I have not yet read it. I will be waiting for the three reports to arrive. The areas will be visited and there will be no decision within the next fortnight.

YALLOURN W POWER STATION DISPUTE.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—In view of the decision of the work force from the Yallourn W power station to abide by the proposal of Mr. Justice Aird for a return to work, will the Minister for Fuel and Power use his good offices to obtain an acceptance of this proposal by the employers so that construction work on this power station will recommence and so that this multi-million dollar project will finish on time?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—I am not sure what is my jurisdiction in this matter. I understand that a meeting was held last Sunday and that yesterday there was to be a meeting between the contractors and the unions. I am not aware of what took place at that meeting or whether further meetings will be held. However, I have endeavoured to keep myself aware of what has been going on, and if there is anything I can do to get the job started again I shall be only too happy to do it.

WHEAT QUOTAS.

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas).—I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that large wheat sales to China have now been achieved and that a Federal Labor Government would recognize that country and increase sales to China, will the honorable gentleman approach the existing Federal Government to see whether quotas can be lifted so that further wheat orders can be obtained?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—On the question of wheat quotas, the Government has always acted with the advice of the Grains Division of the Victorian Farmers Union and will continue to do so.

EUTHANASIA.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—Can the Minister of Health inform me whether he has seen the press reports circulated today that a doctor has allowed between 200 and 300 patients to die and has, in fact, assisted some to die? If he has seen these reports, as a responsible Minister will he investigate whether this claim is authentic and whether it is common practice in the medical profession in Victoria?

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—Yes, I have seen the reports. Yes, I have asked the Medical Board for a report on the matter. Yes, I am concerned about it and I hope the Australian Medical Association, Victorian Branch, will inform me of the ethics of the situation and the position of this doctor in particular.

BOMB SCARE AT VICTORIAN COMPANIES OFFICE.

Mr. McLAREN (Bennettswood).—Following the bomb scare at the Victorian Companies Office in mid-September, what action has been taken to ensure that both the staff and the irreplaceable records in that office are protected? Has consideration been given to the duplication of the records so that they may be kept in a separate place from the Victorian Companies Office?

Sir GEORGE REID (Attorney-General).—Investigation of the incident of the threatened bomb scare is in the hands of the police, who are taking whatever action is practicable in the circumstances for the protection of the people concerned. A scheme for duplication of records and microfilming has been approved by the Public Service Board and the Law Department. This will be implemented as soon as funds are made available for the necessary staff and equipment.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—Is the Minister of Education aware of the regulations of his department which prohibit more than two members of the State schools mothers' clubs serving on the school committee or advisory council? Is this not discriminatory against women, and particularly against women with a particular interest in schools?

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I think the honorable member is asking an opinion of the Minister.

Mr. DOUBE.—Is it not a fact that the regulations discriminate against these women who have a particular interest in the schools and raise millions of dollars towards education?

The SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member is asking the Minister his opinion of a set of circumstances. Questions should be directed to matters of Government administration and what has been done and what has not been done. I suggest the question might be rephrased.

YALLOURN W POWER STATION DISPUTE.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—I wish to ask a question supplementary to that asked by the honorable member for Morwell of the Minister for Fuel and Power. In view of the effect on the livelihood of thousands of workers in the Latrobe Valley, will the Minister undertake to call a meeting of contractors in an endeavour to persuade them to accept the decision of the independent arbitrator, Mr. Justice Aird, on the current dispute, a decision which has been accepted by the workers in the area?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—This matter has been in arbitration before Mr. Commissioner Watson, Mr. Justice Aird, and back to Mr. Commissioner Watson, and several meetings have taken place. Whether a Minister can give directions to people to act on a suggestion is beyond my ken at the moment. As I said to the honorable member for Morwell, I am endeavouring to keep close to the situation, and if I can help in any way I shall certainly do so.

PENINSULA GREYHOUND RACING CLUB.

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland).—Has the Minister for Youth and Recreation received a letter from Frankston City Council stating that if a greyhound licence is granted to the Peninsula Greyhound Racing

Club, land will be made available for a sporting complex for greyhound racing and soccer? If so, what action has been taken in the matter?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Youth and Recreation).—I could have received that letter; I do not know. I have been so swamped with letters in the past three weeks that in some cases there could be three or four days' delay before incoming letters are actually seen by me. I have not read the letter, but when I receive it I will be prepared to discuss with the honorable member any decision that I might make.

COUNSELLING STAFF AT SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I direct a question to the Minister of Education. What trained counselling and guidance staff is provided by the Government at secondary schools to overcome the serious shortage of this type of facility at these schools compared with private schools?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—Approximately 120 staff are attached to the Psychology and Guidance Branch. That is approximately six or seven times the number that were in that branch when the Government came into office. There has been a certain problem with the senior staff of this branch, and that is a matter which has been taken up by the department with the Teachers Tribunal. The appointment of staff to independent schools is not within the jurisdiction of the Education Department.

PORT PHILLIP BAY.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—In the light of the answer given by the Minister of Mines to my previous question, and in view of the fact that petroleum exploration permits No. 67 and No. 6 which cover sections of Port Phillip Bay are in existence, will the honorable gentleman assure the House that, regardless of any fresh applications, no drilling will be permitted within the Port Phillip Bay area?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—I can assure the House that no permits will be granted. They have been refused on previous occasions. I assure the House that no drilling will be permitted to take place in Port Phillip Bay.

COMMONWEALTH TREE-PULL SCHEME.

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—Can the Minister of Lands advise the House of the number of fruit growers who have received assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme, how many fruit growers have applied for assistance under the Commonwealth——

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! Is this not a little too much detailed for a question without notice?

Mr. SHILTON.—I am relying on the Minister's usual notable ability to——

The SPEAKER.—I can rule that this is too detailed; and I think it is too detailed.

Mr. SHILTON.—I will simplify it, Mr. Speaker, by asking the Minister whether he can advise the House how many fruit growers have received assistance under the Commonwealth-State tree-pull scheme.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The honorable member's question ended in a different way from the way it began.

Mr. WILKES.—That is not his fault.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The question has been asked, and the Minister may answer it, or not.

Mr. BORTHWICK.—The latter part of the honorable member's question referred to the tree-pull scheme, although initially he was referring to the rural reconstruction scheme. Under the tree-pull scheme one person had accepted an offer as at the end of last week, and in the short time that the scheme has been in operation fourteen other offers have been made but no reply has been received. In all, there have been approximately 50 applications.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Does the Treasurer still maintain as an accurate statement of his position that in the last Budget sufficient funds were allocated to enable the Environment Protection Authority to do the work the authority believes it has to do under the Act; if so, is it the intention of the Treasurer to maintain that position and to indicate that no further funds will be made available to the authority?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—I am glad to have that question. Let me make it clear to the House that the Environment Protection Authority has priority with the Government. The only question which arose in the compilation of the Budget concerned the amount required to staff the authority and to enable it to carry out the functions which it desires to carry out.

When the estimates were submitted in May, the authority worked on the basis that it hoped the Environment Protection Act would be proclaimed in September. The present target date is December.

Mr. WILKES.—Is this due to a lack of money?

Mr. HAMER.—It is not because of money but because of the comparative slowness in recruiting skilled staff, which is not an easy matter. In part, certain procedures have taken a little longer to formulate than was originally expected.

In the compilation of the Budget it was necessary to calculate the amount which the authority would require to pay its staff during this financial year. The figures appearing in the Budget represented that calculation. However, the authority has been informed that if it recruits staff at a faster rate than is expected and there is a requirement for a further allocation the Government will certainly make it. The authority is not being cut back in any way and it has to be ready to carry out its purpose.

In view of one statement which has been made about the Environment Protection Fund, which was comtemplated to enable loans to be made to public authorities to improve waste disposal techniques, I inform the House that the Board of Works and various sewerage authorities throughout country areas will be spending $73 million on this work during this financial year. Therefore, the work is going ahead and the fund will be used where the ordinary channels available to the Board of Works or through the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission are not sufficient, or where other waste treatment works are in need.

Mr. WILKES.—Is that $73 million to come out of the fund?

Mr. HAMER.—The amount is $73 million in all from loan funds.

LOCUSTS.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla).—Can the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture inform the House whether there are reported hatchings of grasshoppers or locusts in the northern part of Victoria; and if so, whether the Department of Agriculture has any plans to curtail the spread of these insects?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—The areas of infestation of locusts which have caused some concern at this juncture are in the Nangiloc-Colignan area and generally west towards Hattah. From memory, I think there have been some breeding grounds in the Nathalia area. The officers of the Department of Agriculture are keeping a close surveillance on these hatching areas. I assure the honorable member that within the provisions of the Act the department will take the necessary action if it is warranted.

I remind the honorable member that the private landowner has an obligation to spray and treat the

beds of the hoppers when they first breed and before they can come into a band and travel over wide areas of the State. I suggest to all honorable members who represent areas where hopper beds are located that they encourage local landholders, particularly in dry country adjacent to irrigation areas, to seek the advice of the department on the best action they can take, because the State could face an emergency if people do not operate quickly.

OFFICE OF GOVERNOR.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne).—In view of the impending retirement of His Excellency, Sir Rohan Delacombe, will the Premier indicate whether he intends to recommend the appointment of an Australian national to this high office?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—No consideration has been given to this question as yet.

STUDENTS' TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas).—I ask the Minister of Education whether it is a fact that for twenty years country primary school students have been paid at the rate of 10 cents a day for travelling, whether the honorable gentleman can inform the House what it is paid for, and whether the amount will be reviewed in the near future?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—Travelling expenses have been at that level for a considerable period and they will be one of the items which will be subject to review when financial allocations are next being considered by the Education Department.

THE MINISTRY.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—By leave, I should like to make a statement for the information of honorable members regarding the division of duties between the Assistant Minister of Education and myself. It is proposed that as from tomorrow Mr. Scanlan, the Assistant Minister of Education, will assume responsibility for the Special Services Division of the Education Department. That division embraces such branches as audio visual education, the Psychology and Guidance Branch, the Forestry Branch, the Publications Branch, the branch dealing with mentally retarded children and that dealing with physically retarded children, and other branches such as music. The number of branches totals twelve. This is a rapidly expanding section of the Education Department and one which in some respects has won world-wide acclaim. The Assistant Minister of Education is a particularly appropriate person to be in charge of this important facet of administration of the Education Department because he was a teacher in a special school in the Education Department, he has taught in special schools in England and recently he investigated special school education in both North and South America.

PAPERS.

The following papers, pursuant to the directions of several Acts of Parliament, were laid upon the table by the Clerk:—

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended No. 298.

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—Eildon Sub-Regional Planning Scheme 1951 Amendment No. 9, 1971.

Victorian Arts Centre Building Committee—Report for the year 1971–72.

VOLUNTEER CIVIL DEFENCE WORKERS COMPENSATION BILL.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to provide for the payment of compensation to volunteer defence workers injured in the execution of their duty as such and to the dependants of those persons, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the State Electricity Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

CLEAN AIR (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Clean Air Act 1958, the Health Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—I move—

That the Bill be printed, and by leave, the second reading be made an Order of the Day for later this day.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—On the question of the time of the second reading of the Bill I hope the words "later this day" mean that the Minister's explanation of the Bill will be made after the debate on the motion on freeways proposed to be moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which motion, incidentally, did not appear on the proof copy of the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! It is such a rarity for a matter to be left off the Notice Paper that I do not think any apology is needed.

The motion was agreed to.

LIFTS AND CRANES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

For **Mr. RAFFERTY** (Minister of Labour and Industry), Mr. Wilcox (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Lifts and Cranes Act 1967 and the Lifts and Cranes (Amendment) Act 1970.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

METROPOLITAN FREEWAYS.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF WORKS.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I move—

That it is the opinion of this House that all work on freeways within the inner-metropolitan area be suspended pending immediate and detailed reappraisal of Melbourne's transport needs.

It is desirable from the outset to confine this debate to what are important and vital principles affecting not merely the operation of the whole system of Melbourne but also the future quality of life in Melbourne and the transport services of the State as a whole. I should like to make it clear that the expression "all work on freeways within the inner-metropolitan area be suspended" means that any suspension of work that would take place pursuant to the carrying of the motion would involve a termination of work having regard to existing contractural obligations and the completion of actual construction work in hand in a practical manner, having regard to the most effective usage of the work that is completed.

Mr. JONA.—Irrespective of costs?

Mr. HOLDING.—Costs would have to be taken into account. I remind the honorable member for Hawthorn, if he is so sensitive, that Victoria was one of the few States in the modern world which could proudly boast of a brand spanking new freeway which finished at a set of hand-operated railway gates on the border of his electorate.

Mr. WILCOX.—Where was that?

Mr. HOLDING.—When the South-Eastern Freeway was being constructed, the approach to that freeway was to the north of the river. The freeway then proceeded along The Boulevard and its main exit as it moved into Swan Street was a set of hand-operated railway gates. Anyone who travelled along the freeway and used that exit finished up at that set of railway gates.

Mr. JONA.—That is in your electorate, not mine.

Mr. HOLDING.—I said that it bordered the electorate represented by the honorable member for Hawthorn.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I invite the honorable member for Hawthorn not to interject continually. He will have the opportunity of speaking later.

Mr. HOLDING.—I remind Government supporters who may be perturbed about costs that already the Government has abandoned one freeway project at a cost of approximately $1.87 million. The Opposition believes it is necessary at present for the Government to take time off to re-examine seriously all the existing freeway proposals. Those proposals are based upon the Melbourne transportation plan and many of the assumptions upon which the plan is based are no longer necessarily valid, partly because of recent developments arising from Commonwealth Government policies and partly because of the new policies outlined by the Treasurer in his Budget speech and referred to on behalf of the Government by His Excellency the Governor in his Speech when opening the current session.

Several comments can be made about the existing freeway proposals. The first is that the Government is uncertain of their conception. It is true that the freeway system will be extensive, and it is beyond argument that the proposals stand like a dagger pointed at the hearts of residents throughout the inner-metropolitan area. The motion envisages that all freeway development in the inner-metropolitan area shall be frozen and that the Government should urgently reconsider its freeway policy and endeavour to transpose the priorities involved in its transportation proposal into the Government's recently stated policies to update the public transport system. The motion is also deeply related to another aspect of Government policy — the proposals to promote regional development. Finally, there is the Government's proposal for controlling the environment and for pollution control.

Within the past fortnight important developments have taken place in Commonwealth policy. The life of the present Commonwealth Government has not much longer to run, but it has decided after many years that it is prepared to make financial contributions towards the operation of the States' railway systems and to assist the States in promoting regional development. This motion will test the sincerity of the State Government and the confidence it has in some of its recently stated policy objectives. More importantly, it will give the Government an opportunity of developing and indeed of taking a stand on one other important principle — the right of thousands of Victorian citizens living in the inner-metropolitan area to be consulted about their future and the future of the communities in which they live.

In the inner-metropolitan area — not merely in my electorate but in the electorates of the honorable members for Prahran and St. Kilda — there are thousands of citizens who have chosen to live there, who have purchased properties, reared their families and have a deep involvement in their communities, and they are now being told that because a planner has drawn a line on a map they can quit their communities and abandon their homes because those homes will be bulldozed so that

people living in the outer-metropolitan areas can travel into the inner-metropolitan area five or ten minutes quicker than they can at present.

Mr. WHEELER.—That is pretty terrible.

Mr. HOLDING.—It depends upon whether the bulldozer keeps going to the honorable member's house.

Mr. WHEELER.—I have had my worries.

Mr. HOLDING.—I have no doubt the honorable member has his worries. Despite all the glib public relations announcements by the Minister for Local Government, I concede that the honorable gentleman and his predecessor received many deputations from councils and local citizens' groups. Members of the deputations were told that there was a lack of certainty in the plan and a certain degree of flexibility. Although the deputations talked about the problems, the Minister talked glibly about flexibility. Indeed, at one deputation at which I was present, he told representatives of the Prahran City Council that there was no guarantee that the freeway would ever go south of the Yarra River.

Mr. LOXTON.—I was not invited to that deputation.

Mr. HOLDING.—The honorable member can explain his relations with the Prahran City Council. I was invited by a councillor to attend and if the honorable member was not invited, that is his problem, not mine. The Minister indicated that there was no certainty that any freeway would be constructed south of the river but the citizens have the right to participate in the making of any decision which can affect their homes. Nobody understands the bureaucratic process better than the Minister for Local Government. While he talks to deputations and gives them assurances, the bureaucracy grinds inexorably on and citizens may well ponder the extent to which they will be consulted or the extent to which they will be involved.

Already one freeway has been constructed through parklands, and work on it was commenced contrary to law, Parliament was not even consulted, and to the everlasting disgrace of Parliament a matter of privilege has been left unresolved because the Government, rather than face up to the responsibility of dealing with its own bureaucracy, chose to use its numbers to abandon a very important principle of Parliamentary democracy. However, that is another matter and I do not propose to deal with it at length; I allude to it merely to illustrate the attitude that the Government takes towards bureaucracy in freeway projects.

How can any citizen, whether he lives in Prahran, St. Kilda, Carlton or Richmond, feel that he has the capacity to deal with a Government structure which has decided that freeways will go ahead irrespective of any community attitude or any counter suggestion that may be made?

Mr. DIXON.—That is an exaggeration.

Mr. HOLDING.—If the honorable member believes it is an exaggeration, I invite him to look at the public vandalism that is occurring within 5 miles of Parliament House. The honorable member knows that the construction work commenced at Yarra Bend Park illegally and contrary to law.

I now invite honorable members to consider the existing basis of the Melbourne transportation study. In many ways it is an excellent document, which fully reflects the skill of the gentlemen who were instructed to do what was essentially the work of transportation engineering. It was not the committee's duty to worry about the problems of communities through which freeways were planned to be constructed, nor was it its duty to consider the future of Melbourne in terms of the balanced development of the State as a whole. It was not its duty to do any of those things, and what it set out to do and what it did was

to undertake an exercise in transportation engineering. That transportation study was based essentially on one of the great myths of the Liberal Party in this State — that Melbourne's growth is unlimited.

I invite the Premier during this debate to indicate clearly and concisely where his Government stands on this issue. The time has come for the Government to make up its mind whether it is to encourage population growth in Melbourne or ensure that the growth is limited. A decision must be taken and plans made to move people out of Melbourne. This concept of Melbourne unlimited is one which, if not counteracted now, will produce one of the largest capitals in the world located geographically in a State in which the country areas are virtually denuded of population.

It is interesting to note from the transportation study that the basis upon which this thinking and planning took place was that by 1985 Melbourne would have a population of 3·7 million people. Does the Government still support that proposition? Does the Government believe in the objectives which it promotes? The Government should be concerned with effective regional development so that by the year 1985 the population of Melbourne will be fewer than 3·7 million. That is the critical question to be answered. If the present growth is to be restricted, much of the essential thinking and planning which have gone into the Melbourne transportation study will have to be re-thought and re-examined.

What are the recommendations made in this plan? It proposes the construction in the metropolitan area of 307 miles of freeway, 103 miles of new arterial roads and 189 miles of widened arterial roads. The programme was to be completed by the year 1985 and the estimated cost of freeways and road construction works was $2,126 million. It is an interesting comparison that improvements to the public transport sector were estimated to cost in the vicinity of $385 million. It has been suggested that approximately $2,500 million is to be spent. One does not have to be a genius at figures to realize that if all the objectives of this study are to be achieved less than $400 million will be allocated to the public transport sector. From the outset the thinking of the people who compiled this report was geared to the mythology of the motor car.

The report has certain weaknesses. Nowhere does it show that any real consideration has been given to checking undesirable elements in Melbourne's transport. That is a critical point. The report also makes no allowance for the attempts which will be made by the Minister of Transport—attempts that should be made by any responsible Minister of Transport—to induce the public to use the public transport system. To the extent that this system can be magnified, used and developed, the allocation of funds to freeway systems can be reduced.

When reading this report one finds it impossible not to reach the conclusion that the town planning requirements were subordinated to the concepts of traffic engineers. I forgive them for that because it was not their function, but it is the function and responsibility of the Government. Since the report has been tabled, there has been increasing evidence that the Government, through the agency of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board and the Country Roads Board, is continuing to act on the basis of the report. There has been no public suggestion that the fundamental propositions on which this report was based were the subject of any fundamental reappraisal by the Government.

It is interesting that instead of taking the report and using it as it should be used in the context of planning a total transport system—not merely for the metropolitan area but for the whole of the State—the Government has allowed its policies

on public transportation to become fragmented. Any Government that acts seriously on the proposals of the metropolitan transportation study, and continues to build freeways in the inner-metropolitan area, must find sums of the magnitude of $20 million to $25 million a mile. Could anything be more ironic? It is incredible that while the Government is acting on this report, the Bland report states that rail services in smaller country areas will have to be discontinued because they are incurring an annual loss of $80,000. The Government will create enormous problems for the State if it allows its thinking on public transport to be fragmented by a series of different reports which involve incredible conflicts of policy.

