there was only one case in which the level of dieldrin present was high enough to be consistent with poisoning by that substance. On this occasion the person whose illness was being investigated had been acting as a pest control operator.

DAY NURSERY FOR PRESTON.

(Question No. 573)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Minister of Health—

Whether he has been approached by the City of Preston regarding the council's application to the Commonwealth Government for a subsidy towards establishing a day nursery; if so, whether such a project can attract both a State and Commonwealth subsidy and, if not, why?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): The answer is—

I am aware of the intention of the City of Preston to establish a day nursery with Commonwealth Government assistance. The Commonwealth Government provides 100 per cent of all reasonable costs of establishing a day nursery, so the question of a State subsidy towards the council's costs does not arise.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, November 12, 1974

The PRESIDENT **(Sir Raymond Garrett)** took the chair at 4.58 p.m., and read the prayer.

RACING (FURTHER AMENDMENT) BILL.

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

CHIROPODISTS (ADDITIONAL TRAINING OF APPLICANTS) BILL.

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

CATTLE AND SWINE COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare), was read a first time.

PETITION.

ANIMAL WELFARE.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province): I present a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that an immediate public inquiry be held into the administration of animal welfare. The petition is respectfully worded, in order, and bears 2,868 signatures.

By leave, Mr. President, I shall read the petition, which is a follows—

TO THE HONORABLE THE PRESIDENT AND THE HONORABLE THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The humble petition of the citizens of Victoria who are supporters of the animal rights campaign movement of the State of Victoria respectfully sheweth that we, the undersigned, hereby request that an immediate public inquiry be held into the administration of animal welfare in the State of Victoria as the present facilities for lost and stray animals are shameful, inadequate and archaic and that in particular conditions at the Lost Dogs Home, at Gracie Street, North Melbourne, are contrary to the Protection of Animals Act thus causing much needless suffering and distress to the animals at this institution.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that such public inquiry be held immediately into all relevant and authorized societies and institutions connected with animal welfare, and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

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

ANIMAL WELFARE.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province): I wish to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the failure of the Government to enforce the law in relation to the care of animals.

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): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! The subject-matter is rather broad in conception, but in order.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Thank you, Mr. President; it is a broad subject. Animal welfare is a dead duck in Victoria. The serious charge I make is that the Government is failing to enforce the law of the land. If the Government does not like the law, why does it not alter it instead of letting it fall into disuse? The law enforcement agency is the Victoria Police Force whose Minister is the Chief Secretary, Mr. Rossiter. Certain laws deal with cruelty to animals and the protection and care of animals. These laws are included in the Crimes Act and Protection of Animals Act which create offences and prescribe penalties. But the practice of the Victoria Police is to refer complaints concerning animals to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and so wash its hands of the matter. As honorable members heard earlier today, the Minister for Local Government stated, in answer to a question asked by Mr. Walton, that the question of an inspection of the Lost Dogs Home was referred to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which is a voluntary body.

An examination of the annual statistical review of the Victoria Police Force for 1973 shows that only 24 cases of cruelty to animals—I use cruelty in the broad sense of the Protection of Animals Act and the Crimes Act—were handled by the police for the whole of Victoria. The report of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals for the same year shows that approximately 3,000 cases were investigated by that body. As I recall, about three prosecutions followed. In matters of cruelty to animals the Chief Secretary, Mr. Rossiter, is a sleeping beauty awaiting the kiss of life from Miss Carter, of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Mr. Rossiter is known as a large amiable man whom we are hoping to arouse from his slumbers by more practical methods than those of the fairy tales. It is his Ministerial responsibility to enforce the law. To permit him to be selective in the laws he will enforce and the laws he will ignore is to confer on him the whim of a tyrant. Such a capricious exercize of power under constitutional government will never do. The administration of justice must always remain the firmest pillar of government.

The police in this country are the instrument for enforcing the law. As the Royal Commission on the Police in Great Britain, which presented its report to Parliament in 1962, said in chapter IV. on the role of the Police Force and the purpose of the force—

> The police in this country are the instrument for enforcing the rule of law; they are the means by which civilized society maintains order and so on; they are the law's agents.

This may, I hope, appeal to some members of the Government who think that all that needs to be done with any animal problem is to refer it to a voluntary organization. The obligation of members of the Police Force to enforce the law dealing with cruelty to animals cannot be shelved, abdicted or fobbed off. The practice of shedding responsibility for the protection of animals has grown up over the years and it must be stopped.

The Police Force operates over the whole of Victoria from the cities in the south such as Geelong and Melbourne to the smallest country hamlet. The police have the resources, the power and the duty to enforce the law and to apprehend the wrongdoer against man or beast. It is, in short, their job.

Voluntary organizations in this State have a splendid record of achievement in animal welfare. They must continue to enjoy the respect and encouragement of the community, but they cannot stand in the shoes of the police officer, nor should we expect them to.

Our laws against cruelty are not being enforced. They stand " like the forfeits in a barber's shop more in mock than in mark ". Sections 237 and 238 of the Crimes Act provide for imprisonment of up to ten years for cruelty to animals, including cattle. The same Act provides for imprisonment for inflicting grievous bodily harm on persons. It also deals with homicide and so on. Does anyone suggest that an officer of the Police Force, on thumbing through the Act, should administer some sections and ignore others? The Act draws no distinction. It sets out the penalties. If a person cuts someone's throat, a penalty is prescribed and, if a person cuts a beast's throat cruelly—I am not talking about cattle—a penalty is prescribed.

The Protection of Animals Act, which was formerly part of the Police Offences Act and from which the provisions were extracted, provides a maximum term of imprisonment of twelve months upon conviction for various offences of cruelty to animals. In case anybody might think that the consideration of prosecution should be left to voluntary bodies, section 8 of the Act provides for a search warrant to be given to a member of the Police Force where any place is being used for maltreating animals. There is no provision for a search warrant to be issued to a voluntary organization or to a private citizen. The law clearly contemplates that the Police Force has an obligation to apprehend those who are cruel to animals. I do not think any member of this House would feel that that is not a proper function for an officer of the force. The law does not permit the handing over of the responsibility of the police officer to anyone else. That is said deliberately and in answer to the foolish reply that Mr. Walton received to his question on notice. There is no provision for the issue of a warrant other than to a member of the Police Force.

Let us pause for a moment. We do not leave the prosecution of the bank robber or the corporate thief to the Prisoners Aid Society. We do not expect the drunken driver to be arrested by Alcoholics Anonymous. We look to the Police Force, and in saying this I cast no aspersion on Alcoholics Anonymous or the Prisoners Aid Society. I applaud the activities of both organizations, as I do the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Where does the Government stand on this? Admittedly, I am making a serious charge but on reflection I submit it is fully supported by what I have already said. The Government is repudiating the law that it is sworn to uphold. It is no use the Government having statutes and saying it is not going to bother about them, that it is a matter for Miss Carter.

We must bring the Police Force back into the animal welfare field. Every youngster who sees an animal in distress must be encouraged to ring up the local " cop ", if I may use a friendly term. He must learn as early as possible to see the police officer as a friendly person, not as an officer of the law whom he once saw knocking on the door to serve a summons on Dad. Friendly relations between police officers and young children ought to be established and the best way is through the intermediary of an animal because children dislike all forms of cruelty.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: Mr. Galbally's statement is not necessarily true; some children are terribly cruel, some children hate animals.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Some members of Parliament are terribly cruel. I am talking about children who have lived in a happy home and have seen animals as pets.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: It is not necessarily true and Mr. Galbally knows it.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: It is not only the blind who need a seeing eye dog. Social welfare workers and medical men are realizing more and more the enormous benefit that children, handicapped children, the lonely and the aged get from the companionship of pets. Let us not overlook the fact that city life is a lonely existence for many people; a bird, a dog, or a cat is sometimes the only companion many people have. The animal population runs into millions and, ergo, animals should receive more and not less attention from Government. The enforcement of the laws with regard to animals in this State is a dead letter.

You, Mr. President, may recall that during the autumn sitting this House unanimously agreed to a motion dealing with animals but what has the Government done about it? Nothing! I am sorry; as a result of the motion, apparently, the fees under the Protection of Animals (Rodeos Fees) Regulations were increased from $8 to $10 and from $4 to $5 respectively, and the Honorable John Frederick Rossiter, Her Majesty's Chief Secretary for the State of Victoria, was instructed to give the necessary directions accordingly.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Does Mr. Galbally think some reference should be made to sheep and other animals in the electoral redistribution?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: The way the Government is going on, anything that breathes will get a vote. Of course, it will be said that if the Police Force sets out to prosecute some of these people, the definition of cruelty is not wide enough in that it does not include tacit cruelty.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: It does.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Then automatically there is no reason why the Government should not go ahead and prosecute people who cart around the State wild beasts in cages and then ask them to perform under the lash so that they can jump through hoops of fire in hot weather. Does anybody suggest that that is not cruelty?

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: In hot weather, it is very cruel.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I have no objection to the circus trainer jumping through hoops of fire. He has a choice; the lion has not.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Would that not be inhumane punishment?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Having listened to Mr. Gleeson I am not certain that it would come under the definition of inhumane punishment.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: What about racehorses?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I love all horses.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): I think the lash is used very cruelly on racehorses.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I have help from an unexpected quarter, the person who holds the highest office in the Parliament; I must pause and reflect with gratitude.

In making these remarks I do not for a moment reflect upon the Victoria Police Force or on any member thereof because they refer all complaints of cruelty to animals to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals as part of a deliberate policy of the Government—a policy which, I submit, has no statutory authority. In doing so, the Government is repudiating its duty and its high office.

The Government, stimulated by the soaring revenue from the Totalizator Agency Board, takes the view that kindness to animals need go no further than putting one's shirt on a horse.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): Mr. Galbally has attempted to make out a case which would indicate that the Government is not administering the law in relation to cruelty to animals,

but he has failed to cite a single case in which that law has not been administered.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: The honorable gentleman need not worry about that.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: I am concerned about it because it provides me with no case to answer. Not a single instance was quoted of failure by the Government to carry out the law in regard to the protection of animals.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I have said that the Police Force does not prosecute.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: In fact, Mr. Galbally gave examples of cases where the police have prosecuted.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Twenty-four cases in one year.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: The number is immaterial; Mr. Galbally has said that we do not prosecute. Therefore, there is no case to answer. If the Leader of the Opposition, having resumed his seat, is now refuting his own argument, it leaves the Government in a difficult situation as to what to say about the matter.

Mr. Galbally made minor criticisms of only one or two of the legislative provisions which were enacted to protect animals. The Protection of Animals Act is wide-ranging and provides almost a complete umbrella of protection for animals. In a previous debate on a similar subject, Mr. Galbally said that there was not a single legislative provision which protected animals in the course of transport. He was wrong in that statement, because section 4 (1) (c) of the Protection of Animals Act states—

> Any person who drives, conveys or kills an animal in any manner or in any position or in any circumstances involving cruelty shall be guilty of an offence.

The burden of Mr. Galbally's contention was that the only people who ought to enforce the law for the protection of animals are members of the Police Force. I reject that contention. In the first place, it is the responsibility of every member of the community, if possible, to help with the enforcement of the law for the protection of animals.

What is one referring to when one speaks of the animal population? In Victoria, in rough figures—give or take a few million—there are 33 million animals. One could hazard a guess and say that there is an equal number of wild animals.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT: How did you arrive at that number? Cats are not registered, so how does one know what the cat population is?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: I thank Mr. Knight for the question. There are 53,000 horses, 25·9 million sheep, 7 million cattle, 427,000 pigs, 3,000 goats and 400,000 registered dogs. Those figures add up to approximately 33 million. If one includes wild animals and birds—and birds are considered to be animals—the number is considerably increased. My experience—and it would be the experience of most honorable members—is that animals in general are well looked after.

I turn to the contention that only members of the Police Force ought to administer the Act. Mr. Galbally said that in other fields no one but members of the Police Force administered the law.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: No; I say that the Police Force has a duty to administer the law.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: I can cite many exceptions of cases where voluntary agencies are empowered to administer the law. One which I think is relevant is the society which was formerly known as the Society for the Protection of Children and is now known as the Children's Protection Society, which is empowered by the Minister for Social Welfare under the Children's Court Act to take neglected children to the court. There are many private agencies which contribute to social welfare. This is freely admitted, and I

have never heard anyone criticize those agencies. Without them social welfare in Victoria would not be, as it is now, the best system of its kind.

It is because people have grown up to regard community care as an important part of the social order in Victoria that we have been so successful in this field. I take no credit for that; it has been happening for a long time. The same situation exists in the animal welfare field. There is a body of people who are concerned—and Mr. Galbally has referred to these people in the House many times—and have demonstrated their concern by doing whatever they can to ensure that animals are protected. I refer to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The society has authority to prosecute, and it ought to have such an authority because its members are people who are genuinely concerned with animal welfare. These people understand animal welfare and want to spend not only their working lives but also their private time in the performance of these functions, because they have a private concern for animals. Any Government would be extremely remiss in not using to the fullest extent the services of such a body.

The council of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is comprised of a wide range of people, including veterinary scientists, educationists—Alfred Deakin may have been the founder of the society; certainly he was one of its early presidents—people from schools, representatives of the Education Department and members of the Police Force. This wide-ranging group of people have a special concern for animals.

The police do not wash their hands of the matter; they take just as much care in carrying out the provisions of the Act and in their general concern for the welfare of animals as any other section of the community. At the time of their graduation, policemen are lectured by the Administrator of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and by its president, who is also the President of the Victorian Branch of the Australian Veterinary Society. Therefore, there is a close association between all police who are responsible for the administration of this law and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

I suggest to the House that statistics are not a guide to the administration of the law, particularly in view of the special purposes of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The society aims to educate people in the way in which they ought to care for their animals. Mr. Galbally mentioned that approximately 3,000 cases of cruelty had been investigated, and in almost every case—barring the prosecutions—the people who had been mistreating animals were told what they ought to do to look after animals, and they took that advice. Surely that is a better way of looking after animals than by prosecuting the offenders.

Some time ago there was a famous case of the ill-treatment of some donkeys, which Mr. Galbally brought to the attention of the House and which was publicized in the media. Evidence was given that this consignment of donkeys, which eventually ended up at Benalla, had been held up in the far north of Australia on the railroad for three days because of flooding. When the consignment arrived in Victoria, the regional officer of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, who resides at Shepparton, was asked to meet the donkeys at Benalla. What could be more humane, short of meeting one's own family returning from overseas, than to meet the donkeys which arrived from somewhere in the far north-east of Australia, at Benalla? The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals inspector did this at 2 a.m. and the donkeys walked off the train and were put out to pasture and looked after. That is the sort of

concern which cannot easily be demonstrated by a body such as the Police Force.

I do not criticize the Police Force because policemen are as much aware of the need to care for animals as anybody else in the community. Whenever cases of cruelty to animals are directed to their attention, they contact the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which investigates the matter, and on occasion the police prosecute. About a fortnight ago a railway worker was prosecuted by the police for trapping a dog. On that occasion the police certainly enforced the Act.

In 1871 the Chief Commissioner of Police pledged the support of the Police Force to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and that support still holds good as a result of the communication between the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Police Force, the lectures which are given by members of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to police cadets and the recognition by the Police Force that people who are dedicated to looking after animals have the authority to prosecute. For all these reasons this is the best way to do it. There are seven inspectors in the association.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Seven inspectors for the whole of Victoria?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: That is so, and the entire Police Force as well. Inspectors from the society are stationed in regional areas. An officer of the society will be travelling to Gippsland next week to examine and check on the liveweight selling of bobby calves; this is an area that needs examining. The treatment of bobby calves is an area of constant threat. From time to time the media inform the people, as well they might, of the cruelty that is sometimes involved in the transport and sale of bobby calves. All complaints are carefully examined by the inspectors of the society and by the police, in co-operation with the inspectors.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: But they are not responsible to this House and the Minister is; that is the difference. It is a question of responsible government.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: The sale of bobby calves is the area in which it is often alleged that cruelty occurs and the society recently held a conference which was attended by representatives from the Police Force, stock and station agents, stock transporters, abattoir operators, grazier associations and dairy farmers and inspectors from the Department of Agriculture. That means that the problem is constantly under review and Mr. Galbally's complaints about co-operation between the Royal Society, the Victoria Police Force and the community are unfounded, because that is the way in which complaints about cruelty to animals are dealt with in this State.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province): If the speeches made by Government supporters and by honorable members on the corner benches in a debate earlier this year, again initiated by Mr. Galbally and relating to the welfare of animals, are any guide, those honorable members should have no difficulty in voting for the motion. On that occasion Government supporters said that something should be done to prevent cruelty to animals, but those same Government supporters are unable to tell honorable members of any legislation that the Government has promulgated since that time to improve the law relating to the cruelty to animals.

Therefore, it has been necessary for the matter to be again raised in the House. Honorable members from all sides of the House acknowledged in that debate that animals were cruelly treated, and this cruelty was seen frequently by honorable members. I shall quote what Mr. Block said when he debated this matter on behalf of the Government. When speaking about the need for some

animals to be used as food and clothing for humans, he was reported at page 4075 of *Hansard* of 2nd April, 1974, as having said—

> Three which spring readily to my mind are the sheep, the cow, and the pig. These animals are treated by human beings differently from privileged animals. They are raised for the purpose of providing food; they are fed for a certain time and then herded together and forced into large trucks with one tier on top of the other in situations of extreme cruelty; they are then driven long distances to their final destination.
>
> I suppose it is possible to become inured to this aspect, and many people have. However, as I drive around and see large trucks on the road with legs sticking out of the side and animals heaped upon animals. I find myself reflecting upon the extreme cruelty of man to other creatures.
>
> The Hon. S. R. MCDONALD.—I bet that you do not see it very often.
>
> The Hon. P. D. BLOCK.—I see it frequently. I know that the economics of food production demand cheap transport of these animals. I often wonder why we shed tears over one sort of animal and are prepared to inflict the grossest cruelty on another sort. A great deal of cruelty occurs. I call attention only to what I have seen as I have driven around Melbourne, and I am sure that honorable members will agree with me that cruelty is often evident.

Mr. Block was then the leading and only speaker for the Government in the debate in this House earlier this year on the rights of living creatures. I agree with every word Mr. Block said on that occasion, but the problem still exists and all members of this House, but particularly those who travel along country roads, know that the cruelty about which Mr. Block spoke still exists.

Yet, as Mr. Galbally has indicated, last year there were only 24 police prosecutions for cruelty to animals and in one year the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals initiated 6 prosecutions, of which 4 were successful, and in another year initiated 4, of which 3 were successful. Obviously, cruelty to animals is still occurring in the community. The motion on which the debate on the rights of living creatures was conducted was passed unanimously in this House, but nothing further has been done by the Government to obviate the cruelty to which Mr. Block referred.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Except to increase the fees for rodeos.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: The only action that the Government has taken has been to make minor alterations to the regulations relating to the protection of animals, but those alterations refer only to fees for rodeos, for private zoos and for other things, all of which bring in more revenue for the Government. In any case, most of the amendments were re-enactments from other regulations and were merely a bringing together, under one set of regulations, of a conglomeration of regulations.

Mr. Galbally was quite justified in moving the motion. The Government has done nothing since that earlier debate to eliminate cruelty to animals, which is its responsibility. The Police Force has the responsibility for carrying out the law of the land, but members of the Police Force are not responsible to the Labor Party or to individual members of Parliament; they are responsible to the Government. As Mr. Galbally pointed out, there is an abundance of law in existence to overcome 99 per cent of the cruelty that is occurring.

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER: Mr. Walton has been criticizing the Government for not introducing legislation on the subject.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: Of course I have.

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER: Mr. Walton has been saying the law is inadequate.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: As Mr. Block said, the Government must redouble its efforts, but it has not done so.

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER: Is the law deficient.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: There are plenty of laws to deal with most of the problems that occur, but more could be done. The only law passed by Parliament on the subject has

been the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act, which related to the ways of killing cattle by captive bolt and ways of killing sheep. However, no regulations apply to the way in which horses, brumbies or donkeys are killed at knackeries. I have been told of cases where horses stand one behind the other waiting to be killed and when the last horse comes to the gate it is frantic. A similar procedure is followed with cattle when they are killed in a way that is required to enable the meat to be prepared for certain people. Honorable members understand what I mean.

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER: What about the killing of poultry. Does Mr. Walton object to headless chooks? I am told there are plenty running around.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: There are not many headless members of Parliament, but plenty of Government supporters have nothing in the heads they have, and Mr. Crozier would be among the leaders.

In our community animals are kept in zoos. Although a zoo may be an interesting place to take children to, I find it most degrading. It is a place where animals are kept in cages. Sometimes the animals are taken out of their natural environment to be kept in these cages. Many of these animals will not breed in captivity. The best that can be said about zoos is that when the animals in them become extinct in their natural environment, examples of the species that are at present roaming the countryside will be available for observation.

I am sure that honorable members have watched the wildlife programmes on television and will have realized that many species of animals, particularly in Africa, have become extinct. I am sure that they are saddened by this fact. This occurs notwithstanding that in Africa the animals run wild in large areas. However, they are still killed by predators and those who like to make a quick buck. They make money from the ivory from the elephants tusks and from the skins of other animals.

Unless some control is exercised over this sort of activity in Victoria, many of our species of animals will become extinct. I should not be surprised if in the future there is some sort of atomic warfare and all human beings and animals become extinct. The Minister for Social Welfare said that the Opposition has not put any cases of animal cruelty before this House.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: I said that Mr. Galbally had not.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: I have done so on a number of occasions, as has Mr. Galbally. I had to plead with the Government to prevent head masters from placing glue on the roofs of school buildings in attempts to get rid of pigeons. Is that not an act of cruelty? This practice was stopped, and I do not think that product is any longer on sale in Victoria, but I had to plead with the Government to take action.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: The law was enforced.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: Only when the matter was drawn to the Government's attention, and that is what members of the Labor Party are doing today—we are asking the Government to enforce the law. It should not be necessary for members of the Opposition to raise this question in two consecutive sessions of Parliament. It should have been necessary to mention the matter only once, especially when the House decided unanimously that all members held the same view.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: It is not necessary to raise it.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: I say that it is, because the Government has not taken action.

A group of employees at Healesville wildlife sanctuary made complaints about animals dying before

the Government agreed to hold an inquiry. The report of that inquiry is expected this week.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: I would not draw any conclusions about it if I were you.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: I shall not because it would be impossible to do so. However, from the evidence put forward it would seem to be pretty likely that it was not the best place in which animals could be kept or that they were not kept in the best possible manner.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: It is a magnificent place.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: The surroundings are beautiful, as are the birds, but allegations were made about certain protected species of wildlife being shot merely for the comfort of people who like to walk around the place.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: Allegations, but not proven yet.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: That is so. It would be a great advantage if honorable members had that report before them today because so many of the staff were involved and were prepared to put their signatures to the complaint that I am sure there were acts of cruelty.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: Why did you not wait for the report? Then you would have had some ammunition.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: I do not have to wait because there is already plenty of ammunition. I do not wish to read to the House all the complaints that were made by the staff at that time because I am sure members of the Government party are well acquainted with them and must have been horrified at the allegations. This is another example of where the position had to be drawn to the attention of the Government by the staff of an organization before the Government would hold an inquiry.

When the Animals Rights organization made complaints about the Lost Dogs Home at North Melbourne, the matter looked like becoming a "hot potato". In his usual way, the "promising" Chief Secretary promised a police inquiry. Today I asked the Minister for Local Government whether the inquiry had been held. After all, it could have been held the next day. That would have been preferable, before the Lost Dogs Home was cleaned up and before anything else could be done. I do not know whether the police involved would be qualified in veterinary science and would know whether the dogs were emaciated or not. However, the Chief Secretary announced that he had placed the inquiry in the hands of another organization, which I believe to be well meaning. Nevertheless, a number of other groups are concerned—probably because it is a voluntary organization—that it is not able to do anything about the situation. Therefore, the law of the land should be carried out in the proper way by means of the Police Force.

Mr. Galbally has already said that the proper method to adopt is to set up a special squad within the Police Force to protect the welfare of animals. Honorable members know that members of the Police Force who have animals in their care look after them magnificently. One has only to see their horses and dogs to realize that they are well looked after. If the members of the Police Force who look after animals examined the Lost Dogs Home at North Melbourne I should have been satisfied, but I envisage that a constable from the local police station would be sent down to have a look around. Even that step was not taken. A voluntary organization, which itself is subject to a great deal of criticism, was asked to examine the Lost Dogs Home.

Since I first raised this matter I have received two other reports of conditions at the Lost Dogs Home, North Melbourne. I shall read only one of them to the House because I do not want to over-do the case in respect of the Lost Dogs Home, but undoubtedly conditions are not right there.

It was acknowledged in the answer to my question today that the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which should have acted without members of the Labor Party bringing the position to its attention, recommended certain alterations, certain types of pen, and so on, and that more veterinary attention should be available. Members of the Labor Party should not have had to direct the attention of that body to the situation at North Melbourne if it is the organization which the Chief Secretary and the Minister for Social Welfare claim that it is. After all, the Lost Dogs Home at North Melbourne is the main centre for lost or stray dogs. Why should not representatives of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals have visited there and found out the position for themselves? The reason is possibly that it has only a few inspectors, as Mr. Galbally has discovered. Even allowing for the larger population, this organization probably has ten times more inspectors in England than it has in Victoria.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: If a police officer makes an inspection he is answerable to the Minister, and the Minister is answerable to Parliament, but what can one do with a voluntary body?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: Exactly. I shall read the observations of people from the Animal Rights organization who visited the Lost Dogs Home on 4th November—only a few days ago, and since I raised the matter in this House.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: Who were they?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: Miss K. Dempster, Mrs. T. Mathews and Mrs. J. Walker. Their observations were—

1. Pen 9 contained over 30 dogs, many showing signs of distemper and general sickness. One dog in particular was huddled in a corner on bare concrete, very sick, and unable to move.

2. In the puppy yard small listless puppies were huddled in the food trough—no milk or food available.

3. In the area adjacent to Green Street, bitches were with puppies in cubicles at rear of large pens. These pens contained up to twenty dogs and some of these were showing signs of sickness others were harassing the mothers of puppies through the wire.

4. In pen 13 three dogs were waiting to go into the lethanair all these animals appeared to be sick. One in particular a black male puppy was hardly able to walk to the trough to drink water from a concrete container with green slime floating in it. The condition of this puppy was brought to the notice of a female attendant who said she would see if the vet. was in. After a few minutes she returned and removed the puppy from the pen and said she would take it to the vet.

5. The pen next to No. 13 contained two greyhounds. One male and one female (tag. No. 202). These animals were without water, and when it was supplied by the persons making the visit, the animals drank thirstily.

6. In the sick bay, overcrowding was evident, bedding and warmth was lacking and conditions were not conducive to hasten the recovery of sick and injured animals.

7. The only food seen at the home in some of the pens was stale pies lying on the ground.

I have already pointed out that the food bill at the Lost Dogs Home is terribly low in view of the large number of dogs kept there. I cannot recall the precise figure, but it is a small amount compared with that spent by comparable organizations in Geelong and in Sydney. The answer given by the Lost Dogs Home was that it receives lots of donations. There are the donations—stale pies! Without wanting to labour the question of that organization, I again raise the matter in the House.

Certain methods of dealing with animals are grossly cruel. Traps and snares are used, and the use of insecticides is one of the greatest menaces to bird life. Poison 1080 kills not only rabbits but also any other animal that takes the bait. Myxomatosis is one of the cruelest forms of disease that could be inflicted on anybody, but the Government is using it to kill rabbits.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Are you opposed to that?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: I am opposed to any form of cruelty to animals.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: How would you get rid of rabbits?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: The Country Party has joined the debate! Other methods are available. Even rabbits have to some extent become immune to this disease, so stronger strains of myxomatosis have been developed. Almost every honorable member has seen rabbits suffering from this disease. Nothing is more pitiful than to see a rabbit sitting in the middle of the road, with a swollen head and its eyes bulging, waiting for a car to run over it because it cannot see.

The Government has condoned the use of myxomatosis over the years. It is still condoning the clearing of the natural habitats of many species of wildlife which are facing extinction because council by-laws are not being enforced. The police are not ensuring that unnecessary clearing of land, which is against council by-laws, is undertaken. I also refer to the tourists, of whom the Minister for Tourism shows many photographs, along with his own, in tourist-promotion brochures. The people that the honorable gentleman is encouraging to visit many districts do so in greater numbers than the areas can carry.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Name the areas where there are too many tourists.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: Wilson's Promontory is one, and Phillip Island is another. At Phillip Island visitors are kept behind wire so that they may watch the penguins come in at night.

I am sure I will have the support of members of the Country Party and other members who represent country areas when I say that almost every night but particularly at week-ends some people travel around the countryside with spotlights and guns and shoot at anything they see. If they maim an animal, they cannot kill it because they cannot keep it in the beam of the spotlight. When people of this type drink alcohol they make a thorough nuisance of themselves. They break the law because they shoot from the roadway and over private land. When they cannot find anything alive to shoot at, they shoot road signs on the way home. They fire their shot-guns at road signs, and Mr. Hamilton knows that they do. I hate to see a member of this House defending, as Mr. Hamilton is doing in an interjection, people who indulge in spotlight shooting against the law.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON (Higinbotham Province): Mr. President, I take strong exception to that remark. I was pointing out that the Government was doing all in its power to control these people, which is more than any Government supported by Mr. Walton ever did. Mr. Walton deliberately misrepresented my position.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): That is not a point of order, but I agree that Mr. Walton has misinterpreted what Mr. Hamilton said.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province): Every time Mr. Hamilton stands on one foot, he puts the other in his mouth. The honorable member chose to interject while I was speaking and I tried to hear what he said. If I misunderstood him, I apologize. But it is true that every week-end people break the law. They shoot in close proximity to houses and across open land, and they shoot cattle and sheep. Where are the police?

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: Have you ever been spotlight shooting?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: No. I wonder whether Mr. Hamilton has ever been spotlight shooting.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: No.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: Some of these people are so frustrated when they cannot find something live to shoot that, on their way home, they shoot at farmers' water tanks, road signs, and so on. There is plenty of evidence of this. That is a job for the police.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! The honorable member is getting away from the motion which refers to the care of animals, not the care of road signs.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: The point is that the Government is not stopping the shooters and it is they who maim animals and leave them to die. Very often, they shoot at random. Sometimes they shoot themselves; there are many accidents. A short time ago there was a report of a man who shot his companion while putting his gun into the back of his car. They leave a trail of beer cans wherever they go.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: As a friend of mine used to say when a shooter was shot, "That was one for the ducks".

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: That is right; that is the first time tonight that I have agreed with the Minister. Because of its name, in cases of animal cruelty most people go to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. They believe that the society is the only organization concerned with animals; they do not think of the police.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Sometimes the police direct people to the society.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: That is true, but conversely, in many cases people ring the society and find that the telephone is not answered, or they are told that nothing is wrong and, finally, they go to the police. Because, in a sense, this is derogatory to the society, I shall not refer to a list which I have. In some of these cases, the police have prosecuted. One case of which I know concerned an animal suffering from malnutrition. But the police have prosecuted only 24 times in a year. I could find that number of cases in one day; that many would occur in cattle and sheep trucks every day. That is why a specially trained squad of police is needed to deal with cruelty to animals.

Mr. Galbally has justified his presentation of this motion to the House. The Government speaks with a forked tongue. Recently, its supporters voted for a motion to give a better deal to dumb animals, but the Government did nothing. Therefore, I strongly support the motion moved by Mr. Galbally.

The House divided on the motion (Sir Raymond Garrett in the chair)—

Ayes	8
Noes	24
Majority against the motion	16

AYES.

Mr. Eddy	Mr. Walton
Mr. Elliot	
Mr. Galbally	*Tellers:*
Mr. Trayling	Mr. Kent
Mr. Tripovich	Mr. Knight

NOES.

Mr. Bradbury	Mr. Houghton
Mr. Byrne	Mr. Hunt
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Jenkins
Mr. Clarke	Mr. Long
Mr. Dickie	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nicol
Mr. Fry	Mr. Storey
Mr. Gleeson	Mr. Swinburne
Mr. Granter	Mr. Ward
Mr. Grimwade	
Mr. Gross	*Tellers:*
Mr. Hamilton	Mr. Crozier
Mr. Hider	Mr. Wright

PAIR.

Mr. Hauser	Mr. Thomas

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) BILL.

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

PAY-ROLL TAX BILL.

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

The sitting was suspended at 6.29 *p.m. until* 8.4 *p.m.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MUNICIPAL ABATTOIRS) BILL.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Local Government Act 1958 with

respect to the establishment, management and control of local government municipal abattoirs.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

PAPERS.

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

Dried Fruits Board—Statements of accounts for the year 1973.

Land Act 1958—Schedule of country lands proposed to be sold by auction.

Local Authorities Superannuation Act 1958—Reports of actuarial investigations into the financial position and sufficiency of the Local Authorities Benefit Contracts Account for the periods 1st March, 1967, to 28th February, 1970, and 1st March, 1970, to 28th February, 1973 (two papers).

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 189 to 203) (fifteen papers).

Public Service Board—Report for the year 1973-74.

Statutory Rules under the following Acts of Parliament—

Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973—No. 458.

Explosives Act 1960—No. 460.

Motor Car Act 1958—No. 462.

Motor Car Act 1958, Recreation Vehicles Act 1973—No. 461.

Pesticides Act 1958—No. 456.

Port Phillip Authority Act 1966—No. 457.

Stock Foods Act 1958—No. 455.

Tattersall Consultations Act 1958—No. 459.

Teaching Service Act 1958—

Teaching Service (Classification, Salaries and Allowances) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 289, 291 and 292) (three papers).

Teaching Service (Teachers Tribunal) Regulations—Regulations amended (No. 290).

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—

City of Knox Planning Scheme 1965—Amendment No. 142, 1974.

Shire of Bulla Planning Scheme 1959—Amendments No. 32, 1973, and No. 33, 1974 (two papers).

LIQUOR CONTROL (FEES) BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill implements the Budget decision to increase those licences under the Liquor Control Act where the existing fee is based on 6 per cent of the gross amount paid for liquor by the licensee during the twelve months ended on the previous 30th June. The new fee will be 8 per cent. The increase will affect such licences as hotelkeepers' licences, restaurant licences, wholesale liquor merchants licences, retail bottled liquor licences and brewers' licences. It is proposed that the new fees will apply to licences which are renewed on 1st January, 1975, or for new licences which operate from that date.

The Liquor Control Act provides for licence fees to be payable in two equal instalments, the first before the issue of the licence and the second not later than the following 10th June. In addition, an interest charge of 5 per cent on the second instalment is payable with the first instalment.

The Bill provides a concession in respect of licences for the year 1975 by providing that the first instalment of the licence fee shall be three-eighths of the licence fee. The rate of the interest on the larger second instalment has been reduced from 5 per cent to 3 per cent and is payable with the second instalment on 10th June, 1975.

All fees payable under the Liquor Control Act were reviewed as part of the general review of fees and charges to which reference was made in the Budget speech. Most of the other fees payable under the Liquor Control Act are fixed by regulation and no legislation is therefore required in these cases. However, the fees for booth licences, which before 1960 were called temporary victuallers' licences are included in the Act and this Bill also provides for increases in

fees for booth licences which have remained unchanged since 1960. The increases are—

(*a*) Within the metropolitan area—

(i) at any racecourse, $30 for each booth or place instead of $20;

(ii) on any other ground or place —$15 for each of the first three booths or places instead of $10; $30 in respect of the fourth and each subsequent booth or place instead of $20.

(*b*) Outside the metropolitan area—

(i) at any racecourse $15 for each booth or place instead of $10;

(ii) at any other ground or place —$10 for each of the first three booths or places instead of $6; $15 in respect of the fourth and each subsequent booth or place instead of $10.

I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. R. J. Eddy, for the Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

MOTOR CAR (FEES) BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a short and uncomplicated Bill which implements the decisions announced in the Budget to increase the fee payable for a motor car driver's licence from $4 per annum to $6 per annum, and to increase the surcharge on third party motor vehicle policies from $2 to $4. I commend it to the House.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 2) BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill has two purposes: Firstly, to increase the total sum which may be expended in favour of the municipalities from the Municipalities Assistance Fund, and, secondly, to enable payments to be made to advisory committees which may be established by the Building Regulations Committee.

The Bill proposes to raise the sum payable by the Minister from the Municipalities Assistance Fund—which is financed from motor car licence fees—from $600,000 per annum to $1 million per annum. Qualifying municipalities, which are in the main outside the metropolitan area, but include some on the periphery of it, will in the case of cities, towns and boroughs have their annual assistance raised from $3,000 to $4,000. In the case of shires the sum will be increased from $4,000 to $5,000. I am happy to inform the House that henceforth grants will be absolutely untied and unconditional.

The only requirement will be that they must be utilized for a capital project and that the department be notified of the project. It will be perfectly permissible for a council to set and advise my department of its order of priorities for these projects, if it so desires, and that order will not be interfered with by the department. It is desirable that councils should do that. Frequently honorable members desire to know whether support for a tennis pavilion or something of that kind is on a certain municipality's list of priorities. The Government does not propose to lay down any requirements or require councils to obtain approval for a specific project. The only requirement would be that the expenditure be on a capital

project, that the department be notified of this and, if there is a priority list, for it to be supplied to the department.

This, I think, is a real advance. It is a mistake to force municipalities to match grants in cases like this. It tends to distort the order of priorities whereas an untied grant does not.

The second matter to which the Bill refers concerns payment to advisory committees assisting the building regulations committee. For particular matters, the building regulations committee does need the advice of expert groups. Power to appoint these advisory committees was conferred some time ago but no provision for payment was made at the time. If we want expert and professional advice, we ought to be prepared to pay for it and the Government is so providing in this Bill with a view to assisting in obtaining the best possible advice in cases where the expertise of the building regulations committee needs to be supplemented by specialists in particular fields. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

REVOCATION AND EXCISION OF CROWN RESERVATIONS BILL.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the revocation of the permanent reservation of one area of Crown land and for excisions to be made from three other permanently reserved areas. The land described in Schedule One is not required for the purpose for which it has been reserved and is required for another public purpose. The lands to be excised from the reserves listed in Part I. of Schedule Two are required for public purposes other than those for which they have been respectively reserved.

Clause 1 of the Bill cites the short title and provides for the commencement of the legislation. Clause 2 revokes the permanent reservations of the lands described in Schedule One and in Parts II. to IV. of Schedule Two. Clause 3 revokes the Crown grants and certificate of title of the lands described in Parts II. to IV. of Schedule Two.

Clause 4 provides that the lands of which the permanent reservations and Crown grants are revoked shall be unalienated lands of the Crown freed from all trusts, encumbrances and the like. Clause 5 provides that the Country Roads Board shall pay the sum of $74,000 to the trustee of the reservation referred to in item 3 of Part I. of Schedule Two. It further provides that the sum shall be applied towards the maintenance and improvement of the land remaining in the reserve or for such other purposes as may be approved by the Minister. Clause 6 is the usual provision that no liability shall attach to the Crown.

Schedule One lists the land of which the permanent reservation is to be revoked. Schedule Two lists in Part I. the permanent reservations, Crown grants and certificate of title which are to be revoked only so far as the lands described in Parts II. to IV. thereof are concerned.

I shall explain the reasons for seeking the proposed revocation and excisions. Schedule One relates to the City of South Melbourne and a site for Melbourne water supply purposes. This reserve, which originally contained 1·029 hectares, is located at Dodds and Wells streets, South Melbourne. An area of 8,575 square metres was excised from the reserve and sold to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works under the provisions of the South and East Melbourne Lands Act 1906.

The land remaining in the reserve has not been used for the purpose of the reservation, but rather has been the subject of tenancy agreements issued by the Lands Department for commercial undertakings for over 40

years. It has been agreed that by 1976 the whole of the Crown land bounded by Grant, Wells, Miles and Dodds streets, South Melbourne, will be reserved for hospital purposes for the benefit of Prince Henry's Hospital. This is necessary because of the development confronting Prince Henry's Hospital to keep pace with population growth and the needs of medical education.

The land sold to the Board of Works under the 1906 enactment has been purchased by the Hospitals and Charities Commission for surrender to the Crown and reservation for hospital purposes. On revocation of the balance of the water supply reserve, the portion of the land not presently let for commercial purposes will immediately be rereserved for hospital purposes.

I shall now deal with Schedule Two, which contains three items as follows—

ITEM 1: CITY OF BALLARAT—SITE FOR A PUBLIC PARK: This reserve containing 131·7 hectares is known as Victoria Park. The land has been vested by Crown grant in the corporation of the City of Ballarat on trust for the purpose of the reservation. The excision now proposed comprises the small area of 907 square metres as described in Part II. of Schedule Two.

The excision is sought by the Ballarat City Council for road improvement works having regard to the traffic conditions existing at the sharp intersection of Russell and Winter streets. The introduction of night trotting at Bray Raceway has added considerably to the traffic negotiating this intersection, particularly late at night.

The council proposes to adopt a road alignment to enable Adair Street to continue due north into Russell Street. The portion to be excised has not been developed for the purpose of the reservation.

ITEM 2: TOWNSHIP OF BUNINYONG —SITE FOR PUBLIC GARDENS: The reserve referred to in this item originally contained 5·059 hectares and has been vested in the corporation of the Shire of Buninyong for the purpose of the reservation.

In 1962 an area of 5,919 square metres was excised from the reserve and leased under the Land Act to the Buninyong Bowling Club. The land to be excised comprises 1·012 hectares as described in Part III. of Schedule Two.

The excision is sought by the Buninyong Shire Council and the Education Department for the following purposes—firstly, an area of about 6,070 square metres adjacent to the Buninyong Primary School is proposed to be rereserved for State school purposes as an addition to the existing site. The present schoolground is not adequate so far as playing area is concerned and the additional land is urgently required for recreational and sporting facilities.

Secondly, an area of about 3,440 square metres at the corner of Yuille and Cornish streets being used for a municipal depot is to be rereserved for municipal purposes under the control of the municipality.

Thirdly, an area of some 610 square metres at the corner of Cornish and Simpson streets presently containing a pumping station is to be rereserved for water supply purposes under the control of the Buninyong Waterworks Trust. No portion of the land to be excised has been developed for public gardens.

ITEM 3: PARISH OF MORDIALLOC— SITE FOR A BENEVOLENT ASYLUM: This reserve which originally comprised 54·73 hectares, is located at Warrigal Road, Cheltenham, and is the site of the Kingston Centre Geriatric Hospital. The land was granted to The Melbourne Benevolent Asylum on trust for the purpose of the reservation. The Crown grant was, however, subsequently replaced by a certificate of title when the institution changed its name. The Kingston Centre, Cheltenham, is today the successor in title to the original grantee.

In 1951 an area of 2·253 hectares was excised from the reserve and added to the adjacent Heatherton Sanatorium reserve. The land now proposed to be excised contains 5,544 square metres as described in Part IV. of Schedule Two. The excision is required by the Country Roads Board for road improvement works at the intersection of Warrigal and Kingston roads. An increase in the traffic capacity at this intersection is urgently required to provide acceptable conditions, particularly at peak periods. In addition to improving the traffic flow, the alterations planned by the board should appreciably reduce the number of accidents in this location.

The board of management of the Kingston Centre is fully in agreement with the proposal. The board of management has stated that due to the constant heavy volume of traffic, extreme difficulty is being experienced by motorists using the main entrance and exit to the centre in Warrigal Road. It has also expressed the view that the present situation creates serious hazards in the immediate vicinity. The Moorabbin City Council is also in agreement with the Country Roads Board's proposal.

The land required for the road improvement works is laid out to lawns and contains a brick house. As the land has been granted by the Crown to the institution for charitable purposes for development of the objectives of the trust, it has been agreed that the trustee institution is entitled to be compensated for the loss of land from its title. By mutual agreement between the Country Roads Board and the Kingston Centre, the sum to be paid by the board to the centre has been fixed at $74,000.

The authority for the board to make the payment to the centre is provided in clause 5 of the Bill. The moneys received by the trustee institution will be applied for the benefit of the balance of the reserve or, at the discretion of the Minister of Lands, for any other appropriate purpose. A set of plans showing the lands the subject of the Bill has been prepared for the benefit of honorable members, and is available for their perusal. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

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

STATUS OF CHILDREN BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare) was read a first time.

CATTLE AND SWINE COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Under both the cattle and swine compensation Acts provision is made for payment of compensation where carcasses are condemned at abattoirs as unfit for human consumption because of disease. At present these diseased carcasses are condemned under the provisions of the Health Act.

Certain amendments are now required to the cattle and swine compensation Acts in relation to the coming into operation of the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973, the provisions of which will be implemented on 3rd November, 1974. At the time of implementation the control of meat inspection will be transferred from the Department of Health to the Department of Agriculture and meat inspectors will carry out their duties under the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act. The particular provision in each of the cattle and swine compensation Acts relating to condemnation of carcasses is section 4 (1) (*d*). Clause 2 (*a*) (i) and clause 3 (*a*) (i) of the Bill provide that the appropriate paragraph in each Act shall be

amended by deletion of the expression "Part XV. of the Health Act 1958" and the substitution of the expression "the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973".

Section 4 (1) (*e*) of the cattle and swine compensation Acts provides for the payment of compensation where a carcass outside a meat area within the meaning of the Health Act —where the services of a meat inspector are not available—has been certified by a medical officer of health to be unfit for human consumption because of disease. As the Department of Agriculture will be providing a meat inspection service for the whole of the State, this provision is no longer relevant and is repealed by clauses 2 (*a*) (ii) and 3 (*a*) (ii).

There are consequential repeals by clause 2 (*b*), (*c*) (i) and (*d*) and clause 3 (*b*) (*c*) and (*d*) relating to sections 6 (1), 7 (2) and 21 (1) (*b*) of each Act, where the phrase "or medical officer of health" is no longer relevant.

Section 7 (4) (*e*) of the Cattle Compensation Act 1967 provides power to refuse compensation where cattle are destroyed because of pleuro-pneumonia where the disease had developed within three months of the cattle being brought into Victoria. As pleuro-pneumonia has now been eradicated from Australia, this provision is no longer relevant and it is repealed by clause 2 (*c*) (ii).

The Cattle Compensation Act 1967 in section 5 (1) provides for a maximum market value of any one head of cattle and the Swine Compensation Act 1967 also in section 5 (1) provides for a maximum value of any one head of swine. Discussions have been held with representatives of primary producer organizations and it has been agreed that the maximum market value of any one head of cattle should be increased from $150 to $175 and the maximum market value of any one head of swine from $50 to $75.

An investigation has been made of the income and the outgoings of the Cattle Compensation Fund and the Swine Compensation Fund and an estimate has been made of the effect on each fund of so increasing the maximum market value. The estimate has shown that it will be possible to increase the maximum value from $150 to $175 and from $50 to $75 respectively, without any increase being required in the amount of stamp duty payable and, at the same time, without any detrimental effect on the relevant fund. Clause 4 of the Bill gives effect thereto. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

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

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill implements the Budget decision to introduce for the first time in the State a system of licensing sellers of tobacco, with licence fees assessed in a manner similar to that for liquor licences, but at a lower rate. It provides for a system of licensing wholesale and retail tobacco sellers. There will be two types of licences, a wholesale tobacco merchant's licence and a retail tobacconist's licence.

Tobacco wholesalers will require a licence from 1st January, 1975, and retail tobacconists will require a licence from 1st July, 1975.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: These people will be caught twice.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: That would be interesting, but, as the honorable member is aware, that is not so. However, I am sure he will make some interesting comments on behalf of his constituents.

For a wholesaler the licence fee for the year 1975 will be $100 plus an amount equivalent to 2·5 per cent on his sales, except sales to other wholesalers, for the six months

ended 30th September, 1974. For subsequent years the licence fee will be $100 plus an amount equivalent to 5 per cent on his sales, except sales to other licensed wholesalers, for the twelve months ending on the preceding 30th September.

For a retailer, the licence fee for the six months beginning on 1st July, 1975, will be $5 plus an amount equivalent to 5 per cent on his purchases from other than licensed wholesalers for the three months ending 31st March, 1975. For each year after 1st January, 1976, the fee will be $10 plus an amount equivalent to 5 per cent on his purchases from other than a licensed wholesaler for the twelve months ending on the preceding 30th September.

In practice this will mean that a retail seller of tobacco will pay an annual licence fee of only $10, provided that he makes all his purchases from a licensed wholesaler. In this, the licensing of tobacco sellers differs from the liquor licensing system. Under this Bill the main impact of the licence is directed at the wholesale level of the industry whereas under the Liquor Control Act the licensing fee is directed mainly at the retail level.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Would not all wholesalers have to be licensed?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: I think they will be covered by the dragnet. If not, no doubt Mr. Bradbury will be able to advise on the situation.

The difference is largely a result of the different structure of the two industries. There are some 15,000 retailers of tobacco in Victoria ranging from large supermarkets and department stores to small businesses. The operation of a licensing system directed at retailers would be complicated to administer, and the indications the Government has received from the industry confirm the view that the method of licensing contained in the Bill is probably the most efficient method of imposing a franchise in the tobacco industry.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: You ask some of the wholesalers!

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: No one likes taxes, and Mr. Swinburne is aware of the constitutional problem involved in levelling a tax of this nature.

The introduction of the licences in 1975 is staged so that retailers will know whether or not they are dealing with a licensed wholesaler for the purpose of assessing the retail tobacconist's licence fee.

The licensing of retailers in addition to wholesalers is an essential element of the Bill because it provides protection for the revenue in the event of retailers dealing with wholesalers from interstate who would, of course, be unlicensed under the Victorian Act.

The Bill makes it abundantly clear that tobacco sold for delivery and consumption outside the State is to be disregarded for the purpose of calculating the licence fees. Provision is also made in the Bill to avoid any possible double counting in the assessment of licence fees.

As with the liquor licence fees, the tobacco licence fee is payable in advance of the licence being issued. However, provision has been made in two ways to facilitate the introduction of a licensing system of this nature into an industry for the first time.

In the first place, although the Government has decided that the basic licence fee should be at a rate of 5 per cent, it was decided that for the first year of operation the rate of licence fee should be lower. The annual rate of licence fee in the first year is 1·25 per cent. The rate of licence fee payable under the Liquor Control Act is of course being increased from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. In the second place, provision is made in the Bill for annual licence fees which are in excess of $100 to be payable in six instalments, the first being payable before the licence is issued and the other instalments at two-monthly intervals thereafter. If an instalment is not paid by the due date the licence will automatically cease to be in force.

The Government proposes to have circulated to the industry at an early date particulars regarding the operation of the legislation, including the steps to be taken in relation to the application for and issue of licences, and the form of records which licensees will be required to keep. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

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

RACING (FURTHER AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): On behalf of the Minister of Housing, I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the Racing Act 1958—

to enable an extra 50 trotting meetings to be allocated to country tracks, bringing the total to 252;

to enable 30 additional trotting meetings to be held in the metropolitan area, bringing the total to 67;

to empower the Greyhound Racing Control Board to control greyhound training and trial tracks;

to enable the use of the Greyhound Racing Grounds Development Fund and the Racecourses Development Fund for the purchase of land;

to authorize the Racecourses Licences Board to make funds available to the Victoria Racing Club for a computer-based information system;

to raise the amount of the bond required to be lodged by the Victorian Bookmakers Association, and to increase the association's liability in the event of any default by a bookmaker;

to provide that the travelling expenses payable to members of the Totalizator Agency Board be prescribed by regulation;

to empower the Totalizator Agency Board to grant leases of its property; and

to permit the Totalizator Agency Board to conduct quinella totalizators on interstate and overseas meetings. The way in which the Bill achieves these objectives and the reasons for the changes are explained in the notes which have been circulated. On behalf of my colleague, I commend the Bill to the House.

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

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

CHIROPODISTS (ADDITIONAL TRAINING OF APPLICANTS) BILL.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): On behalf of the Minister of Housing, I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes to amend the Chiropodists Act 1968 which set up a Chiropodists Registration Board and generally made provision of the training and registration of chiropodists in this State and for the supervision in practice of those registered as chiropodists.

One of the provisions of this Act was that any person who during the period of twelve months after its commencement applied for registration was entitled to be registered if the board was satisfied that the person applying had sufficient proficiency to practise the profession. This period of twelve months was subsequently extended to two years by Act No. 8218. A further Act extended the period in which application for registration could be made to 30th June, 1973.

As a result of the second amendment the board, which had previously accepted for registration more than 800 of the applicants applying, arranged oral and written tests for 25 persons about whose proficiency it had some doubts. Of this number six satisfied the examiners and the

remainder were not registered. Following representations made on behalf of those nineteen people, the board has considered the matter and has agreed to a proposal that a further amendment to the Chiropodists Act be prepared with a view to granting power to the board to enable it to establish a scheme for the training of persons who had applied for registration on the basis of previous experience and whose applications had been rejected. The Bill will permit the board to arrange this training.

Clause 2 adds a new section—section 10A—to the principal Act. Under the provisions of this new section, any person who before 20th March, 1974, had applied to the board for registration and had been refused, is entitled to reapply and the board may then require the applicant to undergo such further training as it thinks necessary. After completing this further training to the satisfaction of the board, the applicant may be registered to practise as soon as he or she has paid the prescribed fee.

The board will be empowered to terminate the training of any person if that person is not making satisfactory progress or is convicted of a felony or misdemeanour or is convicted of an offence against the Chiropodists Act. Probably the only offence under the Chiropodists Act which would lead to the termination of training would be a conviction for unlawful practice before registration. Once the board has terminated the period of training, the applicant under this new section 10A will have no right to reapply for registration under that section and would need to fulfil all normal requirements before applying again.

By the final sub-section of the new section the Chiropodists Registration Board will be required to bring to the notice of all persons to whom the section is applicable the provisions of that section.

Clause 3 adds a new sub-section (3A) to section 14 of the Act. It is consequential upon the provisions of the new section 10A.

Clause 4 introduces provisions which, because of changing money values, are common in legislation these days. These provisions increase the maxima of certain penalties which are authorized to be imposed by the Chiropodists Act 1968. Paragraph (*a*) amends section 14 of the principal Act which fixes a penalty for persons who use the title of chiropodist unlawfully or who practise chiropody for fee or reward without registration. The penalty proposed to be amended by paragraph (*b*) is one for failure, without reasonable excuse, to return a certificate of registration to the board when that certificate has been cancelled.

Paragraph (*c*) amends the general penalty provisions applicable to persons who fail, neglect or refuse to comply with any lawful order or direction of the board given under the Chiropodists Act 1968.

The main provisions of the Bill —those relating to the further training of persons who could not meet the standards acceptable to the board—will ensure that no hardship will be imposed on any person who has, to any reasonable extent, been capable of undertaking and has received income for the practice of chiropody prior to the commencement of the Chiropodists Act 1968.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

I suggest that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): According to the Minister's notes and the Minister's remarks, it appears that only 25 applications were deferred out of more than 800. I am wondering whether the Minister could check the figure as it seems unusual that of 800 applicants all were accepted except 25. The figure may well be incorrect and I ask the Minister to check it.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, November 19.

STATUS OF CHILDREN BILL.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to remove the legal disabilities of illegitimate children and it will remove the term "illegitimate" from the Acts set out in the schedule to the Bill. Although the direct practical effects of the Bill are unlikely to be dramatic, its significance as a statement of social and legal policy is of the first magnitude.

At common law an illegitimate child was regarded as *filius nullius*, the son of nobody, and it was from this concept that the disabilities of illegitimate children were derived. Over the years the legislature has sometimes intervened to alleviate the hardships of illegitimate children. Examples are—

Provision from 1903, in the births, deaths and marriages legislation for legitimation of children by the subsequent marriage of their parents;

the acceptance since 1928 in the Adoption of Children Act of the rule that an adopted child becomes the legitimate child of his adopters; and

the power conferred on the Supreme Court by the Administration and Probate (Family Provision) Act 1962 to order proper maintenance for legitimate children.

Nevertheless in Victoria at present an illegitimate child and his mother have succession rights on the intestacy of the other. This is provided for in section 52 (2) of the Administration and Probate Act 1958.

One argument advanced against extending property rights to illegitimate children is that the strength of the institution of marriage must be preserved and that removal of the stigma of illegitimacy would tend to remove respect for legitimacy. Another argument put forward is that the granting of rights against a person's estate to those outside his legitimate family diminishes to some extent the material value of the rights conferred by marriage.

If I thought that the provisions of the Bill would damage the concept of marriage I would not put it forward; it simply seems to me that the law should not provide the means for perpetuating whatever discriminatory attitudes may exist towards illegitimate children. After all, they had no choice in the matter.

The philosophy behind the Bill is a simple one—that the law should not discriminate against any child or impose disabilities on him by reason of the accident of his birth. Essentially this is achieved by clause 3 (1), which declares that the relationship between a child and his parents is to be determined irrespective of whether or not the parents are or have been married to each other.

The provisions of the Bill are largely based on the New Zealand Status of Children Act 1969 and lay down a general rule to improve the status of illegitimate children. It is understood that the new law has worked satisfactorily in New Zealand. The provisions also deal with the practical problems associated with succession rights for illegitimates, and deal generally with the problem of proof of paternity. The Bill also provides protection for executors, administrators and trustees—they are under no obligation to inquire as to the existence of any person who could claim an interest in an estate by reason only of any of the provisions of the Act.

The provision of the Bill which will be of most practical concern to the legal profession is clause 3 (2), which abolishes the rule of construction that words of relationship in any instrument signify only legitimate relationships in the absence of a contrary expression of intention. I should make it clear, however, that the new provision will apply only to instruments which are executed after the commencement of the Act. Irrespective of the date of death, a

testator's will is to be governed by the law in force at the time the will was made.

It is not necessary for me to comment in detail at this stage on the other clauses of the Bill. I have some notes on the clauses and can make them available to any honorable member who is particularly interested in the legislation.

In commending the Bill to the House, I should add that a proposal for similar legislation has been discussed by the Standing Commitee of Attorneys-General on several occasions. The Tasmanian Parliament recently passed a Status of Children Bill which is similar in all respects to the Bill before this House and it is likely that other States will follow with the introduction of similar legislation. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

The Labor Party welcomes this Bill. It is a reform for which we have argued for many years. I propose that the debate be adjourned for one week.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): The Bill contains important legal implications which must be studied with care, and I ask the Minister to grant an adjournment of fourteen days to allow members of my party to consider the Bill.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The Government does not wish to prevent the Country Party from thoroughly examining the Bill. The principles contained in the measure are not complex. I suggest that the debate be adjourned for seven days with an undertaking that, if required, further time will be allowed.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, November 19.

FERTILIZERS BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 15) on the motion of the Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister for Social Welfare) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): This Bill is to consolidate and amend the law relating to the sale of agricultural limes, fertilizers and soil conditioners and for other purposes. It is of a technical nature and attempts to maintain certain standards to enforce registration and proper labelling, and to impose fines and penalties for misleading advertising or for forging a certificate or failing to comply with the principal Act. The Bill deals with one of the basic necessities of agricultural production, not only in Australia, but in most agricultural countries of the world.

It is alarming that many people in Australia—including members of the Commonwealth Labor Government—have not recognized the importance of superphosphate to food production. On the one hand, Government Ministers are admitting the need to expand food production and, on the other hand, the action of the Federal Labor Government which is designed to withdraw the superphosphate bounties has dramatically increased the price of superphosphate and is slowing down production in Australia.

I hope Mr. Kent will have the chance to express his dissociation from the attitude of his Federal Labor colleagues, who are literally strangling the country areas of Australia by withdrawing the superphosphate bounty.

The world's population will double by the end of this century, when it is expected to reach 6,500 million.

The Hon. D. E. KENT: And you will still be sucking the last drop of blood out of them.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I thought Mr. Kent, as a country Victorian, would know better than to make such a statement. I am sure the people whom he represents will be interested to know the attitude he takes in the

House when members representing country electorates stand up and fight for the people whom Mr. Kent is supposed also to represent.

The growth in population is alarming, and it is estimated that at the turn of the century 80 per cent of the world's population will live in the under-developed countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. By that time Australia's population will probably be about 24 million people, and we will be sitting in a world of almost 6,500 million people who will be hungry for the food that Australia can produce.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: That is the situation at present; we have a surplus and you are not prepared to do anything about it.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I am outlining the short-sighted attitude of a Government which can go to the world food conference and speak about the need to feed the hungry people of the world and fail to examine proper agricultural policies in Australia. The entire conference was short-sighted. All these matters are interrelated, and I acknowledge the interest of Mr. Elliot in primary industry.

A long-term policy must be adopted in primary industry in order to recognize the problems that will occur in the world and to accept responsibility for the part which Australia can play. Australia is limited in its capacity to be a significant manufacturing nation. Its greatest natural asset is its potential—much of it as yet unused—for primary production. The difficulty is to obtain the food from the producer at a price at which he can afford to produce it, and pass it on to the people who need it the most at a price which they can afford to pay.

How long can this situation continue in the world? In the end we will be forced to take action to overcome the problem. Unless a certain degree of unity can be attained amongst the nations of the world, it could lead to the setting up of a world organization —for which the basis already exists with the food and agricultural organization—which could attempt as a united body to buy produce from other countries, particularly in times of high production and times of glut such as occurred in the wheat industry a few years ago, process the food or store it and sell it to the subsidized nations at a reduced rate which they can afford to pay.

Australia and the other nations which participate in such a scheme would be making a contribution to the people of the world and to foreign aid, but in return Australia and the other countries which have the production capacity would be able to increase production, work opportunities and the number of people who could be employed on the farms. Although that system may seem idealistic, it could work, and in the end the hunger needs of the world's population will force it to work.

Therefore, I am strongly critical of the attitude of the Federal Government in withdrawing the superphosphate bounty of $12 a ton as from the end of December. I hope the Government will review this policy. Thankfully, New Zealand has taken some action — the Government over there must be more enlightened —in guaranteeing to farmers that the price of superphosphate would not rise above $26 a ton in many cases. However, by the end of this year, Australian farmers will be paying $45 and $50 a ton for superphosphate. This represents approximately a 300 per cent increase in the cost of superphosphate in the past year.

Figures for 1971-72 released by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that superphosphate was the third most important cash cost of a typical Wimmera wheat farm. Overall, farm costs had increased by about 40 per cent but the price of superphosphate had increased by 300 per cent. If farmers are to increase production, as they must, they need encouragement to use superphosphate. It is an investment by the Government, not a gift, to maintain

food production in this country by maintaining a sound primary industry.

The use of fertilizers and soil additives is widespread. Indeed, this measure deals with all types of fertilizers and additives which are used not only by farming industries but also by people such as home gardeners. It is only fair and reasonable that the quality and standards of these products should be maintained at a high level, particularly to protect the public interest.

Under this Bill the Department of Agriculture will carry out analyses and registration will be on a three-year cycle system. The department is responsible for carrying out most of the provisions of this legislation. I have a great deal of confidence in the Department of Agriculture but I am critical of the fact that the Government does not recognize the need for expanding the department. It, too, is severely limited with an expenditure provision of $20 million out of a total State Budget of about $1,500 million. Obviously, it will be necessary to expand the department if it is to carry out the important activities and responsibilities envisaged in this and other measures.

Basically the Country Party supports the Bill and what it provides. However, clause 28 prescribes fees payable for anything done under this measure. Parliament should set the upper limit to which fees can be increased, so that it will have some control over them. I am concerned about the number of responsibilities that are being transferred from the control of Parliament to the Governor in Council, which will have power to set fees of all types without bringing them to Parliament for perusal and discussion.

As Mr. Bradbury says, Mr. Nicol has been consistent in his opposition to this principle and the Bill certainly provides another illustration of the responsibility of Parliament being taken away and handed to the Governor in Council. It will be possible for fees to be set at any level without enabling legislation being referred to the Parliament for consideration. I hope the Minister for Social Welfare is wise enough to adjust this and set an upper limit so that Parliament will have some control over the legislation.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: I hope Mr. Dunn will support the amendment which I will seek to move later.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I will be interested to see what it is. The Bill, which is technical in nature, deals with a widespread and important principle of responsibility. I hope it is realized by the people of Australia, and particularly by the Commonwealth Labor Government, that it is important for a determined effort to be made not to depress primary industries into the situation where those engaged in them are just a poor group of country peasants providing cheap food for the nation.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province): I suppose our sincere young friend, Mr. Dunn, is following his party line and I respect him for it. As Mr. Bradbury interjects, there have been plenty of times when I have bucked my party line when I have felt it was necessary. You will recall, Mr. President, that on one occasion it nearly led to my suspension from this Chamber for a period.

I wish that my good friends—and they are my good friends—in the corner, would stop sheeting home every ill that besets them to the Australian Government. They may have a bit of a beef concerning the superphosphate bounty, and I would be a hypocrite if I said otherwise. As I reminded Mr. Dunn, a compromise similar to that advanced by the New Zealand Government whereby it created a subsidy payable on quantities up to 35 tons, and beyond that no subsidy applied, might have been better. That principle has met with wide approval in New Zealand and support for the rural policies of that Government has increased, as has its popularity. Sometimes I suppose we are inclined

to forget that if we do too much too soon people get confused to the point that they do not know what we are trying to do.

This measure repeals the Agricultural Lime Act 1958 and the Fertilizers Act 1958 and consolidates both into the Fertilizers Act 1974. It prescribes standards, constituents, quantities of preparations, chemical or physical conditions, labels, physical methods of analyses, and compliance with specifications as published by the Standards Association of Australia. In other words, the Bill will maximize the protection of the consumer who in turn is seeking ways and means to maximize his primary production, whether it be wheat to which Mr. Dunn referred, or cattle, which Mr. Swinburne and Mr. McDonald are trying to sell.

I acknowledge the ready acceptance of the Government in another place, by a series of amendments, which rightly sought to maximize—if I might use the word again—rather than minimize penalties for offences under the Act. The Labor Party appreciates the ready acceptance by the Government in another place to amend the Bill. I suggest that it is the role of Parliament to direct the attention of courts not to minimum penalties but rather to maximum penalties.

Clause 14, which should be welcomed by the community, requires that advertisements should not contain false information. Extravagant claims for many agricultural products have been made during the years. The farmer is entitled, without any doubt, to rely on the principle that any product which he buys to increase production of his primary products, whatever they may be, is safe; he should not have to check or double check the bona fides of the products which he purchases.

It is also gratifying to know that regularly inspectors will be ascertaining whether the provisions enacted under this measure are being complied with. I hope there is honest activity in that direction because it will keep all concerned on their toes, and once again the producer and the consumer will benefit.

Clause 24 (5) (c) has something of a Gallic touch in that it will enable the prosecuted person to be assumed to be guilty until proven innocent. If the Government sees fit to persevere with this requirement, it must have in mind the difficulty of proof on the inspector's part, particularly if it is stated that the fertilizer in question is not for sale.

If this be so, and it obviously is the reason, why be hypocritical? Dozens of successful defences under the Health Act have been brought about by the simple statement of the accused that he took reasonable care in producing the product for sale to the consumer. Good meat for one may be poison to another.

In Committee I will propose an amendment to clause 28. It is a small but important amendment, which does not justify opposition to the second reading of the Bill. In view of the wide-ranging comments made by Mr. Dunn on the agricultural viewpoint in Australia, I feel I am entitled, on behalf of the Labor Party, to make a few comments. At the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization in New York—its knowledge of lime and superphosphate and its uses throughout the world is extensive—honorable members will see a map of the world on which is shown the productivity of every region in the world. Allied to this is the life expectancy of the average person in the various regions.

In the world today we find from an analyses of the productivity and life expectancy, that more than one-third of the population of the world never eat enough from the time they are born until they die. They are in a starvation zone from birth to death. Malnutrition is rife in more than one-third of the world's population and one can punch holes in the other so-called affluent one-third. There are many pockets of poor

where there is not sufficient food or good nutrition even in our own country.

The ideals of Mr. Dunn are admirable and any person who does not share his ideals would be found wanting. The practicality and reality of implementing his ideals is another question. I should like to hear Mr. Swinburne's comments in that direction because he and I have had many a yarn and I know that his truthful thoughts would be more pragmatic than those of his younger colleague. However, that does not mean that Mr. Dunn does not deserve praise for his philosophy.

I cannot see how we can sit in a Chamber like this in a so-called affluent part of the world and watch this tragedy enact itself before us. There is now talk about letting Bangladesh go, to let the people die in millions because it is impractical to get the food to them because it is too late. The same applies to India and Africa.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): I trust this has something to do with the use of superphosphate fertilizer in this country.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: You are helping me, Mr. Deputy President, because it is the developers of deposits in this country from which fertilizer is made that I hope will help to provide more food, which can then be supplied to the countries I have mentioned. I thank you, Mr. Deputy President, for mentioning superphosphate as a means of continuing my dissertation but I have not much more to say on this because I know it does not apply to the Bill. However, Mr. Dunn is quite right when he says that unless we find the answer to this problem we will be found wanting as a civilization.

It is an indictment against us all. During my visit to Malawi when I had the honour to attend the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference there, it was pointed out that one in five persons died before the age of five years. That situation exists throughout black Africa. The average life expectancy in Peru, Chile and Northern Brazil is only 29 years. Unless that problem is solved that state of affairs will continue. Superphosphate could be a means for increasing production to aid these countries.

We must examine ourselves as a civilization. On the importance of the superphosphate bounty, in many cases I believe there should be an urgent application made to the Industries Assistance Commission as soon as possible because there are certain types of country in Victoria, particularly the granite type country, where unless regular applications of superphosphate are made one might as well not be there because the production falls to nothing. The farmers are faced with cash problems and inflation and at the same time low prices, particularly for beef, and if assistance is not provided they will find it impossible to carry on.

I did a little tour last week and spoke to many stock and station agents, who informed me that in country areas it is quite clear that, because of the present situation, scores of farmers will have to get out of farming within the next six to eight months. As to sheeting the responsibility home to the Australian Government——

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Order! It is not usual to refer to non-existent bodies in this place.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: To which non-available theoretical organization was I referring, Mr. Deputy President?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We have a Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Well, are you and I, Mr. Deputy President, going to have a discussion on that?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We are certainly not. I refer to the Australian Constitution.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: I realize that you refer to it frequently and wave the flag a bit but nevertheless I proudly call it the Australian Government.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think that term would not be recognized in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Obviously, without acrimony, it would not be recognized by you, Mr. Deputy President, but quite a few members of this Chamber would recognize it. However, I bow to your ruling and take note of it.

The Australian national Government is doing its best for the primary producer. It has provided many millions of dollars more than were provided last year and the year before. When he can obtain high prices for his produce, beef, grain, dairy products or whatever else he produces, the man on the land tells the Government to keep away from his door; but as soon as things become tough he squeals like a stuck pig for all the help he can get. You are a pack of blackmailers; why don't you admit it?

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province): Having had a much longer association with the practical aspects of wheat, wool and other types of farming than has Mr. Dunn, and having a keen memory, I feel I have some qualifications to speak on this Bill which I believe is a good one.

I have been a recipient of fertilizer distributed quite indiscriminately by friends and supporters of members of the Country Party. It is important that fertilizers should be properly labelled so that people purchasing or obtaining them by other means are aware of the constituents and value. The Bill provides for that labelling.

Both Mr. Dunn and Mr. Elliot have stated that fertilizers have played an important part in the development of productivity in farming areas of Australia. Everyone knows that they have enabled the development of high yielding wheat crops. In the early days in the Wimmera before Mr. Dunn was born—and probably he has not studied his history—wheat crops were light-yielding because of various difficulties and a lack of knowledge, which apparently some people have not yet rectified. The introduction of superphosphate tended to increase yields which have subsequently been increased to much greater degrees by the development of different types of wheat and the introduction of mechanized methods of farming. The land can now be cultivated at the correct time.

In the pastoral industry—which includes the cultivation of grass—superphosphate, lime and other fertilizers have played a tremendous part, in some cases producing heavy-carrying ground from land which previously had no stock-carrying capacity.

Reference has been made to gypsum which, I am sure Mr. Dunn is aware, has been distributed fairly heavily in recent years on the red clay soils of the Wimmera and has made them much more friable. Land which some years ago was inferior as wheat-producing country has yielded remarkable quantities of wheat as a result of the application of gypsum.

Phosphate which forms the basis of most fertilizers has been obtained in the past relatively cheaply and from a cheap labour source. The cost of phosphate has risen. It provided substantial profits for certain companies in Australia and it provided substantial directors' fees to people who were fortunate enough to be re-elected to the board last week. There are valuable deposits in Australia. They may be extensive but like other resources they should not be wastefully and extravagantly used; they should not be used indiscriminately. One should use products which are in surplus at present and would alleviate the acute food shortage in the world. We have a surplus of beef which cannot be marketed because of prices. It would not be sound policy to encourage by lavish subsidy over-excess production when

attention could be directed to the production of other protein foods which would help alleviate the acute starvation in other areas of the world.

In relation to the problem of starvation in other countries the real problem has not been lack of capacity to produce food; it has been the lack of willingness to evolve a system of distribution. Wheat growers, the core of Mr. Dunn's constituents—if not for them he would have great trouble in maintaining a majority—have never shown any real desire to make personal sacrifice to contribute to this cause.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: What about the Australian taxpayer?

The Hon. D. E. KENT: I am familiar enough with his situation to know something of his financial position over a few years. I know Mr. Dunn is waiting with bated breath for me to commit myself in my reaction to the withdrawal of the superphosphate subsidy. I am surprised that Mr. Dunn, who claims to speak for the Country Party, should advocate the reintroduction of a Socialist subsidy because the platform of the Country Party is free enterprise and open competition. Mr. Dunn is now asking for a subsidy to be given indiscriminately for the production of any sort of primary product, irrespective of whether it is necessary and whether it would create a surplus.

Let us look at the realities of wheat growing. Mr. Dunn knows the quantity of fertilizer which is applied to an acre of ground sown with wheat and he knows the average yield. The amount of fertilizer which is applied to an acre of wheat for the average yield costs about 1 cent per bushel of wheat. Mr. Dunn is making a big issue about 1 cent when he claims to be representing an industry which has an effective marketing system, the best protected one, and a home market price. He is making an issue out of 1 cent a bushel. No purpose is served in subsidizing indiscriminately the use of any product. There must be a definite purpose for doing so. There could be instances where it would be to the advantage of the producers of a product or to an individual to subsidize the whole of primary industry and encourage people to clear land which should not be cleared in order to produce an unsaleable product. That would not only aggravate the depletion of a resource which is so valuable that this Government in its wisdom has decided it should be properly labelled in order to prevent misrepresentation to the consumers. The action of the Australian Government in deciding to eliminate——

The Hon. G. J. NICOL (Monash Province): I raise a point of order. This Bill seems to me to deal with the accuracy of labelling. Would it not be in keeping if various Governments were also labelled correctly by the honorable member?

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province): The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia made a decision to abolish the fertilizer subsidy and this has caused great concern. I have made it perfectly clear that there should not be an indiscriminate subsidy for the production of goods and products.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Mr. Kent is supporting his Federal Government action on the subject?

The Hon. D. E. KENT: Naturally. If any section of the industry is able to produce a reasonable case on the basis of individual need, it will receive the same consideration that has been given to other sections. However, if its concern is just selfish greed, I hope it will get what it deserves. However, I am afraid it will be treated more generously.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: You have deserted your constituents on the superphosphate bounty.

The Hon. D. E. KENT: This Bill has concerned the State Government of Victoria which has seen fit to ensure that all fertilizers are properly labelled and show a proper analysis

so the user will know that he is using the product which will serve the purpose which he intends. I join with my colleague Mr. Elliot in supporting this Bill and in supporting every action which has been taken to conserve and ensure a wise use of fertilizers.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): I must comment on the last two speeches made by members of the Opposition and their views of my party and those people who are trying to produce food for this nation and for people in countries which are in dire straits. I take a dim view of any honorable member saying, as Mr. Elliot did, that we who seek the continuation of a subsidy on fertilizer which has been in existence for years are blackmailers. I did not notice that Mr. Elliot returned the bounty he received from the Federal Government in the past.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: How do you know whether I did or not?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I will accept it from Mr. Elliot that we are blackmailers and that he is not when he gives proof that he returned the bounty.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! This Bill deals with fertilizers on sale in Victoria. I have allowed rather more than the usual latitude in relation to comments on the Commonwealth Government. That is reasonable because the comments all relate to fertilizers, but the debate should not be too wide and I ask Mr. Swinburne not to become too personal.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I am taking part in the debate only to refute the accusation made by the honorable member that we are blackmailers. If we are blackmailers, so is he, because he accepted the bounty as we did. It will be difficult to bring about the continuation of the subsidy on superphosphate when honorable members such as Mr. Kent say that it should not be handed out indiscriminately. It should not be suggested that farming methods in certain parts of the State must be changed because those areas are over producing a particular commodity at a particular time. It is of no use suggesting that, instead of growing meat, people in those areas should produce something with an over-all higher protein content, such as wheat. I should like to see Mr. Kent try to produce wheat in north-eastern Victoria where cattle are grazed. I have used superphosphate on land since 1920 and I have never known people to produce anything worth while without using it.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Superphosphate is not being banned. You can buy it if you want it. It would cost you about $20 a year more, and you are squealing about it.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I listened to Mr. Elliot but he is now trying to prevent me from giving my opinion. This Bill, which deals with the correct labelling of fertilizers, shows the importance which the Government and members of the Country Party attach to that. Apparently the Opposition does not care whether the fertilizer is properly labelled or not. A proper application should be made of the various types of fertilizers. Whether fertilizer is superphosphate, ammonia, or lime-super, surely it is important that if it is needed in agriculture it should be correctly labelled, delivered and applied.

In my opinion, what happened in the Federal sphere was an endeavour by the then Government to boost production. I will not enter into a debate on what has happened to production now. Honorable members hold differing opinions on what caused the present situation and so do people outside the House. But it should be understood that the farmer and the grazier are not subsidized to any greater extent than the rest of the community. Mr. Elliot and Mr. Kent call us blackmailers because we receive a few dollars for the cost of superphosphate. But nobody has said anything

about the fact that tariffs are imposed to protect workers. The result of reducing tariffs by 25 per cent is the worst unemployment for years.

If one section of the community can be subsidized or assisted, surely the rest of the community can be similarly helped. Every honorable member of this House is subsidized in some way, at some time, whatever he does within the community. With the aid of superphosphate and other fertilizers, agriculture in this great country produces 60 per cent of the value of the goods which are exported. This represents the real trading wealth of the country. Surely, if any little assistance can be given by either the Federal or State Government it should be provided to ensure that this great wealth continues to be produced. I assure Mr. Elliot and Mr. Kent that the members of the Country Party will continue to press for this to be brought about. If we do not do this, we shall not only let Australia down, we shall let down the world.

A few moments ago Mr. Elliot said that it had been suggested that Bangladesh and other countries which had reached the stage at which some people thought assistance could only be provided too late to help them should be left to their own devices. I believe that we should try to feed the world's people. Australia is one of the great granaries of the world and anything which the Government, whatever colour it may be, can do to assist primary production should be done.

But I will not take the rubbish put forward by members of the Labor Party that we of the Country Party are blackmailers in attempting to obtain assistance to produce the wealth of this country and the food that the world needs.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): I must admit that I do not know a great deal about fertilizers but one classification could be the by-product of some speeches made in this Chamber. It could be said in defence of my colleagues who referred to honorable members from rural areas seeking too much in subsidies from the Australian Government that this was a wrong attitude and was inhibiting the potential for all types of production in Australia. I would be grateful if the documents could be made available to me but I have not yet seen proof of the chaos that the proposed Australian Government action would have on the production capabilities of rural industry.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: It will take a couple of years to show up.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Swinburne spoke about tariffs. Their reduction by the Australian Government was consistent with its proposed action on rural subsidy. At the time, every economist of any reputation applauded the decision.

When we speak about helping overseas countries, we should remember that Australians are selfish people—Australians living in the country no less than Australians living in the cities. We are selfish as people and as represented by our Governments. However, the record of assistance to overseas countries of the present Australian Government far outshines the miserable record of the previous coalition Government.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): I have allowed quite some latitude on the subject of fertilizers, but the debate should not range too far on the views and actions of the Federal Government.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: I share the noble sentiments expressed by Mr. Dunn who spoke about the effect of fertilizers on production in relation to Australia's potential capability of assisting overseas countries. When I see those noble sentiments expressed as a willingness to make some sort of sacrifice, along with the rest of it, in an honest and sincere endeavour to assist those countries which need assistance, I will believe that they were properly thought out.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: What do you suggest?

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: I suggest that the agricultural industry should produce some proper costing on how the reduction in subsidy affects the use of fertilizers which are needed to increase production. There has been no suggestion at all that the farmer cannot use as much fertilizer as he wants to.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Production could drop by 50 per cent in some industries.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Production will drop if fertilizer is not used but there has been no suggestion that there should be a decrease in its use. In fact, an increase in the use of fertilizer will be a healthy indicator for the economy. That would achieve the sort of thing which Mr. Dunn wants to bring about in order to help other countries.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province): What I have heard in the debate leaves me astounded at the lack of knowledge shown by members of the Labor Party. Most Australian land is naturally infertile and will not produce much food without fertilizer. It particularly needs phosphatic fertilizers for any worth-while production at all. To query, as Mr. Trayling did by saying that he had not seen any figures, the fall in production if fertilizers are not used is quite ridiculous.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: That is not what I said.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE: It has been thoroughly documented over many years by the Department of Agriculture that fertilizer is necessary. I was staggered when Mr. Kent asked why the Commonwealth Government—he used the term "Australian Government"—should subsidize the cost of fertilizer to produce food that nobody seems to want. I remind him that fertilizer is used mainly to produce crops, particularly wheat, on which quotas have been lifted because Australia cannot produce the quantity that can be sold on export markets. There have been so many hoary arguments from the other side of the House that the debate has completely got away from the Bill which provides that fertilizers should be labelled correctly so that the farmer knows exactly what he is buying. The Bill is important but it is extraordinary how the debate has demonstrated that members opposite do not understand. It is consistent with Governments of the same political colour in Australia.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Saving).

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): It never fails to fascinate members how a comparatively harmless and widely-accepted Bill can provoke such exacerbated argument. Nevertheless, while the debate has been extremely wide-ranging—and that would be the understatement of the year—it has generally been interesting and productive. There may have been a few exceptions, and perhaps I could be permitted to mention one, namely, that of the honorable member who started his speech by saying that he did not know anything about fertilizers and spent the rest of his speech confirming that view.

Several proposed amendments have been circulated and I will deal with them when the appropriate clauses are under consideration.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 3 and 4.

Clause 5 (Exemptions).

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I move—

Clause 5, line 31, omit "(5)" and insert "(6)".

This amendment is necessary because of an amendment that I will propose to clause 12.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): At this stage, before I put the question, it might be as well if the Minister will explain the need for this consequential amendment.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: That will necessitate going to clause 12. If that is your desire, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: As I see it at the moment, if this amendment is accepted and the principal amendment is not accepted, we might find ourselves in a little difficulty with the Bill. If the Minister were to deal with the principal amendment at this stage, after the acceptance or rejection of the principal amendment the House would be in a position to deal with the first amendment.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: The principal amendment is in clause 12, with which I shall deal later. By way of explanation of that amendment I indicate that there is no provision in the Bill covering the point—in fact there is a prohibition upon a farmer who receives fertilizer upon an order but who subsequently, by reason of seasonal conditions or some other conditions, may wish to dispose of the fertilizer.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Or sells his property.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: If the farmer is unable to sell the crop or does not harvest it, there ought to be some provision whereby he can sell the fertilizer, but only to another farmer. That is the object of the principal amendment.

I am in your hands, Mr. Chairman. Would you like me to move the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Perhaps the feeling of the Committee could be tested on the proposed amendment to clause 5, and, if the House accepts the consequential amendment, it will indicate acceptance of the principal amendment.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province): I have conferred with my esteemed colleague, Mr. Kent, who is very knowledgeable in these matters and the Opposition has no objection whatsoever. Quite frankly this goes on irrespective of the Bill. Only recently 30 tons of fertilizers were purchased from a person who could not use the fertilizer he had. I would be hypocritical if I did not agree with the amendment, and my party supports it.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): The Country Party supports the principle of the amendment which will, in effect, allow the sale of excess superphosphate from one farmer to another. It is a necessary provision in the Bill and, therefore, has our support.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): I trust that the Committee is quite clear that in voting for the proposed amendment to clause 5 it is in effect giving its approval to the proposed amendment to clause 12.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 6 to 11.

Clause 12 (Special prescriptions and special imports).

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I move—

Clause 12, page 11, line 1, after "(c)" insert "subject to sub-section (5)".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): In clause 12, page 11, line 12, the figure "40" days is used in reference to the manufacturer delivering to the director within 40 days after the date of delivery of the product to the purchaser a copy of the special prescription, together with the prescribed fee. On further reflection the Government considers that 40 days is too short a period in which to impose this requirement because it would involve interruption to production, and so on, and increased costs, so it is proposed to amend that figure to 90 so that a quarterly return will be required from the manufacturers. I therefore move—

Clause 12, page 11, line 12, omit "40" and insert "90".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I now come to the principal amendment which I have already explained. I move—

Clause 12, page 11, sub-clause (4), after this sub-clause insert the following sub-clause—

"( ) Where the person supplying the order in writing and the special prescription is a primary producer it shall not be an offence for him to sell the product if—

(*a*) the purchaser is also a primary producer;

(*b*) the product sold is one which does not contain any pesticide;

(*c*) he supplies the relevant approved label or delivery document to the purchaser with the product;

(*d*) he notifies the Director in writing within ten days of the sale, giving the prescribed details relating to the sale; and

(*e*) he complies with any other conditions that are prescribed."

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province): Something has occurred to me here. I know I am crossing t's and dotting i's but the former Minister of Agriculture was very adept at that quite a few years ago. The proposed new sub-clause states, *inter alia*—

Where the person supplying the order in writing and the special prescription is a primary producer it shall not be an offence for him to sell the product.

This is rightly so. I think it was Mr. Swinburne who mentioned that a person could have sold his property, but by the time he disposed of his property he would no longer be a primary producer. This could happen and will happen. I am being technical, but a legal difficulty could arise, particularly if he has gone out of the business, put his property up for sale, and when it has been sold, a clearance made or the property is sold to a primary producer. At this stage, he is no longer a primary producer; he might be working in another trade or profession.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: He has not normally sold his property until he has given delivery of it.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: It does not always apply. Frequently properties are sold, and when they are sold the person is no longer a primary producer.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): Mr. Elliot has raised a relevant point, but the seller is constrained by the provisions of the Act to sell the fertilizer to a primary producer, and at a time when he is a primary producer. Admittedly, he would be in trouble if he sold the fertilizer after ceasing to be a primary producer, but not if he sells it at the time of the sale of the property.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: What if he cannot sell it?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: He would be in no worse position then. However, he can sell the fertilizer when he sells the property. Although I acknowledge the limitations of the provisions, I think they are reasonable.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): I raise a minor point. The primary producer is required to notify the Director of Agriculture in writing within ten days of the sale of the property, and to provide him with the prescribed details. Is there any reason for limiting the period to ten days? Because of the way the mail services operate, a person may be in difficulty in sending a letter to Melbourne in that time. A moment ago the period for delivery of the product to the purchaser was extended from 40 days to 90 days, so perhaps the time for notification could be extended to a month, because that would be more reasonable.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I do not wish to provoke another Federal-State argument about mail services. Mr. Dunn has raised a valid point, but I do not think it is imposing too much on the seller to require him to notify the department within ten days after the sale of a fertilizer of this nature.

In fact, he is more likely to do it then than 90 days later, because he may have forgotten about it by that time. The restraint is reasonable.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 13 to 27.

Clause 28 (Regulations).

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province). I move—

Clause 28, line 39, after "fees" insert "not exceeding $50.".

I ask the Committee whether it is just to prescribe fees without a ceiling. If Mr. Nicol were present, I am sure he would be sympathetic to the proposition which I shall put to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): I feel quite sure he would be sympathetic.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: I understand that the Subordinate Legislation Committee has experienced some of the difficulties that can arise with this type of legisation. Clause 28 provides—

The Governor in Council may make regulations for or with respect to—

(*a*) prescribing forms and certificates to be used under this Act;

(*b*) prescribing fees payable for anything done under this Act;

In other words, the sky is the limit. After consultation not only with other members of this Chamber but also with people engaged in the industry, it was decided that $50 would more than cover this as a compromise amount on a maximum basis to allow for every contingency.

It is dangerous to set a precedent of leaving to be set by regulation any sum which is determined by the Governor in Council. I do not know why a maximum amount of $50 could not be set. I understand that in another place this proposal received the support of our friends in the corner. I should like to hear some comment from them.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): With some reluctance I find myself in agreement with Mr. Elliot. The clause as it now stands is wrong in principle. Parliament is down-grading itself by various steps it is taking and provisions which it has written into the measure. We talk about the responsibilities of Government and the fact that the States are being down-graded from other sources, but perhaps we are down-grading ourselves by handing over many of the responsibilities that were and should remain those of the Victorian Parliament to the Governor in Council and to persons who can act outside Parliament without legislation or anything dealing with it coming before the House.

Over a period of time the Country Party has maintained that if the fees cannot be set by legislation in Parliament, at least an upper limit should be imposed on them. The clause providing fees payable under this Act is wide open; the expression "fees payable" is used in many clauses of the Bill. There is no indication of what fees are referred to. Even in the Minister's second-reading speech, the actual fees which are envisaged were not mentioned.