There has been no considered policy statement and no White Paper to indicate that the Government has given thought to the effects of freeway development on communities, people and properties. Under the guise of flexibility freeway proposals are proceeding unabated. Even while I am addressing the House, the planners are drawing lines over people's homes without regard to local community feelings, hopes or aspirations. Where is the mechanism which allows a community effectively to oppose some of these proposals, and put its arguments publicly so that they can be objectively examined?

Local communities are involved in a continual series of deputations to the Minister. The freeway proposals will cause vast devastation in parts of Melbourne. The Minister states that of course he is anxious to obtain people's opinions, but while he says that freeway construction continues. There is ample evidence that just as there have been two contradictory reports on transport, no successful co-operation exists between the two freeway authorities—the Board of Works and the Country Roads Board. One is virtually vying with the other.

Mr. WHEELER.—What about having one authority?

Mr. HOLDING.—My colleagues and I would support that. At this stage it is not Labor Party policy—it is simply an expression of opinion—but it is my view that the Board of Works should not have a responsibility for freeway construction but should concentrate on its important basic responsibilities. When two authorities are involved, there is always the possibility of lack of co-operation and effective communication. The Chairman of the Board of Works is happy to see me or anyone else who wishes to see him, and listen to proposals, as is the Minister for Local Government, but at present there is no way that communities or community groups can effectively participate in the planning of freeways which will rip the heart out of local communities.

An old phrase relating to social class divisions referred to "people who live on the wrong side of the railway track". A railway line will never create the division in the community that a 14-lane highway will. I invite honorable members to think about it. At what point in one's suburb—in Hawthorn, Essendon, Prahran, or St. Kilda, for example—does one take the responsibility of saying where a 14-lane highway should be put? The community would be divided in all sorts of impossible ways. If a community is to be so affected, there should be a proper method by which the community has a right, which the law will recognize and protect, to participate in public argument on the efficacy of planning decisions which can be disastrous.

Important recent developments which have taken place nationally must be taken into account when honorable members are considering this motion. These developments can affect not merely transport in Melbourne and country areas, but the State as a whole. For many years it has been the policy of the Labor

Party that, in view of the incredible costs involved in running the railways, particularly in a State of the size of Victoria, the Commonwealth should take over the responsibility of running and updating the railways. They have become an increasing burden and there is no way in which they will ever generate sufficient revenue to be effective. That view also commended itself to the former Premier and Treasurer. He was happy to make the offer to the former Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, if I can mention that name without getting snarls from the Liberal backbench. The former Prime Minister rejected the offer. Subsequently, the present Prime Minister also rejected the offer.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I do suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that this must be dealt with narrowly on a State level.

Mr. HOLDING.—I propose to do so. The two major parties are about to enter a Federal election contest, and as a result of the recent interest taken by the Prime Minister in the railways both parties are now committed to substantially assisting Victoria's railway system. The Minister of Transport is looking for assistance in various ways. It is not relevant to this debate which of the two proposals submitted by the two major parties one supports. The real point is that the promise of that support can radically and dramatically alter the operations of our railway system. That factor ought to involve the Government in a reappraisal of the role of the public transport system.

For many years the Federal Labor Party has believed that the Commonwealth has a responsibility not merely to assist the metropolitan areas in urban renewal but also to assist the State financially in regional development projects. I am delighted that to some extent, again somewhat belatedly, those proposals have been seized upon, perhaps with some degree of desperation, by the Prime Minister. Again the State is in the happy position where the two major Federal parties are now committed to the provision of funds which can affect dramatically any State Government's capacity to effect its regional development proposals. The present level of expenditure amounts to several million dollars, and with Commonwealth involvement rapid regional development in this State could be effected.

Surely, with that commitment, it is now important for the Government to make a major reassessment of the future of transport, not merely in Melbourne but throughout the State. A pause is needed to enable a major reassessment to be made of the role that freeways and public systems will play in the provision of adequate transport facilities for the metropolitan area.

Where there is this degree of Commonwealth involvement no honorable member, whatever his political philosophy, will argue that the Government should not make a major reappraisal at this stage in order that it does not, as it well could, spend too much money on the acquisition of land for and the development of freeways when the emphasis ought to be placed on public transport. No honorable member seems concerned to dissent from that proposition. Surely, it is appropriate for Parliament to make that assessment now.

The Government has stated its policies. Freeways do not move people—they move cars.

Mr. WILCOX.—I have been saying that for a long time.

Mr. HOLDING.—I think this is one proposition on which the Minister of Transport and I fundamentally agree. It is equally true that this has to be looked at in the light of the Government's avowed policy on the problems of the environment and pollution. It is beyond argument that cars are greater polluters of the environment and the atmosphere than are trams and trains.

Accordingly, there should be a re-evaluation of the role of public transport as against freeway proposals. I think that, in his heart, the Minister of Transport will support that proposition.

I do not propose to go into detail about the damage that the existing freeway proposals are causing in some areas of the city. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition accompanied me on a visit to the Yarra Bend Park at Kew and I shall leave it to him to inform the House of the extent of public vandalism that is taking place there.

Less than a fortnight ago, at the request of conservation groups in the Ivanhoe area, I visited a display which was conducted by a group concerned with preserving the Yarra Valley. After inspecting the freeway models which had been created, no one could doubt that the freeways through the Yarra Valley will destroy that valley and what it means to many Melbourne citizens.

The Yarra Valley should be preserved for future generations. It is as important a national asset as Port Phillip Bay. If the Minister of Mines can say that he will not permit any mining company to carry out exploration activities in the bay, the Premier should assert that he will not let any public authority destroy the Yarra Valley. There is no way in which the existing freeway proposals will not have that effect.

Again, this comes back to the Government's evaluation of its stated policies and the things that are actually occurring. It is all very well for the Treasurer, in his Budget speech, to speak of the quality of life and the need to preserve the environment and conserve our flora and fauna. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, you could wax far more eloquently than I on the beauties of the Yarra Valley.

Because of its freeway mania, the Government is planning freeways on the cheap. It is cheaper to construct a freeway through the valley than to build it elsewhere.

Mr. JONA.—That is what you just said.

Mr. HOLDING.—Does the honorable member support the policy of putting freeways through the Yarra Valley?

Mr. CRELLIN.—Not necessarily.

Mr. HOLDING.—I want to know the answer and the House is entitled to know the answer.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I suggest that the debate proceed without a two-way interchange.

Mr. HOLDING.—The honorable member for Sandringham is obviously not anxious to put himself on record as supporting the construction of freeways through the Yarra Valley.

Mr. CRELLIN.—Do not talk rubbish.

Mr. HOLDING.—From his interjections, I take it that the honorable member does support the proposals. The honorable member supports a Government which is proceeding with freeways through the valley, and everybody knows it. There is no contradiction and all honorable members know that this will occur.

Mr. WILKES.—They even know which tender will be accepted.

Mr. HOLDING.—I do not doubt that, either. The Opposition's simple proposal is that the time has come for the Government to make a major reappraisal of the Melbourne transportation survey to fit in any recommendations that the Government may have for freeway projects into its stated policy objectives having regard to the important developments at the Commonwealth level.

I hope the debate will not reach the stage where, in an attempt to prop up its position, the Government will assert that we are opposed to all freeway development as such. I make it quite clear that the Opposition is not opposed to the development of all freeways as such. One result of the motion being carried will be the

acceleration of freeway developments which are undoubtedly necessary in some outer areas.

Mr. BILLING.—Knock down my house but not yours!

Mr. HOLDING. — Unfortunately, the honorable member for Heatherton is so narrow-minded that he believes it is all right to knock another peron's house over so long as his is not knocked over. In essence, that is the honorable member's position and it is the basis upon which, when deputations from areas such as Prahran wait on the Minister for Local Government, the Minister tries to convince the deputations that the Government is not even certain that a particular freeway will be constructed south of the river.

Mr. STEPHEN.—It is just as well that we do not judge you on your interjections.

Mr. HOLDING.—The honorable member for Ballaarat South will find that the electorate will judge him on his record.

Mr. STEPHEN.—At least I have one.

Mr. HOLDING.—I am delighted to know that, because I have sometimes doubted it.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I invite the Leader of the Opposition to debate the motion.

Mr. HOLDING.—Before this debate took place, I was interested to hear some comments by the Minister for Local Government. The only argument which the honorable gentleman was prepared to put up publicly against this proposal was a suggestion that the motion involved an attack upon all freeway proposals. The motion merely asks the Government to give itself some time to work out where it is going regarding transportation needs and what ought to be its transportation plan.

The Government also invokes the argument that it is necessary to get on with the building of freeways because they are much safer for the motorists than existing roads. I think it will be conceded that a motorist who drives his car along a freeway is less likely to have an accident than when he drives along a small street in certain areas. However, when an accident does occur on a freeway, it assumes disastrous proportions. I refer the Premier to the serious accident that took place on the M6 freeway in England, where considerable devastation was wrought. In existing circumstances, it is probably safer to drive a car along a freeway in Melbourne than along a normal road. It is equally true that riding on a tram or a train is safer than driving a motor car. All of these arguments are relevant.

I do not believe it is an argument against the motion to allege, as has been alleged by the Minister for Local Government, that if the Government does not proceed apace with its freeway mania, it could be accused of contributing to the accident rate. The motion is very much in line with the re-evaluations which are being undertaken in other communities which are of equivalent size and which have problems similar to our own. I refer to Helsinki in Finland and to San Diego and other major cities in the United States of America, where the authorities are abandoning major sections of proposed urban freeways. In some centres, they are even ceasing freeway construction work. In many communities there is a swing back to public transport systems.

I believe—and I have given supporting reasons—that the Government should promote a swing back to public transport provided that it receives the degree of assistance which ought to be forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government. The Minister of Transport nods his head in agreement. If this is so, the time has come for appropriate action to be taken.

Mr. WILCOX.—I have been saying for years what the Leader of the Opposition has been talking about.

Mr. HOLDING.—At least I have one vote from the Government side of the House! Accordingly, the proper course for the Government and this House to follow is to decide that the building of freeways should cease and that a major reassessment should be made of Victoria's transportation needs. Freeway proposals will be frozen.

Mr. WILCOX.—For how long?

Mr. HOLDING.—The motion says "pending immediate and detailed reappraisal of Melbourne's transport needs." It is better to stop and think and plan than to continue building freeways at inordinate cost to the State on the basis of a survey which, through no fault of the people who drew it, is in many ways already dated. That is the basis upon which the motion is moved. It is designed to give the Government time to reassess its scale of priorities and to resolve apparent conflicts within its policy objectives. The motion involves a number of important policy points which I believe have to be answered by the Government.

I shall restate them simply by way of conclusion. Is Melbourne's growth going to be limited, or is it going to be unlimited? If one takes the view that it is going to be unlimited one can reject the basic premise upon which the transportation survey is based. Members of the Opposition adopt the attitude that Melbourne's growth has to be limited. If one takes that view, any transportation survey which involves freeways or public transport must be slotted into Government policies which are designed to permit regional and balanced development. The relationship between the public transport system and the private transport system must be reassessed in that context and in the context of a committed Commonwealth involvement; it does not matter which way the Federal election goes, there will be that involvement.

Most importantly, the Government has to examine methods by which local communities which are affected by freeway proposals can involve themselves in the whole process of Government decision-making and Government thinking. This is a basic premise of government. Often, all Governments have to make hard decisions which affect communities, but basically Governments exist to meet the wishes and desires of the community. It is a sad and dangerous thing to allow ourselves to get into a situation where planners, no matter how well motivated and how prominently situated within the bureaucracy, can feel that, by drawing a line on a map in response to a survey such as the metropolitan transportation survey, that ends the argument.

The fact is that if one goes into suburbs in the north, in Carlton, Fitzroy, Collingwood, Richmond, Prahran, St. Kilda, Ivanhoe, there are whole communities——

Mr. BILLING.—Keep going!

Mr. HOLDING.—I named those suburbs to start with. Obviously, within the honorable member's electorate there are others. Those communities are in turmoil; they are entitled to be considered and to have a process by which their views can be formally put and objectively assessed — and I mean objectively assessed. With respect, I do not believe that can be done by the Minister who is responsible for carrying out these freeway projects. By the very nature of his Ministerial responsibility, no matter how well motivated he is, he is involved in almost an impossible dilemma.

There ought to be a structure — as exists in other communities, because there is nothing new in these problems — by which community groups which have alternative plans and arguments can have those plans and arguments put objectively to an independent tribunal which can assess them; they can be argued publicly and considered, and then

the tribunal can make a recommendation which the Minister may or may not accept.

At present, given the integrity of the Minister, there is no way in which he can reconcile his responsibility in terms of Government policy with the legitimate arguments which he will be receiving on an almost day-to-day basis from thousands of people who feel concerned about what these plans will do to them and their communities. Therefore, I believe this motion ought to be supported by all members of this House. It does nothing more than give this Government an opportunity of reassessing its values and its priorities and of getting its scale of priorities and scale of values right. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—This is an interesting motion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. Although the Government is not able to accept it, I think it can come close to doing so in many ways because it really states little more than what is actually present Government policy. I will explain that in due course, but before moving to that aspect I wish to deal briefly with one or two points made by the Leader of the Opposition. Firstly, he was at pains to point out that he related his remarks to the suspension of work having regard only to existing contracts. That is quite important, because if one removes the existing contracts there are no other freeways currently about to start. That is one reason why, as I have indicated, I can go close to accepting the motion.

Of course, the position is not as simple as that because the motion really raises one of the most complex questions of modern times. I interpose here, as I have said previously, that the urbanization of life is a modern phenomenon. At the start of the century, only eleven cities in the world had a population of more than 1 million persons. Now, there are scores of them. As a result, not only Governments but also communities throughout the world have not worked out how to deal with this modern phenomenon. Going along with this phenomenon is the modern revolution caused by the motor car.

I do not believe communities have realized to any extent the tremendous revolution caused by the motor car, which is certainly the biggest revolution since the industrial revolution and possibly since the invention of the wheel. It affects every aspect of community life in every country, and naturally more so in countries such as Australia which are more affluent than others. The motor car affects domestic life, crime in the community and thereby the whole of police activity, hospital activity, and one could mention every other aspect of living. This is something which communities have not yet fully realized and Governments have not fully reacted to because of the lack of realization by communities. It is clear that the modern world has not yet found the proper place for the motor car, although it would be unreal to think that it could not be found.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the metropolitan transportation plan, and as I am chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee and was in that position when the plan was made public nearly three years ago, I accept what has been said in that regard. Much of the comment of the honorable member was in line with what I have been urging as Minister of Transport. I am well aware, as I was when it was produced, that there are weaknesses in the plan, but it was accepted by the Government as providing guidelines. Tremendous planning effort followed the survey, and as something was needed at that stage to provide guidelines, the Government accepted the plan. This is the first occasion in nearly three years when any real challenge has

been made to that plan — a remarkable compliment to the plan itself. In fairness, the Leader of the Opposition said that it had many good points, as it has, and it also has weaknesses.

One other matter mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition was that he felt there was a mixing up of two reports — the report of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee and the report of the Board of Inquiry into Land Transport in Victoria — the whole of the State — conducted by Sir Henry Bland. Those reports can be regarded quite separately because they cover different aspects. The metropolitan transportation report was concerned only with the metropolitan area, but the Bland report ranged over the whole State other than the Melbourne and metropolitan area — because this report had already been done — and the cities of Geelong, Ballarat and Bendigo where similar reports and plans were in process at the time.

I think it is fair to remind honorable members of three points in regard to the Bland report. Firstly, it did not deal with the metropolitan area because there seemed to be no need for that; secondly, it dealt very much with the freighting side of the total transport industry; and thirdly — I wish to put this on the record because it is a matter which some people have been inclined to get out perspective, particularly my friends in the Country Party — the most important recommendations in the Bland report do not — I repeat "not" — concern the closing of rail lines in the country. This subject is much lower down in the list of recommendations, and it would be unwise for anybody to seek to get that matter out of perspective.

I was interested to learn from the Leader of the Opposition that he does not oppose all freeways. He said many things with which I agreed, but I did not want to interrupt his flow as he was doing reasonably well. However, I should have liked to interject and ask him to give some examples of the freeways which he wants built because he made it abundantly clear that he did not mind them being built in the Heatherton area although he did not want them in Richmond.

Mr. HOLDING.—I did not say that.

Mr. WILCOX.—I am sorry if I misrepresented the Leader of the Opposition; I do not want to disturb his equilibrium. I am pleased that the honorable member concedes that some freeways must be built.

I was also glad that the Leader of the Opposition referred to community involvement because I intend to go back nearly three years and refer to the introduction which I wrote to the report of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee when it brought out its transportation plan for Melbourne 1985. The plan looks ahead. I then said that the Government had given the lead by setting up the Metropolitan Transportation Committee and that the committee sought to give a lead by the plan. These were the important words—

> We also need acceptance of the lead by a community which has taken the trouble to understand what is involved and is prepared to act.

If the community is now coming to really understand what is involved and is prepared to act, then I am very pleased.

Let me give some facts of life. At present, Melbourne is a city of 2·5 million people and it has more than 900,000 motor vehicles. Taking into account the recently adjusted figures of the latest Commonwealth census, Melbourne's population will grow to 3·5 million by 1985. Motor vehicle registrations will have increased to well over 1 million by that time. The report showed that if the present trends continue—and I am not suggesting that they should—by 1985 there will be 1·3 million private cars garaged in Melbourne. Added to that will be all the freight side of the automobile industry.

We should be doing a tremendous amount to induce the community to turn from its preoccupation with the motor car. We should be taking active steps to induce people to cease being mesmerized by their motor cars. There are many ways of doing this. I make it clear that what the Metropolitan Transportation Committee set out to do was produce a plan for balanced transport. I have said many times that there is a place for every form of transport in a modern community; I still believe that. In the introduction to the report, I said that the committee believed that balanced transport was the only hope for the metropolis. That statement still stands.

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—Is the financial allocation balanced?

Mr. WILCOX.—No, it is not. That is what I have been striving for and what the Government has been striving for. The honorable member should pay attention.

Mr. EDMUNDS.—You do not have the numbers on your side.

Mr. WILCOX.—It seems that I have the numbers at Canberra, and that is what counts. Conceding, as honorable members opposite concede, that some freeways are necessary, the House should again bear in mind what was said in the metropolitan transportation report: In the introduction I stated—

> The plan contains recommendations which can only be implemented progressively over a number of years. A series of procedures are laid down by law. The necessary reservations of land are required to be made by the planning authority the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. This would require amendments to the metropolitan planning scheme; before amendments can be made, there must be public exhibition, notice to those likely to be affected must be given, objections can be made and must be heard.

That should be emphasized; that is the law as passed by this Parliament.

Mr. WILKES.—It should be carried out.

Mr. WILCOX.—It is carried out as far as the Government is concerned. I also stated that there must be flexibility when dealing with the complex problems of urban congestion and urban renewal, and for any plan to be successful it must have the ability to meet and reflect the changing needs of the community. I still go along with that and so does the Government. In relation to this report, I finally said—

> The need for flexibility leads me to people because it can only be through people that changing needs are expressed and, after all, that is what the plan is designed to meet —the needs of people.

I shall mention one or two other matters to which I have publicly referred as a Minister and with the support of the Government. I go back to September, 1971, when I said—

> If we were to be serious about producing a modern transport system, the community must cease to be mesmerized by the motor car—it must be seen in proper perspective. For any reasonable use of the motor car we will need freeways. However, they will be bought at a price—the price of carving through many areas of Melbourne with all the disturbance which this brings to people and places.

I am glad to say that the Government discussed the situation the very next month. I was in hospital at the time and it greatly assisted my recovery in health to know that on 4th October, 1971, my colleague, the Minister for Local Government, made a statement in relation to the eastern leg of what was colloquially known as the city ring road. The honorable gentlemen then advised the community that—

> Cabinet is convinced that the project would have created an extremely serious and unacceptable disturbance to the charm, the character and the environment of the area through what it was planned; and that more acceptable and less costly alternatives to serve Melbourne's transport needs can be achieved.

The Minister for Local Government also announced—

> The Melbourne Transportation Committee will be asked to investigate—
>
> Substantial modification of the proposed freeway network with a view to minimizing its sociological impact and over-all costs.
>
> Measures to upgrade and attract custom to the public transport system rather than road traffic.

That was a clear statement of the attitude of the Government. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of the importance of people. I agree with him, or perhaps it is he who agrees with me, that cities are made for people, not cars. That is the principle which we should all play a part in implementing. I also said in relation to the public transport side of the metropolitan transportation plan that I believe that we could not allow public transport to languish for lack of funds, because if we did we would put ourselves at great risk. But it is of much greater importance than that. We have in Melbourne a rail network which has land available for its improvement. It is an asset which is there to be used to the full. I have made it clear that the Government has departed from the strictness of the Melbourne transportation plan. It has asked for a review of the suggested freeway network with emphasis on minimizing its sociological impact and over-all cost. That review is proceeding.

Mr. HOLDING.—By whom is it being conducted?

Mr. WILCOX.—It is being conducted under the auspices of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee by officers from the Country Road Board, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, and the committee itself.

Mr. HOLDING.—They are the people who produced the report.

Mr. WILCOX.—And they have been asked to review it. The review will be available shortly to the committee and, in due course, to the Government. These officers have been given clear instructions on what they are to review.

The Government has been positive in its approach to the upgrading of public transport and I can give examples. I am the first to concede that this has not gone nearly as far the Government would like it to go. I know it has not gone as far as the Premier would like to go. Firstly, the Government is in the process of placing an order for some new trams, and that is a real break-through in the field of public transport. It should be borne in mind that after a lot of debate which took place over many years the Government said it would start to build the Melbourne underground rail loop. That has begun and the authority which was set up has displayed great ability. This year, the Melbourne Underground Rail Loop Authority, with some funds left over from last year, will be spending $20 million. That is a substantial sum and it is completely new money going to the public transport side of the transport scene.

I could list the minor improvements in the transport field which have not cost much money. I could tell the House of transport maps and co-ordinated time-tables. I could give a list of these things as long as my arm, but this is not the right time and place to enumerate them. However, I should mention one other matter. Despite their dearth of funds, the Victorian Railways have provided nearly 12,000 car parks at suburban stations in the last few years. That is a real contribution to the over-all problem.

Mr. WILKES.—You mean 12,000 spaces, not car parks?

Mr. WILCOX.—That is so.

Mr. DOUBE.—One peak train load? What a boast!

Mr. WILCOX.—That is completely inaccurate—only 500 per cent out. I turn to the financial situation. It does not matter how many bright ideas emerge from the transport field —although I should like to see a few more popping out of the transport authority from time to time—old rolling-stock cannot be replaced by bright ideas; trucks, signalling and stations cannot be updated with bright ideas. This applies to country areas as well as to the metropolitan area. That is why, on behalf of the Government, through the regular meetings of State Transport

Ministers, I have provided full information in relation not only to the metropolitan situation but also to the country situation and as a consequence last Monday the Prime Minister was able to say that he had this material available to him. In fact, I was speaking to him last Friday. The Premier has given me full support in putting the needs of this Government before the Commonwealth. I have had a long association of working with the Premier in this regard and I inform honorable members that it has now some effect and the results are most encouraging.

Honorable members will know that the Commonwealth Minister for Trade and Shipping, Mr. Nixon, needed a lot of persuading and was quite difficult. However, he now supports the case that Victoria has put forward. It is lovely to have that support from our colleagues in the Country Party! Nobody should think that the transport problems can be solved by emphasis on one form of transport alone. It has been a weakness in past thinking that freeways can solve the problem of moving people. It is just like feeding babies to the lions—they are never satisfied. In a modern community there is a place for every form of transport.

The Leader of the Opposition ranged over this intense urban problem and I was happy for him to do so because, with many honorable members, I share many of his sentiments. I make it quite clear that the only freeway under construction in the metropolitan area is the Eastern Freeway. I said earlier that there must be freeways, and contracts have been let. The widening of High Street, St. Kilda, is expected to commence earlier next year. That is not a freeway but I should not like any honorable member to say that I did not mention the matter.

Mr. WILKES.—Contracts were let before the review.

Mr. WILCOX.—That is why it is going ahead. There is little between the position of the Government and that of the Opposition in relation to this motion. The Government has called for a review but it cannot accept the motion. It can only do as I have indicated, go close to it. Great complexities would arise in accepting the motion as such. It would be unfair to the authorities involved and disturbing to the situations in which contracts have been let and for which programmes are going forward. The Government cannot accept the motion but I am glad that it has been moved because it has given honorable members the opportunity of putting their thoughts and me the opportunity of saying, on behalf of the Government, that it is seised of the problem and that the matter is under review, and of indicating firmly the attitude of the Government.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—My heart bleeds for the Minister of Transport. He reminds me of Pollyanna; he is glad the motion has been moved and he is sorry that he cannot do anything about it. If he had his own way, I believe he would be prepared to support the motion. From the statement he made in the press, he knows better than any member of the Government party that there should be a suspension of freeway planning even though the horse has already gone. It is absolutely ridiculous to talk about a review when freeways are being constructed through parklands. No one could use a review as an excuse for the desecration of the parkland. There should be no duplication of construction authorities as in the case of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Country Roads Board with its consequent muddle. Members of the Opposition are trying to avoid what the Government is always doing—closing the stable door after the horse has gone. Properties have been acquired, people have been

tipped out of their homes and parklands have been desecrated and spoiled.

Mr. JONA.—Rubbish!

Mr. WILKES.—It is all very well for the honorable member for Hawthorn to interject "rubbish", but not one house or park in his electorate has been touched. One wonders what action he would take to protect parklands which are so valuable for posterity. The motion was moved by the Leader of the Opposition to ensure that no further freeways will be built in the metropolitan area until a proper appraisal is made. The Government cannot deny that a lack of co-ordination in freeway planning has occurred. Members of the Opposition believe there is need for a comprehensive study not only of the location of freeways but of the social implications of this. Do any honorable members have the audacity to suggest that the Country Roads Board and the Board of Works take social implications into consideration? Of course they do not. No evidence has been given by either of those instrumentalities of any such consideration.

Mr. WILCOX.—That is what they are doing in the review.

Mr. WILKES.—The only consideration shown by the Board of Works and the Country Roads Board is for status, to see who can get the job and plan and construct the freeway. It is a disgrace that two constructing and planning authorities should exist in Victoria. Public funds are being wasted, the push of freeways into the metropolitan area has been accentuated and now there is to be a review. No review can replace what the freeways have destroyed. No one knows better than the Minister of Transport what problems have been caused by the duplication of planning by the Board of Works and the Country Roads Board. Will the Eastern Freeway be stopped? Freeway F2 will come to a dead-end and no one knows how it will connect with the Eastern Freeway.

Mr. LOXTON.—They do not tell you where it comes down.

Mr. WILKES.—The only plans known of the suggested alternative for ring road F2 indicate that it will finish at the Merri Creek bridge in St. George's Road, Northcote. The municipalities have been asked to express opinions on the route. Nevertheless, the alternatives all finish up at the one location—at a dead-end. Because of their concern for status the Country Roads Board and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works will not try to connect the ring road F2 with the Eastern Freeway. If these conditions exist, the freeway construction programme should be halted, irrespective of whether contracts have been let for F2.

Mr. HAMER.—They have not.

Mr. WILKES.—Preparatory work has been done for Freeway F2, and it can be seen in Broadmeadows. It is a continuation of work on the Hume Highway. The Opposition contends that when freeways enter the metropolitan area there should be no continued construction at enormous cost before there has been an appraisal of whether one and not two authorities should plan the freeways.

Mr. STEPHEN.—Which authority should that be?

Mr. WILKES.—The honorable member for Ballaarat South is not interested in what takes place in the city, but I remind the honorable member that if duplication of planning and other features associated with freeway construction were to be eliminated, perhaps there could be a duplication of highways in his electorate and, in the view of the Opposition, they are projects of much higher priority.

The position is that the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is competing with the Country Roads Board. Out of its allocation of

$72·8 million the Country Roads Board is spending $11·5 million on freeways in the metropolitan area and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is spending, in round figures, approximately $12 million. There is needless conflict and duplication between the two bodies. It leads to waste of money because technological and planning details are being duplicated and this has led to the crisis which now exists in the building of freeways.

The purpose of the motion is to freeze freeway construction in the inner-metropolitan areas until existing inadequacies and problems have been resolved. It is of no use for the Minister or the Government to say that those problems will be resolved simply because it is intended to carry out a review.

The Minister representing the Minister for Local Government in this House is able to say anything he wishes, because he is the Chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. He has criticized a plan and he has also approved it. He wishes to have it both ways. In the *Herald* of 24th September the Minister of Transport said—

> If we could really get stuck into providing more money, if we got more people off the roads and into public transport, it may be that we won't need all the freeways the metropolitan transport council plan thinks we need.

However, while the Minister of Transport is making that statement to Neil Jillett, the freeway planners are competing in back rooms at the Country Roads Board and the Board of Works and saying, "Let us get these jobs completed at any cost". But sections of the Hume Highway and other main highways could have been duplicated with some of the money which could be channelled into those fields. To listen to the Government is to gain the impression that most freeway finance comes from loan funds and other funds provided by the Government, but I point out that that is not so.

The Board of Works raises $8·5 million per annum from the metropolitan improvement rate. All ratepayers in the board's area must pay that rate irrespective of whether they are pensioners, or retired or anything else; and I believe that if this Government had any decency it would abolish that rate.

Mr. JONA.—What has that to do with the motion?

Mr. WILKES.—I shall endeavour to inform the honorable member for Hawthorn. Why should people in the inner-metropolitan area who never use freeways be forced to pay for them? The only reason is the stupidity of the Government and the duplication that occurs between the Country Roads Board and the Board of Works. By means of the metropolitan improvement rate, the Government expects everyone to pay for its mistakes. If the Government wishes to overcome the muddle that presently exists in the construction of freeways, it should do something about the metropolitan improvement rate.

A large percentage of Country Roads Board funds is derived from motorists and, because of that, motorists are entitled to better highways, but if the Government continues to pursue its present policy it will be necessary in 1984 to have 10 miles of 4-lane highways to bring the normal number of motor cars into the metropolitan area. It is estimated that by the same year 15 miles of extra highway will be required in New South Wales to bring cars into the central business district of Sydney.

The Government should make some effort through the Melbourne City Council to restrict the number of cars which enter the central business district, because the Government's present stupid policy causes untold hardship to people in fringe areas such as Collingwood, Richmond, Brunswick, South Melbourne and Port Melbourne.

The Minister of Transport lives in a salubrious area and people who live in such an area have plenty of money and do not have to worry about cars parking outside their doors all day, but because of the Government's freeway policy there are many people who own cars and cannot take them into their properties because there is no access, and during the day the streets in which they live become clearways. For this reason, although they may be within walking distance of their place of employment, they must drive their cars to work. The Government must accept responsibility for this because it has made no effort to restrict the number of cars coming into the central business district.

Once it was suggested that a ring road should be built, but that proposal was subsequently abandoned by the Government. However, it is quite obvious that the construction of an outer area ring road to keep cars out of inner-metropolitan areas will need to be considered by the Government. They cause inconvenience to people who live in those areas because cars are parked outside their homes all day. However, the Government has done nothing. It has allowed the present policy on freeways to continue despite the utter lack of co-ordination between the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Country Roads Board.

As the Government is well aware, many people and organizations are interested in the freeway crisis which exists in this State. One of them is the Carlton Association. The association pleaded for the Government to do something about its freeway policy. A deputation met the Minister for Local Government in February or March of this year and put forward propositions to overcome the present crisis and left a report with the honorable gentleman, but to date the association has not received a reply from the incompetent Minister who is responsible for the present muddle. The report states—

> The Carlton Association is of the opinion that the planning, location and alignment of freeways in the inner areas of Melbourne presents a problem which has reached a crisis situation.

The Minister certainly cannot deny that a crisis exists. The association's report continued—

> These inner areas, due to their centrality and proximity to the central business district, are adversely affected by the freeway proposals to a far greater degree than suburbs in the outer metropolitan areas.
>
> Residents' associations of these inner areas, being aware of the catastrophic effects urban freeways have had on overseas cities, are convinced that the effects of freeways in Melbourne will be equally harmful, unless the controlling authorities accept a social responsibility and avoid the devastating effects of freeways construction.

One has only to look at a map of Los Angeles or visit that city to realize that it is a pock-marked city which has vacant allotments throughout its central business district simply for the parking of cars. The authorities in that city did what this Government ought to have learned not to do. Although the Carlton Association is aware of the problem, the Minister has not replied to its representations. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, the association is not necessarily opposed to freeways, because it believes they are essential in some areas to permit a proper flow of traffic, but it is opposed to the present method of planning. In its report on this aspect of the matter the association states—

> In spite of this the Carlton Association is not necessarily opposed to the construction of freeways—it does however place the preservation of people's homes above the construction of freeways which are not properly researched, planned and co-ordinated, and is determined to prevent unnecessary destruction in such circumstances.

The Country Roads Board should be the sole authority responsible for the construction of freeways. As I said in the House last night, the Board of Works ought to be responsible

for the complete control of the disposal of liquid industrial wastes and it should have nothing to do with freeways.

On 17th September, 1971, the Country Roads Board submitted a hurriedly prepared report to the Minister for Local Government, Mr. Hunt, and it opposed certain recommendations on freeway planning which had been made in an earlier report presented by the Board of Works. In every aspect of the construction of freeways one discovers this duplication of endeavour.

The sitting was suspended at 6.30 *p.m. until* 8.4 *p.m..*

Mr. WILKES.—Before the suspension of the sitting and during your temporary absence from the chair, Mr. Speaker, I was quoting from the report of the Carlton Association entitled *Freeway Crisis,* dated 29th March, 1972. The address of the association is Post Office Box 52, North Carlton, 3054. The arguments advanced by the Minister of Transport against the submissions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition were that the Government almost accepted this motion but it could not go all the way and accept it in its entirety. One of the arguments put forward by the Minister for not accepting the motion was that there was already a committee of review examining the matters mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and examining freeway planning generally.

I direct the attention of honorable members to the composition of the committee of review because it is of vital importance to the subject before the House. The committee of review has been operating for about nine months. It is not an independent authority as honorable members would imagine but consists of members of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee and freeways planners. They are the people who presented the freeway construction plans to the Government in the first place and that plan is being put into operation now. In other words, the freeway construction plan is the work of the committee of review. Therefore, I fail to see how a committee which has already presented the Government with a *fait accompli* could review the situation and admit that it was wrong in the first place.

Representatives of the Carlton Association have appeared before the committee of review and have also had deputations to the Premier and the Minister for Local Government. The evidence available to me leads me to believe that the committee of review will take action to alter freeway planning only if freeways transgress churches, houses declared by the National Trust to be of interest or sports grounds, but it will not take into consideration the fact that a freeway may go through private houses or through national parks. The committee has shown no inclination to suggest to the Government, not even by an interim report, that freeway construction and planning should cease until the committee has considered in depth the proposition which has been put to it by the Carlton Association and other organizations.

The Government could do a lot worse and could not do better than to analyse the report of the Carlton Association in detail. It is succinct in its conclusions on what ought to be done with freeway planning in Victoria. Honorable members should remember that two propositions were put to the Government. The first was by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the second by the Country Roads Board. During your absence, Mr. Speaker, I commented on the duplication of services by these two authorities. The Opposition has made it abundantly clear that there should be only one authority concerned with freeway planning.

Mr. BURGIN.—Which one?

Mr. WILKES.—I have told the honorable member a dozen times which one it should be. In case he is deaf or is too ignorant to listen I shall tell him again. It should be the

Country Roads Board. The Country Roads Board suggested the deletion of Freeway F1 from the planning scheme. That was the eastern leg of the ring road. Honorable members know that the Government adopted that recommendation. In the press coverage of the report of the Country Roads Board there was a reference to a recommendation for the relocation of Freeway F19, which cut across North Fitzroy and through North Carlton in a northerly direction. That was the only proposal made by the Country Roads Board. Owing to the emphasis given to the deletion of Freeway F1 from the plan, it was excluded from the diagram published in the *Age* newspaper of 5th October of last year. Freeway F1 then became known as the secret freeway and was discussed at a public meeting held by the Carlton Association with residents from Carlton and Fitzroy. At this meeting the residents of Carlton and Fitzroy expressed their dissatisfaction with the plan and offered positive proof to the Government and to the two authorities that it was maliciously wrong to design a freeway to go through North Carlton and North Fitzroy. The meeting also stated that it was economically and socially wrong.

The Carlton Association then had a deputation to the Minister for Local Government on 3rd February of this year and the deputation formally asked the Minister two important questions. The first was: What could be done immediately to investigate an alternative that would prevent the destruction of Carlton and the Carlton community as a community? The second question was: Can the present construction of the works on the Freeway F 19 terminal section be halted until such alternatives are thoroughly researched? They were two fair questions to put before the Minister. The honorable gentleman's reply was that the Government certainly had no desire whatsoever to destroy Carlton. In fact, the aim was quite the reverse. The honorable gentleman undertook to obtain information on this possibility from the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Country Roads Board. The Minister requested a written account of the case put by the deputation together with copies of overlays and maps prepared by the Freeway Action Group. These were delivered to him on 8th February of this year. The Freeway Action Group withheld publication of this written account pending agreement by the Minister to its contents. The Freeway Action Group was thoroughly ethical in its approach to the matter and the Minister for Local Government gave it an assurance that it was acting ethically, but to date the group has received no acknowledgment from the Minister and a subsequent request by reply-paid telegram asking for acknowledgment has also been ignored by the Minister responsible for freeway planning in Victoria.

The Carlton Association went to much trouble to put forward its views on the effects of freeway planning in the inner-metropolitan area. It arranged a series of informal discussions with representatives of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the Country Roads Board, the Civil Engineering Department of the University of Melbourne, the Town Planning Department of the University of Melbourne, Loder Bayly and Associates, consulting engineers, the Committee for Urban Action and the Fitzroy Residents Association.

I am sorry that the Government has treated this expert report in a shameful way by not acknowledging the work done by people who are deeply interested in the social aspects of freeway planning. One Minister of the Crown has said that the social aspects of freeway planning have already been taken into consideration, but there appears to be no evidence of it. None of the Ministers know anything about freeway planning and all they can do is make statements by interjecting. If any

aspects of social significance have been applied to the planning of freeways in Victoria, I should like the Minister of Transport to show me where they have been applied.

The purpose of the discussions that the association arranged was to obtain all the relevant facts and achieve a balanced and rational outlook. The Government has never had this. It has ignored the report from the Carlton Association. The association decided that before it started a more active campaign on behalf of the residents who would be affected by the freeway intrusions into their community further investigation should be undertaken. The association said that the contents of its report reflected the association's views and opinions after it had evaluated the results of the abortive deputation to the Minister for Local Government. The association claimed that the scope of the report did not include a discussion of the apparent emphasis on Melbourne by the provision of freeways at the expense of the development of existing and new forms of public transport. However, the association considered that it had become apparent in discussion with individuals and with the groups listed that there was a growing consensus that the only long-term solution to Melbourne's transportation problems lay in the provision of a vastly improved public transport system. That is the key—an improved public transport system.

Most countries in the world today have modern transportation systems. I suppose Amsterdam is the best example that I can cite. Even with the flat terrain of Holland, the Government has decided to spend millions of dollars on a fixed rail public transport system that is probably second to none in the world. The Carlton Association claims that it is impossible to have one system without the other. No consideration has been given to the public transport system, although the Minister of Transport stated that the Government had attempted to update that system. There is no evidence of it in the northern suburbs where the 80-year-old dogbox carriages are still in service on the railway lines. The Minister claims to be updating the public transport system, but where is the evidence of it? Without heat or rancour the Minister said that he had ordered some new trams. Is that updating the transport system? This is 1972, but Melbourne's trams are the oldest in the world. Residents in the northern suburbs welcome the attempt by the honorable gentleman to obtain some new trams, but that is not updating the public transport system.

The Minister of Transport claimed further credit for the underground rail loop which, he claims, will lead to a vast improvement in the transport system. However, there will not be a vast improvement without improvements on other lines, together with improvements to the rolling-stock. The intention of the Carlton Association in presenting the report was expressed to the Minister at the deputation. The association informed the Minister that he had to do something to reduce the number of cars coming into the city area. The honorable gentleman was encouraged to provide a better transport system than the Government has been able to provide over the past seventeen years because there has been a steady diminution in the number of passengers carried by public transport and a corresponding increase in the number of vehicles containing only one person coming into the central city area.

Mr. AUREL SMITH.—It is 1·8.

Mr. WILKES.—I stand corrected. The Carlton Association said that the objectives of the report were very simple. The inquiries the association conducted took less time than this new committee of review is taking in considering the matters to which I have referred. The Government appointed the committee of review to adjudicate after tenders had been called to correct mistakes previously made.

The Carlton Association stated that one of the objectives of the report was to illustrate the obvious lack of co-ordination in freeway planning. That is already obvious, and even the most backward back-bench members of the Liberal Party would understand that; common decency prevents me from naming them. The report emphasized the need for comprehensive studies to be undertaken on the social implications of freeway proposals—which I claim the Government has ignored—and the need for freezing freeway construction in the inner areas until existing inadequacies and problems have been resolved.