We are not happy to hand over to the Governor in Council or anyone else the ability to set a fee, regardless of what level is required. I believe $50 is a reasonable maximum and should allow enough scope to set the fees at a suitable level for the actual functions, such as analysis, for which they are paid.

Therefore, with reluctance the Country Party supports the upper limit of $50.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The object of the clause is to compensate for expenses actually incurred. It is not a revenue-raising proposal. However, the arguments of both honorable members who have spoken are persuasive, and to enable the matters in question to be examined in more detail, I propose that progress be reported.

Progress was reported.

PAY-ROLL TAX BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, which was foreshadowed when the Pay-roll Tax (Rate) Bill 1974 was introduced, is designed to close a loophole in the Pay-roll Tax Act, the use of which is becoming increasingly widespread and is causing a significant loss of revenue.

The Pay-roll Tax Act has always recognized individuals, separate companies and separate partnerships as separate employers for the purposes of pay-roll tax. This situation existed when pay-roll tax was a Commonwealth tax and did not alter when it became a State tax.

The Act contains a general exemption from tax for the first $20,800 of wages paid by an employer in a year. At a rate of 5 per cent, this represents an annual pay-roll tax benefit of $1,040. The exemption was designed for the benefit of the small businessman, but it is being exploited by larger organizations to reduce their pay-roll tax liability and, in some cases, to avoid the tax altogether.

Because every employer is entitled to claim the general exemption, an organization which chooses to operate, for example, through two subsidiary companies can obtain twice the pay-roll tax exemption that can be obtained by an organization operating through one company with two branch offices. Again, a partnership of three individuals which organizes its operations so that the staff are employed by each partner and additional partnerships of two persons can obtain seven times the exemption of $20,800 under the Act, namely, an effective exemption of $145,600 representing a tax saving in one year of $7,280.

As the rate of pay-roll tax has risen, some organizations have taken advantage of this aspect of the legislation to create additional employers, in the form of either additional companies or partnerships between individuals or between companies, to avoid pay-roll tax.

While there are obviously new companies formed on a bona fide basis as part of the normal development of an organization, the Government has become aware of specific cases of action taken to avoid pay-roll tax by the splitting of one organization into a number of parts, each claiming a general exemption. In one instance an organization threatened with proceedings for the recovery of unpaid tax paid the outstanding tax and notified the commissioner it had restructured and registered 100 new companies, none of which would pay wages in excess of $20,800 a year. At current tax rates this action involves a loss of revenue to the State of $104,000 a year. Again, other instances of organizations creating large numbers of employers within the organization have come to the Government's notice. Perhaps the most outstanding case is one organization which would appear to have in excess of 1,000 "employers", and perhaps as many as 1,700. In this case the loss of revenue to the State is between $1 million and $1·7 million a year.

In many cases, "employers" are indeed only nominal employers inserted into the structure of the organization for the purpose of avoiding pay-roll tax. The situation is one where the whole objective of the general exemption in the Act is being subverted. It was designed to help the small businessman; it is being used by large organizations to reduce their pay-roll tax liability. This is a situation which the Government cannot allow to continue both because of the implications it has for the State's revenue, and on the ground of equity.

The methods which have been used to create nominal "employers" both through the creation of companies and through partnership operations, are extremely complex and varied. As a consequence, the Bill now before the House is of necessity of a technical nature. The problem is not confined to Victoria, and this measure has been prepared after consultation with other State taxing

authorities, especially in New South Wales. The New South Wales Government has foreshadowed appropriate legislation to cover the situation at an early date.

The underlying principle of the Bill is that related and associated employers will be grouped together for the purposes of pay-roll tax, and will be allowed only the one $20,800 exemption to which they would be entitled as one employer.

In the case of companies, those that are related companies for the purposes of the Companies Act—that is, in a holding company-subsidiary company relationship—are to be treated as a group for the purposes of pay-roll tax. In addition, a further set of six tests is included in the legislation to determine whether other companies are related for the purposes of the Pay-roll Tax Act and therefore grouped together. These tests cover the situation, for example, where two companies that are not subsidiaries of another company, or are not related in a subsidiary-holding company relationship, are nevertheless both under the same control or direction. The tests in the Bill for this purpose are based on those sections of the Companies Act which determine for the purposes of that Act whether or not companies are to be regarded as associated companies.

The Bill provides an exception for companies which though under the same control or direction are not related companies in terms of the Companies Act, and where the commissioner is satisfied that they are not carrying on business with an intention either directly or indirectly of avoiding pay-roll tax.

For employers other than companies, three tests are contained in the Bill which are directed towards the activities of the employees. In broad terms the tests cover situations where the employees of an employer are performing duties for a business carried on by the employer and another person, or for a business carried on by another person, or where in respect of the employment or the performance of duties by one or more of his employees an employer has an agreement or arrangement with an associate relating to his trade, business or profession. In these cases, the employer and the other person will form a group for the purposes of pay-roll tax and be entitled to only one general exemption.

Again, in these cases, exceptions are provided where the commissioner is satisfied that the trade, business or profession of the employer and of the other person are carried on independently and not with an intention of avoiding pay-roll tax. Once a group has been established for the purpose of pay-roll tax, the members of the group will be free to nominate one member of the group to receive the general exemption on behalf of the group. The group will have the choice of continuing its present administrative arrangements whereby individual members of the group submit separate pay-roll tax returns to the commissioner, or of submitting one consolidated return on behalf of all the members of the group.

As I have explained, this Bill is, of necessity, complex, and an explanatory memorandum has been circulated for the information of honorable members.

There are two other matters I should refer to. Firstly, the circumstances which have resulted in this Bill have been under consideration for some time and there have been interstate discussions at officer level because of the common problems involved. The Government believes that the measure now before the House represents the most effective and equitable solution to the problem.

Secondly, in a number of places throughout the legislation a discretion is given to the Commissioner of Pay-roll Tax. The Government has chosen this course after very careful consideration of the alternatives available. The Government concluded that because of the nature of the

legislation a commissioner's discretion is warranted in order to ensure effective and equitable operation of the legislation.

I suppose this would be comparable to the discretionary powers that the commissioner has in probate matters in relation to proprietary companies in the argument whether a deceased person had a controlling interest in the company.

When this legislation was foreshadowed it was announced that the new provisions would operate as from 1st October. At that stage it was envisaged that the legislation would be introduced before that date. However, the finalizing of the legislation to ensure its operation on an equitable basis has taken a little longer than was expected. In view of this the new provisions are now designed to operate in respect of wages paid or payable on or after 1st November, 1974.

The amount of additional revenue which this Bill is expected to provide could be significant, but until the details of cases have been analysed by the commissioner no precise estimate can be made. For budgetary purposes an amount of $2 million was included in the estimates for 1974-75.

A number of other minor matters are fully explained in the memorandum attached to the Bill. The Government is conscious that with the present exemption level many businesses previously exempt are being brought into the pay-roll tax field. My colleagues and I are looking into this matter with a view to affording some relief, and, as I have already indicated to the House, we will be seeking consultation with the other States in view of the necessity for uniformity. One of the conditions which would make it possible to review the exemption level is to ensure that the larger taxpayers pay their fair share of tax. That is the purpose of this Bill. I commend it to the House.

The Hon. Murray Byrne.

On the motion of the Hon. A. W. Knight, for the Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT (CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. A. J. Hunt (Minister for Local Government), for the Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare), was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF — BRENDAN EDWARDS SPORTS CENTRE.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS (South-Western Province): I wish briefly to direct a matter to the attention of the Minister for Local Government. It concerns the administration of the regional employment development scheme, which is now popularly, or unpopularly, known as the RED scheme. Although this scheme was announced approximately six weeks ago and although it was stated that municipal councils and certain officers of the State Government would be involved, there has been little response from the unemployed in meeting job opportunities which might be made available. I am particularly concerned about the Geelong area. Although specific figures on the Geelong employment district have not yet been made available for the end of October, it is understood that the number of unemployed there is well in excess of 4,000 persons. This number is increasing daily and last week another 70 people were put off work, or will be put off, from an industry associated with the motor car industry in Geelong. A few days ago it was announced that

although the scheme had been in operation throughout Australia for about six weeks only about 450 people throughout the country out of the tens of thousands that were currently unemployed had been placed under this RED scheme.

A peculiar problem has arisen in that, although the Commonwealth Government announced that substantial grants might be made available to some municipalities, it has not yet made any moneys available. Strangely enough, although several newspaper announcements have been made, no specific commitment has yet been given in writing to the municipalities in the area that I represent.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Does this concern State Government administration?

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: I think I can successfully associate this with the State. It concerns State administration because municipalities for which this Government is responsible are being asked by the Commonwealth Government to fund this scheme in the early stages. At present many municipalities are at the limit of their overdraft facilities; they cannot afford to spend 1 cent in anticipation of receiving in the distant future a letter to the effect that they might get some money at an even more distant date. Unfortunately, these shires and cities are not in a position at present to spend one red cent on the RED scheme.

As I indicated previously, a number of large projects have been mooted. It has been asked that these projects should have a large labour content so that they can soak up some of the unemployment. I ask the Minister for Local Government: What is the present position in Victoria; have there been any consultations in recent weeks, particularly in recent days, with the relevant Commonwealth Ministers; and how does the administration of the scheme compare with the experience in previous years?

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): The question I raise is not a Dorothy Dixer. This is an urgent matter directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and perhaps also to the Attorney-General. It concerns the treatment of one of the customers of the Brendan Edwards sports centre. The public should be alerted to what can happen.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Have you got both sides of the story?

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Yes, I have.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Obviously, you are privileged in what you say here.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: I understand this. I would not abuse the privilege which a member of this House has when he talks about a business. What happened was that a Mrs. C. Gregson, of Aspendale, joined the Brendan Edwards sports centre to undergo an " exercise and get fit, take weight off ", course. She signed a contract which is undated. This magnificent document refers to a deposit of $28 and ten remaining consecutive monthly payments, amounting to a total of $208. Towards the end of August, during Mrs. Gregson's third visit, she was injured at the sports centre. The injury was sufficiently serious for the centre to call a doctor.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Would this be a matter for a claim by her?

Honorable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! There are too many interjections. There should be no interjections on matters brought up on the adjournment. I hope the honorable member can tie this matter to Government administration. That is the point.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Certainly, Sir. The woman was subsequently taken from the sports centre by ambulance to the Alfred Hospital. Approximately one month later, towards the end of September, she returned to the sports centre with the intention of resuming the exercise. She discovered that as a result of the injury she had sustained she was unable to do so. She

handed in her ticket and told the girl who was on duty at the time why she could not continue the exercise.

Subsequently, Mrs. Gregson received a letter dated 29th October from a solicitor acting on behalf of Brendan Edwards demanding $180 in full payment, plus costs. I rang the manager of the centre and we had a long discussion. He said that it was not impossible to get out of these contracts. I told him that Mrs. Gregson was now emotionally disturbed about returning to the centre. She had given it another try and was unable to continue. I told him that I was not suggesting that she was permanently injured but simply that she was now emotionally disturbed about going back and wanted to withdraw. He said that consideration could be given to releasing her from the contract if she were to produce a letter from a general practitioner and a psychiatrist to provide evidence of her emotional condition and of being unable to carry on.

I question whether this type of morality can be tolerated. The Government has a responsibility to the people, and this type of activity should be controlled. These contracts are an unfortunate method of involving people at these centres—not only this centre but others. A high proportion of the income of the centres is based on the drop-out level. The people who manage these places are well aware that people often do not complete the twelve-month course. That is fair enough, if that is the way these people want to conduct their businesses, and are now able to, but this woman was injured seriously enough to be taken by ambulance to the Alfred Hospital. She went back to the centre after another try and found it impossible as a result of her injury.

The response of the sports centre was to take action through a solicitor to recover the money from her in full. The manager stands by this attitude and cannot understand my position in pointing out the immorality of the sports centre's stand in not releasing Mrs. Gregson from the contract instead of proceeding with the matter. This is wrong and it might be necessary for the Government to consider legislation to provide for a period to elapse after the signing of these so-called contracts, which do not even bear a date, but which I understand have a legal basis.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I listened with interest to the unfortunate experience of a patron of the Brendan Edwards sports centre. I am sympathetic to everything the honorable member said. Mr. Trayling should ensure that the woman receives immediate legal assistance from the legal aid section; it can be obtained very smartly. I do not think it is a problem. If desired, I will assist in making an appointment so that the woman may obtain proper legal advice.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): Mr. Jenkins has expressed concern at delays in implementing the Regional Employment Development Scheme, as well he might. We were led to believe it was an emergency scheme designed to get people back to work quickly. In fact, its only effect has been to keep people out of work because of a cumbersome and unworkable administrative machinery which is breaking down under its own weight. There are serious aspects of mismanagement of the scheme in that many councils have been led to believe that works have been approved and they can commence operations, but they have not received written confirmation or any money. No one seems to know what the guidelines are. Some applications are going direct to the State committee and others are going direct to Canberra. No one knows under what criteria they are tested by the officers' committee in Canberra or referred to the Ministerial committee of five.

All in all the situation is reaching a critical stage of breakdown where the State is considering whether any good purpose is being served by making its

representatives available. Severe embarrassment has been caused to many municipalities. To my knowledge, only one municipality in Victoria has received any money. Mr. Swinburne will be aware of that municipality. After it had spent $20,000 on the basis of Commonwealth promises, it applied for $20,000 and received $28,800. That is the unusual municipality that has received money.

Mr. Jenkins referred to his area. The Shire of Corio had a $500,000 flood mitigation programme approved and put men to work. However, no money has been forthcoming. The City of Geelong West received approval for a table tennis sports centre to cost $175,000, subject to a local contribution of $75,000, if my figures are correct. I believe no site has actually been purchased and the building has not even been designed. If that is so I fail to understand how this can be accepted as an urgent unemployment relief project, although I certainly do not begrudge the city's luck in getting a subsidy. That is all it amounts to. It is hardly an unemployment relief scheme, in that the building industry there is extended and recent jobs in the area have occasionally not brought forth tenders. In any event, of the total sum of $175,000, only approximately $2,000 relates to labour, so the scheme is hardly achieving the stated aim of getting the unemployed quickly back to work.

Shepparton has just received an offer of money for projects, subject to its providing a $15,000 local contribution. The municipality is just not in a position to comply.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: Shepparton is not in South-Western Province.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! I ask the Minister to confine his remarks to the question asked by Mr. Jenkins as it relates to Geelong.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Mr. Jenkins asked whether people were getting back to work. Another serious aspect is that it can hardly be said that the Commonwealth is acting directly in accordance with its powers in respect of unemployment or social services in forwarding moneys or making promises to councils on the sort of terms I have referred to. It is giving subsidies. Subsidies are welcome, but they should be recognized for what they are, and the only way in which they can be made is through the State Government pursuant to section 96 of the Constitution. The Attorney-General is extremely concerned with the constitutionality of the matter.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! The question is whether the State Government can assist in Mr. Jenkins's problems.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Mr. Jenkins raised three matters. The Attorney-General has obtained the advice of an eminent Queen's Counsel, who believes the promises or payments made are unconstitutional in the circumstances. I point to the way in which the scheme was administered last year and under the McMahon Government, when there were guidelines which enabled the Government to get the unemployed back to work immediately. The moneys were paid to the State under section 96.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: That worked effectively.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: The scheme worked exceedingly effectively, and only two people were utilized at the State level to operate it. There is now a State committee of eight, consisting of five Commonwealth officers, one State officer representing a Commonwealth officer, and two other State officers who were the officers who did the job under the previous system and often supplied answers on the day on which the application was made. There is an officers' committee in Canberra, also a Ministerial committee, and no one knows where he stands.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! In my opinion this is not an answer to Mr. Jenkins's question.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: The answer to Mr. Jenkins's question is that it appears to be impossible to get men back to work promptly under the present scheme. There seems to be no way in which we can guarantee that machinery which is breaking down under its own weight will work. We have repeatedly pressed the Commonwealth to replace this unnecessary and cumbersome machinery with a simple structure of the type that operated last year.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

PAY-ROLL TAX.

(Question No. 160)

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Treasurer—

What is the estimated revenue from pay-roll tax in a full year from pay-rolls of—(i) from $20,800 to $25,000; (ii) from $25,001 to $30,000; (iii) from $30,001 to $35,000; (iv) from $35,001 to $40,000; (v) from $40,001 to $45,000; and (vi) from $45,001 to $50,000?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): The answer supplied by the Premier and Treasurer is—

The estimated revenue from pay-roll tax in a full year from pay-rolls of—

	$
(i) from $20,800 to $25,000	72,000
(ii) from $25,001 to $30,000	350,000
(iii) from $30,001 to $35,000	737,000
(iv) from $35,010 to $40,000	1,023,000
(v) from $40,001 to $45,000	1,340,000
(vi) from $45,001 to $50,000	1,535,000

HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER TRAINING.

(Question No. 164)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

What is the total cost to the State, inclusive of allowances, instruction, administration and proportion of other overheads, and interest on capital costs of buildings, etc., of training a high school teacher?

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

Approximately $18,000.

NORTH MELBOURNE LOST DOGS HOME.

(Question No. 167)

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

(*a*) What was the result of the police investigation required by the Chief Secretary into the North Melbourne Lost Dogs Home?

(*b*) How many police officers made this investigation, and on what date?

(*c*) Did any of these officers have any special qualifications in observing whether animals are being ill-treated, sick or injured, or are suffering from malnutrition or any other diseases?

(*d*) Will the Chief Secretary lay their report on the table of the Library?

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

The police have not conducted inquiries at the Lost Dogs Home.

The desirability of arranging a police investigation was considered some few weeks ago after the receipt of claims that the facilities at the home and the standard of care of dogs were unsatisfactory. However, I formed the view that the appropriate course was to seek the views of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. This was done, and the president of the society, Dr. H. J. Wirth, B.V.Sc., and two of its inspectors, visited the home recently. As the result of the inspection, recommendations were made to the management of the home in respect of, *inter alia*, the increased use of veterinary services by the home and alterations to facilities. Dr. Wirth noted that none of the animals at the home appeared to be undernourished.

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has called attention to the fact that the Lost Dogs Home is providing a most valuable service to the community. It handles a very large number of dogs each year and the problems experienced in carrying out this function are accentuated by the unfortunate fact that relatively few of the owners of dogs received into the home attempt to retrieve their animals. The home does require greater public support and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has recommended that it undertake a programme in an effort to obtain such support.

DONALD HIGH SCHOOL.

(Question No. 168)

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

When will Commonwealth standard library facilities be provided at the Donald High School?

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

Having regard to the number of post-primary schools yet to receive the provision of Commonwealth library facilities and the level of finance made available by the Commonwealth Government I am unable to advise when Donald High School can expect improvements to its library facilities.

NHILL PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 170)

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

When will two additional new class-rooms, approved for construction at the Nhill Primary School, be commenced and completed?

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

It is anticipated that, subject to the availability of funds, tenders for additions to the Nhill Primary School will be invited before June, 1975.

SCHOOL SPORTING ASSOCIATIONS.

(Question No. 171)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation—

Is the Government giving consideration to the recognition of selected school sporting associations for grants from the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation; if so, when will a decision be made?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing): The answer supplied by the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation is—

As a policy the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation makes funds available only to recognized parent organizations for each sport and recreation. Each application for recognition as a parent sporting body is submitted to the Sports and Recreation Council for consideration.

At the next meeting of the council it will consider a number of applications from various school sporting associations for recognition as parent bodies.

HIGH SCHOOL FOR WYCHEPROOF.

(Question No. 174)

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

In view of approval for a high school to be established at Wycheproof for the beginning of the 1975 school year—

(*a*) What buildings have been provided, and when will additional buildings be provided to accommodate students?

(*b*) What type of buildings will be constructed, and for what purposes?

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

(*a*) The Wycheproof High School, when established in 1975, will continue to function in those spaces at present used for the secondary classes of the existing higher elementary school supplemented by portable class-rooms.

(*b*) It is anticipated that a decision concerning the type of permanent building and its location will be made shortly.

RAINBOW HIGH SCHOOL.

(Question No. 176)

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

When will improvements to staff facilities, promised for the Rainbow High School during "operation upgrade", be provided, listing the type of work to be carried out?

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

Rainbow High School is one of many schools yet to receive improvements to staff facilities. Rainbow High School is not included in the building programme for the 1974-75 financial year and the needs of the school will be considered when the programme for 1975-76 is being prepared.

MEAT PRICES.

(Question No. 178)

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare, for the Minister of Agriculture—

In view of the fact that a recent inquiry into the meat industry in Victoria by Mr. L. E. Cozens was carried out during a time of high meat prices, will the Government institute a similar inquiry into the meat industry at this time in order to establish the reasons for the dramatic down-turn in beef, sheep and lamb prices, and possible action that may be undertaken to ensure higher prices and greater price stability?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer supplied by the Minister of Agriculture is—

The inquiry into the meat industry by Mr. L. E. Cozens began in May, 1972, at a time when meat prices were low by today's standards. During the inquiry meat prices did rise dramatically but have now, of course, fallen equally dramatically. The reasons for the fall in prices are well known and a further inquiry is not necessary to establish them. Meat prices fell in Australia because of a fall in export prices, which in turn was caused by reduced overseas demand and rising animal production outside Australia. Neither of these factors can be controlled by Government action and to that extent it is impossible to ensure higher prices or greater price stability. Measures to stabilize farmers' incomes, as opposed to farm prices, are in the province of the Australian Government.

MUNICIPALITIES ASSISTANCE FUND.

(Question No. 186)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

(*a*) From what date will an increased subsidy from the Municipalities Assistance Fund operate?

(*b*) What amount will be available to each municipality in the North-Western Province?

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

(*a*) The increased subsidy from the Municipalities Assistance Fund will operate for this financial year, but allocations will not be made until the Municipalities Assistance Act has been passed and proclaimed.

(*b*) Eligible cities, towns and boroughs will each receive $4,000 and all shires will receive $5,000 for approved works. The Government has decided that the prerequisite for a local contribution to any works shall no longer apply.

GRANTS FOR PUBLIC HALLS.

(Question No. 188)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

(*a*) What grants have been made in the past ten years to municipalities in the North-Western Province for public halls?

(*b*) What applications from the province are awaiting availability of grants, and how long have they been waiting?

(*c*) What will be the effect of the increase in the maximum subsidy to $20,000?

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

(*a*) The following subsidies have been allocated to municipalities in the North-Western Province for public halls over the past ten years—

	$
Birchip shire	4,800
Charlton shire	6,750
Dimboola shire	16,200
Donald shire	2,000
Dunmunkle shire	7,550
Kaniva shire	9,998
Karkarooc shire	9,656
Kerang shire	11,922
Lowan shire	18,634
Mildura shire	9,622
Swan Hill shire	22,370
Walpeup shire	17,174
Warracknabeal shire	18,277
Wimmera shire	2,533
Wycheproof shire	5,972

(*b*) Applications on hand

Lowan shire, Netherby public hall —application date, 15th June, 1973.

Swan Hill shire, Robinvale civic centre—application date, 4th July, 1974; Woorinen public hall —application date, 4th July, 1974.

Wycheproof shire, Berriwillock public hall—application date, 8th December, 1971; Wycheproof public hall—application date, 3rd July, 1974.

(*c*) An amount of up to $20,000 may now be allocated to any one hall.

Those halls in respect of which the former maximum of $9,000 subsidy has already been paid become eligible for a further amount up to $11,000 on a $1 for $1 subsidy for extensions.

Halls in respect of which an allocation has been made or approved but construction has not been commenced or completed can become eligible for a further subsidy above $9,000, if the total cost so warrants on a $1 for $1 subsidy, only if immediate application is made to the Local Government Department.

PROMOTION OF TEACHERS.

(Question No. 187)

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

Concerning the current dispute between the teacher unions and the Minister of Education over the promotion of teachers, will the Minister of Education indicate the areas in dispute and the current policy of the Education Department in relation to same, with particular reference to the following matters—

(*a*) What is an "inspectorial mark", and is it a prerequisite to promotion of senior teachers to principal and deputy principal class; if not, what requirements are taken into consideration?

(*b*) Is the secondary classifiers "R" form the sole evidence considered by the classifiers in deciding "teacher aptitude" for positions of responsibility?

(*c*) Has the committee of technical classifiers rejected the form referred to in part (*b*) above as being unsuitable evidence of aptitude; if so, on what grounds?

(*d*) Under the "R" form procedure, is only one reference considered by the secondary classifiers irrespective of whether the form used is the one recommended by them or the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association form?

(*e*) Is the composition and voting record of the secondary classifiers available as an indication of the independence of that body; if not, how are the decisions made in each case, and are they recorded and filed?

(*f*) Are negotiations between the bodies in dispute and the Minister still current; if so, when is the next meeting scheduled?

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

(*a*) An "inspectorial mark" is a measure of aptitude for a particular position in the Teaching Service awarded by inspectors of schools. The Secondary Schools Division regards an appropriate assessment of aptitude as only one of the conditions to be met by teachers seeking appointment as a school principal. Such assessment is not based solely on class-room inspection but may also involve discussion and interviews with the teacher. The Committee of Classifiers, the body responsible for making appointments, is bound by section 48 (5) of the Teaching Service Act.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No.

(*e*) No. Each application is considered separately and the decision noted on it. No record is kept by the classifiers as to whether the decision is unanimous or a majority.

(*f*) Yes. Meetings are scheduled for 11th and 15th November.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, November 12, 1974.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. K. H. Wheeler)** took the chair at 4.4 p.m., and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

QUESTION ON NOTICE.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Will the Chief Secretary advise me when his department will be able to answer question No. 510 on the Notice Paper?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I thought the answer was in the mail today and would be at the House this afternoon.

OIL IN PORT PHILLIP BAY.

Mr. CRELLIN (Sandringham): Is the Minister of Public Works aware that an oil slick is reported to have fouled beaches in the area of Sandringham and Beaumaris? If so, what

is the extent of the damage caused by the slick and what measures have been taken to rectify the damage?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): I believe the honorable member for Sandringham is referring to a report in the *Sun News-Pictorial* today which was accurate. At 10.30 a.m. on Sunday this week the Ports and Harbors Division's vessel *Franklin* reported a severe oil slick about a mile out from the Sandringham breakwater. The extent of the slick was about 2·5 miles long by about 100 yards wide.

The *Franklin* immediately loaded dispersant and called on the Ports and Harbors Division's vessel *Nelson* from Williamstown to assist in breaking up the slick, which was of a heavy type furnace or bunker oil. The two vessels did not have much success in dispersing the oil. The winds shifted at the time the two vessels commenced work on the slick, with the result that some of the oil came ashore at beaches between Sandringham and Mentone.

The oil is being analysed, and investigations are proceeding to try to ascertain from which ship it came. At that time on Sunday morning four vessels were in the vicinity. Until the investigations are completed I cannot say whether charges will be laid against the master of the ship concerned. However, I hope charges will be laid.

VASCAR.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): Can the Chief Secretary tell me whether the Government proposes to introduce legislation to authorize the use of the visual average speed computing and recording device known as VASCAR, and, if so, when?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I do not think legislation is necessary for the introduction of this device; it it a question of regulations and funds from the Treasury.

AID TO TECHNICAL SCHOOLS.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): Does the Minister of Education propose to take action to assist technical schools to overcome their critical financial situation, bearing in mind that some of these schools are now not able to pay their accounts? If so, what action will the Minister take and when will it be taken?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): The major problem lies in the middle level college field which we have already taken up with the Federal Minister for Education. "We" means myself and other State Ministers. This year it was intended that fees for technical colleges would be abandoned and replaced by money from the Commonwealth. The sum of $4·9 million was expected this year without increasing fees but only $4·3 million has been promised from the Commonwealth. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of that latter sum has not yet arrived. We are awaiting a reply from the Commonwealth Minister, who undertook to make a special investigation into this matter.

PRIVATE TRANSPORT OPERATORS.

Mr. AUREL SMITH (Bellarine): Is the Minister of Transport aware that the Labor Government in South Australia has compulsorily taken over services conducted by private transport operators in the Adelaide area and, if so, can the honorable gentleman assure the House that private transport operators in the Melbourne area will not face the same fate?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): In the opinion of the Government of Victoria Australia is suffering from an overdose of Socialism already. The answer is, "No".

ROBINVALE CARRIER.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir): Will the Minister of Transport investigate the situation in which the only carrier in Robinvale district has been forced to dismiss four of his five employees because he cannot obtain credit from the Commercial Bank of Australia Ltd.? Will the Minister also investigate why the Ampol company

has been refused credit? I ask the Minister to examine the free enterprise system in Robinvale.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): It appears to me that the honorable member has mistaken me for the Federal Treasurer—I am not sure which one. Apparently the honorable member's problem arises from the failure of one of his constituents to obtain credit from a bank. I am afraid that I have no jurisdiction in the matter.

FISH SHOPS.

Mr. SKEGGS (Ivanhoe): In view of a statement which appeared in this morning's *Sun News-Pictorial* attributed to the President of the Victorian Fishmongers Association to the effect that many fish shops have been forced to close because of rising costs and the present regulations regarding the permissible level of mercury in fish, will the Minister of Health give consideration to the position of fish retailers?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): I did see the statement made by the president of the named association. Some of the principal features of Australian life include fish and chips, Australian rules football, pies, and beer—we hope the latter in moderation. The Government would view with great regret and concern any closure of fish shops throughout the metropolitan area.

However, I noted that the president of the association said that the closures were caused not only because of the mercury level in shark but also because of high costs confronting fishmongers throughout the metropolitan area—including wages increases, too. I deny any suggestion that fish and chip shops are closing because of the mercury level in shark. Alternative fish of high quality are available in Victoria. The Government's programme is, through research, to market these high quality fish, including snapper and other fish from Bass Strait, and to ensure that these are consumed in greater quantities.

I hope Victorians will support their fishmongers who provide good fish and chips, and I trust that there will not be any further closures of this fine feature of the Australian way of life.

HIGH SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCILS.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): Can the Minister of Education advise the House what jurisdiction or responsibility high school advisory councils have relative to night classes at high schools and, specifically, if there is to be a major change in the arrangement or the provision of night classes, will the advisory council of the host school be involved?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): The question of jurisdiction arose at the Ministers' conference at Hobart in February this year. It was pointed out that fees had been abolished in technical schools as a result of grants from the Commonwealth but that in many areas identical courses were being carried on at high schools for which students still had to pay fees. We regarded this as anomalous.

The Federal Minister for Education agreed to take up the matter, and he finally wrote to the States—certainly to Victoria—pointing out that if these classes could become part of the technical schools administration the same concessions would apply. So at present, at the behest of the Commonwealth, in order to qualify for the concession we will have no objection if the scheme is administered by the Technical Schools Division.

Therefore, we are in the process of transferring some authority to the Technical Schools Division, so that high school councils will have less power than previously because of this issue.

AID TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): Has the Minister of Agriculture seen a reported statement attributed to Senator Wriedt, the Federal Minister

for Agriculture, that $17 million will be made available gratuitously to aid underdeveloped countries? If so, will the honorable gentleman try to influence the Federal Minister to have this money used towards the under-pinning of the meat industry?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): I am pleased to see that the Commonwealth Government is supporting aid to underdeveloped countries, and I am concerned about the type of aid that is being sponsored by the Federal Government. It has been announced in several newspapers that the aid will be in the form of wheat.

My question to Senator Wriedt, which has already been communicated to him, is whether we will purchase at home consumption price or export price. As the honorable member will appreciate, home consumption price is currently $1.93, and export price ranges between $3.50 and $4-odd a bushel. Obviously, there is a significant difference.

Why confine aid to the grain or wheat industries which are currently enjoying an unusually buoyant time? Why not stimulate assistance to developing countries and, as the honorable member suggested, underpin the meat industry? I have written to Senator Wriedt suggesting that there is a large capacity in Victoria and other States to can meat, not necessarily to freeze it or store it in any other way.

It seems to me that most of these countries would consume meat—perhaps not India—and that because of this factor the Federal Government should join the States in investigating how best this meat can be canned and shipped to the countries where aid has been promised. I have not yet received a reply from Senator Wriedt, but I hope favourable consideration will be given to the proposition.

SAVOY PLAZA HOTEL.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Can the Premier advise the House whether the Government has purchased the Savoy Plaza Hotel in Spencer Street? If so, what was the purchase price, and was it a cash transaction or a purchase on terms? Does this mean that the Government will not now continue with the proposal to purchase the building in Flinders Street owned by the Commercial Travellers Association?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): An offer has been made by the Government and accepted verbally by the proprietors of the Savoy Plaza Hotel, Federal Hotels Ltd. No actual contract has yet been signed, but we expect that it will be signed shortly by the Minister of Public Works. The sale price is $1·85 million. The exact terms have yet to be determined, but it will probably be a cash sale. The purpose of buying the Savoy Plaza Hotel, which I hasten to add does not include the tavern——

Mr. EDMUNDS: What about the night show?

Mr. HAMER: The floor show unfortunately will terminate at a future date. The Government's purpose in buying the Savoy Plaza is to house the police cadets and free them from the Y.M.C.A. and other places where they are at present housed. It is not intended to go ahead with the purchase of the Commercial Travellers Association building in Flinders Street. This was looked at as an alternative beforehand, but renovation costs and other factors excluded it, whereas the Savoy Plaza Hotel is eminently suitable. It will be retained as a police cadet barracks until new quarters are built for the police cadets at Glen Waverley, where they will ultimately be housed.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): Is the Premier aware of a report in today's *Herald* which states that the Landlord and Tenant Act should come under greater scrutiny?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! It is not admissible for a member to quote press releases.

Mr. EDMUNDS: I am asking the Premier whether he has seen a report in the *Herald*. The report detailed the Landlord and Tenant Act, its anomalies and the need to modernize it to ensure that the underprivileged people in the community are not disadvantaged. If the Premier has seen the report, is he prepared to examine its details, and also have the Landlord and Tenant Act scrutinized with a view to having it modernized as soon as possible to ensure that underprivileged people are not disadvantaged as suggested in the report in the *Herald*?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): The Landlord and Tenant Act falls under the administration of the Attorney-General. I am prepared to give a general answer, but a more effective answer will come from him. I invite the honorable member to redirect the question.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): I redirect the question to the Attorney-General.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I saw an article in the Melbourne *Herald* of Saturday last, I think it was.

Mr. EDMUNDS: There was an editorial today.

Mr. WILCOX: I believe there was an editorial on the subject but I have not had an opportunity of reading it. I presume the editorial was based on the information in the article which appeared on Saturday. I inquired into the basis of that article and it seemed that the information came from a retired officer of the Fair Rents Board and the Rental Investigation Bureau. Yesterday I checked the article with the Secretary of the Fair Rents Board. He was amazed at the basis on which it appeared to be written. Indeed, it did not accord with his information and his factual experience of the situation.

The situation is simply that people are able to make complaints to the Rental Investigation Bureau.

Mr. EDMUNDS: They cannot get their complaints fixed up.

Mr. WILCOX: My information is that they can get them fixed up. I am also informed that the *Herald* article was based on simple statements—no facts and no cases. A search has been made to see whether any of the alleged facts in the article could be fitted to cases which had come before the Rental Investigation Bureau and it was found that they could not.

I say only two things. The first is that anybody who has any complaint should make it carefully to the Rental Investigation Bureau and it will be investigated. There is power to make orders bringing premises under the control of the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Honorable members interjecting.

Mr. WILCOX: That is typical of the Opposition. Its members make allegations but when they are given facts in reply they carry on like cockatoos.

Mr. WILKES: Your daughter had trouble getting deposit money back.

Mr. WILCOX: I am grateful for the interjection.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! Perhaps the Minister should not reply to the interjection.

Mr. WILCOX: I wanted to reply to that interjection, Mr. Speaker, because it concerned my daughter. In any case, it leads me to the second matter. The Parliamentary Liberal Party has appointed a committee to look particularly at the bonding of tenants or security deposits. The committee will be happy to receive representations from any responsible person, including any member of Parliament. If any member wants to submit something in writing, I will send the submission to the committee.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Can we go to the Bill committee?

Mr. WILCOX: No, I should like honorable members to come to me and I will forward their submissions. It is not a Bill committee; it is a committee which is considering the particular question of security deposits. If

it is found that there is any need to amend the legislation, in accordance with the Government's usual progressive attitude that will be done.

STOCK EXCHANGE OF MELBOURNE.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party): I direct a question to the Attorney-General. Following the Rae report and the subsequent inquiry by the Stock Exchange of Melbourne, is it the Government's intention to prohibit sharebrokers from being directors of public companies in Victoria, or does it intend to allow this practice to continue?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I have no brief for members of the stock exchange in relation to any behaviour which does not measure up to the code of conduct which should be and is used by the members of the Stock Exchange of Melbourne—no brief at all for anyone who departs from that standard.

But this matter should be kept in perspective. I have an open mind on the question whether sharebrokers should be directors of public companies. There are prima facie reasons why they should not be. Some sharebrokers have experience which goes far wider than the simple mechanics of buying and selling shares, and these people may well be valuable as directors of companies. The matter should certainly be treated with great care so far as concerns the personnel who are involved.

I think the Companies Act would need to be amended to implement the change suggested by the Leader of the Country Party. If this were the case, the Victorian Government would need to consult the Governments of Queensland and New South Wales because, as honorable members know, the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission has been working satisfactorily for some time and Victoria would certainly wish to have uniform legislation in this regard.

NATURAL GAS.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister for Fuel and Power assure the House that he would support any request from the Gas and Fuel Corporation and any demands that it may make upon Esso-B.H.P. to be supplied with the same volume of gas on precisely the same terms and conditions as Esso-B.H.P. were prepared to give to the State Electricity Commission for the proposed Newport power station?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): I do not think the Gas and Fuel Corporation would be particularly happy about the situation. Two contracts are in existence. One is between Esso-B.H.P. and the Gas and Fuel Corporation, and it was originally entered into by the corporation, the Colonial Gas Association Ltd, the Geelong Gas Company Ltd., and the Gas Supply Company. The last-named three were subsequently taken over by the corporation. The other contract is between Esso-B.H.P. as suppliers and the State Electricity Commission.

I believe—and I think Mr. Smith, the Chairman of the Gas and Fuel Corporation, will agree with me—that the corporation's contract is better than the contract between Esso-B.H.P. and the State Electricity Commission. The corporation's contract provides for the supply of gas on 365 days of the year at a fixed price with no escallation, particularly for domestic gas supplies, during the period of the contract. The State Electricity Commission contract is interruptable and does provide for escallation.

Mr. HOLDING: It is a lot lower in cost.

Mr. BALFOUR: I disagree with the Leader of the Opposition; I do not know from where the honorable member obtains his information.

Mr. HOLDING: I am happy to let the Minister give me the information, but he will not.

Mr. BALFOUR: Two contracts are involved and it is difficult to say which contract is better than the

other. From my point of view, and I believe the chairman of the corporation will agree with me, the corporation's contract is better than the one offered to the State Electricity Commission.

REGIONAL FREIGHT CENTRES.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North): Can the Minister of Transport advise which Victorian cities or towns have been selected or alternatively are being considered for the erection of regional freight centres by the Victorian Railways?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): Horsham has been selected as the site for the initial regional transportation centre. Plans are being prepared for the development, which will be a prototype for others in a number of cities yet to be determined.

TERTIARY EDUCATION.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray): Has the Minister of Education received a report from his latest subcommittee, which has been appointed to inquire into the combination of tertiary facilities at Ballarat and Bendigo? If so, will the Minister, as is his normal practice, make available a copy of this report to those honorable members who are interested? Furthermore, what recommendations were contained in the report, and has the Government adopted them?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I did not quite hear the introductory remarks but I take it that the honorable member is referring to the committee which is inquiring into which organization should be the co-ordinating authority for the amalgamation of the colleges at each centre. As yet, I have not received the report, but, when I have received it, I have no objection to making a copy available to anybody who wishes to see it.

ROTOMAH AND LITTLE ROTOMAH ISLANDS.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): Can the Premier inform me whether the Government has purchased Rotomah and Little Rotomah islands in the Gippsland lakes for a reported price of $260,000, in view of persistent statements circulating in the Gippsland Lakes area that in the past five years the previous owner purchased those islands for about $45,000? Will the Premier investigate these allegations and inform the House of their accuracy?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): The Government has purchased the two islands known as the Rotomah and Little Rotomah pair in the Gippsland lakes, south of Paynesville. The price paid was either at or below the Valuer-General's valuation of those islands. The Government purchased them partly on the ground of hardship because the islands were recommended in the Land Conservation Council's report to form part of a future coastal park along the 90-mile beach inshore from the Gippsland lakes. Its owner, therefore, was prevented from developing his land and he applied, for various reasons, to the Government to buy it. That is really why the matter came to a head.

I will investigate the facts, but I know that the price paid was the exact amount or less than that contained in the Valuer-General's report because that is the Government's invariable practice. The Government always gets the Valuer-General's valuation on any purchase made by the Government and, so far as I am aware, it did not go above it.

WASTE DISCHARGE INTO LATROBE RIVER.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): Further to the question asked in this Chamber recently concerning the licence issued to Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. to discharge waste into the Latrobe River, has the Minister for Conservation received a statement from the lecturer in zoology at the La Trobe University concerning the Environment Protection Authority licence referred to, and referring to a different set of circumstances from those referred to by the Minister in this Chamber? If the Minister has

received such a statement, is it being investigated and if so will the Minister inform the House when those investigations are completed?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation): I have received a letter from Mr. Rawlinson of La Trobe University. I should emphasize again in this House that the whole concept of the Environment Protection Act is based on licensing and appeals being outside political interference. I believe that is right and proper, and I think all honorable members agree with the concept. I have sent the letter to the Environment Protection Authority.

I emphasize again that a licence was issued by the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board, which is the delegated agency. The issue of the licence went to appeal, but after investigation the appeal ratified the agreement on alteration of the original licence that was arrived at between the delegated agency and Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. I also point out to the House that the existing levels of mercury discharge are so small that they are hardly measurable and that the discharge of mercury is now less than 10 per cent of the amount permitted by the licence. That should also be emphasized.

I suggest that if the honorable member wants more detailed scientific information he should put a question on notice; if he does so I shall give him a reply along the lines of the advice I received from the Environment Protection Authority.

RENTAL INVESTIGATION BUREAU.

Mr. LIND (Dandenong): I ask the Attorney-General: Is it a fact that a resident of Doveton recently telephoned the Rental Investigation Bureau and informed it that her rental for a weatherboard house was to be raised from $40 to $52.50 a week, and that she was told that she would need to pay the new rental for three weeks before anything could be done, after which it would take some time for an investigation to be made? If this is so, how does the honorable gentleman suggest that this lady can pay the rent from her husband's weekly wage of $113?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I am not aware of the telephone call referred to by the honorable member, but if he will give me the name of the lady and the address of the premises concerned I shall be only too happy to make inquiries about the matter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McCABE (Lowan): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a personal explanation to the House. From the proof copy of the *Hansard* report of my speech on the Chiropodists (Additional Training of Applicants) Bill on Thursday, 31st October, it could be inferred that I had said that a Mrs. Wallis, of Kaniva, had been charged with practising chiropody when not registered to do so. This is incorrect. I know personally that Mrs. Wallis has been registered for some years. The lady to whom I referred lives in Dimboola and is now practising there. The revised edition of *Hansard* will report what I actually said.

PAPERS.

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

Dried Fruits Act 1958—Statement of accounts of the Victorian Dried Fruits Board for the year 1973.

Land Act 1958—Schedule of country lands proposed to be sold by auction.

Local Authorities Benefit Contracts Account—Report of the Actuary on his investigation of the account at the expiration of the Second Triennium (28th February, 1970) and Third Triennium (28th February, 1973) (two papers).

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended—Nos. 189 to 203 (fifteen papers).

Statutory Rules under the following Acts—

Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973—No. 458.
Explosives Act 1960—No. 460.
Motor Car Act 1958—No. 462.
Motor Car Act 1958 and Recreation Vehicles Act 1973—No. 461.

Pesticides Act 1958—No. 456.
Port Phillip Authority Act 1966—No. 457.
Stock Foods Act 1958—No. 455.
Tattersall Consultations Act 1958—No. 459.

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—
City of Knox Planning Scheme 1965, Amendment No. 142, 1974.
Shire of Bulla Planning Scheme 1959, Amendment Nos. 32, 1973 and 33, 1974 (two papers).

JUSTICES (THEFT OFFENCES) BILL.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Justices Act 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MAGISTRATES (SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS) BILL.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to re-enact with amendments the law relating to the procedure and practice of Magistrates Courts with respect to the summary determination of matters, the practice of justices with respect to the taking of information and complaints and the issue of warrants and summonses thereon, the preliminary examination of persons charged with indictable offences, and for purposes connected therewith.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Melbourne University Act 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MARINE STORES AND OLD METALS (BEVERAGE CANS) BILL.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Marine Stores and Old Metals Act 1958 with respect to beverage cans.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MILK AND DAIRY SUPERVISION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Milk and Dairy Supervision Act 1958 and to make a consequential amendment to the Margarine Act 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MILK BOARD (DELIVERY CHARGES) BILL.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Milk Board Act 1958 to make provision with respect to delivery charges and other matters.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

WHEAT INDUSTRY (STABILIZATION) BILL.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill relating to the marketing of wheat and the stabilization of the wheat industry.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund

for the purposes of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways (Amendment) Bill.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Act 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

LAND TAX BILL.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer), pursuant to Standing Order No. 273D, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Land Tax Act 1958, to declare the rates of land tax for the year ending on the 31st of December, 1975 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

EDUCATION (TEACHER REGISTRATION) BILL.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Education Act 1958 with respect to teacher registration, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 22) on the motion of Mr. Hamer (Premier and Treasurer) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): This is an interesting Bill because it reveals a number of contradictions in various policies that the Government has adopted at one stage or another. During my speech I wish to raise these matters. This is a taxing Bill. It will produce substantial revenues for Victoria and will constitute a sales tax. Only yesterday, in a supposed 13-point plan to remove inflation and unemployment problems in Australia, the Premier said that sales tax on items which affect the cost of living should be abolished. The day after he made that statement about action which should be taken by the Australian Government, this House is debating a sales tax which will add to the cost of living and which in Victoria is a totally new sales tax.

The problem with sales taxes—all Governments are guilty of levying them—is that they are inequitable; They fall upon persons who use particular items regardless of their income. Whether a person earns $20,000 a year or $5,000 a year his progressive tax pattern is entirely altered by the existence of a sales tax on items that he purchases from time to time. Tobacco is one such item, and there are numerous others. The proposed sales tax on tobacco will increase the weekly costs of persons who are smokers. One can say that smoking is a habit that should be attacked.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: It is a filthy habit.

Mr. ROPER: It might be regarded in that way. I believe King James I was severely critical of smoking. The Government proposes to introduce a tax that will be levied regardless of income so that a person with a salary of $20,000 a year will pay the same amount of sales tax as a person who earns $5,000 a year.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: A man who earns $5,000 a year cannot afford to smoke.

Mr. ROPER: The Leader of the Country Party suggests that a person with an income of $5,000 a year should not smoke. I realize that this belief is part of the honorable member's philosophy. However, if people find a particular vice pleasurable no limitation according to income should prevent persons from enjoying that legalized vice. It is an interesting suggestion that only those persons with high incomes should be able to indulge in smoking or drinking alcohol or any other such practice.

This tax will be brought into the cost-of-living index which will subsequently be used as a basis for wage increases. The Government is attempting to have it both ways—firstly, to attack sales tax, and secondly, to benefit from its introduction. Any sales tax on tobacco or alcohol will work through the cost-of-living system and affect demands for higher wages which will certainly ensue.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Do you believe tobacco is an item that should be taken into consideration when wages are being fixed?

Mr. ROPER: The normal expenditure of the community on various items determines the cost-of-living index, which is then part and parcel of the determination of wages. That is one of the difficulties which the Government faces.

Another part of the problem is that the Government will become a beneficiary from something which other arms of government are attempting to suppress. One might say that their attempts to suppress smoking are not effective, but an attempt is being made. The Australian Government faces similar difficulties. The sale of tobacco will become such an important part of the Budget that the Treasurer will be reluctant to act in any way to reduce receipts from that item. In New South Wales the poker machine is an excellent example. Although most people in New South Wales if asked now would not agree to the introduction of poker machines, and most members of the New South Wales Parliament would not approve, the situation is that the Government of that State is dependent on the income from that source. I am not suggesting that the Victorian Budget will depend to that extent on this proposed sales tax on tobacco, but it will be another argument against taking effective action against smoking.

Mr. THOMPSON: You are contradicting what you said previously.

Mr. ROPER: No; I am pointing out the Government's internal contradictions. The Opposition is not responsible for the internal contradictions of the Government's policies.

When one examines what the Government has done so far to limit the use of tobacco in the community, one finds that it has done precious little. One has only to read the reports of the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria which have been tabled in this House to realize that the Government has not been sincere in its attitude towards smoking which would limit its use in the community. Honorable members should take into account what has been said in the 1973 and 1974 reports of the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria. The council said, with considerable deliberation, that this Parliament should be introducing legislation to prevent the advertising of tobacco products. On the one hand the Government will be a beneficiary from smoking, and on the other hand it has reports presented to Parliament which encourage it to get rid of the source of this finance. By and large, the Labor Party comes down heavily on the side of discouraging the use of tobacco.

The 1973 report of the Anti-Cancer Council correctly states that this Parliament has the power to control advertising in the non-radio and television media, to limit and to prevent the advertising of tobacco products in the cinema and to limit the promotional use that is made by tobacco companies in the sporting area. On a couple of occasions the Assistant Minister of Education has suggested that this is where the Government is heading. Apparently it is not heading that way; there does not seem to be any indication that the Government intends to move in that direction.

Reports of the Anti-Cancer Council and journals published by the Australian Cancer Society have again and again pointed out that State Governments, apart from introducing legislation about the words which must appear on cigarette packets, have been extremely slow and in fact quite hesitant in doing anything to limit the sale or promotion of

cigarettes. Again, there is a contradiction between the raising of revenue as proposed in this Bill and other action taken by the Government.

Instead of merely prohibiting certain kinds of advertising, the Government should develop a comprehensive smoking education campaign. Part of the tax collected under this measure may go towards such a campaign, but I do not know whether that is intended. All the evidence suggests that the most effective means of limiting the increase in smoking is to concentrate on persons under the age of fifteen years, and particularly children of primary school age. A number of articles and reports have stressed the importance of the State Government's introducing not so much anti-smoking campaigns but anti-smoking as part of health education programmes in primary schools. This is not done at present and it will become less likely following the imposition of this tax.

Members of the Opposition would like the Government to express a much clearer view of what it intends to do about the tobacco industry. On the one hand the Government wishes to tax the tobacco industry heavily, but on the other hand it is not prepared to spend any of that revenue on assisting people, particularly children, to make the decision about smoking which they need to make.

I wish to raise a number of points about the Bill.

Mr. BILLING: It is about time.

Mr. ROPER: I should imagine that all matters relating to the sale or disposal of tobacco in Victoria are relevant to the Bill. I should like the Treasurer to explain a number of questions which are not explained in the Bill or in the second-reading explanatory speech. The first, which seems to be fairly important, appears in clause 10.

The provision states that the amount of the tax shall be calculated on the value of the tobacco sold for the purpose of clause 10 (1), which will be determined by the commissioner as the gross amount which would have been received by the wholesaler on his sale to the retailer, including any duties thereon.

It may be made clearer later, but it is not clear from this provision whether the tax will also be levied on the cost of the tobacco including this tax. Under one interpretation of the provision, if a wholesaler sold $4 worth of tobacco product to a retailer, the retailer would pay $4 plus 5 per cent; in other words he would pay 20 cents in tax. However, on another interpretation, if the tax were levied on all duties, including the duty imposed by this Bill, the tobacco would cost an extra 5 per cent of the 20 cents, which would mean that the cost would be $4.21.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: That would mean he was paying tax on tax.

Mr. ROPER: That is precisely the point; a retailer may be paying tax on the tax. People in the industry whom I have consulted about the Bill are unclear about the position because of the expression, "including any duties thereon".

One would imagine that would include any duties imposed as a result of the passing of this Bill. If the Treasurer can assure the House that that is not so, people concerned with the sale of tobacco will be glad.

The tax is levied on sales for a previous period. When the Bill comes into effect, tax will be levied on sales prior to its being proclaimed. However, a business might shortly afterwards suffer financial difficulty; it may go out of business. There are a number of small wholesalers in this trade and it is always possible that some will "go down the drain". The Bill does not provide for any moneys to be repaid in such a case.

I ask the Treasurer whether consideration was or will be given to the refunding of what is, in effect, a six-months' payment, which will

later be a year's payment, if a wholesaler, who pays most of the tax, goes out of business. A problem arises because other people may have charges against a particular firm. Moneys would be raised on the basis of a previous selling period although sales may not occur because of the failure of a business.

They are two important matters which have not been explained to those in the tobacco industry and on which they would like clarification.

The Opposition does not oppose the Bill but suggests that the Government should sort out its various approaches to taxes. If on a Monday it opposes sales tax, why does it on Tuesday introduce a sales tax on tobacco? Further, if it intends to use the tobacco industry as a milch cow, has it ever been serious in adopting a legal and educational programme which should enable people, particularly children, more competently to decide whether to smoke?

There is no doubt that smoking is a serious problem. All the research carried out suggests that up to 50 per cent of students are confirmed or occasional smokers by the time they leave secondary school. Once children begin to smoke, they are likely to continue to do so, but the Government has done almost nothing about the problem.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) : The Country Party supports the Bill. It should be made clear that this is a money Bill and that it is not concerned with the merits or demerits of the smoking habit. After the first year, a tax of 5 per cent on sales of tobacco will be levied. Although the tax on liquor has gone up over the years, the rate of consumption has not been reduced. Indeed, as the percentage of taxation has grown, consumption has also tended to grow. Time will tell whether the extra tax will reduce the consumption of tobacco, but I do not believe it will.

The honorable member for Brunswick West criticized the Government for imposing another sales tax when it is inflationary in the circumstances. Two points can be made on this argument. One is that cigarettes can hardly be described as essential. People who must cut down on expenses would consider that cigarettes would be one of the first things to go. Another point is that although Mr. Dunstan, the Premier of South Australia, said that he would remove the tax from cigarettes, he said he would do that only if the Federal Government compensated him for the loss of revenue. He adopts the same attitude to taxes on petrol. I am sure that the Victorian Government would abolish charges of various kinds if the Federal Government compensated it for the loss of income.

The Bill sets out a wise way of collecting the tax. The only reasonable procedure is to collect it through wholesalers. If the tax were collected through retailers, corner stores would give up selling cigarettes and this would be to the detriment of the general public. Collecting the tax through wholesalers will be simpler and will not affect the availability of cigarettes.

Retailers will pay a nominal licence fee of $10 a year. Presumably, that is imposed to keep a check on retailers and to ensure that the Government does not lose revenue. Turnover taxes of this type are not ideal but, when they are imposed on non-essentials such as liquor and tobacco, they cannot be criticized too much provided that the market can stand the levy. That will be proved in the course of time.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla) : The honorable member for Brunswick West referred to other matters affecting tobacco as well as the tax which this Bill imposes. As one who represents an area where tobacco is grown, I should offer some comment.

In the liquor industry, in both the metropolitan area and the country, extensions to licences are necessary

for alcohol to be sold outside licensed premises at functions such as football matches, sporting meetings, and other recreational activities. I ask the Treasurer whether the same position will obtain with the selling of cigarettes, whether a special licence will be necessary to sell tobacco at gatherings of that type.

Clause II sets out what is a good arrangement for the payment of the licence fees. If the fee is in excess of $100 a year, it may be paid in six instalments. During the debate on another Budget Bill relating to hotel licensing fees, it was pointed out that fees had to be paid by a certain date. I suggest that provisions similar to the payment of licence fees in this Bill should be introduced into the hotel industry. Something should be done about that before the Bill dealing with the hotel industry is dealt with in another place.

The tobacco industry is involved in public health, and the primary-producing section of the industry is making a contribution towards the health of people who smoke. The tar content of cigarettes has been lowered. The honorable member for Brunswick West referred to this indirectly. When a measure of this type is being dealt with by the House, the attempts of the industry to lower the tar content of cigarettes should be directed to the attention of honorable members. The State Government, through the Department of Agriculture, assists in research in the industry and it is important that Parliament should know about these things. The duty or the fees payable for the retailing of tobacco could be used for extending further the inquiry of the department into varieties of tobacco with a lower tar content.

Honorable members will remember that manufacturers endeavoured to lower the tar content of the cigarette smoke inhaled by developing a filter made of wool. Unfortunately, although it did lower the tar content of the inhaled smoke, it removed the enjoyment which the hardened smoker obtained. He did not receive the happiness or relaxation for which he looked.

If consideration has not already been given to the extension of licences for the sale of tobacco at sporting and recreational functions in the way it is necessary for an extension of a licence to be obtained to dispose of liquor, the matter should be considered now. I ask the Treasurer to clarify that point. I also ask the Treasurer to consider arranging for quarterly instalments for hotel licensing fees before the Bill affecting them is dealt with in another place, so that the fees levied in that industry can be paid in a similar way to those levied on the tobacco industry.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Interpretations).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : The honorable member for Brunswick West drew attention to clause 10(2) and inquired whether the words " including any duties thereon " in computation of the value of tobacco sold for the purposes of profit, would include the tax itself. That was the point of the inquiry. It is not intended that it should, and I do not think the words imply it; but I am prepared to have the wording examined and if it is found to be capable of carrying that interpretation I shall invite Parliamentary Counsel to submit some wording to me that will make it clearer. The appropriate time to do this would be when the Bill is transmitted to another place, rather than to delay the measure for that purpose now.

The honorable member for Benalla raised two questions, one concerning the sale of tobacco at sporting and other events. The matter is covered by clause 7(4) and (5). Sub-clause (4) provides—

> The licence shall specify the premises which are to be used for or in connexion with the business carried on under the licence.

Sub-clause (5) states that the holder of a licence may by notice in writing in the prescribed form given to the commissioner and on payment of the prescribed fee specify additional premises on which he wants to carry on business. The combination of those two sub-clauses will enable an extension for particular purposes, and on particular days, that the member for Benalla had in mind. It is well covered in sub-clause (5) and it is not intended that there should be any restraint of that kind. If the holder of a licence wants to operate away from his established premises and extend his operations to a sporting event, he will be able to do that on payment of a specified fee—which I imagine would not be much. If he is a retailer and has to get supplies from a licensed retailer, he will not be in any trouble, either.

Mr. ROPER: He will have to pay the fee.

Mr. HAMER: Yes, but not the tax. The other question raised by the honorable member concerns the payment of the licence fee by instalments in certain cases as provided for in clause 11. This is more favourable to the taxpayer than the provisions of the Liquor Control Act. I am prepared to look at this. The honorable member would realize that when the Liquor Control Bill was debated an amendment was agreed to which enabled the additional tax to be paid at the end of the year without any penalty by way of interest. That may be even more favourable than this provision, but the Government can adjust this payment.

I am conscious that hoteliers and others who have to pay tax are particularly short of cash at Christmas time. If these groups are companies they have to pay quarterly company tax, a 17·5 per cent loading to employees for Christmas leave, and so on. This causes a liquidity problem. I am eager to assist these people by any means possible, and I know of no reason why they should not be able to spread their payments rather than have to meet a lump sum payment at a particular time of the year. The Treasury is now looking at this in the light of the debate that took place last week.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): If honorable members wish to discuss specific clauses, they should do so at the appropriate time rather than raise the matters on clause 2.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I thank the Treasurer for his undertaking on clause 10. Clearly that matter has caused some concern. In his absence I also raised the problem that may develop if a person who is wholesales tobacco and is relating his sales to the previous period when no tax was payable, goes out of business after the tax comes into effect. Has consideration been given to the possibility of making a refund for the unexpired period of time a man is out of business and for which he will receive no benefit? There does not seem to be any provision in the Bill for this contingency and there is no clause under which I could raise the matter. Moreover, has the commissioner a discretion, if a company's sales drop, to make a refund to the company?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): The licence is for the current period, and the fee applicable to the licence is paid mainly in advance but with some concessions as to instalments. It still relates to the current period. The honorable member for Brunswick West is right; if a taxpayer ceases business within the licence period, I agree he ought to be entitled to a refund for proportion of his licence fee. Some companies apply for a refund under the liquor licensing system. There is no provision in either Act for a refund to be made, but in fact an *ex gratia* payment is always made in the liquor field, and it will also be made in this tobacco field. This practice is well recognized. This Bill will be administered in that way and a proportion of the licence fee will be refunded. This practice is also extended to motor registrations, in the case of a business ceasing when the owner dies,

and so on. I assure the honorable member for Brunswick West that that will be covered.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 3 to 6.

Clause 7 (Application for licences).

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I raise a brief point. When the Treasurer was speaking to clause 2 he suggested that the problem raised by the honorable member for Benalla concerning fees by instalments was covered by this clause, but there still remains a problem that some sporting organizations and social clubs may have cigarettes available for sale at functions that they conduct, but because an application is not made quickly it might not be possible for a licence to be issued in the necessary time. I ask the Treasurer to consider contingencies such as this because they clearly do not fall within the money-raising provisions. It might be possible to make special provision in the regulations to cover sporting clubs and other small organizations.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla): This is an interesting point and it has been developed a little further by the honorable member for Brunswick West. Under the Liquor Control Act a sporting club can get an extension of a hotelier's licence to a sporting area or football ground, but this is granted by the local superintendent of police. An exemption should be made in these cases, or there should be some area of contact or some method by which an application could be made. A fee of $10 or $15 is provided for the extension of a hotelier's licence to a sporting meeting. One would not like to think there will be a fee of this nature for the extension of a tobacco retailer's licence. As well as cigarettes being available at a booth, they may be obtainable in the afternoon tearoom so that ladies could purchase them. There would then be two points on a recreation reserve or at a football ground where cigarettes would be sold. I am assuming that regulations will be made for such contingencies but I should like to see specific acknowledgement made of recreational or sporting areas.

Mr. ROPER: Non-commercial selling.

Mr. TREWIN: Non-commercial selling would be the determination because it would be too costly to obtain a licence and then make a profit from the sale of cigarettes on these occasions.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I am willing to consider the problems discussed by the honorable members for Brunswick West and Benalla. I do not think it is possible in any licensing system to make provision for what could be called the casual seller, of either liquor or cigarettes. The sale would have to be connected in some way with a licence and a licensed retailer. I am prepared to examine how this can be done so as to make it easy for such operations to be effected. I recognize that these things should be available at sporting events and the like. I am not promising that it is going to be quite as easy as it is now. Where cigarettes are sold not for profit but as part of the service to the customer at a particular event, the Government will try to make it as easy as possible. However, I cannot see any way of doing it unless it is connected with the holder of a licence. I will discuss the matter with the people administering the Act and make provision for it in the regulations so far as possible.

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.

PAY-ROLL TAX BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 23) on the motion of Mr. Hamer (Premier and Treasurer) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill could possibly be considered more easily in Committee. It proposes amendments to the Pay-roll Tax Act designed to overcome problems which have

arisen because of various large corporations within the community have endeavoured to escape their liabilities under the Pay-roll Tax Act. They have obtained the benefit of a general exemption from the payment of pay-roll tax, an exemption which was designed and approved by this Parliament to provide a proper concession to small employers. That provision has been used in a variety of ways, as was stated by the Treasurer, to enable their businesses to escape the provisions of the principal Act.

In view of some of the amounts which have been involved and the cost to the revenue of the State, the Treasurer would be derelict in his duty if he did not introduce amendments designed to prevent those companies, which have a clear moral duty in compliance with the intention of this Parliament to pay this tax, to escape their responsibilities by a clever misuse of the provisions of the principal Act. For that reason, the principle enunciated in the Bill for closing those loopholes is not opposed by the Opposition.

Whether any tax legislation designed to place the responsibility to pay pay-roll tax on those who should be paying it is successful or not, is another matter. Honorable members are aware that when Parliament approves amendments to close loopholes in tax legislation, it is only a matter of time before those interested find another loophole. I believe this will be the case with this measure, which is not opposed.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) : The Country Party supports the proposed amendments to the Pay-roll Tax Act. It does so with some trepidation because of the wide discretion being given to the Commissioner of Pay-roll Tax. The Treasurer has stated that this is perhaps the only practical and effective way to achieve the desired results, and I am inclined to agree with him. However, it is a dangerous precedent and one which I predict will cause bitterness following some of the decisions which the Commissioner of Pay-roll Tax will be forced to make.

I take issue with the Leader of the Opposition in his statement that the measure will bring into the net some very big companies which are avoiding pay-roll tax. It will bring into the net some of those companies but I suggest that the greatest effect will be on the smaller companies which have fairly easily broken up their operations into two or three organizations. This has occurred because the pay-roll tax exemption figure of $20,800 was set fifteen or sixteen years ago. A business becomes subject to pay-roll tax when its annual pay-roll exceeds $20,800. When the pay-roll of a small business reaches that figure, it is a simple matter to place its employees under the cloak of two companies and thus avoid the payment of pay-roll tax.

The Treasurer will be pleasantly surprised, and business generally will receive an unpleasant shock, as this measure will raise far more revenue than the honorable gentleman has predicted. It will have two effects. It will catch people who have taken steps to organize their affairs in recent times to avoid the payment of pay-roll tax. It will also have the unexpected effect of applying to partnerships and private companies which have not sought to avoid the payment of pay-roll tax over the years by establishing separate organizations under the same basic control. My prediction is that many of those organizations will be caught in the net ; perhaps the Treasurer and those companies and partnerships have not thought of that occurring. However, it will occur and when it does it will cause tremendous bitterness in the business community.

Five additional minor matters are covered in the measure and the Country Party is of the view that those provisions could be debated during the Committee stage.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 8154 ss. 3, 9, 11 and 12).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : The Leader of the Country Party made an observation about firms which may be brought into the pay-roll tax net from the operation of this measure when it becomes law. He is correct in one way, as there certainly are some firms and companies which, for many years, have operated in a divided fashion for reasons of their own. It may have been for some other taxation purpose that they have split their operations into a number of facets, and up to date they have been entitled to a separate pay-roll tax exemption for each facet. Now they are to be grouped together, and the only way they will have of avoiding pay-roll tax in future will be to convince the Commissioner of Pay-roll Tax that what they did in the past was not for the purpose of avoiding the payment of pay-roll tax.

The commissioner will have to examine the circumstances carefully. He does have this discretion, and it is up to him to exercise it in a sensible and common-sense way. Where there has been no attempts in the past to avoid the payment of pay-roll tax, I am sure he will exercise his discretion in a proper manner.

Other means were considered during the drafting of this Bill. Discussions took place with Parliamentary Counsel and Treasury officers of the various States, and it was thought that this was the only suitable way of dealing with the cases which have arisen.

I recognize the import of what the Leader of the Country Party says—that there may be cases where there will be argument about the matter—but for the reasons I have given this is the only way in which the Government can deal with those cases and still bring within the ambit of the Act those persons or companies which were entitled to an exemption in the first place. Although I agree that what the Leader of the Country Party says may be correct, I assure him that the Treasury will ensure that the commissioner does exercise his discretion with due regard to the real intentions of taxpayers as evidenced by their habits, records and history.

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.

STATUS OF CHILDREN BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 16) on the motion of Mr. Wilcox (Attorney-General) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) : The Country Party supports this Bill, the purpose of which is to remove the legal disability that has applied to children born out of wedlock. The measure is long overdue. As was said by the Attorney-General, it is not the fault of the child that this set of circumstances has arisen, and therefore the problems of the child should not be added to because of the legal consequences which may follow.

I disagree with the comments of the honorable member for Melbourne on the back-dating of a will where provision has been made for illegitimate children in that will. I suggest, and I am sure the Attorney-General will agree with me, that the provisions of a will should prevail if it is made prior to the passing of this measure. It is a practice of law that if a man makes a will after receiving the best and correct legal advice, it is wrong for Parliament to pass an Act which will have the effect of frustrating his intentions. If a

person who makes a will wants to include illegitimate children, he may do so.

It may interest honorable members to know that in the past, because of the application of the common law, the illegitimate children of a person who has not made a will have not always missed out on a share of the deceased's estate. This is now being put into legislative form. I know from experience over the years that illegitimate children who have been proved to be the children of a deceased male have shared the benefits of the estate where there has been intestacy.

I am a little disturbed at the clause which provides that, when a person leaves his assets to his legitimate children, illegitimate children are now included. I hope the legal profession generally becomes aware of this provision. I ask the Attorney-General to make a particular point of bringing this matter to the attention of the law institute because if the term "illegitimate children" is used without knowledge of this, the ordinary person, although intending to mean particular children, would be including others. A person who had illegitimate and legitimate children would most probably name them in the will and have the common sense to name the mother and state whether the children were legitimate. This proposed legislation is long overdue.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas): This Bill puts into effect in Victoria the resolution carried by the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women in April, 1970, which stated that there should be no discrimination against persons born out of wedlock in all matters of inheritance. The draftsmen will face considerable practical problems, particularly in the early stages, in implementing these wide-ranging provisions.

The honorable member for Melbourne referred to the desirability of retrospective operation of this proposed legislation. The arguments posed by the honorable member have some attraction, particularly as wills at present executed may not be put into operation for some years, perhaps not until early in the next century. The situation will pertain that the legislation will not apply to wills executed prior to the enactment of this Bill, but will apply if the will is made a day after its proclamation.

The Leader of the Country Party advanced the proposition that a person making a will may be given legal advice on the operation of that will, and is entitled to rely on the advice. With due respect to the honorable member for Melbourne, I submit that that situation must pertain. It leads to the anomaly, however, which I believe the honorable member has pointed out, that under clause 4(3), if a person dies intestate prior to the operation of the Bill the provisions of the previous law will apply.

The situation could occur that, a person makes a will prior to this Bill coming into effect and dies after it has been proclaimed, as a result of which there is partial intestacy; under clause 4 the Act applies to the partial intestacy. In other words, section 4 brings in the illegitimate children but the Act does not apply to the operative parts of the will which were made before the Act came into effect. That is a problem which, as long as it is recognized, can perhaps be dealt with to some extent.

Clause 3 (1) provides—

> For all the purposes of the law of Victoria the relationship between every person and his father and mother shall be determined irrespective of whether the father and mother are or have been married to each other and all other relationships shall be determined accordingly.

That is the basic operative provision, and the provision that all honorable members should welcome. This will be an Act for public policy. To some extent it makes the father of the illegitimate child recognize his obligation. All honorable members would agree with that and

would agree that it should be difficult, if not impossible, for a testator in that position to opt out of his obligations.

However, the last words of the clause make it clear that the provision regarding intestacy will apply to all cases. A grandparent providing for his grandchildren will also be caught by these provisions; in other words his son's illegitimate children will be covered by this clause. The same provision will apply to an uncle making provision for his nephews: I believe too high an onus is being placed on the classes of testators who are not the parents of the illegitimate child. It is therefore difficult for the actual intention of those people to be put into effect.

Let us consider the situation of the little old lady who goes to her solicitor for instructions regarding her will. She says, "I want to leave certain assets to my son and certain assets to his children". The solicitor has to ask, "Do you include your son's illegitimate children"? In many cases that is a good way of losing clients, but it is a situation which would have to be faced. It should be relatively easy for people, apart from the father of illegitimate children, to opt out of the Act by a simple memorandum that the provisions of the Status of Children Act 1974 shall not apply to the will. Because this is an Act of public policy, that will not be possible in the case of a testator but in the case of non-parent testators it should be possible. It is something that the legal profession must become used to. I shall reserve my further comments until the Committee stage.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Interpretation).

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I thank honorable members who have spoken for their comments. It is clear that they believe this Bill is necessary to overcome any discrimination that may exist regarding illegitimate children.

The honorable member for Dundas and the Leader of the Country Party raised practical questions from their own considerable experience in practice of the law, and I certainly take note of what they have said. I will make every effort to ensure that the profession is notified through the *Law Institute Journal*. However, even if that is done, some problems will arise with individual testators and clients. As the honorable member for Dundas has said, it would be a brave solicitor and perhaps a foolish one who would say to his old lady client, "Have you considered the position of your son's illegitimate children"?

It is one of the practical facts of life that people who are concerned only with achieving social justice and doing good—the Government has introduced this Bill in complete good faith—may create a little evil on the way through. This must be guarded against. I take note of what has been said. It should be well within the abilities of the legal profession to meet that sort of situation.

The clause was agreed to, as was clause 3.

Clause 4 (Instruments executed before commencement).

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): I move—

Clause 4, sub-section (1), line 12, omit "executed" and insert "with the exception of wills as provided in sub-section (2) of section 4, executed and in force."

The Opposition takes the view, as was indicated earlier by the honorable member for Dundas, that the Status of Children Act ought to apply prospectively to all persons who die after the passage of the Bill, irrespective of the date of the execution of their will.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: The honorable member for Dundas did not say that.

Mr. JONES: The question was referred to by him.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: He did not agree with it.

Mr. JONES: I did not say that. The Opposition takes the view that as a general matter of public policy people who wish to disregard the application of the law ought to have an obligation to contract out of it. The Opposition believes the obligation ought to be on people who wish to contract out of the law and the law ought to apply prospectively. The most relevant factor is not the date of execution of the will but the date of death because that is when distribution of the estate is effected.

Many honorable members and perhaps you yourself. Mr. Chairman might have executed wills early in youth or immediately after marriage before the birth of any children. Many people leave their wills in that situation. My colleagues and I recognize the force of the general argument about the law. We know that the provisions of the New Zealand Act on which the Victorian legislation is strongly based maintains the same position as does this Bill. Nevertheless, we take the view that the people who do not wish illegitimate children to be included ought to change their wills. I refer to the general provision which simply says, "to my children". Of course, where children are specifically named—"to my sons, Bill, Tom or Fred"—and there is no other reference, the situation does not apply. It is possible that the number of wills which involve families of illegitimate children could be very considerable.

Recently I estimated that in Victoria something of the order of 600,000 wills could be in existence. Practitioners to whom I have spoken consider that that figure might be conservative. It is true that under the Liberal Government ex-nuptial births have been lower in Victoria than in the other States, although they are significantly higher than the Australian Capital Territory. In the 1960s the figure ranged from 5·93 per cent in 1968 to 6·96 per cent in 1972. It is true that a number of those children would have been adopted or legitimated, but it is reasonable to assume that the number of illegitimate children not otherwise provided for might conceivably be 2 per cent or 3 per cent. If the figure of 2 per cent or 3 per cent is correct, between 12,000 and 18,000 wills could be involved.

Clause 3 (2) states—

> The rule of construction whereby in any instrument, in the absence of expression of any intention to the contrary, words of relationship signify only legitimate relationship is abolished.

Those brave words exclude every will at present drawn in Victoria. I believe that, to incorporate the provisions of the Act, every existing will would have to be redrawn. I cite a hypothetical example of twin brothers, both married, and both with children by their wives and by women other than their wives. One brother makes his will in October, 1974, before the passage of the Bill, and the other in December, 1974, after its passage. Each will simply provides that estates are left to "my children". Both brothers die thirty years later, and the effect of their wills is entirely different. It is hard to consider that this is rational.

The Opposition believes this is an anomaly which should be corrected. In an estate where there is an intestacy, of course, in that case illegitimate children will take. Where there is a valid will with a partial intestacy, the estate covered by the will goes to the legitimate children. The remainder could go to all children, legitimate or otherwise. Members of the Opposition regard that as an anomaly and we consider the House should have an opportunity of resolving it.

The Committee divided on the question that the word proposed by Mr. Jones to be omitted stand part of the clause (Mr. McLaren in the chair)—

Ayes	..	49
Noes	..	17
Majority against the amendment	..	32

AYES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Meagher
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Baxter	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Billing	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Reese
Mr. Burgin	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Chamberlain	Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Guy	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Hamer	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Hann	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Jona	Mr. Vale
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Whiting
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. McClure	Mr. Wiltshire
Mr. MacDonald	Mr. Wood
Mr. McInnes	*Tellers:*
Mr. McKellar	Mr. Ebery
Mr. Maclellan	Mrs. Goble

NOES.

Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Roper
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Doube	Mr. Stirling
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Fogarty	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Holding	*Tellers:*
Mr. Jones	Mr. Amos
Mr. Lind	Mr. Kirkwood

PAIRS.

Mr. Lacy	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Williams	Mr. Ginifer

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): I move—

Clause 4, line 15, insert the following sub-section to follow sub-section (1):—

"( ) This Act shall apply in the case of all testators who shall die after the passage of this Act, irrespective of the date of the will."

I will not repeat my previous argument because it seems to me that this amendment really restates the general principles that I enunciated when dealing with my first amendment. The Opposition leaves it at that.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The Government cannot accept this amendment. The reasons have been stated by the honorable member for Dundas and the Leader of the Country Party, who made it clear that in the context of the Bill the only sensible approach is for a will to be governed by the law which applies when it is executed. That is the point. As to the suggestion that a new will should be made, the problem arises of all the wills that have been in existence for years before a testator dies. That could create problems which would not work in the best interests of the situation.

The amendment was negatived, and the clause was agreed to, as was clause 5.

Clause 6 (Protection of executors, administrators, and trustees).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas): This clause is very important because of the wide nature of the Bill. Trustees would be placed in an invidious position if this protection were not afforded to them. In fact, people would be advised not to accept the job. The present protection in section 33 of the Trustee Act, if complied with in relation to advertisements, is fairly extensive, but usually it is only in the larger estates that the executor would go to that expense. This clause provides that protection without the expense of advertising for claims against the estate which, even in a small estate, could cost $20 to $30, an amount which might be out of proportion to the value of the estate. I welcome the provision as a necessary supplement to the protection given under section 33 of the Trustee Act.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 7 to 10.

Clause 11 (Regulations).

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): The Opposition believes this clause ought to be amended to provide specifically for a fee not exceeding $4 to be

charged for the lodging of documents under clause 8 (2). Accordingly, I move—

Clause 11, line 24, omit paragraph (*b*) and insert the following—

"(*b*) Fees not exceeding $4 to be charged under sub-section (2) of section 8 of this Act; ".

It is difficult to see what fees other than those referred to in clause 8 (2) could be envisaged. That sub-clause reads—

An instrument signed by the mother of a child and by any person acknowledging that he is the father of the child shall, if executed as a deed or by each of those persons in the presence of a solicitor, be *prima facie* evidence that the person named as the father is the father of the child.

Presumably, the document referred to will be deposited with the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages. The Opposition believes fees ought to be determined by Parliament. As a matter of public policy, it is not enthusiastic about having the fees to be charged simply left in the hands of the Administration without further reference to Parliament.

The fee referred to in the amendment appears to be the only fee that could be charged under the Act, but if the Government envisages additional fees, they should be spelt out somewhere in the legislation. The present fee for the lodging of deed polls, for example, to effect a change in name, is $4, and the Opposition suggests that the fee for the lodging of the instrument referred to in clause 8 (2) should not exceed this amount. If other fees are proposed to be charged, they ought to be specified.

It is suggested that before this process takes place searches will have to be made of birth and death certificates. These fees are obviously covered by the ordinary fee structure for people who undertake searches under the existing legislation, and therefore those fees would not be affected by this measure.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The Government does not accept the amendment although the honorable member has pointed out that there does not appear to be very many fees which could be chargeable under this measure. I understand the honorable member's argument that where fees are to be levied the matter should not be left to the Governor in Council but should be a matter for Parliament. As the measure is breaking new ground it would be unwise to amend the clause as suggested by the honorable member because the Government wants the legislation to work with a minimum of fuss and nonsense, and the clause as drafted will help this situation.

The Committee divided on the question that the paragraph proposed by Mr. Jones to be omitted stand part of the clause (Mr. McLaren in the chair)—

Ayes	..	42
Noes	..	25
Majority against the amendment	..	17

AYES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Billing	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Reese
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Burgin	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Chamberlain	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Smith
Mr. Dixon	(*Bellarine*)
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Smith
Mr. Evans	(*Warrnambool*)
(*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Guy	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Hamer	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Jona	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Vale
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. McClure	Mr. Wiltshire
Mr. MacDonald	Mr. Wood
Mr. McKellar	*Tellers:*
Mr. Maclellan	Mr. Ebery
Mr. Meagher	Mrs. Goble

NOES.

Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Roper
Mr. Doube	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Evans	Mr. Stirling
(*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Fogarty	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Hann	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Holding	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Jones	
Mr. Kirkwood	*Tellers:*
Mr. Lind	Mr. Amos
Mr. McInnes	Mr. Baxter

PAIRS.

Mr. Lacy	Mr. Ginifer
Mr. Williams	Mr. Mutton

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

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

The sitting was suspended at 6.27 *p.m. until* 8.17 *p.m.*

WATER SUPPLY WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

For **Mr. DUNSTAN** (Minister of Public Works), Mr. Meagher (Minister of Transport) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the Water Supply Works and Services Bill.

For **Mr. DUNSTAN** (Minister of Public Works), Mr. Meagher (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to authorize expenditure on works and services and other purposes relating to irrigation, water supply, drainage, sewerage, flood protection and river improvement and other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS (CONTINUATION) BILL.

For **Mr. HAMER** (Premier and Treasurer), Mr. Thompson (Minister of Education) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the Educational Grants (Continuation) Bill.

For **Mr. HAMER** (Premier and Treasurer), Mr. Thompson (Minister of Education) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Educational Grants Act 1973.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT (CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 16) on the motion of Mr. Meagher (Minister of Transport) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): This Bill, among other things, repeals the Metropolitan Transportation Committee Act 1963. That Act purported to establish a powerful committee which would co-ordinate transportation for the whole metropolitan district of Melbourne. The committee could be fairly described as a Cabinet of Barons. The Minister of Transport was the chairman and the Minister for Local Government was a member. The other members were the Chairman of the Victorian Railways Board, the Chairman of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board, the Chairman of the Transport Regulation Board, the Chairman of the Country Roads Board, the Chairman of the Road Safety and Traffic Authority, the Chairman of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the Chief Planner of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, a Melbourne city councillor, the State Director of Finance and the Director of Transport.

One would have expected much from such a galaxy of talent, concentrated in the most powerful figures in the State, and presided over by one of the most powerful Ministers. The committee was established in 1963. The Minister of Transport, in his second-reading speech on the Metropolitan Transportation Committee

Bill on 26th March, 1963, voiced all sorts of brave hopes for the committee. The Minister was strongly supported by the then Labor spokesman, Mr. Denis Lovegrove, who also hoped for great things from the committee. It is fair to say that those brave hopes were not fulfilled.

A couple of mistakes were made. One mistake, perhaps, was the replacement of the Minister of Transport by the present Attorney-General. I do not believe that change was necessarily in the interests of transport in Victoria. Many of the hopes and aspirations that the Minister had expressed in 1963 were shunted aside, if I may use a railway metaphor, in the five or six years of hiatus in between. However, it is now proposed to abolish the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. The committee has not done any effective work since 1963. Although it may have met as recently as 1973—the Minister tells me it has in fact met as recently as a fortnight ago—I understand it has not met regularly since 1969.

Mr. MEAGHER: It has.

Mr. JONES: The Minister will undoubtedly correct me later. It is proposed to establish a series of consultative committees. The committees will be set up for the metropolitan area and power will be created for the establishment of consultative committees in other areas of the State. The Bill provides that the persons appointed to be members of any such committee shall include persons experienced in planning and local government and persons involved in the provision and use of transport services and facilities.

The Opposition is glad to see that planners will be involved. I assume that there will be ample representation of private bus operators and private transport operators as well as of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board and of the Victorian Railways. However, the Bill makes no specific provision for representation by the trade union movement. The trade union movement is not excluded by proposed section 11 (2) but the Opposition is concerned, particularly in the case of the local transportation groups, that there may be domination by small local pressure groups.

The whole point of this Bill is to provide a clear over-all view of the future of transport in Victoria. Many mistakes have been made over a long period. Between approximately 1956 and 1970 the railways were kept on a starvation budget. That was before Mr. Jones became Commonwealth Minister for Transport. It should be pointed out that in the period of the Bolte Government a suggestion was made to the then Liberal Federal Government that it might take over the railways. I do not intend to canvass that issue at length now; I merely say that it is impossible to plan the future of transportation in this State without paying due attention to the continuing and growing role of the Commonwealth Government. One would like to hear from the Minister what relationship these consultative committees will have to the Commonwealth. Will these committees themselves confer with Commonwealth Government authorities or will all consultation take place simply at a Ministerial level? Will consultation take place directly between the consultative committees and their supporting staff and the Commonwealth Ministry of Transport? It is important that honorable members should know the answer to that question.

The Opposition would be grateful for an assurance from the Minister that some acknowledgment will be made of the role of the trade union movement. Many thousands of members of transport unions are involved directly or indirectly with the provision of transport in Victoria—members of the Australian Railways Union, tramways union, the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen, the Vehicles Builders Union and a number of members of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union who are associated directly; for example, employees of the railways union and the tramways union working within the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. It is important

that when the Minister chooses the persons who will comprise these all-important consultative committees which will have such an important role, we hope, in planning the future of transport in this State, he will ensure that the trade union movement will be consulted. The Commonwealth Government also will inevitably have to be involved.

The Australian Government will necessarily be involved financially, and I suggest that it will probably have to be involved in organization. There has been a great deal of breast beating within the Victorian Government over the issue of States' rights. It is important that the Australian Government ought to be consulted and ought to be involved in planning, not for the greater glory of Canberra or for the denigration of Victoria or of the Victorian Government, but simply because of its relationship. I do not believe any member of this House, no matter how determined he may be on the question of States' rights, believes that the tendency towards increasing financial control by Canberra, irrespective of which party is in power, will be reversed.

There has been an enormous degree of uncertainty in the area of transport, particularly over the question of freeways. The Metropolitan Transportation Committee, of unhappy memory, brought in recommendations for, or proposed, approximately 307 miles of freeway. Now, for political and related reasons, that proposed length of freeway has been altered drastically, but there is still considerable doubt about what is going to happen about freeways, especially as they impinge on the inner-city areas, and particularly Freeway F2. Many complaints come to me and to other honorable members about the future of Freeway F19.

I appreciate the Minister's desire to get these consultative committees set up briskly. The Opposition is certainly in favour of passing this measure and having those committees set up as soon as possible. But I ask the Minister to ensure that the uncertainty about the future role of freeways in the inner-city area is resolved at the earliest possible time.

I hope there will be a greater degree of democratic participation in the decision-making process. The various authorities on the Metropolitan Transportation Committee were not subject much to the democratic process. Of course the Minister is subject to the democratic process, as is the Minister for Local Government, but it can hardly be said that the Chairman of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is subject to the democratic process. He is very much a power in the land. Members of the Government party are aware of the fact that the Board of Works is the most important body in this State next to the State Parliament.

Mr. BILLING: What about the Melbourne City Council?

Mr. JONES: It is far more important than the Melbourne City Council, but the members of it are elected indirectly. No one ever cast a vote at a council election having in mind that the way he voted would ultimately determine the election of commissioners of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. The enormous power—sometimes the ruthless power—of that organization has not been subject to democratic control, and there is a kind of stand-off relationship between the Board of Works and the State Government. Although there has been considerable talk, and there was considerable talk in 1972 and 1973, about the possibility of restructuring the Board of Works along more democratic lines, nothing has happened as a result. But at least the Board of Works is not to be represented directly on the consultative committee for the metropolitan area. Members of the Opposition regard that as a desirable step.

We also notice that the Country Roads Board is not to be directly or explicitly represented as it was

on the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. However, I ask that the Minister, when he is setting up these committees, will have some regard to the views of local interest groups, that he will have some regard, for example, to the views of some of the anti-freeway groups. I am not saying that the view they express has to be decisive; I am saying that it is a view that ought to be taken into consideration. I hope that the planners will not just be technocrats but that they will include people with sociological experience and insight so that they are seriously concerned not only with planning in the technical sense but are also with the environmental impact of the proposed freeway and other plans.

Most of all, members of the Opposition are extremely concerned that there ought to be a heavy emphasis on the great public transport instrumentalies in this State—the Victorian Railways and the tramways. I support the views of the Minister on the Tramways Board. I think the Federal Minister was premature in his suggestion that there ought to be an overhead way replacing the tramways. If there was no network of trams throughout the metropolitan area and one were prepared to start from scratch, there would be a lot to be said for the views of the Federal Minister for Transport. But of course that is not the case. Melbourne has a metropolitan tramway system working extremely well, and it is a system which we believe should be extended, in part. We also consider that it should be protected and that the livelihood of the people working within it ought to be protected. So members of the Labor Party propose to vote in favour of this Bill.

We hope it will be more successful than its unfortunate predecessor, the Metropolitan Transportation Committee Act, and we hope the Minister will make sure that there is a continuing emphasis on the needs of public transport. The time is coming when there will have to be drastic curtailment of the right of private transport within the metropolitan area and in particular, during ordinary working hours, there will have to be some curtailment of the number of commuter cars coming and going. When one thinks that the average modest sized motor car covers a surface area fourteen times the area of its driver it seems the height of absurdity that a commuter drives into the city, leaves his expensive vehicle in the one spot for a period of eight hours on some of the most valuable real estate in the whole of the metropolitan area, and then after eight hours picks it up and makes his way home.

Mr. BILLING: After having paid.

Mr. JONES: Admittedly, having to pay a fee and contributing to the revenue of the Melbourne City Council. It is an absurd waste of resources on the part of the motorist and of city space.

In reply to the disorderly interjection of the honorable member for Preston, I do not regard myself as a commuter, because if I were a commuter, that is to say, if I left home at an invariable time each day and went to one spot in town and remained there for the whole of the working day, I would travel by public transport.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: It is always right for somebody else.

Mr. JONES: I concede that there is an element of hypocrisy in it. There is a different situation where one conducts a series of transactions in the course of the day. If I were, say, a commercial traveller—as I suppose in a political sense I probably am—it would be obviously absurd to carry out my functions purely by tram, much as I would like to.

Mr. MEAGHER: It would be interesting.

Mr. JONES: It would be an interesting way to do it. If the House sat more regular hours and if we could be absolutely certain that we

would leave this place at a time when public transport was still operating——

Mr. WHITING: And there were not such long speeches!

Mr. JONES: And there were considerably shorter speeches, I would use public transport a good deal more. In fact, I do use public transport a great deal. But those of us who are practising to be Ministers in the future appreciate that it would be impossible for a Minister to give up the perquisites of office. It is true that the Chief Secretary followed the example of the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation and used a velocipede at one stage last year, but we have produced a society which is very much addicted to the motor car, and I regret it. In the United States and in Canada there are progressive disincentives for people taking their cars into the inner-metropolitan area. I was very much impressed by what I saw in Toronto last year where imaginative use has been made of pedestrian streets—much more imaginative than the tentative attempts made by the Melbourne City Council last year.

I hope the new consultative committees will have as their No. 1 priority an examination of the role of the private motor car and the role of the commuter who drives himself each day to and from work, who leaves his car in effect unattended through an eight-hour stretch without any involved tasks to be carried out. This is one of the first tasks that need to be looked at. The Labor Party welcomes the abolition of the former Metropolitan Transportation Committee Act. We hope this legislation will be considerably more successful. The Opposition will vote for the Bill.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): One did not need to be gifted with extra-sensory perception to forecast that the Labor Party would support this Bill because its members, and it seems the Government, love nothing more than setting up new committees, new authorities, new councils, more and more chiefs and fewer and fewer Indians. The stage is rapidly being reached when there will be far too many chiefs and not enough Indians doing the work that needs to be done.

This Bill is a complete waste of time; it is nothing more than sheer window-dressing, because the Minister has not given any explanation of the sort of functions that the proposed committees will be expected to carry out. It seems to me that little could be expected from the committees in the long run in any case.

The honorable member for Melbourne made much of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, but can he say that the committee representing the metropolitan region will not be composed of the same or almost the same people who at present constitute the Metropolitan Transportation Committee? There does not seem to be any provision in the Bill to indicate specifically where these people are to come from. Neither the Minister nor the honorable member for Melbourne referred to the special transportation difficulties of people living in the country. It is apparent that all their thoughts are completely dominated by the state of affairs that exists in the metropolitan area.

One's mind boggles at the huge amounts of money which are said to be required to solve the public transport problems of this city. The underground railway is expected to cost a sum approaching $200 million.

The extension of the role of the metropolitan railways to serve Doncaster and Templestowe at a cost of another $80 million is being considered. A large share of road funds involving vast sums is spent in the metropolitan area. Metropolitan railway services lose enormous sums of money. This year the deficit will approach $100 million and next year it will probably be more. Most of this is lost in the metropolitan area.

When will people wake up to what a tremendous financial burden the metropolitan area is to the State?

Honorable members interjecting.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: It is evident from the reactions of country and metropolitan members on the Government benches that there is a difference of opinion among them. If the honorable member for Sandringham and his colleagues who are truly city members of the Liberal Party objectively examine the Budget, they will understand just where the money goes and how much the metropolitan area costs the State.

The honorable member is displaying his knowledge of current affairs and advising me to think big. The Liberal Party thinks big in the sense that it wants Melbourne to become bigger than Sydney, and its members do not care how they bring that about. They encourage the growth of Melbourne and will do so until it encompasses the whole of the Westernport and Port Phillip areas and overwhelm Geelong so that Victoria has the biggest city in Australia.

I would be interested to hear the honorable member for Sandringham analyse the Budget. Obviously, he has never considered railway losses in the metropolitan area. Equally, he does not know of the proportion of road funds spent in the metropolitan area and other Government expenditure to create employment in the metropolitan area. The honorable member might be interested to know that the answer to a question I asked recently showed that of 150 Country Regulation Board employees who were dismissed in recent months, not one worked in the metropolitan area. People working in the country are expendable, but the employment of those in the metropolitan area is sacrosanct.

The Country Party will not oppose the Bill. The measure is not worth opposing; it is a complete non-event. The consultative committees will do no good, but neither will they do any harm. The honorable member for Melbourne spoke about what he called democratic participation of people in transportation. He referred to the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board, and the Victorian Railways as bodies which should be represented on consultative committees.

Mr. JONES: No, the unions concerned.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: Perhaps I should argue that the Dairy Farmers Association, the Victorian Farmers Union, the Graziers Association and the Sawmillers Association should be represented.

Mr. JONES: Of course they should be on the local consultative committees.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: I am delighted to hear the interjection of the honorable member for Melbourne. I am sure he will support an amendment which the Country Party will move during the Committee stage. It will provide that members of the committees shall be resident in the regions they represent. If that amendment is adopted, the local people will be represented on the committees. What is more important is whether the Government will take any notice of them. The Government sets up committees and authorities of all kinds and uses them merely as a means to avoid its own responsibility. It is high time that Governments in this country comprised Ministers who are prepared to make and stand by decisions instead of setting up committees and abrogating their responsibilities.

Today the honorable member for Morwell raised the question of the environment. The Government set up committees and then washed its hands of them. The Government ignores the decisions of committees if they are not in accord with what it wants. This could be the ultimate fate of the consultative committees. If they are established by the Government, it is likely that they will be influenced by the views of

the Government. If the committees make recommendations which do not suit the Government, the Government has no obligation to accept them. But the setting up of the committees will allow the Government to avoid its responsibilities. It will tell people to blame not the Government but the consultative committee concerned which did not make the right recommendation.

The people of the State are represented by members of this House who should be able to put forward the people's views. If they do not, they are not doing their job. Over the years the Government has had good advice from honorable members on the transport situation. In particular, members of the corner party have put forward sound, sensible, and logical suggestions on how to deal with the transport problems of Victoria, but they have been ignored. Can any different result be expected if consultative committees make similar recommendations?

Mr. CURNOW: Not while this Government is in power.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: It does not matter much which Government is in power. If the Government is not prepared to decide what should be done and do it, consultative committees will make no difference. It is essentially a matter of having Ministers who know what is needed and who take the necessary action, instead of continually passing the buck to subordinate committees which they appoint but of which they take no notice if they do not like their recommendations.

As I have indicated, the Country Party will not vote against this Bill. It is a non-event, but perhaps it could be improved by a small amendment.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): The Government has decided to do away with the Metropolitan Transportation Committee and establish in its place what it calls regional consultative committees. I am concerned with the question of public transport as opposed to private transport. Private transport operates in two ways. There are private bus operators and private motorists, and both impose certain demands on the State's resources. Public transport is transport operated by statutory authorities such as the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board and the Victorian Railways.

Mr. CRELLIN: Do you not consider privately-operated buses to be public transport?

Mr. WILTON: In answer to the disorderly interjection of the honorable member for Sandringham, I point out that private bus operators operate at their own convenience. When a route becomes unprofitable, the operator scraps it without warning to the general public. A classic example occurred when Lancefield and Romsey were in the electorate I represented. A privately operated bus ran from Lancefield to the Clarkefield railway station. When the route became unprofitable, without warning to the public or the Transport Regulation Board, the operator withdrew the service.

The Transport Regulation Board could not take punitive action against him or force him to continue the service. The decision was a purely economic one; the community was ignored. There was no other transport in the area yet the service was stopped overnight. When the Transport Regulation Board was made aware of the fact, the officers concerned did everything they could to help the community but for some time there was no transport in the area. So the specific answer to the interjection is that I do not regard privately-operated buses as public transport.

Mr. CRELLIN: Will you repeat that outside?

Mr. WILTON: I will repeat it anywhere, here or outside. I have been concerned for a number of years about the situation in which the railways find themselves under this Government. It is pointless for

the Parliament to enact legislation setting up consultative committees which will bring forward plans and ideas unless the authorities concerned are provided with the finance they need. The Minister cannot deny that from 1956 to 1972 the Government starved the Victorian Railways of funds to such an extent that the railways were unable to update their services or replace worn-out rolling-stock. That is history and it is all on the record for those who take the trouble of doing a bit of research.

The Government has tried all sorts of schemes. The equalization scheme was tried for a while, and the former Premier decided that he wanted to use the fund for other purposes. He introduced the legislation and then scrapped it. Now the transportation committee is supposed to be the answer to the problems. When the Metropolitan Transportation Committee of 1963 was established Ministers made speeches on what they were going to do. They commissioned a consultative body from overseas to undertake a detailed study. Motorists were stopped and asked where they were going, where they had come from and how many times they had travelled through a particular area. A detailed report was brought out at a cost of thousands of dollars. For a time, freeways were going to be the answer to all the traffic problems. The Government went mad about freeways; plans were prepared and millions of dollars were expended. But as time went on freeways proved to be a complete failure.

Every attempt this Government has made to improve public transport has resulted in abject failure because it has engaged in an exercise of window dressing. The Government has never been prepared to finance statutory authorities to carry out their obligations to the community.

The Government has referred to decentralization and growth areas. Public transport is the key to all these plans. It is ridiculous that no electrified service is provided to cities such as Geelong, Ballarat, Bendigo, Seymour, and Wodonga. There should already be in existence an electrified system connecting these cities, but honorable members have become accustomed to that usual old cry from the Government, "What is it going to cost?" That is all the Government can harp on. It has never had an original thought in its life. Now this Bill is proposed to replace the transportation committee with some consultative committees. Who are these consultative committees to consist of? People selected by the Minister. Members of the Opposition will be interested to learn what the Minister does.

In the metropolitan area the suburbs are still suffering from the heavy burden of financial starvation that they have had to carry for eighteen years. In my electorate areas are in urgent need of public transport; they have to put up with a second-class private bus system operating on a basis that if an economic profit can be made they are interested, but when it becomes uneconomic they are not interested. There is nothing the Government can do to force these operators to continue services. They can withdraw their services at any time they like and there is no way that the Transport Regulations Board can force them to operate unprofitable routes.

One has only to study the development of the outer-suburban areas of Melbourne to realize what the community in those suburbs have had to put up with over the years. Representations have been made by members representing those areas. It is all on the record for anyone who would like to do a bit of homework. The significance of this argument is that unless finance is provided to the community to expend on public transport systems, this proposed legislation, as with other legislation already enacted, will be merely a piece of window dressing and a lot of verbiage that has no substance.

Mr. CRELLIN (Sandringham): They can make as many noises as they like.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I suggest to the honorable member for Sandringham that he does not refer to the Opposition as "they", but as "honorable members".

Mr. CRELLIN: Honorable members of the Opposition may make as much noise as they like.

Mr. EDMUNDS: We do not have the numbers.

Mr. CRELLIN: It is a pity they do not know what they are talking about. It is one of the problems which those of us who have had some experience in the transport system have to put with. The fact that honorable members have been in local councils, progress associations, members of the Opposition—call it what one likes—does not mean that they are experts. Everyone of them is an "expert" on transport.

The Ministry of Transport is now trying to bring those who know something about transport—the operator—into the act. It should be placed on record, because every private bus operator in Victoria should know about it, that the honorable member for Broadmeadows, and other members of the Opposition do not consider these people are involved in the public transport industry of Victoria. Let that be placed on record. The House ought to reflect on the contribution made by the private enterprise sector of the public transport industry. The honorable member for Broadmeadows knows which one because the whole of the transport system in Geelong is operated by private enterprise, and so are the systems in Ballarat and Bendigo in addition to large services in areas of Melbourne. The experts in the other place—I think it is called Canberra—talk about transport. They cannot even run a public bus service in that city. This exercise brings into the whole process the operators, the men who are on the job and involved in planning and organizing public transport for the benefit of everyone. Who better than those who know about what is going on from day to day, and can make some comment on it? I remember the thinking behind this Bill, because in the second-reading speech the Minister talked about the co-ordinated approach to transport.

Mr. EDMUNDS: That is only jargon.

Mr. CRELLIN: I do not care if the honorable member thinks it is only jargon; it may well be fact. The honorable member for Broadmeadows talks about private operators withdrawing their services. One may well ask how many people in the area use the buses. That is what it is all about. If people do not use a public facility, be it private or public enterprise, it does not pay. That should be kept in mind. All private bus operators are controlled by the Transport Regulation Board, which is a Government instrumentality, whether the honorable member for Broadmeadows believes it or not. Their operations are inspected and regulated by a Government authority.

Mr. WILTON: If the operator withdraws his service, can he be made to carry on?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The honorable member for Broadmeadows has made his contribution. I ask him to listen in silence to the honorable member for Sandringham.

Mr. EDMUNDS: There is not a quorum on your side.

Mr. CRELLIN: It is nice to know there are some members on the Opposition side of the House to help us.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honorable member for Moonee Ponds is out of his place.

Mr. CRELLIN: The second-reading notes also refer to the broadening of this approach to the construction of an integrated transport policy which

will apply not just to the metropolitan area but will cover the whole State. I wonder whether the honorable member for Gippsland East belongs to Victoria or whether his area should join New South Wales. One would hope that although honorable members may have the privilege of representing the metropolitan area, their responsibility does not stop there. One would also hope that the member for Gippsland East does not allow his responsibility to stop at Bairnsdale. Members of this Parliament are responsible to make decisions not only for their own districts but for the whole State of Victoria.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: But you never go to other parts of the State to see what they think.

Mr. CRELLIN: The honorable member for Gippsland East knows that is not so. This Bill affects the whole of the State. There have been suggestions that it affects only the metropolitan area.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Where is that in the Bill?

Mr. CRELLIN: There is another interesting comment. The Minister, in his second-reading speech, talks about the provisions regarding representations on the committees having been framed in broad terms.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Knocking the Trades Hall again.

Mr. CRELLIN: One would hope the private bus industry and all other private transport operators are able to make some contribution, and one would also hope, if the Trades Hall Council has some contribution to make, it will make it in a constructive manner, not like some of the other things it gets involved in. In his second-reading speech the Minister went on to say that the best people have to be brought in.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Would that mean Dame Mabel Brookes?

Mr. CRELLIN: It might relate to those involved in the day-to-day operation of transport. The private bus industry in this State forms a very important part of public transport. It is interesting to note that the Broadmeadows electorate is well served by private bus operators but he does not believe they are part of the public transport system. It is interesting to hear the member for Geelong North say that his electorate has no transport.

Mr. TREZISE: There are no buses on a Sunday.

Mr. CRELLIN: The Bill refers to co-ordinated planning and I should like honorable members opposite to show more interest. However, the aim of the Bill is to achieve co-ordinated planning for transport and to ensure that balanced transport facilities are available to meet community needs properly. Members of the Opposition criticize the Government for withdrawing certain public transport services at certain times, but there is one simple point that they ought to keep in mind. That is, that if transport facilities are not used they cannot be provided.

Mr. TREZISE: If they do not make a profit.

Mr. CRELLIN: Do members of the Opposition expect private bus operators to provide services without making a profit?

Mr. TREZISE: Why run the trains they are running at a loss?

Mr. CRELLIN: All the bright people from Canberra come to Victoria to tell the Victorian Government how to operate its trains. The Federal Minister for Transport has done that recently, but, for example, he does not realize that in Queensland the trains run on a railway line gauge of 3 ft. 6 in. and in Victoria the gauge is 5 ft. 3 in. One day the bright people in Canberra will learn, if we wait long enough.

The Bill aims at involving more people in the transport planning process. If with those people who are already involved in an academic sense, we can involve those who are interested operationally, the mix can only be for the good. By having this in

mind the Government has taken a step forward for the good and I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston): After having listened to the honorable member for Sandringham pushing his barrow tonight, I find that his support for private bus operators is choking my throat because in the area I represent the private bus operators are most incompetent. If one talks about and reads the history of the Kingsbury area or the area in the vicinity of Plenty Road, which are serviced by private bus operators, one realizes what I mean. In those areas no bus services are provided after 6 p.m. on a week day or after noon on Saturdays and only three buses operate on a Sunday. What sort of service is that to assist the community to move from one point to another?

The private bus operators provide no service unless there is a profit in it for them. I do not mind the private bus operators making a profit provided that those who push their barrow tell the truth. If those honorable members who support private bus operators say that private bus services are the same as or equivalent to a State transport system, then I take exception. Buses operated by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board provide a service that is far better than that provided by private bus operators. That is recognized by all and sundry. In fact, in the area I represent, on occasions there is no service provided by the private operators.

The Bill proposes that a transportation committee that is already in existence shall become defunct because it cannot do the job envisaged for it by the Parliament. A new committee, if it can be called that, is to be appointed, but again trade unions will not be represented. If representatives of the trade unions were appointed there might be more common sense about the committee than there was about the previous committee. The honorable member for Melbourne expressed the point of view of members of the Opposition well. We are interested in the planning of transportation but we want transport to be provided across the board with no section being favoured by the Parliament or the Government. We do not want the private bus operator to be favoured at the expense of the public transport operator. The Bill will have something to offer if the suggestions made by the honorable member for Melbourne are acted upon by the Minister. There is no reason why the slack cannot be taken up by the Minister for the betterment of total transport planning in Victoria. However the pushing of the barrow, such as that which happened to-night, should not be tolerated and it may even rebound on the honorable member concerned.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (New Part III. inserted in No. 6322).

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): I shall reply briefly to some of the remarks on the Bill. The instant solutions provided for me so kindly by the honorable member for Broadmeadows will not solve the problem but I envy him in his ability to solve these problems with careless and rapturous regard for finance. However, such glories are denied me, and I pass on to the much more logical and quietly and sensibly put remarks of the honorable member for Melbourne.

The honorable member was in error at the outset of his remarks when he said that the Metropolitan Transportation Committee did not meet regularly. There was a time in which it did not meet very often, mainly because at that time the technical group attached to the committee was doing a great deal of work and the committee was awaiting the results of that work. In the past twelve months the committee has been meeting regularly and another meeting is to be held in a fortnight.

The honorable member for Melbourne also said that there is no specific provision for the Trades Hall Council to be represented on the consultative committees. The honorable member for Gippsland East also suggested that the Victorian Farmers Union should be represented. The Bill was deliberately framed in this way because I want the committee to know that in my view a committee which is representative of outside bodies is worse than useless. If I had my way I would never appoint a representative committee if I wanted a job done. I would pick the best men available regardless of where they came from or what organization they represented. Therefore, I reject the idea that there should be a specific reference to the type of origin of the people who are appointed to these committees.

I do not exclude representatives of the Trades Hall Council, the Victorian Farmers Union or any other organization, nor do I specifically include them. I know of a number of people whom I should be happy to appoint to do the various jobs provided that they can make a worthwhile contribution. In my opinion, that is the criterion that should be applied for the appointment of anyone to any of these consultative committees. I hope that is clearly understood by all members. It is not an attack on or a denigration of anyone ; it is a statement of intent. I am seeking to appoint committees that can offer advice backed up by knowledge and experience in the areas in which advice is being sought.

Mr. WILKES : The Minister should not go past Jackie Brown.

Mr. MEAGHER : I would be inclined to agree with that.

Mr. WHITING : Which Jackie Brown? The Country Party also has a Jack Brown.

Mr. MEAGHER : I refer to Mr. J. J. Brown of the Australian Railways Union, for whom I have a great deal of respect and whom I regard as a friend. The honorable member for Melbourne also referred to the need for a clear over-all view of the problems associated with transport. That is what I am seeking. It is not good enough—this has been proved to be so —to leave the planning of an integrated transport system to representatives of statutory bodies. The purpose of the Bill is to ensure that those representatives and others who serve on statutory bodies are included in the planning but have the assistance of people who do not represent statutory bodies. These will be people who have had experience in the hard world of having to make a living. This will qualify them as having something to contribute. I include representatives of municipalities and even representatives of the Victorian Farmers Union, if they can contribute something.

During his speech the honorable member for Melbourne made one provocative remark. I am sure he made it without malice, but I am equally sure that he wanted to provoke me He wanted to know what would be the direct relationship between the committees and the Commonwealth Government. I am happy to assure the honorable member that there will be no relationship because the purpose of these committees is to assist the Victorian Government in its policy of getting the best co-ordinated transport system that is achievable.

Therefore, in attempting to achieve that degree of co-ordination, I, as the responsible Minister, am seeking bodies of people who will report directly to me and help me to find that system of co-ordination. Any relationship between Victoria and the Commonwealth Government is a matter between the Commonwealth Minister and myself—not between the subsidiary bodies and my department.

The honorable member for Melbourne, and also the honorable member for Gippsland East, missed what I believe to be the real kernel of the Bill, which is that the technical group that previously has worked for the Metropolitan Transportation Committee becomes an integral part of

the Ministry of Transport and will be the technical body that will receive and assess all submissions from all the authorities within the Ministry of Transport. It will have the responsibility of checking those submissions and advising me, or the Minister whoever he might be, on how those submissions relate one to the other. In other words, before going to the planning authorities as such with propositions for transport, first of all the over-all needs of the transport scene will be properly coordinated by a group of technical people within the Ministry who will owe no allegiance to any one section of the transport industry but will be taking the over-all view of it. This is one of the most important provisions in the Bill.

The consultative committees will have something to contribute in the way of advice. One of the fields in which I envisage them contributing a great deal is in examining a proposal to close down a railway line or to make some other radical change in the system. A committee of this sort, with people in the main living in the area, who are knowledgeable about the particular region, is a much more appropriate body to which to refer such a proposition than an arbitrarily-selected arbitrator chosen by the Minister. If there is anything to be said for the virtues of participation by the people affected in making such decisions, this is one area in which there is a good deal to be said. Therefore, the purpose is to ensure that that is done.

I agree with the honorable members for Melbourne and Broadmeadows that there should be a great deal more emphasis on public transport, by which we mean not the interpretation of the honorable member for Broadmeadows but the generally accepted interpretation—the trams, the trains and so on. I agree that this is necessary, and as part of the process of achieving that we are making considerable advances in the provision of better facilities in these fields. Honorable members should know also that I have initiated a special independent consultant investigation into all aspects of private bus services to ascertain whether or not, and if so, how, these operations can be made more effective and give a better service. For the honorable member for Broadmeadows to attempt to persuade honorable members that by waving a legislative wand it is possible to get a private owner of a bus line to continue operating that line although he is bankrupt is living in the clouds.

Mr. WILTON: I said that one could not do it.

Mr. MEAGHER: That is so; nobody could do it. For the Government to take over the whole of the private bus operations of Victoria, as the honorable member presumably thinks the Government should——

Mr. WILTON: No, I do not presume that; you presume incorrectly.

Mr. MEAGHER: The honorable member does not want the Government to insist that the owner of a bus line should continue to operate until he is bankrupt, and he does not want the Government to take over the private bus lines. Presumably he does not want any bus services. However, that is beside the point. The survey that is being done will enable us to rationalize and improve the type of service given by private bus operations as part of the total transport scene. If it does that it will make a major contribution to solving the problems that exist. I hope the consultative committees to be set up under this Bill will themselves contribute further assistance in that direction.

The honorable member for Gippsland East chided me with being a Minister who refuses to make decisions and instead tries to fob off his responsibility on to committees.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: The whole Government does that—not just you.

Mr. MEAGHER: I suppose I have to accept my share of responsibility as a member of the Government. The honorable member cannot have it both ways. He cannot come along

here and make representations on behalf of the electorate of Gippsland East and assure us that we ought to have representatives of the Victorian Farmers Union, the local progress association and others participating in decisions and at the same time demand that I act like a dictator. The honorable member just cannot have it both ways.

Mr. B. J. EVANS : I did not suggest that you do it. I took up the remarks of the honorable member for Melbourne and said that I ought to be advocating the same thing, but I did not in fact advocate it.

Mr. MEAGHER : If I misunderstood the honorable member, I apologize. However, all his ranting about how much is spent in the metropolitan area and what a colossal burden the metropolitan area is to the rest of the State, and so on, was really irrelevant to this Bill.

Mr. WILKES : We are not doing too badly—we have one new tram!

Mr. MEAGHER : And in a few days the honorable member will have the pleasure of seeing several more of them. Despite the industrial chaos caused by the current Commonwealth Government, they are at last starting to come off the production line—only ten months late.

Mr. WILKES : How many can we expect?

Mr. MEAGHER : I do not want to say any more. I think I have answered most of the remarks made in the second-reading debate. I thank honorable members for their support of the Bill. I hope it will make a contribution to the better co-ordination of transport in Victoria, for the whole of the State not just for the metropolitan area. When the consultative committees are formed my objective will be to get the best possible advice from the widest possible spectrum of people who have something to offer.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) : I listened to the Minister's speech on clause 2 with great interest, but I am afraid it has not reassured me in any way; nor does he seem to have filled in any gaps in my knowledge of what the proposed committees are expected to do. From the debate on the Bill one can only come to the conclusion that the Transport Regulation Board, for example, knows nothing about transport. I should have thought that after all these years the Transport Regulation Board would be a fairly competent body to recommend to the Minister what ought to be done about bus transportation, commercial goods transportation and taxi operations. The board has had a great deal to do with these operations over a long period. From what the Minister said it seems that all that the committees will be is consultative, as the name implies. In other words, the Minister will talk to them, but whether he takes their advice is up to him. Therefore, ultimately it must come back to Ministerial responsibility.

I can only conclude that the Bill represents the point of view that the Transport Regulation Board, the Railways Board and the Tramways Board know nothing about operating public or private transport and that the Government has no policy on transport because it simply does not know what it is doing; it has to ask nebulous consultative committees about which honorable members basically know nothing; they will consist of anything up to fifteen men whom the Minister can pick as he chooses. The honorable gentleman can pick his own lackeys. They might all be members of the Liberal Party. There is nothing in the Bill to provide that they should not be. I intend to move an amendment to prevent that from happening and to ensure that the members of the committees must be resident in the region to which they relate. One would be flat out finding fifteen members of the Liberal Party in Gippsland East. I move—

Clause 2, page 2, line 28, after the word "persons" insert the words "resident in such region".

Apparently the Minister intends to accept this amendment because he made the point that one of the things he is keen to talk to the consultative

committees about is the closing down of railway stations and railway lines. This is a vexed question in some parts of the State. In recognizing this, the Minister said that these committees would be knowledgeable about the particular region concerned. Certainly the people resident within a region will be more knowledgeable about the region than are most other people. My amendment is reasonable. In his second-reading speech the honorable member for Sandringham said that he wondered whether East Gippsland was in Victoria. Frankly, the residents often wonder that themselves because so little notice is taken of that part of the State. It is a big area; its geographical area is one-eighth of the State.

Mr. WILKES: It will not be after the redistribution.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: It might well be bigger; but as it is well represented its population is increasing. There seems to be little justification for increasing the area of the electorate because people are coming there despite the lack of Government interest. I hope my amendment will have the unanimous support of the Committee.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): Before dealing with the amendment, I point out to the honorable member for Gippsland East that he appears to be under the misapprehension that what I am seeking from these consultative committees is that they take over the role of existing authorities. Of course, that is not so. The Transport Regulation Board is only one of a number of authorities that come under the control of the Ministry of Transport. The Country Roads Board is another. The role of the consultative committees is not to carry out the functions of any one of those other authorities but to assist the Ministry—not the authority—in assessing the recommendations that might come from any one of those authorities, or more than one of those authorities, relating to a particular region. In other words, I am seeking the best advice I can get about recommendations that might come from any one of the authorities or even decisions from the Transport Regulation Board on the region concerned. It is an entirely different role from that which the honorable member suggests of taking over the functions of the Transport Regulation Board. The board will still do the things that the Act requires it to do. What I am seeking as Minister and within my Ministry is a good deal more support and advice than I have had previously on the general question of what will best suit the regions concerned.

I raise no objection to the intention of the amendment moved by the honorable member because these committees would be of little use unless they had considerable local content within them; they could not possibly carry out the functions for which they are designed. However, to insert the words "resident in such region" seems unduly restrictive. Proposed new section 11 (2) would then read, *inter alia*—

> The persons appointed to be members of any such committee shall include persons resident in such region experienced in planning and local government...

That would mean that no person could be appointed to one of these committees unless he lived within the boundaries of the region, no matter how much he had to contribute or how experienced he was in planning and local government. A person might live half a mile outside the boundary of the region and be the best man available, but it would be impossible to appoint him.

The proposed new sub-section then states—

> and persons involved in the provision and use of transport services and facilities.

The customer, the man who is using the freight centre, or something of that sort in the region, can be appointed, even though he is living outside the region and it is possibly more important for him to live within the region than the planner. I believe it would be a mistake to change the wording in this way because it would unduly restrict the

choices open to the Minister and to Parliament. However, I give the assurance that it will be my intention that the majority of people selected for these committees will be resident in the regions, because I see little prospect of the committees working properly unless that is so. I reject the amendment only on the technical ground that it might militate against the intention that I share with the honorable member for Gippsland East, not because I disagree with his intent. I give the assurance that when the committees are appointed they will carry out that intention.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): The Minister chided the honorable member for Gippsland East and myself for not having realized that the most important part of the Bill is that a transport research and co-ordinating division will be set up within the Ministry of Transport. I mildly point out that one is justified in not referring to that because no clause in the Bill indicates that this is so. I should be obliged to know where the Minister referred to that in his second-reading speech. I assume that the supporting staff of the consultative committees is referred to in clause 3, but it is purely a corollary to clause 2.

Mr. MEAGHER: It is covered in clause 14.

Mr. JONES: The Minister says that it is covered in clause 14, although not explicitly. The Opposition proposes to vote for the amendment moved by the honorable member for Gippsland East. The Minister may be reading the amendment in an unduly narrow way. The proposed section, if amended, will provide that "the committee shall include persons resident in such region experienced in planning and local government". In the case of local government it seems to be axiomatic; if a committee is set up for the Bendigo region, someone living locally should be appointed and not someone from the Shepparton region. If there is to be representation from local government, it must be local. However, I know of no reason why this cannot be spelt out in the proposed legislation, and as a result the Opposition is prepared to support the amendment.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): I shall add only one comment in reply to the honorable member for Melbourne. Had the amendment been presented in time for me to take advice on the drafting matters, I may have been happy to accept it, but I have had the amendment only for a few minutes, and with my lack of experience as a draftsman it appears to me that acceptance at such short notice would be unduly restrictive. I shall be happy to examine the amendment and take advice on it, but it would be reckless of me to accept it on face value in view of the doubts I have expressed.

Mr. HANN (Rodney): I express concern at the remarks of the Minister, particularly during the Committee stage. I am concerned that the Minister has made the point that he will largely use these committees to discuss the closure of certain railway lines. This appears to be the very situation which the Minister is denying and for which he is refusing to accept responsibility. I have been pleased that the Minister has managed to keep railway lines open in many of the country towns where there were suggestions that they would be closed. I have commended the Minister on that. Now the situation is arising in which the Minister is suggesting that he will use the consultative committees to get himself off the hook.

Mr. MEAGHER: I merely suggested that the committees would be a more satisfactory way of investigating these matters.

Mr. HANN: That is why I express my concern. If this is the purpose of the Bill, I am opposed to it. The Minister, in consultation with the local people, would be in a better

position to make decisions on these matters than by setting up committees. I support my colleague in suggesting that members of the committee should be resident in the region.

Mr. GUY (Gisborne): Although I cannot support the amendment moved by the honorable member for Gippsland East, I most certainly agree with the sentiments contained in it. As the honorable member for Broadmeadows pointed out, public transport is the key to the development of growth centres. Many of these growth centres—several of which are in my electorate—contain many concerned, vital and interested citizens, who will be able to participate in the proposed committees. It would be a tragedy if they were not allowed to participate in any way that is seen fit. Honorable members should agree to the spirit of the amendment. In today's world of government and Parliament, much is said about open government; by the same token, the same sentiment should be expressed about planning. It is time there was more open planning with public participation, and certainly participation to whatever degree can be managed by the citizens who live in these growth centres where public transportation will be so important. I trust the Minister's guarantees will be implemented.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura): The debate on this clause and the amendment has reached an interesting stage. The Minister and the honorable member for Melbourne have agreed that the principle of the amendment moved by the honorable member for Gippsland East is good. The honorable member for Gisborne also supports the theory that local people should be given an opportunity of participating in the deliberations of these consultative committees. Surely two avenues are open to the Minister: Firstly, that he reports progress at this stage in order to allay any fears he may have about the drafting of the amendment; and, secondly, that he gives an undertaking that before the measure goes to another place he will have the spirit of the amendment included in the Bill.

Mr. CURNOW: The Opposition is supporting it.

Mr. WHITING: I am pleased to hear the interjection from the honorable member for Kara Kara, because members of the Country Party hope back-bench members of the Government party will also support the amendment. Members of the Country Party are so keen to have this provision included in the Bill, either at this stage or before it goes to another place, that we will take it to a division if the Minister is not prepared to report progress or to accept the amendment as it stands.

Mr. CRELLIN (Sandringham): Having listened to members of the Country Party speaking to the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Gippsland East, I think it is appropriate to again refer to the second-reading notes. The Minister said—

> Honorable members who know the transport needs of areas outside Melbourne will agree with me that there is a need to provide a structure by which all areas of the State can be consulted in major transport matters.

Surely the intention is there, and the Minister has already put it on the record, that he is happy to talk to people all over the State. Therefore, there is no problem. The Minister continued—

> There is a specific provision, however, that the committees must include persons experienced in planning and local government.

If persons involved in local government in the areas concerned are not included, who will be? It is clear that under the Bill it is intended to include people in the areas involved. If that is not so, would members of the Country Party spell out where the Bill differs from what the Minister said? The Minister continued—

> The relationship between total community planning and transport planning is a vital one.

If members of the Opposition and of the Country Party are concerned that people in the community are not able to make a contribution, let me spell out who is already doing this. The industry organizations in the private sector—the Victorian Road Transport Association, the Bus Proprietors Association (Victoria) and the Victorian Taxi Association—are already, and have been for a number of years, in direct consultation with the Government. The Bill is formalizing what has been going on for a number of years. When I listen to members of the Country Party I wonder whether they consider the country is part of Victoria.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): I think I can solve the problem to the satisfaction of all honorable members. If the honorable member for Gippsland East were to add the word " persons " at the end of the words proposed to be inserted, the proposed sub-section would then read—

> The persons appointed to be members of any such committee shall include persons resident in such region, persons experienced in planning and local government, and persons involved in the provision and use of transport services and facilities.

This would eliminate the restriction that I feared might be imposed. I shall be happy to accept the honorable member's amendment if the word " persons " is added to it.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): The suggestion by the Minister is not acceptable because it will simply widen the doubt whether there will be many local people involved. The intention of my amendment is that all the persons on each consultative committee shall be resident within the region they are representing. The Minister's suggestion simply means that a minimum of two of the members out of fifteen would be residents of the particular region.

Mr. MEAGHER: It would not.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: I disagree with the Minister's interpretation. As I read it, the provision would then be that persons appointed to be members of such committee shall include persons resident in the region concerned—that is one group of people—persons experienced in town planning and local government, as a second group, and persons involved in the provision and use of transport services and facilities.

Mr. WILCOX: They could all be resident in the area.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: They could all be, but the Country Party desires that they shall all be residents of the area. In reply to the Minister's earlier comments, I point out that at no stage did I suggest that the committees proposed in this measure will replace the Transport Regulation Board or any other existing body. I simply pointed out that apparently these bodies were not producing good advice for the Minister. I am unable to understand what the particular role of these consultative committees will be. For instance, currently the Transport Regulation Board determines whether an operator shall be allowed to transport goods to an area of the State from a railhead or similar position. Does the Minister propose that these consultative committees will make decisions of that nature?

Mr. MEAGHER: Of course not; the honorable member should not be ridiculous.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: What sort of advice will these committees give? Honorable members can conclude only that the Minister will appoint committees comprising mainly residents of the metropolitan area, that he will send these people to the northern part of the State and they will suggest that the Railways Board close a railway station or a railway line. That is all the consultative committees will be there for. The Minister should recognize that local people want representation and a say in the matter.

The honorable member for Melbourne supported that principle. If the Minister will not accept the amendment, the Country Party will take it to a division to demonstrate

its belief that country people should have their say on transport regulation and control in country areas.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): The Minister has made a reasonable suggestion because the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Gippsland East does not correspond with what he says it means. The honorable member spoke as though the amendment suggested that all members of these committees should be residents of the area whereas in fact that is not what the amendment says.

If the Minister's suggestion was included, there would be four categories of persons on the committee. Local residence is a mandatory requirement. People experienced in planning and local government must inevitably include persons who are local residents. It is capricious to think that if a committee is to be set up for the Mildura area a member of the Melbourne City Council will be appointed to it. If it is intended to have somebody from local government, quite clearly the appointment will be from the local area. In those circumstances, the Opposition knows of no reason why the Minister's suggestion is not preferable.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister for Transport): I have endeavoured to meet the wishes of the honorable member for Gippsland East as reasonably as I can but I was astounded at his reaction because I thought I had overcome the problems involved. Obviously, the committees could not function unless they consisted in the main of local residents, and no other intention is feasible. Quite clearly, the committees will predominantly comprise people living in the region; they could not function otherwise. However, I will not be placed in the position, which I would be in if the honorable member's amendment were accepted, of being told that every member of a consultative committee shall reside in the region because that might well exclude a town planner who is working for one of the local councils but who resides outside the boundary of the region. It would be absurd not to use the talents of that man on a committee. Therefore, I shall not be silly enough to accept that type of restriction. If the honorable member for Gippsland East is prepared to listen to a reasonable amendment on his amendment, I shall gladly accept it. Otherwise, I have no alternative but to reject his proposition outright.

The Committee divided on the amendment (Mr. McLaren in the chair)—

Ayes	..	8
Noes	..	55
Majority against the amendment	..	47

AYES.

Mr. Baxter	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Whiting
	Tellers:
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Hann
Mr. Ross-Edwards	Mr. McInnes

NOES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. MacDonald
Mr. Austin	Mr. McKellar
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Maclellan
Mr. Billing	Mr. Meagher
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Chamberlain	Mr. Reese
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Roper
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Doube	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Ebery	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Stirling
Mr. Fogarty	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Templeton
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Guy	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Vale
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. Holding	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Jona	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Jones	Mr. Wood
Mr. Kirkwood	
Mr. Lind	
Mr. Loxton	*Tellers:*
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Mutton
Mr. McClure	Mr. Williams

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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : In order to carry out an undertaking given to the House a fortnight ago, by leave, I move—

That Sessional Orders be suspended so as to allow consideration of General Business, Order of the Day No. 3 before consideration of the remaining Government Business, Orders of the Day.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows) : I raise a point of order. When this matter was previously before the House, several points were put to you, Mr. Speaker, and I believe you were under a disadvantage inasmuch as you were not aware of the contents of the Ministerial statement. In view of the time that has elapsed since the statement was made, honorable members have had an opportunity of giving careful consideration to its contents. When the matter was last before the House reference was made to the eighteenth edition of May's *Parliamentary Practice* which cerning Ministerial statements. I submit that *May* is quite precise on the point, and I now submit that you, Mr. Speaker, should further consider whether the statement is admissible as a Ministerial statement.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : On the point of order, and in answer to the argument raised by the honorable member for Broadmeadows, I submit that the ruling given by you, Mr. Speaker, when this matter was discussed last was entirely correct. The honorable member for Broadmeadows referred to the section of the eighteenth edition of *May's Parliamentary Practice* which indicated that a Ministerial statement should not criticize other Governments. I suggest that the precedent referred to was established in an entirely different era and an entirely different political environment, in that the British Parliament had given powers to various Colonial Governments to run their own affairs and it was considered undesirable to criticize those Governments in the administration of their own affairs once they had been granted responsible Government.

In the Victorian Parliament an entirely different situation applies. Victoria is part of a Federal system of government and it would be incomprehensible and inconceivable if a Minister, in a statement to this House, were prevented from criticizing another section of the Federal system—in this case the central Government. Repeatedly in this House the Premier and Treasurer, in a Ministerial statement in the form of the Budget, has criticized actions by the Commonwealth Government. This applies to Commonwealth Governments of all political colours.

On this occasion the Attorney-General dealt with a matter very much within his own administration. He dealt also with Government policy to uphold the Federal system of government. He merely pointed out that it was becoming increasingly difficult to carry out this policy of maintaining a Federal system of government in view of the almost daily encroachment by the Commonwealth Government into State areas of responsibility.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe your ruling was entirely correct. It would be inconceivable for members of this House who are Ministers of the Crown to be prevented from making criticisms of one section of the Federal system of government —the Commonwealth Government— even though its actions may be preventing the State Government and the State Parliament from acting within their areas of Constitutional responsibility.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) : On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is one other point that I should like to raise in support of the proposition that the debate should continue. The Attorney-General made his Ministerial statement and the Leader of the Opposition debated it. Therefore, the debate is under way. I suggest that if debate was not to be allowed, the proper time to decide that issue would have been at the conclusion of the Attorney-General's speech. It

would be an unfortunate state of affairs if the Government and the Opposition were allowed to debate it and that further debate was not permitted.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! This matter has caused me some concern. On 29th October, when the Attorney-General delivered the statement, a series of points of order were raised. I will not go into each of those in detail; it is sufficient to say that a number of points were raised, some of which were devoted to the nature of the statement and some to its appropriateness as a Ministerial statement. I had very little opportunity to give the matter careful consideration, and I ruled that the contents of the Ministerial statement were in order.

It is established practice that prior notice to Mr. Speaker of a Ministerial statement is necessary, and in fairness to the Attorney-General I should advise the House that he did give me prior notice. However, I was not aware of the content of the statement until it was delivered in the House. Under the practice outlined in *May*, it is not the practice that I should be aware of the content. The predicament faced by the Chair is obvious and I propose raising the issue with the Standing Orders Committee and asking it to consider whether the Chair should be given notice of the content.

A Ministerial statement of itself, does not provide an opportunity for debate, but a substantive motion to take note of the statement does. The motion set out in General Business, Order of the Day No. 3, is a separate proceeding from the Ministerial statement. It appears on the Notice Paper by virtue of the fact that the House resolved to adjourn the debate, and that is the matter raised by the Leader of the Country Party. As an Order of the Day, it is properly before the House, and therefore I cannot uphold the point of order. Is leave granted?

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Yes.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMONWEALTH CONSTITUTION.

The debate (adjourned from October 29) was resumed on the motion of Mr. Holding (Leader of the Opposition) —

That the House take note of the Ministerial statement on matters affecting the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party): I commend the Attorney-General for initiating this debate, because no more important question faces Victoria at present. To my mind, and I support the remarks of the Premier when speaking to points of order raised on a previous occasion, the Attorney-General has a responsibility in circumstances such as those which exist today to bring this matter before the House.

The Opposition constantly criticizes the Government for not allowing debate on matters of vital public interest. From time to time the Country Party supports the Opposition's view that ample debate should be allowed on Grievance Day and private members' Bills. No more important matter faces this State than that of Commonwealth-State relations.

Mr. CURNOW: The Leader of the Country Party must have seen the electoral distribution proposals of the Government.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Why don't you go back to your rabbit warren?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member for Kara Kara is sitting in the aisle and is therefore interjecting out of his place. He must either return to his usual place or cease interjecting.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: I have been doing my best to keep the level of this debate away from the party line but as it is a vital question that will not be easy. The State Labor Party has an obligation to the people of Australia to declare

itself regarding the Federal system of government. There is no doubt where the Federal Labor Government stands because it has made its position clear.

Mr. EDMUNDS: It was elected by a majority of the people.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Yes, it was elected by a majority of the people at a particular time and on a second occasion. There is also a State Parliament which has been elected by the people of Victoria. Australia has a Federal system which is composed of a Commonwealth Government and State Governments.

Mr. BIRRELL: And there is a Senate.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: That is a good point. Of the two Federal Houses, the House of review is dominated by the former coalition parties.

The Federal Labor Party has made its position clear. I pay a tribute to the State Labor parties of Tasmania and South Australia because they have made their positions clear on the Federal issue. It is perhaps relevant that they have the responsibility of holding office and may be more responsible in the views they have declared.

The Premier of South Australia, Mr. Don Dunstan, makes pronouncements almost daily on his State's position in the Federal system of Government and constantly puts forward views which he feels are vital to the State of South Australia. He has been disenchanted for some time because the motor industry which is vital to the economy of his State may be wiped out by the Federal Labor Government. Mr. Dunstan has also put to the Prime Minister some sensible financial suggestions on how the cost of living could be reduced. He wants to reduce State charges. He will do that in conjunction with the other States whose Governments are of a different political colour, provided that the Federal Government agrees to compensate him for those charges. If, in Victoria, that has the effect only of holding electricity and gas charges at their present levels, it will do much to keep down the cost of living.

In Victoria the Australian Labor Party is having a little both ways. On the one hand, it shows a blind loyalty to the Federal Government, but on the other hand it pays lip service to the Federal system, provided that it does not hurt the Labor Party too much. Mr. Dunstan, the Premier of South Australia, has taken over the leadership of the Labor movement of Australia by showing an honesty of purpose. I do not think any member of the Opposition would debate that. The views that the Opposition in Victoria should be supporting are those of Don Dunstan and not those of the Federal Labor movement.

In fairness, the Country and Liberal parties also face problems of centralism from time to time from their Federal colleagues, but the Country Party and the Liberal Party have never been as centralist as the Australian Labor Party. I would point out that John Gorton ceased to be Prime Minister of Australia because the State movement decided that he was too much of a centralist. Some honorable members may disagree, but there is no doubt in my mind about that. I understand that the Liberal Party has already taken moves to write into its platform that a share of income tax revenue should pass to the States. I give the undertaking I have given before that I shall do all in my power to ensure that the Country Party inserts a similar plank in its Parliamentary platform.

Mr. HOLDING: What percentage do you suggest? You could finish up with the principle but less revenue.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: When it is done the percentage will have to be chosen carefully.

Mr. HOLDING: What do you suggest?

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: I shall not make off-the-cuff decisions on whether it should be 28 per cent,

30 per cent, or 32 per cent. That decision will have to be made, and it is disappointing that the Leader of the Opposition does not support this view.

Mention has been made of the problems facing Australia in respect of the High Court. These are similar to the problems that have been faced by the United States of America. There has been a tendency for that Government to support the centralization of power. I was hopeful—I think the Opposition joins with me—that at the Constitutional Convention the view would have been supported by our Federal colleagues that the High Court judges in Australia should be State nominees. That view was put forward. At present the High Court is dominated by appointments from Victoria and New South Wales and the numerically smaller States have little or no representation in the High Court. Often High Court judges have been the personal choice of the Prime Minister of the day. On more than one occasion judges with centralist leanings have been chosen.

Mr. HOLDING: Name them.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Of course I shall not name them. During this debate it has been mentioned that time and time again the Australian Constitution is being bypassed by the present Federal Government. The Government has been using the major weapon used over the years by other Governments—money. It uses it as political blackmail because the States, which are short of money to provide essential services of government, must agree or their other allocations will be reduced or not made in certain circumstances.

The Commonwealth Government is entering into fields which under the Constitution it has no right to enter. I refer to local government. All honorable members know that the Federal Government has assisted local government financially on the basis of allocating moneys to particular regions. In country Victoria these regions have no common interest in many instances. The sole purpose of the Federal Government is to bypass the States in giving small quantities of money to local government. The Federal Government has entered such fields as legal aid, the arts, conservation and education.

Mr. HOLDING: Do you think it should not have entered those fields?

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: It should not have entered them directly. It could have done much more for primary and secondary education by allocating the money to the States.

Mr. WILKES: The previous Federal Government entered the field of education.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: I am not making this speech purely to criticize the Whitlam Socialist Government. I am trying to make a constructive contribution towards working out a proper relationship between the States and the Federal Government, irrespective of the political colour of the Government in Canberra. But Australia is in a worse situation today than ever before, after two years of Labor Government. Since that Government has come to power and has entered into these fields there has been wasteful duplication of services to the people of Australia.

During the past two years the Australian public has taken a renewed interest in the Federal system of government. There is a new awareness of the position of State Parliaments and the place they have in the government of Australia. People are beginning to realize that the best government is the one which is closest to the people. Last Friday in my electorate we were faced with a serious underground water problem. Urgent action was taken and the results were quite exciting and encouraging. On Friday at short notice I contacted three Government instrumentalities—the Rural Finance and Settlement Commission, the Department of Agriculture and the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission—and suggested that a top level conference be held. The three

departmental heads gave their immediate support and sent senior officials to Shepparton to meet the twenty representatives of fruit-growing organizations. A constructive and worthwhile conference took place at about five days' notice. That situation could not have occurred under a centralist Government in Canberra. State government is good government; it is close to the people. Unless we keep State government with the powers that it has, it will be disastrous for the people of Australia.

There was an example of lack of interest by the present Federal Government in Federal-State relations when the Constitutional Convention, which was to have taken place in Adelaide last week, was called off because the Federal Labor Government did not want it to be held. That Government used Steele Hall, the independent Senator from South Australia, by putting him in the Opposition delegation.

Mr. HOLDING: He is with the Liberal movement; he is not independent.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: He is the most independent person in Canberra at present. The Federal Labor Government was responsible for calling off the Constitutional Convention last week. I admit that there was not a great deal of enthusiasm shown by some Liberal and Country Party members of the former Federal Government, but if coalition parties had been in government in Canberra that conference would have been held. The State Liberal Party and the Country Party have some say with their Federal members. The Opposition in the Victorian Parliament has no influence with its Federal Labor members.

This Parliament has perhaps learned a particular lesson from the latest attitude adopted by the Whitlam Government. This is a lesson which must be heeded. The Victorian Parliament could well review its attitude to local government in Victoria. There is a somewhat similar relationship between the Federal and State Parliaments on the one hand and the State Parliament and local government on the other.

Local government is even closer to the people than is the State Parliament. We should give serious consideration to allocating more responsibilities to it and asking it to carry some of the present responsibilities of the State Government. In certain cases, that could be done more economically and the priorities of various areas would be better served if decisions were made locally. That is one lesson which could be learnt from what has happened in Canberra over the past few years.

Money alone cannot give a nation good government. It helps, but money cannot buy everything, which is what the Government in Canberra is trying to do. There must be co-operation between the Commonwealth and the States. I congratulate the Premiers of the six States—I include the Premier of Victoria—whether Labor Party, Liberal Party or Country Party, on the stand they have taken to support the Federal system. It is interesting that such men as Mr. Joh. Bjelke-Petersen and Mr. Dunstan, men of very different backgrounds and very different political philosophies, have been two leaders who have together stood for State rights in fighting the Whitlam Government. Both have played their part in trying to make the Federal system work.

The Opposition in Victoria has a unique opportunity of putting its weight and influence in the Australian Labor Party behind Premier Dunstan who is virtually playing a lone hand in that party in his fight to ensure that State Governments will play a vital role in the good government of Australia.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): I have had a little over a week to examine the Ministerial statement made by the Attorney-General. I can only conclude that the honorable gentleman must have been disappointed that

there was no Constitutional Convention. His was the type of speech which one would expect him to make to the convention, but I do not think it would have gone over any better there than it has here.

Much of his statement consisted of criticism of the Australian Government, the establishment of legal aid offices, the Australian Assistance Plan, the purchase of land within the State for various purposes, the acquisition and development of the Leyland company and the proposed import-export corporation. The honorable gentleman spoke about massive grants made to the arts, conservation groups, and education.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: I think he mentioned *Blue Poles.*

Mr. WILKES: The Attorney-General may have done so; he spoke about the arts. What the honorable gentleman did not say was that if money had not been made available to local government within the States and to various bodies under the area improvement plan this State would not have been able to frame its Budget as it did. Without the $254 million of urban grants made available to the States in this year's Commonwealth Budget, the Victorian Treasurer would have been begging for funds to spend in other ways. The foresight and initiative of the Commonwealth in providing funds for the purposes I have mentioned relieves the States of much expenditure.

Whether we like it politically or not, local government in Victoria was starved of funds. It was fed up with crawling to Treasurers of Victoria and begging for additional assistance. The Minister for Local Government was continually hearing deputations which requested money to improve local government facilities. For years the State Government deprived local government of the necessary funds to carry out its proper function. What did the former Treasurer of Victoria repeatedly tell local government to do? He told it to increase rates to get out of its troubles. There was no question of any assistance.

When the Prime Minister acknowledged the problems of the urban areas of Australia, and particularly of Victoria, we witnessed the spectacle of the Victorian Government saying that money should not be provided in the way it was, that local government was not entitled to receive money direct from the Commonwealth Government to assist it; that it should be provided through the Victorian Government. I do not blame the Australian Government for dealing directly with local government. If the Attorney-General believes that was unconstitutional, he should challenge the Commonwealth in the courts. That would be the honorable course if he wanted to upset what the Commonwealth is doing for local government and regional development.

I have been around the country as much as the Attorney-General and I have spoken to many local government authorities. Although they may not be satisfied with the particular region in which they have been placed, as the Leader of the Country Party suggested, they have not been critical of the funds made available.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: They cannot be organized into entirely satisfactory regions.

Mr. WILKES: That is probably so. If they have had any criticism, they have not been vociferous and have not refused what the Commonwealth Government offered. There were few local government authorities which did not welcome the way in which the Australian Government was prepared to subsidize them.

Mr. BILLING: It was criticized by those that did not get any money.

Mr. WILKES: There is a good reason why money was made available as it was.

Mr. RAFFERTY: It should have been made available through the State Governments.

Mr. WILKES : There is also a good reason why the money was not made available through the State Governments. Local government is as responsible as the State Government. The Commonwealth has the right to deal with another tier of government. Direct assistance by the Commonwealth to local government bodies within the States will be continued whether there is a change of Government in Canberra or not.

That happened with uniform taxation. There was no attempt by the Federal Liberal Party-Country Party Government to change the system of uniform taxation. The only challenge came from the States, and it was not the mendicant States which raised the challenge. The attempt to do away with uniform taxation failed on two occasions. I do not have the legal expertise of the Attorney-General, but I venture to suggest that any challenge to the efforts of the Australian Government to assist local government, as a tier of government, would also fail. Even if there were a change of Government in Canberra, the new Government would continue to assist local government.

What can be said in other areas cannot be said about local government. It may be more desirable to direct certain funds through particular State organizations, but that is not true of local government.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : Why not?

Mr. WILKES : Because local government is competent to handle its own affairs if it receives direct benefits from either the State or the Commonwealth.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : It is a creation of the States.

Mr. WILKES : No doubt that is true, but it is a viable form of government which has operated without much assistance from the States over the years.

Mr. RAFFERTY : Let the Commonwealth give the money to the States, and local government will get it.

Mr. WILKES : The Government should stop whingeing about the Commonwealth dealing directly with local government. It should allow local government to express its own criticisms of the system, whatever they might be. But the Victorian Government is prompting local government to criticize the Australian Government. The only local government representatives who have criticized what the Australian Government has done have been the Lord Mayor of Melbourne and the Municipal Association. But the Municipal Association had to reverse its original attitude on direct Australian Government assistance.

There is nothing wrong with the Australian Government providing assistance direct to local government. No strings are attached to the money. If individual municipalities want to do productive work which creates employment, they can go ahead with it without giving any account of the expenditure to the Commonwealth. In other words, the Commonwealth is satisfied that local government is competent to handle the funds with which it is provided.

The next tier in the structure of government to which funds have been made available is that comprising regions. The responsible bodies within the regions are usually made up of direct representatives of local government bodies. All the municipalities with which I have been associated elect their representatives to the regional organizations. The regions as now proposed may need to be strengthened or tailored to suit conditions and demands which will be made upon them, but the principle of regions—given the opportunity—will work in the interests of local government.

It is in this area that Liberal Party members and Governments develop a fear complex. But the development of regions offers no threat, nor need it offer any threat, to the State Government. For a regional system to operate or for

local government to obtain direct benefits from the Commonwealth will cause no trouble provided that the Executive Government of the State acts responsibly in other ways.

Mr. MACLELLAN: That sounds like blackmail.

Mr. WILKES: It is not blackmail. In Victoria, health services are running down. Teaching hospitals have reached the optimum point in their borrowings and overdrafts. If the Treasurer cares to make inquiries from any of the teaching hospitals in this State, he will find that they lack three things; firstly, the necessary finance to carry on; secondly, the necessary finance to provide proper accommodation; and, thirdly, the necessary equipment. When the foundations were laid for extensions to the Alfred Hospital, the hospital committee said it wanted two additional floors. The then Premier would not acquiesce. Is that the sort of forward planning that pervades the thinking of this Government?

Is it any wonder that the Commonwealth Government is called in to have a look at medi-care services, and medical practitioner services that are available? The Commonwealth Government has instituted a medi-care service in certain areas. There are areas in the north of the city where from 7 p.m. until 7 a.m. only four or five doctors are available to service 160,000 to 200,000 people. Surely that is sufficient for any responsible Australian Government to suggest to the States that something ought to be done. But this Government does not want to co-operate at any level with the Commonwealth Government, and, notwithstanding the platitudes of the Premier, on not one occasion has he been prepared to agree to any proposition initiated by the Commonwealth.

Although it may not be ideal for the Commonwealth to operate its own hospitals in Victoria, one cannot get away from the fact that the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital, and the Footscray and District General Hospital need funds to increase their bed capacity to at least 500 beds. Is there anything being done about that? The Government refuses to acknowledge the need for a priority, as does the Hospitals and Charities Commission. Dr. Wilder cannot say what the priorities are, because he does not know what funds this Government is going to allocate to the hospital and, therefore, it is difficult for him to arrive at any priorities. Because these areas have been starved of medi-care and hospital bed availability, the Commonwealth Government has been forced to come into it. What would the Treasurer suggest the Commonwealth ought to do?

Mr. WILCOX: Give us some of our money back.

Mr. WILKES: The Government has had twenty years in which to improve the hospitals in this State, and it is a disgrace. The Premier can say what he likes about it; it is a disgrace. What steps have been taken to provide adequate hospital facilities for the people in the western and northern areas of this city?

Mr. WILCOX: What about the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital?

Mr. WILKES: I am glad the Attorney-General has mentioned the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital. That hospital treats more patients in its casualty section than any other hospital in Victoria. It is consistently asking this Government when it will be provided with more beds. The Government cannot say. If the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital were to put its case to the Commonwealth, I am sure that the Commonwealth would see reason and provide funds to develop the hospital's services, as it would do at Footscray. I would prefer the Commonwealth to do that than to run its own hospitals, but that again is a personal opinion.

There is no question that Commonwealth-State relations have deteriorated, but they have not deteriorated in the past three years; there has been a steady deterioration over the past 23 years. If one liked to cite speeches of the former Premier and Treasurer and other Ministers, one would hear blatant criticism of the former Federal Government and its proposals for new taxing formulas, proposals for reimbursement grants to be altered, proposals for non-conditional grants, and specific purpose loans. This is not something that has just happened. The Australian Government has set aside $254 million for the States for development in urban and regional areas. This money will be made available once satisfactory agreements have been reached with the States.

Is the Premier prepared to make a satisfactory agreement with the Commonwealth to get Victoria a share of this money? If he is, it is time that he announced it. The money will be made available, once satisfactory agreements have been reached with the States, for projects including land commissions, growth centres, sewerage improvements, urban rehabilitation and the national estate. What is this State Government crowing about? Is that not satisfactory? The Australian Government at long last has realized there are inherent problems in the public sector relating to the urban areas more so than anywhere else. The Premier cannot deny that his Government is not catching up on sewerage and water supply in this State—it is not catching up on services in any way.

The Australian Government is prepared to make large sums available to this State—to the extent of $293,442,600—in addition to tax reimbursements and amounts agreed to by the Loan Council over the period from 1st January to 30th September this year. These are non-repayable grants. A member of the Government party says, " With strings ". The catch cry was a little different before the advent of the Labor Government in Canberra; an amount of $862,500 is available to the Chief Secretary's Department, non-repayable, for road safety protection; grants have been made to assist in the financing of public education programmes and to assist a programme of management and improvements at locations with poor accident records. This is a direct contribution by the Commonwealth. If the Government argues there is no balance between the payments of the Commonwealth directly to municipalities and directly to regions as compared with what is given to the States, then it is a false argument. It is not a question of a Commonwealth Government ignoring the States; the Commonwealth Government is making this money available as non-repayable grants to the various departments in this State.

Allocations to the States are in addition to the money being made available to local government and to the regions, and also for legal aid at which the Attorney-General took umbrage. Furthermore, the Government is providing money for community health services and the Minister of Health has taken umbrage at that. I would prefer health centres to be built and financed by the Commonwealth and the State rather than that the Commonwealth Government should build its own hospitals; again I am expressing my own opinion.

The Australian Government is also providing $1,065,736 for the half share of payments made by the State Government to deserted wives, including deserted *de facto* wives and wives of prisoners and unmarried mothers. Then there is a further contribution of $20,000 for the establishment and operation of social planning units. Furthermore, grants of $467,500 have been made for a survey of recreational needs and assistance for general recreational purposes. Again these moneys are non-repayable. Huge grants have also been made for education.

Mr. MACLELLAN: Is this the honorable member's third Budget debate contribution?

Mr. WILKES: I did not initiate this debate, but I am taking part in it.

Mr. MACLELLAN: Would the honorable member like to mention unemployment?

Mr. WILKES: I should be pleased to mention unemployment within the scope of this debate. The Commonwealth Government has provided $2·85 million for science laboratories and science equipment in secondary schools, and $3·55 million for libraries in secondary schools. What is wrong with that? The State could not provide this sort of money for these facilities. Then, for the provision of special instruction to migrant children with English language difficulties, the Commonwealth has contributed $2,482,730.

In the field of conservation, the Australian Government has provided three large amounts. For local government, the Australian Government has provided $2·4 million for surveys and investigations, and administration and planning assistance and area improvement programmes for the alleviation of urban problems in the western sector of Melbourne. I ask the Government what is wrong with that? It has also provided large sums of money for land acquisition and development.

The Attorney-General referred to Commonwealth proposals for an Australian legal aid office, the Australian assistance plan, the acquisition and development of the Leyland land, the proposed import-export corporation and the massive grants to the arts, conservation groups and educationists. Whatever the Australian Government is providing for these groups is three times more than the State could provide.

The Australian Government has also offered to build hospitals in Victoria and this subject has already been debated. That Government is prepared to provide $2,665,786 for reimbursement of capital and recurrent expenditure on diagnosis, treatment and control of tuberculosis and a grant of $4,409,967 towards development and maintenance of community health and mental health centres and therapeutic day services. If this money had not been provided, large areas on the periphery of Melbourne would be without any after-hours medical service at all. Even if difficulty is experienced in staffing these centres, it will still be a better service than no service at all.

It ill-behoves the Attorney-General to suggest that these actions are not constitutional. The Commonwealth Government believes that it is acting constitutionally and is proceeding on that assumption. The States have not the intestinal fortitude to challenge the right of the Commonwealth to do these things. The States received such a belting over uniform taxation that they have been reluctant to go back to the High Court.

The Australian Government has also provided $1·513 million for the establishment and operation of preschools and child care centres. The Commonwealth Government has contributed $1,343,797 towards capital and recurrent expenditure on programmes to provide a school dental service and to train dental therapists.

Mr. THOMPSON: With more ties than the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has.

Mr. WILKES: Honorable members can see what the Minister of Education thinks about the large sums of money being made available for dental services. It would not matter how many ties or restrictions were involved; provided that the money is spent for the purposes for which it is allocated, it is in the interests of people of this State and quite constitutional. It is of no use the Deputy Premier talking about ties because if

the Victorian Government is competent enough to spend the money the State must benefit from the expenditure.

Mr. WILCOX: The Government is not challenging the payments to the States.

Mr. WILKES: My interpretation of the honorable gentleman's Ministerial statement is that he considered that constitutionally they were doubtful.

Mr. WILCOX: Not to the States.

Mr. WILKES: The Minister referred to the massive grants to the arts, conservation groups and educationists. The grants that have been made to the arts in this State, to conservation groups and to educationists, have been moneys well spent by the Australian Government. I reiterate that the $293,442,600 in grants to the States is non-repayable.

Mr. WILCOX: I did not mention any of those figures.

Mr. WILKES: I am demonstrating that the States have not fared badly from the Australian Government and that all this political criticism of that Government has a credit side as well as the debit side mentioned by the Victorian Government. For housing, more than $42 million has been provided by the Commonwealth Government as well as $327,000 for Aboriginal affairs.

For transport, the Australian Government has provided $32,859,998. Melbourne has one new tram on the rails and tonight the Minister said that within the next week or so we can expect several more. Since the last State election one new tram has been put into service and even that broke down when the Premier went to launch it. Since then no more have been put into service, but the Minister blames this on industrial unrest. Honorable members now hope that with more than $32 million being made available by the Commonwealth Government, additional new trams might be constructed.

For country areas, non-repayable grants of $762,500 have been made for a programme of surface water measurement, and for investigation into underground water resources; of $950,000 for Dartmouth dam; and of $15,000 for King River dam.

Mr. McCLURE (Bendigo): On a point of order, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition appears to be quoting from a document. Would he identify it and be prepared to table it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. McLaren): Has the Deputy Leader of the Opposition identified the document previously?

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): I have identified it, and I shall do so again. The document is an answer supplied by the Treasury to a question on notice. The reference is Legislative Assembly, Notices of Motion, Orders of the Day, No. 14, on Tuesday, 22nd October last, question No. 95, which reads—

1. What amount has been made available by the Commonwealth Government to the State of Victoria, in addition to tax reimbursements and amounts agreed to by the Loan Council, since January, 1974, indicating the individual amounts and the purposes for which they were made available?

2. What amount has been offered by the Commonwealth to Victoria since January, 1973, which has yet to be accepted, indicating the individual amounts and for what purpose they were offered?

I continue with details of Commonwealth payments for specific purposes; Millewa pipeline—a grant of $800,000 towards construction of pipelines and associated works to carry water from the River Murray to rural holdings in the Millewa district was made.

Mr. WILCOX: None of this is relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. WILKES: Neither is the Ministerial statement relevant to the situation that it attempted to create.

Finally, under the sub-heading, "Various Departments", grants for flood relief and natural disasters totalled $7,218. The Commonwealth Government has provided assistance for the States, for local government

and regions in Victoria, for medical health centres and a host of other matters. If the Ministerial statement is critical of the constitutional right of the Commonwealth to do that, the opportunity is there for the Executive Council and the Attorney-General to take whatever action they think fit, but before they do that, they must be absolutely sure that people in country areas and local government bodies in both country and metropolitan areas would prefer to have this money paid to the incompetent State Government for distribution to them. If that choice were given to local government—and I challenge the Premier and the Minister to give them the choice of deciding with whom they would rather do business—without doubt the majority of local government bodies, if not all of them, would advise the Government that they would prefer to continue with the present system where at least they have money, sometimes in excess of $250,000, which they never received and could not hope to receive from the State Government or any of the previous Liberal Governments which occupied the Federal benches in Canberra for 23 years. Never once was any initiative given by the Liberal Government to acknowledge the force of local government.

Mr. DIXON: There were never 200,000 unemployed either.

Mr. WILKES: Of course not; there were 150,000 unemployed. Everybody understands that, and the Liberal Government went out of office.

If previous Liberal Governments had offered initiatives in line with what is occurring now, perhaps the State Government would have something to grizzle about in the Ministerial statement, but these initiatives have not been offered and this is the first time the question has arisen. It is refreshing to think that at least some money is flowing to local government bodies and that the State has no say over how it will be spent. I challenge the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation, when he is tramping around the countryside, to ask any of the local government bodies whether they are prepared to continue to accept this help from the Commonwealth Government or whether they would prefer to receive it from the State Government. They would not prefer to receive it from the State Government because they know that the State Government could not provide it.

The Ministerial statement which has just been put to the House was designed to humiliate the Federal Government, to denigrate its advances in assisting local government and people in necessitous circumstances in areas of Victoria, and it has failed dismally to do so.

Perhaps it will be a long time before the Premier will again allow the Minister to attempt to denigrate the Federal Government without foundation or proof. At least he should insist that if the Minister believes it is unconstitutional for the Federal Government to do what it has done, he ought to take action in that regard.

On the motion of Mr. MACLELLAN (Gippsland West), the debate was adjourned.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

SALE OF FIREWORKS—MIRRIDONG DAY-TRAINING CENTRE—INFANT WELFARE COURSE—STATE COLLEGE OF VICTORIA AT BURWOOD HOSTEL—MEMBERS' ELECTORAL OFFICE REQUISITES — TEACHER HOUSING — GRANTS TO TECHNICAL SCHOOLS—SAFETY HELMETS.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HANN (Rodney): I wish to raise a matter with the Minister for Fuel and Power. It concerns a recent announcement by the Government that the sale of fireworks would be

banned from 15th November. The matter has been raised with me by a retailer in the City of Echuca who was unaware that this legislation would come into effect. Apparently, many retailers purchased from wholesalers their usual quantity of fireworks for the normal sale period until May of the following year. The retailer to whom I refer finds that it will be impossible for him to sell his stocks of fireworks.

Would the Government be prepared to consider either extending the time from 15th November, perhaps until May of the following year, the usual sale period, or alternatively —and this might be more acceptable to the Government—when the inspectors come around, as they have in the past when changes to the regulations have been made, and confiscate fireworks in this category, compensating the retailers for the fireworks which are confiscated?

The situation has been caused by the short notice of the decision. I agree with the banning of the sale of fireworks and commend the Government on this action, but some steps should be taken to assist the people who have already purchased their fireworks for the coming year and now cannot legally sell them because of the new regulations. I direct that matter to the attention of the Minister for Fuel and Power and ask that an investigation be made.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): I direct to the attention of the Minister of Health a matter which affects the Mirridong day-training centre at Yarram. An amount of $60,000 was to have been made available for the construction of this building, and it was promised that the money would be paid in full by October. However, there is a shortfall of $7,715, and the secretary of the Mental Deficiency Training Services has now advised that it will not be paid until the coming year.

It has placed the organization in a position of considerable embarrassment as it has had to find this money by means of an overdraft thereby incurring itself in a further expense of $700 or $800 in interest payments which it does not have. The organization is in an extremely difficult position with the bank so far as accommodation is concerned and feels it has been led up the garden path because it was quite firmly promised that the entire amount would be made available.

The application of the shire secretary, Mr. Arthur Curry, was forwarded to the Mental Deficiency Training Services on 18th July, 1974. The application was in order but it is now found that the situation has changed.

Mr. LIND (Dandenong): I draw to the attention of the Minister of Health a matter which I believe is of urgent public importance, namely, the manner in which the Government is making provision for those students who are to undertake the new infant welfare training course. The infant welfare sisters and their association are not pleased with the Government, particularly the Minister of Health. They believe the honorable gentleman and his department have seriously blundered.

The course that is proposed by the Government is one which was really proposed by the Consultative Council on Pre-school Child Development in Victoria. It is being implemented without recognition of the case put forward by the infant welfare nurses. According to the spokeswoman for these people, the Minister of Health informed them on 12th July this year that their views would be taken into consideration when any matter involving nurses was under consideration.

It is proposed that fifteen nurses who hold general and midwifery practising certificates will be paid an allowance to attend the course for four months. This means there will be three groups a year. Each person attending the course will receive $115.70 a week. A little arithmetic will show that it will cost approximately $1,970 a term for each nurse attending the course or a total outlay of $88,650 a year. The infant

welfare nurses would prefer that the amount of $88,650 be allocated so that seventeen or eighteen selected students could undertake a tertiary level course to obtain a diploma which would have some standing.

For 25 years or more the infant welfare sisters have been endeavouring to raise their course to this standard. They are most disappointed with the action taken by the Minister of Health and the Government. On behalf of those infant welfare sisters and nurses, and the mothers with young children, I ask the Minister of Health to reconsider this proposal before it is too late.

The nursing profession believes that a double-certificated sister or a sister with either one of those certificates would be qualified to undertake a twelve months' course. Of course, the profession would aim for a degree course in nursing as applies in many overseas countries. Recently I was in Manitoba where a prerequisite to undertake nursing is a university degree.

I ask the Minister of Health to take into consideration the wishes of the many women engaged in the profession of infant welfare nursing.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): I draw to the attention of the Minister of Education the concern of many parents in the Latrobe Valley over the proposal to close the hostel of the State College of Victoria at Burwood. Those parents who have approached me have indicated that many, if not most, of the students attending the State College of Victoria at Burwood come from towns in the Latrobe Valley. They have been informed by the college council administrating the hostel that it is considering closing the hostel. They are concerned about the lack of suitable accommodation in the Burwood area. They are also concerned by the number of accommodation units occupied by students attending the Monash University because their children have to attend college courses in the metropolitan area and cannot find suitable accommodation.

I understand that the Education Department has made an offer to the college council with a view to keeping the hostel open. I ask the Minister of Education whether, if the college council has not favourably considered this offer, the Education Department will consider increasing its offer to ensure that the hostel is kept open to provide accommodation for these country students.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I draw a matter of urgent public importance, particulaly to members of this place, to the attention of the Premier and Treasurer. It concerns electoral offices that many honorable membes are attempting to conduct. On 8th August I wrote to the Premier and Treasurer asking whether honorable members who were operating these offices could receive office requisites, such as paper, carbon, Manila folders and so on, from Government stores, thus benefiting from bulk buying in which the Government is able to participate. I further pointed out that honorable members would benefit as they would not have to pay sales tax on their purchases.

Whoever answered the letter on the behalf of the Premier and Treasurer made a very interesting remark, to the effect that $3,000 was considered adequate to run an office. I again wrote to the Premier and Treasurer on 30th September spelling out in greater detail the fact that many honorable members are paying substantially higher amounts to purchase office requisites than they would have to pay if they were able to buy on the same basis as Government departments. I still have not received a reply to that letter and that is why I raise the matter tonight.

I have recently become aware that the Government Printer, from his stationery store, is prepared to make available to honorable members various items appearing in his stationery list, although honorable members would have to pay sales tax on those items. On inquiry from the other main store section of the Government, the Education Department

stores, the officer in charge, Mr. Smith, was extremely amiable and helpful to me but had to say that he was governed by rules and regulations and could not provide the office requisites at the same price at which he provided them to Government departments.

I do not intend to bore the House by referring to a long list of differences in prices ; I think a couple will suffice. For instance, Norman Bros. this morning quoted me $2.55 for one ream of quarto bank paper while a similar quantity is available from the Government Printer at a cost of $2.19. A box of stencils is available from Norman Bros. for $5.50 but is available from the Education Department's stores branch at approximately $2.50 which, by any standard, is a serious difference in cost. One further example is Manila folders which cost $8 a hundred at Norman Bros. but are available from the Government Printer for about $4.

The matter to which I particularly wish the Premier and Treasurer to address himself is that honorable members have to purchase these requisites on the open market. We cannot use a bulk buying facility. We have to pay sales tax on purchases and then proceed to ask for reimbursement by the State Government. So, the State Government is paying a substantially larger amount for our office requisites than if these requisites were made available from the Education Department's stores branch or the Government Printer.

I ask the Premier to look at this question fairly rapidly because it would seem to me to be a waste of Government money and a waste of the amount of $3,000, which does not go very far.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) : I wish to raise a matter with the Minister of Education who I hope will bring it to the attention of the Minister of Housing. It relates to the question of teacher housing, particularly in the areas of Mallacoota and Cann River in the far east of my electorate. For some time there has been agitation for the provision of adequate housing for teachers in that area because of the difficulty which they experience in obtaining reasonable accommodation there. The Education Department has agreed that some form of teacher housing will be provided. Some months ago the Teacher Housing Authority indicated that it was examining a flat which is prefabricated in South Australia by A.T.C.O. Industries Pty. Ltd. I understand that a couple of these were transported to Dimboola and Wycheproof for examination. Several months ago the school committees at Mallacoota and Cann River were advised that if these proved satisfactory it was expected that accommodation would be provided by Christmas of this year. The people there have been frustrated at the prolonged examination that has been taking place and the lack of a firm decision on accommodation.

Only tonight I have been advised that the teachers at these schools feel so strongly about the matter that they propose going on strike on Thursday of this week. Although I cannot countenance the idea of teachers striking, from my personal knowledge of the individuals there I understand that they must be strongly moved to have decided to take this extreme step. They have been very concerned about the state of education and the educational facilities in the area and have gone beyond the normal line of duty to provide the best they can with what is available to them. I find it a telling factor that they are prepared to go on strike on Thursday unless in the meantime a positive decision is conveyed to them.

I ask the Minister to take this matter up with his colleague urgently to see whether it is possible to give an assurance before then that proper accommodation will be available to the schools in the coming year.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows) : I raise with the Minister of Education a serious matter. Earlier today I asked the honorable gentleman a

question concerning the critical financial situation of many technical schools. I believe the answer supplied by the Minister indicates that he does not fully appreciate the real situation at the technical school level rather than at the college level. I should like to advise the Minister of the position now confronting two technical schools in my electorate, Fawkner Technical School and Broadmeadows West Technical School.

At Fawkner Technical School the maintenance grant for this year has been set at $88,000. The fixed expenditure that the school council must meet by way of salaries for staff employed by the school council, other than teaching staff, pay-roll tax and other fixed charges, amounts to $86,253. These figures are documented and available to the Minister. The school is left with a surplus of $1,747 to run its ancillary programme. Last year it took $15,261 to run its programme.

The situation at the Broadmeadows West Technical School is even more serious. Its maintenance grant has been set at $60,000 and its fixed charges — salaries of council-employed staff, pay-roll tax, telephone charges, and so on—amount to $80,000. I am treasurer of the Broadmeadows West Technical school council and last Thursday night the council heard the principal of the school read the report. He informed the council that companies had advised him that they would not continue to supply the school unless accounts were paid; he has been pressed heavily for outstanding accounts to be paid. Members of the staff have informed the council that they are unable to continue with the education programme laid down by the school, and some members of the staff, particularly the departmental heads, are going to the industries of Broadmeadows begging for material to be supplied so that they can continue their work.

Mr. Wilton.

The other serious problem at this school is that next year it will be asked to enrol additional apprentice students, and two additional trades will be added to the school curriculum. This will involve the school council and the principal in placing orders now for additional tools and equipment to enable the staff to carry on the education programme. Unless this equipment is ordered immediately, it will not be there at the beginning of the next school year.

On the secondary side a minimum additional grant of $9,000 is required so that class material can be purchased and repairs of equipment and minor replacements undertaken. The Government has repeatedly shown complete disregard for the problems of the education system of this State. It has done this in many ways.

Mr. WHITING: Has the council been to the Director of Technical Education?

Mr. WILTON: Of course it has made representations to the Director of Technical Education. The council has not only made written submissions; it has also sent urgent telegrams. It has done everything in its power, but it has been ignored.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The honorable member's time has expired.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): Some time ago I raised with the Chief Secretary the inadequacy of safety helmets for motor cyclists. I pointed out that the Australian Consumers Society had made some tests which indicated that about 20 per cent of motor cyclists' safety helmets which were being sold in Australia were inadequate. The chin straps did not hold under pressure and the helmet itself was unable to resist penetration.

On a number of occasions the Minister said that he would look into this matter to ascertain what could be

done. I followed up and asked the Minister whether a report would be made to the House. The matter seems to be still unresolved. I ask the Minister whether his department has looked into this matter. It is known that the motor cyclist is in a most vulnerable position and that his safety helmet is one thing which might save his life. In view of this finding by the organization—I raised this matter in this House a year ago —I ask the Minister whether he can now indicate that he has investigated the situation and, if so, what steps he has taken or proposes to take to ensure that people who buy safety helmets can be assured that they will get an article which will assist them in an accident?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power) : The honorable member for Rodney raised a question about fireworks. Before announcing that bungers would be outlawed after 15th November of this year, I had consultations with the importers and distributors of fireworks. An announcement was made at that time so that these people would not order stocks for next year and would have the opportunity of getting rid of stocks that they already held. The announcement could have been left until after 15th November, but it was considered that these people would be in trouble if the announcement was left until then. I was under the impression that stocks for next year would not be ordered and that the people who had fireworks in stock would be able to get rid of them.

I shall be happy to examine the matter raised by the honorable member, but whether we can assist the people who have over-purchased remains to be seen. However, the announcement was made at a stage when I was under the impression from the importers and distributors that there was sufficient time to get rid of stocks before 15th November and that stocks for the next season which commences on 28th May next would not be ordered.

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health) : I assure the honorable member for Gippsland South that I will refer to the Mental Health Authority the matters alluded to by him in relation to funding the Yarram day training centre. Regarding the matter raised by the honorable member for Dandenong, I suggested strongly that the honorable member appears to be assuming the role that one would traditionally expect the Victorian Nursing Council to assume. Fortunately, the honorable member is not the nursing adviser to the Minister, nor is he a member of the Victorian Nursing Council. I remind the honorable member that in the previous financial year a sum of $530,000 was provided for expanded nurse training. In the current Budget, generously provided by the Premier and Treasurer, the sum of $2·65 million is provided for the new curricula that are to apply in the nursing area.

The Government is guided by determinations and recommendations made by the Ramsay committee and also by the Consultative Council on Pre-School Child Development. The question of nursing training, albeit in this case the students who desire to undertake infant welfare courses, is under examination. We shall be guided by the Victorian Nursing Council on the type of training that is provided for girls who wish to do nursing. This training can be hospital based or based in the tertiary institutions, such as the colleges of advanced education, but we would seek the opinion and advice of the Victorian Nursing Council on these matters. However, the honorable member's comments will be considered.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : I shall be happy to investigate the financial position of the two

technical schools to which the honorable member for Broadmeadows referred. In reply to the honorable member for Gippsland East, I have already asked for a report on the provisions of teacher housing at Cann River. I shall ask for a report on the Mallacoota area, but I stress to the honorable member that the cases for teacher housing in these areas will not be improved one iota by any strike action proposed by the teachers at the two schools.

The honorable member for Morwell referred to a hostel at the Burwood Teachers College, or as it is now known, the State College of Victoria at Burwood. The hostel was built in the middle 1950s for the purpose of training teachers from the country, many of whom in succeeding years came from Gippsland. It is the aim of the Education Department to keep the hostel open. It has already made one move to achieve this aim, and further moves will be made to keep the hostel open for the purpose for which it was originally built.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : The honorable member for Brunswick West asked whether honorable members could have access to stationery and other office material from either the education store or the Public Works Department store. The matter is being examined. I can personally see every advantage especially to honorable members in this suggestion. I will give the honorable member an answer soon. It is simply a matter of how to regulate this, and I believe it can be managed.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The honorable member for Albert Park showed some understandable impatience regarding the time taken in replying to him regarding motor cycle helmets. I remind the honorable member that the Australian Standards Association takes a long time to reply to the inquiries we make on standards.

Mr. DOUBE : Each year 80 motor cyclists die.

Mr. ROSSITER : I listened to the honorable member in silence, and he can extend the same courtesy to me. The Australian Standards Association is completely outside our jurisdiction. From time to time we ask them for standards and we must wait for their answers. At present the police helmet is also under examination.

The honorable member for Albert Park raised another matter concerning whether certain motor cycle helmets imprison carbon monoxide.

Mr. DOUBE : I did not ask that tonight. The Minister should stick to the one answer.

Mr. ROSSITER : The honorable member has asked so many questions on motor cycles that I am trying to cover them all. He asked about chin straps.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park) : I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is true that I have asked a number of questions on motor cycles, but tonight I asked one specific question. I referred to the fact that the Australian Consumers Society discovered that motor cycle helmets, because of their faulty chin straps and their inability to resist penetration, were faulty. That is the only question I have asked the Minister tonight. I asked what he had done about it, and I asked that twelve months ago.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! Has that question been answered?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary) : It has been answered.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12 *midnight.*

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated—

PRISON INSTITUTIONS.

(Question No. 8)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister for Social Welfare—

In respect of prisons, youth training centres and other institutions under the control of the Social Welfare Department—

1. Which such institutions operate industries, specifying in each case the industries involved and the number of persons so engaged?

2. What moneys were paid from each such institution by way of profit from the industries into the Consolidated Fund in the financial years 1972–73 and 1973–74?

3. In respect of each institution in each of the past two financial years, how many persons were paid for the work undertaken, what was the rate of pay, and how much was paid?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare is—

Prison	Industry	Number of persons engaged	Profit 1972–73 Sales	Profit 1972–73 Profit	Profit 1973–74 Sales	Profit 1973–74 Profit	Rate of pay	Total 1972–73	Paid 1972–73
			PRISONS DIVISION						
			$	$	$	$		$	$
Ararat Prison	Mat yard	25	Included in Pentridge sales				Daily rate	*	2,886
	Tubular furniture	20	..	..	3,852	Nil	varies as		
Beechworth Training Prison	Carpenter shop	12	Included in Pentridge sales				follows—	*	1,560
	Farming	11	Internal use only					*	*
Bendigo Training Prison	Sheet metal	15	299	..	2,690	..	Fifteen cents—	*	1,326
Castlemaine Prison	Mat yard	20	Included in Pentridge sales				Poor work	..	1,836 (first year of operation)
							Thirty-five cents—		
Cooriemungle Prison Farm	Farming	21	Internal use only				Fair work	*	*
Dhurringile Rehabilitation Centre	Farming	15	Internal use only					*	*
							Forty cents—		
Fairlea Women's Prison	Laundry	6	Included in Pentridge sales				Satisfactory	*	*
Geelong Training Prison	Clothing	30	Included in Pentridge sales				work	*	4,234
	Laundry	15	Included in Pentridge sales					*	1,904
McLeod Prison Farm	Farming	17	Internal use only				Fifty cents—	*	*
Morwell River Reforestation Prison	Forestry planting	15	Labour provided at no charge to Forests Commission				Excellent Work	..	..
Sale Prison	Mat yard	25	Included in Pentridge sales					*	*
Won Wron Reforestation Prison	Forestry planting	20	Labour provided at no charge to Forests Commission					..	..

*Records are kept of this information, but to obtain it would require a long detailed examination of records in each prison.

Prison	Industry	Number of persons engaged	Profit 1972–1973 Sales	Profit 1972–1973 Profit	Profit 1973–1974 Sales	Profit 1973–1974 Profit	Rate of Pay	Total 1972–1973	Paid 1972–1973
			$	$	$	$		$	$
Pentridge Prison	Mat yard ..	25	4,243	..	5,932	..	..	3,395	3,052
	Carpenter shop	22	9,173	..	11,043	..	..	4,249	3,314
	Boot shop ..	24	9	..	195	..	..	3,597	3,787
	Clothing ..	23	24,532	..	30,798	..	..	2,539	2,775
	Textiles ..	32	..	..	2,692	..	..	4,739	3,403
	Laundry ..	40	15,482	15,482	10,380	10,380	..	3,497	3,582
	Printers ..	27	7,535	Nil	22,793	12,260	..	2,779	3,118
	Bakery ..	36	67,820	..	68,676	..	..	3,515	3,170
	Brush shop ..	35	57,310	..	69,015	..	..	3,558	3,760
	Car number plate ..	25	114,319	70,886	105,160	73,224	..	2,823	2,883
	Farming ..	50	Internal use only					11,697	6,317
			YOUTH WELFARE DIVISION						
Langi Kal Kal Youth Training Centre	Farming ..	21 (1972–1973) 14 (1973–1974)	58,093		108,465		45 cents per day	3,350	2,202

SECONDARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

(Question No. 25)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

Since the introduction of Commonwealth Government assistance for secondary school libraries—

1. Which Government and non-Government schools in Victoria have received assistance in each year and which schools are to receive assistance in each of the next three years?

2. What was the amount of expenditure and what is the amount of assistance to be provided in each case?

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

A summary of the assistance received is as follows. A detailed list of schools is shown in Appendices A–G below.

	1968	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974 30th June, 1974 (½ year)	Refer appendix
	$	$	$	$	$	$	
High Schools	68,468	1,481,774	1,415,657	1,467,343	1,402,782	1,561,792	A
Higher Elementary Schools	2,980	2,290	2,330	2,330	4,165	5,200	B
Central Schools.. ..	..	1,720	1,770	3,120	2,712	3,300	C
Central Classes	805	160	740	750	815	1,350	C
Consolidated Schools ..	3,285	2,430	2,370	..	347	2,000	D
Special Schools	..	2,585	2,950	2,910	3,267	5,534	E
Blackburn Reading Unit..	..	..	..	..	..	500	E
Minor Expenditure (Various Schools)	..	20,051	53,606	25,182	32,200	9,286	E
Design, Supervision and Administration	4,759	147,990	128,359	143,366	129,988	156,608	
TOTAL	80,297	1,659,600	1,607,692	1,645,001	1,575,276	1,745,570	
Technical Schools ..	104,000	241,347	785,786	869,878	473,616	838,668	F
TOTAL GOVERNMENT ..	184,297	1,900,947	2,393,478	2,514,879	2,048,892	2,584,238	
Non-Government Schools	110,800	902,644	936,556	515,621	972,781	573,426	G
	295,097	2,803,591	3,330,034	3,030,500	3,021,673	3,157,664	

For the period 1st July, 1974 to 31st December, 1975, $7,697,218 is available; $6,164,652 is for Government schools and $1,532,566 for non-Government schools. A submission to Australian Schools Commission is in the process of preparation and should soon be completed (by next week). Provided finance is made available by Australian Schools Commission the programme could proceed.