The Carlton Association spent hours in making investigations and its findings are important but they have been ignored by the Government. The Opposition cannot understand this. The association claims that effective co-ordination between the freeway authorities has not been realized and that if it had been achieved, as I pointed out earlier, one freeway planning authority would be sufficient. On the contrary, the association said that planning and construction so far had been characterized by an increasing divergence of responsibilities and action; that there was no valid reason why effective co-ordination should not have been realized.

If there are to be two planning authorities—I do not believe there should be two—the Government should ensure that they work in harmony and produce a plan instead of engaging in a status race to see which is the best freeway producer or the best freeway planner or the best builder of freeways. In the past that has been a problem.

Finally, the Carlton Association said that Melbourne undoubtedly faced a freeway crisis in the inner suburbs, that the Government seemingly was unable to comprehend it, and that there was a need to freeze freeway route location and construction pending a thorough review of the network by the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. This has not been acknowledged, despite insistent requests by numerous municipal councils and residents' associations. I shall inform the House about them. The Carlton Association claims that public participation has been denied to those communities most likely to suffer disruption from freeway intrusion.

Planning by the Country Roads Board and the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works and the Government has resulted in the present state of affairs. I invite honourable members to consider the planning of freeways by the two authorities within 4 miles of this august establishment, and I cite Freeway F2 which ends at the Merri Creek bridge on St. Georges Road.

Mr. MACLELLAN. — The end of civilization.

Mr. WILKES. — No one knows where it goes from there, not even the genius from Gippsland West. On the other side of the creek, in the Fitzroy area, there is this great Eastern Freeway. While the committee of review was considering whether it was right or wrong, and whether it could get the Government out of a mess, the contractors were ripping up Yarra Bend Park, which will never be restored to its original condition. It has been stated that $350,000 will be spent in an attempt to re-establish the park, but it will never be satisfactory, and the project will have a direct social effect on the community.

The Government must change its policies. I suggest that the Minister of Transport is prepared to half accept the inevitable but not all of it. I have some sympathy for the honorable gentleman and his feelings in this matter, because he is chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. If the motion of the Leader of the Opposition is accepted, the Government will have a breathing

space and the Metropolitan Transportation Committee can instruct the authorities that there will be no more freeway construction or planning until a directorate or other authority is set up to make a thorough examination of the needs of the metropolitan area, and to make recommendations for a properly planned public transport system to be co-ordinated with the freeway planning to cope with the requirements of the people of Melbourne for the future. Otherwise many parks all over the State will be cut up as Yarra Bend Park has been. The next intrusion could be into Albert Park or the beautiful Yarra Valley.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—The honorable member has one minute.

Mr. WILKES.—Then there will be further intrusions into residential areas; it is proposed that Freeway F2 will end at Merri Creek in Northcote. I assure the Government that if it wants the municipal councils to express their opinions it should take note of them and act accordingly, otherwise powerful municipal lobbies will be set up in this State—and if it wants to improve the lot of the people in the area of transport needs and freeway planning, the Government should accept the motion ably moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East).—One aspect of development in this State which is most frequently questioned by country people concerns the tremendous amount of money which is devoted to curing the problem of transport in the metropolitan area. Country people read that the underground rail loop was estimated to cost $80 million. That figure has escalated to $117 million, and in the estimation of most country people its cost will outdo that of the Sydney Opera House. Then country people read about what is considered necessary for the construction of freeways to meet the needs of motorists in the metropolitan area, and that the estimated cost of these freeways is in the vicinity of $1,800 million. Of course this is only a start to the expenditure that will be required.

It makes country people feel very cynical when they hear talk of the Government's interest in decentralization. The construction of the underground rail loop and the building of freeways in the metropolitan area will only lead to more people being transported into the central business area of Melbourne. This is necessary to justify the pulling down of acre upon acre of fine buildings in the heart of the city just to enable skyscrapers of 20, 30 or 40 stories to be built. To ensure that those constructions are successful, big business needs to have more people brought into the central business area, so there is a logical explanation for the expenditure of this money.

It comes as a breath of fresh air to realize that there is a substantial body of opinion in the metropolis which believes it is time for the Government to pause for a while, to halt development of the central city area, and to think about what it proposes to do to ensure that the State heads in the right direction. I believe it is in the interests of the people of the metropolitan area for this tremendous growth to continue, and there is no question in my mind that most Melbourne people would like to see an improvement in their transport facilities, provided that more people will not be loaded onto those facilities.

I remind the Minister of Transport that in debating the Bill to set up the Underground Rail Loop Authority I pointed out that by the time the loop was constructed, thus doubling or trebling the capacity of the suburban railways, the number of people using the railways would be more than doubled or trebled. The position will revert to what it is now; the demand will exceed the capacity of the system to cope with it. The proposal which the Government is following in metropolitan development is like a dog

chasing its tail; it is a mad hatter's dream. However, I believe the motion does not go far enough.

Mr. HOLDING.—Are you supporting the motion?

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—We support the principle, of course. The only suggestion I make is that the construction of freeways should be suspended for at least ten years. This would be the best thing that ever happened for Victoria. I move—

That the following words be added to the motion:—" and that funds, other than those raised by the metropolitan improvement rate, which thereby become available be applied to the construction of roads and streets outside the metropolitan area, as a stimulus to decentralization ".

Mr. CRELLIN.—You want metropolitan money to be used for East Gippsland.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS.—Not metropolitan money, Victorian money.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—I will not debate the point raised by the honorable member for Sandringham, but I hope it goes on record as indicative of the attitude of the Liberal Party to the serious problem of drought relief in many country areas of Victoria at present. In submitting the amendment to the House, I make the point that the original motion does not propose any use for funds which are being accumulated for road construction purposes. Funds for road construction, particularly freeways, which are under discussion in the motion before the Chair, come from three sources—the fees paid by motorists to register their vehicles, the Commonwealth Aid Roads Agreement, and the metropolitan improvement rate for construction work which is carried out by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. Members of the Country Party do not want to get their hands on money specifically raised in the metropolitan area. We exclude money which could clearly be defined as being raised in the metropolitan area.

In recent months a great deal has been heard about the virtues of decentralization. Even the present Government has expressed an interest in it. However, an examination of the record will perhaps reveal that the Hamer Government cannot be blamed for any of these ills, but certainly the Bolte Government can be blamed for the decentralization processes that have occurred. A study of the Board of Inquiry into Local Government proves that statement. The board referred to the fact that the Country Roads Board is spending an increasing proportion of its funds in the metropolitan area. On page 31 of the report of the Board of Inquiry into Local Government, in table 9, it is stated that in 1960, during the term of the Bolte Government 15 per cent of the total expenditure of the Country Roads Board was spent in the metropolitan area. By 1970, ten years later, the proportion had increased to 37 per cent. Although the Government expressed an interest in the country, in such a short time the amount of Country Roads Board money spent in the metropolitan area increased by 20 per cent.

Mr. WILCOX.—Where did that money come from?

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—If the Minister of Transport does not know where the money comes from, it is time he gave up his portfolio.

Mr. WILCOX.—I know, but I want the honorable member to tell the House.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—Apparently the Minister knows that the money comes from the registration of motor vehicles, but obviously insinuates that two-thirds of the motor vehicles registered in the State are registered in the metropolitan area. Particularly at Christmas time, 90 per cent of the vehicles on country roads come from the metropolitan area.

Honorable members interjecting.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—Members of the Government are most anxious to pin down where the money is coming from, but when I point out where the people who register those vehicles actually use them, they try to change the subject. On any

country highway at any given time, a high proportion of the traffic consists of vehicles registered in the city. That is a good thing, and we are pleased to see it. On the other hand, on any city road at any given time, the proportion of country vehicles would be infinitesimal. The argument of the Minister is so spurious that it does not hold water. What has the Liberal Government done over the years to stimulate decentralization?

Mr. JONA (Hawthorn).—I rise to a point of order. The motion before the House refers solely to the question of Melbourne's transport needs and calls for a reappraisal of them. I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any amendment or discussion on the original motion on the question of decentralization for country roads is out of order.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—I rise to a further point of order. I draw attention to the fact that the motion does nothing of the sort. It deals explicitly with freeways within the metropolitan area and the pending immediate and detailed reappraisal of Melbourne's transport needs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I recognize that the honorable member for Gippsland East is debating his own amendment.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East). —Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The original resolution is framed in such a way that it is difficult to determine its most specific portion. In my opinion the important part of the motion deals with the suspension of existing construction pending a reappraisal of the situation. During the period of suspension, the money I referred to will still be accumulating to the extent of a few million dollars a year. If the motion is agreed to, many road construction gangs will need employment. I am proposing how this money can be spent and how these men will be employed during the suspension of freeway development in the metropolitan area. Doubtless my interpretation of the inner metropolitan area differs substantially from that of the honorable member for Hawthorn who lives merely a stone's throw from Parliament House. I believe the inner metropolitan area extends a long way from the General Post Office.

I shall endeavour to point out the true attitude of this Government which over past years has claimed to be doing so much and is now going to do so much more for country towns. During the ten-year period 1960–1970, the expenditure by the Country Roads Board on metropolitan roads increased from 15 per cent to 37 per cent, and most of that money was expended on freeways. The tables are not fully comparable, but on page 32 the report points out that between 1966 and 1970, a four-year period, the amount of Country Roads Board's funds spent in country cities, towns and boroughs, decreased from 4·5 per cent to 2·8 per cent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I ask the honorable member to return to the question, which is a detailed reappraisal of Melbourne's transport needs.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hoped you would have in your possession the amendment which I have moved. I am speaking to the amendment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member is in order.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—This is a very important piece of information in a most valuable report. I recommend the report as compulsory reading for every member of Parliament. The points I have raised on the effect of the Government's policies on country municipalities up to date are marginal in comparison with other more important points contained in that report but are entirely outside the scope of this debate. I base the amendment on the point that if this Parliament really has an interest in decentralization it must do more than merely pay lip service to it and say

that a couple of million dollars will be spent on decentralization in the State.

Incidentally, the drought stricken farmers in my part of Victoria have spent more than that amount on buying fodder for their stock in the past twelve months. The amount of money which the Government proposes to spend on decentralization is so miserable it is hardly worth mentioning. A proposition like the one I am submitting has wonderful possibilities. I sincerely hope the Government will set up an investigation and that it will take ten years to reach its conclusion. In the meantime, if the money now proposed to be spent on building freeways and underground railways were to be spent in the country areas of Victoria, in ten years decentralization would be no longer a problem.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Honorable members now addressing the House will address themselves to the motion as well as to the amendment.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne).—Freeway theory is based on the premise that a freeway is the shortest distance between two points. This is true if a freeway is linking two relatively remote points of moderate density and by-passes all the bottlenecks in between. The result is that there could be some rational plans for freeway building. For example, a freeway connecting the Hume Highway and Geelong via Sunshine has a good deal of rationality to commend it. However, a freeway does not succeed in what it is supposed to do if at one end you have an area of intense density, as in the heart of the metropolis of Melbourne, with an almost infinite area of space and arterial roads leading on to it at the other end. That is part of the paradox.

Mr. WHEELER.—What freeway are you alluding to?

Mr. JONES.—The existing network of freeways all finish in or very close to the centre of the City of Melbourne, and in fact in the suburbs immediately abutting the central business district. In a sense, on a metropolitan basis, it is the whole reason for having a freeway system.

The problem is that the greater the car input, the greater the need for parking at the other end, and the more parking the smaller amount of area that is available for shops, services other than parking, and even for public transport. I quote a few words written by Harrison Salisbury as quoted in Jane Jacobs' book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. He says—

> The drawback is that as more and more space is allotted to the automobile, the goose that lays the golden eggs is strangled. Enormous areas go from the tax rolls and are rendered unsuitable for productive economic purposes. The community's ability to foot the ever-multiplying costs of freeways dwindles . .

In fact one could state the general rule: "Too much dependence on private automobiles and city concentration of use are incompatible. One or other has to give". In the long term, it is bad even for the central business district itself. In the short term it is disastrous for those communities which border on the central business district. I suggest that the Minister of Transport, when his interest returns to the debate, may examine the work of Victor Gruen in Fort Worth, Texas, which is almost a classic example of the problem we have around Melbourne. The theory of the freeway is absurd.

The normal sedan car covers an area of almost 80 square feet. Even the largest of us sitting down do not cover much more than 4 square feet. Therefore there can be a ratio of 20 : 1 relative to the size of the vehicle as to the size of the single person.

On the other hand, there could be a situation where a suburban train or series of trains carry, say, 1,000 passengers, who, if they were to drive their own cars in a single line along the freeway, would involve nearly 3 miles of cars bumper to bumper, At one end of that line there is the possibility of almost unlimited expansion and at the other end there

is a finite area and almost no possibility for parking or for expansion of space for cars except by going up nearly to the stratosphere. It seems absurd to encourage a system, as was the situation until recently, where thousands of people were travelling into the city and parking their cars for eight or nine hours a day in the richest real estate area in Melbourne.

Having demolished the freeway theory, I now relate my remarks to the specific subjects raised by the Minister of Transport. The first thing that strikes one about the honorable gentleman's remarks is that he was considerably less than candid. The Minister speaks as though there has been a change of heart by the Government, so much so that there is a change in methodology. Whereas previously the freeway planners did not consider the communities they were going to wreck by freeways, they now are. Is this really true?

First of all, who is really reviewing the over-all strategy of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee? The answer is that the review is being carried out by the committee itself, which is a case of appealing from Caesar to Caesar. The Metropolitan Transportation Committee has retained control. The Government says that the committee has requested a list of sociological criteria from the Country Roads Board—Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works joint committee. It is six months since the joint committee was asked to produce this criteria, but is there any suggestion from the now absent Minister of Transport as to what these criteria are?

Certainly, many people in the community could be called upon to make suggestions. Some of them are in this House and some are members of organizations outside the House. There is no suggestion that they have been called upon and no suggestion that the Government has a specific list of guidelines of what these sociological and phenomena criteria are. Therefore, after six months, the Metropolitan Transportation Committee has been unable to establish the sociological and environmental criteria or to establish a weighting system for the assessment of these criteria. The committee is a cabinet of barons consisting of representatives of the State Government, the Melbourne City Council, the Board of Works, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board, the Victorian Railways and so on—everybody except the people who use the transport system and those in areas of mixed occupation or mixed usage around the central business district itself.

Mr. JONA.—How would you suggest that they should be used?

Mr. JONES.—I suggest that they could be consulted because it is their lives and their environment which will be involved. Heaven knows, it is possible to organize a process of consultation. Admittedly it might not be a familiar process to the Liberal Party, which has a tradition of paternalism, and perhaps the honorable member for Hawthorn has not been so much involved in the process of consultation within the society around him.

In effect, the Minister of Transport says, "Everything is all right. Do not panic!" The honorable gentleman even smiles at the Leader of the Opposition and says that he is on his side. It is difficult to criticize the Minister in his absence but he is an irresistible target when present. The Minister of Transport is my second favourite target, following the Minister of Health. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall St. Augustine's famous prayer when he was on the point of conversion to Christianity and said: "Lord, make me virtuous, but not yet". In effect, the Minister says, "Yes, we go along with you on the freeway policy, we have a lot of sympathy, but not yet. Do not let us put it to the vote and expose those unfortunate members of the Liberal Party in marginal seats, with

areas which are likely to be wrecked by the freeways. On the other hand, let us deal with it like gentlemen and postpone it."

The Minister said that the matter was under review. This has also been said by the Minister for Local Government as recently as 4th October as quoted in the *Age*. However, in this mysterious period of review, a strange thing has happened to the Government in that a freeway of which the Government was hardly aware has crept up on it because, during this review period and before the review had been completed, there was an announcement concerning the F2 Hume Freeway. There has been the promise of a review, of consultation and also of examination of sociological and other factors, but these promises seem to have been delayed somewhere.

There are two kinds of freeways, as Jane Jacobs remarks, namely, those which are "by-passers" and those which are "dumpers". The only effect that those dumpers have is to attract more cars into the system and those cars have to be released somewhere, they have to be dumped. The dumping will take place in and around the metropolitan area and specifically in North Melbourne, Flemington, Carlton, Collingwood, Fitzroy, South Melbourne, Richmond, South Yarra and Prahran, and even as far distant as St. Kilda.

I now wish to refer to the Town and Country Planning Board. As recently as 4th May, the Minister for Local Government said that the board was proceeding with a review of the transportation plan from a planning point of view and that a single network had first priority. Both the Town and Country Planning Board and the Country Roads Board are looking at Freeway F19 as it affects Carlton. This statement is contained in a letter dated 4th May from the Minister for Local Government to the Carlton Association.

The problem is that news travels very slowly and this information, apparently, has not been communicated to the Town and Country Planning Board because the Carlton Association later got in touch with Mr. Keith Tyler, the board's strategic planner. Members of the Carlton Association rubbed their hands with some enthusiasm and agreed that the review from a planning point of view was a good thing, especially as the single network had first priority. Mr. Tyler asked the association what this was about and the association told him that the Minister had assured them that the review was under way. Mr. Tyler scratched his head, and said that it was very interesting but that he had not heard of it. Perhaps the Minister should light a fire on the lawns behind Parliament House, get a blanket and send up some kind of smoke signal. The Town and Country Planning Board knew nothing about this review as recently as a fortnight ago, and it is about time the board was informed.

On the matter of sociological and environmental factors, the joint committee of the Country Roads Board and Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has gone some little distance and understands that something has to be done about these sociological and environmental factors, but the committee does not quite know how to go about it. It has not consulted the local associations at Parkville, North Melbourne or Carlton. I suppose members of the committee can read because they have come to some preliminary conclusions.

The Carlton Association has been informed by Mr. Hepburn, the chief planner of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works that there are certain guidelines relating to the sociological and environmental factors. The first guideline concerns churches. With a Federal election close at hand and a State election coming on before very long, churches are probably exempt from any kind

of interference. I do not disagree with that for a moment. Therefore, one category includes the churches.

The second is the Collingwood football ground and the third category of sociological and environmental factors is houses declared to be national assets by the National Trust. That is as far as they have gone. One striking omission is a distinct reference to people. No reference is made to communities.

The freeway problem has occurred in overseas cities such as Los Angeles, which was referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Many honorable members will know the effect that freeways have had on its communities. Communities as we know them are very intricate things. Planners, who are not infallible, do not always take this into account. In the Australian Capital Territory there is the planned community of Woden Valley which was not particularly successful. Even Canberra still lacks something of a community spirit. A classic example of what a freeway can do to a community is what happened to the suburb of Watts in Los Angeles, which had a background of mixed usage. Once the freeway went through, it became a Negro ghetto because the freeway actually had the effect of physically cutting the suburb out of surrounding areas.

It meant that either a person moved into the Negro community 100 per cent and recognized that it was a sociological island by itself, or he moved completely out of Watts because the freeway constituted a kind of *cordon sanitaire* around the whole area. There was no interchange, no longer any linkage between that suburb and the suburbs which geographically were only hundreds of yards away, but which in terms of the sociological network might have been 10, 15, 20 or 30 miles away, so much were they cut off. I urge that the Minister should point out to the joint committee what he considers the sociological factors are, and he might ask members of Parliament and organizations in the community what they consider the sociological and other factors are.

I want to say a few words about the Eastern Freeway. We are also told by the Minister that things are at present " in suspension ", that the Government is not going to press ahead ruthlessly. The Country Roads Board and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works joint study committee has appointed consultants to examine route alignments in parts of Freeway F6—that is the Greensborough bypass—and F6 in the Mordialloc–Moorabbin area. I suggest that that is well on the way. Once the wheels have been set in motion they are very difficult to stop; once there is a commitment of money, material, resources, and so on, it is hard to turn back the clock.

In another place, on 29th February this year, the Minister for Local Government made a candid statement about legal objections that can be put up. He said, quite rightly—

> Normally the public knows only when a firm plan is produced, at which stage it becomes pointless to object.

In other words, the Government is in a peculiarly strong position. It has all the experts, or what it considers to be experts, around it; it makes a decision. When it is announced, it is often too late to do anything about it. I commend the Minister in another place for his candour, and I invite the Minister of Transport, if and when he returns, to have a look at that quotation from *Hansard* for 29th February, on page 3789.

Plenty of overseas examples exist where authorities were prepared to meet and discuss with the public and were prepared to impose constraints in the community interest. The only contact here has been through councils. This, of course, brings me inexorably to the Melbourne City Council. To say that the Melbourne City Council is a democratic institution would be to state an absurdity.

As ought to be well known by now, half of its councillors are elected by 29 per cent of the ratepayers and the other half are elected by 71 per cent. I invite honorable members to guess who resides in the areas elected by the 71 per cent. Those are the areas of North Melbourne, Flemington and Carlton, and they are the areas which will be ploughed under if freeways are established. The residents of those areas do not have an effective voice in the Melbourne City Council.