Financial commitments for Government school buildings contracts unpaid as at 1st July, 1974, were:

High schools	$4,635,144
Technical schools	$2,373,798
	$7,008,942

APPENDIX "A"

School—High Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
	$	$	$	$	$	$
*Albert Park	500	36,867	64,128	13,544	5,975	2,228
Alexandra	500	650	1,270	700	808	1,083
*Altona	..	710	3,070	750	905	1,230
*Altona North	500	980	3,697	1,420	1,425	18,294
*Ararat	..	630	640	1,010	4,055	1,005
*Ashwood	..	760	4,345	1,221	1,121	1,589
*Avondale	..	..	..	290	300	98,342
Bacchus Marsh	..	720	760	820	979	1,059
Bairnsdale	..	870	910	960	1,219	1,415
*Ballarat	..	1,550	1,530	7,962	62,040	44,211
Ballarat East	..	850	920	1,530	1,353	1,747
Ballarat Girls'	..	750	950	930	924	1,407
*Balmoral	500	350	1,160	380	3,571	5,159
Balwyn	..	810	790	760	892	1,009
Banyule	..	980	900	950	994	976
*Bayswater	500	750	2,175	860	1,039	1,182
Beaufort	..	600	600	640	826	946
*Beaumaris	..	1,000	3,289	940	1,096	8,130
Beechworth	..	660	480	650	742	922
*Bell Park	..	1,010	2,580	1,455	72,147	16,499
*Belmont	..	1,050	1,050	1,050	4,144	60,519
Benalla	..	750	750	730	1,025	1,573
Bendigo	..	850	860	1,440	1,285	1,650
*Bentleigh	..	930	920	2,224	1,033	1,168
Birchip	..	400	370	460	641	724
*Blackburn	..	1,280	1,270	1,298	1,562	14,526
*Blackburn South	..	800	2,360	1,125	922	1,117
*Bonbeach	..	920	850	2,112	1,024	1,116
Boort	..	420	410	430	580	752
*Boronia	..	990	960	2,642	42,828	44,999
Box Hill Boys'	..	900	870	830	881	926
*Braybrook	500	820	3,832	1,330	1,672	1,839
*Brentwood	500	96,642	20,253	2,155	1,155	1,700
*Brighton	..	1,060	960	990	1,082	74,958
Broadford	500	250	1,040	610	662	832
*Broadmeadows	500	1,380	3,679	1,760	1,339	1,948
*Brunswick	500	1,290	7,442	1,400	2,000	2,432
Brunswick Girls'	..	840	910	920	1,952	1,594
*Buckley Park	500	940	3,589	950	1,154	29,299
Burwood	..	930	910	850	964	1,318
*Burwood Heights	..	95,225	7,122	966	653	1,307
*Camberwell	..	7,433	7,199	1,490	4,524	1,906
*Camperdown	..	520	10,083	19,296	708	3,847
Canterbury Girls'	..	860	820	780	926	1,000
Casterton	..	520	890	890	917	1,260
*Castlemaine	..	580	600	960	3,570	1,563
Caulfield	..	1,010	1,070	1,680	1,232	1,136
Chadstone	500	890	1,560	830	1,044	1,216
Chandler	..	..	..	350	427	1,351
Charlton	500	370	980	490	600	683
*Cheltenham	..	980	1,020	1,310	1,243	1,353
Cobram	500	550	1,270	590	761	1,563
*Coburg	500	580	1,350	610	57,824	77,597
*Cohuna	500	480	1,010	540	643	1,111
*Colac	..	1,020	1,570	1,470	1,210	28,315
*Collingwood	500	660	1,500	960	42,670	36,774
Corryong	500	580	1,440	610	685	977
*Croydon	..	1,020	1,050	1,060	1,264	30,154
Dandenong	..	990	1,030	1,080	1,610	1,835
Dandenong North	..	600	620	630	2,352	1,406
Daylesford	..	..	..	690	..	..
*Debney Park	..	..	..	..	92,525	66,337
*Deer Park	..	..	..	..	191	17,765
Derrinallum	..	460	460	480	624	788
*Dimboola	..	560	550	560	3,584	893
Donald	..	600	600	620	712	919
*Doncaster	16,113	81,923	15,262	880	1,124	1,961
Doncaster East	..	..	..	..	..	642
*Donvale	500	580	3,089	1,230	1,051	1,156
*Doveton	..	1,100	3,781	2,181	1,605	24,169
*Drouin	..	610	1,957	1,080	764	1,124
*Eaglehawk	500	700	1,570	2,692	1,578	2,130
East Loddon	..	..	..	..	826	1,313
*Echuca	..	750	2,438	1,250	1,198	1,797
*Edenhope	..	500	530	967	625	861
*Eltham	..	1,030	1,020	930	72,590	35,297
*Elwood	..	830	850	1,390	99,776	11,254
*Essendon	..	840	930	6,557	1,960	1,767
*Euroa	..	560	560	3,395	2,846	1,219
*Fairhills	..	..	..	..	220	6,051
*Fawkner	2,000	850	900	81,845	9,474	1,396
*Ferntree Gully	500	85,130	3,802	880	1,100	1·241

APPENDIX "A"—*continued.*

School—High Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June 1974 (½ year)
	$	$	$	$	$	$
*Fitzroy	..	1,660	1,640	2,079	1,565	2,133
Fitzroy Girls'	..	580	610	640	1,080	1,240
*Flemington	..	1,590	1,670	1,700	97,833	62,817
Flemington Girls	..	740	810	790	..	..
Flora Hills	500	950	1,820	820	974	1,380
*Footscray	500	810	3,974	960	1,425	1,792
Footscray Girls'	..	880	840	820	1,208	2,379
Foster	..	460	660	620	722	1,044
*Frankston	500	89,911	8,786	3,719	1,816	1,896
Geelong	..	930	850	770	846	1,477
*Geelong North	500	930	1,970	2,502	1,636	1,933
Gladstone Park	..	..	..	..	..	709
*Glenroy	500	990	1,780	93,002	6,017	2,465
*Glen Waverley	..	1,120	90,793	4,198	6,510	1,401
*Golden Square	500	660	4,236	1,135	965	1,160
*Greenwood	..	15,842	90,063	2,860	3,555	1,364
*Greythorn	..	860	930	960	1,193	59,071
*Hadfield	500	1,030	62,962	33,279	1,289	3,064
*Hallam	..	12,414	78,979	2,149	1,058	1,327
Hamilton	..	870	910	1,420	1,148	1,440
Hampton	..	850	850	820	1,124	1,204
Hastings	..	..	..	..	..	653
Hawkesdale	500	450	1,460	430	563	715
Hawthorn	..	..	..	..	..	550
Healesville	500	510	1,300	510	1,108	976
*Heatherhill	500	72,119	22,791	4,334	1,157	1,318
*Heidelberg	..	1,490	1,470	1,830	1,587	25,395
Heywood	500	600	1,470	540	678	814
*Highett	..	880	3,047	770	860	1,051
Hopetoun	..	510	520	510	652	778
*Horsham	500	920	1,710	24,092	86,791	16,440
*Huntingdale	..	850	2,880	1,241	1,004	1,237
*Hurstbridge	500	680	1,770	1,507	917	1,139
J. H. Boyd	..	820	790	790	1,040	1,184
Kaniva	..	430	440	440	588	874
*Karingal	..	990	1,080	1,130	1,366	21,287
*Kealba	..	99,884	11,478	1,330	943	1,450
*Keilor Heights	850	84,737	6,979	710	1,464	1,145
Kerang	..	770	830	880	1,038	1,177
*Kew	500	1,620	1,940	980	1,111	88,240
*Koonung	500	870	3,708	1,275	1,090	1,234
Koo-wee-rup	..	2,000	700	540	673	978
*Korumburra	..	620	580	610	4,260	992
Kyabram	..	770	810	820	1,004	1,139
Kyneton	..	710	1,150	730	1,093	1,420
Lake Bolac	..	460	660	660	844	986
*Lakeside	..	660	2,211	1,065	838	1,021
Lalor	..	800	940	1,050	1,611	2,203
*Latrobe	..	39,457	2,803	1,389	1,223	1,448
*Laverton	500	3,289	96,615	3,689	1,244	1,089
Leongatha	..	620	640	600	721	1,057
*Lilydale	..	35,713	9,061	1,167	978	1,367
*Lyndale	500	820	3,397	960	1,256	1,448
*McKinnon	..	1,020	960	89,441	10,151	3,382
*Macleod	..	970	2,922	1,655	1,081	1,170
*MacRob. Girls'	..	21,591	832	730	797	823
*Maffra	..	3,308	1,186	1,049	081	858
Malvern Girls'	..	810	760	700	822	1,175
Mansfield	..	460	490	740	678	897
*Maribyrnong	500	910	1,900	930	1,134	5,337
*Maroondah	500	500	2,935	1,081	920	1,104
Maryborough	..	490	510	930	974	1,321
*Maryvale	..	79,590	20,206	1,120	1,552	911
*Matthew Flinders Girls'	..	660	1,110	45,113	73,700	4,195
Melbourne Boys'	..	1,100	1,140	1,140	1,272	1,392
Mentone Girls	..	820	800	800	914	1,052
Merbein	..	460	680	510	662	843
*Merrilands	..	1,070	2,840	1,251	904	994
Mildura	..	830	810	1,210	990	1,143
Mirboo North	..	600	610	610	716	1,017
*Mitcham	..	960	1,000	80,934	15,193	3,162
Moe	..	750	1,170	1,190	1,280	1,607
Monash	500	600	1,550	860	1,085	1,182
*Monbulk	500	940	2,886	1,411	736	959
*Monterey	500	630	2,893	1,293	924	1,045
*Montmorency	500	100,946	7,102	2,913	1,034	1,591
*Moorabbin	500	840	3,786	760	902	933
*Moorleigh	..	620	2,048	1,218	844	1,066
*Mooroolbark	..	..	..	..	102	3,880
Mooroopna	..	..	..	100	295	1,231

APPENDIX "A"—*continued.*

School—High	Location	Calendar years					
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Mordialloc-Chelsea		..	850	820	810	984	1,116
Moreland		..	900	950	930	1,451	1,454
*Mornington		..	1,040	950	95,725	4,672	3,283
Mortlake		..	450	450	470	586	717
*Morwell		..	910	2,734	1,265	1,319	1,225
Mount Beauty		..	490	490	470	668	808
*Mount Waverley		500	920	3,077	880	1,082	1,273
Murrayville		500	290	370	310	544	1,311
Murrumbeena		..	880	880	890	1,067	930
*Murtoa		..	430	440	823	2,944	809
Myrtleford		500	570	1,180	580	649	969
Nathalia		..	440	450	440	559	731
Neerim South		..	380	360	350	581	642
*Newborough		..	510	2,126	1,091	734	996
*Newcomb		500	103,893	11,887	717	1,151	1,621
*Newlands		..	1,120	2,370	1,261	1,013	1,158
*Nhill		..	520	700	1,230	2,395	875
*Niddrie		..	1,040	3,024	187,052	12,707	1,325
*Noble Park		..	1,080	1,104	1,714	1,392	25,123
*Norlane		..	1,330	3,133	1,831	1,462	1,708
Northcote Boys'		..	1,220	740	790	1,194	1,264
*Norwood		..	960	970	980	1,182	33,184
Numurkah		..	560	600	640	853	969
*Nunawading		..	40,354	49,234	7,556	1,339	1,423
*Oakleigh		..	1,080	1,090	1,110	1,543	20,045
*Oak Park		..	1,100	77,138	10,539	1,213	1,327
Oberon		500	820	1,900	980	1,224	1,428
Orbost		500	440	1,550	690	710	1,070
Ouyen		..	520	530	530	659	875
Paisley		..	..	..	360	370	1,323
*Pakenham		500	580	1,930	790	906	2,443
*Parkdale		500	700	2,934	640	770	855
*Pascoe Vale Girls'		..	640	3,414	1,280	1,539	1,279
*Pembroke		12,505	77,367	5,161	850	1,582	1,240
Pt. Gellibrand		..	610	640	780	1,155	1,120
Portland		..	1,080	660	970	839	874
Prahran		500	1,240	1,640	1,560	2,000	1,901
Preston East		..	850	880	980	1,188	1,644
Preston Girls'		..	740	1,290	1,350	1,198	1,295
*Princes Hill		500	1,490	2,130	46,137	57,737	2,557
Queenscliff		..	380	600	620	763	1,211
*Rainbow		..	380	390	460	611	10,981
Red Cliffs		..	630	920	950	820	1,009
Reservoir		..	800	790	1,210	1,005	952
Richmond		500	620	1,990	890	2,000	1,6147
*Richmond Girls'		500	740	1,440	8,067	6,224	1,258
*Ringwood		..	1,000	1,050	1,100	1,349	1,258
Robinvale		..	700	610	620	669	940
*Rochester		..	610	660	1,990	756	1,046
*Rosanna East		..	50	70,910	400	1,008	1,449
*Rosebud		..	740	750	2,010	3,873	1,490
*Rushworth		500	620	1,390	178	1,561	864
Rutherglen		500	540	1,730	410	584	785
*St. Albans		..	980	1,594	1,110	1,870	1,991
St. Arnaud		..	450	450	430	694	791
*Sale		..	510	530	102,261	10,912	2,578
*Seaford Carrum		500	2,397	84,658	8,380	1,335	974
*Sea Lake		..	500	530	530	46,866	3,619
Seymour		..	660	680	710	907	1,072
Shepparton		500	1,040	1,750	1,130	1,286	1,519
Shepparton Girls'		..	690	620	890	786	1,022
Springvale		..	850	820	910	1,184	1,485
Stawell		500	430	1,680	640	734	1,029
*Strathmore		..	1,040	2,830	91,551	13,975	3,173
Sunbury		..	450	500	550	710	1,083
Sunshine		..	790	820	850	1,292	1,394
Sunshine West		500	820	1,570	1,550	1,795	1,954
Swan Hill		..	810	840	1,550	1,162	1,219
*Syndal		500	5,444	88,812	10,257	1,552	1,349
Tallangatta		500	530	1,340	560	675	925
*Templestowe		..	1,070	1,090	86,858	6,933	25,785
*Terang		..	730	2,822	540	907	923
*Thomastown		..	16,238	71,796	5,983	1,408	1,244
*Thornbury		500	890	4,168	1,560	1,707	23,062
*Timboon		500	540	1,430	540	802	16,909
Trafalgar		..	470	490	490	678	860
Traralgon		500	870	1,690	930	1,210	1,298
*University		..	960	990	4,572	101,478	30,468
*Upfield		500	680	4,182	970	1,229	1,684
Upper Yarra		..	720	890	860	875	1,127
Upwey		..	850	760	790	1,004	1,102
Vermont		..	810	850	860	1,074	1,216

APPENDIX "A"—*continued.*

School—High	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
*Wangaratta	..	..	900	2,119	1,185	835	890
Warracknabeal	..	..	580	550	510	606	874
Warragul	..	..	640	660	700	848	1,143
*Warrnambool	..	..	790	810	2,084	884	995
*Waterdale	..	..	700	2,992	630	887	1,099
*Watsonia	..	..	1,100	1,120	81,778	9,116	1,193
Wattle Park	..	..	980	1,020	1,000	1,148	1,048
*Waverley	..	..	950	2,869	84,340	8,047	1,112
Wedderburn	..	500	390	1,290	390	540	711
Wellington	..	..	..	..	..	174	18,196
Werribee	..	500	830	1,680	890	1,427	1,238
*Westall	..	500	720	3,216	1,331	1,266	1,459
Williamstown	..	..	820	890	860	1,211	1,126
*Wodonga	..	..	860	2,030	1,391	1,225	1,463
Wonthaggi	..	500	560	1,910	920	909	1,222
*Yallourn	..	..	550	1,956	808	629	797
Yarram	..	..	530	550	590	688	939
*Yarrawonga	..	..	490	660	640	732	4,393
Yea	..	..	410	420	420	606	692
Correspondence	..	500	60	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Camberwell Annexe	..	..	..	..	..	1,000	633
Collingwood Annexe	..	..	..	..	..	400	450
Moreland Community	..	..	..	..	..	500	583
South Yarra	..	..	..	..	..	1,000	572
TOTAL HIGH SCHOOLS	..	68,468	1,481,774	1,415,567	1,467,343	1,402,782	1,561,702

* Includes Expenditure on Buildings

APPENDIX "B"

School—Higher Elementary	Location	Calandar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Bright	..	480	290	290	300	519	650
Inglewood	..	330	280	280	260	491	650
Lorne	..	235	260	240	240	461	650
Manangatang	..	320	280	330	330	505	650
Omeo	..	250	270	260	270	470	650
Swifts Creek	..	405	280	290	300	502	650
Winchelsea	..	415	330	340	320	662	650
Wycheproof	..	545	300	300	310	555	650
TOTAL HIGHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	..	2,980	2,290	2,330	2,330	4,165	5,200

APPENDIX "C"

School—Central	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Caulfield North	..	..	240	200	460	384	550
Gardenvale	..	..	190	210	410	427	550
Gardiner	..	..	110	120	330	358	550
Malvern	..	..	110	120	340	395	550
Malvern East	..	..	180	200	330	337	550
Moonee Ponds	..	..	150	250	440	403	550
Elwood	..	..	250	370	510	408	..
Auburn	..	..	230	100	..	..	..
Toorak	..	..	80	90	300	..	..
Footscray	..	..	130	110	..	..	..
Hawthorn West	..	..	50	..	..	..	..
TOTAL CENTRAL SCHOOLS	..	..	1,720	1,770	3,120	2,712	3,300
Cental Classes							
Cann River	..	255	60	250	260	284	450
Mallacoota	..	100	20	220	230	246	450
Pyramid Hill	..	450	80	270	260	285	450
TOTAL CENTRAL CLASSES	..	805	160	740	750	815	1,350

APPENDIX "D"

School—Consolidated	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Apollo Bay		560	320	320	..	144	650
Goroke		375	260	260	..	55	450
Lavers Hill		350	330	280	..	86	450
Werrimull		510	280	280	..	62	450
Boisdale		180	210	210	..	..	..
East Loddon		740	350	350	..	..	..
Kiewa Valley		50	..	..	..	..	..
Lockington		145	220	220	..	..	..
Poowong		150	220	210	..	..	..
Tongala		225	240	240	..	..	..
TOTAL CONSOLDATED SCHOOLS		3,285	2,430	2,370	..	347	2,000

APPENDIX "E"

School—Special	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Yooralla, Carlton		..	65	60	50	50	99
Yooralla, Balwyn		..	84	90	60	56	141
Marathon		..	40	40	50	50	88
Day Special—Mt. Eliza		..	29	40	50	50	86
Shannon Park		..	25	25	50	50	90
School for Deaf, St. Kilda		..	87	90	80	74	140
Glendonald		..	64	70	50	50	99
Ewing House, Ballarat		..	25	25	50	50	90
R.C.H. Parkville		..	25	25	50	50	100
Austin Hospital		..	25	25	50	50	100
Alfred Hospital		..	25	25	50	50	100
Ballarat		..	78	70	70	76	145
Broadmeadows		..	71	70	80	81	147
Croxton, Northcote		..	78	80	80	57	119
Fitzroy		..	47	40	50	50	91
Footscray		..	50	40	50	53	122
Geelong		..	57	60	60	75	121
Bendigo		..	40	40	50	50	90
Mitcham		..	74	80	80	63	122
Montague		..	58	60	60	50	93
Moorabbin West		..	140	150	150	119	186
Ormond		..	34	30	50	50	90
Janefield		..	75	80	70	71	136
Kew Cottages		..	33	30	50	50	90
Pleasant Creek, Stawell		..	80	100	100	94	148
Travancore		..	25	25	50	50	90
Allambie		..	50	30	50	50	99
Helside, Wheelers Hill		..	34	30	50	50	90
Baltara, Parkville		..	88	100	100	103	170
Langi Kal Kal		..	25	80	..	..	90
Royal Park Senior		..	80	90	90	89	112
Winlaton		..	100	80	100	96	131
Carronbank, Kew		..	25	25	50	50	..
Malmsbury		..	25	25	50	50	..
Heatherton Hosp. School		..	25	25	..	..	..
Bayswater		..	51	50	..	..	..
Ararat Prison		..	59	80	50	50	90
Beechworth Prison		..	89	30	100	111	145
Bendigo Prison		..	51	30	50	50	90
Geelong Prison		..	60	60	50	50	90
Pentridge		..	110	300	190	455	239
The Basin Boys,		..	..	..	50	58	92
Tally Ho		..	83	90	90	74	105
Ballarat Children's Home		..	33	30	50	50	90
Glenmore		..	28	25	50	50	90
Meglin, Diamond Creek		..	25	25	50	50	90
Lunan House		..	35	25	..	..	..
Dandenong		..	..	..	..	50	108
Watsonia		..	..	..	..	50	138
Fairlea		..	..	..	..	50	90
Frankston		..	..	..	..	..	123
Moe		..	..	..	..	..	90
Vermont South	Burwood East	..	..	..	..	62	157
Victoria Park		..	..	25	..	..	92
Warrnambool East		..	25	..	..	..	..
Box Hill		..	25	..	..	..	..
Lake Tyers		..	25	..	..	..	..
Armadale Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
Ballarat Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
Footscray North Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..

APPENDIX "E"—*continued.*

School—Special	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st December, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Geelong West Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
Hampton Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
Moorabbin Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
Ringwood Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
St. Kilda Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
Wattle Park Rem. Centre		..	..	25	..	..	..
McLeod Via Lang Lang		..	..	..	50	..	..
TOTAL SPECIAL SCHOOLS		..	2,585	2,950	2,910	3,267	5,534
Blackburn Reading Unit		..	..	..	..	..	500
Minor Expenditure (Various Schools)		..	20,051	53,606	25,182	32,200	9,286
Design, Supervision and Administration		4,759	147,990	128,359	143,366	128,988	156,608
TOTAL		80,297	1,659,600	1,607,692	1,645,001	1,575,276	1,745,570

APPENDIX "F"

School—Technical	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Altona North		2,000	770	770	790	1,121	1,472
Ararat		2,000	440	440	480	336	836
Aspendale		2,000	750	750	780	1,289	1,487
Bairnsdale		..	860	560	580	981	1,339
Ballam Park		..	..	..	330	522	1,144
Ballarat		2,000	820	850	880	1,152	1,425
Ballarat North		2,000	1,230	1,460	1 610	2,000	2,766
*Batman Motor Trades		..	..	..	353	1,971	..
Bell Park		2,000	380	63,619	34,814	2,856	1,286
Benalla		..	490	900	670	678	1,231
Blackburn		2,000	500	510	570	686	1,042
Boronia		..	..	..	..	193	873
*Box Hill		..	11,353	2,115	1,220	790	1,090
*Brighton		..	1,290	1,260	690	1,715	27,851
*Broadmeadows		2,000	600	640	1,010	1,159	53,683
Broadmeadows West		2,000	540	600	940	1,329	1,318
Brunswick		..	1,140	1,150	960	1,769	1,984
Burwood		2,000	840	1,000	840	622	760
Castlemaine		..	580	800	740	757	1,151
Caulfield		2,000	980	860	920	729	1,173
Clayton		2,000	780	780	810	1,106	1,211
Cobden		2,000	210	290	550	448	1,000
Coburg		..	1,110	690	1,170	1,068	1,381
Colac		..	930	1,030	1,090	1,098	1,555
Collingwood		2,000	940	940	870	1,637	1,889
*Corio		..	1,690	1,570	1,570	2,000	37,675
Dandenong		..	1,160	1,160	1,100	1,006	1,633
Daylesford		..	630	980	960	1,004	1,295
Diamond Creek		..	..	..	..	133	827
Doveton		2,000	1,300	1,120	950	1,337	1,621
Dromana		2,000	790	640	1,000	672	881
Echuca		2,000	530	580	570	707	1,003
*Endeavour Hills	Doveton North	2,000	140	390	730	1,606	1,454
*Essendon		..	1,150	111,214	14,531	8,294	1,301
*Fawkner		2,000	750	880	90,288	2,537	12,499
Ferntree Gully		..	1,110	730	1,260	1,194	1,399
Footscray		..	1,330	1,320	1,340	1,847	2,079
*Frankston		..	1,090	730	4,041	94,773	14,861
Geelong		2,000	950	940	940	805	1,169
*Geelong East		2,000	1,090	1,110	1,090	1,044	42,930
Geelong West		2,000	1,510	1,460	1,490	1,245	1,872
*Glenroy		2,000	1,260	90,192	6,691	2,787	3,963

APPENDIX "F"—*continued.*

School—Technical	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
*Hamilton		..	610	970	640	1,246	17,898
*Heidelberg		..	470	680	920	8,530	2,837
Horsham		..	590	630	1,010	913	47,676
Huntingdale		..	..	..	370	384	810
*Irymple		2,000	3,579	88,600	14,988	3,479	869
Jordanville		..	470	960	830	1,011	1,050
Kangaroo Flat		..	930	1,010	1,130	1,305	1,565
*Keon Park		2,000	580	650	83,265	11,574	1,290
*Kingsbury		2,000	57,552	22,955	4,842	979	950
*Knox		2,000	770	880	1,000	1,206	118,199
*Lalor		2,000	360	41,476	55,385	10,462	2,540
*Leongatha		2,000	68,070	24,194	3,542	1,872	936
Lilydale		..	130	300	660	930	1,961
*Macleod		2,000	520	1,060	1,220	1,243	57,032
Maryborough		2,000	940	980	1,010	1,804	1,961
Mildura		..	970	1,510	1,360	1,718	2,054
*Mitcham		2,000	760	820	71,978	17,056	4,509
Monterey		2,000	1,190	1,410	1,470	1,219	1,826
Moorabbin		..	670	740	760	786	993
Mooroolbark		2,000	720	720	700	862	1,051
Morwell		..	690	670	1,130	1,069	1,234
*Niddrie		2,000	570	930	2,905	1,526	1,203
*Noble Park		..	1,020	830	850	60,362	18,524
*Northcote		2,000	460	7,841	1,860	1,926	1,866
*Oakleigh		2,000	800	20,785	89,666	5,279	1,082
Portland		..	60	140	430	428	1,134
Prahran		2,000	1,030	830	940	1,262	1,300
Preston		2,000	2,480	2,600	2,070	2,000	2,563
*Preston East		..	1,630	1,320	1,250	2,000	28,525
Richmond		..	790	760	790	1,217	1,302
Ringwood		2,000	890	890	920	1,074	1,133
Sale		..	910	950	950	1,594	1,932
*Sandringham		..	950	890	1,370	1,084	18,051
*Sebastopol		2,000	1,780	1,860	1,850	2,000	17,415
Shepparton		2,000	790	870	810	916	1,172
Shepparton South		2,000	650	1,190	1,310	1,253	1,702
*South Melbourne		..	830	67,163	18,429	5,856	2,513
Springvale		..	..	..	..	..	693
St. Albans		2,000	540	570	570	840	1,160
Stawell		..	510	740	530	654	930
*Sunshine		2,000	1,460	89,234	9,386	6,611	2,948
Sunshine North		2,000	1,090	1,030	690	1,661	1,735
Swan Hill		..	680	1,150	1,070	776	1,045
Swinburne		..	1,140	1,190	1,290	1,935	1,839
Syndal		..	600	640	670	817	1,239
Templestowe		..	..	80	420	491	1,057
Tottenham		..	700	680	820	1,357	1,676
Traralgon		2,000	550	570	520	619	830
*Wangaratta		..	1,210	1,090	100,538	3,611	4,135
*Warragul		..	630	2,153	2,931	1,348	1,334
*Warrnambool		2,000	790	1,300	31,837	55,444	3,571
Warrnambool North		2,000	770	670	940	1,023	1,172
Watsonia		2,000	740	780	810	916	1,050
*Werribee		..	..	..	..	..	71,806
*White Hills (Box Hill Girls)		2,000	1,220	1,200	60,831	27,927	4,195
Whitehorse		..	760	900	840	860	1,052
Williamstown		..	1,100	670	1,100	997	1,230
Wodonga		..	610	650	660	583	1,095
Wonthaggi		..	810	820	860	1,260	1,524
*Yallourn		2,000	780	760	1,150	936	33,887
Miscellaneous (Various Schools)		..	8,497	16,614	10,341	20,624	9,552
Design, Supervision, Administration		..	15,836	64,201	84,246	31,898	77,846
TOTAL TECHNICAL SCHOOLS		104,000	241,347	785,786	869,878	473,616	838,668

APPENDIX "G"

School	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Academy of Mary Immaculate	Fitzroy	..	..	30,000	5,000	7,600	4,008
Adass Israel School	Elsternwick	..	..	..	..	822	..
All Hallows	Balwyn	..	..	..	..	..	..
All Saints	Portland	..	..	..	..	..	..
Annunciation	Kingsville	..	..	..	..	..	..
Aquinas College	Ringwood	..	..	..	..	4,000	4,000
Assumption College	Kilmore	..	30,000	5,000	3,600	5,219	1,500
Ave Maria	Essendon	..	..	..	..	1,500	1,500
Avila College	Mt. Waverley	..	..	36,500	7,356	1,807	1,500
Ballarat College	Ballarat	..	29,000	..	1,160	..	..
Ballarat and Queen's Grammar School	Ballarat	..	..	..	..	580	..
Beth Rivkah Ladies College	East St. Kilda	..	3,800	..	..	..	..
Bialik College	Hawthorn	..	..	..	870	..	..
Blessed Oliver Plunkett	Pascoe Vale	..	..	..	..	..	..
Bostock House (Geelong CEGS)	Belmont	..	..	..	..	..	..
Brighton Grammar School	Brighton	..	..	12,655	1,660	2,500	1,500
Camberwell C.E.G.G.S.	Canterbury	..	20,000	..	3,460	2,300	2,200
Camberwell Grammar School	Canterbury	..	20,000	18,500	11,800	11,720	11,700
Carey Baptist Grammar School	Kew	..	..	37,000	7,100	7,100	7,100
Cathedral College	Melbourne East	..	..	..	..	1,000	..
Catholic Ladies College	Eltham (formerly East Melbourne)	..	..	30,000	1,500	..	2,730
Catholic Regional College	Camperdown	..	..	..	..	600	300
Caulfield Grammar	East St. Kilda	..	..	31,500	9,500	9,500	9,470
Caulfield Grammar	Glen Iris	..	..	..	..	580	..
Champagnat College	Wangaratta	..	..	19,000	..	16,453	..
Chanel College	Geelong	..	..	..	..	1,500	750
Chavoin College	Burwood	..	..	2,000	..	23,700	19,100
Christ Church Grammar School	South Yarra	..	..	..	..	..	..
Christ Our Holy Redeemer	Oakleigh East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Christ The King	Braybrook	..	34,663	4,000	2,700	1,000	..
Christ The King	Geelong East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Christ The Priest	Scoresby	..	..	..	..	..	..
Christian Community College	Maryborough	..	..	..	..	..	500
C.B.C. Parade Prep.	Alphington	..	..	..	..	1,750	..
C.B.C. Parade	Bundoora	..	..	..	..	..	..
C.B.C. St. Kilda	St. Kilda East	..	..	..	1,500	..	1,500
Clarendon P.L.C.	Ballarat	..	..	20,000	4,160	7,000	3,000
Clonard College	Geelong West	..	..	..	..	3,000	..
Clyde School	Woodend	..	..	..	..	..	..
Convent F.C.J.	Benalla	15,000	2,000	9,679	1,100	1,000	2,539
Convent of Mercy	Kyneton	..	..	..	750	..	..
Convent of Sacred Heart	Glen Iris	..	..	..	..	500	..
Corpus Christi	Glenroy	..	..	..	..	..	..
Corpus Christi	Kingsville	..	..	..	..	..	..
Delaney College	Beechworth	..	..	..	..	500	..
De La Salle	Malvern	..	40,000	5,000	800	4,608	500
Edmund Rice College	Bundoora	..	..	..	..	..	..
E.R.A. School	Warrandyte	..	..	..	2,000	320	..
Essendon Grammar School	Essendon	..	21,750	3,000	5,512	2,700	2,700
Firbank C.E.G.G.S.	North Brighton	..	..	..	..	..	9,000
Firbank C.E.G.G.S.	Sandringham	..	..	..	..	..	..
Fintona Girls' School	Balwyn	..	..	..	..	..	..
Geelong College	Geelong	..	5,400	..	7,828	7,300	7,300
Geelong Grammar School	Geelong	..	..	..	2,000	..	..
Genazzano	Kew	..	2,000	32,695	4,200	..	..
Geoghegan College	Broadmeadows	..	..	..	..	38,665	2,000
Gilmore College	Preston	..	..	..	..	..	..
Girton C.E.G.G.S.	Bendigo	..	15,000	3,000	865	300	200
Glamorgan (Geelong CEGS)	Toorak	..	..	..	..	..	..
Good Samaritan College	Koroit	..	..	..	..	..	..
Good Shepherd	Brandon Park	..	..	..	..	..	..
Haileybury College	Keysborough	..	25,000	13,000	17,103	17,080	17,080
Hamilton College	Hamilton	..	..	..	..	..	7,385
Hermitage (Geelong CEGGS)	Geelong	..	..	..	5,900	10,001	8,115
Holy Child	Dallas	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Cross	Caulfield South	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Cross	Daylesford	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Eucharist	Chadstone	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Family	Bell Park	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Family	Brunswick East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Family	Doveton	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Family	Maryknol	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Family	Mt. Waverley	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Name	Preston East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Redeemer	Ripponlea	..	..	..	750	750	750
Holy Redeemer	Surrey Hills	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Rosary	Heathcote	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Rosary	Kensington	..	..	..	..	..	..
Holy Rosary	White Hills	..	..	..	..	..	..

APPENDIX "G"—*continued.*

School	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Holy Spirit	Thornbury East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Huntingtower	Mt. Waverley	..	..	12,000	781	..	..
Immaculate Conception	Hastings	..	..	..	..	..	..
Immaculate Conception	Ivanhoe	..	..	..	..	..	..
Immaculate Conception	Omeo	..	..	..	..	..	..
Immaculate Heart	Preston	..	..	..	..	2,000	..
Immaculate Heart of Mary	Birchip	..	..	..	..	500	250
Immaculate Heart of Mary	Hampton East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Immaculate Heart of Mary	Newborough	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ivanhoe C.E.G.G.S.	Ivanhoe	..	20,000	..	3,300	3,247	3,200
Ivanhoe Grammar School	Ivanhoe	..	..	21,500	4,200	4,100	4,100
Kilbreda	Mentone	..	..	29,695	40,005	6,000	175
Kilbride	Albert Park	..	..	..	..	2,500	..
Kildara College	Malvern	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kildare College	Traralgon	..	12,978	3,597	998	2,302	2,000
Killester College	Springvale	..	..	..	..	33,000	10,000
Kilmaire	Hawthorn	..	..	..	..	3,000	1,000
Kilvington Baptist G.G.S.	Ormond	21,750	..	..	4,160	3,000	3,000
Kingswood College	Box Hill	28,800	1,750	..	320	2,000	..
Korowa C.E.G.G.S.	Glen Iris	..	..	..	..	1,160	..
Larmenier	East Camberwel	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lauriston Girls' School	Armadale	..	..	..	..	..	..
Little St. Margaret's School	Malvern	..	..	..	..	..	..
Loreto Abbey	Ballarat	..	..	..	..	17,000	8,113
Loreto Convent	Ballarat	..	31,766	5,969	1,333	3,667	..
Loreto Convent	Portland	..	..	..	700	700	700
Loreto Convent	Toorak	..	..	..	..	750	750
Lowther Hall C.E.G.G.S.	Essendon	..	15,000	..	2,160	2,000	..
Luther College	Croydon	..	..	20,000	1,800	1,800	1,800
St. Peter's Lutheran School	Dimboola	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's Lutheran School	Geelong	..	..	..	..	..	..
Hamilton Lutheran School	Hamilton	..	..	..	..	..	..
Tabor Lutheran School	Tabor	..	..	..	..	..	..
Tarrington Lutheran School	Tarrington	..	..	..	..	..	..
Vectis South Lutheran School	Vectis South	..	..	..	..	..	..
Warrayure Lutheran School	Warrayure	..	..	..	..	..	..
Maranatha School with the Bible	Doveton	..	..	..	..	..	..
Marcellin College	Bulleen	..	..	..	2,500	2,500	1,000
Marcellin Junior	Camberwell	..	..	..	..	1,000	1,000
Marian College	Ararat	..	..	..	..	1,400	700
Marian College	Myrtleford	..	20,297	3,893	446	3,500	..
Marian College	Sunshine West	..	35,000	2,000	1,694	970	2,541
Marillac House	East Brighton	..	..	..	..	..	..
Marist Brothers College	Bendigo	..	28,475	8,416	..	4,000	2,000
Marist Brothers College	Warragul	..	10,417	..	1,080	1,000	..
Maryknoll College	Hamilton	..	..	..	..	1,400	..
Mary McKillop	Werribee	..	..	..	..	1,800	..
Mater Christi	Belgrave	..	..	..	1,000	24,325	16,949
Mazenod College	Mulgrave	..	..	..	..	..	35,000
Melbourne C.E.G.G.S.	South Yarra	..	..	..	..	..	..
Melbourne Grammar	South Yarra	..	..	..	1,160	3,700	3,700
Mentone Girl's Grammar	Mentone	..	21,000	2,800	4,800	9,600	..
Mentone Grammar	Mentone	..	20,000	5,700	11,800	7,900	3,900
Mercy College	Coburg North	..	..	..	1,000	1,000	1,000
Methodist Ladies College	Elsternwick	20,000	..	..	5,512	4,700	4,600
Methodist Ladies College	Kew	..	..	..	29,141	29,100	29,100
Monivae College	Hamilton	..	..	..	10,000	13,389	4,044
Morongo Presbyterian Girls' College	Geelong	..	..	..	7,800	7,750	7,700
Mother of God	Ardeer	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mother of God	Ivanhoe East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mt. Carmel	Middle Park	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mt. Carmel	Rutherglen	..	..	..	..	1,000	..
Mt Lilydale College	Lilydale	..	30,900	5,100	1,000	400	40
Mt. St. Joseph's	Altona West	..	..	2,000	..	..	..
Mt. St. Joseph's (Girls)	Altona West	..	..	40,000	2,900	4,042	190
Mt. St. Joseph's	Yarraville	..	..	..	..	900	900
Mount Scopus	Burwood	..	..	..	2,320	15,600	15,600
Nazareth Boys' School	Sebastopol	..	..	..	..	..	..
Nazareth House	Ballarat	..	..	..	..	..	..
O'Neill College	Elsternwick	..	..	30,000	2,500	2,700	..
Our Lady's	Manifold	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady's	Melbourne South	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady's	Sunshine	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady's	Woodend	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of The Assumption	Cheltenham	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Fatima	Dunnstown	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Good Counsel	Deepdene	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady Help of Christians	Brunswick East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady Help of Christians	Eltham	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady Help of Christians	Murtoa	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady Help of Christians	Warrnambool East	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady Help of Christians	Wendouree	..	..	..	..	..	..

APPENDIX "G"—*continued.*

School	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
Our Lady of Lourdes ..	Armadale ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Lourdes ..	Bayswater ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Mercy College ..	Casterton ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Mercy College ..	Heidelberg ..	..	..	28,000	5,300	5,650	789
Our Lady of Mt. Carmel ..	Middle Park ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Mt. Carmel ..	Sunbury ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of The Nativity ..	Essendon West	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Perpetual Succour	Pascoe Vale South	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Perpetual Succour	Ringwood ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Perpetual Succour	Wattle Park ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of The Sacred Heart	Bentleigh ..	..	2,000	44,000	3,435	..	..
Our Lady of The Sacred Heart	Elmore ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of The Sacred Heart	Merbein ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Sion	Box Hill ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of Sion	Sale	..	..	12,921	1,600	4,311	1,000
Our Lady of Sion	Warragul ..	..	..	..	..	2,768	100
Our Lady of Victories ..	Camberwell ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Our Lady of The Way ..	Kingsbury ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Padua College	Mornington ..	..	..	..	..	1,500	1,500
Peninsula School	Mt. Eliza ..	..	20,000	..	6,000	11,900	..
Penleigh P.L.C.	Moonee Ponds	..	16,750	1,000	3,660	1,300	1,200
Presbyterian Ladies College ..	Burwood ..	..	..	..	..	..	5,600
Presentation Convent (Nagle Coll).	Bairnsdale ..	..	..	..	7,797	5,252	1,000
Presentation College.. ..	Moe.. ..	..	..	14,733	1,520	2,000	577
Presentation Convent ..	Windsor ..	..	..	..	16,800	30,317	3,000
Preshil	Kew.. ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Regina Mundi	Thornbury ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Resurrection	Essendon ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rossbourne House	Hawthorn ..	..	..	2,000	..	..	..
Ruyton Girls' School ..	Kew.. ..	..	..	..	..	5,900	5,900
Sacred Heart College ..	Ballarat East ..	..	33,626	5,000	1,780	7,102	1,771
Sacred Heart	Casterton ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Colac ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Corryong ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Diamond Creek	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Fitzroy ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart College ..	Geelong ..	..	1,180	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Kew.. ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Kyneton ..	..	..	..	..	750	750
Sacred Heart	Mansfield ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Mildura ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Morwell ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Newport ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart (Primary) ..	Oakleigh ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart (Secondary) ..	Oakleigh ..	..	..	..	..	1,500	..
Sacred Heart	Preston ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart College ..	Rochester ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Sandringham ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Seymour ..	..	..	..	1,130	750	750
Sacred Heart College ..	Shepparton ..	..	..	2,757	..	26,692	3,655
Sacred Heart	St. Albans ..	..	2,500	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	St. Kilda West	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Yarrawonga ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart High School ..	Yarrawonga ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart	Yea	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sacred Heart and St. Mary's ..	Tatura ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Agnes	Geelong ..	..	..	..	..	1,000	..
St. Agnes	Highett ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Aidan's	Bendigo ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Alipius Boys	Ballarat East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Alipius Girls	Ballarat East ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Aloysius	Caulfield ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Aloysius	Melbourne North	..	..	..	28,000	37,770	18,000
St. Aloysius	Queenscliff ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Aloysius	Redan ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Ambrose	Brunswick ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Andrew's	Werribee ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Angela's	Dandenong ..	..	2,000	..	..	..	..
St. Anne's	Kew East ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Anne's	Seaford ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Anne's College	Warrnambool	..	..	..	..	1,400	..
St. Anne's & Gippsland Grammar	Sale ..	..	13,750	10,000	3,484	..	9,700
St. Anthony's	Alphington ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Anthony's	Glenhuntly ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Anthony's	Kew.. ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Anthony's	Manifold ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Anthony's	Noble Park ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Anthony's	Oakleigh ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Augustine's	Creswick ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Augustine	Geelong ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Augustine's	Kyabram ..	..	..	..	..	500	500
St. Augustine's	Maryborough	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Augustine's	Wodonga ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Augustine's Boys ..	Yarraville ..	..	..	..	..	..	..

APPENDIX "G"—*continued.*

School	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January 1974–30th June 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
St. Augustine's Girls	Yarraville	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bede's	Balwyn North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bede's	Mentone	..	..	..	29,700	18,000	43,155
St. Benedict's	Burwood	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bernadette's	Ivanhoe West	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bernadette's	Sunshine North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bernard's	Bacchus Marsh	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bernard's	Belmont	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bernard's	Coburg East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bernard's Senior	Essendon West	..	..	..	..	27,500	20,000
St. Bernard's Junior	Moonee Ponds	..	..	..	..	1,500	
St. Bernard's	Wangaratta	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brendan's	Coragulac	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brendan's College	Coragulac	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brendan's	Flemington	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brendan's	Lakes Entrance	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brendan's	Shepparton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Bridget's	Greythorn	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brigid's	Crossley	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brigid's	Fitzroy North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brigid's	Gisborne	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brigid's	Gordon	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brigid's	Healesville	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Brigid's College	Horsham	..	..	..	..	2,923	2,077
St. Brigid's	Mordialloc	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Catherine	Geelong	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Catherine's	Moorabbin East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Catherine's	Toorak	..	20,000	..	3,000	3,000	3,000
St. Cecilia's	Camberwell South	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Christopher's	Airport West	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Christopher's	Syndal	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Clare's	Box Hill North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Clement's	Bulleen	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Colman's	Balaclava	..	..	..	..	700	..
St. Colman's	Mortlake	..	..	..	..	700	..
St. Colman's	Shepparton	..	..	..	1,559	500	
St. Columba's	Ballarat North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Columba's	Elwood	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Columba's	Essendon	..	..	..	25,500	11,500	35,140
St. Damian's	Bundoora	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Dominic's	Broadmeadows	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Dominic's	Camberwell East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Edmund's	Croydon	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Euphrasia's	Collingwood	..	..	..	..	2,000	1,500
St. Fidelis'	Moreland	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Finbar's	Brighton East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis de Sales	Oak Park	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis de Sales	Ringwood	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis Xavier College	Ballarat East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis Xavier	Box Hill	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis Xavier	Frankston	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis Xavier	Montmorency	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis Xavier	Prahran	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Francis Xavier	St. Arnaud	..	..	..	..	1,400	700
St. Gabriel's	Castlemaine	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Gabriel's	Reservoir	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. George's	Carlton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Gerard's	Dandenong North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Gregory The Great	Doncaster	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Ignatius Boys	Richmond	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Ignatius Girls	Richmond	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. James' College	Bentleigh East	..	..	..	..	2,000	1,000
St. James	Gardenvale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. James	Mitcham	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. James	Richmond North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. James	Sebastopol	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joan of Arc	Brighton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Braybrook	..	2,000	600	..	58,000	20,000
St. John's	Clifton Hill	..	..	..	..	750	..
St. John's Regional College	Dandenong	..	4,000	66,000	10,000	4,400	980
St. John's	Dennington	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Euroa	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Frankston East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Hawthorn	..	..	..	..	1,000	..
St. John's	Heidelberg	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Kooweerup	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Maidstone	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Melbourne East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John's	Mitcham	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John The Baptist	Ferntree Gully	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John Bosco	Niddrie	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John Vianney's	Parkdale East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. John Vianney's	Springvale North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's Technical	Abbotsford	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Ballarat	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Beechworth	..	..	..	..	..	..

APPENDIX "G"—*continued.*

School	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January 1974–30th June. 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
St. Joseph's	Benalla	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Black Rock	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Boronia	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Brunswick East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's College	Charlton	..	..	..	300	300	300
St. Joseph's	Chelsea	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Chiltern	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Cobram	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's College	Colac	..	..	..	..	1,000	
St. Joseph's	Coleraine	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Collingwood	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Cora Lynn	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Echuca	..	..	..	..	2,100	..
St. Joseph's	Elsternwick	..	..	..	..	2,000	..
St. Joseph's	Ferntree Gully	29,000	3,500	4,000	3,000	3,380	..
St. Joseph's	Fitzroy North	..	..	..	..	4,000	..
St. Joseph's (Newtown)	Geelong	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Hastings	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Hawthorn	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Hopetoun	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Iona	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Kerang	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Kilmore	..	340	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Korumburra	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Malvern	..	..	..	500	500	..
St. Joseph's College	Maryborough	..	..	..	..	1,500	..
St. Joseph's	Melbourne North	..	..	..	..	750	..
St. Joseph's Technical	Melbourne South	..			..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Meredith	..	7,476	31,390	..	..	..
St. Joseph's College	Mildura	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Nagambie	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Noorat	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Northcote	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Numurkah	..	..	..	500	..	100
St. Joseph's	Orbost	..	586	291	314	622	..
St. Joseph's	Ouyen	..	..	..	..	400	200
St. Joseph's Junior College	Pascoe Vale South	..	30,000	5,000	2,180	2,960	..
St. Joseph's	Penshurst	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Pirron Yallock	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Port Melbourne	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Quarry Hill	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Red Cliffs	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Rochester	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Sorrento	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	South Yarra	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Springvale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's Home	Surrey Hills	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Trafalgar	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Wangaratta	..	..	..	13,000	10,000	1,500
St. Joseph's	Warburton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Warragul	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's (C.B.C.)	Warrnambool	..	19,615	19,091	1,333	2,667	..
St. Joseph's College	Warrnambool	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Joseph's	Wonthaggi	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Kevin's	Bulleen	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Kevin's	Ormond	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Kevin's Junior	Toorak	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Kevin's Senior	Toorak	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Kieran's	Moe	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Kilian's Girls	Bendigo	..	..	..	..	1,000	..
St. Lawrence's	Leongatha	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Leo's	Box Hill	..	..	30,000	2,000	..	3,230
St. Leo The Great	Altona North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Leonard's	East Brighton	..	..	..	9,800	8,020	7,700
St. Leonard's	Glen Waverley	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Liborius	Eaglehawk	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Louis de Montfort	Aspendale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Luke's	Blackburn South	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Luke's	Lalor	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Macartan	Mornington	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Malachy's	Edenhope	..	..	..	..	1,000	..
St. Marcellus	Purnim	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Margaret's	Ascot Vale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Margaret's	Berwick	..	..	12,000	3,000	2,000	1,000
St. Margaret's	Geelong East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Margaret's	Keon Park	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Margaret's	Reservoir East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Margaret Mary's	Brunswick North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Margaret Mary's	Spotswood	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mark's	Fawkner	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mark's	Fitzroy North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Martin de Porres	Avondale Heights	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Martin de Porres	Laverton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Martin of Tours	Macleod	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Alexandra	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Altona	..	..	..	..	..	..

APPENDIX "G"—*continued.*

School	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st January, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
St. Mary's	Ararat	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Ascot Vale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Bairnsdale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's College	Bendigo	..	..	..	..	2,000	..
St. Mary's	Castlemaine	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Clarke's Hill	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Cohuna	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Colac	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Dandenong	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Donald	..	..	..	..	762	381
St. Mary's	Echuca	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's Boys' Technical / St. Mary's Girls	Geelong	..	..	30,000	4,750	3,750	500
St. Mary's	Greensborough	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Hamilton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Hampton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Inglewood	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Kyneton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Lancefield	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Maffra	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Malvern East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Mansfield	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's Boys / St. Mary's Girls	Melbourne West	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Mooroopna	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Myrtleford	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Northcote	..	..	21,500	13,600	..	..
St. Mary's (Deaf)	Portsea	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Robinvale	..	..	..	500	500	500
St. Mary's	Rushworth	..	..	..	..	..	500
St. Mary's	Rutherglen	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's Boys / St. Mary's Girls	St. Kilda East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Sale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Sea Lake	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Seymour	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Swan Hill	..	..	..	320	320	320
St. Mary's	Thornbury	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Warracknabeal	..	..	..	..	1,200	600
St. Mary's	Werribee	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Williamstown	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Woodford	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary's	Yarram	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary of The Angels	Nathalia	..	..	..	..	1,898	..
St. Mary Magdalen's	Jordanville	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mary Magdalen	Trentham	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Matthew's	Fawkner North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Mel's	Shepparton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Ashburton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Berwick	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Bungaree	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Daylesford	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Gordon	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Heyfield	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Melbourne North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Tallangatta	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Traralgon	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Michael's	Wycheproof	..	..	..	..	500	250
St. Michael's C.E.G.G.S.	St. Kilda	..	..	..	160	1,000	..
St. Michael & St. John	Horsham	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Monica's	Epping	..	34,000	2,000	5,158	200	..
St. Monica's	Footscray	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Monica's	Kangaroo Flat	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Monica's Boys	Moonee Ponds	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Monica's Girls	Moonee Ponds	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's Primary	Ballarat	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's Secondary	Ballarat	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Camperdown	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Geelong West	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Gordon	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Kilmore	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Koroit	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Lilydale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Manangatang	..	..	..	250	..	250
St. Patrick's	Mentone	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Murrumbeena	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Nhill	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Pakenham	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Port Fairy	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Pyramid Hill	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	St. Arnaud	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's College	Sale	..	..	..	18,449	..	..
St. Patrick's	Stawell	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Stratford	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Tongala	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Patrick's	Wangaratta	..	..	..	..	..	..

APPENDIX "G"—*continued.*

School	Location	Calendar years 1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1st December, 1974–30th June, 1974 (½ year)
		$	$	$	$	$	$
St. Paul's	Altona North	..	50,000	6,000	..	7,063	2,380
St. Paul's Technical	Ballarat	..	..	..	..	3,170	4,629
St. Paul's	Bentleigh	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Paul's	Coburg	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Paul's	Deer Park	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Paul's	Frankston	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Paul's	Traralgon	..	..	..	..	18,518	312
St. Paul's School for the blind	Kew	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter's	Bentleigh East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter's	Epping	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter's	Clayton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter's	Keilor East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter Chanel	Deer Park	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter Julian	Mooroolbark	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter and Paul's	Doncaster East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Peter and Paul's	Melbourne South	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Philip's	Blackburn North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Pius X	Heidelberg West	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Pius X	Warrnambool West	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Raphael's	Preston West	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Robert's	Geelong	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Roch's	Glen Iris	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Scholastica's	Bennettswood	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Stephen's	Reservoir East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Teresa's	Albion	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Teresa's	Essendon	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Teresa's	Kennington	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Teresa's	Kyneton	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Teresa's	Yallourn	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Thomas'	Blackburn	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Thomas'	Clifton Hill	..	..	..	....	750	..
St. Thomas'	Sale	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Thomas'	Terang	..	..	..	..	600	300
St. Thomas Aquinas	Geelong North	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Thomas More's	Belgrave	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Thomas More's	Hadfield	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Thomas More's College	Nunawading	..	34,000	2,295	2,801	1,250	140
St. Timothy's	Forest Hill	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Vincent's College	Bendigo	..	..	..	330	770	1,007
St. Vincent's	South Melbourne	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Vincent de Paul's	Morwell East	..	..	..	..	..	..
St. Vincent de Paul's	Strathmore	..	..	..	..	..	..
Salesian College	Chadstone	..	..	..	..	48,000	3,000
Salesian College	Sunbury	..	..	..	..	1,500	1,500
Sante Maria	Northcote	..	..	18,500	..	10,450	4,000
Santa Sophia	Glenroy	..	31,000	5,500	2,800	3,000	..
Scotch College	Hawthorn	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Bendigo	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Croydon	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Geelong	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Hawthorn	..	..	10,655	1,670	700	700
Adventist Academy	Lilydale	..	12,075	2,925	3,000	1,500	1,500
Seventh Day Adventist	Mildura	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Nunawading	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Oakleigh	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Preston	..	..	..	..	..	..
Seventh Day Adventist	Warburton	..	..	..	..	..	..
Shelford C.E.G.G.S.	Caulfield	..	20,000	..	4,200	8,200	..
Siena Convent	Camberwell East	..	2,000	959	..	..	..
Star of the Sea	Apollo Bay	..	..	..	..	..	..
Star of the Sea	Gardenvale	..	..	..	2,000	29,090	11,795
Stella Maris	Beaumaris	..	..	..	..	..	..
Stella Maris	Frankston	..	..	..	..	1,500	1,500
Strathcona Baptist Girls'	Canterbury	..	20,000	4,000	6,400	8,720	6,400
Therry College	Broadmeadows	..	..	..	..	16,500	579
Tintern C.E.G.G.S.	Ringwood East	..	..	..	..	..	5,900
Toorak College	Mt. Eliza	..	..	10,000	700	700	600
Trinity College	Brunswick	..	..	..	..	750	1,350
Trinity College	Colac	..	..	..	..	1,200	600
Trinity Grammar	Kew	..	1,300	..	..	..	..
Vaucluse Convent F.C.J.	Richmond	..	..	..	1,250	1,250	8,000
Villa Mareta	Oakleigh	..	..	..	..	..	..
Wesley College	Prahran	..	..	12,000	15,860	14,600	14,600
White Friars	Donvale	..	..	..	1,000	..	1,000
Williamstown Grammar	Newport	..	..	..	..	..	..
Xavier College	Kew	..	..	..	..	..	..
Xavier Preparatory	Brighton	..	..	..	..	750	..
Xavier Preparatory	Kew	..	..	..	..	..	..
Yarra Valley	Ringwood	18,000	..	..	6,096	6,000	6,000
Yavneh College	Caulfield	..	..	..	..	..	..
Yeshivah College	East St. Kilda	..	1,000	12,240	..	580	..
TOTAL		110,800	902,644	936,556	515,621	972,781	573,426

STATE SCHOOL LANGUAGE COURSES.

(Question No. 43)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Education—

Which State schools teach language courses in either Italian, Greek, Yugoslav or Turkish, indicating the languages taught and the number of pupils taking each language in each school?

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

Italian—

Brunswick High School	269
Brunswick Girls High School	258
Donvale High School	158
Essendon High School	335
Fawkner High School	248
Fitzroy High School	179
Fitzroy Girls High School	50
Glenroy High School	254
Hadfield High School	115
Keilor Heights High School	171
Lalor High School	300
Myrtleford High School	77
Newlands High School	107
Northcote High School	120
Pascoe Vale Girls High School	65
Princes Hill High School	237
Richmond Girls High School	86
Swan Hill High School	431
Thomastown High School	75
Thornbury High School	328
Werribee High School	290

Greek—

Brunswick High School	108
Brunswick Girls High School	7
Collingwood High School	27
Fitzroy High School	120
Footscray High School	212
Richmond High School	90
Richmond Girls High School	135

Serbo-Croatian—

Collingwood High School	18

Turkish—

Brunswick High School	17
Brunswick Girls High School	14

LAND PRICES.

(Question No. 93)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Premier—

Whether the Government is prepared to take action to reduce the inflated price of land and stop speculation in land; if so; what action?

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

The Government has taken as much action as is possible to stabilize the price of land adjacent to the metropolitan area. In particular, it has—

(1) declared large areas of land around the metropolis to be investigation areas under the Development Areas Act, thus effectively stabilizing the price of land in those areas for a considerable period;

(2) initiated land price stabilization legislation for the area adjacent to Wodonga in order to minimize speculation in land which might have followed the inception of the Albury–Wodonga growth centre;

(3) introduced strict planning controls in other areas;

(4) will continue to introduce such controls wherever necessary to discourage speculation by preventing unplanned subdivision of rural land;

(5) has authorized the Housing Commission to purchase large tracts of land in many parts of the State which will be converted into fully serviced blocks and offered for sale at prices which will effectively control the price of privately owned land in the same area.

OVERSEAS TEACHERS SELECTION PROGRAMME.

(Question No. 117)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

How many teachers have been recruited from overseas each year for State schools since the inception of the Overseas Teacher Selection Programme and how many of these teachers have resigned each year?

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

Airlift date	No. of teachers Arrived	Still here	Date resigned 1971	1972	1973	1974
August 71 (U.S.A)	107	24	..	7	58	18
Various 71 (Canada)	66	14	..	16	27	9
January 72 (U.S.A)	70	20	..	1	24	25
May 72 (U.S.A)	97	48	..	4	8	37
August 72 (U.K.)	117	67	..	2	3	45
August 72 (U.S.A.)	209	114	..	..	11	84
August 72 (Canada)	145	63	..	..	18	64
February 73 (U.S.A)	49	39	..	..	..	10
April 73 (U.S.A.)	49	45	..	..	4	..
May 73 (U.S.A.)	70 (Plus 19 by sched. air services.)	86	..	..	1	2
July 73 (U.S.A.)	5	5	..	..	..	..
August 73 (U.S.A.)	116 (Plus 9 on sched. services.)	16	..	..	7	2
October 73 (U.S.A.)	5	5	..	..	..	..
February 74 (U.S.A.) ..	127	124	..	..	..	3
May 74 (U.S.A.)	233	233	..	..	..	..
July 74 (U.S.A.)	19	19	..	..	..	..
August 74 (U.S.A.)	300	300	..	..	..	..

EMPLOYMENT OF CONVICTED PERSONS.

(Question No. 202)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Premier—

What is the policy of each Government department, authority or instrumentality in respect of employment of staff where a previous Children's Court conviction and/or other conviction is involved?

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

The Public Service Board which is responsible for the appointment of staff to State Government departments, does not take Children's Court convictions into account when considering the employment of staff.

Where other convictions are involved, each case is treated on its merits having regard to the nature of the convictions, when they were committed and the nature and location of the duties to be performed.

In each case, the board consults the department in which the office or position is located.

Government authorities and instrumentalities generally treat each case on its merits.

PLUMBING TRADE APPRENTICES.

(Question No. 269)

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

What action he proposes taking to deal with the position of plumbing trade apprentices being taught—(*a*) in grossly overcrowded workshops; (*b*) with inadequate welding equipment; and (*c*) without necessary laboratory facilities for appliance testing and training aids?

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

1. The Technical Schools Division has approved the design of new units for the teaching of plumbing apprentices and Public Works Department architects are currently drawing up plans and specifications.

The unit will be incorporated in a number of technical schools including the new technical colleges at Newport and Richmond.

2. Welding facilities are adequate in most technical schools and colleges. In a few schools there are not sufficient welding machines to meet the requirements of the new syllabus in plumbing. Suppliers are having difficulty in meeting targets and finance available for purchase is limited.

3. It is only recently that laboratory facilities have been considered necessary for the training of plumbing apprentices. They wlil be incorporated in the units mentioned in (1) above.

In the past the State has contributed not ungenerously to the purchase of equipment through maintenance grants and loan funds. These funds have been supplemented from the Commonwealth technical training grants which ceased to operate in the middle of this year. There is currently a vacuum in the provision of Commonwealth capital finance and funds will not apparently be available until next year. In addition the realistic recommendations of the Kangan committee report have been reduced in amount by the Commonwealth legislation and further made to cover a period of two years instead of the one and a half years recommended by the committee.

This has occured at a time when the demand for apprentices by industry has experienced an upward surge for which provision could not have been made in anticipation.

SCHOOLS IN BRUNSWICK WEST ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 359)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of the disadvantaged schools programme and schools in the electoral district of Brunswick West—

1. Which schools are so classified?

2. Which schools have had educational briefs prepared by the task forces?

3. What works were proposed for each school?

4. Whether any tenders for such works have been called; if so, what tenders and when the remainder will be called?

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

1. Brunswick High School, Brunswick Technical School, 3585 Brunswick North, 4399 Brunswick North West, 4304 Brunswick South West, 2890 Brunswick West, 3941 Coburg West.

2. Brunswick High School, 4304 Brunswick South West, 2890 Brunswick West, 3585 Brunswick North.

3. Brunswick High—acoustic treatment to six classrooms and conversion of a room to second kitchen.

4304, Brunswick South West—multi-purpose hall.

2890, Brunswick West—adventure playground and removal of class-room platforms.

3585, Brunswick North—Multi-purpose room as part of new class-room block.

4. The Public Works Department is in the process of planning the requirements of those schools for which briefs have been submitted. At this time I am unable to state exactly when tenders will be invited for these projects.

MIGRANT EDUCATION.

(Question No. 395)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Education—

With respect to the 53 primary and secondary schools of high migrant enrolment surveyed by the State Education Department and the Australian departments of education and immigration in 1972—

1. How many now have special migrant portable class-rooms?

2. How many will be provided with such class-rooms in this financial year?

3. How many schools use any of the following categories of rooms for migrant English classes as per Table 18 of the report (Commonwealth Parliamentary Paper No. 81 of 1973)—(*a*) class-room; (*b*) cloakroom; (*c*) office; (*d*) staffroom; (*e*) storeroom; (*f*) first aid room; (*g*) veranda; (*h*) corridor; and (*i*) other, but not class-rooms?

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

1. Twelve of the schools now have special migrant demountable class-rooms.

2. The number of special migrant demountable classrooms to be made available by the Commonwealth to Victoria in the 1974–75 financial year has not yet been decided.

3. The number of schools using various categories of rooms for migrant education programs is set out below.

Room categories	Number of schools
(*a*) Class-room (excluding demountables)	33
(*b*) Cloakroom	5
(*c*) Office	5
(*d*) Staffroom	7
(*e*) Storeroom	12
(*f*) 1st aid room	5
(*g*) Veranda	0
(*h*) Corridor	1
(*i*) Other	11

The comments listed hereunder are pertinent to the statistics provided.

Most schools have a variety of room categories for migrant education programs.

Some room categories listed are not used on a full-time basis.

The areas formerly used as cloakrooms, offices, staffrooms, storerooms and 1st aid rooms have been suitably converted to instruction rooms for small groups of migrant students.

Categories listed under "other" include small annexes, houses and part use of a library, a laundry and a canteen.

INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATING SERVICES.

(Question No. 400)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister for Social Welfare—

1. Whether the Social Welfare Department employs interpreters or translators in any of its divisions, regional offices, or institutions, specifying where such interpreters are employed and which languages are spoken?

2. What arrangements are made to obtain interpreters or translators when required?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare is—

The Social Welfare Department does not specifically employ staff as translators or interpreters, however, if and when the occasion arises that translation or interpreting services are needed, the services of multi-lingual staff who are employed for other purposes are used.

The translation service made available by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and Immigration is also used.

RATE SUBSIDIES FOR GEELONG PENSIONERS.

(Question No. 403)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Treasurer—

Whether he will give consideration to subsidizing rate concessions for eligible pensioner ratepayers of the Geelong Waterworks and Sewerage Trust?

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

I have already indicated to the House that the Government is prepared to look at ways in which pensioners in necessitous circumstances may be provided with some relief in the payment of Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works rates. Any action taken in this direction could be extended to include pensioner ratepayers in country areas, including those of the Geelong Waterworks and Sewerage Trust.

I might add that a committee set up by the Commonwealth Government is presently considering the matter of rebates for pensioners on council rates, sewerage and water rates. The Prime Minister has informed me that the recommendations of this committee will be given careful consideration by his Government when they are received. The State Government will review this whole matter of rate relief in the light of the decisions taken by the Commonwealth.

SCHOOLS IN MOONEE PONDS ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 411)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Education—

1. How many pupils and teachers, respectively, it is estimated will attend each State primary and secondary school within the electoral district of Moonee Ponds at the commencement of the 1975 school year?

2. What works the Education Department is undertaking at each of these schools will be completed for the start of school in 1975, and what works are proposed for the following financial year?

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

1.

	School	Pupils	Teachers
4220	Aberfeldie P.S.	620	22
2608	Ascot Vale P.S.	583	21
4025	Ascot Vale West P.S.	630	22
	Buckley Park H.S.	985	51·65
	Essendon H.S.	960	53·30
3987	Moonee Ponds P.S.	367/140	20
2901	Moonee Ponds West P.S.	645	23

2. In view of the current uncertainty in the building industry and the possibility that our expectations in regard to the completion of projects on our building programme may not be realized, I am not prepared to make available information in regard to proposed works at all the schools in an electoral district. I would be happy to furnish by letter information in regard to works at a particular school if the honorable member so requests.

CRIME IN SUNSHINE AND FOOTSCRAY.

(Question No. 423)

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine) asked the Chief Secretary—

How many reported cases of larceny, breaking, assault, rape, vandalism, illegal use of cars and other forms of crime were investigated by police stationed at each of the police stations situated within the municipalities of Sunshine and Footscray during the twelve months ended 30th September, 1974?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

Statistics are not kept of the different categories of crime reported to each police station in a municipality. However, the

crime statistics in respect of the total number of offences reported in the municipalities of Sunshine and Footscray, respectively during the twelve months ended 30th September, 1974, are as follows—

	Sunshine	Footscray
Larceny	758	1661
Breaking offences	676	770
Assault	300	353
Rape	18	3
Vandalism—		
(*a*) Malicious damage ..	11	11
(*b*) Wilful damage	250	232
Motor car stealing	338	352
Other crimes	378	616
TOTAL	2729	3998

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

(Question No. 424)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister for Social Welfare—

Since the proclamation of the Adoption of Children (Amendment) Act 1972—

1. On how many occasions the Director-General of Social Welfare or his officers have been informed of the existence of severely retarded or deformed babies or young children—(*a*) whose parents have deserted them either at birth or shortly thereafter; and (*b*) whose parents can no longer cope and have requested the Director-General to take over guardianship?

2. On how many occasions in respect of categories (*a*) and (*b*) respectively, the Director-General has—(*a*) refused; or (*b*) failed, to undertake guardianship?

3. Whether the Social Welfare Department has commenced discussions with the department of Health with a view to overcoming the problem of children who cannot be placed for adoption; if so, who is on the committee discussing the matter and when it will report?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare is—

1. (*a*) 16; (*b*) 14.

2. The cases were finalized as follows—

	Refused	Withdrawn	Undecided	Total
Category (*a*)	4	4	3	11
Category (*b*)	4	2	2	8
Total ..	8	6	5	19

In the eleven remaining cases the children were accepted into departmental guardianship.

3. In July 1974, an inter-departmental committee was set up by the Social Welfare Department and the Mental Health Authority to examine the problems associated with providing residential care for mentally retarded children including those who cannot be placed for adoption.

The committee is as follows—

Dr. D. Baginn, Co-ordinator of Mental Deficiency Services.

Mr. R. Bates, Secretary Mental Deficiency Services.

Mr. W. Davey, Deputy Director of Family Welfare.

Mr. M. Olijnyk, Supervisor, Classification and Treatment, Youth Welfare Division.

The committee's report is expected by the end of 1974.

PREMISES RENTED BY GOVERNMENT BODIES.

(Question No. 452)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Premier—

1. Which Government departments, corporations, commissions, and semi-government bodies are housed in rented offices in buildings not owned by the Crown?

2. Where these rented premises are located?

3. What rent is paid in each case?

4. Which accommodation is occupied on lease and what are the terms of the lease in each case?

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

The information sought by the honorable member is not readily available because many departments and semi-government agencies arrange their own rentals of privately-owned office buildings.

Assembly of this information would be costly and time-consuming. I suggest, therefore, that the honorable member discuss any particular cases with the Minister of Public Works before any further action is taken.

ST. ALBANS NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 458)

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park) asked the Minister of Education—

What plans the Education Department has for the provision of—(*a*) Migrant English classes; and (*b*) a remedial teacher at the St. Albans North Primary School?

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

(*a*) The Education Department has appointed two migrant teachers on a full-time basis to St. Albans North Primary School. The appointments took effect from 8th October and 21st October respectively. Seventy-eight migrant pupils are currently included in the migrant education pro-

gramme at the school. Plans for 1975 include in-service education for both classroom and migrant teachers of the school.

(*b*) The department has no plans to appoint a remedial teacher to St. Albans North Primary School. With the establishment of the Footscray demonstration unit remedial facilities available to schools in the St. Albans area have been given impetus. No specific proposal has been received to appoint a remedial teacher at St. Albans North but it is planned to extend Special Education Units on a strategic basis as funds become available. Special Education Units provide consultant remedial services to teachers in regular class-rooms and give direct remedial assistance where necessary to children who have particularly difficult educational problems.

OATGROWERS' POLL.

(Question No. 463)

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

In respect of the conduct of a poll of oatgrowers for the purpose of determining a single grain-handling authority in Victoria—

1. Who may request such a poll and under what authority?

2. Who determines the eligibility of voters?

3. Who conducts the poll?

4. Who pays for the conduct of the poll?

5. What majority is necessary to decide the question on which a poll is conducted?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer is—

1. If there is to be such a poll of oatgrowers, a request for the holding of the poll must be submitted to me and the request must be signed by 330 growers each of whom in respect of the period of three years ending on the 31st August, 1974, harvested and sold or delivered to be sold—

(*a*) not less than 800 bushels of oats within any one year of that three-year period; or

(*b*) not less than a total of 2,000 bushels of oats during the whole of that three-year period.

2 and 3. The returning officer who would be appointed by me. The returning officer would be the same officer of the Department of Agriculture who acts in that capacity for polls and elections conducted under the Marketing of Primary Products Act.

Eligibility to vote would be compliance with the qualifications specified in 1 above and with the other general qualifications laid down in the Marketing of Primary Products Act in connection with polls and elections conducted under that Act.

4. The costs associated with the conduct of the poll would be met by the Government.

5. Provided that at least 60 per cent of the growers entitled to vote cast valid votes, the poll would be deemed to be in favour of the question if at least 60 per cent of the valid votes cast were in the affirmative.

BELL PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 470)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether, in view of the existence of three proposals regarding migrant class-rooms at Bell Primary School, he will indicate what is the present position concerning this matter?

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

There are more than 130 State schools in Victoria which require a demountable class-room (36 ft. x 24 ft.) for migrant education programmes. In the 1973–74 financial year, 32 demountable class-rooms were supplied through Commonwealth funding and it is anticipated that approximately 20 will be supplied this year. As Bell Primary School has already received a demountable class-room, it is highly unlikely that additional support for accommodation from Commonwealth sources will be forthcoming in the 1974–75 financial year. Therefore propositions one and two do not appear feasible in the short term. No clear cut decision can be made on proposition three for it is not known exactly how many portable class-rooms will be required to house regular classes in 1975 because of uncertainty in the completion dates of a number of building projects.

SCHOOLS IN MURRAY VALLEY ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 482)

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of the electoral district of Murray Valley—(*a*) which schools have been closed in each of the past five years; (*b*) which schools are at present classified as unstaffed; and (*c*) which schools had an enrolment of ten or less at the commencement of Term III., 1974?

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

(*a*) The following schools in the electoral district of Murray Valley have been closed in the years indicated.

School	*Year*
1015, Lilliput Primary School	1969–70
2109, Bundalong South	1970–71
2839, Bearii	1971–72
4634, Bonegilla Migrant Centre	1971–72
1965, Katandra	1971–72
3105, Peechelba	1973–74
2862, Springdale	1974–75

(*b*) The department's records indicate that there is no "unstaffed" school in the electoral district of Murray Valley at this time.

(*c*) 1752, Dugays Bridge
2341, Boorhaman North
3200, Mywee
3260, Barmah
3317, Boorhaman East.

DEPENDENT-RELATIVE UNITS.

(Question No. 485)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

When occupants of Housing Commission premises will be allowed to apply to have the commission erect self-contained units on their properties for pensioner parents?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

The legislation is at present being debated in the House and Housing Commission purchasers may currently make a preliminary registration with the commission.

PROJECTS IN LATROBE VALLEY–GIPPSLAND AREA.

(Question No. 490)

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

Whether he has had discussions with Japanese interests into the establishment of a new land or resource utilization project in the Latrobe Valley–Gippsland area, or anywhere else in Victoria; if so, what discussions?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer is—

I did have some discussions with Mr. Ishi, a member of the Japanese Diet, when he visited Victoria recently.

Those discussions were informal and exploratory, and I consider that the matters discussed should be treated as confidential until such time as there has been some firm resultant progress about which an announcement could be made.

CHILD MIGRANT EDUCATION EXPENDITURE.

(Question No. 492)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of child migrant education—

1. What was the total expenditure between 1st January and 30th September this year, specifying the contributions from Commonwealth and State sources, respectively, for each major aspect of the programme?

2. What is the proposed expenditure for this financial year, specifying the respective contributions by the Commonwealth and State Governments?

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

1 and 2. Migrant children attending State schools are not isolated from other school pupils but they do receive special assistance within the normal school system. Consequently State assistance to migrant pupils is not shown separately in the accounts of the department.

	Commonwealth sources:	$
1. Receipts	Salaries	1,818,257.00
	Other (Equipment, etc.)	142,422.00
	Provision of portables	550,000.00
		2,510,679.00
Payments	Salaries	2,762,129.00
	Equipment	21,261.00
	Direct payments for class materials	24,900.00
	Other (Training allowances, travel and petty cash)	613.00
	Portables	484,637.00
		3,293,540.00
2.	Salaries	4,000,000.00
	Other	52,833.00
	Portables	619,345.00
		4,672,178.00

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT ACCOMMODATION.

(Question No. 493)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Premier—

In respect of each Government department and semi-Government instrumentality, how many own or lease premises within the electoral district of Melbourne which are not currently being occupied in whole or in part, indicating in each case—(*a*) the address; and (*b*) the unused floor area of each premises?

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

The information sought by the honorable member is not readily available because many departments and semi-Government agencies arrange their own rentals of privately-owned office buildings.

Assembly of this information would be costly and time-consuming. I suggest, therefore, that the honorable member discuss any particular cases with the Minister of Public Works before any further action is taken.

POLICE COMMUNICATIONS.

(Question No. 507)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What recommendations were made in the Nicol report on police communications?

2. What is the estimated cost of implementing the recommendations?

3. When each of the recommendations will be implemented?

4. When the report was first received by the Government?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. The basic recommendations made by Mr. Nicol were that—

(*a*) A communications system should be developed having 25 separate channels and 15 operators with capacity for future expansion to 35 channels and 25 operators.

(*b*) Each operational position should have equipment to work into five channels.

(*c*) Metropolitan police districts should have individual ultra high frequency radio networks.

(*d*) D24 should have master control facilities enabling operation within district radio networks when necessary.

(*e*) Duplex or two frequency simplex operation should be adopted by the department.

2. The probable cost of implementing the recommendations is not yet known but a new communications system has previously been estimated to require the expenditure of not less than $2,000,000.

3. The feasibility of the proposals made by Mr. Nicol is being examined. Because of the complexity of the recommendations, the major system changes suggested and the fact that the recommendations appear to be based largely on British experience, a committee has been established to study the report and to produce a plan suited to the Police Department's particular requirements. The committee is working in liaison with telecommunications experts from the Postmaster-General's Department.

It is not possible at present to state when the recommendations will be implemented and, indeed, variations of the Nicol proposals may be indicated by the further study. Some modifications are being made to the existing communications system to extend its life while the investigations mentioned are being undertaken.

4. The final report was received in May, 1974.

POLICE COMPUTER.

(Question No. 508)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What progress has been made for establishing a mini-computer for the police force which was promised last year, and what is the estimated cost?

2. When the computer will be in operation and for what specific purpose it will be used?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. The implementation of the "patrol" computer-based enquiry system has been delayed because of difficulties in completing the new computer centre at Police headquarters as a result of industrial disputes and shortages of materials.

At this stage, the computed centre is almost complete and work is proceeding on the installation of the computer. Approximately half of the programming for the computer system has been completed.

The estimated cost of the patrol system (Stage 1) is—

	$
Computer equipment ..	207,000
Project development ..	60,000
Site preparation and special equipment	84,000
	351,000

This figure includes an allowance of $17,000 because of the recent devaluation of the Australian dollar.

2. Operational use of the patrol system by police personnel is scheduled for mid-March, 1975.

The initial computer configuration (stage 1 of the patrol system) is designed as an integral part of a large, integrated communications and information system for police purposes. The initial system will accommodate telephone and radio enquiries from the field in respect of stolen vehicles and plates, wanted vehicles and vehicles obtained by fraudulent means.

Planned extension of the initial system into stage 2 will provide police in the field with access to information on criminal records, stolen property, motor vehicle registration and similar data.

POLICE DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE.

(Question No. 509)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What amount will be spent in respect of the Victoria Police Force this financial year on—(*a*) maintenance of existing buildings; and (*b*) new buildings, indicating the locations of these buildings in each category?

2. What amounts of money will be spent this financial year on equipment and hardware, specifying the particular equipment that will be purchased?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. (*a*) Maintenance of police buildings 1974–75—

Location of buildings	Estimated expenditure
	$
Police College, South Yarra	30,000
Police Training Academy, St. Kilda Road	30,000
Police Traffic Centre, Brunswick	20,000
Mildura police station	12,000
Police Garage, Russell Street, Melbourne	20,000
Police Headquarters, Melbourne	88,000
Swan Hill inspector's residence	12,000
Essendon police station	27,000
Conversion of residences etc., in metropolitan area for the ten districts plan	50,000
Provision of amenities to various localities	20,000
Updating cells, etc., at various localities	20,000
Maintenance works costing between $4,000 and $10,000 at various localities	150,000
Minor maintenance works costing up to $4,000 at various localities	700,000
TOTAL	1,179,000

(*b*) New police buildings 1974-75—

Location of buildings	Estimated expenditure
	$
Daylesford	50,000
Greensborough	60,000
St. Arnaud	45,000
Warrnambool	17,000
Kilmore	14,000
Mansfield	40,000
Alexandra	30,000
Tangambalanga	30,000
Pyramid Hill	17,000
Wycheproof	30,000
Culgoa	20,000
Kyabram	15,000
Nathalia	13,000
Frankston district headquarters	45,000
Frankston police station	12,000
Police Training Academy, Glen Waverley	300,000
Terang	32,000
Port Fairy	15,000
Rushworth	30,000
Police Traffic Centre, Brunswick	20,000
Collingwood (New General Store, etc.)	40,000
Police Training Academy, St. Kilda Road	17,000
New residences (various localities)	120,000
Sites and Properties—purchase of at various localities	440,000
TOTAL	1,452,000

2. Police equipment and hardware 1974–75—

Type of equipment	Estimated expenditure
	$
Motor vehicles—	
Additional vehicles	265,000
Replacement vehicles	258,000
Spare parts	105,000
Personal equipment and uniforms, etc.	340,000
Radio equipment	300,000
Scientific equipment	78,950
Photographic equipment	45,750
Search and rescue equipment	10,000
Training equipment	5,300
Equipment for—	
Information Bureau	12,000
Criminal Investigation Branch	19,000
Transport Branch	2,000
Mounted Branch	12,000
TOTAL	1,453,300

FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL.

(Question No. 510)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. Which buildings in the City of Melbourne were referred to by the Chief Fire Officer as fire risks and for what reasons?

2. At what maximum height or floor level the Metropolitan Fire Brigade can deal with an outbreak of fire in these particular buildings?

3. Whether the equipment available to the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board is capable of dealing with fires in any building in Melbourne; if not, in what areas equipment is ineffective?

4. How many persons employed in these buildings are not covered by adequate fire protection, indicating for what periods they are not covered?

5. What fire drill is carried out in areas of buildings that are not covered by adequate fire protection?

6. What notices are posted to warn persons employed or otherwise of the existing fire risk in these buildings?

7. What action the Government intends to take in conjunction with proper authorities to see that all existing buildings and future buildings in Melbourne have complete and adequate fire protection?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. Statements made by the Chief Fire Officer were of a general nature and particular buildings were not mentioned.

2. There is no limitation as to the maximum height or floor level in dealing with a fire. The time taken to control a fire would depend on the type of fire protection installed in a building, the design and contents of the buildings, and the height and magnitude of the outbreak.

3. The equipment available to the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board is equal to the best in the world in both range and capacity, and is capable of dealing with fires in any building in Melbourne subject to the conditions stated in answer 2 above.

4. Statistics of this nature are not maintained by the Metropolitan Fire Brigade.

5 and 6. Fire drills and warning notices in buildings are the responsibility of the owners or occupiers.

7. As a first step, I am arranging a conference of appropriate authorities to consider the matter.

TRAINING OF POLICE CADETS.

(Question No. 511)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What is the cost of training a police cadet?

2. How many cadets are in training at present?

3. What is the duration of the training course for cadets?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. The present estimated annual cost is $5,626 made up of—

	$
Average salary of a cadet	3,767
Proportion of salaries of instructional and general staff	902
Accommodation	468
Uniform	360
Swimming fees, etc.	15
Acts, regulations, stationery, etc.	80
Teaching aids and library	10
Travelling and incidentals	19
Hospital attendance	5

2. 176.

3. The duration of training for police cadets varies from three months to two years and three months, depending on the age of each cadet at the time of his appointment.

TRAINING OF POLICE OFFICERS.

(Question No. 512)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many police officers are in training at the officer training college?

2. What is the annual cost of maintaining the college?

3. What is the cost of training a police officer?

4. How many officers are trained each year at the college?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. Sixteen.

2. $317,890 for the financial year 1973–74. This amount was expended as follows—

	$
Salaries—	
Police staff	60,000
Education Department officer	12,500
Public Service staff	55,500
Students	157,170
Administrative costs—	
Stores and stationery	5,000
Minor maintenance	1,200
Light and heating	2,300
Library	1,000
Laundry	750
Telephone	700
Postage	150
Provisions	21,620

3. Approximately $9,934 for the 1973–74 financial year. (This figure has been calculated by dividing the total number of students for that year into the total cost of maintaining the college.)

4. An average of 32 since 1971.

POLICE DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE.

(Question No. 513)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

What amounts were spent by the Victoria Police Force in 1973–74 other than items shown in subdivision 1 and 2 of division 187 and subdivisions 1 and 2 of division 190 of the estimates for the year 1974–75 and what estimated amounts will be spent this financial year?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

Item	Amounts expended in 1973–74 financial year	Estimated expenditure for 1974–75 financial year
	$	$
Fees for members of Police Service Board	6,992	10,600
Works and services—metric conversion	9,276	40,628
Police buildings—maintenance of	800,982	1,179,000
Building works, purchase of sites and properties, etc. ..	1,348,719	1,452,000

POLICE VEHICLES.

(Question No. 516)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. In what way the policy of the Victoria Police Force of discontinuing the use of privately owned vehicles affects the mobile strength of the force?

2. What was the number of privately-owned vehicles previously in use?

3. What is the present number of police vehicles?

4. What is the present number of police motor cycles?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. The replacement of privately-owned vehicles with police vehicles improves the mobile strength of the Police Force. Radio-equipped police vehicles are available 24 hours a day, and are considered more suitable for police work, including accident prevention, highway patrols and assisting in emergency situations.

2. At the 30th June, 1974, there were 850 privately-owned vehicles used on police duties. Of these, approximately 750 vehicles are used only occasionally. It is proposed to replace thirteen privately-owned vehicles with police vehicles during the 1974–75 financial year.

3. 1,146 (including motor cycles).

4. 113.

VICTORIAN COUNCIL OF THE ARTS.

(Question No. 517)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Minister of the Arts—

Who are the members of—(*a*) the Victorian Council of the Arts; and (*b*) the committee of advice for specific areas of artistic concern, indicating in each case the term for which the member was appointed and the specific artistic areas of interest and/or expertise?

Mr. HAMER (Minister of the Arts): The answer is—

(*a*) Members of the Victorian Council of the Arts are—

Mr. Len Reason (chairman)
Dr. Don Hossack (deputy chairman)
Miss Kate Baillieu
Mr. Colin Bennett
Dame Joan Hammond, D.B.E., C.M.G.
Mr. John Leslie, J.P.
Mr. John Hopkins, C.B.E.
Mr. Peter Rankin
Mr. John Summer, C.B.E.
Mrs. Marjorie Tipping
Dame Peggy Van Praagh, D.B.E.

Under section 11 of the Ministry for the Arts Act these members were appointed for a term not exceeding five years effective from 1st March, 1974.

(*b*) Committee of advice for specific areas of artistic concern (sub-committees of the council) are—

Performing arts centres sub-committee—
Mr. John Sumner, C.B.E., (chairman)
Dame Peggy Van Praagh, D.B.E.
Dame Joan Hammond, D.B.E., C.M.G.
Mr. Colin Bennett
Mr. John Hopkins, C.B.E.
Ministry staff (ex officio).

Arts activity centres sub-committee—
Dr. Don Hossack (chairman)
Mr. John Sumner, C.B.E.
Dame Peggy Van Praagh, D.B.E.
Mr. John Leslie, J.P.
Ministry staff (ex officio).

Orchestra sub-committee—
Mr. John Hopkins, C.B.E. (chairman)
Mr. Len Reason
Ministry staff (ex officio).

Opera sub-committee—
Dame Joan Hammond, D.B.E., C.M.G.
Mr. John Hopkins, C.B.E.
Mr. John Sumner, C.B.E.
Ministry staff (ex officio).

DEBNEY MEADOWS PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 518)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Minister of Education—

1. When Debney Meadows Primary School will be opened?

2. How many pupils will be accommodated at the school and what area the pupils will be drawn from?

3. Whether there will be open class-rooms?

4. Whether the Education Department will provide a representative to meet with the Flemington Residents' Association to discuss the opening and proposed development of the school?

5. Whether Mr. Barti, the music teacher at Flemington Primary School, will be made available to Debney Meadows Primary School?

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

1. (*a*) Construction is virtually complete. Only minor adjustments and provision of floor coverings remain to be attended.

(*b*) Tenders for site works have closed and a contract is being let to William Loud Pty. Ltd. with expectation of work commencing on 6th November and first attention being given to the area on the eastern side of the building to permit access to the parkland play space.

(*c*) It is therefore currently proposed, that given reasonable weather conditions and completion of Stage 1 of site work, to commence operation of the new school from Monday, 25th November, 1974.

2. The zone declared for the school is enclosed by the line of Racecourse Road on the south, the railway line on the east, Mr. Alexander Road on the north and Princes Street on the west.

There will be 471 pupils transferred to the new school and the predicted enrolment, at February, 1975, is 600.

3. The school is of open class-room design. Provided in the building are several areas for withdrawal of small groups of pupils for special activities or instruction. A further feature is the provision of six "operable walls" which will permit a good degree of flexibility in the school's organization of instruction/learning groups.

4. Should the Flemington Residents' Association seek to meet an Education Department representative, within the next two or three weeks, to discuss the "opening and proposed development of the school", they will be welcome and met by an authoritative representative.

5. The Mr. Barti referred to is Mr. John Barti whose permanent appointment as an assistant with responsibility to Flemington Primary School charges him with general teaching duties to that school. He is not appointed as a specialist music teacher.

POLICE TWO-WAY RADIOS.

(Question No. 519)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many personal two-way radios are in use by the Victoria Police Force?

2. In which police district these radios are used?

3. How many such radios are used by personnel using police vehicles?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. 153.

2. All police districts throughout the State.

3. Personal radios are not allocated continuously to personnel using police vehicles but are made available when circumstances warrant their use.

PROTECTED ROAD SCHEME, PRESTON.

(Question No. 530)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What roads in the City of Preston the Road Safety and Traffic Authority has recommended to be within the protected road scheme?

2. Whether the City of Preston has been approached by the authority to seek agreement on the scheme; if so, what are the views of the council?