Mr. HOLDING.—Has the honorable member examined who owns the car parks in the metropolitan area?

Mr. JONES.—One would not be surprised if they were friends or relatives of councillors who are elected by the 29 per cent. They would like to see the Carlton and North Melbourne areas turned into huge car parks because they are interested not in the residential areas but in the financial prospects and the revenue coming out of the Golden Mile, the central business district.

Mr. BILLING.—Did a member of the Labor Party win the last council election at North Melbourne?

Mr. JONES.—No, and I am not saying that a democratic Melbourne City Council would necessarily favour the Labor Party. It would increase the Labor Party's representation and would at least leave the possibility open to elect a council controlled by independents or the Labor Party; or if property owners who are not residents were allowed to continue to vote it is conceivable that independents could support the Civic Group, which would by no means result in an overall Labor majority.

Mr. MACLELLAN.—Is the honorable member speaking on the amendment or on the motion?

Mr. JONES.—I was doing a courtesy to the neighbour on the honorable member's left, and I do not say that in any political sense.

The Country Roads Board employs a sociologist. I do not envy the poor man his task. It has often been said by the Minister for Local Government that the Country Roads Board now has a sociologist on its side to examine social factors. This is an example of what is sometimes used in the Senate, referring to Senator Bonner, and sometimes where women are concerned—and I do not intend any discourtesy to the honorable member for Mitcham—the phenomenon of "tokenism". It is said, "Of course we are concerned with sociology in this department. Stand up, Fred, and let them see you." Fred then sits down, and that is the end of it, but there is no established input from the result of his examinations. The Country Roads Board sociologist is one sociologist in a committee which is overwhelmingly dominated by builders, engineers, and people concerned with construction.

This goal, this dream, came from the Bolte era—the idea of Melbourne unlimited, to say "The sky's the limit" and the more its population increases the better it is for the State. However, those who are concerned with the interests of the people in the inner-city area do not regard this as a good thing and consider that the sociological input of the Country Roads Board has been inadequate, and what the Minister has said has been quite inaccurate.

I return briefly for another look at the Carlton Association's freeway report, in which it made this comment—

> It is recognized that the cost components of urban freeways are—
>
> (*a*) capital costs, borne by the motoring public and other highway users through taxation; and
>
> (*b*) social costs, borne by the residents and property owners disrupted by the freeway.

An HONORABLE MEMBER.—You came back.

Mr. JONES.—It is probably too late, unless of course by unanimous vote of the House I am granted a long enough extension to go through it all again for the benefit of the Minister who has now returned.

Freeways may well turn out to be the Vietnams of State Governments; that is to say, at the beginning there

was a strong and almost universal feeling of sympathy. Then people started to have second thoughts, and at last I think there will be a feeling of revulsion against them. There has not been adequate consultation; things are still taking place behind the curtain. I was staggered to hear the Minister unblushingly—I watched carefully to see if he did blush—say that there is always plenty of information, that people are consulted, and so on. I refer to the commencement of the Eastern Freeway in 1971 and to the extraordinary and quite unconstitutional way in which that was done. The matter was then brought to Parliament as a *fait accompli*. That was not an encouraging precedent. There has not been enough publicity about what is taking place and there has been too much parochialism.

Mr. WILCOX.—When the honorable member has been here longer he will understand the planning process.

Mr. JONES.—I know something about the planning process, and I understand the irritation that Ministers suffer when they are accountable to Parliament. Ministers have all the information in their own hands and are inclined to adopt the view, "We have the best advice; we are the masters; we know what is best. Members of Parliament and members of the community at large are either fractious, factious, or uninformed. Therefore, why should we consult them? We know all that there is to know about the subject." I suppose when one has been a Minister as long as the Minister of Transport, it becomes second nature to think like that. One no longer thinks as a Parliamentarian but essentially as an administrator. One is part of the executive wing of Government and feels it is hardly worth while to raise these matters and talk about them in the Parliament. Consultation has to be held at every level.

Mr. MACLELLAN.—Are you supporting the amendment?

Mr. JONES.—I am sympathetic to the amendment; as a member representing a metropolitan seat my interest is naturally with my constituents, and that means the motion put by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not believe that our interests and the interests of country people are altogether separate; I think we are tied by an umbilical cord. If Melbourne expands to the idea of a greater Melbourne of 3·5 million people by 1985 and 5 million people by the year 2000, it will not be good for the State or for the country. Members on the Opposition side of the House genuinely believe in decentralization. There are members on the Government side who do not. Often when politicians talk about ideals, one needs to be wary of them. When politicians talk in terms of self interest they are probably nearer the truth.

One has to bear in mind that the introduction of industry in the country areas will be beneficial only to one party in this House, and that is the party for which I am speaking at present and of which I have the honour to be a member. I am very much opposed to freeway dumping, and I think the Government has been much less than candid with the House. I hope the House will agree to pass this motion, which is not intended to be divisive. It is a motion which I believe many members of the Government party will feel badly about. The worst course would be to adjourn the debate without coming to a vote. Whether it is won or lost, I hope a vote will be taken so that honorable members will be able to stand up and be counted on it.

Mr. WHEELER (Essendon). — I venture to assert that no other member of this House has had more problems with freeways running through the electorate he represents than I have had over the past five years. However, I believe the construction of freeways upon which the Government has entered as a result of its far-sightedness has been a success for the city of Melbourne, for mem-

bers representing country areas, particularly to the north of Melbourne, who use the Tullamarine Freeway, and also for persons carrying merchandise interstate. The honorable member for Melbourne said that one of his first concerns was for the constituents in the area he represents, and I compliment him for that attitude. Does the honorable member believe that his constituents do not travel on the Tullamarine Freeway? Before the freeway was constructed, areas in North Melbourne and West Melbourne were strangled; one could neither get out of nor get into the city quickly.

Mr. CURNOW.—One still cannot.

Mr. WHEELER.—The honorable member for Kara Kara would not know where the Tullamarine Freeway is. He should go back to his ferrets. Until the Tullamarine Freeway was constructed, the business area along Sydney Road, in both Coburg and Brunswick, was gradually dying. Motorists who wanted to shop there could not do so because they could not find parking space. The entire road from Bell Street to Brunswick Road was congested to the extent that traffic was almost immobilized. Transport vehicles as long as three motor cars monopolized the area. The situation became so grave that the Brunswick City Council wisely introduced a by-law to provide that no freight vehicles could use Sydney Road between the hours of 4 p.m. and 6 p.m.

Mr. WILTON.—Why did they do that?

Mr. WHEELER.—The first reason was that the entire area was so congested that it was dangerous. The second was that freight vehicles could use the alternative route of the Tullamarine Freeway.

Mr. WILTON.—The Country Roads Board would not give the council funds to rebuild Sydney Road.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—I ask honorable members on the Opposition benches to allow the honorable member for Essendon to give his address.

Mr. CURNOW.—If he spoke the truth, we would listen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! I am inclined to regard that as an offensive remark. I call on the honorable member for Essendon.

Mr. WHEELER.—There is no point in debating whether the construction of freeways should be continued. All honorable members know of the relevant statistics. The Royal Automobile Club of Victoria 1971 Traffic Survey states—

> More finance is required to improve the existing surface street system, and to enable the present 20 miles of freeway essential for the high volume of commuting and commercial traffic to be increased by 200 miles.

I have no doubt that that is a factual statement. The report also states—

> The need for greater freeway mileage throughout the metropolitan area is emphasized by the fact that 79 per cent of the arterial route sections analysed had an average speed of 25 m.p.h. or less, whilst 32 per cent of arterial route sections analysed had an average speed of 15 m.p.h. or less.
>
> The effect of freeway development on travel times can be seen from the study.
>
> The Tullamarine Freeway enables motorists to travel 5 miles from Bulla Road to Flemington Bridge at an average speed of about 48 miles per hour in both the a.m. and p.m. peaks.

That was the freeway on which the honorable member for Kara Kara suggested that traffic could not move.

The honorable member for Melbourne has said that a freeway, naturally, is built to provide quick access from point A to point B. He suggested that it was a tragedy if any of the freeways by-passed certain areas. Decentralization is a fact of life and it will continue on a larger scale. It must be recognized that, with decentralization, it will become more and more necessary to have good roads of freeway standard between some of the country centres and the central business areas. There is no doubt about that. The honorable member for Gippsland East condemned the use of Country Roads Board money in the metropolitan area.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—I merely presented facts; I neither condemned nor praised.

Mr. WHEELER.—The honorable member spoke of 37 per cent of Country Roads Board money being used in the metropolitan area. Yesterday, the honorable member for Northcote asked a question on notice, No. 244, of the Minister of Transport for the Minister for Local Government. The honorable member asked what was the total value of the tenders let by the Country Roads Board in each of the past three financial years for freeway and highway construction. If I mentioned all of the tenders listed in the answer, the honorable member for Gippsland East might be staggered. In 1971-72, the total value of tenders accepted by the Country Roads Board for road works was $12·49 million. The works provided for by that sum included the Lower Yarra Freeway at Princes Highway West, the Nepean Highway, the Maroondah Highway, the Frankston Freeway, the Bacchus Marsh secton of the Western Freeway, the Mulgrave Freeway, and the Western Highway at Rockbank. I could name many more country areas.

Mr. B. J. EVANS.—It is news to me that they are country areas.

Mr. WHEELER.—I do not suppose Rockbank is in the city. Melbourne now has a population of 2.3 million people and there are about 35 motor vehicles per 100 of population. Those figures are taken from the metropolitan transportation study. It is expected that, by 1985, Melbourne's population will have risen to 3·5 million people and that the number of motor vehicles per head of population will have risen to about 52 per 100 or even more.

Mr. GINIFER.—Not if the policy of the Minister of Transport is accepted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Interjections which are being made from the Opposition benches should be made in speeches.

Mr. WHEELER.—When consideration is given to the expected increase in population and the greater number of motor cars per 100 of population, what alternative is there for any Government but to pursue a policy of improving the road system? If that policy is not followed, the stage will be reached when there will be congestion on the roads to the extent that the motor car industry could eventually be killed.

Honorable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I remind the honorable member for Gippsland East that he occupied the attention of the House for quite some time.

Mr. WHEELER.—Because of the increased congestion, people would refrain from buying motor cars. That might suit some members of the Opposition who believe that if unemployment is created the Opposition will win a few more seats than it has now. I make a comparison with the United States of America. Most honorable members have had the privilege of going overseas and most have seen what has happened with freeway systems in certain parts of America.

The city of Los Angeles has been mentioned several times tonight. To me, the freeway system there was a monstrosity. There was freeway upon freeway. It was nothing less than a concrete jungle. But, in Victoria, because of planning, all our freeways are constructed at ground level and the situation is quite different. The way in which the Board of Works has developed garden sites on the side of the Tullamarine Freeway and elsewhere reflects great credit on it.

In 1964, on the average, American cities had 40 miles of freeway for each 1 million of population, with a range from 33 miles to 80 miles, whereas Melbourne has 10 miles of freeway for each 1 million of population at present. There is a vast difference in the two situations. Melbourne has not gone mad with freeways, although I agree that, if the

metropolitan transportation plan was put into effect, there would be too many freeways in Melbourne. There is not the need for them at present.

There must be closer co-ordination between our two transport systems. If the present density of traffic on freeways is to be maintained, we must do our best to encourage more people to use public transport. Assistance will have to be given to local authorities to enable them to provide parking spaces at suburban railway stations so that commuters can leave their cars there. This may encourage more people to use the railways. The Melbourne underground rail loop will encourage more people to use the railways. We must have a better standard of trams and trains than we have now. Only more money poured into the public transport system will ensure that these objectives are reached. But that does not alter the fact that, in a decentralized Victoria, good arterial roads will be needed between country centres.

Every time a debate of this type is conducted in the House, members of the Country Party talk a lot of nonsense about the city being opposed to the country and country money being spent in the city. Does the honorable member for Gippsland East honestly believe that when city people travel to Lakes Entrance at Christmas time they should do so on bad roads? A great deal of poppycock has been heard tonight about stopping construction of freeways.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS.—Not stopping, suspending.

Mr. WHEELER.—We all know what happens when construction on a project is suspended; it stops for keeps. While a road system is in the course of construction, work should continue. The roads in Melbourne and throughout Victoria ought to be the envy of people in other States of the Commonwealth. We need good freeways which motorists will be glad to travel on, and the work which has started should not be suspended.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—In all fairness to the honorable member for Essendon, I point out that the facts he quoted were irrelevant because they were taken from the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria traffic survey for 1971. The whole basis of the motion introduced by the Opposition is that in recent weeks there has been a revolutionary change in the situation. The honorable member spoke about a road system which is financially starved and also about a financially starved public transport system. He also spoke about population trends which would grow to a certain figure.

The basis of his argument was that whether there be a Liberal or Labor Government in Canberra, revolutionary changes which were quite unexpected some time ago will take place and now much more finance will be put into public transport which will affect the demand for freeways and motorways. In recent weeks, both Federal parties have claimed that past trends of Melbourne growing in an unlimited fashion will be reversed by decentralization for which finance will be provided. Therefore, the motion moved by the Opposition rules out the argument of the honorable member for Essendon.

The debate tonight is unique. In his lengthy reply to the Leader of the Opposition, the king-pin of the Liberal Government on transport, the Minister of Transport, agreed 99.9 per cent with the principles inherent in the motion. The honorable gentleman agreed in the newspapers and on the public media that this is what was wanted. His colleague, the Premier, in a recent public relations statement spoke about the quality of life in Victoria. The Premier and the Minister of Transport have the opportunity of living up to their promises to the people of Victoria by voting for this motion. Victoria has had the Bolte era for twenty years and now is the Hamer era. Some years ago, the Mayor of Toronto said that that city did not belong to motor

cars but to the people. Members of the Opposition — I am sure the Government also — believe that Melbourne should belong to the people and not to the motor cars.

After its promises to the public, if the Government votes against this motion it will be disappointing to the people and contrary to the beliefs of the town planners, the civic fathers, the business people and other folk in the community who were prepared to look at the future of Melbourne. As I said previously, in recent weeks plans for the future of Victoria have dramatically changed because both parties in Canberra, Liberal and Labor, are now prepared to assist the public transport system in a manner which was undreamed of several weeks ago. The Victorian Government has also said that it will play the Pied Piper and lead the people away from Melbourne into the country. Therefore, the need to develop Melbourne in the manner previously envisaged does not now arise. Only 24 hours ago, in answer to my question, the Minister of Transport said —

> Following a request from the Government in October 1971, the Metropolitan Transportation Committee is now reviewing the freeway network proposed by the metropolitan transportation study with a view to its modification in terms of sociological impact and over-all costs.

If that statement is not exactly in line with the motion moved by the Opposition, I am very wrong. It would be morally wrong for the Government and the Minister of Transport to vote against this motion for political purposes. Surely, as elected representatives of the people, parliamentary affiliations should be thrown away on this subject and in the interests of Melbourne honorable members should combine to support a motion which in all fairness they all agree with.

I do not agree with the present situation in the community of two rival camps with roadways, motor cars and freeways in one camp and public transport in the other camp. Too much rivalry has existed in public transport. There is a place for both freeways and public transport in the community but we must be careful that the use of freeways does not turn into abuse. Abuse has occurred in North America and the people now realize they were wrong in developing freeways as they did in years gone by. Victoria is now at the same cross-roads which confronted the people of Los Angeles many years ago. Melbourne is in the same dilemma. In the light of the present Federal policies, Victoria should look ahead. If it does not this State will go down the road to disaster both economically and socially.

Serious consideration should be given to steps which must be taken to ensure that they are not wrong and that they will serve future generations. The taxpayer should not and will not accept the present trend whereby large areas of our parklands and suburbs are being carved up unless he is satisfied that the freeway policy is the only possible alternative to overcome the traffic problems. Surely, the present should be a waiting time, a period of review, to determine what is to be done. More attention should be paid to the public transport system. If this is done, the finance considered necessary for freeways will not be as much as was previously estimated. Honorable members will agree that the public transport system throughout Victoria, particularly in the inner-metropolitan area, is operating under nineteenth century conditions and is competing against twentieth century motor vehicles. One cannot blame people for turning from antiquated, cold and draughty trams and trains to their warm motor cars. Melbourne is now growing with great streams of motor cars at traffic lights and for many hours each day our lovely streets and other areas like the Exhibition grounds and St. Kilda Road have long lines of parked cars waiting for their owners to come back in the evening. They are jungles.

The Minister of Transport agreed that the metropolitan transportation plan has its shortcomings. I agree that it was wrongly based and that it did not take into account that the railways had not been extended in the metropolitan area since 1931. Many people, particularly the young folk in the outer areas, do not have the choice of public transport to reach their destinations and they must use the motor cars. The Minister has said that he wants the plans to be balanced. Is a balance achieved by providing $385 million for public transport and $1,675 million for freeways, apart from the $40 million for car space? It must not be forgotten that the estimate of $1,675 million has now grown to $3,000 million. From an economic point of view it must also be realized that approximately 139,000 acres of soil space will be occupied by these concrete jungles. Is it not economically and socially stupid for the Government to go along the same old track when circumstances have altered drastically?

Is it not silly to allow these concrete jungles through South Melbourne and St. Kilda to pour pollution and noise over the people and destroy large regions in little less time than North Vietnam has been destroyed in recent years? If only for the next seven weeks, I believe the Government should accept the motion and freeze its policy on freeways. The Federal election date of 2nd December was announced yesterday. Whether the new Prime Minister be Mr. McMahon or one of the cutthroats around him, or Mr. Whitlam, surely this Government should wait and say, " You have won the election; what are you prepared to do? You have made a lot of promises. What are you going to provide for our public transport system? " I presume that whatever party forms the Government will say, " We will give you so much for the transport system and the sums available for freeways can then be reviewed ". But to carry on in the meantime would be a waste of hard-earned taxpayers' money which could be spent in other directions.

Many people, apart from members of the Government party, drive motor vehicles and they say that they must have motor cars and freeways. Do they realize the consequences of a freeway system and the comparative differences between freeways and motor cars on the one hand and the alternative public transport system on the other hand? The policy should be, firstly, to move people and, secondly, motor vehicles. I shall give a few comparative figures which may make people change their minds.

One railway track moves 30,000 people an hour, whereas a 1-lane freeway moves 2,000 people an hour. One 8-car Harris train, fully loaded, can transport 1,400 people, but one motor car in Melbourne, on present statistics, carries only 1.4 persons. From those figures it is obvious that if only one additional passenger train were to operate, and people were encouraged to use it, it would be the equivalent of 1,000 motor cars on the roads. At 30 miles an hour, 1,000 motor cars occupy 11 miles of freeway. That number of cars would occupy 6 miles of kerb space, and need a parking lot of 5 acres to accommodate them. If people who work in a 20-story building came to work at the rate of 1·4 persons in each motor vehicle, the building would need an additional 30 storys to provide sufficient parking space.

This matter has deep implications, and the Government should seriously consider whether the use of a public transport system should be encouraged and freeway construction discouraged. After examining the matter the Government must eventually come to the conclusion that, in the public interest, a public transport system would best serve the people of our community.

Overseas countries have learnt from experience that the development of high-rise buildings in a business area and the development of

freeways at the same time is not sound policy because the best way in which to serve an area where there are high-rise buildings—such as those which are being developed by the Government itself—is to have an efficient public transport system. Despite that, the Government has just announced that it will build State offices in the central business district, and the State Savings Bank plans to erect a multi-story building in the heart of the city even though it will have inadequate parking space for its employees. The policy of the Government is just as suicidal and hypocritical as that of many business leaders in the community. It should be realized that freeways divide the people, and that a public transport system unites them.

I ask the Government to abandon party politics and not be too proud to change its mind. I remind the House that the City of Toronto was not too proud to do so; in recent years, it cancelled the construction of the Spadina Expressway, which was a $273 million project. Proposals for motorways in London have also been cancelled, pending a review of the situation, and the United States of America admits that its policy, which is the same as that which has been followed by this Government—namely, the building of freeways because there are more and more motor cars—is suicidal. The Government should adopt the same view.

When the vote is taken on this motion, as the guardians of this State honorable members have to decide whether to continue the present freeway construction policy in the hope that it is the right system or to improve the public transport system and thus avoid leading the people of Victoria down the suicidal path that has been followed in other countries. If it is decided to continue the present policy, and that decision is wrong, it will be binding on Victorians for centuries. For that reason, the Opposition believes that the Minister should join in supporting the motion which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I trust that the Country Party will also lend its support.

Mr. CRELLIN (Sandringham).—I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In the first place, it appears that the honorable member is not going to speak. For that reason I believe I should be given the call.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—There is a long time usage in this place that the call is taken over and back again. I checked with the Chairman of Committees when I came into the House, and the last call was with the Opposition. I think it is appropriate that the call should go to the opponents of the motion, whoever they may be. I think the call should pass to the other side of the House.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Mr. Speaker, I should have thought that the Government would have given more consideration to this debate than it has. The Minister of Transport and the honorable member for Essendon were the only speakers on behalf of the Government in opposing the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The motion was moved before the dinner break, and the only reply from the Government has come from the Minister and one back-bench member, yet the Government now wishes at this early hour to have the debate adjourned.