3. What increase in traffic flow would be envisaged by such a scheme?

4. Whether it is considered that car accidents will be reduced by this scheme; if so, how?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. Albert Street—from Plenty Road to Murray Road; St. Georges Road–Spring Street—from High Street to the municipal boundary; Murray Road and Cramer Street —sections between High Street and St. Georges Road.

2. Yes. I am advised that the council has expressed agreement with the proposals of the Road Safety and Traffic Authority.

3. No long-term increases in traffic flows are envisaged. Some temporary increases may be expected pending the completion of the proposed priority road system in the metropolitan area.

4. It is hoped that the incidence of vehicle accidents along the routes in question will decrease with the elimination of uncertainty as to right of way at intersections.

YARRA BRAE DAM PROJECT.

(Question No. 533)

Mr. LACY (Ringwood) asked the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister of Water Supply—

1. How many hectares of land have been acquired for the Yarra Brae dam project?

2. How many hectares will not now be needed for this project in view of the recent Government decision to build only a small weir and pumping station on the Yarra River?

3. How many hectares of this acquired land will now be available for public open space, recreation and conservation purposes?

4. When this land will be available for these purposes and under whose control it will be?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister of Water Supply is—

1. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has purchased 572·47 hectares for the Yarra Brae dam project.

2 and 3. It is expected that this matter will be resolved in approximately one month. When the information becomes available it will be conveyed direct to the honorable member.

4. This has not yet been determined. It will be necessary to investigate all the various uses and under whose control this surplus land could best be put, e.g. public open space, recreation or conservation purposes, return to private ownership, etc.

AVOCA BUSH NURSING HOSPITAL.

(Question No. 538)

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

Whether he has now examined the position in relation to the Avoca Bush Nursing Hospital; if so, whether the grant of $215,000 still required will be made available in the near future, and, if not, why?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): The answer is—

Grants of $167,500 have already been made available towards the cost of the Avoca Bush Nursing Hospital and further grants to a total amount of $375,000 (or three-quarters of the estimated capital cost of $500,000 of the new hospital) are available on request.

RETIREMENT OF POLICEMAN.

(Question No. 539)

Mr. LIND (Dandenong) asked the Chief Secretary—

If he will lay on the table of the Library the file relating to the retirement from the Victoria Police Force of Sgt. Glen Donald Christie, such file to contain the examination questions and Sgt. Christie's answers thereto, together with the marks he obtained?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

Files have been laid on the table of the Library dealing with the discharge of Mr. Christie from the Police Force on 1st December, 1974, as being medically unfit, and with Mr. Christie's request to be permitted to view his final examination papers in connection with the sub-officer's course which concluded on 7th July, 1972. It will be noted that the last paper on the second mentioned file is dated 4th May, 1973. The examination papers are not available having been destroyed when the section conducting sub-officer's courses was transferred to accommodation in Parliament Place, Melbourne. The transfer took place on 2nd October, 1973.

BROADMEADOWS TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

(Question No. 541)

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows) asked the Minister of Education—

Further to the answer to the question without notice asked on 18th October, 1973, regarding the desirability of Broadmeadows Technical School being co-educational, whether he has examined the matter; if so, what plans are in hand; if not, why?

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

The Technical Schools Division has a lengthy priority list of schools desiring co-education, but it must direct most of its limited resources to the development of post secondary technical education, and is able only to meet the demands for co-education at the rate of one or two a year.

Broadmeadows is on the division's list but it will be some time ahead before its priority for co-education is reached.

PORTABLE CLASS-ROOMS.

(Question No. 548)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

1. Which supplier or suppliers are—(*a*) currently providing; or (*b*) will be providing during 1975, portable class-rooms for the Education Department?

2. What is the expected cost in each case?

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

1. (*a*) The suppliers currently providing portable class-rooms for the Education Department are A.T.C.O. Industries Pty. Ltd. Barfield Crescent, Elizabeth West, South Australia and Signal Industries Pty. Ltd. of 513 Grand Junction Road, Wingfield, South Australia.

(*b*) The A.T.C.O. contract is due to be completed in December, 1974 and the Signal contract is due to be completed in February, 1975.

There are no further contracts planned for 1975 at this stage.

2. A.T.C.O. Structures contract amount is for $2,290,260.00; Signal Industries Contract amount is for $853,500.00.

PRESTON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

(Question No. 549)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of the Preston Institute of Technology—

1. Whether in July, 1972, when the secondary section was separated from the institute of technology, he indicated that an urgent building programme would commence, embracing—(*a*) a graphic communication wing; (*b*) a combined administration and Commonwealth-financed library block; and (*c*) workshops for engineering, electrical and motor mechanic practices, together with timber storage and machine facilities?

2. Whether a contract was let for the above-mentioned facilities?

3. Whether a promise was given that a gymnasium would be built when finance becomes available; if so, who gave this undertaking?

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

1. (*a*) and (*c*). Because of the restricted nature of the site and the necessity to continue the operation of the school while building is in progress a three-staged development of a new trades and graphic communication facility was initiated in 1972.

Stage one has been completed and is occupied, stage two is at present under construction and stage three is at the documentation stage.

(*b*) A new multi-story block containing administration and staff facilities, student amenities, a Commonwealth library and some class-rooms is proposed for erection in the future at the Cramer Street section of the school and the project is in the early stages of planning.

2. For stages one and two of the new Trades and Graphic Communication facility only.

3. The Assistant Director of Technical Education (Buildings) indicated that a gymnasium would be provided at the school when finance could be mobilized for this purpose from divisional funds.

HOUSING COMMISSION PROPERTIES IN BRUNSWICK AND COBURG.

(Question No. 551)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

In respect of properties owned by the Housing Commission in the cities of Brunswick and Coburg and let to tenants—(*a*) how many have been sold in each of the past five years to private individuals who were not the tenants; and (*b*) to whom such properties were sold, specifying the address and selling price?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

(*a*) Vacated properties sold for last five financial years and up to 30th October, 1974—

Financial year	City of Brunswick	City of Coburg
1969–70	1	3
1970–71	1	5
1971–72	1	5
1972–73	—	2
1973–74	1	5
From 1–7–74	1	3
	5	23

(*b*) It is suggested that the honorable member discuss this confidential information and any particular aspects of it with the Secretary to the Housing Commission.

LEVEE BANKS IN MURRAY VALLEY ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 556)

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley) asked the Minister of Public Works—

1. What length of levee banks are maintained by the Public Works Department along the River Murray in the electoral district of Murray Valley?

2. Where these banks are located and when they were constructed?

3. Whether any assistance is available to help landholders maintain those levees not maintained by the department ; if so, what are the details of such assistance?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer is—

1. Approximately 40 miles.

2. The banks are located on the south side of the River Murray downstream of Cobram extending towards Yielima and they were constructed between 1895 and 1910.

3. No.

EAST KEILOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

(Question No. 557)

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether he is aware that a document has been circulated in East Keilor indicating that the children who are to attend the Lincolnville school next year will be transported by bus to Brunswick; if so—(*a*) on whose authority this document was circulated; and (*b*) whether these pupils will be conveyed next year to Brunswick and, in that event, why?

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

The builders of the Lincolnville school confidently predict that the school and appropriate site works will be ready for use on 3rd February, 1975.

No document regarding the transport of pupils to Brunswick by bus has been issued by this department and no permission has been given for anyone to circulate such a document.

LEARNER-DRIVER PERMIT TESTS.

(Question No. 558)

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

In respect of the learner-driver permit provisions of the Motor Car Act 1958—

1. What fees were charged for—(*a*) appointments for learners permits and testing; (*b*) learner tests; and (*c*) driving test appointments, prior to and after 20th September, 1974?

2. What is the estimated revenue from each of the fees specified above for the year 1974–75 and a full financial year?

3. Whether the cost of administering these three fees will raise the cost of administration of permits and licence testing, mentioned in his answer to question No. 343 asked on 23rd October, 1974?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

	Prior to 20th September, 1974	After 20th September, 1974
1.	$	$
Appointments for learner permits and testing ..	Nil	5
Learner tests	Nil	10
2.	1974–75	Full Financial Year
Appointments for learner permits and testing ..	400,000	600,000
Learner tests	800,000	1,200,000
Driving test appointments	400,000	600,000

3. No.

BENDIGO HIGH SCHOOL.

(Question No. 562)

Mr. McCLURE (Bendigo) asked the Minister of Public Works—

1. What stage has been reached in the planning of a new science block at the Bendigo High School?

2. On what date planning commenced?

3. Whether the local architectural office of the Public Works Department is preparing the plans?

4. On what date plans will be completed?

5. Whether tenders will be called to enable construction to commence during 1975?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer is—

1. Schematic design has been completed and is being forwarded to the Education Department for approval.

2. June, 1974.

3. The Bendigo office is instructing a Bendigo private architect in the preparation of the documents.

4. Approximately six working months after approval of the schematic design.

5. Tenders will be invited when funds become available.

FARM PRODUCE MERCHANTS AND COMMISSION AGENTS.

(Question No. 563)

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

1. What licence fees are paid by primary wholesalers under the Farm Produce Merchants and Commission Agents Act 1965?

2. What total amount was collected in each of the past four years?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer is—

1. The annual licence fees paid by primary wholesalers are as follows—

(i) self employed auctioneer licensed under the Auction Sales Act 1958 and engaged in the wholesaling of farm produce—$15.00;

(ii) broker or factor of farm produce who during the course of his business as a commission agent does not take delivery of farm produce consigned to him by a producer for sale or receive on behalf of a producer any moneys owing to that producer in respect of any sale of farm produce —$38.00;

(iii) bona fide fruitgrower who anticipates that his wholesaling activities will be limited to the purchase of less than 3,000 bushels of fruit during the licence period in bulk lots of not less than 500 bushels for packing and resale by wholesale under his own name or brand—$38.00;

(iv) bona fide fruitgrower who anticipates that his wholesaling activities will be limited to selling on commission in the growers' section of the Melbourne Wholesale Fruit and Vegetable Market in conjunction with his own produce fruit grown by neighbours on properties which adjoin (nothwithstanding an intervening road, stream, &c.) the applicant's property provided that the total of such sales is restricted to a quantity of fruit which, during the licence period, is less than the amount of his own sales in the said Market and not more than 1,000 bushels of fruit—$38.00;

(v) producers' co-operative societies registered under the Co-operation Act 1958—$38.00;

(vi) all other primary wholesalers of farm produce—$60.00.

2. The total amount collected in each of the past four years from primary wholesalers as licence fees was—

1970–71—$27,294
1971–72—$27,038
1972–73—$22,589
1973–74—$31,415

(Question No. 564)

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

What amounts were paid into the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of section 21B (2) of the Farm Produce Merchants and Commission Agents Act 1965 in each of the past four years?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer is—

No amounts have been paid into the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of section 21B (2) of the Act for the four years 1970–71 to 1973–74 inclusive.

STATUS OF TEACHER.

(Question No. 566)

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether Mr. Tousson Hussein Seoudi, a teacher at St. Albans High School, has applied for permanency with the Education Department; if so, whether the Secondary Schools Division of the department has forwarded the application to the Teachers Tribunal with a recommendation that this gentleman be granted permanent status and, if not, why?

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

The application with departmental recommendation for permanency was delivered to the secretary of the Teachers Tribunal on 15th October, 1974.

DRIVER EDUCATION.

(Question No. 567)

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

Which organizations have applied to the Government for grants for driver education projects in the past two years, specifying the amount asked for, the purpose, and the amount granted in each case?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

The records of my department indicate that, in the past two years, four applications for grants have been received. The details are:

1. Requests made by, and on behalf of, the Committee of Management of the Goulburn Valley Driver Training Complex for assistance in meeting establishment costs. Such costs were estimated at $245,000 and Government grants have totalled $160,000. A special grant of $17,753 has been made available to assist the committee in meeting the costs of the repair of flood damage. The Government has contributed substantially to the costs of establishing the centre on the basis of its importance as an experimental project in driver training. Decisions in respect of support for other similar projects and in relation to the establishment of Government-operated projects of the same nature, will be influenced by the evaluation of the results obtained from the operation of the Shepparton complex.

2. A request by the Committee of Management of Nunawading's Aim for Safety on the Roads for Government assistance in establishing a Driver Training Centre. The estimated capital cost of the project is $500,000 and annual operating costs are estimated at $125,000. The Road Safety and Traffic Authority was specifically requested to make available a grant of $40,000. No grant has been made to date and the desire to ascertain the benefits obtained from the operation of the Goulburn Valley Driver Training Complex is relevant in this respect.

3. A request by the Driver Education Trust of Australia for a grant of $50,000 to assist with the costs of establishing a Driver Training Centre at Ivanhoe. No grant was made.

4. A request by George Taylor & Staff Pty. Ltd. for a grant to meet the costs of $150,000 involved in the obtaining of equipment, and the establishment of facilities and procedures, in connection with a proposed drivers' training course. The request is still under examination.

ELECTRICITY GENERATING CAPACITY.

(Question No. 576)

Mr. STIRLING (Williamstown) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power—

Whether a recent study was carried out by Monash University into future electricity needs for Victoria; if so, whether the study indicated that, at the present growth rate projected into the future, Victoria will have adequate reserves of electricity generating capacity into the 1980s without the inclusion of the 1000 megawatts from the Newport "D" power station?

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

Some discussions were held recently between Dr. Birrell of Monash University and officers of the State Electricity Commission concerning background information for Dr. Birrell's proposed report.

Neither I nor the commission have as yet seen the report.

POLICE TO POPULATION RATIOS.

(Question No. 577)

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What is the police to population ratio for the areas served by the police stations listed in the answer to question No. 247 asked on 17th October, 1974?

2. What is the police to population ratio for the area served by the Thomastown police station?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1 and 2. It is only possible to give approximate police to population ratios for the localities referred to by the honorable member. The areas of the police subdistricts are not, in most instances, identical to areas of the shires and municipalities in which the police stations are located.

Locality	Police to population ratio
Nhill	1 : 750
Ouyen	1 : 1,000
Stanhope	1 : 2,300
Mortlake	1 : 2,400
Portland	1 : 875
Korumburra	1 : 1,200
Marysville	1 : 1,450
Mitta Mitta	1 : 500
Axedale	1 : 500
Mooroolbark	1 : 1,416
Nunawading	1 : 2,671
Maffra	1 : 1,325
Rokewood	1 : 900
Thomastown	1 : 3,875

With regard to Thomastown, it was recently decided to increase the personnel strength of the police station by two senior constables or constables, and the vacancies for these positions were advertised on 31st October, 1974. The above ratio in respect of Thomastown is based on the present strength of the Thomastown Police Station.

The police to population ratio is only one of the factors taken into consideration when determining the personnel strength of

a police station. Other factors include the work load of the station, its location and the coverage provided by other police branches such as the Criminal Investigation Branch, Crime Car Squad and divisional vans.

NATHALIA PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 578)

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley) asked the Assistant Minister of Education—

When a remedial teacher will be appointed to the Nathalia Primary School?

Mr. DIXON (Assistant Minister of Educaton): The answer is—

The Principal of Nathalia Primary School made application for remedial teacher assistance on the 23rd August, 1974 and was advised on the 2nd September, 1974 that his request had been recorded and that as staffing situation becomes clearer, further consideration would be given to his request. He was advised to inform his inspector of his school's needs. As a result the inspector made an application for consideration of the establishment of a Special Education Unit at Echuca. Special Education Units provide consultant remedial services to teachers in regular class-rooms and give direct remedial assistance where necessary to children who have particularly difficult educational problems.

Arrangements are being made with regard to the proposed accommodation and it is likely that a Special Education Unit will open in Echuca in 1975. This proposal has the support of the Primary Division of the Education Department. Current policy is to give preference to this form of assistance as against the appointment of a remedial teacher to a particular school.

RAGLAN STREET, PRESTON, RECLAMATION AREA.

(Question No. 582)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

1. What was the average price of—(*a*) 1-bedroom; (*b*) 2-bedroom; and (*c*) 3-bedroom units, sold by the Housing Commission in the Raglan Street slum reclamation area since 1972?

2. Whether residents or former residents of the area were given priority in such purchases?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

1. No units in the Raglan Estate have yet been sold. The estate is still in course of construction.

2. Former residents were offered priority of accommodation and currently thirteen have taken occupancy.

BROOKS CRESCENT, NORTH FITZROY, RECLAMATION AREA.

(Question No. 583

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

Whether the Housing Commission intends to sell any of the units it plans to construct in the Brooks Crescent slum reclamation area; if so—(*a*) what prices it will seek for such units; and (*b*) whether residents or former residents of the area will be given priority in such purchases?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

The Housing Commission is considering selling some of the units it plans to construct in the Brooks Crescent slum reclamation area.

(*a*) The prices the commission will seek for such units have not yet been determined.

(*b*) Residents whose properties are acquired will be given priority.

SCHOOL COUNCILS.

(Question No. 586)

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

1. In which newspapers and on what dates the four proposals for reconstitution of school councils were advertised?

2. Whether such advertisements were placed in any foreign language newspapers in the relevant foreign language; if not—(*a*) why; and (*b*) whether it is his intention to authorize such action in the immediate future?

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

1. The proposals for reorganization of school councils were distributed in the following publications:—

(*a*) *Education Gazette*, 11th September, 1974 (distribution 22,500 copies).

(*b*) *The Sun* (648,000 copies) and *The Age* (217,000 copies), 21st October, 1974.

(*c*) *The Australian* (43,000 copies) 9th November, 1974.

2. Advertisements to publicize meetings to consider school councils were placed in the following foreign language newspapers—

(*a*) Greek: *News Cosmos* and *Hellenic Herald.*

(*b*) Italian: *Il Corriere, Il Globo* and *La Fiamma.*

(*c*) Turkish: *Turk Lesi.*

(*d*) Yugoslav: *Novosti* and *Jedinstvo.*

Translations of the four proposals for reorganization of school councils have been available in Greek, Italian, Yugoslav, Turkish and Maltese.

Interpreters have also been available at meetings. Within the Prahran region special ethnic meetings have been held for the Greek, Italian, Turkish and Yugoslav Communities.

No further advertisements are planned on school council proposals.

BRUNSWICK GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL.

(Question No. 588)

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

1. Whether a roneoed letter signed by the Acting Minister of Education dated 28th August, 1974, was circulated to individuals and organizations who made representations concerning conditions at the Brunswick Girls High School; if so, to whom the letter was circulated?

2. Whether it was claimed in the letter that "considerable improvements have been made in the staffing position at this school in recent years"; if so, on what evidence the statements relating to enrolment figures and staffing were made?

3. Whether the statements relating to enrolment figures and staffing were accurate; if not—(*a*) what inaccuracies they contained; and (*b*) what steps he has taken or expects to take to inform those individuals and organizations to whom the letter was sent of the errors it contained?

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

1. Yes; to sixteen correspondents.

2. Yes; from staff returns held in Secondary Schools Division.

3. The information contained in the letter was accurate with respect to staffing in 1968 and at 28th August, 1974 but not with respect to the 1968 school enrolment.

(*a*) The enrolment of 478 for 1968 was taken from a return submitted by the Principal at that time, Miss Ruby Tout. In 1968 schools were staffed on the basis of estimated net enrolment. It was later found that the actual enrolment proved to be 371. This meant that the Brunswick Girls High School was overstaffed at that time.

(*b*) As the incorrect 1968 enrolment figure has not affected the issue, no further statement is required.

APPLICANTS FOR ESTATE AGENTS' LICENCES.

(Question No. 595)

Mr. HANN (Rodney) asked the Chief Secretary—

With regard to the answer to question No. 391 asked on 22nd October, 1974, concerning applications received by the Estate Agents Committee for estate agents licences under Rule 4, what are the names and addresses of the persons referred to in part 4 of the answer?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

Mr. Alfred John Gane of Boundary Road, Mt. Duneed, via Geelong. Business address: care of Strachan and Co. Ltd., 25-43 Moorabool Street, Geelong.

Mr. Francis Leslie George James of 24 Livingstone Street, Mathoura, New South Wales. Business address in Victoria, 539 High Street, Echuca.

Mr. Thomas O'Brien of "Moora Binda", Redlands Road, Corowa, New South Wales. Business address in Victoria, 137-139 Belmore Street, Yarrawonga.

HOUSING COMMISSION ESTATES IN FRANKSTON.

(Question No. 596)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

1. What houses on Housing Commission estates in the Frankston district were sold in the two-year period 1st October, 1972, to 30th September, 1974?

2. In each case, what was the—(*a*) original sale price by the Housing Commission; and (*b*) sale prices during the period 1st October, 1972, to 30th September, 1974?

3. Whether any property was sold on more than one occasion during the period 1st October, 1972, to 30th September, 1974; if so, what was the sale price on each occasion?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

1. Housing Commission houses sold in the Frankston district in the two-year period 1st October, 1972, to 30th September, 1974—

1st October, 1972, to 30th September, 1973—Frankston North Estate ..	11
1st October 1973, to 30th September, 1974—Frankston North Estate ..	46
Total	57

2. It is suggested that the honorable member discuss this confidential information and any particular aspects of it with the Secretary to the Housing Commission.

3. No properties were sold on more than one occasion by the commission during this period.

YOUTH AND SPORTS AND RECREATION FUNDS.

(Question No. 604)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation—

What amount was contributed to the youth and sports and recreation funds, respectively, from the operations of the Totalizator Agency Board during the year ended 31st July, 1974?

Mr. DIXON (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation): The answer is—

The following amounts were received by Treasury and credited to the department's Youth, Sport and Recreation funds in the period ending 31st July, 1974.

Youth Fund	$1,092,195.92
Sports and Recreation Fund	$2,230,484,.35
Australian Rules Football Fund	$10,000.00
	$3,332,680.27

The annual report of the Totalizator Agency Board as at 31st July, 1974, showed the actual amounts received to be credited to the department's funds was $3,536,447.85. As the Totalizator Agency Board under section 116AN-(1) of the Racing Act 1958 requires the Totalizator Agency Board to pay all moneys to the Treasury within fourteen days of a race meeting, the difference between the amounts of $3,536,447.85 and $3,332,680.27 was paid to Treasury in August, 1974 and has now been distributed to the funds as follows—

Youth fund	$59,330.30
Sports and recreation fund	$138,437.28
Australian rules football fund	$6,000.00
	$203,767.58

SCHOOL MEDICAL SERVICES.

(Question No. 605)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Assistant Minister of Education—

What regional medical assessment facilities for schools are available or are being developed in association with the Education Department Special Services Division?

Mr. DIXON (Assistant Minister of Education): The answer is—

The allocation and dispersal of medical assessment facilities and their availability are matters for the Health Department. At present the establishment of Special Education Authorities comprising minimally a medical practitioner, an educational psychologist and a special teacher to be set up in accordance with the provisions in the Education (Handicapped Children) Act 1973 is under discussion and the first of the authorities will be established on a trial basis early next year. The special education authorities will be established on a regional basis in due course.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, November 13, 1974.

The PRESIDENT **(Sir Raymond Garrett)** took the chair at 4.28 p.m., and read the prayer.

SESSIONAL ORDERS.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I desire to give notice that on the next day of meeting I will move the motion that is usual at this time of the year—

That so much of the Sessional Orders as provides that the hour of meeting on Tuesdays shall be half-past four o'clock and on Wednesdays four o'clock, that on Wednesday in each week private members' business shall take precedence of Government business, and that no new business be taken after half-past ten o'clock be suspended until the end of December next; and that until the end of December next the hour of meeting on Tuesdays shall be four o'clock and on Wednesdays two o'clock, and that Government business shall take precedence of all other business.

It is also proper that I should indicate that as from next week the House will almost certainly meet on each Thursday. I have already given the normal undertakings to the leaders of the other parties that private members' Bills at present on the Notice Paper will be given consideration. I am not going to say that they will be finalized before December; that is a matter for the parties and for the House, but the Government

will certainly not stifle debate or consideration of matters already on the Notice Paper.

PAPERS.

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

Gas and Fuel Corporation—Report for the year 1973-74.

National Fitness Council—General report of activities, together with account of receipts and expenditure and balance-sheet, for the year 1973-74 (two papers).

VICTORIAN PENAL SYSTEM.

The debate (adjourned from October 23) was resumed on the motion of the Hon. J. W. Galbally (Melbourne North Province)—

That, as the punishments provided by the laws of the State of Victoria are anachronistic, have failed to protect the community and to reform the wrongdoer, there be appointed a Select Committee of this House of Parliament to investigate the penal system of Victoria, with special reference to the punishments awarded and, giving consideration to the emerging patterns of violent crimes amongst youth, to recommend appropriate changes in the law.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): In effect, the motion deals with three subjects, namely, punishment and the failure to implement the laws, the appointment of a Select Committee and what emerging patterns may come from the proposals put forward by the Select Committee. Mr. Galbally has raised an important and humane matter and has dealt with it in a practical way. He traced the history of punishment although he did not go back through the ages. Whilst I was overseas, I visited the wax works at Victoria in British Columbia. If anybody wants to have a horror session, I recommend a visit to these works because some of the most horrible punishments imaginable were portrayed in the chamber of horrors. Possibly, it would be better to forget about those things instead of providing the opportunity for people to view such horrors.

Mr. Galbally has traced the history of punishment and produced statistics relating to crimes committed by youth today as compared with the incidence of such crimes some years ago. He has also expounded views on how the prison system should be reformed. My only criticism is that Mr. Galbally's information was not up to date. In presenting his case, Mr. Galbally dealt with what might be termed the punishments or penalties which existed some years ago and not so much present-day punishments. Furthermore, it is difficult to find a base for the statistics which he produced. In using statistics to outline crimes committed by youth today, it is necessary to go back only about twenty years before the figures are completely out of context with what might be termed the modern motor age which has brought about many of the problems which exist with our youth today.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Galbally will agree that the motor car and liquor have probably produced the greatest problems that we, as citizens and legislators, would find in any era of Victorian history. It is necessary to examine carefully whether the main cause is the motor car, drink or the individual, and what is going to happen in the future. Honorable members have studied ways of overcoming the problems. Many methods have been tried but at the moment motor cars and drink are the major problems facing this country.

To return to punishments, Mr. Galbally mentioned that little had been done in the way of prison reform. The worst factor in any reform programme is related to the actual prison buildings. The Minister for Social Welfare will probably agree that most prison buildings are of middle-age standands. Until modern buildings are provided, grave difficulty will be experienced in carrying out any reform programme. The Minister for Social Welfare has a programme in mind and publicity has been given to a proposed dividing up of Pentridge and the provision of a remand prison at the old

Melbourne Gaol opposite police headquarters. I have inspected many prisons over the years and one of the greatest problems is adapting the existing buildings to modern thinking in penal reform. I do not criticize the present Government or any previous Government for this, but Victoria is fast reaching the stage where ideas on punishment have to be changed in view of the types of crimes being committed. Possibly, the Minister is well aware of the changes that are necessary and has been doing his best since he assumed the social welfare portfolio.

Mr. Galbally also criticized the lack of work for prisoners, and the resultant problem of idleness and its effect on prisoners. At one stage, a lot of manufacturing work was undertaken in prisons but this was discontinued due to pressure from the unions on the basis that labour was free and that the products were in competition with outside industry. Perhaps honorable members should not criticize this attitude because naturally a person on the outside would be upset if he were out of work while a person on the inside was fully employed and not being paid. Possibly, the problem could be overcome by providing some form of remuneration for prisoners. Perhaps the Minister is currently looking into the situation, but until the prisoners are better equipped, there is little chance of much improvement in this direction.

In some country prisons, endeavours are being made to engage prisoners in reaforrestation and other manual work, which gives them a break from the continual idleness and confinement. Probably 99 per cent of the prisoners are responding to this activity. At the Beechworth Training Prison, the Governor, Mr. Davis, and his dedicated staff are doing a good job. However, there is always the odd prisoner who betrays the trust reposed in him. Even at Ararat and at Won Wron in Gippsland, there has been the individual prisoner who will attempt to escape. We should not lower our sights because one prisoner betrays the trust; we should endeavour to lift the 1 per cent and not denigrate the 99 per cent of prisoners. In time, something will have to be done about the non-criminal class which is creating a problem in the prisons today.

Mr. Storey traced the history of the treatment of offenders and also set out at great length the methods that had been adopted by the Government to bring about changes in punishments and adaptions of the law to meet changing conditions.

Then Mr. Kent proffered the theory that eventually accommodation would not be needed for prisoners because being found guilty of a crime would be sufficient punishment in many cases. He felt that offenders should not be imprisoned but dealt with in other ways. He did not expand too much on the theory.

Various lines of thought have been adopted concerning penalties for driving offenders. At one stage there was a tendency to fine an offender for a first offence and to gaol him for a second offence. Most members of the judiciary and magistrates have concluded that gaoling has not been successful and they are now imposing heavy fines.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY: Not in all cases.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Mr. Eddy can develop his arguments later. In the main justices are endeavouring to impose heavy fines, even on first offenders. In addition, licences are cancelled for certain offences. The convicted persons are also becoming liable to pay compensation for the damage they have caused to the car which they may have stolen and which in many cases has been wrecked or stripped. Consequently, in the community a different attitude now prevails. Instead of putting a convicted person behind bars, it is evident that the judiciary is making the convicted person work to pay, firstly, the fine and, secondly, compensation to the owner of the damaged vehicle.

Two cases occurred in my area recently. The first involved a car which was stolen and eventually rolled over. The person responsible had to pay the cost of restoring the car. The other case involved a stolen car which had been stripped and dumped in the bush. The convicted person was required to pay to the owner the cost of completely restoring the car to its original condition. The penalties imposed will mean that the two lads who were convicted for the offences will probably have to pay a certain sum for four or five years before they have eventually paid the fine and the compensation for restoration of the cars. This, in my opinion, is a better way of dealing with the problem than has been adopted in the past. It allows the convicted person to continue working and to realize that he has a responsibility. He knows that if he does not keep up his payments, he will be taken before the court and charged with contempt and probably sent to prison, which he certainly does not want to happen. I believe the procedure being adopted enables the convicted person to be reformed.

In dealing with Mr. Galbally's motion, I have summarized the comments of previous speakers. I now return to the three fundamental points which I stated at the commencement of my speech. I do not accept that we have not made a fair effort towards changing many of our punishments, especially in the light of the changing conditions today. We still have some archaic penalties under the Crimes Act. It is the Country Party's belief, which has been expressed on several occasions when private member's Bills have been before the House, that it is the Government's responsibility to do something about introducing modern methods of punishment. Some of these methods were mentioned in the report of Mr. Smith, the Law Reform Commissioner. The report, as far as it goes, is good, but it does not go far enough. I agree that a number of the matters which are still outstanding should be dealt with.

Whether a law reform commissioner is the right person to deal with this question or whether it should be performed in some other way is a matter of opinion. After a committee of the Country Party studied Mr. Smith's report, it reached a decision that the appointment of a Select Committee of the House was not the right and proper method of dealing with the question. This is probably because the Country Party believes a Select Committee, consisting of representatives of the various political parties, raises the grave difficulty that the political philosophies of the parties must influence the committee's report. For over 21 years this House has debated the abolition of capital punishment, and probably on fifteen or sixteen occasions it has debated inhumane punishments. It has also dealt with other aspects of the criminal law which have been brought forward by Mr. Galbally. These are not matters which should be dealt with on the basis of political philosophies.

It is difficult for each party to finalize its policy on vital issues of this type, but to throw the three political parties into the one arena and expect them to reach unanimity on them is somewhat optimistic. I feel that probably Mr. Galbally might have achieved some unanimity on these matters, and I give him credit for doing so. However, members of the Country Party have differing views on the various aspects of the criminal code and the types of punishments which should be imposed. Honorable members have observed during the debates on these matters that certain divisions exist within the ranks of Government supporters. Without being critical, I suggest that it is not satisfactory to set up a Select Committee of the House for the purpose of dealing with a matter which is difficult to resolve on a political basis. I believe such matters should be considered on the basis of the facts as they exist and then a decision could be reached.

The Country Party has decided that somebody outside the House should be appointed to deal with this matter, and at the conclusion of my remarks I intend to move an amendment to the motion moved by Mr. Galbally. Probably one of the most important requirements would be to consider the emerging patterns after the report stage of a committee has been reached. As I stated earlier, the Country Party has asked on several occasions that important features of the criminal law should be examined. I am disappointed that this has not been done as the Country Party has requested it for the past six or seven years. It was even discussed prior to that time. In fact, I remember it being raised when the late Sir Percy Byrnes was Leader of the Country Party in this House. However, the Government has not seen fit to take action on the matters that the Country Party has raised in this connection.

At the moment the Minister for Social Welfare, the Government, the departments and the legal fraternity in this State are dealing with methods of punishment on what might be termed the basis of changing conditions from day to day. I realize that a judge or magistrate, when dealing with a case, must consider the evidence placed before him. Both sides have every legal right to make representations and submit arguments, and eventually the judge or magistrate must make a decision on the evidence that is available. I believe we are expressing a change in thinking. As I stated earlier, the Country Party has proposed many amendments for adoption on penalties. Between 50 per cent and 60 per cent of the time of the House is spent in debating the changing conditions and penalties applicable to various areas of law.

The law cannot be updated in a few moments; it must take its course in probably 60 per cent of cases. The remaining 40 per cent embraces the severe criminal cases, which in my view have not received careful consideration over many years.

The Country Party would welcome change and the introduction of better guidelines than are available at present. Many sections of the community are pressing for changes and benefits without considering the effects which those changes will have on other people in the community. These aspects should be taken into consideration. In the world today, there are many so-called "do-gooders" who might be trying to bring about reforms in certain sections of our law without giving consideration to the possible effects of the changes on the ordinary citizen.

Honorable members could ask: How should reform be achieved? If no reform is achieved, in the end we will experience a breakdown in the society, as we know it today. Honorable members might claim that we are now fast reaching that stage. I agree that in some areas society is starting to breakdown a lot of the social standards which we have established over the years.

In recent years this House has debated several private member's Bills covering many aspects of crime and punishment. I give due credit to Mr. Galbally for his persistence and his endeavour to convert the members in this Chamber to change their thinking and their political policies so that certain reforms will be achieved. I will be frank and state that it is difficult every session to debate Bills on the same issues and try to come up with some new thoughts on them. Unfortunately, the Government of the day has refused to accept new proposals which have been advanced. I am not criticizing the Government as that is its prerogative. However, it is difficult for Country Party members to sit on the corner benches and endeavour to find some fresh crumb to submit, when one side of the House consistently advances the same thoughts and the other side just as consistently knocks them down. When this occurs, nothing is achieved.

I have tried to throw into the ring a few ideas on how to resolve the problem. However, if for the next

five or six years the House continues to debate the same Bills, I do not believe we will make a contribution in the right direction. As I have already foreshadowed, I move—

That the words "Select Committee of this House of Parliament" be omitted with the view of inserting in place thereof the words "a committee of three persons of whom one shall be a barrister of not less than ten years standing who has practised extensively in the criminal law, one shall be a member of the Police Force of or above the rank of inspector, and one shall be a senior officer of the Social Welfare Department".

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! The House will consider the amendment first. Members who have already spoken to the motion may speak to the amendment. Members who have not spoken to the motion may speak to both the motion and the amendment.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The amendment is a considerable departure from the original motion moved by Mr. Galbally for the appointment of a Select Committee and I doubt whether the House would be able to examine it in depth immediately.

The Hon. W. G. FRY (Higinbotham Province): I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

I suggest that the debate be adjourned until next Wednesday.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province): The House is much indebted to Mr. Swinburne for his research and for his practical suggestion. I am the first to acknowledge his quiet criticism of me for introducing these Bills on capital punishment from time to time, but what other way can I urge a change in the law except through the constitutional channel of Parliament? It is true that I have been preaching to the unconverted.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: It was only kindly criticism.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I know that, but it called for some explanation by me. Mr. Swinburne has expressed some doubt whether a Select Committee could resolve the matters outlined in the motion. He considered that aspects of crime and punishment had been put on a political plane. With great respect, I do not agree. I do not think that has much to do with political alignment. I rely upon the experience of Sir Ernest Gowers, who was the chairman of a Royal Commission on capital punishment in Great Britain and who later wrote a book on the subject. When he was appointed he thought the matter would not take him much time. He was a firm believer in capital punishment and thought he would finish his task quickly and accordingly make a report. He said that it was only after he got into the subject and realized the futility of capital punishment that he changed his mind.

I have had some experience on Select Committees, as has Mr. Swinburne. I was the chairman and he was the deputy chairman of a Select Committee on the Little Desert and I was also the chairman of the Select Committee on the Royal Botanic Gardens. On that occasion the late Sir Percy Byrnes was deputy chairman. I saw no politics displayed in either of those Select Committees. I thought some might have been shown in the Select Committee on the Little Desert, which was concerned with the development of land, but I was delighted at the way in which both committees went about their tasks. In fact, the then Leader of the House, the late distinguished Sir Gilbert Chandler, commented favourably on the work of the Select Committee on the Little Desert.

It seems that Select Committees do have certain advantages over inquiries by outside bodies. A Select Committee of the Parliament does its work in public and through the medium of the press its work is made known. There is also debate on it and great interest taken in it from time to time. People come forward and give evidence, and they can be and are cross-examined on their views. It seems to me that it may not be the view of the House that a Select Committee

of this House could adequately do the job I propose. I agree it would be an arduous task, and it has also been suggested that an inquiry of this nature, which is of great importance to the administration of justice, ought to be considered by a Parliamentary committee chosen from both Houses and if it is thought the terms of reference are too wide, they could be narrowed. The modern Parliament is at its best when specialized committees are operating. The work of the committees has, of course, to be ratified by the Parliament as a whole. The British Parliament has these committees and in the American system there is provision for Congressional committees.

I am reluctant to give up the proposal for the appointment of a Select Committee, but I am quite happy to consider the appointment of a Select Committee of both Houses with narrowed terms of reference, if it is thought an inquiry of the type I suggest would go on for too long. However, I am opposed to the proposal put forward by Mr. Swinburne. What I suggest is a start and nothing but good could come from it. Too often, if I may say so respectfully and without malice, the Government has not put its full Army into the field, so to speak, in debates on capital punishment. That did not happen years ago. The Leader of the House always took the responsibility of outlining clearly and forcibly the attitude of the Government to these matters which are of great importance to the community. Now that task is given by the Leader of the House—I am not singling out anyone in particular—to a back-bencher. It is like throwing a bone to a dog.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: I took part in the debate last time.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Mr. Byrne was an exceptional back-bencher and should have been elevated to the Ministry earlier.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! I remind the House that the motion being debated is for the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I am not showing disrespect to back-benchers when I make those comments; we were all back-benchers at some time. I understood that the Government intended to ask for some time in which to consider Mr. Swinburne's proposal.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: A motion for the adjournment of the debate has been moved.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Not at Government level.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Fry moved the motion.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Did he move the motion for the adjournment of the debate so that the Government can consider the matter?

The PRESIDENT: The Minister mentioned that.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I accept that. All I want to know is whether the Government proposes to consider at Government level the amendment moved by Mr. Swinburne.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: It does.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I am perfectly happy to agree to the adjournment of the debate.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, November 20.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT (CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES) BILL.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has three major purposes. The first is to enable a further and necessary step in effecting the co-ordinated approach to transport policy initiated by the Government with the transfer to the Ministry of Transport of responsibility for land transport operations—road and rail. The second purpose is to enable the achievement of closer links between transport operators and transport users in consideration of major

transport policy matters relating to services for all areas of the State. The third major purpose is to bring closer together not only the users and providers of transport but those concerned with local government and town planning in consideration of transport needs and policies.

Those who have, over the years, studied and observed the transport industry will have often been aware of a tendency towards an insular approach by specialists in different forms of transport. The basis of this attitude is a desire to see the best for the particular form of transport with which the individuals are involved. This attitude has many desirable features in fostering a competitive thrust for transport improvements and new thinking but it can be allowed to go too far.

Transport is an integrated industry the various elements of which interact with each other and with so many facets of our community life. Changes in transport administration have been made by the broadening of the scope of the Ministry of Transport to enable transport policy to be evolved with recognition that transport is a total industry. Experience has shown that it is time for a further step to broaden the basis of policy evolution by bringing in to consultation those persons who are vitally concerned with transport but who are now not directly involved in discussion of major transport proposals. This Bill will enable proper mechanisms for such consultation to be effected.

The broadening of this approach to the construction of an integrated transport policy will not just apply to the metropolitan area but the approach will cover the whole State. I am sure those honorable members who know the transport needs of areas outside Melbourne will agree with me there is a need to provide a structure by which all areas of the State can be consulted in major transport matters and integrated transport operations planned so that the best possible service can be given.

To carry out its proper functions, clearly the Ministry of Transport must have access to the best advice available from the whole community and not just from the providers of transport. This Bill, in establishing a structure of consultative committees throughout the State, is a major step forward in transport administration.

The Bill provides that there shall be a number of transport regions within Victoria and consultative committees for these regions. The provisions regarding representation on the committees have been framed in broad terms so as to enable the best people available to be brought into the consultative process. There is a specific provision, however, that the committees must include persons experienced in planning and local government and persons involved in the provision and use of transport services and facilities.

The relationship between total community planning and transport planning is a vital one and I draw honorable members' attention to the inclusion of the specific provision that the consultative committees must include persons experienced in planning. Honorable members will agree with me, I am sure, that planning is one of the most debated and discussed subjects in our modern communities. Much has been said on the essential need for proper planning for the future. Much has also been said, however, on the need to allow our communities to evolve properly within the planning framework.

There is a difficult balance to be resolved among all communities around the world, between the achievement of broad planning aims and objectives and the successful detailed planning and operation of particular projects within this framework. Great and diverse expertise is required in both the broader and the detailed fields if we are to achieve satisfactory solutions to future needs.

One of the major factors in the detailed carrying out of our daily life and, at the same time in the

shaping of our community, is transport. With co-ordinated planning we can ensure that transport is properly able to meet community needs in a balanced manner.

The provisions of this Bill will enable the Ministry of Transport to properly co-ordinate planning of transportation investments and will enable the Ministry as one body to deal on transport matters with those involved in total planning. Such a close liaison can only benefit the communities concerned.

The organization of transport consultative committees will be such that the areas with which they are concerned will be closely aligned to those used by the State planning authorities. It will be a step in the implementation of the provisions of this Bill that a transport research and co-ordinating division will be set up within the Ministry of Transport. The bringing together of the major transport planning functions at the Ministry of Transport will make for better over-all use of our total transport resources. This action will also make for proper evaluation of the use of alternative means of transport for particular transport tasks.

Transport is a huge industry. In Victoria, Government transport authorities alone spend almost $400 million per annum on transport and this does not include all the expenditures on private transport and truck transport by commercial undertakings. Honorable members will see the value in a co-ordinated approach towards the provision of major transport facilities and transport investments so that these can be properly integrated to meet the planned development of communities.

The Bill repeals the Metropolitan Transportation Committee Act 1963 for the purpose of constituting a consultative commitee for the metropolitan area with wider representation to meet today's needs. The technical resources of the Transportation Committee will in the main be taken into the Ministry of Transport as the basis for the Ministry's new transport research and co-ordinating division.

At this point I wish to pay tribute to and place in proper context the pioneering work of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee and to the highly expert and skilled team who have worked with the committee over the past years. The committee was the first of its type in this country and we have learned by its work and experience. It is important that the technical skills and the experience gained by the staff of the committee are used to the benefit not only of the metropolitan area but of the country and urban areas of the State, and that these skills are used in close liaison with those responsible for building transportation policies.

Provision is made in this measure to take into the Ministry, through the Public Service, staff employed by the Metropolitan Transportation Committee and staff seconded to the Ministry from the transport authorities. Clauses 14 and 15 provide for the transfer of these people and ensures that they shall continue to be employed with emoluments not less than those to which they were entitled immediately before the transfer.

The Bill, in clauses 7 to 13, provides for the assets and liabilities of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee to transfer to Her Majesty, and protects the rights of all parties under existing contracts with the committee.

Clause 3 of the Bill amends the Ministry of Transport Act 1958 to provide for the appointment of not more than two Assistant Directors of Transport and makes provisions regarding these appointments. Broadly speaking, these provisions follow those already provided in the existing legislation for the appointment of the Director of Transport. The complexity of duties undertaken by the director and staff at the Ministry have grown enormously over recent

years and it is appropriate that provision should be now made for the appointment of Assistant Directors of Transport.

The measures provided in this Bill to set up transport consultative committees throughout the State and to strengthen planning facilities at the Ministry of Transport will enable a better co-ordination and utilization of our transport investment resources for the benefit of the community. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

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

VALUATION OF LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 23) 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. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): This Bill improves the principal Act in various ways. Members of the Labor Party are concerned about several clauses but we are satisfied with the attempt that has been made to improve it. Provision is made to vest power in the Valuer-General to make valuations for the Taxation Department. This is being done because of the new Commonwealth capital gains tax. It is an expression of co-operation by the Minister.

The Bill also extends the confidentiality provision to include employees of the Valuer-General's Office. I have no argument with that. The information supplied under Schedule 32A of the Local Government Act is confidential and this is too easily obtained. There are approximately 804 valuers in Victoria and I understand that three-quarters of this number are engaged in private practice. The Act states that a valuer, estate agent, or his agent, or an owner, may obtain the information prescribed in Schedule 32A. I have heard complaints—no doubt the Minister has also—that this information is too readily available. I do not know whether it is possible to make this information strictly confidential.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: The specific right of obtaining it under the Local Government Act depends on the payment of a fee.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: That is so, but I take this opportunity of expressing general concern about the confidentiality of the information listed in Schedule 32A, and, although it might be a difficult task, perhaps something could be done to improve the situation.

Clause 5 makes a significant change whereby the date of valuation is specifically defined through a judicial decision. This used to read "at the time of valuation". That was in respect of any claim for compensation. That wording has now been changed to read "at the date of the return of the valuation". These are two different points of time. I foresee problems arising in the future as a result of this change. For example, what would happen if between the time of the valuation and the date of the return of the valuation there was a re-zoning? This would have a dramatic effect on the valuation and could cause a new work load to be imposed on the municipalities to conform to the new provision.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: Would not the landowner then appeal against the valuation?

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Yes, but it is not desired that large numbers of appeals should be instituted. That is not the purpose of the principal Act; it is to improve the processes of valuation. However, I raise this query in case such an eventuality should arise.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: The provision is specifically designed to cover the case where there is a rezoning

between the date at which the valuation is directed to be made and the date of the return of the valuation.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: I accept the Minister's word, although I did not interpret the provision in that way. In fact, outside experts from whom I sought advice interpreted it in the same way as I had, so perhaps there is a need for clarification.

Clause 7 refers to the fees which are paid by other rating authorities which use the valuations compiled by the municipalities. The system is good because the municipalities undertake the task of compiling the valuations. There is no sense in this activity being duplicated by other rating authorities such as the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works or the Land Tax Office, but municipalities are concerned about the fees which these authorities are prepared to pay for the service provided.

The Bill provides that where the parties cannot agree on the fees which other rating authorities will pay, the amount will be determined by the Valuer-General. In the past such fees have not been satisfactory to many municipalities. It may be possible to remove some of this arbitrary fee-fixing power from the Act by incorporating in the measure a specific method of assessing the amount to be paid by other rating authorities. One way of doing so would be to compute the amount based on the number of assessments made by any municipality. It may be said that the cost of assessments may vary in different municipalities, for example, in the city and in the country, but I do not think the variation would be great. The Minister may consider making it easier for municipalities to know what amount they will be paid for the work they are doing and which they need to do for their own assessments, of which other authorities will make use.

Consideration might also be given to the possibility that as the valuations are made over a four-year period—which costs the municipality a substantial sum of money, very often involving a six-figure amount, particularly in the metropolitan area—the other rating authorities which are making use of the information might pay the municipality an estimated one-quarter in each of the first three years, with the balance to be struck following the determination of the Valuer-General at the end of the fourth year. This would ensure that municipalities would know what income they would derive from their work, and would enable them to offset some of the substantial costs of compiling valuations.

The Bill also provides that the chairman or a member of the Land Valuation Board may be replaced by the Minister and not by the Governor in Council. That is a sensible change.

The Labor Party agrees that the Registrar should keep a register of all claims for compensation. This was not done previously, and the omission will now be corrected. For many reasons it is proper to keep a record of claims.

It is proposed to increase the amount of money for valuations involving objections and compensation claims from $10,000 to $50,000 in cases where the Land Valuation Board of Review may hear the claim instead of it being taken to court. I agree with this provision, and with any measure which will obviate the need for money claims to be dealt with by courts instead of tribunals or boards. I shall not enlarge on that statement.

Where an authority compulsorily acquires property, at present the Act provides that if a claim has not been made against the valuation within two years, it is deemed to have been waived. The Bill is more generous in this area because it provides that if a complainant wants more time to consider a claim for compensation, agreement may be reached between himself and the board, or, failing agreement, the Land Valuation Board of Review will determine if such time is to be allowed, and how long the period should be. This provision will improve the situation, and we do not disagree with it.

The Bill places the onus on the municipalities to advise both the owner of a property and the person liable to be rated of the valuation of such property. This could cause difficulties, certainly in municipalities such as St. Kilda which has a significant itinerant population of flat-dwellers. It could also apply to other municipalities. The burden imposed on municipalities is too great. No doubt the Minister had reasons for including that provision, and I am sure he will enlighten me about them.

Another clause of the Bill removes the valuer's ability to "fob off" an objector who is objecting against the valuation by making a minor adjustment to the valuation. Under the principal Act, if an objector seeking a change to the valuation seeks an interview with the valuer, the valuer may make a minor adjustment to the valuation and not need to interview the objector. The Bill has been designed to improve the situation so that the objector will have reasonable access to the valuer whether or not a minor adjustment is offered. That is an important inclusion in the Bill.

I have pointed out one or two matters about which the Labor Party is not entirely satisfied. However, it is an improvement to the principal Act and we will not oppose any proposal to improve the Act.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): My Leader invited me to handle this Bill in the House because of my local government experience, and because most of the clauses in the Bill deal with local government. I am a member of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers. At one time valuers were called "sworn valuers"; they were later referred to as "qualified valuers", and when this Bill is passed, they will be called "registered valuers". As you know, Mr. President, I am engaged full time on my Parliamentary duties—if 70 or 80 hours a week can be called full time—but I do have an indirect interest.

I again thank the Minister for his courtesy in this regard. It is better to be able to iron out some of the difficulties with the Minister beforehand. I am grateful also to Mrs. Shelton, Parliamentary Counsel, for her help to us this afternoon in drafting some amendments. In investigating this Bill I also received assistance from various professional associations such as the Municipal Association of Victoria, the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, various municipal councils and a number of municipal valuers.

The Bill amends the Valuation of Land Act 1960. This Act is the one which created the office of Valuer-General within the Local Government Department. The activities of valuers in the department's employment are mainly of a supervisory nature. The number of field staff employed is not as large as the number employed in Queensland, New South Wales, and Tasmania. In spite of that, a measure of supervision is exercised over valuers employed in the Local Government Department and by other statutory authorities, and their work is co-ordinated.

The Act provides for regular valuations for municipalities, based on evidence of the sale of properties, and allows a period between valuations of up to six years, which the Country Party considers generous. It is six years in the country and usually up to four years in the city. Most honorable members will agree that uniformity is the most important factor for rating purposes; realism is important but inflation over the period of the valuation renders this factor non-operative.

Under this legislation in fact uniformity has been achieved to assist valuers. Records of sales are provided to municipalities by the Valuer-General's Office and for each record of sale for transaction a charge of 6 cents is made. The records of sale are available only for valuation purposes but many municipal valuers rely to some extent

on records from other sources of information. The public is starting to realize the incorrectness of one of the greatest myths of valuing, namely that high valuations cause high rates. This is not so. The rate in the dollar causes the high rates. If a valuation is increased, merely by reducing the rate in the dollar the same rate figure is achieved.

Productivity has often been acclaimed as a method of valuation and the Act states that in this regard productivity should be considered. The courts have held that productivity on its own is not an acceptable basis of valuation because so many hypothetical factors arise. A difference in an interest rate of 1 per cent on an annual rental of $20,000 would make a big difference in the final valuation.

In his second-reading speech the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, speaking on behalf of the responsible Minister, explained the various clauses which are mostly of municipal interest. Many clauses of the Bill insert in the Act the term "registered valuer" instead of "qualified valuer". The Country Party fully approves of most of the clauses. Because of the time factor I shall not enter into a debate on the clauses with which we agree but shall refer to the ones that do not meet with our approval.

Referring to clause 2, the Minister said in part that registered valuers are the only persons entitled to carry on public practice of the profession of valuer and to charge fees for making valuations of land. I believe this statement is incorrect or is a simplification because the Act states that registered valuers are the only persons who can carry on the public practice of the profession of valuation as from 1st January, 1979. Until then anyone can do a valuation and charge for it. However, it would be fair to say that unless they are qualified valuers—to be known in future as registered valuers—the valuations that they render do not carry the weight that would be required by most people seeking a valuation.

The Country Party probably has the greatest disagreement with clause 3 which refers to section 3 of the principal Act. In his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

> A further amendment made by this clause will authorize the Valuer-General to make valuations for the owners of property for taxation purposes. At present there is specific authority for him to make valuations for the purpose, *inter alia*, of the assessment of duties under the Probate Duty Act 1962 and for the assessment of stamp duty under the Stamps Act 1958 on any deed of gift or settlement. The amendment now proposed is to enable him to meet requests for valuations for the purpose of the future assessment of the Commonwealth capital gains tax.

This means that the Valuer-General and his staff will be competing with private enterprise in what could be a big field. I asked a question of the Minister and he has been kind enough to give me prior notice of the answer. I asked what was the level of activity under sections 3 (5) (*a*), (*b*), (c) (i) and (*c*) (ii) of the Valuation of Land Act 1960 with regard to the work done by the Valuer-General for the years 1972, 1973 and 1974. The answer supplied by the Minister shows that the level of activity for fees charged rose from $40,000 in 1972 in round figures to $103,000 in 1974.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: That is because of an increase in the scale.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: I am not saying that is a huge amount but the number of valuations increased from 1384 in 1972 to 4258 in 1974. Although those numbers are not great, they show a huge rate of increase which could be of importance. The Country Party believes in the free enterprise system and opposes this extension of Government activity. We believe that to be the philosophy of the Liberal Party and are surprised to see this clause in the Bill.

A further objection is that a State department could be in conflict with a Commonwealth department. I refer to the taxation office. This is wholly undesirable and should be avoided. I realize, of course, that no legislation relating to a capital

gains tax has been introduced into the House of Representatives or the Senate. That is not significant; the principle is important if the Bill is introduced.

An argument has been made that there would be difficulty in private sector valuers covering the entire State. I point out that the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers has 500 members spread throughout the State. They have assured the Government and the Minister that they will be able to service all the valuation needs of the public in regard to Commonwealth capital gains tax or any other matters which rightfully belong in the private sector. The Premier, when he was Minister for Local Government, gave an assurance that it was not the policy of the Government to disturb the position of private-enterprise valuers. After an inquiry by the President of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, Mr. Ian Robinson, on 10th May, 1970, Mr. Hamer, the then Minister for Local Government, replied to him. I shall not read the whole letter but only the two paragraphs that are relevant to this situation. The second paragraph reads—

> It is not and never has been the policy of the Government to disturb the position of private enterprise valuers by the intrusion into your field by Government valuers.

The final paragraph reads—

> I hope that all this will indicate that the Valuer-General has not initiated any act nor sought to change any policy on these matters nor is there any intention that this should happen.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: Did he tell you why he did it?

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: The reason was that he did not believe the Valuer-General should intrude into the private enterprise sphere of valuations. It is clear in that regard.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Nor has it ever been suggested that he should enter into general competition with private valuers.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: The main suggestion is the clause in the Bill to which I am expressing opposition on behalf of the Country Party. An argument has been put forward that if in ten or twenty years' time—assuming that a capital gains tax is introduced—there were some type of dispute in the court, because of the continuing nature of the Valuer-General's Office it would be in a better position to protect the client. In opposition to that I submit that with regard to a valuation the personal appearance of the valuer is not the significant factor; the tendering of the document and the signature on the document are relevant. If in twenty years' time one was in a court and relying on the memory of a particular valuer, that would not be a good situation to be in. In fact, it is the practice to rely on the valuation signed by the valuer expressing the situation as at the date of the valuation.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Would you like to see a reduction in the number of staff in the Valuer-General's Office?

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: I have not said anything about that. I shall proceed to outline the work that the Valuer-General is doing at present. I feel that the staff he has——

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Is doing an extremely competent job.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: I agree and I was going to say something along those lines.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: That valuation would be hearsay and therefore could not be tendered in evidence.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: Which valuation?

The Hon. R. J. LONG: The one you mentioned.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: I think I had better proceed with my speech; I have answered three interjections in a row.

In 1965 the Land Tax Valuation Branch which was later amalgamated with the Valuer-General's Office was responsible for valuations for probate duty purposes, for stamp duty purposes, and for making valuations on behalf of the public for each of

those purposes, but the latter duties were not necessarily encouraged by the department. Valuations for land tax were carried out but were mainly effected as overtime duties. At that stage there were approximately 60 qualified valuers on the Valuer-General's staff plus unqualified valuers and administrative staff.

Since 1965 the department has dropped its responsibility for land tax valuations. These valuations are now mainly being purchased from municipalities—this is the case in the metropolitan area. The following are the present responsibilities of the Valuer-General's Office—supervision of municipal valuations; provision of valuations for various Government departments and authorities, for example, the Housing Commission, the Chief Secretary's Department, the Co-operative Housing Registry and the Forests Commission; provision of valuations for compensation purposes for instrumentalities such as the Country Roads Board and the State Electricity Commission.

They are good fields for the Valuer-General's Office to operate in. At this stage I should like to make favourable reference to the assistance that the Valuer-General and his officers give to members when various queries arise. I have had two or three complicated transactions which the Valuer-General has straightened out in a competent and tactful way. I can only express appreciation for the work done.

However, the Country Party feels that the situation with regard to the work being done by the Valuer-General should be left as it is. At the appropriate stage the Country Party intends to move an amendment that clause 3 be deleted. Clause 5 authorizes the Minister to fix the date on which the value of all rateable property in a general valuation shall be assessed. At present, only the Minister is empowered to do this. Although in practice he does do it, the amendment will make it obligatory for the Minister to fix the level of value date for all general valuations. In his second-reading speech the Minister said—

> For the purpose of such general valuations the valuer must have regard to all things and conditions present affecting the value of the land at the time of the valuation. There have been differences of opinion as to the meaning of the expression "at the time of the valuation". Recently it was decided judicially that it means "at the date of the return of the valuation" . . . .

I have copies of the judgment and of the appeal in the case of *A. E. Scott* v. *The City of Castlemaine.*

The valuers believe clause 5 is desirable. However, they are of the opinion that it is not workable because the valuer is required to assess the value of the property, taking into account all things and conditions affecting the property at the date of the return of the valuation. At the moment that is 30th September, 1976, and the date of the level of valuations is set at 30th June, 1972. This means that the valuer not only must anticipate the physical alterations and improvements to the land, but is also expected to anticipate the economic things and conditions.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: No.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: That is my interpretation of the clause. The valuer has to anticipate the economic things and conditions which are likely to take place up for to 27 months, which is the time lapse between the relevant date fixed by the Minister and the date of the return of the valuation. In country areas this period is likely to be less. The municipal valuer is now required to determine the levels of value expected to prevail some two years hence. I have had a discussion with the Minister who was kind enough to give his views. The honorable gentleman said that the clause enables a valuer to return a municipal valuation at a prescribed level of value date and yet have regard to all things and conditions present at the time of the valuation. He went on to say that the valuation is to be made having regard to all things and conditions present at the date or time of inspection, keeping in mind that this

will be a period of 27 months. This gives the valuer the opportunity to amend his valuation to take into account all things and conditions which may have changed up to the actual returning of the valuation.

I have had discussions with Mr. Allan Kearns, a valuer of the City of Moorabbin who is highly regarded in the valuation profession. He is an executive of the Municipal Group of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers. This group has 153 municipally employed members, and there are 100 fully practising members. Mr. Kearns is probably well known to Mr. Fry. This group maintains that clause 5 is highly impractical, and I am inclined to agree. In Moorabbin six members of staff are working on the valuation of 38,000 propeprties. They must start three years ahead, and anticipate the starting day slightly to get the work completed. They work progressively for three years in order to do these 38,000 valuations. On the date of the return of the valuation they are expected to bring in the alterations caused by economic and various other factors. It will be realized that for these people to spend three years working on 38,000 valuations and then on the date of the return of the valuation be required to alter those valuations, is a huge task. The alterations could be significant. The factors are fluctuating, and they are virtually unpredictable. They involve interest rates which have fluctuated from about 8 per cent to 15 per cent, and even to 22 per cent.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: It is lucky the rise has been up.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: As my colleague has reminded me, interest rates have certainly fluctuated upwards. I suppose that could be expected, but they must come down now. When the building societies injected finance into the housing field, the value of properties increased immensely. When the amount of money available for housing decreased, huge fluctuations occurred in the values of properties. Therefore, we consider this requirement is not reasonable, and we will propose an amendment to the clause.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

> Clause 15 will vary the present rule that compensation for the compulsory acquisition of land must be claimed within two years after service of a notice to treat by an acquiring authority. The claim is deemed to be waived and abandoned if it is not made within that period. However, it is sometimes claimed that a longer period may be necessary for an owner to accurately estimate his loss and claim compensation. It is now proposed that provision shall be made for the parties to agree on a longer period in which compensation may be claimed. If the parties cannot agree the claimant will have the right to apply to a chairman of Land Valuation Boards of Review, sitting alone, who may fix such period as he sees fit. Provision is also made for the claimant to have the right of appeal to the court against a decision of a chairman. In such a case, the court's decision will be final.

Proposed new section 27 (1) (*b*) as contained in clause 15, states, *inter alia*—

> fixed by a chairman upon the application of the person entitled to make the claim.

The Bill contains no machinery for the acquiring authority to be informed of an application for an extension of time, nor to be heard on the application and we consider this to be unreasonable. We shall also be proposing an amendment to clause 15.

Referring to clause 17, the Minister said—

> Clause 17 concerns the notices of valuation which a rating authority must give in respect of any valuation which it has made or caused to be made. The authority must, in respect of each rate it makes, give notice of the valuation to the owner of each rateable property and the person liable to be rated—if he is not the owner. It has been claimed that in its present form the provision on this subject permits the rating authority to issue notices of valuation only after making a rate. To put the matter beyond doubt it is proposed to provide that a rating authority shall issue a notice of valuation in respect of each rate it makes or intends to make.
>
> A further amendment is proposed to make it obligatory to show on each notice of valuation the date as at which the value of the property was assessed. This is of particular significance in country municipalities where a valuation may be in force for six years.

There is a confusion in the addition of the words contained in the amendment to section 37 of the principal Act " and the date as at which the value of the property was assessed ". The valuing profession considers that this is too ambiguous and we foreshadow an amendment in this regard. It is confusing that there are three different dates of valuation being referred to. There is the date at which the valuation is returned, the date at which the level of valuation is ascertained and the date at which the valuer physically makes the inspection. The wording of the clause is ambiguous, and I foreshadow an amendment at the Committee stage. Members of the Country Party support most of the clauses, but will move certain amendments at the appropriate stage.

The Hon. W. G. FRY (Higinbotham Province): I merely wish to go on record as saying that I have received substantial submissions from the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers Inc., a full case from the municipality of Moorabbin by Mr. Kearns, and a submission from the Mordialloc council. It was interesting to note that although from three different sources each letter began by saying, " We congratulate the Minister on bringing forward this Bill. We think it is a first-class Bill, and it has done a good job in the field of valuation ". They may not be the exact words, but that was the general opinion. These people expressed doubts about the valuer generally entering into competition, as they said, with the private sector of valuers, and about the date of valuation and the economic implications of the Bill. I have put these views to the Minister, and he has considered them. These people saw me only recently and I did not have time to prepare a full submission in one day. I discussed the matter with the Minister and he has my notes.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): I support my colleague, Mr. Wright, in his remarks on the Bill to amend the Valuation of the Land Act. I commend him for his knowledge of the subject.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: The honorable member is always very thorough.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: He certainly is. It is always of benefit to Parliament if its members are well versed in certain subjects. In his introductory speech, the Leader of the House, stated that he would have liked to see the reaction of the late Country Party Leader, Sir Percy Byrnes, to the Bill. It is just as well that Sir Percy Byrnes is not still with us, because although I am sure his remarks on the proposed legislation would be well worth listening to, I think they would be most critical. I say this because there is no mention in the Bill of section 5, the controversial section of the principal Act, which outlines the basis on which valuations shall be made. That was a favourite subject of the late Sir Percy Byrnes. Recently I have taken the trouble to read in *Hansard* debates that have taken place over the past ten years. There have been some exceptionally good debates on that subject. The three main speakers from the Country Party were the late Sir Percy Byrnes, my predecessor in the Northern Province, Mr. Percy Feltham, and our Leader, Mr. Swinburne.

I relate my remarks to a matter to which Mr. Wright referred, that is the change proposed in clause 3 in which the authority or the ability of the Valuer-General and his department to carry out valuations for certain purposes has been extended.

As the Minister pointed out in his explanatory second-reading speech, the Valuer-General at present has the authority to carry out valuations for the assessment of probate duty, gift duty and for a number of other purposes. The amendment contained in clause 3 (c) will insert in section 3 (5) (i) of the principal Act the words " or for taxation purposes ".

The Minister stated that the reason for the proposed amendment is to enable the Valuer-General to meet requests for valuations for the purpose of the future assessment of the Commonwealth capital gains tax. Mr. Wright has already outlined the reasons why members of the Country Party oppose this amendment at this stage.

It seems to me that there is no justifiable reason why the Victorian Government should in November, 1974, provide for this nebulous change in the Commonwealth law, because in his Budget speech delivered on 17th September, 1974, when referring to the capital gains tax, the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Crean, said—

> There are many complex technicalities involved and extensive anti-avoidance provisions will be required. For these reasons it will not be practical to introduce legislation before the autumn sitting.

Mr. Crean was referring to the autumn sitting of the Federal Parliament next year.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: He does not know what he is going to do after last night.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I was about to say that there have been so many switches and reversals of form and policy in the past couple of months in the field of Federal politics that it is extremely doubtful whether the proposed capital gains tax legislation will ever be enacted. I am not convinced. by the reasons advanced by the Minister for State Development and Decentralization that at this stage the Victorian Parliament should make this provision. Mr. Wright mentioned that this amendment represents an intrusion of the Valuer-General's Office or the State into a private enterprise field, and I share his view on this point.

The remaining clauses of the Bill, generally speaking, will be more appropriately dealt with in Committee. I rose merely to make the point that it is not appropriate or justified at this stage for Victoria to provide authority for the Valuer-General to carry out valuations for the purpose of a capital gains tax when the basis of that tax is not known. As I said earlier, there is no guarantee that such legislation will be passed by the House of Representatives or by the Senate.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL: What about a State tax?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I am getting considerable assistance from Mr. Nicol and Mr. Tripovich, but I do not think I should continue in that vein.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: One interjection and Mr. McDonald shuts up like a book. What about a State tax? Do you not think the Government contemplates State taxation on land?

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! I do not think we can assume at this juncture what the Federal Government may or may not do.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: That is so, but I make the point that there is no justification for the State to make provision for something that may not eventuate. With those remarks I indicate that, generally speaking, the Country Party supports the amendments, with the reservations expressed by Mr. Wright.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

The sitting was suspended at 6.20 *p.m. until* 8.5 *p.m.*

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

Clause 3 (Amendment of No. 6653 s. 3).

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): I move—

> Clause 3, line 9, omit "and".
>
> Clause 3, paragraph (c), omit this paragraph.

I outlined the reasons for the amendments during the second-reading debate and I shall not cover the ground again. The amendments are in line with the free enterprise outlook of the Country Party and of the Government that the preserves of the private valuer should be retained and the work of the Valuer-General's Office

should proceed in the important fields in which it now operates. More than 500 private valuers are spread throughout the State and they have the ability to undertake valuations for the purposes of Commonwealth capital gains tax. It has been suggested that already private valuers are run off their feet with this work, but nothing could be further from the truth. Most people are waiting to see whether the Commonwealth legislation will be enacted. Admittedly, this does not affect the State Government but it would be detrimental to the profession if the clause, as drafted, were agreed to.

Another factor is the possibility of a clash of interests in the work of the Valuer-General's Office. Currently, a valuer makes valuations for municipal purposes and he could also be requested by a private client to undertake a valuation for capital gains tax purposes. In this sense, there could be a clash of interests which should not be permitted.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): The Opposition will not support the amendments. The paragraph, as drafted, which will be omitted if Mr. Wright's main amendment is accepted, refers to " or for taxation purposes ". Surely, the State Government, which has a Valuer-General's Office, has the right to impose taxes from time to time and at least should have the power to effect valuations either through the department or by employing others to undertake the valuation. It does not matter which procedure is adopted.

Mr. Wright has attempted to make out a case for private valuers to do the work that might be done if ever a capital gains tax is introduced. I suggest that Mr. Wright has argued against the main amendment as not being needed. Whether it is a Commonwealth tax or a State tax, the Valuer-General's Office should have the power to make valuations for the purpose.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): The Bill contains some 30-odd amendments to the principal Act in 24 clauses, many of which are corrections or improvements in drafting. I think there are thirteen substantive changes, seven of which involve a matter of principle, and clause 3 is clearly one of those seven. I appreciate the points raised by Mr. Wright. If it were felt that the provision would be an intrusion on a field properly exercised by private valuers or was likely to damage the interests of the valuing profession, I would not hesitate to drop the provision.

I will give an undertaking that there will be no seeking by the Valuer-General's Office of business in this field. There never has been any seeking of business in the fields already entrusted to the Valuer-General. The intention of the Government is merely to enable a service to be rendered in special circumstances. I want to outline what those circumstances are, the extent to which the Valuer-General's Office provides the service at present, and what the small difference now proposed in fact is.

The Valuer-General is empowered under the principal Act to provide valuations for stamp duty and probate duty purposes. Probate and stamp duties are accompanied in the Commonwealth field by two similar, almost identical taxes, in the form of estate duty and gift duty. It would be ludicrous, for example, if two different valuations had to be obtained upon death. In practice, the one valuation by the Valuer-General is used for both Victorian probate duty and Commonwealth estate duty. There is no strict warrant for the latter use but it is so used as a matter of common sense. Some executives believe quite correctly that if the valuation is made by an independent statutory authority, as the Valuer-General is, the chances of challenge are negligible because if there were disputations, it would be the first one sought to be relied upon.

The same thing applies in the field of stamp duty upon settlements on the one hand and gift duty on the

other; valuations for identical purposes done at the one time. Again there is no strong warrant for the use of the valuation by the Victorian Valuer-General for stamp duty or gift duty purposes, and I should like to put that beyond doubt. His valuations are accepted. He is a continuing statutory entity whose valuation can always be supported on any challenge, no matter how long it arises after the event. That does not apply with a private valuer.

Recently the Commonwealth announced a capital gains tax which would have effect from the date of the budget. I know there is no legislation on the matter and I hope there is not. However, this does not remove the fact that it has been proposed and if it proceeds people will want valuations as at a date which has now past. I know that in anticipation of the legislation proceeding, many people have seen valuers already. The valuations they have obtained, even if the tax comes into operation, may not be needed to be used for 20, 30, 40 or even more years, at a date long after a private valuer has died.

In the case of the Valuer-General, although the occupant of the position may change, the Valuer-General continues to exist. It is a case of something like: The king is dead; long live the king.

The valuation of a private valuer twenty or more years after the event could be open to most serious challenge, particularly if he is not present to support his valuation.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: He would have the documents.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: He may be dead.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: The documents would still be available.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Some people may desire to avail themselves of services such as these. The clause does not only provide for valuations for only one purpose but for taxation purposes in general and will validate the use, if validation is necessary, of valuations for gift and probate duty purposes.

I might add that I also give a firm undertaking that there will be no undercutting of fees. The Valuer-General has never engaged in, nor has there been any suggestion of his engaging in, competition or seeking to obtain business by undercutting. All that is sought is to enable the Valuer-General to make a valuation.

I might add that in certain remote country areas—far distant places, as they have been called by some honorable members—there are not always private valuers readily available to undertake valuation work. The Valuer-General, if requested, is obliged to do the work and to provide a service under circumstances which might be difficult for a private valuer.

In raising this issue during the second-reading debate, Mr. Wright referred to an answer which I had given to him but which has not yet been presented to the House. It was in reply to a question which Mr. Wright placed on the Notice Paper last night. I believe he may have mis-read the answer. In the current year, the Valuer-General undertook only 409 valuations out of a total of something like 28,000 valuations undertaken altogether. In other words, less than one valuation in 70 was undertaken by the Valuer-General.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: How many were there in the two years prior to that?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: For the previous year, there were 309 valuations out of a total of about 25,000 valuations, and for the year prior to that, there were 314 valuations out of about 24,000 valuations all told. This is a drop in the bucket in relation to the total work and business of the Valuer-General's Office; it is designed to be a service only.

I repeat my specific undertaking that at no stage will the fees charged by the Valuer-General be less, and business in this field will not be sought by the Valuer-General's Office. The only desire is to provide an additional service for those who want it, particularly where otherwise it might be lacking.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: The Valuer-General would increase his fees if the private valuers increased their fees?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: That has been the normal practice, to ensure that there is no suggestion of undercutting on the part of the Valuer-General.

I repeat the undertaking that I gave earlier to the effect that it was a matter of principle. It was clearly raised in Cabinet, with the Government party and with the party committee and, on balance, although there was an understanding of the point which would be raised, it was decided that it would be valuable to make this service available.

I am not therefore prepared to accede to the amendments at this stage. If Mr. Wright is prepared to allow it to be defeated on the voices, I will take the matter back to my party for further consideration before it is dealt with in another place. If, however, the Committee is forced at this stage to a division, I will regard the matter as committed and the Government will vote against the amendments.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): I respect the undertakings that the Minister for Local Government gives in this House but unfortunately they may not be binding on a subsequent Minister for Local Government or a subsequent Government. If we pass this measure, at some future time the Valuer-General may interpret his powers in a far wider and different manner. I mention that in passing without throwing any aspersions upon the undertakings given by the Minister for Local Government.

If the Minister for Local Government is prepared to give an undertaking, it would be preferable to have his undertaking embodied in the legislation. I wonder whether he would consider redrafting the clause so that his undertakings are incorporated in the legislation.

The other point which concerns me, and this is in the form of a question to the Minister, relates to the availability of the valuations which are made by the Valuer-General's Office.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: That is covered by clause 4.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: The valuations are made by an officer of the department. It has been stated that they are safely stored away so that they may always be taken out again. The records of a private valuer may not be available, but the records of valuations made by officers of the department are kept in the Valuer-General's Office and presumably they are available to the other valuers and the Valuer-General. If there are to be periodic valuations in various municipalities, what guarantee is there that there will not be a continuous revaluation? If there is a five-year period between valuations, but two or three valuations are made within that period for taxation purposes, what is to prevent the municipal valuer from looking at those valuations and using them as a yardstick?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): I am a bit surprised at the attitude of the Minister for Local Government on this matter. As I understand the Valuation of Land Act, which provides the basis on which the Valuer-General operates, every municipal valuation is available to every Government department which wishes to use it. Certainly a fee must be paid when the municipality requires it, but every valuation is available for all other State purposes. That is the principle of the Act.

I do not understand the argument which has been advanced by the Minister for Local Government. I believe he has to put it beyond doubt that there is a basis on which this valuation shall be needed for State purposes. All departments have the right to access and can purchase the valuation from the municipality. Therefore, the valuation is readily available.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Is Mr. Swinburne speaking to clause 3?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I am speaking to clause 3 (*c*), which relates to valuations for taxation purposes. The Minister for Local Government stressed that valuations may be needed for various State tax purposes.

The principal Act makes it abundantly clear that valuations are available to every department; there is no doubt in my mind on that point. I do not think the Minister can justify any argument to the contrary. I do not believe we should become involved in valuations for Federal tax purposes—some mythical concept which may or may not come into existence. After the happenings in the Federal sphere in the past few weeks, honorable members must be doubtful in their minds concerning what will occur in the future.

The Minister for Local Government has given certain undertakings; he has also threatened that if the Country Party divides the Committee on the amendment, he will not further consider the matter. If the Country Party allows the amendment to be defeated on the voices, the Minister will take it back to his party. This is the first time in the many years in which I have sat in this Chamber that I have heard a Minister make a threat of this kind. The Minister for Local Government stated clearly that if the amendment is defeated on the voices he will give an undertaking to take the matter back to his party between the passage of the Bill in this House and its introduction in another place. It is the Minister's own Bill and it concerns his department. I could understand the honorable gentleman giving an undertaking of this type if he was dealing with another Minister's Bill from another place, but that is not the position. The Minister has thrown it back to the Country Party by stating that if it forces a division on this matter, he will not take it back to his party and that he will not do anything about it before the Bill reaches the other place. Surely the Country Party is entitled to express its view. It is entitled to call for a division to show it is sincere in what it is doing. I take a dim view of the remarks of the Minister for Local Government.

It will be the responsibility of the Minister for Local Government and his Government whether he accepts or rejects the amendment and whether we divide on it. If that is the attitude of the Minister I will ask the Country Party to divide on the amendment. We will throw it back to the Government and claim that we have shown our genuineness on the point and that it is the Government's responsibility to decide whether it should proceed further.

All State taxes are covered under the principal Act and I know of no reason why we should get involved with something which may or may not come about in the Federal sphere. That is the sole argument on which we are basing our opposition to the proposal. I assure the Minister for Local Government that if he rejects my party's viewpoint; as he has indicated he will, the Country Party will call for a division on the amendment.

The Hon. R. J. LONG (Gippsland Province): My position is very clear, irrespective of whether the matter goes back to the party or wherever it may be dealt with. I am totally opposed to the amendment and I shall use my influence wherever possible to oppose it. The Minister made it clear in his second-reading speech that the words " for taxation purposes " were inserted for one specific purpose and that was to overcome problems associated with any capital gains tax that may be introduced. Honorable members must bear in mind that the important date associated with a capital gains tax is 17th September, 1974. Many people have approached me personally asking whether they should have their properties valued as at that date.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: What advice did Mr. Long give them?

The Hon. R. J. LONG: I could not advise anyone to obtain a valuation from a private valuer for the purposes of capital gains tax. The reason is simple. A capital gains tax will be imposed at some time in the future. It may be 5, 10, 20 or 30 years hence.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: It may be imposed on the day before a person dies.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: That is so. After two or three generations there will be no farms left. In his second-reading speech Mr. Wright said that a valuation from a private valuer would be acceptable in court. That is not so because the rule of hearsay applies. The valuation would be inadmissible and could not be used in court. It could be used only in a limited way before a board of review.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: Is Mr. Long sure of that if it is a document?

The Hon. R. J. LONG: I am; it is hearsay and is inadmissible.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: I do not believe it.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: I have no doubt about it. When I am asked by people whether they should get a valuation and whom they should get it from I have to bear in mind all the possible steps that can be taken. It depends on whether the valuation is required for presentation to a board of review or for submission to a court. If a person wants a valuation for a court I must advise him to use the services provided by the Valuer-General because the Valuer-General keeps records going back for many years and even 50 years hence the valuation would be on record. It would be possible to determine that at 17th September, 1974, the property was valued at such a figure. Such a record would be admissible in court, and that is the important point.

Anyone who advises a person to seek a valuation today from a private valuer is not in his right senses. I agree with Mr. Wright even though it hurts me to say so because what he said is the basis of private enterprise, which I support. Unfortunately, we must face the facts and this situation has arisen and I must follow it. Therefore, I am totally opposed to the amendments.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province): Mr. Long has carefully and properly put forward the arguments against the point raised about obtaining valuations only from the Valuer-General and what would happen 50 years hence or the day before a person dies when the value of the property has to be determined for taxation purposes because it forms part of an estate. Mr. Swinburne has said that valuations made for municipalities are available to all State departments and therefore there was no need for a valuation to be made by the Valuer-General. Perhaps Mr. Swinburne has glossed over this process because anyone who understands the situation knows that a municipal valuation is made at a certain date and is used only for municipal purposes If a valuation is required for gift duty, estate duty or probate duty it must be made on the appropriate date and the valuation made for municipal purposes, which is made as at a specific date, would not be suitable.

The Hon. I. A SWINBURNE: There is no reason why the municipal valuation could not be used.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE: That is so, but there could be a considerable change in a valuation between the date on which it was made for municipal purposes and the date on which it is used for gift duty, probate duty or estate duty purposes Therefore, Mr. Swinburne's argument falls to the ground.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Mr. Grimwade has missed the point.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE: The Minister for Local Government has clearly put forward the reasons for the proposal in the Bill and I accept his undertakings when he says that the Valuer-General will not go out of his way to seek business. An answer

to a question recently stated that during the past three years the Valuer-General made fewer than 1½ per cent of all the valuations made in Victoria in any one year. It is ridiculous to suggest that the Valuer-General will compete unfairly with valuers in private practice. Perhaps some honorable members are being over-enthusiastic. In view of the reasons put forward by the Minister and Mr. Long, there is no reason to support the amendments and the clause should be accepted as drafted.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): I am disappointed that the Minister does not propose to accept the amendments because I thought he was impressed by the arguments in support of them that were put forward.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: His legal advisers have been pressuring him.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: That is the trouble. The point made about the answer to the question on the number of valuations made by the Valuer-General is not valid. In one year the number of private valuations increased from 309 to 409, which is an increase of approximately 33 per cent. One does not need to be a mathematician to work out that ten years hence valuations made by the Valuer-General will reach a huge figure.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: That is a fallacious argument because in the second of the three succeeding years the number of valuations decreased.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: That is not my recollection, but I shall check again. The present Premier, when he was Minister for Local Government, said that it was not and never had been the policy of the Government to disturb the position of private enterprise valuers by the intervention of the Valuer-General into the field. That assurance was given some time ago and honorable members now see what is happening. An assurance given in 1970 has been altered in 1974.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: It has not been altered.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: It has, and that shows how ridiculous the assurances are. Another aspect which is of some concern, although I am not saying that this was done deliberately, is that the Government in correspondence with the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers gave an indication of the contents of the Bill but made no mention of the clause being debated. I realize that there might be a time factor involved, but when I contacted the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers I was told that the institute did not know that this far-reaching clause was being inserted in the Bill.

The suggestion that the Government is to enter the field and make the valuations in competition with private enterprise has been taken very lightly.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: Does Mr. Wright believe in free enterprise?

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: I do and the Government should state quite clearly that it will look after the interests of private enterprise. During the debate there has been reference to the relative merits and credence of valuations made by valuers from the staff of the Valuer-General and those of valuers from the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, particularly regarding the acceptance of valuations in court. I reject completely the concept that valuations made by valuers from the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers would not have the same standing in a court as valuations made by the Valuer-General.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: Who suggested that?

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: Mr. Long did.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: Mr. Long said that the evidence would be hearsay.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: That is so and I am submitting that that argument about lack of credence of valuations made by valuers from the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers is incorrect. Those valuations would be accepted in court just as readily as

would valuations from the Valuer-General. If a valuation was signed by a private valuer, the court would take just as much notice of it.

I refer now to valuations for the purpose of a capital gains tax. It is my opinion that the increase in values over the years will be so large that little court work will be involved. The Commonwealth Government will be quite happy to accept the tax it receives on the valuation as at 17th September, 1974, if that is the applicable date.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: If Mr. Wright will give me a guarantee in writing on that I will agree with him.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: I do not have to give Mr. Long a guarantee. It is completely erroneous to suggest that a valuer from the Valuer-General's office has more standing than a valuer from the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers. A member of that institute has undertaken difficult study for four years by night school or correspondence, a preliminary requirement is matriculation—it used to be leaving standard—and he must have three years' experience in the field. A qualified valuer knows his job well and truly.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: Is it a seven-year course?

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: A four-year course, with three years' experience in the field; the period may or may not be cumulative. For those reasons the Country Party is disappointed that the amendments have not been accepted and it rejects the offer that has been made by the Minister. The Country Party will certainly divide on this issue and show the people where it stands.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province): I rise because I have been provoked by some of the arguments advanced by members of the Country Party in rejecting the proper, reasonable and gracious approach by the Minister to this matter. I hope that next time a Bill is introduced in this House which might enable somebody to operate in the field in which barristers and solicitors operate, members of the Country Party will support the legal profession as well as they have supported the valuers' profession today. This measure has been described by Mr. Wright as far-reaching. That is such an exaggeration that it betrays the way in which the Country Party has approached the matter.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: When did I say it was a far-reaching measure?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY: I made a note of Mr. Wright's remarks.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: How big is Mr. Storey's block—60 feet by 170 feet? That is about the size of his holding.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY: Mr. Elliot and I are on the same side. Perhaps later he will supply the dimension of his land in hectares or whatever is appropriate. The Minister has given an excellent reason why people may wish to use this facility, if the clause, as drafted, is passed. It does not indicate that the Valuer-General proposes to enter into competition with the competent and reputable private valuers. It does not indicate that the Government intends to interfere in this field, but it provides an opportunity for persons who wish to protect their position for the future to avail themselves of the services. The Minister has gone further than giving the necessary undertakings, and the clause ought to be strongly supported.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): I enter this debate under a little provocation from my friends who believe in free enterprise. I believe in a little free enterprise, too, and if people want to go to a single valuing authority to obtain valuations they should be allowed to do so. The Minister has been sincere in his suggestion that the Government has not encouraged the Valuer-General to compete with outside valuers.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: It has a choice of 500 valuers.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: The Valuer-General has carried out 300 valuations of a total of 25,000. Why does Mr. Wright object to a little competition? He says that he believes in free enterprise. That is a little hypocritical. I refer to the capital gains tax which has been injected into this Bill. When a person takes an option on a property less than 40 miles from Melbourne for less than twelve months and trebles the price on the purchase and resale of the property, somebody is entitled to look at him in regard to capital gains.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Order! Mr. Tripovich shall not pursue that argument.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: I said that I would not pursue it. I have made my point and I am entitled to do so in view of the remark that the proposed legislation has been introduced for this purpose. The Country Party's attitude is to " take on " the Government in country newspapers with a political incentive in view. Members of the Labor Party support the Government on the issue and will vote with the Government because they believe the principle is sound. I am happy, therefore, that the Government has the numbers in its own right and can implement policies in which it believes.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): My colleague, Mr. Wright, has moved amendments to clause 5. Contributions to the debate have been made by Mr. Trayling, the Minister, and two of his colleagues. Mr. Trayling seemed to be concerned about clause 5 not being used as a capital gains tax.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: The honorable member is not allowed to mention that aspect. I was prevented from doing so.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Order! I inform Mr. Tripovich that the Chair is quite capable of giving its own ruling.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: I do not wish to reflect on the Chair but I hope the same ruling applies to other members.

The CHAIRMAN: Whether Mr. Tripovich wishes to do so or not, he is in grave danger. He should exercise better control over himself.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: When I referred to capital gains tax I had no intention of debating its correctness but I used the reference in the same incidental way that the Minister used it when explaining the Bill. Honorable members would agree that if there are to be any new State taxes, and enabling legislation is needed, that will be considered when the time arises. The Minister submitted to the House why this amending legislation was necessary and desirable. His point of view did not convince me that there was need to validate some aspects of probate and death duty.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: They are for Commonwealth purposes and taxation purposes also.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: The second-reading remarks of the Minister are relevant. He has stated that, at present, the Valuer-General has specific authority to make valuations for State purposes. I am not convinced that the honorable gentleman's remarks were sound. I reiterate my statement that it does not seem logical or necessary to introduce this amending legislation if there will be no relevant Commonwealth legislation on the statute-book for at least six months. It would be better to wait and see if Commonwealth legislation is introduced. On the question of admissibility of valuations carried out by independent valuers other than a valuer in the Valuer-General's Office, the arguments put forward by Mr. Long and Mr. Storey assumed that all disputes over valuations in the future would be resolved by court action.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY: I did not put the same argument as Mr. Long.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I inferred that from the remarks of Mr. Storey. The provision for valuations carried out by either the Valuer-General's Office or an independent registered valuer is contained in

section 5A of the Valuation of Land Act. It seems to me that registered valuers, whether employed by the department or independent, will have equal standing. It is not a controversial matter whether valuations are carried out in the future by an independent valuer or a valuer from the Valuer-General's Office.

As Mr. Swinburne pointed out, the Minister for Local Government took an unusual course. He said that if the members of my party did not force a division on this amending legislation, he would put their views to the Government before it was transmitted to another place. Like my Leader and Mr. Wright, I do not accept that proposition. The Minister could move to report progress and look at this matter another time.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Does Mr. McDonald consider that the Minister was a little menacing?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I will not go into that. I do not believe it is necessary to have this amending legislation at this stage. The Government should have waited to see if the Commonwealth introduced capital gains taxation.

The Hon. R. J. LONG: What about people who want to protect themselves in the event of capital gains tax coming in? Does Mr. McDonald want to deny them that right?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: If Mr. Long had been listening to me and accepted my argument, he would realize that valuations carried out by registered valuers under the Valuation of Land Act, on a uniform basis, should be equally reliable whether done through the Valuer-General's Office or by an independent valuer.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: They have proved to be that way during the year.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I seem to be getting a great deal of assistance, but I want to end by saying that I inferred from the remarks of Mr. Long and the interjection of Mr. Jenkins that matters of capital gain should be dealt with by the Valuer-General's Office. When those honorable members say that they do not intend to interfere with private enterprise or the operation of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, their attitudes are not consistent because on the one hand they are not opposed to private enterprise being affected in this way and on the other hand they want to give the Valuer-General's Office as much business as possible.

This Bill has been introduced too early; the Government should have waited to see whether it was necessary.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): I am deeply grieved that my good friend and frequent mentor, Mr. Swinburne, should have thought I was threatening his party. Nothing could be further from the truth. I was making an offer in a most conciliatory spirit. There is no way in which I could threaten the members of the Country Party. I could have simply said that the Government would vote against their amendments. I made it plain that I included these provisions only on balance and that the matter was considered successively by Cabinet, the party committee and the Government party.

Perhaps it was not considered as fully as it has been in the House. In the light of that, I was prepared to give further consideration to the provision. As the debate has progressed, I have been by no means convinced that the course taken was wrong—in fact, the further the debate has progressed the more I have been strengthened in the view that the clause is sensible. If members of the Country Party propose to call a division on the clause, that is their business and their right and I do not challenge it in any way. The Country Party will vote for the amendments. The Government will vote against them.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Mr. Wright has proposed two amendments to this clause, the first one to omit from line 9 the word

" and ", and the second to omit paragraph (c). The first amendment will be consequential on the second one.

With the approval of the Committee, I propose to take a test vote on the consequential amendment, and the result will indicate whether the main amendment will be agreed to. If that course is acceptable to the Committee, it may save a little time, but if not I am prepared to put both amendments. Is the course I suggest acceptable to Mr. Wright?

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): That course is acceptable, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I direct the attention of honorable members to Standing Order No. 155, which reads—

> No Member shall be entitled to vote either in the Council or in any Committee thereof upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any Member so interested shall be disallowed.

The Committee divided on Mr. Wright's amendment (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	..	5
Noes	..	24
Majority against the amendment	..	19

AYES.

Mr. Clarke	*Tellers:*
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Bradbury
Mr. Swinburne	Mr. Dunn

NOES.

Mr. Block	Mr. Hunt
Mr. Byrne	Mr. Jenkins
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Kent
Mr. Crozier	Mr. Long
Mr. Dickie	Mr. Storey
Mr. Eddy	Mr. Trayling
Mr. Elliot	Mr. Tripovich
Mr. Granter	Mr. Walton
Mr. Grimwade	Mr. Ward
Mr. Gross	
Mr. Hamilton	*Tellers:*
Mr. Hauser	Mr. Fry
Mr. Houghton	Mr. Gleeson

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): I take it that the decision of the Committee is that that disposes of Mr. Wright's second amendment.

The clause was agreed to, as was clause 4.

Clause 5 (Amendment of No. 6653 s. 7.)

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Before Mr. Wright speaks to this clause, I suggest that the same procedure be followed as was adopted in regard to the previous two amendments, the first being consequential upon the second. I ask Mr. Wright, when moving the first amendment, to explain the second one.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): I move—

Clause 5, line 27, omit " and ".

We are moving away from the matter of principle and dealing with the carrying out of valuations. This will be a difficult task for municipalities, because the clause means that the valuer must forecast the economic and physical changes which will occur over a period of three years.

In my second-reading speech I mentioned the situation of the City of Moorabbin where six valuers must carry out 38,000 valuations over three years. It is virtually impossible for them to forecast economic factors such as fluctuations in interest rates or availability of funds for housing purposes. They must wait until the date of the return of the valuation before completing it. That means that, in the City of Moorabbin, 38,000 valuations have been completed and the valuers must consider all the changes that have occurred over the three years, and to conform strictly with the Act the 38,000 valuations should be carried out again. The amendment I propose would exclude economic factors.

Physical factors would be included. These physical factors include things such as rezoning but exclude economic factors relating to interest rates and financial matters. This will

be a real and difficult problem for municipalities unless the amendment which the Country Party has moved is accepted.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): I make it clear that the clause in the Bill makes no amendment to the substantive law but merely seeks to clarify it, whereas the amendment made by Mr. Wright does propose a far-reaching amendment to the existing law. The clause in the Bill derives from the case of *Scott* v. *The City of Castlemaine* to which Mr. Wright has already referred. Three issues were involved in that case. Firstly, after the date as at which the Minister had directed the valuation should be made but before the date on which the valuation was returned there was a change in the law which affected valuing procedures, the forms of valuation.

Secondly, between the date as at which the valuation was to be made and the date on which the valuation was returned, the ratepayer had blasted the top off a mountain with a view to building a home there and had installed a road. The first two issues were: Firstly, was a change in the law which slightly affected the valuing process before the valuation was due for return to be taken into account and, secondly, was the physical change in the land before the date on which the valuation was returned to be taken into account? The principal Act refers currently to the time of issue. A third issue emerged: What was the time of valuation? Was it the date on which the valuer physically inspected the land or was it the date on which he put his figures on paper and returned them to the municipality?

All three judges in the Full Court held that the purpose of fixing a prior date is to ensure that the general level of valuations is a constant one that applies equally to everyone. The purposes of requiring the valuer, as the law does, to take all things and conditions present up to the time of valuation into account, merely meant that if there were changes between the date as at which the valuation was to be made and the date of valuation itself, these should be regarded as having occurred retrospectively as at the date on which the Minister directed the valuation should be made.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: Do you mean the level of valuation and not the return of valuation?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Yes. Thus, for example, if a house is built on the land before the valuation is made, that house is treated as having been built a little earlier, at a date which would keep the level consistent with values throughout the municipality. If one did not do that, of course, there would be a number of properties valued as at 30th June, 1968, as the year was in that case, and this particular one would be 30th June, 1969. Clearly the economic conditions are as at the date at which the Minister directs the valuation should be made, a retro-active date. In any event the three judges decided that those physical events which transpired between the date as at which the valuation was directed to be made and the date on which the valuation was made were to be taken into account. All three were agreed that a legal change—in this case a change in legislation which occured during the period—should also be taken into account. It follows that a change in zoning between the relevant dates would also need to be taken into account. Clearly that is logical. It is a valuation that is to apply to the future, after the date of making.

Where the three judges disagreed was on the simple point of what constitutes the date of valuation. Two judges said that the valuation was not complete until the returns were signed and the general valuation for the municipality lodged. That was the date of valuation and not the date of physical inspection by the valuer. One judge in the Full Court disagreed and said that he was inclined to think, although it was necessary for him to express a firm opinion on it, that the date of valuation was the date of

physical inspection. So there was disagreement between members of the Full Court on that point.

In this clause the Government is simply adopting the words used by the majority of the Full Court to put the matter beyond all doubt and to ensure that nobody considers it necessary in the future to clarify the point by going to the High Court. The existing law is being clarified and conformed.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: You are talking about physical things.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: No, I am not speaking of physical things. Mr. Wright seeks to imply a completely new principle by using the words " other than economic factors ". How could a valuer make a valuation without considering economic factors? He considers the economic factors as at the date on which the valuation is directed to be made. That is the whole purpose of having a retro-active date as at which all valuations in a municipality will be made, whether the house has existed on that date or on a subsequent date on which the valuation is returned. That is all we are doing.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: Would the Minister please repeat that? Is it at the date of the return of the valuation which is the latter date, not the previous date?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: In determining general levels of price and the price which a particular property would have brought, the date to be taken into account under the law as it stands and as it is proposed to be amended by the Bill is the date as at which the Minister directs the valuation shall be made. That date is always a past date which can provide a common basis for the whole of the municipality.

However, in making the valuation all things and conditions present, including physical changes in the land, changes in the zoning or changes in the law are in fact taken into account by the valuer and treated as if they had occurred at the date as at which the valuation was directed to be made.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): From what Mr. Wright and the Minister have said, this is one of the most technical and complicated matters with which this Parliament has to deal. One needs to be a Rhodes scholar in the legal field to be able to follow the Valuation of Land Act and the Local Government Act. I suggest to the Minister that there is a great need for him or his department to have prepared an explanatory memorandum on this whole issue so that the matters to which he has just been referring and also the more general matters relating to municipal valuation can be quite clearly and explicitly understood.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province): I second that thought because it is somewhat difficult and hard to understand when one refers to the date of valuation and the date of return of valuation. I suggest that they are separate dates, as the Minister has stated, and that the Government should standardize the words to clarify what date is being referred to. The date of valuation is quite clearly that which has been nominated by the Minister as the date of valuation. That is a day which is the most distant one in time. The date of return of valuation is the date on which the return is made. I think the word " return " must be used.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: It is used.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE: I know it is used but in the debate the matter has become rather confused because some people have referred to one or the other date. I think the Minister should clearly distinguish between the date of valuation and the date of return of valuation.

This amendment refers to the addition of the words " other than economic factors ". That is a wide expression. It is hard to understand how one can make a valuation and disregard economic factors. These

must be taken into account between the date of valuation and the date of return of valuation.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: The Bill does that.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE: I agree with the honorable member. I reject the amendment and support the Bill as it stands.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): Just to try and get this clear, when the Bill is passed, section 7 (2) will be—

> The Minister after consultation with the valuer-general shall fix a date as at which the value of all the rateable property within the area of such general valuation shall be assessed and such general valuation shall be assessed accordingly, but having regard to all things and conditions present affecting the value of the date of the return of the valuation.

I am seeking to insert after " present " the words " other than economic factors ".

This clause clearly created disagreement at various dates of valuation. Three dates are involved. Let us assume that they are 1974, 1975 and 1976. 1974 is the level of valuation when the market value is ascertained. The date of the valuer's inspection might be 1975 and the date of the return of the valuation could be 1976. As I read the Bill, it is intended that 1974 will be the general level of market value.

Things that have happened between then and 1976 must be taken into account by the valuer and disregarding the physical things that have been happening between 1974 and 1976 the valuer has also to estimate what the economic factors will be. It is clearly impossible for him to do this. He must wait until 1976 to make amendments for any economic factors and he has done so in the case of, say, the City of Moorabbin. That is the way I understand the matter. The suggestion to have another look at the Bill is good.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province): Mr. Wright has clearly explained the reason for his amendment. Earlier the Minister explained the present effect of the Act and the purpose of the Bill. As I understand it, Mr. Wright is saying that at the date on which the property is valued—1974 in his example—the valuer is to take into account changes in economic conditions between 1974 and 1976, the date at which the valuation is returned. I do not agree with Mr. Wright. Having examined the Act and the Bill, it appears clear that the valuer assesses the value of the land as at 1974, and then takes into account in the words of the section, " things and conditions present as at 1976 ".

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT: That is all the things at 1976.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY: No. If the land is vacant in 1974 and a house is built on it, or there has been a rezoning of land, the valuer has to make a return of the valuation in 1976 and take into account those changes in the things and conditions relating to the land, the erection of the house or the rezoning, so that the valuation at the date of return reflects the present state of the property in question.

If, as Mr. Wright suggested, the valuer also took into account the changes in economic factors between 1974 and 1976, the year 1974 would have nothing to do with the valuation because he would be valuing the property entirely on its state and value in 1976. When that is realized, it is clear that the Act requires the valuer to look at the economic factors, that Mr. Wright is referring to, in 1974. That is, he must consider what was the state of the land market in 1974, and what were the values of land in 1974. Having done that, the valuer adds on something if the land has had a building erected on it or there has been a rezoning, and he returns the value in 1976. He is not required to take into account changes in economic factors. To interpret the words of the Act in that way would make nonsense of the Act because 1974 would no longer be relevant. The Act does what Mr. Mr. Wright wants it to do.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Why not accept the amendment then?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY: If Mr. Wright's amendment was accepted, tremendous problems would be created in interpretation because something which at the moment does not involve consideration of economic factors would be so worded as to require the valuer to disregard economic factors. Therefore, he would have to ask what are the economic factors that he is supposed to disregard but which apparently it was contemplated he should refer to under the Act as it stood. No one would know what the situation was. The expression " economic factors " is so wide that it could mean anything. It may require the valuer to disregard things that perhaps he should regard under the present words " things and conditions ".

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: But does not an economist know everything about nothing?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY: An economist probably knows something about everything and everything about nothing. Mr. Wright has the right idea on what should occur in valuations of properties. However, the Act as it stands does what Mr. Wright wishes it to. If his amendment is accepted, instead of simplifying matters it will complicate them and cause much confusion. There would be another appeal to the Full Court, which might be good for lawyers but not for the public generally.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): The Labor Party will not support the amendment. However, I understand the reasons that led to Mr. Wright moving it. I confess to being confused about the clause, and I sought advice from people whom I considered to be fairly expert. These people were also confused. It is not easy to reconcile the Bill with the principal Act, but I accept the Minister's explanation, particularly in the light of Mr. Storey's remarks.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): Members of the Country Party will be happy to accept an assurance from the Minister that the problem we envisaged does not exist and that the municipal valuers will not have to be concerned about economic factors up to the date on which the valuation is returned.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): I assure Mr. Wright that his intentions are precisely the same as those of the Government. I am confident that the Bill achieves the result desired. I am fortified in my belief that the Bill does so by my reading of the judgment of the Full Court in the case of *Scott* v. *The City of Castlemaine*.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Does the honorable member seek leave to withdraw the proposed amendment?

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Hon. S. R. GLEESON (South-Western Province): I am even more confused about this date of valuation in a year such as 1974. A valuer might look at a property, half of which could be under water. This may be the first time this flooding has occurred, but how does a valuer value the property on the date referred to?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): Mr. Gleeson is technically correct. There are three possible relevant dates—the date which the Minister directs shall be taken for assessing the general level of values, and the values of certain properties; the date on which the valuer made the physical inspection; and the date on which the valuation was returned. I have explained that the Full Court was divided on the meaning of the phrase " date of the valuation ". Two of the judges held that it was the date on which the valuation was taken and one thought it probably meant the date on which the valuer made his physical inspection. We are adopting the view of the majority. Thus, if the property was

inundated on the precise date on which the valuation was returned, I suppose it is true that that was a thing or condition present on that date. Whether it should be deemed retrospectively to have occurred two years ago, I do not know. However, I think that common sense would prevail. If this inundation was a rare event, it would be disregarded, although if it were Mr. Gleeson's property he would no doubt be tempted to appeal against the valuation.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: One property in Swan Hill is still under water.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: If the flood was not of short duration, but had been there for some time and looked like remaining for some time, it would be not only technically correct but morally just that the valuer should take that into account.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province): I am intrigued by Mr. Gleeson's point and the Minister's explanation. I suggest that if the land is flooded at the date of the return of the valuation that is a thing or condition present, and plainly the valuer would have to take that into account. However, that would not require him to say that this is a piece of land that is to be treated as though it is to be for ever under water. He would rather have to treat it as a piece of land that is subject to flooding and this would have an effect upon its value. A sensible valuer might take this approach and take into account the factor of flooding but would not value the land in a unreal manner.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Mr. Wright has sought leave to withdraw his proposed amendment to clause 5. Is leave granted?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): Yes.

By leave, the amendment was withdrawn.

The clause was agreed to, as was clause 6.

Clause 7 (Fees to be paid in respect of copy valuation).

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

Clause 7, line 17, after this line insert—

'(3) In sub-section (3) of section 6 of the principal Act for the expression "sub-section (7) of section seven and sub-section (1) of section eight" there shall be substituted the expression "section 8AA".'

This amendment is necessary merely because an earlier clause of the Bill removed a sub-section of the existing section 8 and created a new proposed section 8AA. It is a technical amendment.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 8 to 14.

Clause 15 (Amendment of No. 6653).

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): I move—

Clause 15, line 35, after "claim" insert "after notice of the application has been given to the acquiring authority".

As I said earlier, proposed new section 27 (*b*) states, *inter alia*—

. . . fixed by a chairman upon the application of the person entitled to make the claim.

There is no opportunity or machinery for the acquiring authority to be informed of this application for an extension of time, and no opportunity for him to be heard. This is a most reasonable amendment, and I commend it to the Minister.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): By way of interjection during the second-reading debate, I said that Mr. Wright is always thorough in his studies, and I meant it. We are indebted to him for drawing a defect in this clause to our attention. Quite clearly where a matter affects the rights of a statutory authority it should have notice of application. I regret that I omitted to provide for this in the clause. I am grateful to Mr. Wright. The Government has no hesitation in accepting the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as was clause 16.

Clause 17 (Amendment of No. 6653, s. 37).

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): I move the following amendment—

Clause 17, line 31, after "was assessed" insert "being the date fixed by the Minister under sub-section (2) of section 7".

This amendment gets back to the problem that has been discussed freely tonight, that is, which of the three dates is the relevant date. There is no need for me to say any more. This amendment will clarify the position for the people out in the field who have to comply with the provisions of the Act.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): The phrase "the date as at which the value of the property was assessed" appears on a number of occasions in the principal Act. The judgment to which reference has been made makes it quite plain that the meaning of that phrase is the date directed by the Minister, that is, the date directed to be taken into account in the general revaluation. To add in simply one provision a supplementary phrase "being the date fixed by the Minister under sub-section (2) of section 7" would imply that something different was intended in all the other cases where the expression "the date as at which the value of the property was assessed" appeared in the principal Act. Thus, although I certainly can understand Mr. Wright's intentions, to include those words in one place in the principal Act and not in others would cause rather than remove confusion. In any event, the confusion has been removed by the unanimous finding of the Full Court on the point.

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

The Bill was reported to the House with amendments, and passed through its remaining stages.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

The debate (adjourned from October 30) on the motion of the Hon. D. G. Crozier (Western Province) for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech was resumed.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): On behalf of the electors of the Northern Province, who are represented in this House by Mr. McDonald and myself, I offer my congratulations to Sir Henry Winneke, the first Australian Governor of this State. All honorable members are familiar with Sir Henry's record as Chief Justice. He will make an excellent Governor.

At this stage in Victoria's history, the Governor, being the link with the Crown and the Queen, has probably become a more important symbol than ever in the past because there is in this country a fairly strong republican movement. I refer particularly to the Commonwealth or Australian Government which appears to me to be doing its best to sever our connection with Great Britain and even with the Commonwealth itself.

I have been perturbed by the fact that Mr. Whitlam, the Prime Minister, has ordered that the tune *Advance Australia Fair* shall be played as the National Anthem, relying upon an extraordinary straw vote. I am glad that in northern Victoria, anyway, *God Save the Queen* is normally played. But there is some confusion. I was appalled recently at an official function when I was approached by the bandmaster and asked whether it would be "all right" for him to play *God Save the Queen* because he understood that instructions had gone out that bands were to play *Advance Australia Fair.*

I do not think many people are familiar with the history of *Advance Australia Fair* or even know who wrote it. It was written by a Scottish immigrant called Peter Dodds McCormick who arrived in this country in 1855 and who died in Sydney in 1916 after a lengthy career as a school teacher and as a choir master in the Presbyterian Church. He wrote the song, the music and the

words, in 1878. There was no intention then that it would become the National Anthem; I am sure it was the last thing that Mr. McCormick intended.

Nobody thought of this until 1933 when the stormy and tempestuous Mr. J. T. Lang, then Labor Premier of New South Wales, who was violently anti-monarchy, decided that he would adopt it as the Australian National Anthem. That did not succeed and the matter was let rest until Mr. Calwell revived it during the second world war and requested cinemas to play it. But there was a public reaction against it, and Mr. John Curtin, the Labor Prime Minister, in 1943 announced that it was not the National Anthem and the practice was discontinued. There has been an extraordinary revival recently under the most spurious circumstances.

I do not know whether those members of the Labor Party who advocate *Advance Australia Fair* as the National Anthem have read the words of the song. It contains four official verses, although I do not wish to read them. Perhaps they could be incorporated in *Hansard*?

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Mr. Clarke may read the verses.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: I shall not read the four verses but I shall quote certain portions which may cause those who advocate that this song should be Australia's National Anthem to withdraw their support.

The first verse refers only to Australia's sons. There is no mention of daughters or women. The words are entirely addressed to men and on the ground of sex it is discriminatory. In His Excellency's Speech, Sir Henry Winneke assured honorable members that the Government intended to do away with discrimination on various grounds, including sex, and yet the adoption of *Advance Australia Fair* as Australia's National Anthem would involve discrimination on the ground of sex because only Australia's sons are referred to.

The second verse refers to Cook coming here and raising old England's flag. Naturally, the flag referred to is the Union Jack. I wonder how many members of the Labor Party knew that that was written into the official verse.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: It also discriminates against age because the second line reads, " Because we are young and free ".

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: I did not want to point out too many aspects but the Minister for Social Welfare is correct; the middle-aged and the elderly are not mentioned at all.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: What about the migrants?

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: Mr. Hamilton is ahead of me because I was coming to that. Verse 3 contains the words—

> From England, Scotia, Erin's Isle,
> Who come our lot to share,

The English, Scottish and Irish are the only ones mentioned whereas today Australia has a mixed population with people from many countries of the world, but those other migrants do not get a mention.

The second verse also contains the words, " Britannia rules the waves ". I suspect that members of the Labor Party would be horrified if they knew that they were supporting that contention, although it is somewhat outmoded. Only one member of the Labor Party is present but I am sure that he will take this matter back to his party and its members will scrap the idea of *Advance Australia Fair* becoming Australia's National Anthem. The last verse not only refers to Britannia but also asks Australians " to still keep a British soul ", which is a good idea.

The question of a National Anthem is complicated. I should like Australia to have its own National Anthem. The playing of *Waltzing Matilda* overseas can be quite dramatic at times. It is an excellent tune, but unfortunately nobody has yet written suitable words. To return to the point I made at the beginning,

the position at present is that Australia is in danger of falling into a republican form of Government. Undoubtedly the Crown and the Crown system of government with the Governor-General and State Governors preserve us from the sort of situation that arose in the United States of America in the past few months. Honorable members read how difficult it was when the head of State, the President, fell by the wayside and had to be replaced. With the Crown we have a continuity of succession flowing through.

Another point in favour of the monarchy is that it is a shield against a dictatorship. There has been a tremendous centralist movement in Australia and there is some danger of a dictatorship unless we have this safeguard of the monarchy. I may be old-fashioned and too much of a traditionalist but Australia should keep its links with Great Britain and retain *God Save the Queen* as its anthem. I reiterate my loyalty and I am sure the loyalty of practically everyone in the Northern Province to the Crown and the present Constitution.

I wish to refer now to strikes that have occurred throughout the Teaching Service. Mostly, the strikes have been concentrated amongst secondary teachers who are members of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association. Fortunately, in northern Victoria the strikes have not been extensive and comparatively few members of the association have been on strike. However, the strikes have disrupted the educational system of the State. The time has come when firmness must be shown.

During the coming year there will be confrontation with the teachers which will be staggeringly greater than the confrontation already experienced. The Victorian Secondary Teachers Association has passed certain resolutions. I am referring to a minority of high school teachers because not all belong to that association and not all members of the association support its policy. Unfortunately, there are enough teachers to cause a confrontation.

Victoria had a strike which lasted for several days and involved some 2,000 teachers over the question of promotions. The teachers want to lay down their own procedure for promotions. The Government and the Committee of Classifiers have their procedure and the employee is attempting to dictate to the employer exactly how promotions should take place.

Members of the Country Party had the idea that all sides, the teachers, the Teachers Tribunal and the Committee of Classifiers should meet in an endeavour to reach some compromise. After discussions we realized that there was practically no chance of reaching a compromise and no great desire on the part of the secondary teachers to reach a compromise. They wanted it all their own way or nothing.

Unfortunately, the teachers who have been promoted to principal, deputy principal and so on by recognized authorities are now being threatened by members of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association that they will be boycotted, ignored and that their posts will not be recognized next year. I am hopeful that the Government will stand firm. These principals and deputy principals have been appointed and the Government must support them. If there is any intimidation by other teachers of those who have been appointed the Government must step in.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: These are standover tactics.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: I agree. Another matter on which there will be a confrontation next year relates to the higher school certificate because the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association has passed a resolution that its members will boycott the certificate in 1975. The association passed a further resolution that it wants to do away with

principals and to form executive committees to run the schools and that these executive committees will determine the curriculum. It is part of the whole pattern. The Government has to decide who is running the State and who is going to determine the promotion of teachers, the posting of teachers, the curriculum to be taught and what form of entry will apply to tertiary education because universities will not put up with a boycott of the higher school certificate.

Unfortunately, over a period, the journal of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association has been giving the views of the radical leaders but I was delighted that the last issue contained articles from the other side. This may be some glimmer of common sense coming out. The October issue contained an article pointing out the advantages of the inspectorial system of promotion. I will not mention her name but I commend the lady who wrote the article. It is essential for the Government to make up its mind which way it is going with the teaching profession in 1975.

Some 44 per cent of the State Budget is allocated for education and Victoria has the highest-paid teachers in Australia. Money is beginning to flow through to build new schools and there is the prospect of a better educational system in this State. If the teachers disrupt the system all that money will be wasted and the careers of a large number of students will be in jeopardy. I was appalled, as I am sure Mr. Fry was, that teachers should go out on strike in the middle of third term just before the examinations. What really appalled me was their statement that they would not be hurting the pupils much because at that stage the students would be able to work on their own as they were doing only revision work. As the examinations approach, a student needs a teacher's help more than it is needed early in the school year.

The Hon. M. A. Clarke.

This brings me to the number of hours that teachers are actually employed. I do not know how the Government is going to handle the situation but it appears from negotiations between Dr. Shears and the association that a teacher has to attend school for some 29·5 hours a week. Teachers do not work 52 weeks of the year; with school holidays and so on the number of weeks is substantially fewer than that. The attendance time is from 8.45 a.m. to 4 p.m. each day. The actual time spent in teaching before the class must be either 22·5 or 23·5 hours a week. The rest of the time they are claiming for preparation of lessons.

The Government has now proclaimed legislation which for the first time will give it power over the workload of teachers. The Minister of Education stated recently that if every teacher worked an additional period before his class the Victorian educational system would be saved 1,000 teachers. The Minister, for whom I have great respect, the officers of the Education Department and the Teachers Tribunal, must face up to the situation.

I put the proposition to the Leader of the House that if by making the teachers take one extra period a week the Government can save 1,000 teachers, that will be an enormous saving in money, instead of recruiting teachers from America —which is expensive although it has been successful—and training new teachers. As finance is tight in Victoria, and the teachers' award gives them a generous salary, the Government should ensure that they work for that salary. There should be no more shilly-shallying. The patience of the Minister of Education must be exhausted; if it is not, it should be. The Government has the powers and the machinery, and I hope it will use them.

The other point to which I refer relates to the floods we have experienced in the Northern Province. A sum of $4·25 million has been made available by way of flood relief.

It is generally recognized that the funds which have been allocated by the State Government, with the assistance of the Commonwealth, have been in accord with the claims which have been lodged.

I have received a number of letters in recent weeks indicating that the damage may have been, and probably has been, under-estimated. When surveys were conducted to determine flood damage, some roads were still under water. One shire had 22 miles of road under water when it lodged its claim and it could not accurately estimate the damage. Now that these roads are emerging from the water, some have been found to be badly damaged. Unfortunately, as the water dries out under the road the seal cracks and we are finding in northern Victoria dangerous roads with cracked seals, all of which have to be repaired.

It is inevitable that a number of municipalities are going to make further claims. This will be the third claim they have lodged because claims have been lodged following two floods and this will be a consequential claim from the second series of floods. It is expected that the extra claim from the Shire of Shepparton will be in the region of $200,000.

I hope the Premier and Treasurer will be as sympathetic to the subsequent claims as he was to the previous claims. I know the Minister for State Development and Decentralization has had a look at a number of the devastated areas which have been affected by floods.

What those areas have not yet received, but urgently need, is money for the construction of flood mitigation works. A start has been made on the Goulburn River, but in a high flood the danger to Echuca is acute because there is only a sand-bag barricade. A permanent levee bank is required. An example of this is to be found at Maitland in New South Wales where bad floods have occurred and at Launceston where the Esk River flooded some years ago.

People residing in Shepparton, Mooroopna, Nathalia, Numurkah, Echuca and Kerang will not feel safe until flood mitigation works have been carried out and secure embankments erected. When this work is finished, if a big flood occurs, as it will, the water can safely pass the town, join the River Murray and go on its way to South Australia. I hope the Government will bear this in mind, and I trust that the Public Works Committee will present its report on flooding in northern Victoria as soon as possible and that action will then be taken.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Western Province): It is the custom when debating the motion for the presentation of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, and in my case it is a pleasure, to reaffirm the loyalty to the Crown of the constituents of the South-Western Province, which my colleague Mr. Jenkins and I represent. At a time like this, as Mr. Clarke has pointed out, there is some criticism of our system of government and the place of loyalty and of the monarch. However, no other country can produce the type of Government we have in Australia or in Victoria. We have adopted the Westminster system under which the true monarch is not necessarily the ruler. I again pledge my loyalty to the Queen and state my admiration for the Royal Family and for the institution of the monarchy.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. It is always interesting to speak on it because it gives one the opportunity to discuss many subjects. I should mention, Mr. President, that it is seldom that honorable members are prevented from extending their discussions in wide terms. However, I propose not to infringe upon your generosity. If any criticism I make can be related to a particular Government or any party, I shall treat all the same way.

I congratulate the new Governor, Sir Henry Winneke. I am sure he will join that illustrious group of former Governors in serving this State

well and wisely. I say farewell to Sir Rohan Delacombe in this Chamber and give him the praise he deserves for the way in which he carried out his duties, with Lady Delacombe, as the representative of the Queen in Victoria.

Looking around this Chamber—I have been here quite a while now—I see a number of new faces. Although we all need new faces, we do not always get them. I regret that a number of members who have been with me in this Chamber are no longer here and have passed on. It is always a matter for regret, but I do not propose to dwell on that subject.

Looking through the Governor's Speech and at matters on which I might speak, I decided to class them rather differently from the terms the Governor used. I have listed four items I wish to discuss. I hope I will not be too long but, at any rate, there is always the opportunity for honorable members to lean back and not listen.

The first item I shall discuss is mobility. I use this phrase to refer to everything concerned with the motor car, transport generally and the aeroplane. The second is egalitarianism. It is claimed to be better for people to be made equal by means of taxation or by education, but I see this claim as extraordinary and I hope to make that argument quite clear. The third part is a deficiency in most Governments in long-term planning. This covers the field of environment, energy and food. The fourth item for discussion is a general look at problems which are not usually tackled by Governments but which should perhaps be tackled by individuals.

If ever I attempted to write a book it would be one which I would call, for want of a better title, *Survival in the Modern Community*. I do not think this aspect is adequately covered by any textbook I have seen and I feel it is most desirable. I doubt whether I will write it but I shall refer to various things which are not adequately covered by our education system or generally by our upbringing, or are plainly neglected. A number of people do not live to a reasonably old age because of accidents or happenings which could be avoided.

The first point is mobility. It is extraordinary that we regard mobility so highly. Of course, it goes back to ancient days when the person who could run or walk or possessed a great deal of agility had advantages over others. Then the advantage transferred to the man who could ride a horse. Even the nation whose people could ride horses was far ahead of the rest. This is evidenced in the invasions by great armies using animals, including elephants. Although elephants were not so mobile, the same principle applies. Then there were the Mongols, who rode horses, and other historical examples. All those people demonstrated the advantages of mobility.

It is only in recent years that extra mobility has been given to people, partly because in the Western World we have had extraordinarily cheap energy available and reasonably prosperous conditions in which to use it. I here introduce a note of gloom. I feel we have already passed the stage when we will enjoy this as we have in the past. I feel now that mobility will be restricted and there are a number of good reasons why this idea should be accepted.

I shall take a few points. The motor car, for a start, is a terrible creature of destruction. When honorable members consider the number of people we kill and maim each year in the pursuit of this wonderful goal of mobility and pleasure—I suppose that is all combined—one wonders whether it is worth while. Most people do think it is worth while. Overseas, when the price of petrol goes up, as it does in some countries

to three times what it is now in Australia, even with the increased cost of insurance and maintenance, people still use their motor cars or motor bikes.

I shall examine some of the reasons why mobility will be restricted. We should take this into account in the future planning of roads and what we might expect of the tourist industry. For a start, we will never again see cheap energy or energy as cheap as it has been. It is true that there is any amount of energy in the world. I was disappointed to read of a symposium of people talking about energy a few months ago and saying that all our problems will be solved because there is plenty of energy.

There is plenty of energy. As honorable members know, the physics of matter relate energy to matter in similar terms. They are interchangeable but not interchangeable as readily as that, thank goodness, because otherwise the world would dissolve about us. The net energy input, in general, is at a loss to change matter into energy except on the odd occasion, such as with unstable elements of radioactive material.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE: There is nuclear fission.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON: But nuclear fission is, on the whole, a complex and difficult proposition. We still have some doubts whether we shall satisfactorily solve it except in huge static power plants. We will get over this and man will be provided with energy but he will not have mobile energy which will allow him to drive a motor car, to fly an aeroplane or to send a ship around the world.

There is no proposition yet in sight to replace the reserves of fossil fuels as a readily transportable energy source. There is plenty of energy but man will not be able to control it to enable him to do what he has been doing up to date. There are other propositions, such as turning water into hydrogen and oxygen and so on, but these are all terribly expensive and it is unlikely that they will be used because our demand for energy for essential purposes will mean that we will not have the finance to enable us to do these sorts of things for pleasure or personal satisfaction.

I will stick my neck out and say that we have passed the glorious age of everyone having his own car and going where he wants to go because from now on the car will require so much energy that we will be unable to meet the demands. Public transport will replace cars in some areas but will never give the same mobility that some people have enjoyed over the past 20 or 30 years.

On the question of energy, it should not be thought that we can by technological advances solve any of these problems. There just is not an answer to them, but we can replace energy sources and substitute materials which nearly always will result in a net loss. If we look to technology to save us I am afraid we have another think coming.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Mr. Gleeson is a Job's comforter.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON: No, I am not and I do not know why everyone should think these things are most important for human happiness. We can still lead a full, useful and interesting life but we will not have the same ability to move around as we have had in the past.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Mr. Gleeson and I are reaching that stage now.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON: That is so and I accept the position with resignation. If one looks at the different situations that might arise one finds that instead of travelling from Melbourne to Albury or Sydney one might be able to use a telecommunication system which might give a sight of the person as well as complete communication. Then one wonders whether the journey is really necessary. I do not look upon this as a tragedy, but it is most likely to occur.

We have been through a period in which we have wastefully used our cheap sources of energy. That is not

so bad because we have enjoyed them while we had them. It is just a matter of accepting the inevitable and replanning the way we go about things.

On the subject of egalitarianism that many Governments look at, it is fashionable nowadays to try to give everyone the same chances in life with the same prospectus and with the same material gains. For a start that is fallacious biologically because we are not equal and we are not even similar in our physical structure or in our abilities. Sir Macfarlane Burnet pointed out that if you start with the idea that you can change your hereditarily acquired characteristics you are mistaken. You can influence them, but whatever happens you are stuck with them.

I brought this matter up because honorable members may wonder whether it is the task of government to try to equalize people by taking from those who have greater ability and giving to those who have less. There is a very good argument for helping the unfortunate or those who for some reason are deprived, other than of their ability, but there is no such good argument for taking from those who are willing to work hard and giving it to someone who is just plain lazy or decides not to work. Perhaps he is an artist or engages in some other occupation. Members on this side of the House believe—I do not know whether I can persuade some of the members of the Labor Party—a very good argument can be put that a return commensurate with the energy put in and rewards for those who do not spend on consumer goods is a worth-while aim for people to have and should be encouraged by Governments.

There is very good reason to think that people who look after themselves are providing a service to government. Where we have gone off the rails on this, or some people have, is in thinking that private enterprise is of itself selfish. Private enterprise properly looked at is when a person decides that he would rather look after himself and perhaps his family and others also than make them a burden on someone else and to rely on the Governments to provide them with education, health services and a number of other things and for their old age. It would be well for Governments from now on to encourage the type of person who is willing to work for himself and to give him some sort of incentive which will encourage saving.

I thought I might bring in a slightly lighter note. There was a competition in the *Statesman and Nation* some time ago in which a certain famous author—Kingsley Martin—who edited the *Statesman and Nation* was presented with an epitaph prematurely because he was not dead. It might be appropriate to quote it now. It went something like this—Kingsley Martin here lies dead, buried 'neath this hallowed ground; the intellectuals led round and round and round and round. I think we could say that of some of our political leaders at the moment.

Perhaps we should turn back to the elitist philosophy. Ayn Rand, who wrote the *Fountain Head,* and others tend to think the most important people in the community are the privileged few with the extreme ability to contribute more than most other people to humanity.

The Hon. D. E. KENT: Mr. Gleeson wants to take more away.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON: No, I do not. These people undoubtedly do need consideration, perhaps rather more than some Governments give them. Alongside that, I do say, however, that Governments would be well advised to look at the proposition of helping by tax inducements, these people in the community who want to provide for their own health, education and superannuation services.

That reminds me of a statement which appeared in an English newspaper but I do not propose to quote it verbatim. It was to the effect that if everyone in the community realized what an economic

farce saving and personal drive resulted in at present, the community would collapse because people would say that it was not worth their while and it was up to the Government to look after them. That is all tied up with the idea that there is something wrong with private ownership. In actual fact it is very likely part and parcel of human nature to need to own things—the need to own a minimum amount of personal property. I do not go along with that to the extent of saying that it should be applied to controlling large corporations, but I am saying that this is an important part of us which likes to think we own a certain amount of property—consider the territorial imperative, as some people call it.

The question of whether you want to own your own home and certain other things goes right back to the savage man who liked his own weapons, such as his spear and his sword. If he had these he had a few personal possessions. It goes on to a good many other things and perhaps I can relate it to the field in which I am most knowledgeable which is farming—that is if I am knowledgeable in anything. It is obvious throughout the world that private ownership makes a tremendous difference to the farmer. This is seen by the fact that hardly any country with a totalitarian approach manages to feed its people and the countries that make out best are the ones that have private ownership of land.

I now move to the field of education and this is another field where many Governments have thought that by providing a person with education they were going to solve all the problems of equality between people. Most people would readily admit privately that there is a very big difference in natural ability, but as well as that there is a very grave doubt whether we properly understand what we mean by education. In the past, education was a process of adapting to life, a process of survival. In a savage community a person learnt to do things or he did not survive. He learnt how to hunt, how to cook, how to deal with climatic problems and how to protect himself against other wild people and wild animals. This was a continual process through life and some help was given by teachers, who were probably from the immediate family. It was part of the process of growing up. I should not like to say whether or not we have properly replaced this natural process. I doubt whether we have, but I shall give my views on how education should be tackled. I am not a specialist in education so I feel free to say what I want about it.

Ways of training the brain can be divided into three broad areas and we should look at them like we look at a computer. The first is communication. I put that first because unless a person has some form of communication he cannot build up the second, which is the evaluation process and memory of facts. One has to evaluate facts and then store them, so as to develop the third and most important section and that is problem solving. That means the use of this stored knowledge in living an ordinary life. Most of the education that we get in the so-called educational establishments do not really look at education in this light. I doubt whether they have a cohesive approach to it.

I shall point to one interesting fact. The group of people who present one of our most pressing problems are those who fail to communicate in one form or another. I am not talking about people with brain defects or damage of some sort that makes them rather different from the average person; I am talking about people who just fail to advance at school because their communication system has broken down either in speech or in their ability to read. The work of people like Sylvia Ashton-Warner and a man whose name I have forgotten, seems to indicate that it is difficult to teach people to read unless they have an adequate speaking vocabulary. It is like teaching someone to memorize something of

which he has no knowledge. It is much harder for a person to learn a foreign language if he has not a proper appreciation of the meaning of the words.

I shall give another example of this. One of my grandchildren at an early age did a psychological test. He was quite good at recognizing up to twenty words and he could repeat them even though he did not know what they meant. He forgot them in a year or so because there was no memory link to join them to the memory structure.

The prime consideration in learning how to read is family background or a group of children with whom one plays. This will give vocabulary and background to the language and will enable children to take up reading automatically. No one has yet produced a simple way of teaching children how to speak. Children generally learn to speak at home. Some experiments have been made on this. Most children learn to speak at an early age and can communicate quite well, but it has been indicated that a basic failure stems back to the problem of the child learning how to use the language and how to use the words properly within the family. It is from this wide background of vocabulary that the child can very easily move into reading; the child has used a word many times before, and when he sees it in print he has no problem in recognizing it. It is not a matter of learning the alphabet and spelling it out but of moving onto the spoken word.

If these matters were more widely recognized and the responsibility of the family appreciated, parents would take more pains with their children than they do. I do not know what pains parents do take, but they should teach their children to speak well and have as wide a vocabulary as possible. I am sorry to say that the basic problem of need in a home with limited vocabulary and limited speech is a defect which is hard to overcome in later life. It is another one of those egalitarian problems which start with that basic defect. This has little to do with poverty and very little to do with material possessions. It has a great deal to do with the parents and the rest of the family in the home.

I said earlier that I should like to write a book about survival in the modern community. I do not know whether there are any tips on this for members of Parliament, but lack of teaching of survival in the modern community is a defect in our education system. The art of survival, starting from a very early age —avoiding accidents generally, electric shocks and traffic accidents, and survival against climatic extremes— is not fully taught in our education system. This deficiency was illustrated on the Geelong Road at Lara during the bush fires when people were ignorant of the danger of radiant heat. People should be taught how to survive when cars get into deep water, how to drive a car properly and how to avoid accidents. All these things are fairly well known by some, but not properly known by everyone.

People should know how to handle cars in skids, how to take evasive action in accidents, and what happens when tyres burst or brakes lock on a car. If people are going to have cars these things should be part and parcel of education. I could go on and refer to tragedies that happened at Heyfield, near Cradle Mountain and other places. People are often ill-equipped to deal with emergencies and have gone close to meeting with tragedy. People go out on the bay in boats which are inadequate. There are accidents throughout society caused mostly because people have inadequate knowledge, not only of the risks taken but because they do not know what they are tackling. When a tractor overturns, it is often due to ignorance of how the tractor operates. These things are worth teaching people and should be part of our education system, but they are not.

If one then moved into the field of teenagers and young adults looking after themselves in what is a hostile environment where society allows financiers and financial entrepreneurs

to use their skills and take money from other people, a good basic understanding on these matters would save a number of people from the depredation of others. If a person is trying to make a "fast buck" by a doubtful investment even though he has no knowledge of it, that person deserves to be taken down. But no one deserves to be taken down in what should be a satisfactory and honest deal. Instruction on this should form part of the basic education structure.

Education should go even further and take in natural disasters or climatic problems. I have referred to fires. There are also floods, droughts, famines and other disasters. It is interesting to note what happened in New York when the electric supply system failed. It was surprising how people failed to cope with a relatively simple situation. The lights went out, subways failed to work, and people waited for someone to rescue them.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: And the birth rate went up!

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON: That is another point I should put in my book; plain facts about sex and what people should know about it should be in a survival book.

I refer now to long-term planning. I doubt whether most people are interested in long-term planning. Stephen Leacock wrote a sketch illustrating that the person who dies next door is twice as important as the person down the street who dies and ten times more important than the one who dies in Sydney, and can make more impact than 1,000 deaths in Malaya. The same applies to the time syndrome and events removed in time.

People are not very concerned about what is going to happen next year and are very little concerned about what is going to happen in ten or twenty years' time, but there is some room for interest in this, particularly by the young people who are going to be involved. I do not know whether any honorable members looked at the television programme *Monday Conference,* featuring Dr. Ehrlich. He is an aggressive person and talks rather much. There was a a large element of truth in what he said, and there is no technological solution to the problems that were raised. It was said that probably the world is going to see worse climatic extremes over the next 20 or 30 years than it has seen in the past 20 or 30 years. There has been a favourable climatic spell in the world. Australia did have quite a long drought in Queensland in that period, but on the whole Australia has a better than average succession of seasons.

The general impression of climatologists is that the world is going to experience less favourable seasons. A number of things might happen, such as a very cold spell in Europe. It could happen at any time, perhaps this year. Australia may benefit from it because it might sell more wool and food. Drought could be experienced. At present Australia is experiencing extreme floods but dry seasons will come again. Earthquakes will occur. Someone predicted that in 1982 there will be a major earthquake in Australia because planets will be in conjunction and will create gravitational force accentuating instability in the earth's crust.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Are you an Aquarius?

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON: It has nothing to do with astrology; I refer to gravitational pull. It is extraordinary that hospitals and multistory buildings are being built on faults in the Earth's crust and in earthquake areas. One fault runs through California. In recent trips abroad I saw that much of the area near Mount Etna, although seriously damaged by earthquakes in the past, is now rebuilt with buildings of up to ten stories being erected. I could not understand the psychology of that practice. It was probably on the basis that "it cannot happen to me". As an honorable member said, some tall buildings can be made earthquake-proof, but not absolutely so if constructed in

concrete. I am pointing out how people in the world do not seem to worry about long-term problems. Perhaps it is not our job to do so. I will write of this in my little book.

The Brisbane flood was predictable. It happened before and was not even the worst flood that could happen. I was in a tropical depression in 1946 and the south-western corner of the State had 14 inches of rain in two days and most of that in one day. This could happen again with a combination of cyclonic depressions in a certain set of circumstances which causes these extreme weather conditions. Brisbane's flood was the result of three cyclones in succession. If there were four or five cyclones the floods would be even worse. The highest flood that has recently gone down the River Murray was only about half as great as some that have occurred in the past. This can be seen by the tree growth and other natural signs. Whose job is it to ensure that buildings are not placed in areas subject to these disasters, in earthquake regions or in some other places where it is possible a disaster will occur? I suggest that a certain amount of long-term planning is desirable.

I shall now comment on inflation. This is a very topical subject. A well-known economist said a short discussion of economics is platitudinous or wrong. Perhaps I speak from a philosopher's point of view. Objective observers point out that inflation is now caused by many factors, a major one of which is exaggerated expectations. For politicians to be pessimistic is not good. Most of us are optimistic when talking to the people in our electorates. I am slightly pessimistic in this House. The idea that everyone is going to have more of everything in future is erroneous unless we alter our thinking. I do not see how this can be done technologically ; perhaps it can be achieved by longer hours of work. Our expectations are too high and we will not have as much of everything as we thought we would have. Therefore, the idea of spending on the basis of what will happen in the future will cause trouble.

The second cause of inflation is relying on technological progress to get us out of trouble. Here we will make a mistake. Technology has taken us a long way and although many of the easy problems have been solved, the difficult ones are ahead of us.

Some times have been extremely lucky. I shall quote a simple example which might appeal to the President. The internal combustion engine is an inefficient way of producing energy. The jet engine—the first one was produced in about 1938—solved some problems because it fulfilled the conditions that people wanted at the time. The jet engine is also not very efficient, but it is reliable, powerful, has a good power-weight ratio, and it solved travel problems immediately after the second world war. However, it involves a colossal wastage of fossil fuel. From now on people will be very much aware of this and the problems caused by overseas air travel will increase.

Everyone knows that almost every company in the world specializing in transporting people by aeroplane is experiencing financial difficulty, with the exception of one or two companies in extraordinary circumstances. I do not see any answer to this, because there will be no more technological break-throughs like the jet engine. With the jet-propelled aeroplanes reliability and ability to fly high and fast, enabling it to rise above the weather, it made a step forward which no one could have prophesied earlier, but despite all the way-out thinking that is occurring at present, no one has the next step in mind, so there will be trouble.

In the area of shipping where fossil fuel is relied on trouble will be experienced in maintaining transport. Time is the important element, and one of the biggest problems is that so much emphasis is placed on speed. If this were not so, it would be much better.

The third cause of inflation is limited resources. Other honorable members and I have spoken about this in the House over the past years. We have been brought face to face with this problem much more than we had expected by the action of the Arab States in restricting their output or raising their prices for oil. Mr. Laird was recently reported in the press as having said that in the future we will be grateful to the Arabs, even if we are not now, for making us more aware of the immediate problem we have to solve. There is no immediate answer.

One of the causes of inflation is our profligate use of energy. This will have to change because the price of energy is rising faster than many other factors. Australia is well off with its food supply, but much of the world is not so well off. Australia is facing a major problem of what to do about the countries which are short of food. It cannot afford to give away the quantities which would make a significant difference, but in the long term it must be realized that food is the major problem. Long-term plans must be made to ensure that the agricultural industry does not suffer by neglect. I do not believe any Government would allow it to suffer by design.

I have waffled on a good deal tonight because of the opportunity provided by this debate and because no one else seemed to want to take over. I reiterate my support for and loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, and I sincerely believe that in the Westminster system, as it is called, we have the best possible system of government—not the best system that any man could devise, but the best available in the world today.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) : On the occasion of this debate on the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, I wish to express the loyalty of the electors of the Doutta Galla Province to the Crown and also to congratulate Sir Henry Winneke on his appointment as Governor of Victoria. The appointment of an Australian to the office of Governor is a step in the right direction.

The debate on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor allows honorable members to speak on many subjects. Many honorable members have spoken about matters concerning their provinces, and others have delved into the operation of the Australian Parliament. I intend to tell honorable members of another matter that concerns the people of Victoria and of Australia. Government supporters are well aware of this, and the Government is responsible to the workers for not having introduced legislation to protect the people.

On 19th August last, Mainline Corporation Ltd., which was one of the largest Australian construction groups, went into receivership. It has been said that Mainline asked its principal shareholder, the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd., to appoint a receiver. I shall relate what took place. A report in the *Australian Financial Review* of 20th August headed, " Doctor for Mainline " stated—

> One of the largest Australian construction groups, Mainline Corporation Limited, last night announced that it was seeking the appointment of a receiver.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It has requested its principal creditor, the Australian New Zealand Banking Group Ltd., to appoint Mr. J. H. Jamison as receiver and manager.
>
> The appointment of a receiver means that the group will be striving to maintain its normal operations, though whether this will be the final arrangment will depend upon the agreement of the creditors.

It goes on to say —

> Some of them may not be satisfied with this arrangement and may seek to have the company liquidated.

I do not wish to quote everything that is said on that page. In another article published on the same date, the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd. is listed as Mainline's fifth largest shareholder.

The Hon. V. T. HAUSER : The bank or its nominee?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : Its nominee company. As at 5th August, 1974, some of the twenty shareholders in Mainline were the Mutual Life and Citizens Assurance Co. Ltd., with 1,137,691 shares; W. R. Carpenter, with 1,000,580 shares; the Australian Mutual Provident Society, with 981,400 shares; Joanrich Holdings, with 806,395 shares, followed by the Australia and New Zealand Bank Nominees, with 615,453 shares.

The Hon. V. T. HAUSER : Probably not one share was owned by the A.N.Z. Bank.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I am not interested in who owns the shares ; the point is that they did not ask the largest shareholder to appoint the receiver. During this time a heavy fall in the sale of Mainline shares was triggered off by the collapse of the Mainline corporation. The fall was caused by an order placed on the Sydney stock exchange for the sale of 200,000 shares in the Mainline corporation at any price. This order came from London. An article concerning the order from London appeared in the *Australian Financial Review* of 22nd August under the heading " Sydney Exchange bungles the Mainline Affair ". It stated, *inter alia* —

> That, however is the only commendable feature of an almost completely incompetent handling of the affair by the Sydney stock exchange.

The article contains further references, but I shall not weary the House by quoting what was reported in the *Australian Financial Review*— which is supported by members of the Liberal Party—about the fall of the Mainline corporation.

In one day 106,700 shares were traded in Sydney and Melbourne at prices as low as 23 cents each. In the previous weeks' total trading in both Sydney and Melbourne, only 22,000 shares were sold. What was the mysterious London seller aware of which was not known to the rest of the market? Surely he was not disillusioned with the Whitlam Government. Surely he was not having a nightmare or a " Gallagher scare " on Sunday night and woke up on Monday morning and decided to sell all those shares at any price. Many members of the Federal Opposition and the senior management of Mainline have blamed the situation on the economic environment and union unrest, both of which they have attributed to the Federal Government. They blame the Federal Government for the collapse of the Mainline corporation and are trying to use it as a scapegoat. These people would do well to read the words of Churchill, which go something like this—

> Those people who do not read history will end up making it.

That is true of Mainline because its backers did not read history books.

In June, 1973, it was evident that this company had borrowed short and invested long in property for resale. The same mistake caused the fall of Korman, Reid-Murray and Minsec. I could quote again from the *Australian Financial Review* but I do not wish to detain the House.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : What about giving us your own thoughts on the matter.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I have given my own thoughts.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : You are fooling us.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY: Mr. Campbell is not hard to fool. Surely the company was aware of the problems facing it which were evident in the poor balance sheets of 1973 when it recklessly extended into Squaw Valley in the United States. Even as late as three weeks before going into receivership it was talking of a multimillion development in Collins Street. It is interesting that Korman, Reid-Murray, Minsec and Mainline have

one thing in common. Today Mainline is in the hands of the receiver but it is also known that this company is continuing operations overseas using Australian money which is owed to the workers and subcontractors in Victoria.

The Hon. H. M HAMILTON : Do you admit that Mr. Gallagher claims that his union destroyed Mainline?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I am not interested in what Mr. Gallagher says. In last week's *Australian Financial Review* it was stated—

Noahs Ltd., the motel/hotel group which is 49 per cent owned by Mainline Corp Ltd., now in receivership, is facing a very tight liquidity situation and some of its creditors have indicated uneasiness.

Noahs last night announced a trading loss of $629,596 for the year to June 30, compared with a loss of $950,730 for the previous corresponding period.

After bringing extraodinary items to account, the loss for the year was reduced to $28,174 — there were no such items in the previous year.

Noahs, apart from Mainline's equity interest, has other links with the company, including common directors and management agreements.

Mainline is also constructing hotels for the company, including the troubled Coral Gardens project in Fiji.

The main point with which honorable members should be concerned today is the payment by Mainline of the workers and sub-contractors who have been left out in the cold.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : What would you do?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I will tell the Minister what he should do. Many heroes of the cause have emerged since that day. In the Melbourne *Age* of 14th October, 1974, the following article appeared—

The Minister for Public Works (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday arrangements would begin immediately and Mainline subcontractors would be kept on as far as possible.

The two projects involved are the Aspendale Technical School, which is 80 per cent. completed, and the new dental therapy school and building on St. Kilda Road which is about 30 per cent. completed.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : Is that a bad thing?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : Whose money did the Minister use to complete it? It was not Mainline's money that was utilized by the Minister of Public Works.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : The Australian Government asked the Victorian Government to do that.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : Nothing has been said about what will be done by way of compensation. I think that should not be beyond question.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : Do you know the financial arrangement that was made between the Minister of Public Works and the Mainline liquidator? That is relevant to the argument. You have told us that you are bringing up this matter.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I am just pointing out what the Government should do to help workers when companies go into receivership.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : Your point has no relevance unless you have financial details.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I believe that because of the works Mainline is still undertaking, the Government should safeguard the workers and sub-contractors who work for firms which decide that rather than fulfilling their commitments they are better off speculating overseas. Both workers and sub-contractors stand to lose millions of dollars. For the man who has to work hard and earn through his sweat and blood it is a hard pill to swallow.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : Are you reading from the *Herald* or the *Australian Financial Review*?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I am giving my comments. Some of these people have family commitments and education expenses which nobody can

deny. They have mortgages to pay and countless other commitments allied to their field of business.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : They were destroyed by union action.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : Mainline, this giant of giants, says, "Blow you Joe" and forgets its responsibility to its employees. On 11th September, Jamison, the receiver of Mainline——

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : Mr. Jamison.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY: Mr. Campbell can refer to him in that way. He notified the staff and management of the construction firm, who had shown their loyalty to the firm by working for three weeks under him, that their employment was terminated.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : That was after they had been on strike for six months.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : These were members of the staff.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : Staff do not go on strike.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : It was pointed out to him on 13th September, 1974, in a telex that the construction company, if it had continued, could have pulled itself out of the mess and the workers' solidarity would have continued; but that was not to be. The receiver was intent on winding up the company and did not give a damn about the worker and the sub-contractor.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : Are you aware that the liquidator accepts personal responsibility for all debts if he does carry on the business?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : He is not accepting responsibility.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : But if he carries it on, he does.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : But he did not carry it on.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : I do not blame him.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : On 13th September, Jamison said, in a letter sent to an employee—I can quote his name if you desire it, Mr. Deputy President—the following—

Dear Sir/Madam,

Mainline Industrial Contractors
Pty Limited (Receiver &
Manager Appointed)

I have to advise that, as a result of the appointment of a Receiver and Manager to the company and the consequent downturn in activities of the company, it is necessary to terminate the employment of certain persons.

I must therefore advise you that your employment with the company is hereby terminated with effect from

You are hereby advised that under the provisions of the Companies Act, amounts due to employees by way of wages (up to $1,500), long service leave and holiday pay are payable in priority to the claims of other creditors. The amount due to you is being calculated and will be paid to you as soon as funds are available to the Receiver for that purpose.

The man has not heard anything more.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: Have you any evidence that these men were not paid?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : Yes.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS : Tell us about it.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I know the man personally and he told me the story and finished up out of work.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS : Did he get his holiday pay?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : He may have received his holiday pay but he did not receive his long service pay.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : Maybe he had been working there for only for six months.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : He had been a member of the staff.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : How many years' service did he have?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : He had been with the company for a few years.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS : One has to be employed for ten years.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : One is entitled to long service leave after five years. It has been established that Mainline crashed after a run on the company by creditors. Following months of rumours and liquidity problems the company crashed leaving the workers and sub-contractors in a vulnerable position. The sub-contractors were in such a position that they appealed to the Government in this newspaper.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : Which Government?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : The Victorian and New South Wales Governments were approached to protect the interests of the workers.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : What about the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : It does not say that in this newspaper. In both New South Wales and Victoria when contract work is satisfactorily completed for a certain portion of the job, the builder is paid. However that builder may have done little of the actual work and therefore may owe the sub-contractor a substantial portion. By not paying him for a further month or even longer, many builders can build up their reservoir of credit funds.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. G. J. Nicol) : The honorable member is clearly conveying the impression of reading from a document. If so, he should inform the House.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : Everything I say comes from the *Australian Financial Review*.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT : I am speaking of the impression the honorable member is creating of reading a speech from some document.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY: I received all my information from the *Australian Financial Review*. Has the Government done anything about this appalling state of affairs? It is not for the Federal Government to take action. It is obvious that State Governments must legislate to protect workers within the State. In South Australia some protection is afforded. That is because the Dunstan Labor Government is in office in South Australia, and it looks after the interests of the businessmen, the sub-contractors and the workers.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : Are there no liquidations in South Australia?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : The South Australian system known as the "workmen's lien" gives any workman, contractor or sub-contractor employed by an owner a lien against the property. Therefore, the only protection sub-contractors to a builder are afforded is the money still owed to the builders, which is 100 times better than the system in New South Wales and Victoria.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON : We will have to send Mr. Halfpenny and Mr. Gallagher over there. They would soon fix that situation.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY : I ask this Government to legislate to protect workers and sub-contractors. I was endeavouring to make the point that the Government should have a good look at the situation and introduce legislation to protect these people.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) : I congratulate Mr. Crozier and Mr. Long on the manner in which they moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. At the same time, I express my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, and to her representative in Victoria, Sir Henry Winneke. I support the sentiments expressed by honorable members in congratulating Sir Henry on his appointment to the high office of Governor. I am certain that he and Lady Winneke will discharge their important responsibilities with much distinction and charm.

The Speech of Sir Henry Winneke referred to many matters which are to be included in the Government's

legislative programme in this Parliament. For the first time frequent mention was made of relations between the State Government of Victoria and the Commonwealth Government in Canberra. I venture the advice that in future it would be a good idea when the Governor's Speech is compiled to delete references of this nature. If this is done we will not have an Address-in-Reply debate such has taken place this year when nearly every second member on both sides of the House has devoted his time to a slinging match on State and Commonwealth relations.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : I was an exception.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: That is so. I intend to refer constructively to an aspect of Commonwealth and State relationships. The Governor's Speech referred to the important matters of pollution control and preservation of the environment. I wish to refer to the important environmental matter of the quality of the water in the River Murray. This is an interesting constitutional problem because the River Murray is in New South Wales. It might be suggested that the quality of its water is not Victoria's responsibility, but on reflection the quality of the water in the River Murray is a matter in which Victoria should be interested. Navigation and irrigation activities on the River Murray are controlled by the River Murray Commission. There is complementary legislation in the three States, Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia, and also on the Commonwealth statute-book to control this river.

In recent years, because of the increased attention paid to pollution control and to the environment, much more attention has been paid to the water quality in the River Murray. Undoubtedly some pollutants are entering the river from Victoria. The most important is the inflow of saline water to the river. It is worth pointing out that of the 1·25 million tonnes of salt that enters the River Murray each year, it is estimated that 604,000 tonnes enter from natural sources. In other words, that amount, which is almost one-half of the total, would have entered the river even if Australia was still populated only by Aborigines. The other 670,000 tonnes is derived from artificial or man-made sources. The question that we must decide as a community or as a State is what action should be taken to improve the situation whereby this 1·25 million tonnes of dissolved salts is entering the river each year. Two main proposals are at present under consideration or being put forward on how the River Murray Commission should be altered to enable it to have some influence on the quality of the water. There are two schools of thought on the subject. One has been put forward and supported to some extent by the Prime Minister. It envisages the establishment of a new authority with wide executive powers to control water and land use in the Murray-Darling Basin, and consequently the quality of water in the River Murray.

This view is shared by some members of the Federal Public Service and certainly by some members of Federal Parliament. In the past few days the Prime Minister addressed a meeting of the Murray Valley Development League in Canberra. His press release of 22nd October is headed—

> Speech by the Prime Minister, Mr. E. G. Whitlam, Q. C., M. P., to the Murray Valley Development League meeting Parliament House, Canberra, Monday, 22nd October, 1974.

Among other things the Prime Minister had this to say—

> Our position in relation to management of the River Murray is clear: the River Murray Commission should have the responsibility for control of water quality in the River Murray.

That view is accepted by most persons and organizations interested in this subject, provided that the manner in which this responsibility is exercised is detailed. The Prime Minister went on to say—

Further, I believe that the River Murray Commission should have certain responsibilities in relation to all aspects of the use and management of the waters of the River Murray and its related land.

This is where the proposals of the Prime Minister and some of his Government members will be in conflict with the policies and ideas of the three States. I do not believe the three State Governments will accept the over-all executive power of a new body which will have control of water and land use. This was the first proposal. The second one, which is the one to which I am attracted, and which is the obvious one to use, would involve what Mr. Nicol has referred to on occasions as a spirit of co-operative Federalism. This is a first-class example of where the concept of Federalism or co-operation between the States and the Commonwealth could be the solution.

The matter has been investigated fully as a result of a research project carried out on behalf of the Water Resources Council which is a Ministerial Council involving the appropriate State and Federal Ministers. The Australian Water Resources Council commissioned an investigation by Dr. Sandford D. Clark of the University of Melbourne Law School. In the fourth volume of his report entitled *Interstate Rivers*, Dr. Clark went thoroughly into the legal and administrative question of how best to overcome the problem of interstate river control. I shall quote two brief passages which sum up very well the way in which this important matter should be tackled. On page 338 of volume 4 of his report, Dr. Clark said—

The ideal role of an interstate basin authority would seem to be that of the high-level policy formulator which sets standards, priorities and general guidelines but delegates the actual administration of water use to State authorities.

I believe that sums up the correct and most appropriate method of tackling water quality in the River Murray. On the same page Dr. Clark instanced two cases in the United States of America where there are already interstate basin compacts. He quotes the Delaware River basin compact which involves the four States of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey and Delaware. He describes another similar interstate basin compact, and he is firm in his recommendations that this is the type of approach to use in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia with the River Murray. He also referred to the idea of having a comprehensive new authority with executive powers to do the same job. He said—

Thus any possibility that such authorities might develop into numerically large quasi-governments, supplanting and ignoring skilled and experienced State authorities must be firmly suppressed.

I hope negotiations between the State and the Commonwealth will take important cognizance of the investigation commissioned and carried out by the Water Resources Council. It sums up the position very well in that the problems of water quality in the River Murray can be overcome by amending the River Murray Waters Act under which the River Murray Commission was set up to give the commission authority or responsibility for the quality of water in the river and to enable the commission to investigate and identify sources of pollution to the River Murray, and at the same time be able to make recommendations to the three States as constructing or administering authority to put these recommendations into effect.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL: Do you think the Environment Protection Authority should come into this?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: That is a good question and is one which Dr. Clark investigates at some length in his study. If the Victorian Environment Protection Authority is brought in we would be obliged to do the same thing with other States and the Commonwealth, and the commission or authority might become too large. I have discussed this matter with Mr. Bromfield, the Victorian representative on the River Murray Commission and a commissioner of the State Rivers and Water Supply

Commission, and the other commissioners, one of whom, Mr. Little, has been appointed as temporary head of the Environment Protection Authority. I have formed the opinion that these gentlemen are well versed and knowledgeable on the protection of the environment. Therefore, I doubt whether there is any need to include the Environment Protection Authority.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL : If the Environment Protection Authority is not included the other authority could have the right to examine every tributary of the River Murray. This would cover a large area of Victoria.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I would give the River Murray Commission the right to examine tributaries so that it could determine the source of pollution. Having identified the source of pollution, no State could afford to disregard the commission's recommendation about the way in which it should operate.

As well as giving the commission authority or responsibility for water quality in the River Murray, it would be a good idea to give the commission power to investigate and recommend on the conservation of flora and fauna and the use of Murray waters for recreational purposes. All of these things relate to good management of the river.

The second matter I refer to involves transport and also the River Murray. I refer to the urgent need for a new interstate river crossing over the River Murray at Echuca. This matter has been under consideration for as long as I have been a member of this Parliament—slightly over eight years. In the early days of the project there was some delay because of difficulty in deciding a suitable site for the new bridge. This decision was delayed and complicated to some extent by the State Government's decision to support the restoration of the port of Echuca.

I was ultimately advised by the Premier that the Victorian Cabinet decided—in my opinion correctly—that the restoration of the port project at Echuca should not be affected in any way by the new bridge. The Premier accepted the view put forward by Mr. L. M. Perrott, the leading town planner, that the effect of a new bridge over the Murray in the vicinity of the port of Echuca would be disastrous in its environmental impact.

Recently, the Echuca City Council and the Shire of Murray, which is the corresponding shire in New South Wales, unanimously decided on the site of the proposed bridge. Shortly afterwards I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Meagher, who accepted the proposed site and endorsed it to the extent that he instructed the Country Roads Board to confer and co-operate with the Department of Main Roads of New South Wales in planning this bridge. It is obvious to anyone who has driven over the Murray at Echuca that the bridge is in urgent need of replacement. It is used by both rail and road traffic, and it is dangerous from a road safety point of view. Numerous accidents have occurred on the bridge in recent years, some of them fatal.

As the crossing at Echuca is on a main arterial road from the Riverina into Victoria it is probably second in importance only to the Albury-Wodonga crossing. There is urgent need for the project to proceed. Obviously, as about $2 million is involved, the question of finance is important. I put to the Premier and the Government that it should take up this matter urgently with the New South Wales Government in an endeavour to obtain finance, to appropriate it and to construct the bridge as soon as possible.

The final matter I refer to is directly connected with many of the matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech and relates to the efficiency of administration by the Government or by the seventeen Ministers in charge of the various departments. Since I have been a member of this Chamber I have noticed that when

one writes to a Minister or to a department the average time taken to obtain a reply is increasing.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Especially when the House is meeting.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: That may be so, but as a general statement it is true that it is now taking longer to obtain suitable replies. It is also true that the time taken to obtain answers to questions is increasing.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: There are more of them.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I have taken the trouble to go through the *Hansard* reports for the past ten years. Previously it was rather unusual for a question to appear on the Notice Paper for more than one day.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: How many questions were asked?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I knew that point would be raised by interjection. Mr. Jenkins is obviously indicating that more questions are asked these days. I can give him a sound reason why that is so. It is because it takes so long to get information by any other process. Questions tend to be repeated and more questions are asked because many members find that it is easier and quicker to get the information they desire by asking a question than by writing a letter.

That leads me to the suggestion that, to brighten up proceedings in Parliament, a system of presenting awards could be instituted. Each year an award could be given for the most efficient and best-run department.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON: What would be the prize?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I do not know, but I am sure Mr. Gleeson with his undoubted ability could make some excellent suggestions. In my experience the Minister for Conservation, Mr. Borthwick, would take the prize for the Minister who runs the best department. I am not sure who would get the wooden spoon at the lower end of the scale but the competition would be keener there than it is at the top.

I am pleased to have again had the opportunity of taking part in this debate on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply. As I said at the outset of my remarks, I am pleased with the appointment of Sir Henry Winneke as Governor of Victoria. I am certain that he and Lady Winneke will discharge their important duties with charm and distinction as was done by their predecessors Sir Rohan and Lady Delacombe.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS (South-Western Province) : I, too, wish to reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty and to express the opinion that loyalty to the Crown is as strong as ever although there may be evidence to the contrary. The recent visit of Prince Charles to this country demonstrated without any doubt that the loyalty of the people of Australia to the Crown has not diminished. I also congratulate Sir Henry Winneke on his appointment as Governor of Victoria, and I wish him and Lady Winneke a long, productive and happy term of office.

Included in the Governor's Speech was the statement that the Government has co-operated with the Federal Government to the full in the development and implementation of programmes and projects involving both Governments which are for the benefit of Victorians. I want to illustrate what can happen when a project is commenced and the Federal Government attempts to take control. This matter concerns regional councils for social development.

About twenty years ago the Geelong Community Chest was formed. It was sponsored originally by the Apex Club. This organization has promoted a series of successful annual appeals to meet the needs of the many charitable organizations in the area. When this organization had

been operating for about seventeen years its members were concerned that they may not be properly servicing the social welfare needs of the City of Geelong and the surrounding areas. On their own initiative they sponsored a report on the community services of Geelong. The report was undertaken by Mr. Hayden Raysmith whose services were made available by the Victorian Council of Social Service, and its preparation took about a year. A copy is available in the Parliamentary Library if any honorable member is interested to read it.

The purpose of the report was to assess the community needs for social welfare services in the Geelong area, and necessary funds were made available from the resources of the Geelong Community Chest.

At a later date the community chest expanded the inquiry and a further report was made entitled "The Geelong Experiment in Social Planning". This inquiry was undertaken by three gentlemen, Mr. Hayden Raysmith, who was the author of the original report, Mr. John Rimmer and Mr. Don Wookey, who is a citizen of Geelong and a former manager of the Shell Refinery at Corio. I remind the House that this report was made long before the present Federal Government came into office and it outlined the role of a regional council in the co-ordination and integration of services. At page 78, the authors state—

> A regional council for social development, therefore, cannot be a central controlling body, nor should it be. It is not a new level of Government. Rather, it must be repeated that it is a "common arena" for co-operative integration of planning and action by all levels of Government and private organizations.

The concept of the Barwon Regional Council of Social Development was to co-ordinate voluntary services in Geelong, to assess the needs of social welfare in an attempt to meet the needs of the community. As a result of those plans, this regional council was set up and sought funds for its work. The Victorian Government indicated its support through the former Minister for Social Welfare, Mr. Smith, and the present Minister, to the extent of $9,000 a year for three years. The Federal Government promised $25,000 a year. To indicate the interest of local government, local municipalities supported the regional council to the extent of $3,700, and representative members and associate members contributed another $588 and the community chest provided a further $9,000. The organization was maintaining its independence because of the various areas from which it was funded. The total contributions for the year ended 30th September, 1974, amounted to $47,000.

When the council sought registration under the Companies Act, it was asked by the Attorney-General for an assurance that it would maintain its independence and that its memorandum and articles of association would indicate that the directors of the regional council would be in full control of the affairs and would not be dominated by any particular outside party.

With the advent of the present Federal Government, a Social Welfare Commission was set up and took a great deal of interest in the Barwon Regional Council of Social Development. The interest was so great that Mr. Hayden, the Federal Minister for Social Security, and his troops decided that this sort of plan, in an adapted form, ought to be extended throughout Australia. To date, about 35 pilot projects have been set up throughout Australia. I understand that there was some dispute between the Minister and the Social Welfare Commission because the Minister wanted things to move considerably faster and although the commission felt that twelve might be set up within a reasonable period, the Minister insisted that many more should be established.

In essence this was to be an experimental pilot programme. The problem is that many of the other regional councils have been set up on an *ad hoc* basis without any real community involvement. In many cases, there is evidence that the councils are not properly involved. They have attempted to adapt the regional set-up which originated in Geelong but have failed in many areas.

The council in Geelong co-operated with all Governments and municipalities in attempting to work out priorities for the Geelong area. It was appreciated that it did not have the over-all facilities to assess the needs and had not sufficient staff to assess these needs in relation to outlying areas, or the way in which the needs might be met in co-operation with areas such as Ballarat or Colac, particularly in areas such as the mental health field.

The Federal Minister, through officers of his department, is seeking to dominate the Barwon Regional Council of Social Development in two ways. Firstly, he is asking the council to be responsible for assessing and distributing a large *per capita* grant over the whole area. As I mentioned earlier, I have some doubt whether the council has the ability to assess and to make available these particular funds. Secondly, if the council does this, it is acting as an agent of the Federal Government and will in due course lose its independence.

There is evidence that at least one of the councils set up in the western suburbs of Melbourne, which has about $400,000 to distribute, is experiencing difficulty and is already running into problems. Councils do not have the ability to properly assess the needs of their own particular areas.

It is rather interesting that the moment the Federal Government comes into the picture it produces a publication and in this case it has distributed "Guidelines for Pilot Programme under the Australian Assistance Plan". This 100-page document sets out the things that these regional councils should be doing. As a condition of providing funds, the Federal Government sets down the criteria which will be followed. At page 3 of the guidelines, it is stated that the Commonwealth Government has to approve the constitutions of the regional bodies and all regional councils, approve the appointment of social planners, prepare and issue administrative and financial procedures to regional councils and be involved in the approval of the appointment of the senior staff.

The regional council in Geelong was set up as an independent body but, as one of the conditions of making funds available, the Commonwealth Government is insisting that the Barwon regional council must adhere to the criteria set out in the guidelines, which means that practically everything has to be approved by Canberra. Surely this is a loss of independence for the sake of becoming virtually an agent of the Commonwealth Government in the Geelong area. There is no doubt that the Commonwealth Government is seeking to dictate to regional councils on social development and insists that these councils will do it the Commonwealth's way.

It is interesting to note the attitude of at least one municipality in the Geelong area, which is set out in the *Geelong Advertiser* of 31st October. According to the newspaper, the Corio Shire Council has agreed to support the Barwon Regional Council of Social Development subject to the proviso that the regional council confines its activities to an advisory role and does not supervise welfare projects or distribute money. The regional council was set up as an independent body which had the backing of almost all municipalities in the area. Now one council re-affirms this role and does not want the regional council to be responsible for the distribution of money or to become an agent of the Commonwealth Government.

Only two weeks ago, officers from the Department of Social Security visited Geelong for discussions with senior executives of the regional council. In a kind way, they told the executives that if the council did not choose to distribute the money in accordance with the wishes of the Commonwealth Government, it may withdraw its administrative support. Honorable members should compare this with the attitude of the Victorian Government which made available $9,000 a year for three years with no conditions attached; the council merely had to keep on doing the job it was set up for—to assess needs of the area and particularly to co-ordinate the valuable work being done by the voluntary agencies in the area.

At a recent dinner the objectives of the Geelong Community Chest, which was responsible for establishing the regional council of social development, were set out. The objectives included—

> The chest enables individuals and local voluntary organizations to fund their own initiatives—initiatives which are community responses to community problems, recognized or sensed.
>
> The chest recognizes that where volunteers and professionals work together through a community-funded project, that project becomes both less expensive to the community to operate and less likely to outlive either its usefulness or its need.
>
> The chest recognizes that plans and planning tend to rationalise and concentrate resource into professional hands and this in its turn, could lead to a further weakening in the welfare field of the idea of voluntary individual service to the community.

At the moment, the Federal Government is spreading professionalism throughout welfare fields in Australia. I have seen evidence that the Government is supporting voluntary agencies only indirectly and on the Government's terms, which is an undesirable trend.

I hope the Barwon Regional Council of Social Development will stand firm and maintain its independence and continue to assess and recognize the needs of the area and to co-operate with voluntary agencies and not merely be an agent of the Commonwealth Government.

Briefly, I wish to outline one other example of the same situation which recently came to my notice. In at least one municipality in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne, various task forces, whatever that term is supposed to mean, were set up on transport. This again appears to be an *ad hoc* arrangement of groups of people in certain municipalities working in isolation without conferring properly with municipalities and certainly conferring even less with any State Government department or instrumentality. These task forces are dealing directly with the Federal Minister for Transport and making submissions to him. Again there is no real co-ordination either with the municipalities or the State Government. They are dealing with the Minister in isolation and appear to be politically motivated by the Federal member for the area.

The point I make about this is that for well over 100 years the system of government in this country has slowly and quietly evolved and this present Federal Government, with its so-called initiatives, is cutting swathes through what I believe was a soundly based and developing system of government at all levels. That Government is disturbing the very fabric of sound, sane and logical government in this country and the sooner it goes the better.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS (Western Province) : At the outset I congratulate my colleague from Western Province on his noteworthy speech when he moved the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of his Excellency. I compliment those speakers who have taken part in this debate during which a wide variety of subjects have been discussed.

Naturally, I confirm my loyalty to Her most gracious Majesty the Queen. I congratulate His Excellency, Sir Henry Winneke, on his appointment as Governor of Victoria. I wish him

and Lady Winneke a long, happy and successful term as our vice-regal representatives in this State.

The first item I wish to mention concerns the State crest. Recently I was asked by a lady cub leader for a coloured copy of the Victorian State crest. I thought that would be quite simple to secure and I said, "Yes, no worries at all". Unfortunately, it was not as easy as it first appeared. The only copy I could obtain was from the Library of Parliament House. It was lent to me so that I could give it to this lady cub leader to enable her to allow her group to carry out a project.

I mention this because our State crest is something of which we should all be very proud. The younger children should be made aware of the beauty of it and it should be freely available to schools and various youth organizations which undertake projects on the State crest.

The second matter I wish to touch on briefly concerns the road toll. At the outset I congratulate the *Sun News-Pictorial* on its continuing campaign in its fight to curb and reduce the road toll. Many reasons have been mentioned for the drop in the road toll which has occurred this year but there is one reason which has not been mentioned at this stage. I refer to the number of vehicles actually using the highways. It has become apparent to me this year in particular, that the traffic on the highways is lessening. I have also been told this by other honorable members. I made inquiries from the Country Roads Board engineer in my province. I inquired whether traffic counts were made at particular spots on the same day each year. He informed me that this was the case and he has furnished me with a table extending from 1957-58 and containing figures up to the present time.

The figures quoted are those obtained at the annual manual twelve-hour traffic count conducted each year on the third Wednesday in March. The engineer informed me that a general trend can be determined rather than a specific, abnormal variance with these counts because they can be influenced by particular conditions existing on the day, such as a race meeting, a local show, road construction or clearing sales and the like.

To interpret these figures, it must be understood that they are based on the growth pattern from 72 stations located throughout the rural sector of Victoria. It is not just one particular area; the figures are collated from all over the State. If we take 1957-58 as the base year with an index of 100 vehicles, there has been a gradual increase. For example, in 1959 the index went up to 109; in 1961 to 125; in 1964 to 149; in 1965 to 167; in 1966 to 168; in 1967 to 176; 1968 to 182; in 1969 to 193; in 1970 to 201; in 1971 to 218; in 1972 to 240; in 1973 to 250, and this is the interesting one, in 1974 it dropped to 249. So, from 1957 to 1974 there was an actual growth of 149 per cent but from 1971 to 1974 there was a growth of only 14 per cent. From 1973 to 1974 there was a minus 1 per cent or a 1 per cent decrease in traffic vehicles using the highways.

If this is related to the actual drop in the road toll of something over 100 at present, compared with what it was this time last year, that is approximately equal to the 14 per cent growth rate which has been going on year after year but which this year is not present. I am suggesting one of the big factors this year for the drop in the road toll is the smaller number of vehicles actually using the highways.

I should add one criticism. I do this constructively because I use the roads quite considerably, as all country members do, but from time to time I use the roads at week-ends when police blitzes, which have been announced, are carried out. Only last week-end I had occasion to drive from Bacchus Marsh to Horsham and in the journey of 150 miles I saw four police vehicles. I shall tell honorable members where they were. Sometimes we wonder whether the police are being used to their full

effectiveness or whether the police are actually endeavouring to catch the dangerous driver.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: Did you see them all?

The Hon. K. S. GROSS: I saw them all. The first police vehicle was in the City of Ballarat. The second vehicle was parked at a service station. The third vehicle, with three police officers, was manning an amphometer on the outskirts of the town. The fourth vehicle was parked on the side of the road behind a clump of trees on a slight rise with the driver obviously waiting for anyone who was speeding—he was ready to pounce.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: You did not get caught yourself?

The Hon. K. S. GROSS: No, I did not. The second police car which was parked at the service station was a "Candy" car. My understanding of the introduction of "Candy" cars was that they were to be used to patrol highways. In the past two or three years I have observed "Candy" cars being used to man amphometers. I have even known of one being parked outside a sports ground for six hours whilst the driver played sport in the afternoon. On other occasions they have been parked beside roads or behind trees in an endeavour to catch speeding motorists.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: I thought "Candy" cars only went after kids.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS: If that is Mr. Trayling's interpretation he is welcome to it but that is not the case. Police officers in general could do much more by just patrolling the roads. Whether they book anybody or not is immaterial. The fact that a police car is patrolling the road with its blue light flashing would be a warning to many drivers to behave better while they are travelling on the roads. With other honorable members, I see many bad driving mistakes made by people everywhere on our roads, not only on country roads or highways but also in cities and towns. These are the people who cause the accidents. As I have said before, driving is like any other job—one has to concentrate and give 100 per cent attention to it at all times.

The next matter to which I wish to refer is the agricultural situation not only as it affects Victoria but also as it affects the whole of Australia. I know other honorable members have spoken of this subject in the course of their speeches. I do not want to go over what they have already said. However, there has been a continuing campaign over the past eighteen months to two years to have lower meat prices for the consumers. That has been done quite blatantly by the Federal members of the Labor Party Government in Canberra, aided and abetted by the media in all States.

It was claimed that the rise in meat prices eighteen months ago was the main reason for inflation. The cry was: "Lower meat prices and inflation will disappear". We have low meat prices now but we have the highest rate of inflation. So, Parkinson's Law does not apply to that.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: Mr. Gross can blame the Australian Government for everything else but he cannot blame it for that.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS: Why not? I blame any Government or body which makes a statement of that type. At present graziers are receiving much lower returns for their stock. However, the housewife is still paying almost the same price for meat in the shop. I believe the Commonwealth Government has helped that situation along and members of the Labor Party know it.

A couple of weeks ago there was a conference in Rome of the Food and Agricultural Organization. Many alarming statements came from that meeting on the future of food supplies in the world, and indeed the future of people in some countries. Some agricultural producing coun-

tries that have surplus finance have made gestures by allocating sums of money to other countries that have poorly developed agricultural systems. The Australian Government has allocated $17 million to assist with irrigation works, the building of dams and providing equipment for some of these countries. I question the wisdom of making a grant of $17 million for these works. Surely when we in Australia can produce considerable amounts of food, given incentives—there have not been too many in the past two years—it would be better if that amount of $17 million were spent on buying food and giving it to these countries. Technological assistance and equipment could also be provided. There is a surplus of beef in Australia and despite the religious beliefs of the people of some countries in the world if people are starving they ought to be willing to eat good food.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : Mr. Gross should try to tell that to the Indians.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS : If that is so, there is no salvation for them. There are other people who have no religious scruples concerning the preparation of food, and our surplus beef could be given to them. I understand that there are meat companies in Australia that would be only too willing to do this and that would be a tremendous boost to primary industry.

When I first heard the suggestion which I will describe I was sceptical about it, but knowing the person who made it I thought about it more seriously. This gentleman recently suggested that grain should be stored in Antarctica. I thought the suggestion sounded silly, but it is not. Antarctica is Nature's biggest natural deep freeze. Grain could be stored there. There would be no weevil problem because the weevil cannot live in a temperature below 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Other fresh foods, such as meat, could be stored there. I realize that transport costs would be involved but if food is to be stored for any length of time, say, 1, 2 or 3 years, it would be a payable proposition. At least the suggestion should be investigated.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : The United Nations Relief Organization has reported against it. The scheme was investigated by the Liberal-Country Party Government years ago. Mr. Gross should read the reports on it.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS : That may have been the position years ago, but that is history. We are now talking about 1974 and technological processes have improved vastly. These could make the scheme possible. Surely it is worth having a look at. I refer now to subsidies applied to rural products.

The Hon. S. R. MCDONALD : That is a dirty word.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS : It is. Mr. Jenkins, in his recently concluded speech, spoke about the money made available to regional councils. That is nothing more than a subsidy and I can see no difference between that and a subsidy to primary producing industries. I know that some people do not think this country is worth saving, but we have an unlimited future as a food producing nation. I have said this before and I shall continue to say it. If the producers are given the incentive and help when it is required and if the average Australian is prepared to allocate a certain percentage of his increased wages towards buying food, subsidies will not be necessary in many cases. However, a great deal of incentive has been lost during the past two years because of production controls and decreases in prices. Some production controls have now been terminated and I hope all will be finished in the near future.

When the Federal Government and other Governments negotiate trade agreements with other countries I hope they will concentrate not only on minerals but also insist on agricultural products being part of the bargain. Surely it is time

we told the importing nations of the world that we have a certain number of tonnes of food available, and if they want it there is 15, 20 or 30 per cent of it available for them. We should do that rather than have the importing countries tell us that they have a quota and we may fill it this year but then be told next year that our quota is not available. It is time we asserted our authority not only as a food producing nation but as a food trading nation.

The motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech was agreed to, and it was ordered that the Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor by the President and such members of the Council as may wish to accompany him.

ADJOURNMENT.

RURAL TEACHER AIDES—SCOPE OF ADJOURNMENT DEBATE.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization) : By leave, I move—

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization) : I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER (Western Province) : There is a matter of Government business which I wish to bring to the attention of the Leader of the House, who represents the Minister of Education. My colleague, Mr. Gross, and I, with our colleagues from another place, Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. McKellar, have been concerned for some time about the effect of a ruling of the Education Department, or more particularly a regulation which was promulgated last May concerning the employment of rural teacher aides, often known as sewing mistresses. These are support personnel who are so important to many small rural schools. As honorable members may know these regulations were altered as from 1st July last.

The regulations provide that as from 1st July last no further people can seek employment as rural teacher aides unless they are qualified primary teachers. I have no doubt concerning the intentions of the statutory body, the Teachers Tribunal, that made the recommendation. They were of the highest order and the tribunal sought to upgrade the standard of education which is available in primary schools. However, the regulation has disadvantaged many children in small rural schools and the reasons for this are not hard to find.

Once this regulation came into force—its impact was felt from the beginning of the school year—the number of people willing to seek this type of employment was reduced because anyone with the necessary qualifications would be able to find regular employment as a teacher. The rural aide is usually employed half-time and the pay scale is graduated accordingly. I shall give the comparison between the pay of a fully qualified primary teacher and a rural aide. The range for the primary teacher is from $6,425 to $11,400 for the "A" certificate qualification and the range for the rural aide is from $2,445 to $2,720.

In the intervening period, no doubt together with other members representing rural electorates, my colleagues and I have made representations on the matter to the Minister. I know that he is sympathetic and I hesitate to add to his already considerable burden by inflicting this matter on him. Although there are not many schools involved and therefore not many children affected, it is a matter of considerable concern to the children who are affected by having the staffing at their school reduced. I have a number of letters from several school councils in my electorate on the subject.

Honorable members are no doubt aware that in a primary school when the student enrolment falls below 30 the school no longer qualifies as a two-teacher school. It does not take

a great deal of imagination to realize that there would be a good deal of difference in the standard of teaching when a school is reduced from a two-teacher school to a one-teacher school, no matter how willing or dedicated the teacher is. It is not physically possible for one teacher to give full attention to seven grades, but if the teacher had an assistant, his or her burden could be relieved.

I ask the Leader of the House to take up this matter with the Minister of Education. The solution as I see it can be found in one of several ways. One solution is that the Teachers Tribunal could increase the pay scale of rural aides to a figure comparable to that paid to a regular teacher. Another solution is that the tribunal and the Education Department could consider making a separate classification for remote rural primary schools so that if the student attendance fell below 30 a second teacher could be appointed, provided that attendances were reduced only to, say, about twenty. I assure honorable members that while there are not a great number of people involved, those who are involved consider that their children are being seriously disadvantaged. I entirely support that view. I am concerned because this is happening in my province and so far the solution seems to have eluded us.

I request the Leader of the House again to use his good offices to make the necessary representations to the Minister of Education with a view not only of again emphasizing the problem—it is a problem which I hope can be resolved by the beginning of the next school year—but possibly of providing some remedy.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): I direct my question to you, Mr. President. I was rather disturbed at what took place on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting last evening in relation to a question asked by Mr. Jenkins, replied to by the Minister for Local Government, and to which I made interjections and took serious objection. I wonder if you, Mr. President, could codify the rules associated with speeches made on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting because I do not like Ministers making Ministerial statements on this motion. If the rules were codified, all honorable members would know where they stood in this matter and they could get on much better.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): I knew Mr. Tripovich would bring up this matter. Honorable members will be aware that over the past few months I have been concerned about the matters that have been brought up on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting and I have indicated to honorable members the line they should take. However, today the Clerk and I checked precedents on this matter and we have produced fairly complete notes. I did not propose to read them to the House tonight because of the lateness of the hour.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: No, but I think the House should have notice.