Mr. WILCOX.—The Government has other work to do.

Mr. WILKES.—That is not the fault of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition and I waited on the Premier in his chamber and suggested that there should be Sessional Orders and that the Parliament should meet on Thursdays right from the beginning of the sessional period. I understand that that was not practical, and the Leader of the Opposition and I are the first to

acknowledge that it is not in the first two weeks of a session. However, there was nothing to prevent the House from meeting last Thursday and I do not think there is anything to prevent the House from sitting on Thursday of this week. I point out that the Opposition regards the freeways problem as one of urgency.

The Opposition established a committee which thoroughly investigated the effect of the Government's freeway planning, but only one member of the committee has been permitted to speak because of the Government's motion for the adjournment of the debate.

I have been a member of this House long enough—indeed, longer than some of the members who frequently interject—to know that if this motion is adjourned now it will be placed at the bottom of the Notice Paper and will never see the light of day. The Opposition does not accept that situation, and will regard it as an insult if this important debate is adjourned.

Members of the Opposition have done hours of work upon the committee to which I have referred and have interviewed many people by courtesy of the Government and of others, and they are entitled to express their views; indeed, it is their duty to do so on behalf of their electors who will be affected by the Government's policies. If the motion is agreed to they will be denied that right.

I ask the Government to consider the point I have raised. Members of the Liberal Party may not wish to speak to the motion because their electorates are not affected by freeways, but for the opposite reason members of the Opposition do wish to speak to the motion. I strongly oppose the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—Other members of my party and I oppose the adjournment of this debate, because there is no suggestion concerning the period of the adjournment.

Mr. WILCOX.—The House has not yet reached that stage.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS.—It should be indicated now. I suspect that the sole purpose of this motion is to have the matter placed at the bottom of the Notice Paper so that it will become a dead issue. If some undertaking is given, the situation may be different. I invite comment, but I see that none is forthcoming.

This situation is ridiculous. This House seems to be adopting the sitting hours of another place. Since there has been a change in the leadership of the Government, the House has been sitting from 4 p.m. until 10.30 p.m. week after week with no business being conducted before the House rises. The House ought to settle down and do some work. It should sit until 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. and deal with this miserably weak Notice Paper. There is nothing on the Notice Paper to speak about, and my party is prepared to sit until any hour the Government chooses. The Government should be ashamed of the way in which it is conducting the business of the House, and the Leader of the House should indicate the period of the proposed adjournment of this debate. If it is until tomorrow or until next Tuesday, the Country Party will agree; but if it is to be adjourned until another unspecified date, the Country Party will wholeheartedly oppose the motion.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I think it is fair to say that members of the Opposition—in fact, honorable members generally—have had ample opportunity of expressing their views on this important subject, but I suggest that there has been a considerable amount of repetition in the arguments which have been presented.

With regard to sittings of the House, I agree with the suggestion of the Leader of the Country Party that we have reached a stage at which we should extend the sittings by starting at 2.30 p.m. on Wednesdays. I inform honorable members

that the House will also meet on Thursday of next week. There have been expressions by many honorable members that we should adopt reasonable hours of sitting in keeping with those observed by outside members of the community so that this institution may be conducted more efficiently.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I have heard many glib statements in this place, but none so glib as the statement which has been made by the Minister of Education. I do not think I have ever heard a statement quite so contemptible. If the honorable gentleman is being completely frank with you, Mr. Speaker, and if as he suggests the reason for seeking the adjournment of the debate is that the debate has tended to become repetitious—I put it to you that it has not—the appropriate action for the honorable gentleman to take is to move the gag and have a vote on it.

Mr. WILCOX.—We could have a vote on this motion.

Mr. HOLDING.—I have some sympathy for the Minister of Transport because from the outset of this debate——

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! The Leader of the Opposition should speak on the motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HOLDING.—One has to look at the nature of this debate because it has been put by the Minister of Education that the reason for seeking the adjournment of the debate is that the debate has become repetitious. The Minister of Transport said that the Government agrees with the motion that I moved and does not intend to vote against it. The honorable member for Melbourne, in the polite Parliamentary parlance of the day, indicated that the Government was being less than frank with the House and with the people of Victoria.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The debate must be narrow on whether the debate should be adjourned. It should not be on the subject-matter of the original motion.

Mr. HOLDING.—The Leader of the House has not heard most of the debate. I shall not be repetitious and indicate the course taken by the debate because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has already outlined that. A debate is being conducted on an issue which affects nine members of the Opposition, six members of the Government party and the independent member. Most of those honorable members want to speak to the motion. The Government is too craven to call for a vote and have the matter disposed of by using its numbers, as it is entitled to do. It proposes to bury the motion. The Minister of Education was given the opportunity by the Leader of the Country Party of indicating a time early next week when the debate would be resumed. However, as it is the intention of the Government to bury the motion, the honorable gentleman did not accept the opportunity. In the longest and most erudite speech the honorable member for Sandringham has ever made, he nobly and courageously moved that the debate be adjourned.

The subject-matter of the debate is an important issue that affects many thousands of people in Victoria but the Government is not prepared to use the gag. which is open to it, if the explanation given by the Minister of Education is accepted. It is untruthful to suggest that the debate has become repetitious.

The SPEAKER.—Order! I direct the attention of the House to Standing Order No. 84B which relates to the scope of the debate on the motion for the adjournment of the debate. Debate must be on the motion for the adjournment and not on the subject-matter of the motion.

Mr. HOLDING.—If there is one thing worse than a Government not joining issue in a debate it is a Government which abuses the processes of Parliament. What is occurring now is not merely an abuse of the processes of Parliament but a craven, cowardly and wicked abuse of the processes of Parliament. The Opposition will vote against the motion for the adjournment of the debate. It is one thing for the Government to use its numbers to railroad legislation through the House but it is a thoroughly contemptible and unworthy procedure for the Government to use its numbers to avoid a debate on an issue which is vital to the people of Victoria.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I support the motion for the adjournment of the debate for several reasons. The Leader of the Opposition alleged that there has been some abuse of the forms of the House. That is sheer nonsense because the normal procedures of the House are being followed. It is customary for this House to have matters of this nature debated under an adjournment procedure as provided for in Standing Orders, but on this occasion the Opposition used the forms of the House, as it is entitled to do, and decided to have the matter debated under a substantive motion, notice of which had been given. As all honorable members know, the rules of the House provide that an adjournment debate may proceed for two hours. The motion now before the House has been debated for 3 hours and 35 minutes. I object strongly to the Leader of the Opposition saying that there has been an abuse of the forms of the House. The Leader of the Opposition is entitled to use the forms of the House and so is the Government.

I remind honorable members that quite apart from the debate tonight —the motion now before the House is to adjourn that debate—there will be a further opportunity of debating this matter because the motion will stay on the Notice Paper and who knows when it may be brought on.

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—Honest Vern!

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member for Brunswick East should watch the forms of the House.

Mr. WILCOX.—I can understand honorable members being interested in this question; I am interested in it. Honorable members should concede that a case has been put both from the Opposition side of the House and from the Government side, but I remind all honorable members who may be interested in expressing a view on the subject covered by the motion that they will still have two further opportunities of debating the subject. The Budget debate is still listed on the Notice Paper.

Mr. WILKES.—Do not say that the Address-in-Reply is still on the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER.—Order! There is too much interjecting. I call on the Minister of Transport.

Mr. WILCOX.—Honorable members also have the opportunity of speaking to the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency. There has been no abuse of the forms of the House by the Government or by the Opposition. The motion for the adjournment of the debate is in order. The Government has business on the Notice Paper and it wants to get on with it.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—The Minister of Transport has told the House that matters of this nature are usually dealt with in a two-hour adjournment debate. I suggest to the honorable gentleman that in the history of this Parliament there has probably not been another matter of such importance as this one. It is not an ordinary matter which could be introduced concerning a temporary inconvenience or a misdirection of Government activity. Tonight the House has been debating a matter

which could shape the future of Victoria and particularly the future of Melbourne.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member is arguing the subject-matter and not the adjournment.

Mr. DOUBE.—The argument put by the Government is that ample time has been given in which to debate this matter and I am suggesting that it is one of the most important matters ever to be dealt with by Parliament and therefore additional time for the debate is warranted. Another point I want to make is that this is one of the few occasions on which the Executive bureaucracy has come face to face with Parliament on an important issue. Behind the scenes the Executive is working away on its plans for the construction of freeways and tonight the Parliament is being given an opportunity of voicing its approval or disapproval of those proposals. This is a direct clash between the power which is embodied in the Executive and the power which is embodied in this Parliament.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member is arguing the subject-matter.

Mr. DOUBE.—That is why the debate should not be adjourned. This Parliament, not the Executive, is supreme. The Minister is attempting to move this matter out of the realm of Parliamentary discussion. All honorable members know that he is using a form of the House to ensure that the motion will not be debated again and that, in addition, honorable members will not be able to raise the subject-matter in any other way because the motion will remain on the Notice Paper. The Minister is using this form of the House to hide the Executive from the wrath of Parliament, and I object to that.

I also object to the motion for the adjournment of the debate being moved by an honorable member when neither he nor his constituents will be affected by the outcome of the motion in the way in which many other honorable members and their constituents will be. That is a good enough reason for any honorable member to oppose the proposition that the debate be adjourned. It is a pretty poor pass when this course is adopted on a motion as important as that which was being debated. Meetings are being held all over Melbourne to discuss this matter and people were watching Parliament hoping that, somehow or other, it can interpose the feelings of the people, because the Executive and the bureaucracy are overriding those feelings. It will be dangerous if the people see that Parliament is hamstrung tonight by this motion for the adjournment of the debate.

I urge any honorable member who has respect for Parliament and for the wishes of the people and who will be affected by the matter which was being discussed to vote with the Opposition against the motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East).—As the mover of the amendment to the original motion, I strongly oppose the motion for the adjournment of the debate. The specific purpose for which I moved the amendment was to determine the attitude of individual honorable members to the questions posed in the motion and the amendment. It is abundantly clear from the remarks of the Minister of Education that the Government does not propose the adjournment of the debate to allow further research to be undertaken or further argument to be developed. The honorable gentleman clearly indicated that, in his view, the arguments put forward have been repetitious.

In view of the reasons given in support of the motion by the Minister, I wonder whether there is a Standing Order under which the motion for the adjournment of the debate is out of order. In the light of those reasons, I also wonder why the honorable gentleman did not move the gag. I should be only too pleased if he did that. I agree that

probably the arguments have been thoroughly canvassed, but I certainly do not agree that honorable members should not be asked to say how they view the motion and the amendment. The sole purpose of the motion for the adjournment of the debate is to prevent that. The Government intends that the motion shall be placed at the bottom of the Notice Paper, where it will remain until the end of the session. Then the public will not know how individual members would vote on this issue.

It is outrageous for the Government to adopt this procedural method of avoiding its responsibility and preventing citizens of the State from knowing what their elected representatives think about the propositions. I wish that more of the voters could hear what is going on in this House now. If they could, the Liberal Party in this State would be at an all-time low in the estimation of the people.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order, I ask you to rule whether the motion is in order in view of the fact that the Leader of the House has made it clear that the Government has no intention of allowing further debate on the matter. In the light of that, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule whether the original motion for the adjournment is in order.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! The original motion for the adjournment is in order and is in conformity with the Standing Orders. The intentions of the Government are another matter, but the motion is in order.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—I oppose the motion for the adjournment of the debate. It is a poor start for the new administration of the Premier and the Leader of the House, who have been in office for only a short period, to introduce this tactic into an area where the Opposition in its legitimate pursuits is raising a controversial subject. Two Ministers have spoken but neither has said whether the debate will ever be resumed.

The Leader of the House can smirk, but a number of points about freeways should be aired. The original motion affects many honorable members on the Opposition side of the House and even some on the Government benches. The honorable member for Essendon spoke sketchily about a freeway which affects parts of the electorate he represents. I believe it is necessary for me to reply to what he said because the freeway also affects the electors I represent and the honorable member did not put the whole case on that freeway. If the motion for the adjournment of the debate is carried, I shall be denied the opportunity of rebutting some of the arguments of the honorable member for Essendon.

Since this session began, Parliament has been entertained with a mass of drivel. Not one policy matter has come from the Government. The only Bills presented have been trivial departmental Bills. If honorable members are to be denied the opportunity of stating categorically where they stand on the controversial issue of freeways, that will be a denial of democracy. The matter which was being debated perplexes many people in the metropolitan area and it should be determined.

I should be pacified if a Minister moved a motion which would ensure that the matter could be debated tomorrow week. That would be a fair proposition, but what the Leader of the House has suggested is that the motion will remain on the Notice Paper and that will be the end of it. As I understand the position, any honorable member who wants to mention the subject-matter of the motion will be ruled out of order. For those two reasons, which are succinct and to the point, the Government is at fault, and it is a poor start for the new administrators to

use these tactics which will deny honorable members the opportunity of doing anything but talk.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—Since being elected to this institution I have endeavoured, both inside and outside the House, to speak of the importance of Parliament and its role in the community. This has also been done by members of the Government party on numerous occasions. They now have a chance to show how sincere they are in their concern for Parliament as an institution. The Government, by forcing on the House the motion now before it, is denying the House its right as an institution to work effectively and to allow minority groups, the Opposition, the Country Party, and individual honorable members to put forward legitimate points of view. If the motion for the adjournment of the debate is carried, that cannot be done.

I was disappointed and dismayed at the comments of the Minister of Education. The attitude of the Government on this most important issue is that it will take notice of the points raised during the debate. No one would deny the importance of this matter to Victoria and particularly to the metropolis. But instead of allowing the debate to go on or a vote to be taken on the issue the Government will take note of what was said. The Minister of Transport said that the same subject-matter could be covered during the Address-in-Reply debate or in the Budget debate, but honorable members know how the Government has treated those debates in the past. The Government has used the Address-in-Reply debate as a filler. No vote is taken on the issues canvassed during that debate and perhaps that is right. But that is not the appropriate method of dealing with the issues which were before the House.

The forms of the House provide for the type of debate which was in progress and for individual honorable members and the Opposition to raise issues such as those being discussed, and for them to be debated properly and voted upon. It is important that that should be done. For the Government to use this debate as a filler would be a disgrace. The forms of the House are of great importance and are of even greater importance to members of the Opposition as they enable it to bring forward important issues and have them thoroughly debated. I am disappointed that the Minister of Education said that there has been considerable repetition. The honorable gentleman was not in the Chamber for most of the debate. I remained in the Chamber and I was interested to listen to the different points which have been raised by honorable members from all parties, and I hope to hear from the independent honorable member in the House. Members of the Opposition spent considerable time and effort in preparing material for the debate. They have not repeated material, and by arrangement there were to be different points raised on different issues. I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, have the responsibility of ensuring that individual members of the Opposition have the opportunity of raising these points at this time. For this reason the matter should not be put out of reach in the cowardly way that the Government is proposing.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—As a supporter of the Government, I realize the mass of business that the Government has before it. I listened with much interest to the arguments put forward this evening, but as the elected representative of the Heatherton electorate—which also has been badly affected by proposed freeways—I have a duty to those electors and I register my disappointment at being unable to express on their behalf their fears and their individual positions on various aspects of the proposed freeways. Having expressed that point of view, I hope that the Government will, at an early date give me an opportunity,

on behalf of my electors, of expressing their views on how they are affected, particularly by Freeway F7 which runs down——

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member is now arguing the matter of the motion; this is the debate on the adjournment of the motion.

Mr. BILLING.—I reiterate that I hope the Government will give me an opportunity at an early date of expressing the opinions of the electors of Heatherton.

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg).—I, too, state my views on this debate. I join very strongly with and support the Opposition in objecting to the actions of the Government which is now seeking the adjournment of a very important debate. I, like other honorable members on the Opposition side, represent an electorate that has been almost cut into three sections by the intrusion of three freeways. I consider that I should be given a democratic right to make my protest to the Government on behalf of my electorate. The Minister of Education made a statement that during the debate there has been nothing more than repetition, but I support the views expressed by Opposition members that the majority of the important members of the Government were not present during the debate and would not know whether there was repetition. I have an article contained in a letter which would prove to members of the Government that at least I can make a statement to the House which would not be repetition. On behalf of the electors of the Coburg electorate, I strongly oppose the actions of the Victorian Government in denying me the right of speaking on behalf of my electors on a most important subject.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura).—I was hoping that a Minister would have given some indication following the appeal made by the honorable member for Heatherton that he, together with other honorable members in the Chamber, would be given an opportunity of putting his point of view. I am disappointed that no honorable gentleman has made such an announcement. I remind the House that since the honorable member for Gippsland East moved the amendment to the motion, only two hours of debate have elapsed. The motion has not been fully canvassed. Apart from the speech of the honorable member for Gippsland East, and that of the Minister of Transport on the Government side only two members from the Opposition have spoken to the amendment. This indicates that the motion was not fully or thoroughly debated in a way that would be desirable in a Parliament in this State. The only reason that I can think of why the Government would move the adjournment of the debate is that it does not wish to put those members of the Government party representing country electorates to the test of having to vote on the motion. Because of the contents of the amendment moved by the honorable member for Gippsland East, such a course could be embarrassing to those honorable members. I am disappointed that this form of the House has been used rather than the guillotine because had that been the case at least honorable members would have known how Government supporters who represent country electorates would have voted. In view of the remarks made by at least one Government party back-bench member, I believe the motion for the adjournment of the debate should be defeated.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—I desire to make a contribution to the debate on the basis that there are also freeways going through my electorate and I have not yet had the opportunity of expressing to the House the concern which is felt by the electors of Reservoir electorate.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member should speak on whether

the debate should be adjourned and not to the matter contained in the motion.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I was making the point——

The SPEAKER.—The honorable member will speak to the point.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—The motion for the adjournment of the debate should not be carried and the debate should not be adjourned because I have not had an opportunity of putting the points of view of the electors of the Reservoir electorate. They are also affected by the proposed actions of the Government but I should be ruled out of order if I attempted to discuss decentralization or the effects that the freeways will have on the electorate. However, I believe it is in order for me to lodge my protest on behalf of the electors of Reservoir for not being given the opportunity of putting their points of view. Their points of view should be expressed in this Parliament and even at this stage, in view of the remarks that have been made from the corner party and from the Opposition party, the Government should reconsider its position and allow further debate on a matter which is of grave concern not only to the metropolitan area but also to the whole of the State of Victoria. If the Government fails to allow the debate to continue it stands condemned for its actions and any honorable member who chooses to vote for the motion for the adjournment of the debate also stands condemned.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—As the representative of an outer-suburban electorate, I am being denied the right to put before the House the views of that electorate. I claim the right to put constructive suggestions and alternatives not previously advanced during the debate which should be adequately considered by the Government. To deny me that right by seeking to have the debate on the motion adjourned, the Government is denying my constituents natural justice. I should be given an opportunity of presenting these alternative suggestions. I ask the Government when it is considering the proposal to adjourn the debate, what is its view on the rights of a member of Parliament? Does it deny him the right to raise these important issues at the appropriate opportunity?

Are they so devoid of intelligence that they are not prepared even to consider alternatives, knowing full well that they are headed for an onslaught? In effect the Government is saying that it is lacking in courage by not allowing the debate to reach a conclusion. This shows that it is on insecure grounds. The Government is procrastinating by allowing the motion to remain on the Notice Paper and eventually lapse. The Government is holding itself up to public ridicule and it will lose its chance forever of having a representative in the electorate of Greensborough. The Government is insincere.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park).—The honorable member for Gippsland East has moved an amendment which introduces fundamental changes in attitudes which may be enunciated on the financial aspects and the over-all question not only of freeways but of decentralization. In your absence, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker indicated that the matter before the Chair was not only a substantive motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition but also an amendment moved by the honorable member for Gippsland East. Members of the Opposition wanted the opportunity of debating the proposals which could be put by members of the Country Party.

I represent a metropolitan electorate but I have a knowledge of rural electorates and I was looking forward to participating in the debate because of the fundamental attitudes that were being introduced. The Minister of Education said that sufficient debate had taken place but his statement indicated that he did not have a full understanding of the motion or the amendment. On behalf of

the constituents of Deer Park, I place on record my dissatisfaction and protest at being denied the opportunity of putting the attitudes of the people I represent on a fundamental problem.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I join with members of the Opposition and of the Country Party in expressing my disgust at the attitude displayed by the Government in this matter and for the contempt with which it is treating not only the Opposition but the Country Party and this Parliament and its procedures. If the Government were genuine it would allow the debate to proceed or be adjourned to a specific date. Honorable members have not been told by the Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport when they can prepare themselves for the resumption of the debate. Both Ministers have clearly refused to give the House any indication of when the debate will be resumed. The only conclusion that can be reached is that the Government does not intend to resume the debate and will allow the item to remain on the Notice Paper and lapse. The Government is taking the cowardly way out because it will not allow honorable members to vote on one of the most vital issues ever to come before the Parliament.