The PRESIDENT: The notes are fairly lengthy. I suggest that they be left till the next day of meeting when the sitting will finish a little earlier. However, I shall be quite happy to read them now if it is the wish of the House.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: I thank you, Mr. President, and in raising this matter I do not wish to be discourteous to you. I accept your advice in relation to the reading of the notes.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I have some knowledge of the matter Mr. Crozier has raised. I have a lot of sympathy for him and I thank him for his constructive suggestions. It is not often a member makes suggestions on how a specific matter can be solved. I can assure Mr. Crozier that I will discuss the matter with my

colleague and offer every possible assistance to him regarding the matter he raised.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.49 *a.m. (Thursday) until Tuesday, November* 19.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

LIFTS AND CRANES REGULATIONS.

(Question No. 163)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister of Water Supply, for the Minister of Labour and Industry—

(*a*) When will new regulations be promulgated under the Lifts and Cranes Act 1967?

(*b*) Will operators of farm machinery and municipal plant be included?

(*c*) Will farmers and farm labourers be required to pay licence fees; if so, how much?

(*d*) Will such operators be required to travel to Melbourne or regional centres to obtain a licence?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): The answer supplied by the Minister of Labour and Industry is—

On 15th October, 1974, I made a statement to the press that it has never been the intention of the Government to require farmers to be licensed to operate equipment such as back hoes and bucket scoops attached to farm tractors. As to operators of equipment owned by municipal councils, the answers are—

(*a*) Not before March, 1975.
(*b*) Yes.
(*c*) Not applicable.
(*d*) No.

MOTOR VEHICLES.

(Question No. 169)

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

Are motor vehicles in Victoria required to have fitted either an odometer or a speedometer; if not, why?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): The answer supplied by the Chief Secretary is lengthy, and I ask leave for its incorporation in *Hansard.*

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows—

Motor vehicles are not required by the Motor Car Act 1958, or the regulations made thereunder, to be fitted with a speedometer or an odometer but commercial vehicles licensed by the Transport Regulation Board are required to be so fitted.

The law places the onus on the driver of the motor vehicle to drive within the speed limits prescribed by law and he is at liberty to do that by any means he sees fit. There are, of course, very few passenger motor cars and passenger car derivatives which are not fitted with speedometers at the time of manufacture.

Insofar as most speedometers do not accurately measure the speed of a vehicle it is considered that there is no worthwhile advantage in statutorily requiring the owner of a motor car to have a speedometer fitted.

Speedometers are not certified for accuracy by a recognized testing laboratory at the time of manufacture. To be accurate a speedometer would have to be calibrated having regard to the diameter of the wheel of the vehicle, the type and profile of the tyres fitted to the vehicle and the differential ratio of the vehicle. Any change in any of these characteristics would affect the accuracy of the speedometer.

The law makes it an offence for any person to make a statement as to the mileage travelled by a motor car that he knows to be false or does not believe to be true. In support of the provision it is an offence for any person with the intent to deceive to tamper with an odometer fitted to a motor car or to substitute an odometer already fitted to a motor car.

BREAK-DOWN WARNING DEVICES IN CARS.

(Question No. 179)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for Local Government, for the Chief Secretary—

Has the road traffic regulations sub-committee recommended any alterations to existing legislation regarding the carrying of break-down warning devices in private motor cars; if not, are any changes under consideration?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): The answer supplied by the Chief Secretary is lengthy, and I seek leave for its incorporation in *Hansard* without being read.

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows—

The Road Safety and Traffic Authority, which is the body vested under the Road Traffic Act 1958 with the responsibility of advising the Minister on matters relating to the Road Traffic Regulations 1973, has not recommended any alteration to the existing regulations concerning the carrying of break-down warning devices in private motor cars. No such alterations are proposed at the present time.

The Motor Car Regulations 1966 contain provisions relating to break-down warning devices. Those regulations enable a motor car (not including a motor cycle) fitted with signal lamps, displaying amber light only to the front and amber light only to the rear, to also be fitted with equipment controlled by a switch which will cause the signal lamps to flash simultaneously and regularly at the front and rear and on both sides of the motor car at a rate of not less than 60 and not more than 120 flashes per minute at any time the switch controlling the said manner of flashing on both sides is in the "on" position.

TRACTOR SAFETY.

(Question No. 185)

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province) asked the Minister of Water Supply, for the Minister of Labour and Industry—

(*a*) Which municipalities in Victoria have sought to be gazetted as municipalities in which roll bars are to be fitted to tractors under the Labour and Industry (Tractor Safety) Regulations 1972 (S.R. No. 251 of 1972), showing when this gazettal was made?

(*b*) Are these municipalities predominantly rural or urban, and what is the estimated number of tractors within each municipality?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): The answer supplied by the Minister of Labour and Industry is statistical, and I ask that it be incorporated in *Hansard* without being read.

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows—

(*a*) The following municipalities have made application to the Minister of Labour and Industry for a direction under subsection (5) of section 175 of the Labour and Industry Act 1958 requiring tractors subject to the Labour and Industry (Tractor Safety) Regulations 1972 within their municipal district to be fitted with protective frames of cabs—

Municipality	Date of gazettal
Shire of Yea	18th April, 1973
Shire of Bulla	6th June, 1973
	21st November, 1973 (Revoked)
City of Croydon	13th June, 1973
Shire of Heytesbury	13th June, 1973
City of Coburg	13th June, 1973
City of Castlemaine	13th June, 1973
Shire of Upper Murray	18th July, 1973
Shire of Towong	18th July, 1973
City of Springvale	18th July, 1973
City of Richmond	18th July, 1973
City of Oakleigh	25th July, 1973
Shire of Sherbrooke	25th July, 1973
Shire of Benalla	25th July, 1973
Shire of Alexandra	8th August, 1973
City of Doncaster and Templestowe	8th August, 1973
Shire of Narracan	8th August, 1973
Shire of Werribee	15th August, 1973
Shire of Broadford	5th September, 1973
Shire of Upper Yarra	12th September, 1973
Shire of Diamond Valley	12th September, 1973
Town of Portland	12th September, 1973
Shire of South Gippsland	12th September, 1973
Shire of Pyalong	19th September, 1973
Shire of Mirboo	3rd October, 1973
Shire of Kyneton	10th October, 1973
Shire of Lillydale	21st November, 1973
City of Knox	9th January, 1974
Shire of Korumburra	31st January, 1974
Shire of Orbost	15th May, 1974
City of Berwick	31st July, 1974
Shire of Korong	14th August, 1974
Shire of Gisborne	Being processed

(*b*) It would appear that the municipalities are predominantly rural. The number of tractors which are subject to the Labour and Industry (Tractor Safety) Regulations 1972 within each municipality is not known. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (Victorian Office) published figures as at 31st March 1973 of all wheeled tractors on rural holdings within the municipalities under question are as follows:—

Municipality	Number of wheeled tractors
Shire of Yea	407
Shire of Bulla	221
City of Croydon	32
Shire of Heytesbury	1,466
City of Coburg	—
City of Castlemaine	21
Shire of Upper Murray	310
Shire of Towong	530
City of Springvale	169
City of Richmond	—
City of Oakleigh	—
Shire of Sherbrooke	214
Shire of Benalla	876
Shire of Alexandra	322
City of Doncaster and Templestowe	195
Shire of Narracan	1,085
Shire of Werribee	516
Shire of Broadford	72
Shire of Upper Yarra	328
Shire of Diamond Valley	83
Town of Portland	N.A.
Shire of South Gippsland	802
Shire of Pyalong	95
Shire of Mirboo	307
Shire of Kyneton	397
Shire of Lillydale	1,004
City of Knox	251
Shire of Korumburra	839
Shire of Orbost	522
City of Berwick	—
Shire of Korong	524
Shire of Gisborne	128

ALTONA SPECIAL SCHOOL.

(Question No. 190)

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, for the Minister of Education—

(*a*) At what stage of planning and design is the Altona Special School?

(*b*) When is it expected that tenders will be called for its construction?

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

(*a*) The planning and design of the Altona Special School is at an advanced stage and includes many improvements on previous buildings of this type.

It is expected that the planning will be completed by the Public Works Department and the Education Department within the next two weeks.

(*b*) From 4 to 6 months of completion of planning.

LAND VALUATIONS.

(Question No. 193)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

In each of the three years ending 30th June, 1972, 30th June, 1973, and 30th June, 1974, how many valuations have been carried out by the Valuer-General's Office in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (5) (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) (i) and (*c*) (ii) of the Valuation of Land Act 1960, respectively, and what fees were received for these valuations in each category in each year?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): The subject of this question has already been bandied about in debate on the Valuation of Land (Amendment) Bill. The question was placed on the Notice Paper only last night, and I wish to thank the Valuer-General in particular for his extensive efforts to produce the required information at such short notice. I understand that he first had notice of the question at about 2 p.m. today.

I seek leave for the incorporation of the answer in *Hansard,* without my reading it.

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows—

The information supplied by the Valuer-General is as follows—

Valuations under section 3 (5) of the Valuation of Land Act
Year to 30th June

	1972		1973		1974	
	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount
Paragraph (*a*) .. .. .. } Paragraph (*b*) .. .. .. }	1,384	No fee	1,874	No fee	4,258	No fee
Sub-paragraph (*c*) (i) .. .. } Sub-paragraph (*c*) (ii) .. .. }	314	$40,208.18	309	$45,329.27	409	$103,382.96

NOTES:

1. No separate statistics are kept to distinguish between paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*).

2. No separate statistics are kept to separate (*c*) (i) and (*c*) (ii) but the Valuer-General reports that valuations carried out under (*c*) (ii) would not exceed approximately two per year.

3. These figures do not include the valuations made by the Valuer-General in the normal course of duty for the Commissioner of Probate and Stamp Duty, the Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies, the Housing Commission and Public Works Department and the Albury–Wodonga Corporation, which together account for more than 23,000 valuations per annum.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, November 13, 1974.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. K. H. Wheeler)** took the chair at 2.35 p.m., and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

POULTRY INDUSTRY.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): In view of the uncertainty that exists in the poultry industry today, and because of the serious over-production problem that the industry will face next year, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he will announce that 1st January of next year will be the date of the commencement of the licensing season for the hen quota under the egg industry stabilization scheme.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): I agree with the honorable member that there is a problem of over-production of eggs in the poultry industry at present. I am having talks with the Egg and Egg Pulp Marketing Board tomorrow morning. It has been suggested to me that 1st January next should be the date of the proclamation of the Act. I shall hear what the board has to say, and a decision will be announced at the end of the week.

SUPPER LIQUOR LICENCES.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party): Is the Chief Secretary aware that the Liquor Control Commission has not granted any supper licences for some months? This is apparently because of an anomaly in the Act, and applicants for licences are placed in an invidious position. If the Chief Secretary is aware of this, what steps is he taking to overcome that problem?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): Would it be in order for me to ask the Leader of the Country Party whether he means supper licences for trading during the week or supper licences for any time?

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Supper—full stop!

Mr. ROSSITER: If the Leader of the Country Party is asking about supper licences in hotels and other business areas for Sunday nights, I inform him that the matter is being considered by the Government. Certain amendments will be introduced and the question of anomalies relating to supper licences granted for a Sunday night is being looked at. I should like to have notice of a question concerning supper licences for week days. I do not know what the reference is concerning week-day supper licences.

FIRE HAZARDS IN BUILDINGS.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Is the Chief Secretary aware that, according to his fire chief, a number of buildings in Melbourne are regarded as potential fire hazards? Is the Chief Secretary also aware that, in an answer given to a question in this House yesterday, his department expressed the view that it was not aware of hazards in individual buildings? I should like the Chief Secretary to state why his department cannot name the individual buildings, and what action he proposes to take when he is informed of the buildings which are, according to his fire chief, potential fire risks.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The history of this question is of interest. Yesterday the Deputy Leader of the Opposition requested an answer to question No. 510, and I indicated that the answer either was on its way or had arrived.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Tell us about the history.

Mr. ROSSITER: I should like to set the honorable member for Moonee Ponds alight.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has asked a question and I hope the Chief Secretary will be heard in silence.

Mr. ROSSITER: It is possible to answer the question. It has taken a long time to answer question No. 510 because of the intricacies involved. I am arranging for a conference with the Secretary of the United Firefighters Union, Mr. Webber; the Chief Fire Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board; the Under Secretary; and insurance representatives to discuss this matter.

Mr. WILKES: Why can the Minister not name the buildings so that action may be taken?

Mr. WILTON: The Minister does not know because there are so many.

Mr. ROSSITER: Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence and protection if I am to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has asked a question and I requested the Chief Secretary to answer it. I appeal to honorable members to cease interjecting, otherwise I will rule the question out of order and it will not be answered.

Mr. ROSSITER: I should hate that to happen because I want to answer the question. However, Mr. Speaker, you should not appeal to members of the Opposition, but tell them.

The whole subject is involved in modern technology. If every high-rise building in Melbourne were converted to use modern fire-fighting appliances such as sprinkler systems, the cost would be tens of millions of dollars. Architects have told the Government that every new building will have these fire-fighting appliances installed, but to convert the existing high-rise buildings would require such an expenditure that the Government is not prepared to insist that private enterprise incur the cost. If a Socialist Government comes into power in Victoria and insists that building owners in Melbourne convert their buildings, the cost of living will increase astronomically.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas): In view of the fact that the largest employer of labour in Stawell is the textile industry and that firms have been forced to put off up to 50 per cent of their labour force as a result of the Federal Government's tariff policy, and also the failure of the Prime Minister last night to announce any assistance for these industries, can the Premier advise what action the State Government can take to restore employment in these areas?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): The textile and clothing industries, along with the footwear and electronics industries, have been the greatest casualties of the Federal Government's so-called anti-inflation policy. The Victorian Government has been saying this for some time, so it is not new. It is unnecessary to go any further for statistics than the Secretary of the Clothing Trades Union, who estimates that some 10,000 people are out of work in this industry throughout Australia because of the Federal Government's policies in reducing tariffs by 25 per cent, removing import quotas and revaluing the currency. The net effect of all three policies exposed these good Australian industries, some of which were well established, to intense competition from imports from lower-wage countries.

For months the Victorian Government has been urging the Federal Government to restore a reasonable measure of protection to these industries. It is disappointing that in the package served up in Canberra last night no mention was made of any protection to be given to the industries which need it most—the clothing, footwear, textile and electronics industries.

The Victorian Government will be pursuing this course and trying as hard as it can to bring about some action along these lines. The honorable member will understand that in a town like Stawell, where, as he said, the bulk of industrial employment is in this field, it is not easy to

persuade other industries to absorb the work force, which is comprised mainly of women. Although the Minister for State Development and Decentralization has been successful in establishing alternative industries in some areas where the textile and clothing industries have been closed or output has been reduced, it is not possible to do this in all instances.

We will do our best, and I urge all members of Parliament from both sides of the House to follow this up, because it is iniquitous that good Australian industries should be debilitated in this way when they could be given a reasonable measure of protection.

LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): I direct a question to the Minister for Fuel and Power. Following the decision made by the Prices Justification Tribunal in May this year allowing a 50 per cent increase in the cost of liquefied petroleum gas to Shell Petroleum Pty. Ltd., did the honorable gentleman make any and, if so, what representations to the Commonwealth Government or to the Prices Justification Tribunal indicating that flow-ons to other oil companies ought not to be automatically granted? In particular, did he make any and, if so, what representations to Esso–B.H.P. stating that, in view of the considerable profits it has made from the export of liquefied petroleum gas, it should not automatically adjust its prices in accordance with the determination? If so, can the Minister inform the House of the results of all these representations?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): When the oil companies applied to the Prices Justification Tribunal for increases, the Gas and Fuel Corporation of Victoria, on behalf of the companies' distributors in Australia, put a strong case to the tribunal. Instead of granting the requested increase of $29 a ton, the tribunal increased the price by $14 a ton. I understand that the tribunal heard only one case, and the increases flowed on to the other companies.

Since then another increase of $4 a ton has been granted to the oil companies without any hearing. I understand that the Chairman of the Gas and Fuel Corporation made representations to the oil companies to ascertain whether that increase would have to flow on to them under the present contracts which the corporation has.

FUNDS FOR BOWLING.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): In view of the large number of Victorian citizens who obtain a great deal of pleasure and recreation from the sport of bowling and of the recognition given to that sport at the Commonwealth Games, is it a fact that the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation informed representatives of the Victorian Bowls Association that so long as he is Minister no funds will be available for that sport from his department? If so, can the Minister give the reasons for that decision?

Mr. DIXON (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation): That is not a fact. When I received representations from various bowling clubs and from representatives of the Victorian Bowls Association, it was stated that applications for funds for bowling club facilities would go through the same channels as applications for any capital grant.

These applications could apply to projects such as community family leisure centres, a cycling stadium, or a basketball stadium. Funds would be granted to a bowling club if the club received a No. 1 priority from the municipality. The department has established this principle of dealing with the municipalities and asking them to list their priorities for these capital facilities.

However, other types of grants are available, including grants for administration and for coaching. I invite the honorable member for Gippsland East to make certain that the Victorian Bowls Association applies for

a grant for administration and for coaching. If it can be shown that the grant will help to increase the number of people participating in the sport, there is no reason why the grant will not be made.

The Government has absolutely no prejudice against the sport of bowling. One of the reasons why bowling usually receives a low priority with municipalities is that many bowling clubs already have pretty good facilities. Many of them have restricted membership. In those areas, one generally finds that other facilities have a much higher priority within the municipality.

GOVERNMENT IMMIGRATION POLICY.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): Can the Premier or the Minister representing the Minister of Immigration inform the House what the State Department of Immigration and the Minister of Immigration are doing to encourage or discourage immigrants into Victoria at present in view of the unemployment situation?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I ask the honorable member for Moonee Ponds to put his question on notice so that I can give him a comprehensive answer.

OIL IN PORT PHILLIP BAY.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): In view of the answer given by the Minister of Public Works yesterday that efforts by vessels of the Ports and Harbors Division to disperse the oil slick in Port Phillip Bay were unsuccessful because the oil was bunker oil, can the honorable gentleman inform the House why those emergency vessels do not carry a dispersing agency in case bunker oil is the pollutant? Further, can the Minister guarantee that vessels will be able to disperse bunker or fuel oil if it is spilt in the bay in future?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): I will make inquiries into the matters raised by the honorable member for Albert Park and advise him accordingly.

MERCURY CONTENT IN FOODSTUFFS.

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine): Following investigation and the enactment of legislation covering the mercury content of shark, is the Minister of Health aware of any further investigations into the mercury content of that type of fish or molluscs—for example oysters—and, if so, what was the result of those inquiries? Has the Minister carried out any further investigations into the mercury content of other foodstuffs such as bananas and, if so, what is the result of those inquiries?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): The honorable member has asked a broad question. The Government is continuing research into the mercury content of a wide range of foodstuffs. The results of the research are constantly being brought to its attention and that of the Federal Minister for the Environment and Conservation. Because of the breadth of the question I ask that it be placed on the Notice Paper.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): Yesterday, in answer to question No. 493, which requested information about the actual areas of space occupied by Government instrumentalities in the electoral district of Melbourne and how much area was unused, the Premier replied that the Government did not have that information at its fingertips and that it would take too long to assemble the information. The honorable gentleman suggested that I should ask the Minister of Public Works about specific cases. I ask the Premier: Is there no central record or list of Government holdings and leases of property within the metropolitan area to which members can have access? If not, will the Premier give serious consideration to adopting the method used by the Commonwealth Department of Services and Property and provide a central listing?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): Of course there is a list of buildings in which space is occupied or rented by the Government. However, that was not the point of the honorable member's question. He wanted information about the amount of unused space. This is not easy to ascertain and, as an honorable member interjected, it changes from time to time. If the honorable member is asking only a general question, the Public Works Department should not necessarily be put to the problem of measuring the space in every building. About 71 buildings in the City of Melbourne alone are occupied by parts of Government departments.

If the honorable member has a particular case or building in mind, I have invited him to obtain the details from the Minister of Public Works. The honorable member is also at liberty to study the records of the buildings involved, and their names and addresses. The Government undertakes to give him an answer on any specific case he has in mind.

SOCCER POOLS.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla): Can the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation inform the House of the success or failure of the soccer pools, whether there have been any winners and, if so, who they are?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The first part of the question is in order but to expect the Minister to know the names of the winners is unreasonable.

Mr. DIXON (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation): Because of my department's interest in soccer pools I try to obtain the relevant figures. Honorable members will be interested to learn that the pool in the first week was $144,782 and in the second week $141,619. This amount is somewhat different from the reported figures because some $50,000 subscribed in the first week consisted of pre-paid amounts that will be added on where people have had 3 or 4 or perhaps 10 weeks' entries on the one form. The balance in the winners' fund as a result of the Victorians not qualifying for the total amount of money which is available and which comes under Treasury scrutiny is $58,000. Ultimately, of course, there will be a jackpot, when a lucky Victorian will scoop the pool, and that amount will increase greatly.

This week it was reported in the press that the English winners each received $200,000. To the best of my information there has unfortunately been no winner in Victoria, and this is understandable because there are many more entries in the United Kingdom and the people there have a considerable degree of expertise because of local knowledge. They have also been familiar with the pools over a long period and know the names of teams which have figured in drawn games. I believe Vernons are giving consideration to making an extra amount of money available to the top scorer of the Victorian and Australian winners so that the amount of money received by that person will be increased. The most important point that emerges from the figures is that for the two weeks, for which I have figures available, they are running at $140,000 a week.

COMMONWEALTH EXPENDITURE.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): In the Premier's proposed thirteen-point plan to fight inflation and unemployment, did he suggest to the Commonwealth Government in writing or in any other way that Commonwealth expenditure should be cut by 10 per cent? If so, did he specify which areas of Commonwealth expenditure should be cut, and will he inform the House which areas of Commonwealth expenditure he considers should be so cut? If he raised this question of a 10 per cent cut in Commonwealth expenditures, has he considered a similar step by the State Government, and in which department and programmes does he propose to have cuts made in this State?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): Yes, one of the thirteen points which I submitted to the

Federal Government for consideration in an anti-inflation package was that it should reduce its expenditure by 10 per cent. The actual over-all increase in Federal expenditures this year over last year, according to the Budget, is 32·4 per cent. If the honorable member will examine the State Budget he will find the over-all increase this year over last year is something under 25 per cent. If the Victorian Government can hold its expenditures to that figure, which is roughly equivalent to increases in inflation and in wage costs, the Federal Government should be able to do the same. To be increasing expenditure at a time of inflation only adds to inflation. I believe this is a perfectly valid suggestion to make.

BROADCASTING OF STATE PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. SKEGGS (Ivanhoe): In view of the recent decision of the Federal Government to allocate amplitude modulation broadcasting licences in addition to the new frequency modulation licences, will the Premier consider making representations to the new broadcasting authority to have one of the new stations cover in part or in whole the broadcasting of proceedings of State Parliament?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I did not quite hear the whole of the question, but I can only say that I will ask for consideration to be given to it.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I am not sure whether that question should be directed to the Premier. I will rule it out of order, but as Speaker I will undertake to give consideration to the honorable member's question.

SAVOY PLAZA HOTEL.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Is the Chief Secretary aware that the building known as the Savoy Plaza Hotel in Spencer Street, which was purchased by his Government——

Mr. DUNSTAN: It has not been purchased yet.

Mr. WILKES: Yesterday the Premier stated that everything was ready for the signing of the contract for the purchase of the Savoy Plaza Hotel. Is the Chief Secretary aware that that building has a fire order on it, and does the honorable gentleman propose to allow police cadets to occupy the building before the fire order is expunged, and proper arrangements are made to bring the building into conformity with the fire regulations of this city? Can he also state what the cost of those repairs will be?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): My learned and honorable colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, used the word "expunged" in relation to a fire order. I do not know what he means by that. We will not allow police cadets to go into a building—I use "we" in the sense of the Royal plural for the Government—which is in any degree a hazard to them. With regard to the cost of this project, will the honorable member please place the question on notice?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

COMMONWEALTH ROADS LEGISLATION.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a Ministerial statement.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): I raise a point of order. I wish to make an inquiry because last week when a Ministerial statement was made there was a good deal of argument whether it constituted a Ministerial statement. I ask whether you, Mr. Speaker, have been provided with a copy of the proposed Ministerial statement as a matter of courtesy and whether you could indicate to the House if the statement proposed to be made is appropriate to be in the form of a Ministerial statement.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honorable member has raised a point that is important in respect of the forms of this House. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker passed some remarks when the debate was resumed on a Ministerial statement that I had made.

If I may say so, Sir, I thought your remarks were very much in point and were certainly appreciated by those members who understand the forms of this House.

Mr. CURNOW: Mr. Speaker told you that your statement was not Ministerial.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I repeatedly ask the honorable member for Kara Kara to cease interjecting. Furthermore, the honorable member would have no knowledge whether I gave any direction to the Attorney-General, so I suggest that he should not repeat his statement.

Mr. WILCOX: There are no Standing Orders pertaining to Ministerial statements. That is clear to all honorable members, and you, Mr. Speaker, said that it may be that that question should be looked at by the Standing Orders Committee. I do not disagree with that suggestion.

However, the practice in relation to the making of Ministerial statements in a Parliament which follows the Westminster pattern is quite clear, and that is that a Ministerial statement is one of the few matters that can be given attention by the House for which the member making the statement does not require leave. It is obvious that that practice has grown up over the years, and sensibly so, because in many circumstances it may be most necessary for a Minister to make a Ministerial statement. I have no doubt that my colleague, the Minister of Transport, has such an occasion now when, consistent with his duty and his oath as a Minister responsible in this Parliament, he should make a Ministerial statement. It would be tragic for this Parliament if the practice of making Ministerial statements was not allowed to be continued.

I conclude by saying that just as members of the Opposition rightly use the forms of the House as they are advised, so members of the Government party are entitled to use the forms of the House for the good of the House.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): Mr. Speaker, I know that you have made a close examination of what is required in regard to the making of Ministerial statements because of a statement that was made in the House recently. The Attorney-General has just attempted to establish some sort of case on the ground that there are no Standing Orders relating to Ministerial statements. I make it quite clear that the honorable gentleman has deliberately avoided saying for the benefit of honorable members that the Standing Orders provide that, where the Standing Orders of this House are deficient on any question, the House uses the forms of the House of Commons which are laid down in May's *Parliamentary Practice*. The honorable gentleman knows that *May* clearly sets out what a Ministerial statement is and what form such a statement shall take. This was referred to in recent weeks when this House was dealing with a matter involving the Attorney-General. I support the Leader of the Opposition in what he is attempting to establish because it is most important. Apparently the Attorney-General has not bothered to consult previous references regarding Ministerial statements. Page 331 of the eighteenth edition, *May* clearly sets out what a Minister may say in a Ministerial statement.

Mr. WILCOX: We know.

Mr. WILTON: If the Attorney-General now admits that he knows what is required in a Ministerial statement, he also knows that he has prostituted the principles of democratic Parliamentary procedure.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I find the remarks of the honorable member offensive.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! If an honorable member finds words offensive—I take it the Attorney-General does find the words of the honorable member for Broadmeadows to be offensive—he can ask for their withdrawal.

Mr. HOLDING: Which words did you find offensive?

Mr. WILCOX: I am not sure whether you heard them, Mr. Speaker, but the words used by the honorable member were that I had prostituted the forms of the House.

Mr. WILKES: Not "the forms"—"the principles".

Mr. WILCOX: He said "the forms of the House".

Mr. WILKES: He did not; he said "the principles". The Attorney-General does not know what was said.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is difficult for anybody to hear what goes on in this place. I appeal to honorable members. If this institution is to conduct itself as it has over the years, there will have to be a change of attitude by some honorable members. I have referred to *May*, not only today, but on other occasions, and I almost know its provisions off by heart. If the Attorney-General believes the statement made by the honorable member for Broadmeadows is offensive, and he takes objection to it, I am sure the honorable member will withdraw it.

Mr. WILCOX: The honorable member said that I had prostituted the forms of the House.

Mr. CURNOW: Don't withdraw, Jack!

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I heard a statement by the honorable member for Kara Kara advising the honorable member for Broadmeadows not to withdraw the statement. I ask the honorable member to apologize to the Chair.

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara): I apologize.

Mr. ROSSITER: Crawl, you ———!

The SPEAKER: Order! The expression just used by the Chief Secretary is unbecoming of the honorable gentleman and to this place, and I ask him also to apologize.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I apologize unreservedly.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I do not want to do anything which will cause more heat than has already been generated. The honorable member for Broadmeadows said that I had prostituted the forms of the House. If he had said that I had prostituted the practices or the principles of the House—I do not mind which words he used—I would find them objectionable. I ask the honorable member to withdraw the words that he used.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): I make it quite clear that the exact words I used were "In my opinion the honorable gentleman has prostituted the principles of democratic Parliamentary procedure".

Mr. WILCOX: I want them withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The appropriate Standing Order, No. 94, states—

> No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.

The Attorney-General believes the words used were offensive and I am sure the honorable member for Broadmeadows, in accordance with his usual custom, will withdraw them.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is an honorable member to decide whether the words are offensive, or have you to decide whether the words are offensive? If the matter is taken to its logical conclusion, any honorable member could find the words of any other honorable member to be offensive. Such a situation would be ridiculous.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! It is an honorable member's decision whether or not he believes the words are offensive to him.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): Mr. Speaker, I used the words deliberately, because they expressed my opinion. The Attorney-General has found them offensive and has requested that I withdraw them. I will withdraw the words. It does not change my mind. I will substitute for them a statement that the Attorney-General has grossly abused the forms of this House as they apply to the long-established practice of Ministerial statements.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I find the substituted words objectionable. They are not in accordance with the practice of this House. The normal practice is for objectionable words to be withdrawn. I find the substituted words objectionable and I ask for their withdrawal.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): I wish to pursue the point of order raised by the honorable member for Footscray. It is true that it is within the discretion of any honorable member to ask for the withdrawal of offensive words. An honorable member must decide whether he thinks specific words are offensive. I point out with respect, Mr. Speaker, that in the past it has been the practice for the Chair to adjudicate on whether it is reasonable to ask for a withdrawal. It is obvious that if the Minister's request is agreed to he could easily ask for a substituted word—it might be careless, inept, or incompetent—to be withdrawn. Thin-skinned members who can dish it out but cannot take it, will then be asking for any adjective which is used to describe them, and which they claim to be objectionable, to be withdrawn. If this pattern developed, debate in this House would cease. One can imagine what would happen if in the next five minutes the honorable member for Broadmeadows applied another well-deserved adjective and the Minister sought a withdrawal—the proceedings in this House would become farcical.

Any honorable member has the right to ask for a withdrawal of a word, but it is the proper function of the Chair to adjudicate on whether the request is reasonable.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): On the point of order, obviously the Attorney-General is still consumed with guilt because of his performance last week. Within the forms and usages of the House, two categories of terms have been the subject of rulings from the Chair. The first term has been ruled as clearly unparliamentary and the term has been withdrawn. The other category is where an honorable member may find a term used to be offensive. In that situation, he is entitled to ask for a withdrawal but it is for the Chair to indicate whether the words so used fall within a category which would entitle a normal and reasonable honorable member to be offended.

When one hears some of the colorful language used by the Chief Secretary, it is not beyond credibility that some honorable member might find the words used by him to be offensive. However, honorable members who know him well have become used to his colorful expressions and are not easily offended.

Mr. ROSSITER: What about the basis of your argument?

Mr. HOLDING: The basis of my argument is simply that the House could reach a stage where eventually any statement could become the subject of the sort of objection taken by the Attorney-General. To suggest that the honorable gentleman may have prostituted the rights of the House may well be offensive to him, and the honorable gentleman has a right to ask for a withdrawal. However, to suggest that the Attorney-General has grossly abused the forms of the House is merely a matter of opinion—I think he did—and would not come within the category where the Attorney-General, who is being somewhat tender in his approach these days, feels compelled to seek a withdrawal. This approach affects the whole nature of debate in this place. I believe you, Mr. Speaker, should satisfy yourself whether the term used is capable of constituting an offence to an average reasonable honorable member. Many terms have double meanings and double usages and the test is very much a subjective one. The objection taken by the Attorney-General is without substance. Such things affect the good conduct of this place and are contrary to its traditions.

Mr. MACLELLAN: What about an unreserved withdrawal?

Mr. HOLDING: I do not think it is an unreserved withdrawal. On many occasions, the Minister has used colorful, descriptive and unpleasant terms in the heat of debate.

Mr. WILCOX: And when asked to withdraw them, I have done so.

Mr. HOLDING: I regret that the Attorney-General can dish it out but cannot take it. I submit that you, Mr. Speaker, cannot uphold the view put by the Attorney-General because it would substantially affect the conduct of debate in this place.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The matter has been canvassed quite adequately. A number of honorable members have spoken to the point of order and the House has almost reached the stage when Standing Order No. 99, applies. It states—

> The House will interfere to prevent the prosecution of any quarrel between members, arising out of debate or proceedings of the House or any Committee thereof.

That Standing Order has almost become relevant to the present situation. I remind the House that Standing Order No. 94 states—

> No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.

A number of rulings have been given and one reference appears at page 100 of *Speakers' Rulings* 1856-7 to 1898 by Gavin Duffy, LL.B., Clerk Assistant. It states—

> A member should not use words which another says are personally offensive.

Many precedents are available for any honorable member who wishes to refer to them. I believe the first statement made by the honorable member for Broadmeadows was offensive, and that the Attorney-General was perfectly in order in asking for its withdrawal. In accordance with the usual traditions of this place, the honorable member for Broadmeadows withdrew the statement. He did make another statement but, in all fairness and in the best traditions of this place, I cannot agree that exception could be taken to the subsequent statement.

Mr. WILCOX: But I did take exception to it.

Mr. BORNSTEIN: It is up to the Speaker to decide whether the statement is offensive; there cannot be two rules.

The SPEAKER: There cannot be two rules, one for back-bench members and one for the Chair. I believe that the second statement made by the honorable member for Broadmeadows was not offensive. If the Attorney-General believes it cast some reflection on his character or his debating ability, he is quite entitled to ask for its withdrawal.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I found the substituted words used by the honorable member to be objectionable but if it will assist the proceedings of this House, the practice and forms of which I have been involved in for more than eighteen years and which I have never abused on any occasion, I will not insist on a withdrawal.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): The point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition related to the Opposition's position in this House and also to the long-standing practice concerning Ministerial statements and their contents. It is not necessary for me to read the appropriate section of *May* because you, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly closely scrutinized it when this matter was debated in relation to a Ministerial statement which was made a couple of weeks ago by the Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Will the honorable member come to the point of order?

Mr. WILTON: It is the view of the Opposition that a Ministerial statement must be confined to certain facts within the Minister's area of responsibility. What the Leader of the Opposition is trying to establish is that the Ministerial statement to be made by the Minister of Transport does in fact relate to matters within his area of responsibility—or is the House going to be subjected to another dose of a Minister's personal political philosophy?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! Will the honorable member come to the point of order?

Mr. WILTON: *May* sets out clearly what form a Ministerial statement should take and states that the subject-matter of the statement should be described. The Opposition is trying to establish whether the Government will honour the long-standing practice of Parliament.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): On the point of order, I do not believe the House is aware of what the original point of order was. The Leader of the Opposition asked you, Mr. Speaker, whether you had been given notice of the Ministerial statement and whether you had received a copy of it. The rules in *May*, which you know backwards, Mr. Speaker, require that you be given notice of a Ministerial statement. The Minister of Transport has advised me that, firstly, he gave you notice in writing and, secondly, that a Ministerial statement requires neither the permission of the Speaker nor the leave of the House.

That leaves you in the position, Mr. Speaker, that if need be, you may rule the Ministerial statement out of order for the reasons given in *May*. However, it would be premature to rule it out of order because not one word of the statement has yet been heard.

I submit that there is no point of order because you, Mr. Speaker, have received notice that the Ministerial statement would be made.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition was clear, and I cannot understand why there was any need for the debate which ensued. The Leader of the Opposition asked me whether the Minister had advised me that the Ministerial statement would be made. The answer is that the Minister did so advise me by letter two days ago. The Leader of the Opposition also asked me whether the Minister had advised me of what was contained in the Ministerial statement. I shall read from *May*, which has been thoroughly canvassed, and which has this to say—

> Prior notice to Mr. Speaker is necessary.

That has been complied with.

> But neither his permission nor the leave of the House is required.

The Minister did not give me a written statement setting out the contents of the Ministerial statement, but a verbal description, and I rule that the matter is perfectly in order.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, you have already advised the House that I gave you an indication of what was contained in the Ministerial statement which I am about to make, and I now assure the House that it is directly and vitally concerned with the administration of my department.

Since allocations of road funds to municipalities were made last month by the Country Roads Board, I have received a considerable number of representations from honorable members protesting that the level of funds is inadequate. In the circumstances I believe this House is entitled to a report on the position of road funds in Victoria following the enactment of recent legislation by the Commonwealth Parliament.

The legislation to which I refer is—

National Roads Act 1974, which provides total funds for the construction and maintenance of national roads.

Roads Grants Act 1974, which provides financial assistance for roads other than national roads.

Transport (Planning and Research) Act 1974, which provides financial assistance for planning and research in connection with both roads and urban public transport.

The National Roads and Roads Grants Acts received Royal Assent on 20th September, 1974—nearly three months after the expiration of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Agreement 1969—and are effective for a three-year period to 30th June, 1977.

The Transport (Planning and Research) Act received Royal assent on 21st August, 1974, and is also effective to 30th June, 1977.

Before outlining the manner in which the Commonwealth Government seeks to control Victoria's roads programme through these Acts, I wish to reflect briefly on the sequence of events which preceded the framing of this legislation.

A report produced by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads entitled "Report on Roads in Australia 1973" was released in mid-December, 1973—it was to form the basis of the new roads legislation.

The report was based on road data collected by State road authorities and on other material obtained and analyses made by the bureau. It is estimated to have cost Victoria almost $700,000 to compile detailed information sought by the bureau for this report.

A meeting of the six State Ministers responsible for roads was convened in Sydney on 23rd January, 1974, to discuss the recommendations contained in the report.

At this meeting all six State Ministers expressed total opposition to the recommendations relating to the Commonwealth assuming the right to tell the States how to spend their own taxes and to the detailed controls proposed by the Commonwealth. The Ministers resolved to seek talks with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, Mr. Jones.

In a letter dated 18th February, 1974, I informed Mr. Jones of the recommendations contained in the bureau's report to which I objected. In summary, these objections related to—

- The detailed control the Commonwealth seeks to exercise over State road programmes. These controls must result in duplication of effort and long analyses of simple projects.
- The provision requiring States to raise a high sum of money from its own resources in matching grants—thereby forcing States to increase taxation on motorists.
- The loss of funds for State urban and rural roads brought about by the redirection of some funds to national roads.
- The inordinate delays which would be caused by the Commonwealth's detailed involvement in the planning of urban road systems.
- The requirement to obtain Commonwealth consent for the most minor safety and operational improvement on any road.
- The concept of committees to "formulate strategy", which would interfere with the working machinery set up in the various States to develop planning strategy for the community as a whole.
- The enormous additional administrative burden which would be placed on the States if these procedures were adopted.
- The fact that the Commonwealth seeks control of the planning of road systems which include no Commonwealth money.

These points were reaffirmed at the meeting between Mr. Jones and State Ministers responsible for roads, which took place on 19th February this year. Mr. Jones said that he would note the comments of State Ministers and discuss them with his colleagues. He refused to reply to the comments by State Ministers or to indicate to what extent the Commonwealth intended to agree with the bureau's recommendations. Contrary to past practice, he did not at any time submit to the States a draft agreement for discussion. The new roads Bills introduced to the House of Representatives without any further discussion with the States proved that little or no notice had been taken of State views.

I want to make it perfectly clear that opposition to the roads legislation is widespread—it does not just emanate from State Governments.

In order to highlight the extent of the concern over a virtual Commonwealth takeover of roads, I refer to the comments of the Australian Automobile Association. In a submission to the Commonwealth Government on the bureau's report, the Australian Automobile Association stated—

> The State and local government also have a greater degree of what can perhaps best be described as local knowledge—a greater familiarity with the problems and difficulties of particular areas.
>
> To overrule this expertise and local knowledge would not only be wrong but uneconomic.
>
> If the Australian Government through the Bureau of Roads is to have the power to approve or disapprove the programmes of the various roads authorities—even the individual projects—it will entail an unnecessary build-up of staff.
>
> This staff would need to be highly trained and specially qualified and—regardless of whether or not such people could be found —would be a blatant example of staff duplication.
>
> A less kindly description would be empire building!
>
> Further diseconomies would result from the delays inherent in the proposal that all States road programmes, even those already under way, should be subject to Federal approval.

On 15th March, 1974, the President of the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria said—

> We oppose the recommendation that the Commonwealth should have overriding power to say where and which roads should be constructed and redeveloped as this can only lead to delays in construction work and greatly increased expenditure.

Despite the fact that every State Government, many municipalities and motoring organizations of the stature of the Australian Automobile Association and the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria voiced their opposition to the controls the Commonwealth seeks to exert over State road programmes, the Commonwealth pressed ahead with the legislation.

In framing the legislation the Commonwealth Government tightened the detailed controls it plans to exercise over State expenditure on roads, and also reduced the grants recommended. In the case of Victoria, the bureau's recommended $293 million was reduced to $232 million—down $61 million over three years.

The three Bills were introduced into the Federal Parliament in mid-July this year. A number of amendments to the national roads and roads grants Bills were carried in the Senate and accepted by the House of Representatives. Because the Roads Grants Act is of particular concern to the States, I will mainly refer to this Act.

The most important of the amendments to this Act was the elimination of the need for the States to obtain approval for their roads programmes from not only the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, but also the Minister for Urban and Regional Development, and the Minister for the Environment and Conservation. The amendment deleted the latter two Ministers from the Act. The involvement of the Commonwealth Treasurer was also modified.

Clearly, the intention of the Federal Parliament in removing the names of the Minister for Urban and Regional Development and the Minister for the Environment and Conservation from the Act was to obviate the need for States to deal with a number of Commonwealth departments on road matters because of the confusion and consequent delays this procedure would create.

The Commonwealth Government, however, by using the reference to "a Minister" in the Acts as relating to any Commonwealth Minister, intends evading the obvious objective of the Federal Parliament in amending the legislation.

This approach to the administration of the Acts has been confirmed in statements from senior Commonwealth officers, indicating that the Federal Cabinet decided that the previously intended administrative arrangements will be observed.

In other words, the Commonwealth Government is ignoring the will of the Federal Parliament and is proceeding as if the Act has been passed unamended.

Let us now examine some of the provisions of the Roads Grants Act, 1974. Section 4 (1) of the Act states—

> A Minister may notify a State the date before which a programme of projects in respect of a period to which this section applies, being projects of a special kind, is to be submitted to him for approval, and may, if the notice relates to a programme of projects by way of the construction of urban arterial roads, in the notice, inform the State that the programme should include all the projects of that kind that are to be carried out by the State and by municipal, shire and other local authorities in that period.

Section 4 (1) provides that the States will, if called upon, be required to submit programmes for all road works carried out on urban arterial roads—defined as arterial and sub-arterial roads in the Act—by any authority involved in road construction; there are some 500 road construction authorities in this State alone.

The immense administrative machinery that will need to be set up in Canberra to analyse the road works programmes of these and similar bodies throughout Australia and the delays in road construction that will inevitably follow must be obvious. Perhaps this is a subtle attack on unemployment—men dismissed from road building are to be employed on bureaucratic form filling!

The Commonwealth has modified the conditions relating to the programmes of local authorities for the period 1st January to 30th June, 1975, simply because neither it nor the States could cope with the flood of data which would need to pour in from the States. Only the other week we saw the spectacle of further increases in the Commonwealth Public Service by the placing of full-page advertisements in papers for staff who will be employed to duplicate the work of State road authorities.

I have received a letter dated 24th October, 1974, from Mr. Jones. Referring to the Roads Grants Act, Mr. Jones stated—

> In accordance with clause 4 (1) of the Act I now request that your State submit a proposed programme of works for urban arterial roads for the period 1st January to 30th June, 1975. In accordance with the power given under that sub-clause, I ask that the programme include all road projects which are to be financed from Australian Government grants, together with projects financed either in whole or part from the State's own resources.

I draw the attention of honorable members to the fact that the programmes are to be submitted whether the Commonwealth provides funds for the project or not.

During an interview on the *Labour Hour* on radio station 3KZ on 27th October this year, Mr. Jones said, when remarking on what the Commonwealth does with petrol tax taken from the States—

> Now we raised the money, and I say we the Australian Government, raised the money by way of fuel tax—and we are the ones that are going to decide where it's going to be spent.

If Mr. Jones wishes to use that criterion for expenditure of road funds he clearly cannot justify his attempt to usurp the right of States and local governments to themselves determine the expenditure of the sums they raise.

However, Mr. Jones invalidates his own propositions by saying to the States, "We will spend the money we raise the way we want to, but you cannot spend the money you raise the way you want to." This is a typical example of the sort of inconsistency with which the States have to contend.

Attached to the letter from Mr. Jones is a list of headings, under which the details of every arterial and sub-arterial project in Victoria must be submitted. In order to place into perspective the size of the administrative load being forced on the State I now list the headings. Comprehensive investigations and studies will be required of social, environmental, land use and

economic issues and considerations including travel demand; economic warrant; safety; preservation and enhancement of the environment; equity; consistency and contribution to urban and regional development; and co-ordinated transport development.

Mr. Jones says that the studies and investigations are to be undertaken on a number of alternatives, including a "no-build" alternative, plus extent of planning undertaken, including the alternative road, transport and other solutions considered and the reasons for selecting the proposed scheme; objectives of the project; itemised costs; transportation service, including public transport; results of economic evaluations; housing relocation and compensation; urban form and development, including basic land use plan involved; community or regional economics; landscape, open and historic resources; air and noise pollution; community social arrangements; ecology; physical and human resource requirements; environmental impact statement as appropriate—or a statement expressing the view of the State Environment Protection Authority.

Detailed location, alignment and extent of the project are to be identified by the State by such means as photomosaics, maps, plans and descriptions; design traffic capacity, including level of service and design and operational speed; length of project; access control (full, partial, nil); maximum grades; cross-section details, including numbers and widths of lanes, shoulder widths; median and right-of-way widths; expected pavement; possibility of flooding; bridges and other structures; description, number location, type and design loading; operational details: traffic control devices, priority options, reserve lanes, street lighting; connections to adjacent street network; landscaping, aesthetics, noise screening; land and property acquisition; demolition of buildings; and an outline of staging of road and structure works, if applicable, and their related traffic operation. This is for every project irrespective of its size.

It is of course the practice of State road authorities, including municipalities, to take into account all appropriate factors when planning roads, but to require States and local government authorities to send to Canberra this detailed information for every arterial or sub-arterial road project is unrealistic and would cause havoc to State and local government road programmes.

The cost to the State of providing this mass of information will run into many millions of dollars a year—the $700,000 spent on supplying information to the Bureau of Roads will fade into insignificance. This estimate does not take into account the further losses which must be caused by inevitable delays brought about by lost opportunities to undertake projects; uncertainties regarding the commencement of works; loss of amenity to road users through delayed completion of works; and dislocation of projects under way and a reduced purchasing power of funds when they are eventually received.

In addition to requiring these detailed submissions for every arterial and sub-arterial road project, similar rigorous conditions have to be fulfilled for all national road projects. It is interesting to observe that the Commonwealth expects the States to go to these extraordinary lengths in submitting data on road projects, yet the Commonwealth has proceeded with the construction and exhibition of a mock-up of a standard train without even draft specifications for the project.

Section 4(6) of the Roads Grants Act goes to the extreme of requiring the States to obtain Commonwealth approval to purchase road-making plant. In other words, if the Country Roads Board needs a grader, a submission may have to be sent to Canberra for analysis and approval

before it could be purchased. Clause 9 of the Bill refers to the quota requirements of the Commonwealth.

Over three years under the terms of the three Acts the Commonwealth is to provide Victoria with $71·4 million for national roads, $156·6 million for roads other than national roads and $4 million for planning and research relating to both roads and urban public transport. In order to obtain this sum Victoria is required to raise a quota of $281·2 million over the same period from its own resources. Victoria therefore becomes the major shareholder in this operation. Furthermore unless Victoria raises this $281·2 million and spends it in accordance with Commonwealth wishes, Commonwealth funds may be withheld.

It is interesting to note that the Commonwealth will take well in excess of $500 million from Victorian motorists in the next three years and return less than half in grants for roads. Yet the Commonwealth will force this State to raise $282·2 million from its own resources—thereby compelling the State to place an unnecessary burden on Victorian motorists by increasing motor registration fees.

State road finances are to be further eroded by the comparatively low level of Commonwealth allocations. For the past three years of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act 1969, contributions from the Commonwealth for road funds had been increasing by a little more than 14 per cent per annum. Yet over the three years 1974-75 to 1976-77, the rate of growth has decreased to about 8 per cent in the first year and remains static for the two succeeding years at a time when inflation is running at approximately 20 per cent.

It has been estimated that under these Commonwealth proposals the value of allocations to Victoria over the next three years will, in real terms, be down at least 23 per cent on the previous three years.

Because of the decrease in the real value of Commonwealth funds Victoria and its municipalities will be left with no option but to reduce their road works programmes.

Even increases in motor registration fees will not bridge the gap brought about by the reduction, in real value, of Commonwealth funds and will result in the curtailment of road works worth $78 million and jeopardize the jobs of hundreds of people employed in the road construction industry.

It is very significant that the State is required to increase such basic costs as motor vehicle fees—in an attempt to minimize the need to reduce important road works—which apply to commercial vehicles as well as private vehicles and as such enter into the cost structure for the movement of all goods. How can this be reconciled with an anti-inflation policy?

Section 11 (2) makes the State responsible in all detail for anything which any road-constructing body may do and if any road-constructing body—and remember there are more than 500 in Victoria—spends any money at all on an arterial or sub-arterial road project not approved by a Commonwealth Minister, the State in effect will be "fined". Section 12 (1) (*e*) reaffirms this arbitrary power. The term "a" in this context would appear to mean any Commonwealth Minister who cares to interfere.

Section 12 (1) (*c*) provides that the States, if requested to do so, will arrange for representatives of the Commonwealth Government to take part in deliberations of a body specified by the Commonwealth Minister. This body is to be one specified by the Commonwealth Minister as one established by the State to carry out planning and furnish advice in connection with the provision and maintenance of roads. This provision is far-reaching as it changes the constitutional responsibility of Commonwealth, State and local governments and reduces the ability of an elector

to vote for a specified policy put forward at a State or municipal election for such a policy can, in effect, be vetoed by the Commonwealth Minister.

It is apparent that the Commonwealth seeks to require the State to organize its own administration according to the dictates of the Commonwealth Government.

Section 15 (1) permits "a Minister" to delegate all his powers under clause 4 to a Commonwealth public servant. This, in effect, will place this officer above elected representatives of other Governments and grossly violates the democratic process of taxation with representation and responsibility.

So far as the National Roads and Transport Planning and Research Acts are concerned, there is a place for the Commonwealth in these areas, but the Commonwealth Government is not interested in working co-operatively with the States—it seeks to dominate and control.

Section 4 of the National Roads Act exemplifies this approach as it leaves room for the Commonwealth virtually to take over responsibility for any road which "facilitates trade and commerce" between States or with other countries. This would mean practically any road, and could be used to dictate layouts and plans of ports, railway yards, and so on.

Only last week Mr. Jones stated that he intended to invoke his powers and take over two Queensland highways, and when asked about Queensland's attitude to this takeover Mr. Jones is reported to have said, "I am afraid the Premier has not much say in this one".

The National Roads Act will also adversely affect Victoria's rural areas as the Commonwealth has redirected funds to national roads at the expense of general road works in rural areas.

With regard to the Transport Planning and Research Act, there is a clear need for substantial funds for these purposes. Again, however, the Commonwealth has gone so far as to use its financial strength to enter into fields in which it has no special expertise. For example, in his second-reading speech, Mr. Jones referred to Commonwealth studies of fare structures and technological advances. Clearly, this would mean interference in State budgetary procedures, not through financial channels, but through the transport area.

Because the Commonwealth is unable to administer the three Acts, it has been forced to provide funds to the States on an interim grants basis without the States providing the detailed information required under the Acts.

After waiting three months, Victoria received $14·98 million midway through October. This three-month delay cost Victoria in excess of $750,000 in lost purchasing power as inflation eroded the real value of the funds eventually provided.

A three-month delay in receiving $17·4 million for national roads, $52·3 million for roads other than national roads and $1·3 million for transport planning and research promised under the terms of the Acts for 1974-75, amounts to $3·7 million in lost purchasing power.

This sort of delay is an example of what we can expect if all the detail that the Commonwealth requires on specific roads programmes must be sent to Canberra.

There are many objectionable aspects to the three roads Acts but the five points of major concern are—

1. Taxes and charges raised by elected local and State Governments are to be spent in a way determined by Commonwealth Ministers or Commonwealth public servants.

2. The considerable delays and increased costs caused by unnecessary duplication of effort.

3. Victoria's share of Commonwealth roads funds will, in real value, be substantially reduced. Because of the reduced Commonwealth funds and the Commonwealth "quota"

requirements, Victoria will be forced to increase motor registration fees. Even then the roads programme will need to be reduced.

4. The Commonwealth, without detailed local or expert know-how on the subject of road building requirements, is to pass judgment on State road projects—even the most minor road improvements.

5. The State is to be responsible in all detail for anything which any road constructing body may do and if any road constructing body spends any money at all on a project not approved by the Commonwealth, the State, in effect, may be "fined".

The legislation gives the Commonwealth Minister for Transport virtually complete control over roads and will lead to the establishment of a new and all-powerful central administration remote from, and inexperienced in, the realities of road needs.

However, if the demands of Mr. Jones in his letter of 24th October, 1974, are to be met it will be apparent to even the most casual observer that he is claiming the right to interfere in many State Ministries other than transport. These include at least the Treasury, the Chief Secretary's, local government, planning, conservation, housing, lands and public works departments.

The legislation ignores the constitutional responsibilities of the different Governments and places even minor administrative decisions in the hands of the Public Service of Canberra, and the result can only be fewer roads, more delays, uncertainties in construction, a system which is in a state of chaos, and enormously increased costs to the whole community.

The responsible and less expensive alternative is for the Commonwealth to make a reasonable allocation of petrol tax funds to the States so that State and local government road construction programmes may be maintained at proper levels to enable them to channel road funds into those projects where those people with the local and specific knowledge of the problems can make the decisions.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks today have been designed simply to place the facts relating to Commonwealth legislation and attitudes before this House and by so doing before the people of Australia. The cost of the administrative mess created by the Commonwealth Acts to which I have referred will be borne, as I have shown, by the motorist, who will be forced to pay more for fewer roads, by the consumer in higher transport costs and by road authority employees who will lose their jobs. This is bad enough but there will be an even higher price to be paid by all of us—the loss of freedom to determine regional and local policies, and the ultimate destruction of all constitutional safeguards against the arbitrary use and abuse of highly-centralized power. This type of action, power for which has been constantly denied to the Commonwealth in many referendums, will be imposed upon the Australian community by the Commonwealth if its implications are not fully exposed. In the interests of responsible government and the economical and sensible expenditure of public money, I draw these facts to the attention of all honorable members and the public at large.

PETITION.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLY.

Sir EDGAR TANNER (Caulfield) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to amend existing legislation to ensure that fluoridation of any public water supply is not undertaken unless requested by a majority of voters in a referendum held in the area administered by the water trust concerned. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 181 signatures.

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

ACTING OMBUDSMAN.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler) announced that he had this day administered to Thomas Antony Neesham, Esquire, Acting Commissioner for Administrative Investigations, the oath required by section 10 of the Ombudsman Act 1973.

PAPERS.

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

Gas and Fuel Corporation—Report for the year 1973-74.—Ordered to be printed.

Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works —Statement of accounts, together with particulars of rates made, for the year 1973-74.

National Fitness Council—Report and statement of accounts for the year 1973-74.

NEWPORT POWER STATION.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): I wish to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the Minister for Fuel and Power to co-ordinate the use of the fuel resources of the State, in respect of the proposed Newport power station.

Approval of the proposed discussion was indicated by the required number of members rising in their places as specified in Standing Order No. 8B.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

One of the greatest controversies that have arisen in this State for some time has centred around the proposed Newport power station and the allocation of fuel resources to that power station.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: I cannot hear the honorable member.

Mr. AMOS: I am afraid the honorable member will have to listen a little more attentively.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member for Morwell has throat problems, and I ask honorable members to be patient and listen intently because it must be difficult for the honorable member to make himself heard.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) (*By leave*): The honorable member for Morwell has a throat infection and it is difficult for him to raise his voice. Would the House have any objection if he spoke from the table?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I invite the honorable member to speak from the table.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for the courtesy extended to me. As I said, one of the greatest controversies that have arisen for some time concerns the proposed Newport power station and the allocation of fuel resources to power it. Many questions have been raised inside this Chamber and by the community generally about the use of natural gas as a power source and, on the question of decentralization, the need for a power station at Newport.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The motion refers to "the failure of the Minister for Fuel and Power to co-ordinate the use of the fuel resources of the State in respect of the proposed Newport power station". That wording narrows the debate considerably.

Mr. AMOS: I have moved this motion to allow debate on the failure of the Minister to co-ordinate the fuel resources of Victoria, particularly in respect of the Newport power station. Many statements have been made about the need for a co-ordinated fuel policy. For many years the Labor Party has directed attention to the need for a co-ordinated fuel and power policy which would bring about a better evaluation of the fuel resources for the benefit of the people. Recently the Premier has appeared to take over from the Minister for Fuel and Power, and has referred to a proposed White Paper on this subject and the intention of the Government to appoint a Select Committee to

investigate the recommendations of that White Paper and to examine the fuel and energy resources of Victoria.

If the fuel resources needed for the proposed Newport power station are related to the motion before the Chair, and if the question is asked what fuel resources are to be used to power this proposed station, one has to turn to the report entitled "Proposed Extension to State Generating System, Newport", produced by the State Electricity Commission in 1971. Paragraph 28 of that report states, *inter alia*—

> It is realized that part of the declared reserves of natural gas in the Victorian deposits must be kept available for industrial, commercial and domestic purposes and this consideration has already been taken into account in the recent allocation by your Ministry of 0·8 million million cubic feet of natural gas for power generation over a 20-year period.

An examination of the implication of that will show that the total reserves of Bass Strait natural gas are at present estimated to be approximately 8·5 trillion cubic feet. The estimated resource figure has changed over the years since the discovery of natural gas in Bass Strait. The reserves have been updated, further drillings have been made and certain other exploratory work has been carried out. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the reserves generally spoken about in Bass Strait are estimated to be 8·5 trillion to 9 trillion cubic feet. The report to which I have referred suggests an initial allocation of 0·8 trillion cubic feet for Newport over a period of twenty years.

If one looks at further reports and examines other recommendations on gas-fired power stations, one will see that there is need to give a further option on gas reserves. It is not unfair to talk about allocating a reserve of between 1·2 and 1·8 trillion cubic feet, which is a reserve of approximately 15 per cent for power station generation. Therefore an allocation of, say, 15 per cent of our natural gas resources for a peak load power station will seriously deplete gas reserves for other uses. One then questions whether a properly planned co-ordinated policy on the use of natural gas reserves would have resulted in a situation where the State Electricity Commission maintains that it requires this type of fuel for the Newport power station. When considering that aspect one has to look at all the views of other people on a co-ordinated fuel policy and about the use of natural gas to fire a power station.

Recently Mr. L. J. Clark, the President of the International Gas Union, proposed to deliver, at a conference held at the Southern Cross Hotel, a paper entitled *The Role of the International Gas Union in World Energy*. I was fortunate in being able to hear Mr. Clark speak. Although his address to the conference was not the same as the written paper he submitted, his paper received a great deal of publicity. I refer to the report of "The Thirteenth Annual Convention of the Australian Gas Association" held in Melbourne from 13th to 17th October, 1974. At page 3, Mr. Clark stated that the world was using fossil fuels at a rate 100 times faster than a century ago. He said—

> In regard to oil and gas, more energy from these sources will probably be consumed in the next ten years than has been used since the beginning of time.

At page 4 Mr. Clark stated—

> Though political situations dominate some aspects of the present world energy problems, they could well be a blessing in disguise to halt man's greedy and headstrong rush to plunder and empty nature's storehouse of fuel reserves.

The significance of what Mr. Clark had to say about co-ordinated fuel usage is best summarized by the Chairman of the Gas and Fuel Corporation in a summary of the papers delivered to that conference. Mr. Clark's view is summarized as follows—

> At the present time in terms of total fossil fuel reserves, natural gas is the smallest of the energy resources and with the growing demand for this popular and efficient fuel,

care must be taken to ensure that it is used only in markets where its special qualities are employed to maximum advantage.

He considered that the use of gas for crude heat such as large-scale boiler firing is inept and wasteful unless it is used for special circumstances prevailing in the region.

That supports the contention the Opposition has consistently put to this House regarding the firing of the Newport power station by natural gas. Mr. Clark is a person of considerable experience in the co-ordination of fuel resources and he has said that he considers the use of natural gas for crude heat such as large-scale boiler firing is inept and wasteful unless it is used for the special circumstances prevailing in the region.

Following Mr. Clark's address, questions were raised in this Chamber about the use of natural gas for the firing of the power station. As reported at page 1740 of *Hansard* of 30th October, 1974, I asked the Premier about the use of this resource, and whether he had reconsidered the decision in view of the statements made by a gas expert with wide international experience. I was referring to Mr. Clark. The Premier replied—

All he said, in effect, was that if it is necessary to use natural gas for the generation of peak-load electricity, it is advisable to design the station so that it can be used with other fuels as well because world reserves—

The Premier was saying that Mr. Clark, the international expert referred to, did not mean that the firing by natural gas in this power station was wasteful, but that it was desirable to design the power station so that it could be operated on another fuel. Honorable members know that the Newport power station is designed to run on an alternative source of energy—oil. Honorable members also know from statements made in this Chamber, and from industrial knowledge, that the agreement secured between Esso-Hematite and the State Electricity Commission does allow for an interrupted gas supply for the power station.

When the Opposition has asked the Minister for Fuel and Power for details of the agreement to reach a proper evaluation of the allocation of fuel reserves in Victoria and to ascertain whether the State Electricity Commission and the Government were correct in their assessment of peak-load requirements, the Minister for Fuel and Power has consistently refused to divulge the details.

In replying to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier is reported in the *Sun News-Pictorial* of 12th November as having said in regard to the State Electricity Commission's negotiated arrangement with Esso-Hematite—

... industries which were prepared to take an interrupted supply and not have first call on supplies, if they were rationed, could expect to get gas cheaper.

Previously the Minister for Fuel and Power was reported as having said—

Supply of gas to the State Electricity Commission for Newport could also be interrupted while the corporation was guaranteed supplies for every day of the year.

It seems to the Opposition extraordinary that the Government would commit the State to the expenditure of well in excess of $130 million or $140 million for the building of this power station when a source of energy to fire it was uncertain. One could draw no other conclusion from the remarks of the Minister for Fuel and Power and the Premier, mainly because of the failure and refusal of the Government to provide the House with details of the special secret negotiations with Esso-Hematite about which we were asking.

If one talked in industrial circles about the price paid for natural gas by industry and what deals are available, one could receive all sorts of answers. None of these answers can be confirmed by the Opposition; they can be confirmed only by the Government. Therefore, I ask the Minister for Fuel and Power and the Government either to confirm or deny the facts that the Opposition will put forward concerning its knowledge of the secret negotiated

deal with Esso-Hematite and the State Electricity Commission and its unco-ordinated use of fuel resources in this fashion.

I call upon the Government to confirm or deny that the State Electricity Commission of Victoria has been able to purchase gas from Bass Strait by a direct deal with the suppliers, Esso-Hematite, at a price of 2·5 cents a therm. I ask the Government to confirm or deny that the Gas and Fuel Corporation at present is paying to the suppliers of natural gas between 2·9 cents and 3·1 or 3·2 cents a therm for natural gas. I ask the House to question the wisdom of any statement made by the Premier or the Minister for Fuel and Power to the effect that the Government will build a power station and commit the State to the expenditure of millions of dollars, although it cannot guarantee a supply of fuel to fire the power station.

I ask the House to consider the wisdom of allowing this type of deal to take place and of the Government asking the House to consider the sorts of propositions that have been put to it without providing details to allow members to reach a proper evaluation about the co-ordinated use of fuel resources in Victoria.

I ask the Minister for Fuel and Power or the Premier to confirm or deny the existence of a 25-year contract which the Gas and Fuel Corporation has with the suppliers of natural gas in Victoria; that its price is not 2·9 cents a therm; that the contractual arrangement with the suppliers allows the corporation approximately only 500 million cubic feet of gas at that price; that any additional gas is sold at a new price; and that the special non-escalating contract about which honorable members have heard so much applies only to gas which comes into the first category.

I ask the Government to confirm or deny that a stage is rapidly approaching when that first allocation of gas to which I referred will be exhausted. I ask the Government to confirm or deny that the allocation of 15 per cent of the reserve for the purposes of firing a power station will not affect the capacity of the Gas and Fuel Corporation to negotiate properly a better price when this contractual arrangement is reached in the near future.

These questions require answers, but they cannot wait until the Government at its leisure establishes a Select Committee of the House to investigate the fuel and power resources of the State, or until the Ministry of Fuel and Power brings down its White Paper. Surely the Opposition is entitled to put forward the view that in the years since the formation of the Ministry of Fuel and Power in approximately 1967 there has been ample time for the Ministry to produce a White Paper detailing how natural resources in Victoria are used and setting out what their best use ought to be and where they can best be applied.

The Minister for Fuel and Power has had ample time to advise the House about the best use of these resources. As the honorable gentleman has not done so, the Opposition is not surprised at the statement reported in the *Age* of 9th November when the Chairman of the Gas and Fuel Corporation announced gas price increases of up to 9 per cent for all Victorians. The Opposition is not surprised at the inability of the corporation to negotiate properly with the suppliers because of the special arrangements that have been made beween Esso-Hematite and the State Electricity Commission.

I ask the Government to confirm or deny that these special arrangements were made during 1971 at a time when Colonial Gas Holdings Ltd. had the franchise area for Newport and Williamstown. That company was aware of its rights to supply gas to industry in that area. At that time the Gas and Fuel Corporation was not directly involved, but surely the major gas and fuel authority in this State ought to have been consulted about the project and the pricing arrangements which were being

entered into. I challenge the Government to tell the House what consultations took place between the State Electricity Commission, Esso-Hematite, the Government, Colonial Gas Holdings Ltd., and the Gas and Fuel Corporation.

These are some of the questions which exercise the minds of all honorable members. The need for answers to these questions is apparent because the Gas and Fuel Corporation has just announced a 9 per cent increase in the price of gas. A controversy is raging about the proposed Newport power station, and there is an urgent need for the Government to arrive at a co-ordinated policy on the usage of Victoria's fuel reserves. It is ludicrous that the two main fuel authorities in this State often act in completely different ways and spend huge sums of money in advertising campaigns to try to capture a share of the fuel market. The Premier, in a statement reported in the *Herald* of 6th November about the lack of a gas and electricity link-up, said—

> But... the need for competition between the two may be limited, or even eliminated, after a White Paper on Victoria's energy sources and needs is produced.

Why has not this White Paper been produced? Why has it been possible that from 1967 until 1974 there has not been a co-ordinated approach to the usage of Victoria's fuel and energy reserves?

On 20th October, in answer to a question, the Minister for Fuel and Power referred to the amount of money used for advertising by the Gas and Fuel Corporation and the State Electricity Commission. The Minister said on that occasion that $1·3 million was spent by the commission and that $320,000 was spent by the Gas and Fuel Corporation on advertising their various products.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The honorable member's time has expired.

On the motion of Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows), Standing Order No. 8B was suspended to enable the honorable member for Morwell to continue his speech for fifteen minutes.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): I thank the honorable member for Broadmeadows and other honorable members for their courtesy.

Even the Premier seems to agree that there is a need for rationalization in the advertising budgets of the State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation. It is my opinion and the belief of the Opposition that if it were not for the State Electricity Commission's vigorous advertising campaign designed to capture the domestic market, the commission would not be in its present position in regard to peak-load requirements.

Mr. HAMER: There would be no peak.

Mr. AMOS: I take up the interjection of the Premier, but not in total because I believe there still would be a peak load. Industry still requires electricity because natural gas cannot fully compensate industry that requires electricity for motive power. However, 40 per cent to 50 per cent of peak-load demand is caused by domestic users, especially in the evenings. I ask the Minister for Fuel and Power, when he replies to my speech, to give a further explanation of this matter. If 40 per cent to 50 per cent of the peak demand is in the domestic field, that certainly brings to light what I am trying to put to the House.

If the State Electricity Commission had not vigorously advertised and campaigned for that domestic market that could be just as easily and possibly better covered by the Gas and Fuel Corporation, it would not face the problems it does today.

The State Electricity Commission, in forecasting its energy requirement increases, has ranged from 10 per cent a year; it talks about doubling its electricity generation every ten years. But it then states that because of the decline in migration and the decrease

in industrial development, requirements will increase by only 6 or 7 per cent a year. If one studies the reports, as my colleagues have done, one realizes that the forecasts made by the State Electricity Commission bear no relationship to actual usage and peak demand. My colleagues will elaborate on this later in the debate. The information given to the Opposition and to this House is by no means adequate. Honorable members should have been given the details of the contractual arrangements reached between the suppliers of natural gas and the Gas and Fuel Corporation. They should have been advised of the details of arrangements reached between Esso-Hematite and the State Electricity Commission. For years the Government has neglected to ensure the proper use of Victoria's fuel and energy resources and only now, when gas and electricity prices are due to rise, does it talk about bringing out White Papers and appointing Select Committees to examine the issue. It is a bit late to be putting the cart before the horse. Certainly the horse ought to have been put before the cart. Members of the Opposition should have been given the courtesy of being supplied with this information to allow this House to make a value judgment on the issue.

If the Government stands condemned on any issue it stands condemned on that of the Newport power station; it also stands condemned for its failure to give this House the details; it stands condemned for its failure at least to refer the whole question to a Select Committee of this Parliament; and it stands condemned in the public eye for the increases in gas and electricity charges that have been foisted on the public.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power) : I have listened with interest to the honorable member for Morwell. I do not believe he has proof that I as Minister, the Ministry of Fuel and Power or the Government has failed to co-ordinate the use of Victoria's fuel resources in respect of the proposed Newport power station. The Government's policy is to make the best use of Victoria's fuel resources for the economic benefit of the community. This is why the Ministry was established in 1967. Since that time it has been doing that job. During those years the gas industry has changed from an industry which manufactured its own gas and sold it to consumers at a high price to an industry that is now a distributor, purchasing natural gas from a producer and distributing it to its various customers at a much lower price than that of the manufactured gas. In view of the recent increased price of oil, the Gas and Fuel Corporation has done exceedingly well. From time to time members of this House praise its efforts. I assure the House that the Ministry and the Government have kept the needs of both the State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation closely under review.

For the past 50 years Victoria has been producing its base-load electricity in the Latrobe Valley. As all honorable members are aware, Victoria has a wonderful resource of brown coal in that area, and while it can be mined readily and taken by conveyor belts into power stations to produce electricity, that can be done at a cheap cost. However, owing to its 64 per cent moisture content, if one were to endeavour to transfer brown coal to some other location the operation would become costly; the only way to do it would be to briquette it —this has been done—and transfer it in that form for use in the generation of power.

As far as possible in Victoria hydro-electric activities have been developed at Kiewa, Eildon and on Lake Hume where Victoria shares a station with New South Wales. Victoria receives one-third of the power generated in the Snowy Mountains area. The stage has been reached when Victoria has fully committed its hydro-electric power for peak-load electricity and is not able to provide peak loading with the brown coal stations. The commission, therefore, had to think of some other type of

station to meet the need. After a great deal of thought and examination the decision to build Newport was made. At that time three options of fuel were available—gas, oil or pump storage.

Pump storage was investigated. The cost of installing pump storage to provide a similar amount of electricity to that which would be provided by the Newport station, which was nominated to cost $145 million, was about $280 million.

Mr. DOUBE: What site was explored?

Mr. BALFOUR: Sites north of Seymour were investigated.

Mr. DOUBE: North of Seymour could be all the way up to the North Pole. What site was explored?

Mr. BALFOUR: North of Seymour means a few miles north of Seymour in anyone's language.

Mr. DOUBE: I thought you would have been more exact.

Mr. BALFOUR: In order to have pump storage, base-load electricity must be available at night, and at that time it was not available. It is hoped that in the years to come when the Loy Yang plant is constructed it will be possible for pump storage to be used for intermediate load or peak-load electricity.

Oil was considered. In order to generate electricity at the same rate as would be required at Newport a 30 per cent load factor would be involved and this would require 900,000 tonnes of fuel oil annually. That is more than the quantity of fuel oil being currently used in Victoria. At that time oil was not as costly as it is today, but on today's figures honorable members would appreciate that that would be a considerable sum of money, possibly six or seven times more than the cost of natural gas.

Gas was thoroughly examined. When a request was made to the Ministry by the State Electricity Commission for an allocation of gas for the production of electricity, it was possible that New South Wales might have received its gas from Bass Strait; negotiations were taking place. This matter was thoroughly examined by the late Mr. Bill Roberts, who was then secretary of the Ministry, and later by Mr. Cook, of the Mines Department. Knowing the amount of gas available and knowing the expected requirements of the Gas and Fuel Corporation, and because this station was to be in a particular situation, the Ministry advised the State Electricity Commission that for a peak load station for the first twenty years 0·8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas could be allocated and for the next ten years 0·4 trillion cubic feet. The Government believes that this would be a suitable use for gas.

When all is said and done, how will gas be used? Ultimately it will be burnt. One has to decide whether special circumstances exist and whether gas should be used to produce electricity to run trams, trains, lifts and wheels in factories or whether it should be burnt under gas stoves, in space heaters, in boilers of factories, hospitals and other places.

The honorable member for Morwell quoted from papers delivered by Mr. Clark. I realize that Mr. Clark is an eminent gentleman in the gas industry. It has been my pleasure to meet him and a lot of other people connected with the gas industry. He said, that the use of gas is wasteful unless it is "used for special circumstances prevailing in the region". There was some publicity about Mr. Clark, who was quoted as having said that degrading gas was too good for this and that it should not be used in power stations.

In 1967 I visited Italy, primarily to study pipelining there. I also had the opportunity, during three or four days in the Po Valley, of talking to people in the gas industry. When I returned to Australia a reporter asked me whether there was anything particular that I had learned. My reply to him was, "Yes, I learned that natural gas is a very valuable commodity and should not be wasted." That is still my view today. Throughout the world people say that it should

not be used for base load electricity but in special circumstances prevailing in the region, as has been stated by Mr. Clark, the production of electricity by the use of natural gas is a good and proper use.

Mr. DOUBE: I am pretty sure he would not agree with that.

Mr. BALFOUR: I could tell the honorable member of many people throughout the world who would agree with me on that.

Mr. DOUBE: Quote some.

Mr. BALFOUR: I refer to people in the American Gas Association and others who would say what Mr. Clark has said in his paper. The honorable member for Morwell read it; I did not bring it into the debate. It was reported in the *Sun News-Pictorial* of 15th October that Mr. Clark said that arguments about the power station affecting the environment were a red herring. In the report where he is alleged to have said that degrading gas is too good for this, that may well have been an interpretation by the gentleman who wrote the story rather than Mr. Clark's opinion.

Gas is being used for the generation of electricity. I do not wish to criticize South Australia, because there I believe special circumstances apply. The Torrens Island station in South Australia has a present capacity of 480 megawatts which run on a 90 per cent load factor, and that is being produced from natural gas. This enables Adelaide to receive natural gas.

Mr. HOLDING: No coal is being burnt there.

Mr. BALFOUR: I know that. Special circumstances apply.

I am not criticizing Mr. Dunstan for doing this. He is giving the population of Adelaide the opportunity of having natural gas as a fuel by bringing large quantities of gas to Adelaide. Kwinana, in Western Australia, which has problems, is using gas for base-loading generation. I do not criticize that.

The honorable member for Morwell referred to a quotation by Mr. Clark regarding the use of gas in special circumstances prevailing in the region. This was why it was decided that it would be reasonable and proper to use gas to fire the Newport power station.

Mr. DOUBE: It is difficult to know how the reasons the Minister has given involve special circumstances, as referred to by Mr. Clark.

Mr. BALFOUR: The Newport power station is a special circumstance in the city.

Mr. DOUBE: I think the Minister has misunderstood what Mr. Clark meant.

Mr. BALFOUR: I have visited other places in the world. I have stood on a tall building and counted the number of power stations in the city, some running on black coal and some on gas. It is a special circumstance to have a power station in a city. Certainly it would be more costly to run the station on oil and there would be greater dangers of pollution. If we are endeavouring to give the people of Victoria electricity at the cheapest possible price, we should use the cheapest possible fuel.

The honorable member for Morwell referred to contracts, and so on. I repeat that I am not prepared to divulge the contents of the contracts. I have discussed the matter with the chairmen of both authorities and the producers.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The Minister has one more minute.

On the motion of Mr. JONA (Hawthorn), Standing Order No. 8B was suspended to enable the Minister for Fuel and Power to continue his speech for ten minutes.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): I thank the honorable member for Hawthorn and the House for allowing me to continue. As I was saying, the chairmen of the authorities and the producers do not want these matters to be divulged. They are private documents between private people who are dealing with other people.

Mr. HOLDING: Should they be? That is the question.

Mr. BALFOUR: That is a good question. But these people are dealing with a tough, competitive world and they are both competing with the oil industry. They consider that they must keep their cards close to their chests. I do not want to disappoint the honorable member for Morwell, but I am not prepared to divulge the details. I repeat what I said yesterday, that the contracts are entirely different. The Gas and Fuel Corporation could carry out its business on a similar contract to that held by the State Electricity Commission from Esso-B.H.P. I do not agree with the prices quoted by the honorable member for Morwell. I believe the contract of the Gas and Fuel Corporation is better than that of the State Electricity Commission.

Over the period advertising by the State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation has been reduced and is still being reduced. These authorities have the right to put their wares before their respective customers. The State Electricity Commission has not pushed its domestic cooking wares for a few years. Certainly other people advertise electric stoves. It is unfortunate for the Gas and Fuel Corporation that it is cheaper to buy an electric stove than a gas stove. The customers may buy the cheaper stove. However, the State Electricity Commission has been pushing midi-banks, under-floor heating and off-peak load electricity which can be used at night. Both authorities are competing against oil and it is in this area that the Gas and Fuel Corporation has made its great advance in sales, particularly with the increase in the price of oil.

The State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation are going along very well. There is a great deal of kindly feeling between them and they are possibly getting on better than they did in the past. Competition is good for both. It keeps them on their toes. Oil is their main competitor and both bodies are doing an excellent job in getting into the market place and allowing the general public to see the wares they have for sale.

The Premier has asked the Ministry to prepare the White Paper that has been mentioned. I hope it will be ready by the end of this Parliamentary session. It is hoped this will set a platform for a committee to work on and investigate whether we should be heating and cooling buildings, and whether this should be done by gas, electricity or insulation. Many areas need to be investigated.

I believe the choice of gas for the Newport power station was right and proper. No objections were raised when the legislation was passed by the House in 1971. In other countries of the world there has been talk about an energy crisis. These countries have totally different circumstances to those in Australia. Everyone should be aware that our resources must not be wasted. They are very precious and cannot be replaced. Whether the power station is to be at Newport or some other place, it is needed to safeguard the electricity system of the State. If the decision to use gas had to be made today instead of in 1968-69, I think the decision would be the same.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister for Fuel and Power has put the best possible case that could be put on behalf of a Government which is concerned to maintain secrecy in the price being paid to Esso-B.H.P. for gas, and is caught in the dilemma of having committed itself to the Newport power station, which will ultimately not only waste a valuable commodity —natural gas—but will also create great difficulties for the community and the Government of the day in the future application and usage of oil, natural gas and brown coal deposits. Part of the dilemma that confronts the Minister is that he is unable to put to the House a cogent principled statement that represents Government policy on the usage of these important resources.

It is ironical that on the first occasion that this matter has been debated since a confrontation occurred between the Government and the trade union movement, which says that it will not build the Newport power station, the Premier has falsely raised the question of the supremacy of Parliament. During this debate no more than a dozen members of the Government party have dealt with this issue. So much for the supremacy of Parliament and for the honorable members opposite, who are so concerned to deal with these issues that they absent themselves from the House. They will not absent themselves from the vote, but they are not participating at any level in what is a significant and important debate.

The supremacy of Parliament has unfortunately been invoked by the Premier. It will be singularly unfortunate for this State if we allow a situation to continue in which there is an endless confrontation with the Government, which says that no matter what arguments are advanced or what evidence is produced about fuel and energy usage and conservation, it will proceed to build the Newport power station on the site selected. When asked why it takes that view, the Government invokes this odd concept of the supremacy of Parliament. That is a foolish position for any Government to take, because whatever else might be said for members of the Government party, few of them will put on boiler suits or have the skills to build the power station. It is important to realize that the unions have not taken this position in a dog-in-the-manger attitude or to cause industrial obstruction. It is because of a deeply-held view which is shared not only by the unionists but by the conservationists, firstly that the erection of the power station constitutes and will continue to constitute a real threat to the environment; and secondly, that it involves wastage of energy resources.

If the Government intends to adhere to the principle of the supremacy of Parliament, it cannot have double standards. There cannot be a standard that exists between this Parliament and one group of citizens and this Parliament and another group of citizens. The concept of the supremacy of Parliament is a difficult one. It rests in the concepts established in the House of Commons in which there is a unitary system of government and no written constitution. In a Federal system of government the concept is more difficult because no one Parliament is supreme. That is part of the philosophy of this Government, although there has been a suggestion that one Government is trying to be supreme in some areas.

The State Government is supreme in the direction and control of the Victoria Police Force. However, when the State enters the sphere of the future use of the fuel and energy resources of the State at a time when arguments are taking place about off-shore legislation and who controls them, it is a moot point how far this odd doctrine of the supremacy of Parliament can be invoked. If Parliament is to be supreme, it is supreme because the average citizen is entitled to take the view that the subject has been canvassed in Parliament and a decision has been made on the basis of the best available information.

When conservationists and unionists are concerned—I have raised the point about which they are concerned—we are not able to say, nor is any member of the Government party, that all the relevant information has been considered by this Parliament, that all the information that ought to have been the subject of discussion and rational debate before a decision was reached was canvassed.

I refer to the illustration today when the honorable member for Morwell—to whom the House should be indebted for the clarity with which he put a principled argument—challenged the Minister for Fuel and Power to inform the House whether the State Electricity Commission had

purchased large volumes of natural gas, pursuant to its contract to fuel Newport, for a price of about 2·5 cents a therm. One cannot talk about the supremacy of Parliament when the Minister will not answer a question. The honorable gentleman has given his reasons. The fact is that you know, Mr. Speaker, and I know—my information comes from an extra-Parliamentary source—that one can read about the contract price in trade journals—all extra-Parliamentary sources.

What should be so secret about these matters? We are dealing with a vital fuel commodity, with an issue that goes to the whole future economy of Victoria. On that basis is a member entitled to say to a unionist, "You have to accept the concept of the supremacy of Parliament, but don't ask me how much the State Electricity Commission is paying; don't ask me how much the Gas and Fuel Corporation is paying; don't ask me how much liquid petroleum gas Esso-B.H.P. has exported in the past twelve months; don't ask the price that was charged to the Japanese; don't ask the price to the Gas and Fuel Corporation, because I am not good enough to know those matters. I cannot be trusted. They are matters which are secret to Esso-B.H.P." Why are they secret?

The honorable member for Broadmeadows will inform honorable members how when he visited South Australia as a member of this House he inquired about the cost of purchasing gas in that State from the chairman of the relevant State authority and was informed that it was 2·3 cents a therm. There was no secret about it. Why should these matters be secret? They are secret because it is in the interests of Esso-B.H.P. to keep them secret. The tragedy of this Government is that it has no effective policy for the development of fuel and energy resources. This means that the decisions about how the resources are being developed are made not by the Minister but by the skill and capacity of people in either the Gas and Fuel Corporation or the State Electricity Commission, and I pay them that tribute. Fundamentally the policy is being determined by Esso-B.H.P. in the interests of Esso-B.H.P.

I remind the honorable member for Hawthorn, who is interjecting, that Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. took out an exploration licence, which did not cost very much. It did not have the skill or capacity to drill for oil off shore, so it "flogged" the licence to the Esso company which had the foresight to take it up. The only basis on which the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. was involved was that if the Esso company made any discoveries Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. had the right to opt to take up a 50 per cent shareholding. Of course, much of the information that was supplied came from Government departments—largely from the Mines Department—and considerable subsidies were paid. In fairness to Esso-B.H.P., it was lucky that it did not have to expend very much—I think about $10 million—to make these rich discoveries.

Mr. JONA: That might not have been the case; it might have had to spend $50 million.

Mr. HOLDING: The fact is that it did not have to spend $50 million; it spent $10 million. I do not condemn Esso-B.H.P. because, as I have said previously and will repeat, and as I have said to the chairman of Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd., the first duty of the directors of Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. and of the Esso company is to maximize profits in the interests of their shareholders and companies. If Esso-B.H.P. can get a price which is exorbitant for the sale of its oil or gas to this Government that is the responsibility not of Esso-B.H.P. but of the Government.

The Esso company is not operating as part of the largest international company in the world and making colossal profits because it is in the

charity business. I am the first to concede—I do not know why the honorable member for Hawthorn does not do so—that the first duty of a director, both morally and as a matter of law, is to his company and its shareholders. There is no question about that. I do not understand why there is confusion about the attitude of this company. It is not the responsibility of the Esso company to subsidize the gas consumers or electricity consumers of Victoria. It is entitled to take the best price it can get, and the people of Victoria are entitled to look to the Government to get the best deal they can get.

The honorable member for Hawthorn talks about profit.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member has one more minute.

On the motion of Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows), Standing Order No. 8B was suspended to enable the Leader of the Opposition to continue his speech for fifteen minutes.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) : I thank the House for its courtesy. The honorable member for Hawthorn is concerned to talk about profits. On 31st May, 1972, the paid-up capital of the Hematite company was $56·4 million. In 1971 its net profit was $22 million ; in 1972 it was $35·8 million, and in 1974 it was $55·9 million. That is a generous return on any view.

Esso-B.H.P., in terms of its control of the vast oil and natural gas deposits in Bass Strait, is in a situation without equal anywhere else in the world. No company, including Esso, has ever been placed in a situation of virtual monopoly where it can dictate the terms of its exploration and the way in which it will develop its resources. No Government anywhere else in the Western World has adopted such a scheme, which is unique to this Government and to Victoria. The Government had available to it the expert opinion of Dr. Hetherington, who was not a young radical. The first thing that Dr. Hetherington pointed out was that, whatever else happened, the supplier of natural gas should not be allowed to be the distributor.

It is known, as the Minister will concede, that Newport powerhouse in its present location is within the franchise area of the Gas and Fuel Corporation. Previously, it was in the franchise area of Colonial Gas Association Ltd. Why did not the State Electricity Commission negotiate with the company in whose franchise area it was going to purchase gas? The answer is that that did not suit the Esso company because it was concerned to make substantial bulk sales. I agree with the Minister on one view of it that the contract obtained by the Gas and Fuel Corporation is a better contract than that obtained by the State Electricity Commission. The State Electricity Commission has a lower price because the contract allows for an interruptable supply—although nobody seriously believes it will be interrupted.

As the honorable member for Morwell pointed out, the real problem is that by mid-1975 it is expected—the Minister for Fuel and Power will not deny it—that the Gas and Fuel Corporation will have used up the reserve limit under its contract for the purchase of natural gas at about 3 cents a therm. At that stage any further supplies have to be the subject of further negotiation.

Until the establishment of the Newport powerhouse the biggest single distributor of natural gas in Victoria, by and large, is the Gas and Fuel Corporation. If in the long term the Esso company wants to maximize the price that it obtains from natural gas, it has to find another competitor with the Gas and Fuel Corporation and place that other competitor in a competitive situation. Of course that has been done. The other competitor is another statutory authority—the State Electricity Commission—which has committed itself to take up one-sixth of the reserve, and it has

acquired it for a price, which will not be admitted or denied by the Minister, of about 2·5 cents a therm with an escalation clause.

I invite honorable members to think about that escalation clause. It means that once the structure is built at Newport and the gas supply is geared and running, the Esso company will be in a superb position to determine what the price of natural gas will be. The skill and adroitness it has shown is completely in accordance with its method of operation overseas. It is no accident that the United States Government had to establish a fuel and power corporation. Is it any wonder that in this situation this House is not going to be given facts? Is it any wonder that these agreements are regarded as sacrosanct?

I now wish to deal with one other minor aspect of the approach of Esso-B.H.P. In question time today—I raise this matter for the interest of the Country Party—it was pointed out that in June this year the Prices Justification Tribunal increased the price of liquefied petroleum gas by approximately 50 per cent. What the Minister for Fuel and Power said was perfectly correct. I believe the increase would have been higher if it had not been for the principled intervention of the Gas and Fuel Corporation. The difference is that the Prices Justification Tribunal had to consider increases in costs of liquefied petroleum gas as a by-product of refining activities of the Shell company. There is a significant difference between the cost of producing liquefied petroleum gas by the Shell Oil Refinery and the gas coming out of Bass Strait.