I hesitate to refer to the Minister of Transport as a liar or even to suggest that he has misled the House because I know they are unparliamentary terms. However, I suggest that he was pulling the wool over the eyes of every honorable member when he suggested that if the debate is adjourned, honorable members may then raise the subject in the debate on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech or the Budget debate.

Mr. SCANLAN.—Which is next Tuesday.

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—I ask the Minister without Portfolio to listen to my statement carefully because it may be of interest. If the motion to adjourn the debate is carried and if before the debate is resumed, an honorable member attempts to discuss the same issue on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech or during the Budget debate, it will be your duty, Mr. Speaker, or that of the Chairman of Committees, to prevent that honorable member from continuing his remarks because the matter is already on the Notice Paper. That seems to have escaped the notice of the Minister of Transport. He has misled the House in suggesting that the matter can be raised on the two debates to which I have referred. That is another example of the contemptible attitude of this so-called new look Government. The Leader may be different, but the activities and the attitudes of the Government are as despicable as ever they were. I hope honorable members will reject this motion.

The House divided on the motion for the adjournment of the debate (Sir Vernon Christie in the chair)—

Ayes	37
Noes	29
Majority for the motion	8

AYES.

Mr. Balfour	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Billing	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Stokes
Mr. Burgin	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Dixon	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Taylor (*Balwyn*)
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Taylor (*Gippsland South*)
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Trethewey
Mr. Jona	Mr. Wheeler
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Wiltshire.
Mr. McLaren	
Mr. Maclellan	*Tellers:*
Mr. Rafferty	Mr. Crellin
Mr. Reese	Mr. Guy.
Sir George Reid	
Mr. Rossiter	
Mr. Scanlan	

NOES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Lovegrove
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. McDonald (*Rodney*)
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Doube	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Shilton
Mr. Fell	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Floyd	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Ginifer	Mr. Turnbull
Mr. Holding	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Lewis (*Dundas*)	Mr. Wilton.
Mr. Lewis (*Portland*)	*Tellers:* Mr. Broad Mr. Jones.

PAIRS.

Mr. MacDonald (*Glen Iris*)	Mr. Moss
Mr. Meagher	Mr. Lind.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I move—

That the debate be adjourned until tomorrow.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The Minister of Transport knows as well as you and I, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow means never. The stupidity of the Minister is obvious if he says he did not say that. He has listened to the debate. I have some regard for his intelligence, and he is aware of what the debate is about. Tomorrow means never to the Government. Members of the Opposition suggest that the debate should be adjourned until Tuesday next. If it is, the fears expressed by the honorable member for Heatherton, and perhaps those of some of the silent members on the Government side of the House, may not come to fruition, because the debate can continue. At least the matter will be listed on the Notice Paper on Tuesday next with other business. It will then be the prerogative of the Government to give the debate some priority or give Bills priority ahead of it.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that under the motion before you it is not necessary for the Minister to have this matter listed on the Notice Paper for Tuesday next. He can place it under General Business, which means that the matter will not necessarily be debated on Tuesday next, Wednesday next, or any other day. I have had sufficient experience with Notice Papers to know that the motion of the Minister does not mean Tuesday next. The Minister is also aware of that fact. You, Sir, have heard the debate and the reasons why the debate should be continued and not be gagged. You have heard the reasons why the Government walked away from moving the gag.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—It is just a question of time.

Mr. WILKES.—Indeed it is, and the time should be Tuesday next. The motion moved by the Minister is "that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow". There is no reason why the debate could not be adjourned until Tuesday next or some other date. The Country Party and the Opposition have asked for a reasonable opportunity of debating this motion to its conclusion and doing the things that should have been done during the debate on the adjournment motion.

The Minister should give an assurance. If he is not prepared to do so, I can give notice of motion that next week the Opposition will make provision for a debate. If the Minister thinks we have not the right, the prerogative or the ability to do that, he can think again. If the honorable gentleman will not give an assurance that the debate will be continued next week, I promise him that next week the Opposition will move a motion that will provide for a discussion on freeways.

All that the Minister, his stupid Government, and his stupid new Leaders have to do is to give an assurance that the debate will be continued next week. In the absence of an assurance, I promise that a motion that will lead to a debate will be moved. It may not be the motion that was moved today, but it will be a vehicle that will allow members of the Opposition to do what they have been denied the right to do in this debate.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—I deplore the motion that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow. The Minister of Transport is showing disrespect for Parliament in submitting it because he is well aware that he is putting the debate aside.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I rise to a point of order and to make a personal explanation. I have never shown disrespect for this Parliament and I ask the honorable member to withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I rule that the remark cannot be considered in its context unparliamentary and that there is not any point of order.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—I wish to give an explanation, if I may. I consider that the Minister has shown a disregard for Parliament in moving the motion. The Leader of the House has indicated that because of repetition he considers the debate has gone far enough. Therefore, he has indicated that the debate will not be continued. As a contradiction, the Minister of Transport is moving that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow, knowing that that means for an indefinite period. I suggest that the Government has shown bad judgment. The Country Party is disappointed, and obviously many of the Government's own supporters are disappointed.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—By way of cross-exchange, the Minister indicated that when he referred to "tomorrow" he was not ignoring the possibility of the debate being resumed next Tuesday.

Mr. WILCOX.—That is so.

Mr. HOLDING.—And as the Minister and we are very much *ad idem* concerning this debate — and I presume the Minister has good intentions — I will save the Government embarrassment by moving—

That the word "tomorrow" be omitted with the view of inserting the expression "Tuesday, 17th October instant."

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—There is an amendment before the Chamber, and it is that the word proposed to be omitted be so omitted, the object of that motion being to enable the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition to be further considered — that is, that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I stand by my motion that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I should now like to speak to the amendment that I have moved.

The SPEAKER.—I was under the impression that the Leader of the Opposition had addressed me on the amendment.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I should like to speak to the amendment which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. First of all, it is important to point out that the Minister of Transport has not been entirely frank with the House. Some honorable members on the Government side of the House would be under the impression that when the Minister claims that this debate can be resumed at some time in the future he means what he says, but the honorable gentleman knows that that is not the situation. As all experienced members know, if this motion is carried this item of business will go on to the Notice Paper under General Business and cannot be brought back for debate unless the Government agrees to a motion similar to that which was moved to enable the Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. debate to come back before the House.

Orders of the Day, Government Business, must be postponed, and the Minister has not indicated that the Government is prepared to do that in the future. It has already

been said that the reason the Government has chosen this method of curtailing the debate and bringing it to a close is that it has not the courage of its convictions and has not the courage to let the original motion proceed to a vote. That is the real reason.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I think this is rather the argument for the adjournment and not on time. This argument is concerned with tomorrow or Tuesday.

Mr. WILTON.—I was attempting to lay the foundations for my argument on why the Leader of the Opposition has found it necessary to move an amendment which is more specific on when the debate will be resumed. That is the crux of the question. The Leader of the Opposition is attempting to obtain a clear and definite undertaking that the debate will be resumed on a specific date in the future.

Mr. WILCOX.—That is what I understand.

Mr. WILTON.—I am delighted to learn that the Minister of Transport is prepared to admit that he understands what is going on in this place, because his past actions have never indicated that. The Leader of the Opposition has moved that the word "tomorrow" in the motion moved by the Minister of Transport be omitted and that the expression "Tuesday, 17th October instant" be inserted, and I think the House ought to accept that amendment.

I put it to the Premier, in all fairness to the honorable gentleman, that he made a valiant effort in presenting the Budget to establish himself as a credible Leader; and I suggest to the honorable gentleman that if he wishes to preserve that credibility, he should support this amendment. Unless he does that I suggest that his credibility will be destroyed in the eyes of members on all sides of the House and of responsible organizations which are involved in this freeway problem, including many of his own departments.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Mr. Speaker, I should like to move a further amendment and I seek your advice about when I should do so.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! I think the honorable member should let the Chamber know what the amendment is.

Mr. WILKES.—It depends upon whether the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition is defeated or carried.

The SPEAKER.—The Deputy Leader of the Opposition might speak to the present motion and foreshadow the amendment.

Mr. WILKES.—I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next, and foreshadow that in the event of that amendment being defeated I shall move a further amendment that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday week. That will enable the Government to dispose of the miserable list of proposed legislation which appears on the Notice Paper. I cannot remember a spring session of Parliament when the Notice Paper has contained only departmental Bills which are of little consequence. I cannot understand why the Government will not accept the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, because it will merely result in the matter being placed on the Notice Paper for next week instead of being buried in general business. If the amendment is defeated because the Government wishes to deal with these small Bills next Tuesday, the Government could clearly accept a further amendment that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday week, because there is nothing to be debated on that day.

I can appreciate the problems facing the Government in these matters, but it is regulating its business badly

and, because of that, it expects the Opposition, the Country Party, and the Parliament to suffer from its ineptitude.

My foreshadowed amendment depends on whether the Government is prepared to accept the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I support the amendment moved by my Leader and I foreshadow a further amendment.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport) (*By leave*).—I am happy to agree to the debate being adjourned until Tuesday next because that seems to be the same as tomorrow. In Parliamentary terms, as I understand it, the House will not be sitting until Tuesday next, which means that Tuesday next becomes tomorrow.

I make it clear to Opposition members that the Government can give no guarantee when the matter will be reached on the Notice Paper. It will appear in its ordinary position and it may well be brought on at some later stage.

Mr. GINIFER.—Will its ordinary position of the Notice Paper be under Orders of the Day—General Business?

Mr. WILCOX.—It will appear under General Business and it will be brought on in due course if the Government feels that it should be brought on.

Mr. WILKES.—You are not fooling Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILCOX.—I am not trying to fool anybody. The matter is quite simple. The question that the debate be adjourned, was carried, and I am prepared to agree that it be adjourned either until tomorrow or Tuesday next. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to insert "Tuesday next" I can do no more than agree with it.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—The honorable member for Albert Park, speaking to the motion and to the amendment.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—I will not traverse the reasons that have been given but, in the event of these two amendments not being carried, I foreshadow a further amendment. I foreshadow that I will move that this matter be set down for debate on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—The position of the debate as it seems to be proceeding is that there are two amendments foreshadowed and each amendment will be very much controlled by the fate of the first question which is that the word "tomorrow" which is proposed to be omitted stand part of the question. If that be defeated, the first amendment, which includes the words "Tuesday next" and to which the Minister has just addressed himself, will then be put to the House. The fate of the other two amendments can be decided after that. I propose to put the motion to the House "that the word 'tomorrow' stand part of the question". If honorable members wish to support the amendment to include the words "Tuesday next" they will vote against the word "tomorrow" standing part of the question. I put the motion—

That the word "tomorrow" stand part of the question.

I think the Ayes have it.

Mr. Holding's amendment was negatived.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—I will put the full question, which is—

That the debate be adjourned until tomorrow.

The House divided on the motion (Sir Vernon Christie in the chair)—

Ayes	37
Noes	29
Majority for the motion	8

AYES.

Mr. Balfour
Mr. Billing
Mr. Birrell
Mr. Borthwick
Mr. Burgin
Mr. Dixon
Mr. Dunstan
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)
Mrs. Goble
Mr. Hamer
Mr. Hayes
Mr. Jona
Mr. Loxton
Mr. McCabe
Mr. McLaren
Mr. Maclellan
Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Reese
Sir George Reid
Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Stephen
Mr. Stokes
Mr. Suggett
Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Taylor (*Balwyn*)
Mr. Taylor (*Gippsland South*)
Mr. Templeton
Mr. Thompson
Mr. Trethewey
Mr. Wheeler
Mr. Wilcox
Mr. Wiltshire.

Tellers:
Mr. Crellin
Mr. Guy.

NOES.

Mr. Amos
Mr. Bornstein
Mr. Curnow
Mr. Doube
Mr. Edmunds
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)
Mr. Fell
Mr. Floyd
Mr. Fordham
Mr. Ginifer
Mr. Holding
Mr. Kirkwood
Mr. Lewis (*Dundas*)
Mr. Lewis (*Portland*)
Mr. Lovegrove
Mr. McDonald (*Rodney*)
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Mutton
Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Shilton
Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Trewin
Mr. Trezise
Mr. Turnbull
Mr. Whiting
Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Wilton.

Tellers:
Mr. Broad
Mr. Jones.

PAIRS.

Mr. McDonald (*Glen Iris*) — Mr. Moss
Mr. Meagher — Mr. Lind.

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

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—I raise a point of order. Earlier in the debate, two amendments were foreshadowed. When will those amendments be put, assuming they are to be put?

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—As I explained earlier, in the complicated nature of all the amendments, the House having decided not to omit the word "tomorrow", there is no place for the amendments.

WRONGS BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Sir GEORGE REID (Attorney-General), was read a first time.

MINES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines), was read a first time.

RIVER IMPROVEMENT (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.

VOLUNTEER CIVIL DEFENCE WORKERS COMPENSATION BILL.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Some years ago the Commonwealth Government, although not expecting any act of aggression to be directed against Australia, recognized that this possibility existed and that the potentialities of modern weapons of mass destruction mean that civil defence cannot be effective unless it forms part of the normal organization of the community and ceases to be regarded merely as a "crisis" organization.

It was considered essential that sufficient persons be trained in the various skills necessary to ensure that in the event of a nuclear attack, loss of life could be kept to the absolute minimum. The Civil Defence School was established at Macedon to train persons from all over the Commonwealth who would form a nucleus who could themselves raise and train local civil defence organizations.

Responsibility for raising civil defence organizations rests with the local authorities at municipal level, their activities being co-ordinated by civil defence headquarters at State level. Many people have now received training at the Civil Defence School at Macedon and civil defence organizations have been established in more than 100 municipalities.

The same skills which would be needed in the event of an attack by an aggressor are also necessary in dealing with peace time disasters, including bush fires, floods, storm damage, explosion or accident, such as the *Southern Aurora* train wreck and the collapse of the West Gate Bridge. I would also include search and rescue operations where there is a need for the skilled assistance which can be provided by trained civil defence volunteers.

Voluntary civil defence organizations are playing an increasingly valuable part in support operations under the State Disaster Plan, and the community undoubtedly benefits greatly from the work carried out in the public interest by these volunteers. In effect, they represent a valuable but unpaid extension of the State's emergency services.

The main purpose of this short Bill is to provide insurance cover for those dedicated men and women who are members of a civil defence organization in Victoria. I am certain that honorable members on both sides of the House will agree that these persons who, without remuneration or reward, voluntarily engage in civil defence activities, should be indemnified against possible loss of life or personal injury sustained thereby.

Mr. Hamer.

Provision already exists under the Country Fire Authority Act to insure casual fire fighters engaged in fighting bush fires. Similarly, the Police Assistance Compensation Act provides for payment of compensation to persons who are injured when they go to the assistance of a police officer in the execution of his duty. The present proposal is an extension of the concept that the Government should accept the responsibility to ensure that persons who are acting in the public interest are adequately compensated for any personal injury they sustain or loss of or damage to their personal property which results from those activities.

After consideration of several alternative means of providing suitable insurance cover, it was decided that it would be most satisfactory if volunteer civil defence personnel were to be covered under the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act.

The advantages of this arrangement are, firstly, the insurance benefits under the Workers Compensation Act are specific and are amended from time to time as the cost of living varies. The cover provided would therefore always be at a recognized level.

Secondly, the machinery for making and determining claims under the Workers Compensation Act is well established and any claim made in accordance with the provisions specified in this Bill would be dealt with by the Workers Compensation Board. It does not involve setting up any separate claims machinery.

Thirdly, it is considered that provision of insurance cover as proposed would be welcomed by all civil defence volunteers and would, of course, provide uniform cover.

Fourthly, any compensation paid and any claim and any expenses incurred in the administeration of the claims machinery will be paid out of the Consolidated Fund. There is no cost involved unless and until a claim is made and compensation awarded.

I mentioned earlier that the main purpose of the Bill is to provide insurance cover for people who are members of a civil defence organization in this State. Civil defence is organized at municipal level by the local council, which appoints a volunteer civil defence controller who is then responsible for organizing the recruitment of volunteers for that service in the municipality concerned.

It will be noted that the Bill refers to "registered" civil defence volunteers. These people are members of a local civil defence organization who engage in training and exercises as well as being available in the case of an actual emergency. It is intended that these people should be covered at all times whilst engaged on civil defence work, which by definition in the Bill also includes the conduct of, and participation in, training activities. Provision is included in the Bill for these people to be "registered" by a registrar appointed under the Public Service Act. He will be an officer attached to State civil defence headquarters.

It is recognized, of course, that when an actual emergency occurs, people come forward and volunteer their services. It is intended that these people, who are not members of a civil defence organization, should also be given insurance cover when they are actually engaged in disaster suppression activities at the request of, or with the approval of, an officer in charge of the work. In the Bill these persons are termed "casual" civil defence workers.

This measure is obviously in the best interests of all civil defence volunteers and also every citizen of Victoria. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 18.

CLEAN AIR (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to—

(*a*) Transfer the administration of the Clean Air Act 1958 from the Commission of Public Health to the Environment Protection Authority; and

(*b*) To abolish the Clean Air Committee as established under the Clean Air Act.

The Bill has been introduced as part of the Government's programme by which all aspects of environmental control will be administered by the Environment Protection Authority, within the Ministry of Conservation. Its objective is in the short term only. The intention is to continue the operation of the Clean Air Act until such time as the balance of the Environment Protection Act has been fully proclaimed.

Upon proclamation of the balance of the Environment Protection Act, the Clean Air Act and the Clean Air Regulations will be wholly repealed. In the meantime, the staff of the Clean Air Section of the Department of Health will be transferred to the Environment Protection Authority to supplement the authority's staff in its preparation for the implementation of the clean air provisions of the Environment Protection Act.

By these means, the Environment Protection Authority will be enabled to integrate the activities of the personnel of the Clean Air Section with those of the remainder of the Environment Protection Authority staff almost immediately. This is vitally necessary in the formulation of environment protection policies and in the framing of licensing and enforcement procedures. Economy of effort by trained and scarce technical staff will also be achieved.

The Clean Air Section of the Department of Health is a complete unit within the department and its

transfer to the Environment Protection Authority will not create any administrative problems. It comprises highly skilled people who have made a substantial contribution to the control and abatement of atmospheric pollution in Victoria in recent years. They will bring an immediate additional element of expertise to the Environment Protection Authority in a specialized field and this will be of great value to the authority.

Clauses 2, 3, 4 and 6 of the Bill do little more than make the necessary word changes for administration by the Environment Protection Authority and its staff. Clause 5 of the Bill repeals sections 10 and 10A of the Clean Air Act, those sections which establish the Clean Air Committee, set out its functions and enable it to appoint sub-committees.

During the ensuing period the Environment Protection Authority will not be without the advice of an expert committee because its advisory body, the Environment Protection Council, has among its members a number of persons with expertise in this field.

I should like to say in passing that the Government acknowledges the excellent work done by the Clean Air Committee over many years.

Subordinate legislation will be proposed to bring about the necessary amendments to the Clean Air Regulations. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. WILKES (Northcote), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 18.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS (REGISTRATION) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill to amend the provisions of the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1970, which require the registration and annual renewal of registration of boilers and pressure vessels. At present, the registration of a vessel remains in force until 31st December in the year in which it is registered and is renewed from year to year upon payment of a fee. Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (4) of section 24, a system of cycle billing is used to spread the work load over a calendar year. Under this system a boiler or pressure vessel in fact remains unregistered from 1st January until the date on which the owner effects the renewal of registration following receipt of a notice from the department.

Recently, the owner of a vessel raised a doubt whether it would be covered by insurance during the period while it was not registered.

Results of inquiries made of the Fire and Accident Underwriters Association have shown that some insurers, at least, would not be likely to accept liability for damages incurred in such a situation. For this reason, it appears desirable to provide for continuity of registration. However, it is not desirable that this be achieved by a major alteration of the present system, involving an increase in the work load and additional cost. The simplest method would be to amend the Act so that continuity of registration would be provided and the present cycle billing system retained.

The Bill provides for application for renewal of registration of a vessel to be made in each year not later than on a day to be notified and for the previous registration or renewal of registration to be deemed to remain in force until that day where it is later than the expiry date — 31st December. Thus the owner of a vessel would no longer need to have any doubt concerning his insurance cover by reason of a vessel being unregistered for a period in each year in the circumstances described.

Clause 1 of the Bill is introductory, the substantive provisions being contained in clauses 2 and 3. Clause 2 inserts new sub-sections (4A), (4B) and (4C) after sub-section (4) of section 24 of the Act. Sub-section (4A) specifies when application for renewal of registration of a vessel shall be made in each year and provides for notice in writing to be given to the registered owner. Sub-section (4B) enables application for renewal to be made by the owner in the absence of notification in writing of the renewal date. Sub-section (4C) contains the main provision, whereby a registration or renewal of registration is deemed to remain in force beyond the date of expiry until a subsequent renewal date.

Clause 3 provides for the amendments to be retrospective to the commencement of the principal Act, so that the provisions of the Bill may be applied to registrations or renewals of registration which otherwise would have expired on 31st December in 1970 or 1971. If any question arises whether a vessel was registered on a date in 1971 or 1972 before the renewal of registration was effected in accordance with the system described, this clause would deem the registration to have been in force on that date. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 18.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

LIFTS AND CRANES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I understood that the second reading of the Lifts and Cranes (Amendment) Bill was to proceed today. I was not here for the first reading, but it was moved on my behalf and there is now some doubt whether the second reading was ordered for today or for tomorrow. Am I now permitted to move the second reading by leave?

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! It is quite firm and definite and recorded that the second reading was ordered for tomorrow. I will look into whether there is a procedure by which this can be altered but I should imagine it would have to be by leave of the House.

In the efficient way in which this House can do things suddenly, if the House agrees by leave, the Minister may move by leave, that the Order to be read a second time tomorrow be rescinded and it be made an Order of the Day for today.

Mr. RAFFERTY.—By leave, I so move.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—Leave is refused.

The SPEAKER.—Leave being refused, the matter can go no further.

ADJOURNMENT.

FALLS CREEK ALPINE RESORT: ADMINISTRATION—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: BUCKLEY PARK HIGH SCHOOL: MARYVALE HIGH SCHOOL—EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES: PERMIT FOR PIONEER QUARRIES (VIC.) PTY. LTD.—MORNINGTON PENINSULA: RESTRICTION ON CAMPERS—VICTORIAN INLAND MEAT AUTHORITY: RETRENCHMENT OF EMPLOYEES—COUNTRY ROADS BOARD: SOUTH GIPPSLAND HIGHWAY—VICTORIAN RAILWAYS: CLOSURE OF RAILWAY LINE TO WEDDERBURN — DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH: SUBSIDIES TO KINDERGARTENS — HOSPITAL BENEFITS ASSOCIATION: ADMINISTRATION—HOUSING COMMISSION: ELDERLY CITIZENS AT PRESTON.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next, at half-past Three o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MITCHELL (Benambra).—I direct to the attention of the Minister for Fuel and Power a situation which obtains at Falls Creek. In representations made to me, a firm of solicitors stated—

The Falls Creek Chamber of Commerce has also asked us to draw to the attention of the appropriate authorities certain discrepancies in the administration of the Falls Creek resort by the Falls Creek Tourist Area Management Committee . . .

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Can the House hear the source of the quotation?

Mr. MITCHELL.—I stated earlier that it was from representations made to me by a firm of solicitors. I then commenced to read the submission. May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER.—Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL.—The submission continues—

. . . including what is alleged to be favouritism of projects sponsored by certain large operators in the Falls Creek area at the expense of the smaller commercial operators.

On a previous occasion, I asked the Government for a Royal Commission into Falls Creek. Unhesitatingly, I again ask the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into Falls Creek.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—I raise with the Minister of Education a matter relating to the Buckley Park High School which is situated in the Moonee Ponds electorate. This secondary school has three basic educational deficiencies for its 968 pupils. It has no assembly hall and no Commonwealth library, and there is a shortage of workroom space for the staff and particularly for the pupils. On the Education Department's priority list for high school assembly halls, Buckley Park is currently No. 15. The advisory council and the parents' organization have an amount of $15,700 for the construction of the assembly hall whenever the department can get around to lifting the priority. The Buckley Park High School is the only secondary school in the district and in the City of Essendon that has no assembly hall or Commonwealth library. This weakens the educational efficiency of the school and the Government, and particularly the Minister, should state categorically what priority has been accorded to the school. The pupils who attend the school should not be disadvantaged because of the lack of an assembly hall, a Commonwealth library and adequate workroom space, especially when it is the last secondary school in the area, either private or State, to be provided with these facilities.

I ask the Minister to review the priority for the assembly hall and to expedite the provision of a Commonwealth library at the Buckley Park High School. This would also solve the problem of inadequate workroom space. I invite the Minister to inform me tonight of his attitude to these questions. If the honorable gentleman's reply was favourable, the school would no longer be at a disadvantage and it would be on an equal footing with the other schools in the surrounding locality.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister of Education concerning the Maryvale High School, which is situated in Morwell. As the Minister knows, the school is an experimental high school which the Government uses to illustrate to the public what the Education Department can do in this form of secondary education. However, the advisory council has requested me to make certain representations to the Minister concerning the school. Recently, I referred to the honorable gentleman a question relating to the site works surrounding a newly-constructed school building. In a reply dated 3rd August, 1972, the honorable gentleman stated—

Dear Mr. Amos,

I again refer to your representations on behalf of the Maryvale High School Advisory Council, regarding site works at the school. Contract plans and specifications are at present being prepared and it is anticipated that tenders will be called at an early date.

I forwarded the Minister's reply with a copy of my own letter to the school advisory council, which promptly replied, in effect, "Well, what on earth is going on?" The advisory council brought to my attention two similar letters it had received from the Education Department. On 25th May, 1971, Mr. Crellin, the Secretary of the Education Department at the time, sent to the principal of the Maryvale High School a memorandum, which stated—

The Public Works Department has been asked to complete site works around stage 2 of the school as soon as possible.

These works were not done. Again, on 22nd June, 1972, two months before I made my representations, the advisory council was advised by Mr. Scully, Secretary of the Education Department, in the following terms:—

I refer to a recent letter concerning site works in the vicinity of stage 2 of the schedule.

Contract plans and specifications are at present being prepared and it is anticipated that tenders will be called for at an early date.

This has gone far enough and I should appreciate it if the Minister would investigate the matter with the Secretary of the Education Department and the authorities in the Public Works Department with a view to expediting the work.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government and to the Minister of Mines. It refers to town planning permit No. 52908 and an extractive industry licence No. 53 issued on 15th July, 1970, to Pioneer Quarries (Vic.) Pty. Ltd. of Heatherton Road, South Clayton. Condition 9 of the permit provides—

For the purpose of this permit access to the site shall be by way of Dunlop Road only.

Condition No. 10 provides—

That part of Dunlop Road between the point of access and Heatherton Road shall be sealed.

Mr. R. F. Bawden, of South Clayton, has alleged what he considered were contraventions of this permit. I raised this matter in questions without notice directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government on 5th and 6th September, and subsequently, a letter dated 4th September was received by Mr. Bawden which indicated that there were possible contraventions of the permit. About twenty days after I asked the questions in this House, the Local Government Department wrote to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. On the 22nd September Pioneer Quarries (Vic.) Pty. Ltd. wrote to the Board of Works explaining the alleged contraventions. Paragraph 2 of that letter reads—

With respect to conditions 9 and 10 we refer you to our letter of November 8th, 1971, in which we stated that we considered that we were not breaching condition 9 and that by the rewording of details in the letter we would not be in breach of condition 10. As no reply was received to that letter we assumed that our proposal was satisfactory to the board, but we do now request that the proposed rewording be adopted and that the permit be amended accordingly.

I quote from the copy of a letter sent to me from the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works addressed to the Secretary for Local Government dated 10th October, 1972. The last paragraph reads—

Access from the subject site will be to Dunlop Road. Since the permit was granted, the company has acquired a 5-acre lot of land on the west side of Dunlop Road which is at present within the rural zone. The company has formed a road on this land and, under the provisions of the rural zone, a road is a permitted use in the zone and no permit would be required. The purpose of the road is to provide access to Dunlop Road opposite an access point on the subject site onto Dunlop Road and to take the sand truck traffic onto Heatherton Road at a point which would be far less hazardous from the traffic point of view. In view of this the company intends to ask that the condition of the permit requiring the sealing of Dunlop Road between the point of access to Heatherton Road be waived, and in this regard it is understood that the council plans to institute action for the closure of

Dunlop Road. The company also plans to make application for a permit to use part of the 5-acre lot referred to for car parking and a despatch office.

The question I raised was that Dunlop Road, which is covered by the permit, has been sealed off from Heatherton Road by a fence. As the permit was issued in its present form by direction of an appeals tribunal, it is claimed that any variation is not within the prerogative of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, and according to the documentary evidence in my possession there has been a blatant disregard of the conditions of the permit issued to Pioneer Quarries. On behalf of the residents who approached me on the matter, I ask the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government and the Minister of Mines to institute a prosecution against Pioneer Quarries for breaches of this permit.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I bring to the attention of the Minister for Conservation a possible threat to the future of 5,000 campers on the Mornington Peninsula over the Christmas period and throughout the year. I understand that discussions on the subject of camping have taken place between the Shire of Flinders and the Minister for Local Government. Have these discussions taken place and has the Minister any knowledge of representations of the Shire of Flinders to prevent people from camping on the foreshore of Mornington Peninsula? If so, what is the purpose of a plan which could affect people throughout Victoria who like to take their families to the Mornington Peninsula for a pleasant holiday?

Subsequent to these discussions, what action has been taken on the alleged request of the Shire of Flinders to have a complete ban imposed on camping, which is a similar type of progression of the problem, of which honorable members are aware, of people camping on their own allotments? Is it designed to keep people, other than those sufficiently affluent to build a home, off the Mornington Peninsula? I ask for some clarification.

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—I raise with the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government or the Premier an urgent matter concerning workers at Bendigo. On 12th September I referred to the fact that 110 men had been laid off by the Victorian Inland Meat Authority at Bendigo. I asked what alternative plans the Minister of Agriculture had for other employment for the men who were dismissed.

Subsequently, I received a letter from the Minister of Agriculture advising me that everything possible was being done. A meeting called by the Mayor of the City of Bendigo was attended by representatives of the Victorian Inland Meat Authority and trade union members representing the dismissed men. A member of the Government stated that money from the Rural Relief Fund would be available by the following Wednesday. On 27th September the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government was asked whether arrangements would be made for relief funds for the employment of these men who had been dismissed.

I understand that the honorable gentleman said that the matter would be examined immediately. At present 43 of these men are still registered for unemployment benefits. No additional funds have been made available to the City of Bendigo for their employment. I ask the Premier to apply to the Prime Minister, who has suddenly become generous, for funds for this purpose, or alternatively, if there are no funds available, that the Minister for Local Government should make an emergency grant to the City of Bendigo. There is plenty of work on which these men can be employed.

Mr. J. A. TAYLOR (Gippsland South).—I refer to the attention of the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government the matter of a connecting road to the South Gippsland Highway between Sale and Longford. In 1970 a survey was started but owing to the floods in February, 1971, it was not completed. The survey has now been completed and I believe the details of it are in the hands of the Country Roads Board. This road being the main connecting road to the South Gippsland area from Sale creates a problem not only for the people working in Longford, but also for the school buses which bring children into the schools south of Sale.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—I am sorry, I might have missed the point of the honorable member's adjournment speech, but has he asked for Government action or is this a statement?

Mr. J. A. TAYLOR.—I have previously asked for Government action on this matter.

The SPEAKER.—I am talking about now.

Mr. J. A. TAYLOR.—I am raising the matter with the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government to ascertain what action can be taken. The school buses that use this route can traverse an alternate route from Rosedale which adds 30 miles to the journey for the children. The children must leave home at 7.30 a.m. or 7.45 a.m., and the additional mileage involved adds to the existing problem of the normal traffic on the road. In view of the fact that the figures from the survey are now in the hands of the Country Roads Board, I ask the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government to investigate whether some action can be taken.

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara).—On 26th September, 1972, I received a letter from the Chairman of the Victorian Railways Commissioners, Mr. G. F. Brown, dated 21st September, which in part stated that the Wedderburn railway line would be closed from 5th October of this year. In other years the line will be closed from July until December; in other words, the line is being closed down seasonally. However, the letter went further than that. The fact is that between July and December of every year the line will not be opened, and from December until June, when it will be opened, it will be used only for grain and superphosphate traffic. Immediately after I received the letter from the chairman, I asked a question on notice on this subject, but it has not yet been answered. I remind the Minister of a statement he made, as reported at page 4581 of *Hansard*. It is as follows:—

> Before any railway line can be closed a procedure to be followed is recommended by the board. The first step will be a proposal by the Victorian Railways. The second step will be for the proposal to be remitted to an investigating authority—and I now quote the words of the report—" which, after considering all necessary data (including the financial savings resulting from the action proposed), and consulting all proper local interests on the spot, would make its recommendations ". These would include, where the proposed action was endorsed, the organizing of alternative services.

Last week I visited Wedderburn to ascertain at first hand what the railways had done in this respect. I discovered that 24 hours ahead of me the railways had sent one or more representatives to inform the local shopkeepers and business people and others who will be affected by the closure of the railway line that it would be closed. So far as I can ascertain, no investigations were made and no proper statements were made to the interested local bodies. The majority of people would have seen the last train roll out on 5th October without another word being said, but I was able to visit Wedderburn and make them aware of the position.

I should like to know why question No. 323, which first appeared on the Notice Paper on 27th September has not been answered.

There are many reasons why the railway line should not be closed, particularly from the economic aspect. If the railways had any knowledge of the line, surely my question could have been answered the next day. I suspect that no accurate figures on the railway line are available. I understand that the train ran again today, which seems to indicate the railways did not curtail the service. I wish to know if that information is correct. It would appear that the Minister knows little about the matter. I invite him to throw some light on it for me.

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland).—I direct the attention of the Minister of Health to the present system of the Department of Health regarding subsidies to kindergartens. Under the present system if a kindergarten teacher goes on holiday or sick leave, the committee of the kindergarten is bound to pay the wages of the teacher during her absence. Several kindergartens in the Portland electorate have protested to me about this and I have been asked to raise the matter with the Minister so that the serious anomaly which exists can be rectified. Much voluntary work is done in these institutions. It is only fair that the Department of Health should provide the moneys which are absolutely necessary to subsidize these committees. I ask the Minister of Health to examine the situation with a view to correcting the existing position.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I make a request to the Attorney-General to approve of action beyond that which the honorable gentleman indicated he is prepared to take in answer to a question on notice which I asked last month. On 19th September, 1972, I asked the Attorney-General whether he had received correspondence dated 24th February, 1972, from certain contributors of the Hospital Benefits Association, detailing, firstly, alleged irregularities in the conduct of the 1971 annual meeting of Hospital Benefits Association contributors; secondly, possible breaches of the association's licence; and thirdly, objections to proposed amendments to the association's memorandum and articles of association; and if so, what action the Attorney-General intended to take on this matter.

In reply, the Attorney-General stated that he had received such a letter. He had advised the contributors on 9th March this year that he would examine the matters referred to in the letter. The honorable gentleman pointed out in his answer to me that a preliminary examination had revealed that some of the matters did not involve suggestions of breaches of the provisions of the Companies Act 1961, but he added that it had not been possible to undertake a detailed examination of those complaints, which, in the Minister's own words, suggested breaches of the Companies Act. The honorable gentleman said this was because of the heavy pressures of work which are being experienced by the investigation section of the Companies Office. In a fairly lengthy answer to my question, the Attorney-General also pointed out that action was being taken to increase the establishment of the investigation section of the Companies Office. The Attorney-General also admitted that because of the difficulty in recruiting qualified accountants, it was difficult to promise any increase in the investigation section.

The SPEAKER (Sir Vernon Christie).—Order! Is the honorable member asking for any action to be taken?

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Attorney-General has a responsibility in relation to the approximately 1 million contributors to the Hospital Benefits Association and another 2 million dependants of those contributors to investigate as quickly as possible the alleged breaches of the Companies Act. I think the investigation section of the Companies Office is

investigating matters which are of lower priority and have much less impact than the alleged breaches to which I have referred. I strongly urge the Attorney-General to give these matters a higher priority.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Housing to request that Minister to arrange for a meeting with the Federal Department of Housing in connection with a matter which is the cause of some concern to elderly people living in Housing Commission flats in McLennan Place, Preston. Their flats adjoin flats which are owned by the Commonwealth in Wood Street. Previously the elderly people were able to walk from their flats to Wood Street along a walkway across the Commonwealth property, but the Commonwealth authorities are now closing off that access, so that the elderly citizens now have to walk into Tyler Street, then through Laurel Street before reaching Wood Street. I should like the Minister of Housing to put a forceful case to the Commonwealth Department of Housing in an endeavour to have a locked walkway provided across the Commonwealth property by means of which pensioners, who would be issued with keys, could be afforded access.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer).—I will have the matter raised by the honorable member for Midlands investigated tomorrow, and if there are still 43 men who have not been provided with employment, I shall ensure that sufficient funds are made available to Bendigo to make sure that they are in employment.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The honorable member for Moonee Ponds raised the question of a library and assembly hall for Buckley Park High School. I shall have the position of that school on the priority list checked, and advise the honorable member.

The honorable member for Morwell not unreasonably requested a clarification of the date upon which site works will commence at Maryvale High School. I will take up the matter with the Minister of Public Works.

I will discuss the matter raised by the honorable member for Preston with the Minister of Housing and suggest that the honorable gentleman should contact his counterpart in the Commonwealth sphere to ensure that the people in elderly citizens' flats are not locked in.

Sir GEORGE REID (Attorney-General).—The honorable member for Brunswick East raised a question concerning the Hospital Benefits Association. It is apparent from press reports and correspondence that I have received that there are conflicting parties in this organization.

I point out to the honorable member that the degree to which the Attorney-General can intervene in this matter is on a somewhat narrow basis, and it may well be — and I believe this is so — that certain matters being raised by certain objectors to the present administration of the association are matters more for civil action than for investigation by the Attorney-General. I will be taking special action to ensure that, so far as any of the matters relate to problems which call for investigation by me, action will be expedited.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I will direct the attention of the Minister for Local Government to the matter raised by the honorable member for Gippsland South which affects highway problems in his area.

In relation to the matter raised by the honorable member for Kara Kara, I am aware that there is a question on the Notice Paper covering the subject. I have not had time during the past few days in which to obtain the information. It is coming forward. However, I am sufficiently familiar with the situation to dispose of the answer now.

The honorable member is mistaken in thinking that the Bland report applies to this type of operation, because this covers 5 miles of spur line between Wedderburn and Wedderburn South. There is no passenger service on the line, but there is a goods service. The line will not be closed down. It will be used during the season when required to transport grain and superphosphate. For the rest of the year goods will be transported by the railways but they will be carried by road through a local carrier. I am concerned that adequate services are provided, and I feel that under this arrangement the service will be much better.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The honorable member for Benambra raised a question relating to objections by certain people to the proposed construction of a hotel at Falls Creek. I do not think there should be a Royal Commission into operations at Falls Creek. However, I have received a copy of the objections and I assure the honorable member that consideration will be given to them.

The honorable member for Heatherton raised a matter concerning the operations of Pioneer Quarries (Victoria) Pty. Ltd. at a sand quarry in his electorate. The question falls into two categories. The Mines Department is responsible for the operations of the quarry under the conditions which are laid down in the extractive industries licence. If any of the terms or conditions which are imposed under town planning regulations are incorporated in the licence requirements, it is the responsibility of the Mines Department to see that they are observed. On the other hand, if these are town planning requirements and a permit is necessary, it becomes the responsibility of the appropriate authority which, in this case would, I think, be the Board of Works. I know of the honorable member's interest in this matter and that he has made previous representations to the Minister for Local Government. I undertake to examine the matter to ascertain within whose jurisdiction it falls and to consult my colleague to determine whether we can assist the honorable member.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation).—I am at a complete loss to understand where the honorable member for Greensborough obtained the information on which he based his question. Honorable members will realize that the administration of foreshores comes exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Land Act and that committees of management of foreshores operate within that legislation. They are not answerable to the Minister for Local Government, nor do they operate under the Local Government Act.

I am quite certain that if representations of any kind were made to the Minister for Local Government on matters pertaining to my administration, that Minister would advise the people accordingly and they would be referred to me.

At no time have I had discussions with the Shire of Flinders on the restriction of camping on foreshores within the shire. I remind the honorable member that only in some parts of the extensive foreshores in the area is the Shire of Flinders the committee of management. For instance, the Rosebud Foreshore Committee is not the Flinders Shire Council.

I can only think that the honorable member is confusing some regulations which I have seen referred to in the press and which the Shire of Flinders has brought down to restrict camping on private property by providing the distances that camps must be situated from existing residences. That is the only knowledge that I have of the proposal; certainly I have had no discussions with the shire on the matter.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.13 *a.m.* (*Thursday*), *until Tuesday, October* 17.