The Chairman of the Gas and Fuel Corporation, in May, 1974, was concerned that the 20 per cent increase would affect every country consumer when a price rise was not justified. It is all very well to talk about increased prices to farmers and everybody else, but where the Government has the power to prevent such price increases, it ought to act accordingly. The Prices Justification Tribunal should not have allowed the price of liquefied petroleum gas to be fixed to the cost increases of the Shell refinery and it certainly did not apply to Esso-B.H.P.

According to the *Age* of 9th May, 1974, the Chairman of the Gas and Fuel Corporation said that it would be ludicrous for the corporation's biggest supplier to get an automatic rise in that the corporation made millions of dollars out of exporting Bass Strait gas and that it should be forced to justify a rise on the local market. Were the corporations forced to justify the rise? Did the Minister for Fuel and Power or the Government say, "Not on your life, because you are making a mockery and a joke of decentralization; this is a power resource upon which the future of smaller country towns and country residents is predicated". It was open for the Minister or the Government to do that because the Minister's own permanent head had given the lead.

The Government took no action. I have some sympathy for the Minister because it takes a politician of considerable courage to take on a corporation the size of Esso-B.H.P. That indicates the strength of the forces that are controlling this important Victorian resource. The corporation has no duty to the State but it is the Government's and the Parliament's job to protect the people of the State.

The Government has failed time and again when confronted with the economic power of Esso-B.H.P., and now two State instrumentalities are in competition for this valuable commodity. The one thing that does stand to benefit the Government, if it is adroit enough, and the one factor which might enable it at this time in history to step back and to produce a properly co-ordinated fuel and power policy which will conserve our resources and prevent consumers from being faced with the sorts of prices slugs that they are now being forced to meet because

the Minister for Fuel and Power could not and would not say to the Gas and Fuel Corporation that it would get all these reserves of natural gas for precisely the same price as the State Electricity Commission got for generating electricity is the decision by the trade union movement not to proceed with the building of the Newport power station. That one ingredient might give the Government the time it needs. Parliament has not been provided with the best information or the detail to enable honorable members to make the mature decisions that must be made about the way in which this particular resource should be developed. Once the gas is wasted, it cannot be got back.

I hope the debate will cause Government members to think again and cause the Premier not to embark upon a confrontation with the trade union movement, but to enter into serious negotiations with the trade unions. I have copies of letters that have passed between the trade unions and the Premier. These are not documents of confrontation, but they seek a further inquiry into resources allocation, and point out that there are other areas in the State where a power station could be sited and where an alternative fuel could be used for the undertaking. The unions also give an undertaking to the Premier that, if the investigation is embarked upon, full information is made available and a decision is then made, the trade union movement will ensure that the new power station, wherever it might be sited, will be proceeded with. I am happy to make the letters available for the benefit of honorable members who may want to peruse the correspondence.

Mr. WILTSHIRE: Whom do you speak for—Mr. Gallagher or Mr. Halfpenny?

Mr. HOLDING: I am delighted that the honorable member for Syndal has slipped into his corner seat, for he has not been here for half of the debate. Having done so, he makes a silly interjection. Mr. Halfpenny, of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, has shown greater responsibility than has the honorable member.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The Leader of the Opposition will return to the motion before the Chair. He has one minute remaining.

Mr. HOLDING: I will not have time to read the letters, but I am prepared to table them and undoubtedly one of my colleagues will read them. I point out the readiness of the trade union movement and the unions involved to co-operate in a proper analysis of the proper use of this resource. This invitation ought to be accepted in order to break the nexus of the confrontation which will not do the Government, the Parliament or the State any good. It is not a question of making a final decision, but of making the right decision.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South): I will endeavour to confine my remarks to the motion moved by the honorable member for Morwell. However, it is pertinent to comment on statements of the Leader of the Opposition, who has taken honorable members through his usual witch hunt on this subject and exhibited his hatred of private enterprise, particularly Esso-B.H.P. It has become an absolute obsession with the honorable member. In order to reduce the honorable member's blood pressure it would be necessary to quote the contracts which have been entered into because the subject does seem to concern and arouse the Leader of the Opposition.

The honorable member spoke about the needless confrontation of the Government with the unions. In this instance, one could accuse the unions of being in confrontation with the Government, which is the elected representative body of the community. It is relevant to examine why the Leader of the Opposition chooses to take the other side in

this matter. The Government is endeavouring to provide a generating station to cater for peak load electricity demands in Melbourne and Victoria in the years ahead. The Minister has stressed that if the station is not built by 1978 the city and the State will be gravely short of electric power. Very few fuels can be considered for use at the station. The three fuels are oil, gas and hydro-electric pump-back storage, but the latter does not seem practicable until after 1980 and therefore it is necessary to consider oil or gas as the fuel for the generating station. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned conservationists who oppose the building of the station, along with some of the unions. It is interesting to note that one spokesman of the unions is an avowed Communist and his motives must be in doubt. I seriously challenge those motives.

Oil has been mentioned as an alternative fuel for the power station, and the Minister for Fuel and Power has pointed out that it would require 900,000 tons of oil a year to fuel this peak load station. The honorable gentleman also stressed that the burning of oil in a power station at Newport would not be nearly as acceptable to the so-called conservationists, environmentalists and the other "ists" who have objected to the building of this power station. Gas, which was proved to be four to six times cheaper than oil, would be a more acceptable fuel. The Minister has shown no failure to coordinate the use of fuel resources in this State for the benefit of the community at large and in the State's best interests.

The price, cleanliness and availability of natural gas and its acceptability will be supported by all honorable members. One must consider the cost factor of some four to six times more for oil and the delay of some three or four years in the building of a power station for the other possible fuel, and at an alternative site to Newport. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to tell Victorians that they have no need to worry about four or five years of power restrictions, that this should not concern them, whilst the community is confronted by unions and the Government is told where it gets off. That is what it is all about. It is interesting to note the identities of those honorable members who support the opponents to the building of the Newport power station.

The honorable member for Morwell referred to the conservation of natural resources. All honorable members would support him in his suggestions because the value of the great asset of natural gas available in this State is realized. I am sure that the Minister for Fuel and Power in his dual capacity of being responsible for the State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation is conscious of how these fuels can be used in the best interest of the citizens of Victoria.

I believe the honorable gentleman and those two statutory bodies are responsible. The criticisms which honorable members have heard tonight concerning excessive advertising are not warranted. Advertising is undertaken in the interests of the consumer. In many instances the advertisements make known what is available by way of gas space heaters, electric heaters, heat banks, and so on. This type of advertising is mainly informative rather than competitive. The competition between these two statutory bodies is a healthy competition which is necessary in the community today. I have no criticism of the way in which the Gas and Fuel Corporation and the State Electricity Commission carry out their responsibilities in this State.

Legislation was passed by this Parliament for the construction of the Newport power station, and it would be interesting to read the debates which took place when the relevant Bill was under consideration. All parties represented in this House supported the measure. Yet honorable members have witnessed an about-turn by the Opposition in a very short space of time.

Why? I suggest that it is because Mr. Halfpenny says that there should be an about-turn, and the Opposition jumps. Mr. Halfpenny has drawn a blank this time because the Government is not going to jump; the Government will carry out what it has promised the people of Victoria it will do.

Accusations against the Minister of Fuel and Power have been made during the debate. It was suggested that the proposed 9 per cent rise in charges for services provided by the Gas and Fuel Corporation is excessive. That suggestion is amusing in these days when it is competent for certain Governments to appear in court and support unlimited wage rises. It is these increased wages which have caused the proposed small rise in tariffs.

The honorable member for Morwell quoted extensively from remarks made by Mr. Clark at a recent seminar held in Melbourne. The honorable member read some passages and the Minister for Fuel and Power read other relevant passages. It was obvious that there were two sides to the paper prepared and delivered by Mr. Clark. The honorable member for Morwell was generous enough to say that Mr. Clark's speech deviated substantially from the paper presented. Yet Mr. Clark, in the paper, suggested that the use of natural gas in special circumstances and for use in certain locations and regions was quite justified.

I cannot understand why the honorable member for Morwell based his whole case on the paper presented by Mr. Clark when obviously Mr. Clark included the proviso to which I have just referred. I support the endeavours of the Minister for Fuel and Power in his particular field of responsibility. The speech of Mr. Clark was reported in the *Sun News-Pictorial* under the heading, "Red Herring". It may be a "Halfpenny Herring" that we are getting now. I assure Opposition members that the Minister for Fuel and Power has the full support of members of the Government and enjoys the confidence of the Cabinet in his endeavours to co-ordinate the use of the fuel resources of this State.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): It is obvious that the honorable member for Ballaarat South is so prejudiced against trade unions and trade unionits that he is incapable of making an objective judgment.

Mr. STEPHEN: I have been involved in more unions than the honorable member for Albert Park, and I have paid my dues.

Mr. DOUBE: That may be so, but I imagine the honorable member was thrown out of them just as fast. We will not solve problems of this nature by engaging in ridiculous and unpleasant comments about people who are not in this House to defend themselves.

I have spoken to the unions on this matter, just as the Premier has, and whatever may be thought of the political views that they hold, it was apparent to me that they are concerned about the total problem. Their decision has not been taken suddenly; it is based on a number of conditions which have existed for some time. However, those opposed to the construction of the Newport power station have found the Government uncompromising and not prepared to give an inch. The Government has insisted that the project must go ahead.

Mr. HAMER: Parliament said it had to proceed.

Mr. DOUBE: That is a subtle point. It has been claimed that Parliament said this, but Parliament did not need to. The State Electricity Commission could have gone ahead with the proposal without the Government bringing the project before Parliament. I sometimes wonder why it was brought to Parliament. The Premier well knows that Parliament did not need to give the project its imprimatur. However, for some odd reason the relevant Bill was introduced, and now Government supporters say that Parliament has to be proven supreme in the matter.

Parliament has made mistakes before; the Premier has admitted this. I recall the introduction of a measure which included a proposal to build a restaurant in a certain area. When the objecting people knocked on the door of the Premier he did not tell them to go and that the restaurant would be built. There was also a proposal to impose a blanket control over land on the Mornington Peninsula. Control was imposed by regulation of the Governor in Council. That was the law, but when people stated that they wanted to talk about the proposal, the Premier did not tell them to get out of his way, that the law was supreme. Something similar occurred with the proposed restaurant in the Royal Botanic Gardens and the Little Desert development.

Mr. BALFOUR: What has that to do with it?

Mr. DOUBE: It has a lot to do with the spurious arguments advanced by honorable members who support the Government. Surely those who are interested can put an alternative viewpoint. What should be supreme is what will be sensible for the community. I suggest that all honorable members will agree with that proposition. Surely what we want is the best, the most sensible, and the sensitive course for the State of Victoria.

If somebody else happens to have an adverse argument we should be prepared to listen to it. We will get ourselves into a lot of trouble in a society, which is changing as fast as ours, if we do not listen to what is said by the community. Society is changing fast, just as is technology and the interests of the community. I cannot say that something we did three years ago is right. As a result we will now have many more days of photo-chemical smog over Melbourne.

I have been supplied with figures which indicate that inversions which limit the escape of warm air from the surface of the land and keep it contained in a sort of blanket over the city——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. McLaren): Order! The House is referring to the co-ordination and use of fuel supplied. I suggest that the honorable member for Albert Park is getting rather wide of the subject.

Mr. DOUBE: One wonders whether it is because it is a complicated proposition. If smog does occur, there will be a further demand for electricity because of the need for air conditioning. I can demonstrate that we will be allowing an ozone level higher than anybody else in the world, even higher than the World Health Organization permits and twice as high as that permitted even in America. Day after day there will be intense photo-chemical smog, and the inversions in weather will cause a photo-chemical smog by imprisoning the warm air underneath. It is occurring on some days above the height of the proposed State Electricity Commission chimney.

I have information which shows that inversions are taking place on summer mornings and afternoons at heights between 600 feet and 1,200 feet. That means that air will be trapped. The answer of the State Electricity Commission is that people should buy air conditioners. One can live anywhere if one has an air conditioner. It is no exaggeration to say that air conditioners will become as commonplace as the washing machine in the households of Melbourne. I suppose the State Electricity Commission claims that that is good business, but it will be creating the circumstances which will make air conditioners necessary.

Mr. BALFOUR: The motor car is just as bad.

Mr. DOUBE: The motor car does emit fumes. Control is proposed over emissions from motor cars, but they will be no more effective than the controls which will be put on this power station stack.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. McLaren): Order! I have already pointed out to the honorable member for Albert Park that the subject-matter he is pursuing is, in my

opinion, beyond the motion being debated. Although he can make points with regard to pollution, they are not relevant to the co-ordination of the use of fuel resources. I suggest that the honorable member should adopt a different line of argument.

Mr. DOUBE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I return to the subject of resources. One cubic foot of gas used as gas gives 1,035 British thermal units. One cubic foot of gas used as a fuel gives only 480 British thermal units. One system costs more than the other, and I invite honorable members to consider the enormous waste of fuel and energy that is involved in the proposition.

Mr. HAMER: What is your alternative?

Mr. DOUBE: If the State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation had carried out their planning correctly, they would be in a position to use a pump-stored hydro-system as a potential source of power, but the State Electricity Commission has not enough power available at present to engage itself in this pollution-free possibility. Lack of planning has been the problem. For years the Minister for Fuel and Power has said that we did not have enough water, and it was not until quite recently that the over-all advantage of a pump-stored hydro-system was considered. If it had been considered, the Government would be in a position now to get this large number of megawatts which are needed.

Is there a need for a 1,000-megawatt station? All the predictions that the State Electricity Commission has made about the need for it do not seem to be working out. The commission seems to like to keep a fairly high percentage of power in reserve —higher than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. BALFOUR: That is not right.

Mr. DOUBE: It is higher than in most other places. It was proposed that by 1978 there should be a reserve capacity of at least 1,000 megawatts and one wonders why such a large reserve is needed. In 1972 there was a 31 per cent reserve; in 1974 it was 32·7 per cent and in 1974 it decreased to 23 per cent. If one has a look at the predictions and compares them with the electricity being used in Victoria, one finds that in 1971 the estimated need was 2,750 megawatts and the demand was 2,593 megawatts. That was despite the intense sales campaign by the State Electricity Commission. In 1972 the expected demand was 2,950 megawatts and the actual demand was 2,749 megawatts. If a graph is made of those figures and projections are made into 1978 one finds that instead of using the estimated 4,754 megawatts the actual demand will be 4,200 megawatts. That is a vast difference and if the Government takes note of the evidence put before it it could save the State millions of dollars.

On the figures available it is obvious that a 1,000-megawatt station is not needed. If there is any doubt about the need for a new power station honorable members have a responsibility to examine the proposal carefully. Just because a person is a member of Parliament does not mean that he can spend money that belongs to the people on projects that are not required. A rationalization of the programmes of the State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation would probably reduce the estimated demand of the State Electricity Commission to 4,200 megawatts in 1978. This could be achieved by ensuring that power for domestic and cooking purposes is supplied by the Gas and Fuel Corporation.

Mr. BALFOUR: What about the need to run trams and trains?

Mr. DOUBE: I am not saying that trams and trains should not be run by electricity, but it is perfectly clear that a larger proportion of the domestic load for cooking and heating could be taken by the Gas and Fuel Corporation. That would be

good for the corporation because it gets a higher return from gas used for domestic cooking.

Mr. HAMER: Would the honorable member forbid people from using electric stoves?

Mr. DOUBE: I would not, but it is not difficult to convince people, especially those who are mindful of preserving natural resources and the environment, that it is better to use gas. I am sure that the Premier would be the first to agree on that point. Why cannot I boil my eggs in the morning on a gas stove? It is ridiculous for the State Electricity Commission to be saying that it is better to use electricity for domestic purposes and for the Gas and Fuel Corporation to be advertising freely the delightful freshness of natural gas.

Mr. HAMER: It is competition.

Mr. DOUBE: It is good sense to have competition, but energy is a scarce resource. It is so scarce that there should not be false competition in its use. It is not like beer; one should not have the right to say whether one will use one brand or another. It is apparently possible to go on making beer for ever but it is not possible to draw gas out of the ground for ever. Gas is the scarcest of the fossilized fuels and warnings to this effect have come from all over the world. It is ridiculous for the Government not to heed these warnings about the prodigal use that some countries have made of natural gas.

For the reasons advanced by the honorable member for Morwell and others, the House should accept the motion and adjourn.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): It is about time the House got back to debating the terms of the motion, which seeks to condemn the Minister for Fuel and Power for his failure to bring about a co-ordinated use of the fuel resources of Victoria, and especially relating to the Newport power station. If there is one thing the Ministry of Fuel and Power has done successfully it is to co-ordinate the use of the fuel resources of Victoria.

The honorable member for Morwell, who moved the motion, spoke as though the White Paper, which will soon be put before Parliament, should have been produced a few years ago, but he failed to tell the House how the Ministry has been making proper use of the fuel resources of Victoria, particularly since the discovery of oil and gas in Bass Strait. That discovery has completely transformed the use of energy in Victoria.

Mr. AMOS: The Ministry was formed in 1967.

Mr. HAMER: That is right and natural gas was first used in 1970. Now, four years later, the Government needs a complete picture of the future needs of energy for Victoria and the sources of this energy. It also wants information on the relative costs and other aspects so that, after discussion in Parliament, a proper policy for the future can be determined. This has been made necessary by the discovery and use of oil and gas in Bass Strait, and particularly natural gas. The nature of the gas market has changed since the introduction of natural gas. Victorian natural gas is much cheaper because it has much wider use in industry and in the home.

Mr. SIMMONDS: That makes it more important to ensure that it is used properly.

Mr. HAMER: That is so and that is why there is a need for the survey that the Minister has initiated. The motion is six months or a year too late because the inquiry that the Opposition suggests should be undertaken has been under way for that time. It is hoped that within a few weeks that examination and the ensuing report will be completed and the House will have something to examine. There is no point in condemning the Minister for his failure to carry out something that he has already initiated and has under way. The introduction of the Newport

power station into the argument as an illustration appears merely to be an exercise. It has been held up as some sort of example of misuse of resources but honorable members should have a clear understanding of why the Newport power station is required. It is a peak load station and I am sure the honorable member for Morwell knows the difference between base load and peak load requirements. He also knows that the economics of generating base load power are entirely different from the economics of generating peak load power. He also knows that base load power comes from a different energy source.

Therefore, the alternatives that are available for a new peak load station must be examined and nobody denies that there is a need for a peak load station which, at the moment, is to be built at Newport. What are the alternatives? If natural gas is not used there will be a need to use 900,000 tonnes of fuel oil a year. That is more fuel oil than all industry in Victoria uses in a year.

Mr. CURNOW: What fuel is used in other countries for power stations?

Mr. HAMER: They use natural gas and fuel oil where they can and sometimes nuclear power and hydro power. Fuel oil is not available from Bass Strait and it has to be imported from the Middle East at six or seven times the cost of natural gas. The alternative to using natural gas is to import thousands of tonnes of fuel oil from the Middle East for the Newport power station at a cost of some hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Mr. AMOS: That depends on the estimated demand.

Mr. HAMER: I do not think the honorable member for Morwell will deny that there is a need for peak load stations and one of the alternatives is pump storage. However, for pump storage to be effective there is a need for a considerable reserve of base load power for use in the early hours of the morning. It is during that time that the water is pumped from the lower storage to the upper storage. The simple fact is that at the moment the State Electricity Commission has not the necessary reserves of base load capacity to introduce a pump storage scheme.

Mr. DOUBE: That means that there has been a lack of planning.

Mr. HAMER: The honorable member for Albert Park should study the economics. If he did so he would not make a remark like that. The Newport power station will be available for use in the early 1980s, and that is when it will be required. Pump storage is not an alternative to the Newport power station and would not be available to meet peak load needs.

Hydro power is used in many countries for peak loads but in Victoria we have used our resources and streams for hydro power to the full. We have been using the Snowy Mountains scheme in New South Wales and Victoria and it is being used to capacity. We have come to the end of our available resources of that type. Even the Dartmouth dam project, which will provide 160 megawatts, will not be sufficient. The honorable member for Albert Park, by his clever estimates, worked out that there will be a need for an additional 500 megawatts, but the State Electricity Commission estimates that there will be a need for 1,000 megawatts, and this quantity cannot be provided from the existing hydro power facilities or from pump storage. Therefore, it must be provided by natural gas. In any case, the use of natural gas is preferable. It is cheaper, less polluting and is available. To use other resources would simply be making the position a great deal worse and would fail to provide the amount of power that is needed.

Any rational examination of the alternatives to the Newport power station will show that the Minister and the State Electricity Commission have made the correct decision.

It is preferable to the various alternatives that have been put forward and will use the fuel resources of Victoria to the best advantage. The motion should be defeated.

The House divided on the motion (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler in the chair)—

Ayes	..	17
Noes	..	47
Majority against the motion	..	30

AYES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Lind
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Stirling
Mr. Doube	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Fogarty	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Holding	*Tellers*:
Mr. Jones	Mr. Fordham
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Roper

NOES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Meagher
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Baxter	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Billing	Mr. Reese
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Chamberlain	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Smith
Mr. Dunstan	(*Bellarine*)
Mr. Evans	Mr. Stephen
(*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Evans	Sir Edgar Tanner
(*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Templeton
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Guy	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Vale
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Jona	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Williams
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Wiltshire
Mr. MacDonald	Mr. Wood
Mr. McInnes	
Mr. McKellar	*Tellers*:
Mr. McLaren	Mr. Hann
Mr. Maclellan	Mr. Plowman

PAIRS.

Mr. Ginifer	Mr. Burgin
Mr. Mutton	Mr. Lacy

The sitting was suspended at 6.22 *p.m. until* 8.6 *p.m.*

CEMETERIES (PIONEER MEMORIAL PARKS) BILL.

For **Mr. SCANLAN** (Minister of Health), Mr. Borthwick (Minister for Conservation), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Cemeteries Act, 1958, to make provision with respect to pioneer memorial parks and other matters.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MUNICIPALITIES ASSISTANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

For **Mr. DUNSTAN** (Minister of Public Works), Mr. Borthwick (Minister for Conservation), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Municipalities Assistance Act, 1973.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

RAILWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Railways Act, 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

HOUSING (COMMONWEALTH-STATE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT) BILL.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Housing Act, 1958, and to authorize the Premier of the State of Victoria for and on behalf of the State to enter into a housing agreement supplemental to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, 1973, with the Commonwealth of Australia and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

ELECTORAL PROVINCES AND DISTRICTS BILL.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to provide for an increase in the number of electoral provinces and electoral districts and for the redivision of the whole of Victoria into electoral provinces and electoral districts and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry), moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Labour and Industry Act, 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

ELECTORAL PROVINCES AND DISTRICTS BILL.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): Before I make my formal second-reading speech on this Bill, I thank my learned, honourable and gallant friend, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, for allowing this measure to be introduced tonight with the concurrence of the Opposition. It is important that the Bill should be explained now so that Parliament will have sufficient time in which to consider the matters raised in it. I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of the Bill is to provide for a composite redivision of the whole of Victoria into 22 new electoral provinces for the Legislative Council and into 81 new electoral districts for the Legislative Assembly.

The effect of the Bill, therefore, on the Legislative Council will be to increase the representation, on the existing statutory basis of 2 members for each province, from 36 to 44 members. This increase in membership will be achieved, in normal circumstances, over the period of the holding of the next two periodical elections unless, of course, a dissolution of the Legislative Council should occur beforehand, which would mean that the membership would be increased to 44 at the Legislative Council general election. Unless such a dissolution occurs, four additional members will be elected at the next periodical election in 1976 and a further four additional members will be elected at the subsequent periodical election to be held in 1979. In the case of the Legislative Assembly, the representation will be increased by eight new members as from the next general election, which is expected to be held in mid-1976.

Before dealing more fully with the contents of the Bill, I feel that a brief account of the background to the legislation is necessary, if the purpose and scope of the measure are to be seen in their true perspective. As honorable members are aware, the last redivision of Victoria—a partial redivision for Legislative Council purposes and a full redivision for the Legislative Assembly—took place in 1965, which increased the membership of the Legislative Council by two and that of the Legislative Assembly by seven. These increases were justified by the fact that, notwithstanding the growth in population in Victoria, the membership of the Legislative Council had remained unaltered since 1906 and the membership of the Legislative Assembly had been increased by only one during the same period.

Upon reflection, I would say that, when viewed in the light of the increases in population, the increases in membership of both Houses as a result of the 1965 redistribution were most conservative. Since that redivision took place, not only has the population growth continued, but the lowering of the voting age to eighteen years has also contributed to the increase of 500,000 electors in the voting population over the last nine

years which makes necessary the increases in the number of members as now proposed.

This Government, and I am sure, every reasonable and unbiased person, has been aware for some time of the need for a redivision of the State into new electorates for both Houses of Parliament, but action was withheld until the voting age was reduced and the newly enfranchised electors were enrolled. Any action which may have been taken to correct the imbalance in electorates before these new electors became enrolled would have been rendered ineffective by the upsurge in enrolments.

The date of operation of the Act reducing the voting age did not allow sufficient time for a redivision of electorates before the 1973 elections, but an undertaking was given after those elections, which has been reaffirmed on a number of occasions since then, that there will be a redivision of Victorian electorates before the elections due in 1976. This Bill will honour the Government's promise in this matter by providing for the appointment of three independent commissioners to carry out a redivision of the whole of the State.

I am sure that all honorable members are aware of the disparities which exist between metropolitan and country electorates, and even between electorates within the same areas, but it may be of interest to see the extent of these disparities as revealed by the latest enrolment figures. In the Port Phillip area for the Legislative Assembly, the electoral district with the lowest enrolment is Richmond with an enrolment of 21,657, whilst Scoresby district contains 68,204 electors. The country area contains electoral districts ranging from Kara Kara, with 17,970, to Gisborne, which contains 40,284 electors. Thus the Legislative Assembly electoral districts range from a low of 17,970 to the highest, Scoresby, 68,204, containing almost four times the number of electors of the lowest, namely, Kara Kara.

The Legislative Council provinces reflect a similar imbalance between the lowest country province, North-Western Province, with 51,357 electors, and the highest province in the southern area, Boronia Province, with 210,753—more than four times the size of the lowest province. The range of provinces in the southern area is from Melbourne Province, with 113,999 electors, to Boronia Province, containing 210,753, whilst the country area contains provinces from North-Western Province, with 51,357 electors, to South-Western Province, which has an enrolment of 116,476.

Clearly these figures show the urgent need for a redivision, and the passing of this Bill will enable a redistribution to be carried out so that the next elections can be held on new electorates which will give fairer representation to all electors. The principle of zoning the State into areas for redivision purposes is well and truly established in our electoral law and is again contained in the present Bill. The need for different quotas for the prescribed areas of the State is fairly obvious and, without delving too deeply into the frequently debated question of area versus enrolment, I may say that the achievement of complete parity between electorates, as regards both size and enrolment, is most difficult, if not utterly impossible.

The Legislative Council presents the greatest problem in this regard and this can easily be recognized by considering, for example, the Western Province which, at present, contains some 67,030 electors in an area of 12,090 square miles—that is, approximately one-seventh of the area of the State. The average enrolment for the present ten Legislative Council provinces is 120,412 and if the Western Province was combined with North-Western Province in an attempt to create a province attaining this enrolment figure, the province would contain 118,387 electors but would cover almost 33,000 square miles, which represents about three-eighths of the surface area of the State.

Clearly any attempt to adjust provinces upon an equalized enrolment basis would result in the creation of some country electorates of quite unmanageable size, particularly from the view of Parliamentary representation. The electoral districts for the Legislative Assembly do not present as great a problem but, nevertheless, it must be recognized that electorates with equal enrolments would confront country members with a much more difficult task than city members in attempting to give effective representation to all constituents.

The Government makes no apology for adhering to the well-established and amply justified principle of zoning the State into areas for redivision purposes and of prescribing different quotas for each of those areas. In continuation of this policy, therefore, the Bill now before this House divides Victoria into zones for the purpose of the proposed redivision. The zones are—

(*a*) for the Legislative Assembly—a Port Phillip District, which contains the Melbourne metropolitan area, and a country area, being the remainder of the State; and

(*b*) for the Legislative Council—a Southern District, containing the bulk of the territory in the southern area as prescribed in the Electoral Provinces and Districts Act 1965, and a country area, being the remainder of the State.

The figures I have already quoted illustrate the imbalance that now exists between the Legislative Assembly electoral districts and which will be corrected by the following provisions of this Bill in time for the 1976 elections. The districts now in the 1965 Port Phillip area, are, with the exception of a few subdivisions, or parts of subdivisions, at the extremities of that area, contained in the new Port Phillip District, which will be divided into 49 new electoral districts with a quota of approximately 28,000 prescribed for each such district.

The subdivisions and parts of subdivisions formerly in the 1965 Port Phillip Area will be included in the country area where they can be combined with other areas of similar characteristics in districts on the outer fringes of the metropolitan area. The country area—the remainder of Victoria outside the Port Phillip District—will be divided into 32 electoral districts with a quota of approximately 24,500, which is only slightly less than the average enrolment of the electoral districts at present in the country and provincial areas.

The difference in these two prescribed quotas acknowledges the need for a lower quota in the country area for the reasons previously explained but, because of the smaller size of electoral districts as compared with provinces, it is considered that the margin between the two quotas need not be as great as that for the Legislative Council.

For the purpose of the Legislative Council redivision, the 1965 Southern Area has been redefined as the Southern District and reduced by the transfer of sixteen non-metropolitan subdivisions to the area which will provide the nine country provinces. The Southern District will be divided into thirteen provinces, each with a quota of 112,000 electors, and the remainder of Victoria will provide nine provinces with an average enrolment of approximately 80,000. The reasons for the greater margin between the quotas for Southern District provinces and the provinces in the remainder of the State have been explained previously and this Government believes the quotas prescribed will help to correct the imbalance in the Legislative Council provinces without making it impossible for any country member of the Legislative Council to represent effectively the electors in his province.

I am sure that this House will endorse the Government's decision to bring forward this measure for the proposed redivision of the State into

new provinces and electoral districts and to thus correct the imbalance that at present exists. The Government considers that the adoption of the redivision proposals set forth in the Bill will ensure that the next elections for both Houses, due to be held in 1976, will be conducted on a fair and reasonable basis of electoral distribution.

I wish now to refer briefly to some of the other important features of the Bill in the order in which they appear therein. In accordance with the established principle followed in all redistribution legislation, the proposed redivision will be drawn up by an independent commission comprising the Chief Electoral Officer of Victoria as Chairman, the Commonwealth Electoral Officer for Victoria, and the Surveyor-General.

The commissioners' task for the Legislative Assembly will be to divide the prescribed Port Phillip District into 49 electoral districts with a quota of approximately 28,000 electors and to divide the remainder of the State, or country area, into 32 electoral districts containing approximately 24,500 electors. For the Legislative Council, the commissioners will divide the Southern District into 13 provinces each containing approximately 112,000 electors and divide the remainder of Victoria into 9 provinces with a quota of approximately 80,000 electors.

In making their proposed redivision, the commissioners are empowered to depart from any specified quota to the extent of 10 per cent more or 10 per cent less and, in any case where the greater part of any proposed electorate is sparsely populated may depart from the quota by 15 per cent. There is provision for the commissioners to make such minor adjustments as they consider necessary in the boundaries between the Port Phillip District and the remainder of the State for the Legislative Assembly and also between the Southern District for the Legislative Council and the rest of the State. This will allow the opportunity to eradicate any unsatisfactory lines that may be discovered in the common boundary line between such areas. Their power, in this regard, is limited to the extent that any adjustment or adjustments so made shall not result in more than 5,000 electors in the aggregate being transferred from one area to another.

If the commissioners consider it necessary to vary from any prescribed quota, or to make an adjustment to boundaries they are required to take into account the likelihood of changes in the number of electors in the localities concerned. As is usual in redistribution measures, the commissioners, in making their proposed redivision, are required to take into consideration, (*a*) community or diversity of interest; (*b*) means of communication; and (*c*) physical features.

The commissioners are obliged to tender their proposed redivision to the Minister, by way of a report, together with a statement of the number of electors enrolled in each proposed electorate, and also maps showing the names and boundaries of the proposed Assembly districts and Council provinces. In turn, the Minister is required to present a copy of the report, statement, and maps to both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after he receives the same; or if Parliament is not sitting at the time, then within fourteen days after the next meeting of Parliament.

The commissioners' proposals are deemed to be adopted by Parliament unless, within 21 days after the tabling in the Legislative Council of the report, statement, and maps, either House rejects the proposals. In normal circumstances the report and accompanying documents would probably be tabled simultaneously in both Houses, but there is always the possibility that the Legislative Council might not be sitting on the day when they are tabled in the Legislative Assembly. To ensure a full period of

21 days in both Houses, the Bill therefore provides for the period to commence from the tabling of the redivision proposals in the Legislative Council.

If the proposals are rejected by either House the Minister may direct the commissioners to prepare a fresh redivision which, the Bill provides, will be furnished to the Minister and be presented to both Houses in similar fashion. Again, the same processes will apply and, unless rejected by either House, the proposed fresh redivision will be deemed to be adopted by Parliament. Only one such fresh redivision may be submitted by the commissioners. In other words, if both the original proposals and the fresh proposals are rejected, the legislation will lapse entirely. It should be noted that Parliament is given the right to alter, by resolution of both Houses, the name of any electorate as proposed by the commissioners, but that any such alteration will not constitute a rejection of the commissioners' proposals.

In the event of a proposed redivision being deemed to be adopted by Parliament, the names and boundaries of the provinces and electoral districts so adopted will be proclaimed and become the basis for future general or periodical elections for the Council and for future general elections for the Council and for future general elections of the Legislative Assembly. However, until the eighteen old provinces finally disappear in 1979 and the old electoral districts go out of existence when the present Assembly terminates, any by-election to fill the place of a member for one of the said eighteen old provinces or for one of the old districts will be conducted on the basis of the boundaries of the old electorate concerned. If it becomes necessary to conduct a by-election for any of the old provinces after new electoral rolls for the new electorates have been prepared, the Governor in Council may redivide the old province concerned into new subdivisions corresponding as nearly as practicable with the subdivisions proclaimed for the new provinces, in order that the new rolls may be used for conducting the by-election.

Mr. WILKES : Does that mean that by-elections will be fought on the new boundaries?

Mr. ROSSITER : No. This will overcome the possibility of the completely unnecessary task of preparing, from the latest enrolment information, electoral rolls for subdivisions which may have ceased to exist two years or more before the by-election.

As soon as practicable after the names and boundaries of the 81 new Assembly districts and of the 22 newly-substituted provinces have been proclaimed, new electoral rolls will be prepared for all subdivisions in order to meet future election requirements ; and special powers have been given to the Governor in Council to cope with any problems that may arise in connection with the printing of the rolls or with the next periodical or general election of the Council or Assembly.

The final provisions of the measure contain consequential amendments of The Constitution Act Amendment Act 1958, which will come into force when the new electorates become effective. These amendments increase the numbers of members of both Houses and also increase the numbers of provinces and districts, as previously explained.

I have already quoted individual enrolment figures in relation to some of the existing provinces and electoral districts and have referred to the area of two of the country provinces. These quotations are from tables of statistics which I have had prepared showing the enrolments for each province and electoral district at the three elections which have been held since the 1965 redistribution and also the latest enrolment figures available. The areas of all electorates are shown on another set of tables.

During the course of the debate on the Bill, honorable members will doubtless find it convenient to

acquaint themselves with these statistics and, therefore, I feel obliged to make the tables available to the House. As these tables are quite lengthy, I do not consider any good purpose would be served by reading the whole of the tables for the information of the House but I have arranged for sufficient copies to supply all members to be available in the Parliamentary Library. I commend the Bill to the House and ask for the support of honorable members in giving it a speedy passage.

On the motion of Mr. WILKES (Northcote), the debate was adjourned.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary) : I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, November 27.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) : Redistributions rarely occur in Parliament and the guidelines that are set for the commissioners in the Bill require careful examination. The Opposition has not yet had the opportunity of examining the guidelines or the maps. The Chief Secretary will doubtless make officers of his department available, as his predecessor did in 1964-65, to assist the Opposition in determining its attitude to the redistribution. I hope on this occasion the Chief Secretary will allow the Opposition time to consider the proposals which have been put forward by him in a responsible way. Members of the Opposition would like to evaluate the proposals in an equally responsible way. If the Chief Secretary is prepared to allow three weeks during which the proposals can be examined, the Opposition will ensure that there is no delay in the passage of the proposed legislation after that.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary) : I do not know whether the House will sit until Thursday, 12th December. I am unable to agree to an adjournment of the debate for three weeks because the measure must go from here to another place. However, if it appears that the House will sit on 12th December, I shall be prepared to discuss with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition an extension of the period of the adjournment of the debate.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until Wednesday, November 27.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of the Bill is to amend the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Act 1958 to raise the present limit on the board's borrowing powers from $30 million to $45 million. This increase in the power to borrow is necessary to enable the board to undertake its borrowing programme for 1974-75 which will include funds for new trams and buses and other improvements to public transport services.

Deliveries of the board's 30 new buses have already commenced and it is anticipated that ten of these vehicles will be in service this year. Deliveries of the board's 100 new trams have been delayed by shortages of materials and industrial troubles but the first new trams will be delivered shortly and will be introduced into service progressively during the new year.

The programme for the current year provides for the ordering of another 50 new buses and doubling the delivery rate of new trams. The Government is pressing ahead with these projects for public transport improvements and the Commonwealth has been invited to provide financial assistance. A regular programme of vehicle replacements is necessary to provide an up-to-date fleet of modern trams and buses. Deliveries of new buses are protracted and replacement programmes must be determined quickly to provide for deliveries of new buses over a number of years.

This is being hindered by the Commonwealth's policy of looking at the replacement of vehicles on a year-to-year basis. Such an approach is unrealistic and is seriously impeding the Government in its endeavours to provide new public transport vehicles.

I turn now to the other provision in the Bill which relates to salary levels. Honorable members will be aware that in these days of high inflation and wage increases, salary levels have increased. It is therefore proposed to amend the provisions of the present Act regarding appointments to the board which require the consent of the Governor in Council.

Section 17 (2) of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Act 1958 provides that no officer shall be appointed by the board at a salary exceeding the rate of $5,000 per annum without the consent of the Governor in Council. The figure of $5,000 was set in 1959 and is unrealistic in the light of today's salary levels. Clause 2 of the Bill proposes to increase this figure to $15,000.

The main amendment proposed in the Bill will assist the board to carry out the Government's policy to improve public transport facilities. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. JONES (Melbourne), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, November 27.

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS (CONTINUATION) BILL.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the payment of *per capita* grants to independent schools in 1975 at the rates which I announced in this year's Budget. The rates are $80 for each primary pupil, and $135 for each secondary pupil.

Last year I made it clear that the Government proposed to continue its support to the independent schools by providing grants on a *per capita* student basis without any exclusions or means test and that a specifically Victorian standard would be developed as a basis for assessing these grants.

The rates which have been included in this Bill are those which have been so assessed. They compare with $62 and $104 paid in 1974 for primary and secondary pupils respectively and are an increase of just on 30 per cent on those grants. The expenditure arising from the payment of *per capita* grants to the independent schools in 1975 will be in round figures $20·3 million.

Provision is made in the Bill to save the application of the original legislation in so far as the payment of 1974 grants are concerned. This is necessary in order to retain the application of the provisions relating to the conditions under which grants are payable, to the grants already paid in 1974. It also covers the situation which may arise in the event of a late application by a school authority for a 1974 grant. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, November 27.

MILK AND DAIRY SUPERVISION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes several amendments to the Milk and Dairy Supervision Act 1958. The principal amendment proposed relates to the pending marketing of dairy blend following a recent decision of the Australian Agricultural Council that all States amend their legislation to allow for the production and marketing of vegetable oil and butterfat blends. Co-operative research work in South Australia and

Victoria at the respective State Government dairy research institutes has led to the possibility of marketing a butterfat and vegetable oil blend that promises a new outlet for butterfat that is an addition to the range of butters at present available.

Other matters also dealt with in the Bill in the main relate to metric conversion, licensing of factories, and the need for a review of evidentiary requirements in legal proceedings; and a provision is also sought to enable more effective prevention of contamination of dairy produce by antibiotics and pesticides.

Clauses 2 and 12 of the Bill refer to the new product, dairy blend. This product will have an improved spreadability over that of butter while retaining its other desirable characteristics. Similar legislation to the present Bill has been, or is being, enacted in other States of Australia to permit the manufacture of dairy blend and to ensure the effective control of composition and physical characteristics that is so necessary with a new product.

The product will be manufactured from a mixture of butterfat and high quality vegetable oil and, if necessary at certain times of the year, with added vitamins to ensure a product of constant vitamin content. Because the product is a new one and changes may have to be made to minor details of the composition and specification after marketing experience, it is proposed to prescribe the composition and specification in more detail by regulation.

Clause 2 (*a*) (*i*) contains the interpretation of "dairy blend" and subparagraph (*ii*) ensures that the product is included under the interpretation of dairy produce. Paragraph (*b*) will amend the principal Act to require that dairy blend be made by a certificated buttermaker and that adequate records be kept. Paragraphs (*c*) and (*d*) will ensure that the product is graded, packed in a package marked with a brand approved by the statutory Dairy Produce Board and not blended with lower grade produce.

Clause 2 (*e*) will require records of the amount of edible vegetable oil or oils as well as of milk or cream received at a factory to be maintained. Paragraph (*f*) will permit the issue of a restricted dairy factory licence for establishments wishing to make dairy blend only and, if the board so recommends and the Minister so determines, subject to the further conditions that the cream needed shall be purchased only from the holder of a dairy factory licence. Paragraph (*g*) will provide regulation-making powers so that microbiological and compositional standards may be prescribed.

Clause 12 of the Bill excludes dairy blend from the definition of margarine under the Margarine Act 1958. Clauses 3, 7, 9 and 10 provide for administrative amendments. The amendments required under clause 3 are for the adoption of metric units.

There is now no designated office of "chief dairy inspector" and as the provisions in section 59 (3) of the Act now apply to the Chief of Division of Dairying clause 7 gives effect to the necessary amendment.

References to action by members of the Police Force will be written out of the principal Act by clause 9 of the Bill in conformity with a long-standing request from the Chief Secretary's Department, and police services should be sought only where no alternative is available. The principal Act currently gives power to an inspector, supervisor or officer to prosecute in addition to a member of the Police Force.

The Act now provides that specific proclamations may be revoked, amended or varied but no such power exists for proclamations made pursuant to section 99. Clause 10 will provide this power which is required, even if only for the purpose of revocation, for the consolidation of all such proclamations made over a period of many decades.

Clause 4 of the Bill contains two proposed amendments relating to the issue of factory and store licences which have been included on the recommendation of the Dairy Produce Board. Firstly, it is proposed to amend section 29 of the Act to provide that all applications for licences for factories and stores throughout Victoria shall be subject to a report by the Dairy Produce Board to the Minister. Currently a person wishing to erect and operate a milk collection premises from which the milk could be forwarded to a distant factory need only comply with departmental requirements as to building and equipment and he would be issued with a store licence for such premises as of right. Such a situation could disrupt the operations of factories in the area of such a store just as much as the issue of an additional factory licence in the area.

Secondly, it is proposed to amend section 31 (1) (*b*) of the principal Act to widen the source of supply of milk or cream to factories holding restricted licences under paragraph (*a*) of that sub-section. Currently milk or cream for such a factory may be purchased either only from the holder of a general factory licence or only from the holder of a licence for a store which is prescribed for this purpose. A significant number of holders of restricted licences have difficulty in securing continuity of adequate milk supplies from either one source or the other and it is considered that, in view of the reduction through consolidation and amalgamations of the number of both dairy factories and prescribed stores from which the holders of restricted licences can draw milk, the conditions should be widened to allow such holders to purchase milk from factories or prescribed stores.

The amendments proposed in clauses 5, 6 and 11 arise from discussions with officers of the Crown Solicitor's Office concerning review of the legal provisions of the principal Act with relation to the procurement of evidence and evidentiary proof in court proceedings following difficulties which have arisen in legal actions under the Act.

Sections 48, 94 (1) (*b*) and 116 (3) of the principal Act have each been reframed by clause 5 of the Bill to include a provision that where in answer to an inquiry by an authorized person another person fails or refuses to state his correct name and address or gives any false or misleading information he shall be guilty of an offence.

Sections 52 and 86 of the principal Act have each been reframed by clause 6 of the Bill to include a provision that statements by an authorized person in a prosecution or other legal proceedings that the provisions of Part II. of the Act apply or do not apply to a factory, store, municipal district or milk area, as the case may be, shall be taken to be correct until the contrary is proved. An additional provision has been written into the principal Act in section 52 (2) which will provide that for the purpose of proceedings under the Act a package on which the description of dairy produce is written or printed shall unless the contrary is proved be deemed to contain dairy produce of that description.

Clause 11 of the Bill will add to section 117 of the Act a new subsecion (2) which, like the amendment referred to previously will provide that in any prosecution or other legal proceedings under Part III. of the Act a statement by an authorized officer that the whole or any part of a municipal district is or is not included in the metropolis shall be taken to be correct until the contrary is proved.

Under clause 8 additional provisions to sections 82 and 85 of the Act are proposed to give more reasonable control of serious sources of contamination of dairy produce by

providing that no person shall sell, store or keep for sale any dairy produce which contains any prescribed contaminating substance greater than any tolerance that may be prescribed. These provisions would cover such contaminants as antibiotics, detergents and sterilizing material and residues of pesticides that are sometimes found in milk. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, November 27.

MILK BOARD (DELIVERY CHARGES) BILL.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Until March last year, the Milk Board had, with one or two minor exceptions, always determined a common retail price for milk, irrespective of whether it was purchased at a shop or delivered to the customer's home.

However, evidence placed before the Milk Board at price inquiries in recent years has shown that costs associated with home deliveries, and particularly labour costs, have increased at a much greater rate than the costs of delivering milk to shops. In view of these disproportionate increases in home delivery costs, the board last year set a slightly higher price for home-delivered milk than for shop milk. On 1st March this year, this differential was increased, and it was further increased on 21st July.

On each occasion the increase followed a price inquiry which heard evidence of continuing increases in home-delivered milk costs. Milk which is home delivered from Monday to Saturday currently costs the consumer 3 cents a quart more than milk purchased at a shop, and the differential is 6 cents a quart on Sunday deliveries.

Retail prices determined by the board are fixed prices and it is an offence under the Act for a dairyman to sell milk below the appropriate determined price. Following the price increase in July, a number of country dairymen have complained that, because of the increased differential between home delivered milk and shop prices, they have lost substantial numbers of customers on their retail rounds and this has adversely affected their profitability, particularly in those cases where they do not supply the shops patronized by the customers they have lost. In most cases these dairymen are owner-operators who employ little or no labour and they claim that they would achieve a better financial result if they could charge a lesser price for home delivery and so retain their retail customers.

The Victorian Milk Distributors Association has made representations to the Milk Board on behalf of its country members with a view to having this position remedied. The board has given consideration to the best means of meeting the situation and it has now recommended an amendment of the Milk Board Act.

Section 19 of the Act empowers the board to determine fixed retail prices and it provides that the board may determine different prices according to whether the milk sold is delivered to the purchaser at a dairy or milk shop or elsewhere. It is in accordance with this provision that the board has determined higher prices for milk which is home delivered.

Under the amendments now proposed in clause 2, the board would determine fixed base retail prices for milk in various sizes and types of containers, which would apply both to milk purchased at a shop or home delivered. In addition the board would be empowered to determine a

maximum delivery charge in respect of home deliveries. This charge would necessarily be based on costs associated with the distribution of milk by dairies employing labour to effect their deliveries. However, as it would be only a maximum charge, smaller owner-operated dairies employing little or no labour could, if they so desired, impose a lesser delivery charge or make no delivery charge at all. This measure is primarily designed to meet the situation in which these smaller country dairymen have found themselves; it will, at the same time, have the effect of reducing the retail price of home delivered milk in areas serviced by these dairymen.

Although the liquid milk industry in Victoria has not yet set a date for the changeover to the use of metric containers, the opportunity is being taken in clause 3 to make the necessary amendments to certain sections of the Act in anticipation of metric conversion. References to imperial measures appear in three sections of the Act.

Section 3 defines "retail", when referring to the sale or distribution of milk by a dairyman, as the sale or distribution to a person of not more than 2 gallons on any one day. It is proposed to substitute the expression, "10 litres" for the expression, "2 gallons", 10 litres being equal to 2·199 gallons.

Section 18 CA (1) provides that any person other than a dairyman who in any one day transports or delivers milk in a quantity greater than 15 gallons to a milk shop shall be guilty of an offence. In this case it is proposed to substitute the expression, "70 litres" for the expression "15 gallons", 70 litres being 15·398 gallons.

The only other reference to imperial measures appears in section 29 (*b*) which requires a dairyman rendering an account for milk sold by retail to specify on the account the price per quart charged for such milk. When Victorian dairies change to metric containers it could be that, in addition to 1 and 2-litre containers, there will also be 600-millilitre containers, and possibly other sizes less than 1 litre, as presently applies in New South Wales. In the circumstances, it is proposed to substitute for the words, "the price per quart charged for such milk" the words, "the amount charged for each litre or other relevant quantity".

Provision has been made for clause 3 which deals with metric conversion, to come into operation on an appropriate date to be fixed by proclamation. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine), the debate was adjourned.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture) : I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, November 20.

If the Opposition or the Country Party requires a longer period of adjournment, I shall be prepared to consider it.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until Tuesday, November 20.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It comes after a long hard battle to try to retain stabilization for Victorian wheat growers. The Bill is complementary to the Commonwealth Wheat Industry Stabilization Act 1974 which has already been passed by both Houses of the Australian Parliament. It is essential to the continuation of the Australian Wheat Stabilization Plan, which has operated successfully since 1948. It is in accordance with the decisions of the Australian Agricultural Council, of which I am a member, and is

the result of protracted negotiations between the Commonwealth Government and the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation, whose affiliated organization in this State is the Victorian Farmers Union.

The Bill replaces the Victorian Wheat Industry Stabilization Act 1968 and the Wheat Industry Stabilization (Amendment) Act 1973, which covered the seasons 1968-69 to 1973-74. It provides for the implementation of a wheat industry stabilization plan in respect of the five seasons beginning 1st October, 1974, and for the continuing operation of the Australian Wheat Board as the sole marketing authority for wheat in Australia and for wheat and wheat products exported from Australia. As is the case with the existing plan, the board's marketing powers will extend for two seasons beyond the duration of the stabilization plan. This will enable continuity of the board's operations to be maintained. It is necessary for complementary legislation to be enacted by each of the States as some aspects of the arrangements—in particular, the vesting of the ownership of wheat in the hands of the board, the implementation of any wheat delivery quotas and the marketing of wheat within the State of production —rely on State law for their operation.

The new wheat stabilization arrangements are the result of a major revision undertaken by the Commonwealth Government. It was concluded from a review of the previous plan that the provision of a guaranteed price for a specific quantity of exports, with the price being adjusted according to certain cost movements from year to year, was not conducive to maximum efficiency in the wheat industry.

The basic aims of the proposed plan are to give the industry some security against price fluctuation without distorting the underlying trend in market prices and without providing an unduly large, and very often unpredictable, net contribution by the Commonwealth Government to the industry over the period of the plan.

The agreed plan sets out to achieve these aims by, firstly, abandoning the concept of a " guaranteed price " and replacing it with a " stabilization price " related to movements in the international wheat market; secondly, cushioning sharp changes in export prices by moving the stabilization price gradually into line with market prices; thirdly, providing definite limits to the extent to which the Commonwealth Government can be called upon to underwrite the plan; and, fourthly, providing a mechanism which could reasonably be expected to continue to operate indefinitely and not to require frequent renegotiation although periodic review and new legislation would be necessary.

The stabilization price is to be set for the 1974-75 season at $73.49 a tonne free on board, or $2 a bushel, and adjusted for each of the next four succeeding seasons by the application of a formula set out in section 29 (5) of the Commonwealth Act. Subject to the financial limits which I shall indicate later, the stabilization price will apply to all wheat exports of a season.

As in previous plans, the Commonwealth legislation provides for a Wheat Prices Stabilization Fund to meet the difference when export prices are below the stabilization price. When the average export price for a season is above the stabilization price and above $55.12 a tonne free on board, or $1.50 a bushel, growers will contribute to the fund up to $30 million or $5.51 a tonne, or 15 cents a bushel, whichever is the lower, provided that the net return to the grower is not less than $55.12 a tonne. The stabilization fund has a ceiling of $80 million.

When the average export price for a season is below the stabilization price, growers will receive from the fund payments to lift the average

export price to the stabilization price, subject to a maximum payment in a season of $30 million or $5.51 a tonne, or 15 cents a bushel, whichever is the lower, and provided that the final net price does not exceed $73.49 a tonne, or $2 a bushel.

When funds in the stabilization fund are insufficient, the Commonwealth Treasury will meet the deficiency, but the net Commonwealth Government contribution to the fund over the five seasons is limited to $80 million. Provision is made for any Government contribution to the fund to be repaid from industry contributions in subsequent seasons of the plan. The position with any outstanding Government contributions not recouped by the end of the fifth season was debated, and I argued strongly that the Australian Government should be prepared to put at risk an amount of up to $80 million over the five years of the plan. I am pleased to say that the Government has agreed to write off any outstanding contributions at the end of the fifth season.

As honorable members will know, the stabilization plan provides wheat growers of Australia with a guaranteed price for all wheat consumed in Australia as flour, breakfast foods, stockfeed, and so on, which price is fixed under State legislation. In the proposed plan, as in all previous plans, the home consumption price is the same as the cost of production as determined by the Commonwealth Minister for Agriculture after consultation with the Ministers of Agriculture in each State. The proposed plan, however, provides that sales of basic wheat on the domestic market shall be at a single price for wheat for all purposes. In other words, there is no provision authorizing the board to make special pricing arrangements for wheat for non-human consumption, as is the case under existing legislation.

Turning now to the Bill itself, I point out to honorable members that, with the exception of several important amendments and additions, the legislation is substantially similar to current legislation. I should like, for the information of honorable members, to refer to the prinicpal variations from the 1968 State Act.

Clause 12 (1) (*b*) has been included in the Bill to strengthen the position of the Australian Wheat Board in curbing dealings with wheat outside the board. In particular, these provisions have been inserted with a view to meeting problems arising from the taking of leases of land on which there is a growing crop of wheat. They will close a loophole in existing legislation which has enabled circumvention of the long-standing requirement that growers should deliver all their wheat production to the board except quantities retained on farms for seeding and for the feeding of animals.

Clause 13 sets out how the board shall determine the price payable for wheat delivered to it. With the exception of sub-clause (5) (*e*), there is no change from the current legislation. Sub-clause (5) (*e*) has been included in the Bill to give effect to an undertaking given to the wheat industry by the Australian Government that, should the Minister direct the board to sell any wheat on terms more generous than the board has been prepared to grant on strictly commercial terms for that wheat, the Government will bear the full risk of non-payment in respect of the additional period involved in the direction.

Clause 14 (3) (*b*) relates to the declaration by the Australian Wheat Board of " readily-saleable " wheat. It provides that only wheat sold for export at a premium on the price of Australian standard white wheat and paid for in full during the relevant season shall be included in the pool for a quota season. Under previous legislation the board declared certain grades of wheat sold on the local market at a premium in the pool for a quota season. In the same sub-clause (3) (*b*), it will be noted that

the old term "fair average quality" has been replaced by the term "Australian standard white". This is seen by the Wheat Board as a more precise description of the basic wheat grade and as representing an improved image for Australian wheat in world trade.

Clause 17 provides for the stabilization provisions in the legislation to apply to the season commencing on the first day of October, 1974, or any of the next four succeeding seasons.

Clause 18 refers to payments from the Wheat Prices Stabilization Fund to be included in the net proceeds of the disposal of wheat of a season. Details of how the amount payable out of the fund under the Commonwealth Act is determined are not included as they are not considered legally necessary.

Clause 19 gives effect to the proposals concerning the home consumption price. Details of basic price and of the adjustments to be made as the Commonwealth Minister considers appropriate by reason of changes in cash costs are omitted. Under the Bill the home consumption price for wheat in each State for each of the five years of the new stabilization plan is the price fixed for the Australian Capital Territory in accordance with the Commonwealth legislation, which provides that the home consumption price for the Australian Capital Territory for Australian standard white wheat in bulk, free on rails at a port of export, shall be fixed by the Commonwealth Minister before the 1st December each year after consultation with the appropriate Minister of each State.

Clause 20 provides that, when the home consumption price is determined each year, allowance shall be made for an amount to cover the cost of shipment of wheat by the board to Tasmania. Sub-clause (6) has been included requiring the board to take all practicable measures to obtain recoupment of the cost of shipment of wheat used in the production in Tasmania of wheat products that are sent to mainland States for consumption in Australia.

Clause 24, relating to access to premises for inspectorial purposes pursuant to the Bill, has been varied from the current legislation. The new Commonwealth Act provides that an authorized person may, with the consent of the occupier of any premises, enter premises for the purpose of exercising the functions of an authorized person under the Act. Alternatively, an authorized person being a Commonwealth police officer or member of the Police Force of the State could, under specified circumstances, apply to a justice of the peace for a warrant to enter the premises.

It is considered that these procedures serve only to give an offender the opportunity to take evasive action and the clause provides that a person authorized by the board may undertake the inspectorial functions set out in the clause. The Victorian Farmers Union has specifically requested the deletion of the words "with the consent of the occupier of any premises" as the union considers that strengthening legislative provisions is fundamental to the efficient handling of the wheat crop at the lowest unit cost. References to members of the Police Force have been deleted in accordance with now established policy where demands are not made on the Police Force for services when other alternatives are available. I understand that the Australian Wheat Board has not used Victorian Police in the past.

This Bill is an integral part of the Commonwealth wheat stabilization scheme, and it is essential that the new legislation be passed during the present sessional period in order that the stabilization and marketing arrangements will apply to the current wheat crop. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, November 27.

MARINE STORES AND OLD METALS (BEVERAGE CANS) BILL.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend section 3 of the Marine Stores and Old Metals Act 1958 to facilitate the collection of used aluminium cans for the purposes of recycling the aluminium.

When "all aluminium" beverage cans were introduced in 1969, the producers of those cans examined the possibility of phasing used cans into the well-established reclamation system for scrap aluminium, which has for many years been an integral part of the industry.

When the recycling programme for these cans was commenced, the main producer, Comalco Ltd., assisted charitable and community organizations to set up collection systems to generate funds for their work with the market value of aluminium scrap at approximately $220 a tonne. Collectors can obtain the equivalent of half a cent a can with the result that the collection system has proved to be useful to those organizations.

The rate of returns of aluminium cans has steadily increased since the inception of the scheme. During the year 1973 in excess of 6 million used cans were returned for which payments totalling more than $30,000 were made by Comalco Ltd. This represents a return of about 6 per cent of aluminium cans sold.

To assist in increasing the rate of return, Comalco Ltd. last December decided to augment the charity collection system by establishing buy-back centres at which individuals could return used cans for cash. Four such centres were established at Clayton, Brunswick, Keon Park and Oakleigh.

It has been drawn to the Government's notice that any person who establishes such a buy-back centre could be deemed to be a collector or dealer within the provisions of the Marine Stores and Old Metals Act 1958 and as such would be required to take out a licence.

Such a requirement would result in severe curtailment of the placement and operation of buy-back centres because of the restrictions imposed by the Act on a licensed dealer or collector.

Those restrictions are—

(*a*) Such collectors or dealers can operate only at certain times and on certain days;

(*b*) The mode of collection and transport of collected goods are the subject of stringent control;

(*c*) Metals may be purchased only from persons over the age of fifteen years;

(*d*) Old metals must be kept by the licensed dealer or collector for at least seven days;

(*e*) Dealers are required to keep names and addresses of vendors and particulars of purchases in a register.

At present scouts, girl guides, approved youth clubs and other approved organizations are exempt from the provisions of the Act only in relation to the collection of marine stores but not the collection of old metals.

Having regard to the benefits accruing the community from the point of view of charitable and community organizations, the protection of the environment and the economic benefits to be obtained in the preservation of such a valuable resource as aluminium, the Government considers that the collection of used aluminium

cans should be outside the ambit of the provisions of the Marine Stores and Old Metals Act 1958.

Although the purpose of the Marine Stores and Old Metals Act 1958 is to require the recording of transactions in a commodity as a protection against theft, it is considered that the exemption of aluminium cans from its provisions would not be repugnant to the purposes of the Act.

Clause 2 of the Bill therefore includes aluminium beverage cans amongst the items exempted by the proviso to section 3 of the Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. STIRLING (Williamstown), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, November 27.

MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The law relating to the University of Melbourne has remained much as it was since 11th April, 1853, when the University of Melbourne was officially constituted and it is now proposed to revise the Act. The revision will be done in two stages and the first stages covered by this Bill consist of mundane amendments. The more earth-shattering amendments will be contained in another Bill! The amendments proposed in this Bill cover a variety of matters. For example, the Government is taking the radical step of abolishing the right of the council of the university to prohibit women from attending lectures at the university. This somewhat strange section, which has been in the Act since the inception of the university, allows women to sit for examinations but gives the council the right to exclude them from lectures if it so desires.

A substantial proportion of the Bill deals with changes that have been recommended relating to words and descriptions applying to university bodies. For example, the Standing Committee of Convocation will be replaced by a body to be termed the graduates committee. The unusual term " convocation " is of Latin derivation and will no longer exist in the Act. In future, the standing committee will be known as the graduates committee. It is also proposed that the teaching staff will no longer be known by that low-brow term and will in future be known as the academic staff.

The Council of the University of Melbourne consists of 38 members, or 39 if an outsider is chosen as chancellor. It is proposed to make two changes in the composition of the council. Over the years the Governor in Council has had power to appoint a representative elected by the councils of technical schools and also, *ex officio*, the Chairman of the Advisory Council on Agricultural Education has been admitted to the council of the university. It has been considered desirable to replace these two members by one elected by the non-academic staff and another elected by the teaching staff, other than professors.

Some changes relating to the financial management of the university are also proposed. For example, the University of Melbourne will be given the same power as Monash University and La Trobe University to invest its moneys in any manner which the council thinks fit. At present no section in the Act covers the right of the council to invest its money.

There is also a provision to appoint another deputy vice-chancellor who will be in charge of research. The University of Melbourne, and I think rightly, is attempting to place increased emphasis on research and in order to get a person of high calibre to co-ordinate research activities the appointee will be given deputy vice-chancellor status.

It is appropriate that I should briefly discuss the clauses of the Bill because they are not closely related. Clause 2 contains definitions and includes for the first time mention of a diplomate as a person who has obtained a diploma at the University of Melbourne. There have been a number of diploma courses at the university, such as the diploma of physical education, and for the first time people completing these courses are to receive official recognition. This is provided for in clause 2 (*b*). Clause 2 (*f*) specifically defines an under-graduate as not only a person undertaking a degree course but also a person undertaking a diploma course.

Clause 3 is rather interesting inasmuch as it redefines membership of the university and it does so for three reasons. The first is that at present there is no provision to include on the council of the university diplomates—people who have obtained diplomas at the University of Melbourne—or persons who are graduates but not graduates of the University of Melbourne. A person may have graduated at an interstate university and be doing post-graduate studies at the University of Melbourne. Proposed new section 4 (4) is of interest because it caters for people of tender conscience who object to being defined as members of the university together with non-believers.

Mr. DOUBE: What does that mean?

Mr. THOMPSON: I have a number of letters on the file but they do not make clear what these people believe in. However, I do know they take strong personal objection to being associated by the definition contained in the existing Act with people who have beliefs that are different from theirs.

Mr. DOUBE: Religious beliefs?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes. The Council of the University of Melbourne has had considerable correspondence with these people and has finally recommended that the definition be altered. Proposed new section 4 (4) provides—

> Where a person who is or is to be in a category which by virtue of this section makes or would make him a member of the University—
>
> (*a*) requests the council to permit him to remain or be in that or any other category but not to be considered as a member of the University; and
>
> (*b*) gives reasons justifying his request which are satisfactory to the council—
>
> the council may grant his request if he enters into such undertakings and guarantees as the council may require in order to ensure that he will observe the statutes and regulations of the University as if he were a member thereof.

That is an unusual request but it has been made seriously by people with unusual religious beliefs and this provision will meet their objections.

Mr. FORDHAM: It is remarkable.

Mr. THOMPSON: It is.

Mr. ROPER: Could honorable members see the file?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am prepared to make the letters on the file available to honorable members. Another amendment contained in clause 4 provides for representation on the council of three members of the teaching staff other than professors, instead of two at present. It also provides for the first time for one member to be from the non-academic staff. It also makes provision for an additional deputy vice-chancellor, who will take charge of research.

The amendment contained in clause 6 will result in a more flexible provision for the election of people to the council of the University of Melbourne. It provides that elections shall take place within three months instead of within one month.

Clause 7 deals with members of the academic staff who are not professors. Clause 8 relates to representatives of members of staff other than academic staff and their representation on council. Clause 9 is

a consequential clause dealing with the change of description from the Standing Committee of Convocation to the Graduates Committee. Clause 10 once again deals with the appointment of another deputy vice-chancellor. Clause 11 refers to diplomas as well as degrees or honours. Clause 12 is interesting; it makes it clear that degrees can be conferred other than by examination and that the university has always had such a power. For example, degrees can be conferred as an honour or a distinction, and it would not be technically correct for people who receive these degrees to submit to an examination at the university.

Clause 13 is consequential on the change of name from Standing Committee of Convocation to Graduates Committee. Clause 14 relates to the appointment of members of the Professorial Board. At present the governing provision is section 28 of the principal Act which states that the board must consist of senior officers of the university and the professors. In an effort to introduce a more democratic form of structure into the faculties, departments have been created in those faculties and the chairmen are elected by people of the rank of senior lecturers and above to take charge of those departments. Under the existing form of the section relating to professorial boards, such chairmen cannot be members of the Professorial Board. A change is made here—the same principle was followed in the Deakin University legislation—to allow the statutes and regulations of the university to govern the appointments and the functions of the Professorial Board. It is a worth-while change.

Clause 15 is also consequential. Clause 16 relates to the manner of investment of moneys by the Council of the University of Melbourne and makes it clear that the council may authorize the investment of such moneys in any form of investment whatsoever. Clause 17 is an updating provision relating to the surplus moneys that have been applied to the students' loan fund, and includes for the first time securities of the Commonwealth of Australia in addition to Victorian Government securities. I believe there is some doubt whether there are such things as Victorian Government securities at present. A further amendment may be proposed at a later date to exclude that term and so be strictly correct. Clause 18, which was referred to previously, takes from the Council of the University of Melbourne the long-standing right to exclude females from attendance at lectures.

It will be seen that the Bill covers a variety of matters, it updates sections of the principal Act, and it makes other amendments designed to assist in, the efficient functioning of the university. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, November 27.

JUSTICES (THEFT OFFENCES) BILL.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of the Bill is to enable Magistrates Courts to deal with cases involving the theft of motor cars, whatever their value. The need for the amendments arises from drafting errors in the schedule to the Crimes (Theft) Act 1973 in relation to section 102A of the Justices Act 1958, which confers upon Magistrates Courts, in appropriate circumstances, summary jurisdiction in relation to some indictable offences.

Prior to the Crimes (Theft) Act 1973, section 102A of the Justices Act 1958 conferred summary jurisdiction upon Magistrates Courts where the property alleged to have been

stolen was a motor car or the amount or value of the property alleged to have been stolen or embezzled did not exceed the sum of $1,000.

Paragraph 2 of the schedule to the Crimes (Theft) Act amended section 102A and increased the monetary limitation to $2,000. However, the fact that the limitation did not previously apply to a motor car was overlooked and no exception was made in respect of a motor car. To correct this error, clause 2 (*a*) and (*b*) of the Bill restore the exception formerly made in section 102A of the Justices Act in respect of motor cars.

The other purpose of the Bill is to correct another drafting error in the schedule to the Crimes (Theft) Act 1973. I interpose that the Crimes (Theft) Act was a considerable piece of legislation which put into one Act all the law relating to thefts. It was a substantial piece of work undertaken within the Law Department by Parliamentary Counsel. I say that in extenuation of the two drafting errors which occurred. Although that may not be an excuse for the errors, there could have been many more because of the complicated nature of the legislation.

The second purpose of the Bill is to insert a new paragraph (*d*) in section 102A of the Justices Act to replace provisions in relation to false pretences, obtaining property by false pretences and receiving stolen property. The new paragraph (*d*) should have referred to section 81—obtaining property by deception—section 82—obtaining financial advantage by deception—and section 88—handling stolen goods—of the Crimes Act 1958.

However, the new paragraph (*d*) of section 102A incorrectly referred to sections 80, 81 and 87 of the Crimes Act. The sections originally having those numbers were, in fact, renumbered as 81, 82 and 88 as the result of the insertion of a new section 79, and this was overlooked. This is corrected by clause 2 (*a*) of the Bill.

The Bill will give section 102A of the Justices Act appropriate operation, and I commend it to the House.

On the motion of Mr. JONES (Melbourne), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, 20th November.

WATER SUPPLY WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Authority is sought in this Bill for expenditure of $39 million on works of water supply, irrigation, drainage, sewerage, flood protection and river improvement throughout the rural areas of the State. The Bill provides authority for expenditure during the period of approximately twelve months until the next Water Supply Works and Services Bill has been approved by Parliament. Honorable members should note that works and services Acts authorize expenditure during calendar years and that actual cash allocations, which are made by the Treasurer in accordance with priorities determined by the Government relate to financial years.

The amount allocated for expenditure on works during the 1974-75 financial year is $24·03 million. The expenditure of this sum is authorized partly by the provisions of the Water Supply Works and Services Bill at present before the House and partly by the preceding Water Supply Works and Services Act. Although portion of the amount included in the Bill is a reauthorization of expenditure included in the previous Act, this does not mean that there was any shortfall of expenditure in 1973-74 when, in fact, the cash allocation of $19,693,119 was fully expended.

Parliamentary authority is sought in the Bill for $39 million so that works may be continued beyond the end of the present financial year until another works and services Bill is

passed at the end of 1975. The explanatory statement and memorandum which accompany the Bill provide details of works proposed to be undertaken and amounts to be expended during the current financial year.

Approval of the Bill will enable the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission and other authorities operating under the various Acts to continue, within the limits of funds made available, essential works planned for the most efficient use of the water resources of the State. 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, November 27.

VICTORIAN PUBLIC OFFICES CORPORATION BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 16) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): When this important Bill was introduced honorable members had little knowledge of what it involved. It makes a fundamental change by vesting in four Ministers the responsibility for transactions concerning public lands. The Bill provides powers which are unique in the State of Victoria and in the Commonwealth of Australia. It empowers the four Ministers to sell, subdivide, compulsorily acquire and exchange public lands. The Ministers will be enabled to deal and treat more powerfully than any private entrepeneur could. It grants a privilege not conferred on Ministers with respect to public lands.

Land legislation in Victoria has always been viewed seriously by the Opposition party. Victoria has gained an unsavoury reputation regarding public lands because of its history of land dealings. I shall not dwell on that subject because the Bill does not deal with it, but here is ample evidence from the pioneer settlements that the land boards of the day were stacked with local puppets, from Ministers to Premiers, who were bought and sold in the market place. Because of this Victoria, first as a colony and later as a State, ensured that land legislation was made watertight, and it has stood the test of time. The essence of Australia's land legislation has been that the public estate has a certain emotional appeal, and economically, socially, and politically, the decisions concerning the treating of public lands have been important.

For a long time a certain ritual was followed in the disposal of Crown lands. Although it has been varied occasionally, following the exposure of certain anomalies in the way in which public lands have been treated, the legislature has always attempted to ensure that the privileged people of the community have received no greater or lesser advantage than any other section in their activities, and that the public has been well-informed of what is occurring with public lands.

This Bill establishes a new set of precedents on the handling of public lands and the difficulties associated therewith. The Opposition is particularly concerned about the change from the existing well-established practices of the sale, disposal and exchange of public lands and the safeguards that have always existed. There have been and will continue to be enormous pressures within Governments regarding the procedures for the advertising, handling, sale and exchange of lands held in trust for the public.

Members of the financial community have always been hostile to any proposed change in procedures which would mean that their activities would be placed under the public spotlight. Those people consider their

land dealings to be extremely important to them, but it is more important that the public should be informed of events that occur.

I emphasize the importance of the Bill. It was introduced innocently and given no publicity. The measure had a torrid passage through the Bill committee of the Government party. It was originally considered by the party's Bill committee approximately eighteen months ago, but after it was approved it took the Government six months to present it to Parliament. One of the difficulties is that the Bill introduces an entirely new concept for the disposal of public lands.

Parliament must recognize that there are enormous pressures in both financial and entrepreneural activities in Melbourne. The Bill is designed to provide circumstances in which representatives of these pressure groups are given an entrée to the inner sanctums of the Government so that they can obtain decisions quickly. The financial world obviously is always hostile to any suggestion that the public will know what it wishes to do.

This Bill is designed in a curious fashion. I shall not go into detail on its merits or demerits, but it is said to be designed to provide better accommodation for public servants. The Opposition questions whether that is the real objective of the Bill, because Victoria's history, first as a Colony and then as a State, is so nefarious that one must immediately be suspicious about the objectives of a measure such as this one. All sorts of potential problems lurk in public land offices. In any area where the public interest is involved, it is crucial that any new concept such as the one contained in this Bill should be thoroughly examined and the public informed of the changes it proposes and what the Government hopes to achieve.

The philosophy of the Australian Labor Party as a whole and of the Opposition in this Parliament is diametrically opposed to that of the Government in regard to the handling of the public estate. The meaning of "the public estate" may be argued in the House, but my colleagues and I are radically opposed to the concepts of the Government in this regard.

Mr. RAFFERTY: Why?

Mr. EDMUNDS: Because without a thorough examination we do not trust any new concept such as this which is presented to Parliament.

Mr. RAFFERTY: The Leader of the Opposition said that there was a good deal of elasticity in the Labor Party's policy.

Mr. EDMUNDS: This concept is entirely new to Parliament. The Bill is tremendously important, and I shall continue to say so. Government supporters do not know what is contained in the measure. I shall amplify my concern, and I hope to convince the Minister and his supporters that the Bill should be examined by an all-party committee which has no concern other than to promote the well-being of the State of Victoria.

Because of Victoria's history in land dealings and the audacity of certain Ministers and Premiers in the past, a complex procedure has been developed in the handling of the public estate. As a simple equation, if it is necessary to sell publicly-held lands or Crown lands, certain procedures prescribed by the Land Act must be complied with. In the past these procedures have protected not only the public's interest and lands, but also Ministers in the proper discharge of their responsibilities, which they have sworn oaths to uphold.

I see no reason to change radically the way that these procedures have been followed. If I have the opportunity, I should like to deal with some of the problems created by the Bill if it is accepted in its present form without being examined by an

all-party committee. I give notice that Opposition members intend to oppose the Bill forcefully because we believe that public servants are working in circumstances which are not in their best interests, and that the situation ought to be updated.

The provisions of the Bill are so radical that the problems it creates ought to be examined by an all-party committee. The Bill was introduced after a Government party committee had devoted much time to deliberating on the issues involved. I understand that the chairman of that committee, who is a member of another place, has been worrying whether the Bill is suitable for what is proposed. The Opposition and the third party have little time to examine the issues involved.

There is urgent need to provide better accommodation for public servants in Victoria, particularly in the metropolitan area. How can this be achieved? There is a lack of revenue for departmental accommodation in Victoria and difficulty regarding the provision of that revenue. The Bill aims to do many things, including the provision of a new system regarding public offices. The Opposition believes there are certain difficulties in the proposed method of dealing with public offices and is gravely concerned at the way in which the Bill aims to achieve its objectives.

In its objective of raising revenue the Government should not destroy all existing Acts relating to public lands. The State and the people of Victoria own a considerable amount of property used for public offices in the metropolitan area An article in the *Australian Financial Review* of 25th October stated that, among the millionaires of Melbourne's "Golden Mile", the State of Victoria was the greatest single holder of city land with 13·3 per cent of the total, if authorities such as the State Electricity Commission, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Melbourne Harbor Trust were regarded as State bodies. If the State Government holds some of the largest areas in the central business district, the method by which the State handles problems associated with the development of those areas is extremely important.

As there is an incredible accumulation of commercially valuable Crown land sites in the city, it is important to assess the present value of these sites, their future value and how their disposal will be handled by a responsible Government either now or in the future. In the past that disposal of Crown land in the sphere covered by the Bill had to be done by public tender rather than by negotiation.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Public auction.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Yes. That can present great difficulty with enormously valuable land, but I do not believe it is necessary for a Bill to be introduced to circumvent Acts that over a long time have been developed to ensure that Ministers, the Parliament and the State of Victoria are not disadvantaged in the handling of public lands. During the history of Victoria, from the Governor Darling land scandals, there have been numerous boards of inquiry, Royal Commissions and other investigations into Ministries on the handling of public lands.

The Bill proposes to turn back the clock to before the turn of the century and to provide four Ministers with enormous power in this regard. It is not that the Opposition distrusts the Ministers at present holding the portfolios with which the Bill is concerned, from the Premier to the Minister of Lands, but the pressures that have been placed upon Ministers in the past have meant that land scandals have been a part of Victoria's history. The rogues should not be allowed to be regenerated. I know the Minister of Public Works is sympathetic to some of the problems involved. The Department of Labour and Industry is at present housed in Exhibition Street in an enormously valuable building.

Mr. DUNSTAN: And a totally unsatisfactory one.

Mr. EDMUNDS: That may be so, but the freehold is held by the people of Victoria and the Opposition believes that freehold ought not to be parted with lightly. The Bill provides that four Ministers—the Treasurer, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Lands and the Minister for State Development and Decentralization—can make decisions in a cabal of their own and can make recommendations to the Governor in Council, notice of which is to be given to the public only in the *Government Gazette*.

The *Government Gazette* is a publication that is not freely available on the streets of Melbourne. A member of the public would have had to seek it out to ascertain what the Ministers had decided regarding the building in Exhibition Street that houses the Department of Labour and Industry. Having decided that they will sell or lease the building or do something with the land in Exhibition Street, the Ministers can, under the provisions of this Bill, proceed with their plans. Why would four Ministers wish on themselves the enormous responsibility of deciding the future of that piece of real estate? In this generation, decade or century that may be an important decision to make, but if the Government decided to part with that land that action might be proved in the next century to be the most foolish decision that this Government had ever made.

In my brief remarks I am not trying to state whether that ought to be a consideration. I hope to prove only that the disposal of public land is extremely important to the future of Victoria and should not rest with four Ministers without first being brought to the attention of the public. Under this Bill the four Ministers can decide to dispose of the land in Exhibition Street, and make appropriate private recommendations to the Governor in Council. If approval is given, the matter is reported in the *Government Gazette* and the public has a week in which to ascertain whether a decision has been made.

This is far too important a subject to be decided briefly in this arena of public debate. It is foolish for the Government to introduce the measure in this way. I have talked to the Minister's officers and know that they are people of goodwill regarding the proposition. They have been influenced by the procedures in Canada and other places. This is a new venture in the handling of public property in Victoria, and the Opposition intends to move an amendment to the second-reading motion. I move—

That all the words after "That" be omitted with the view of inserting in place thereof the words "this Bill be referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee for examination and report".

Opposition parties find themselves in difficulties in a Parliament such as this when without prior notice by the Government a radical suggestion is made on the handling of public lands. They are afforded little opportunity to examine all the ramifications of the proposal. The Government has had ample opportunity to examine the matter.

As I said at the outset, members of the Opposition recognize the real need in the community to provide public servants with better accommodation, but they suggest to the Government that there should be no haste on such a matter. There is no need to make a decision between now and Christmas, or even between now and Easter, that this measure shall become part of the Victorian statutes. This proposition should be examined by an all-party committee. The Minister was a member of the Statute Law Revision Committee and is aware that on controversial issues where there are serious doubts in the community, it is better to weigh all the circumstances in the calm and lucid atmosphere of an all-party committee which can submit a report to Parliament.

I do not think anything nefarious has occurred in the past couple of years. However, I asked the Library to produce certain figures regarding these problems. It is important to realize that Premiers have been involved in nefarious activities in the handling of public lands. The Library produced a reference to a Dr. George LeFevre, a member of the Legislative Council for North Yarra, and a Collins Street specialist who had studied in Edinburgh under Lister. For many years he extracted diseased organs from his patients, and a fortune from land deals with equal dexterity, while helping to make the State's laws in his spare time. The Opposition believes better public offices should be provided for public servants, but it does not believe for a moment that Parliament ought to cede to Ministers a responsibility which means that their actions are never vetted by Parliament. This Bill introduces an absolutely new concept.

Mr. WHITING: Is it not similar to the old Board of Land and Works?

Mr. WILKES: The Board of Land and Works was a positive failure.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Political expediency often produces procedures and solutions to an immediate problem. In this context the immediate problem is better accommodation for public servants. However, examples are on record which finally and ultimately show that these decisions were wrong. My argument is simply that this is a novel procedure. I have not examined the Bill in detail. I am fairly well versed in what the Bill is designed to achieve, but it proposes an absolutely novel procedure. It is proposed that four Ministers shall become an organization and that they can recommend to the Governor in Council—which is a committee of Ministers—that certain property held by and on behalf of the State of Victoria shall be used for certain purposes. They may do all these things without Parliamentary supervision and without observing the provisions of the Land Act in respect to the disposal of lands by public auction.

The Bill committee of the Government took no less than six months to come forward with the proposal that is before Parliament. If it took that committee six months, why should not a little extra time be provided for a Parliamentary committee to examine what is contained in the Bill? One of the most respected Parliamentary committees, the Statute Law Revision Committee, could examine the Bill and make recommendations for or against the proposals. The Opposition is concerned with the ruthless application of the entrepreneurs in the community in wheeling and dealing in some of the most valuable land available in the southern hemisphere at the moment — the land contained within the central business district of Melbourne. This land includes the Queen Victoria market site, the Windsor Hotel, the site of the Labour and Industry Department in Exhibition Street, the land on which the Housing Commission building stands in Queen Street, the land occupied by the State Electricity Commission building, the Social Welfare building, the Department of Health building and the Titles Office building.

We are concerned with the buying and selling of land and the buildings thereon in the central business district. Recently there have been reports in the press that the Government is prepared to sign a contract for the purchase of the Savoy Plaza Hotel in Spencer Street. It is important to recognize that when an organization—it may be the State—wheels and deals in the buying and selling of public property, there can be all sorts of implications. I understand that the Police Department was interested in the building in Flinders Street which is owned by the Commercial Travellers Association. This is a magnificent building and most suitable for the purpose. In the course of negotiations for this building, all sorts of offers were made by the Commercial Travellers Association. Not the least of these was that it would accept as part payment

some of the land in South Melbourne held by the Public Works Department.

While this matter was being considered, further negotiations were proceeding in regard to the land in Spencer Street on which the Savoy Plaza Hotel is situated. Somewhere through the system a mysterious decision was made to drop the Commercial Travellers Association building proposal and go ahead with the negotiation for the Savoy Plaza Hotel. This will be the subject of a great deal of debate in the future and it may or may not cause much public controversy. It may be that the Opposition will be vindicated in castigating the negotiations for the purchase of a fire-trap in Spencer Street for the use of the Police Force. For political expediency the Government has decided to take certain action. The Opposition is saying that at this time under the provisions of the Bill these matters can be resolved one way or the other. Certain attitudes can be exhibited through the public media. Under the provisions of the Bill these matters will never see the light of day.

Mr. DUNSTAN : They will be in the annual report.

Mr. EDMUNDS : As the Minister has interjected, the annual report will be published after the event has occurred. I am not suggesting that the Minister of Public Works will be a crook, that the Treasurer will be as bad as the land boomers of the past, or that the Minister of Lands or the Minister for State Development and Decentralization will set a new level of entrepreneural activity in public lands. I am suggesting that the Bill provides a vehicle for the land boomers, and all the other entrepreneural characters in the community will be able to lean on sworn Ministers of the Crown. The Opposition should not allow the Bill to go through Parliament without pointing out to the Government that it is setting itself up, for reasons best known to itself, in circumstances which could rebound on it.

The Bill appears to be innocent. I am aware that the Minister of Public Works is honest and innocent in his attitude to the matter, but as a former member of the Statute Law Revision Committee he should know that the Bill has certain problems built into it which, in view of Victoria's history, should be examined by an all-party committee. An all-party committee may return with a recommendation to Parliament that the Bill is good or bad or that it should be amended in a variety of ways. Because of the difficulties that Victoria has experienced over its long history as a result of political expediency in the handling of public lands, the Bill ought to be referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee. This is a committee with which the Minister had a great deal of experience. While he was a member of the committee it presented some of its most enlightened recommendations, and they were accepted by Parliament.

There is no need to enact legislation in haste. The purpose of the Opposition's long and perhaps tedious examination of this Bill is to ensure that the Minister is well informed. Although members of the Opposition realize that there is an urgent need to provide better accommodation for public servants, this Bill, which the Government took a long time to produce, should not be passed without a thorough examination by an all-party committee. There are many precedents for that procedure to be followed. Political expediency is not the criterion which should apply to the Bill. It should not be pushed through by weight of numbers to bring about a solution of the immediate problem. The measure should be thoroughly examined by all members of Parliament and particularly by a committee.

My argument is simply that this is a unique and novel proposal about which there has been little, if any, public discussion. I do not suggest that the public is particularly concerned, but other members of the Opposition and I are concerned at the

way in which it is proposed to dispose of public lands under this Bill. I do not consider that any Minister or cabal of three or four Ministers should have this responsibility without the backing of Parliament. It is the Parliament's responsibility to focus attention on some of the problems which the Bill attempts to solve. An all-party Parliamentary committee, such as I propose in my amendment, should examine this novel proposal.

The provision of public offices is a matter which should be examined objectively by an all-party committee. This proposal has not been tried in any other State of the Commonwealth, although it has been examined overseas by experts. Common sense should prevail. My amendment should be accepted or at least considered by the House. The Minister is well aware of the difficulties in providing office accommodation for public servants. He should acknowledge the valuable contribution made by the Opposition in this debate and should accept the Opposition's proposal for an examination of the measure by an all-party committee.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): There is certainly something novel in the image portrayed by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I point out that future speakers in the debate will be deemed to be speaking to both the motion and the amendment.

Mr. McINNES: The image created by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds is novel in that a group of senior Ministers, acting as the corporation, will get into the real estate market as entrepreneurs and hustlers and undertake deals in a somewhat conspiratorial manner in their efforts to make a "fast buck". This deals with the matter lightly, but the more one considers the Bill the more one comes to the conclusion that innocent though it seems at first, and even appealing, something of a monster is being created. It has been said that it has taken about 25 efforts to get the Bill to its present stage. It has certainly had a difficult time in its gestation. The Government is now asking the Parliament to officiate at the birth of the infant without really knowing what sort of infant it will be and what form it will take.

Mr. WHITING: It may even be a monster.

Mr. McINNES: That is so. Somewhat of a bait is held out in the Minister's second-reading notes. The concept of the growth of public offices could not be denied by any honorable member. I am sure the intent of the Bill is to place great emphasis on real estate in the inner-city area, but as a sop the Minister said that it was intended to put public offices in Bendigo, Geelong and Ballarat. Members who represent outer electorates are taken with the idea of the expansion of public offices. None of us denies the need for them and they can be a powerful force in decentralizing the economy and giving to the public the level of service to which people are entitled because the taxpayers provide the money.

I should like to see established in the main regional centres public offices which are worthy of the name of the State of Victoria and which are on a par with municipal offices in country towns. They should be equipped not only to give service to the public but also to attract the right type of staff to enable the public to have access to information and other services which are often lacking in country areas simply because of lack of communication as the facilities are so far away. Pressing though the need is for public offices, the question arises of how to go about providing them. Should the Government lease, own or construct them? How should it finance their purchase or construction?

It has been stated that public offices are a good business proposition. The Minister was certainly referring to the inner-city areas of Melbourne and Sydney when he mentioned an article in the *Australian*

Financial Review of 6th September, 1973. The writer of that article applauded the decision of the Australian Government to gain ownership of its State offices and buildings. The article commented that the return on capital could be envisaged to be from 10 per cent to 12 per cent and that the initial capital investment would be recovered in from eight to ten years.

It appears to be a wonderful proposition, but it makes one grit one's teeth when one examines investment in rural enterprises and finds that if a person is lucky the return might be about 3 per cent and the period for the recovery of capital, if ever, is nearer 30 years. When he dies, probate duty might account for half of the estate, leaving his family back where it started from.

The nub of the Bill is that the corporation, as planned, proposes to finance its operations by "flogging off" Crown land. Honorable members realize that under the statutes the Government is unable to sell Crown land which has been permanently reserved, but the land to which the Minister refers is obviously not permanently reserved and is therefore disposable although only under the auspices of the Land Act. This means that the Government has to give public notice of its intention and must auction the land; an upset or reserve price must be fixed, and presumably all of the facts of the negotiations must be given. In the Minister's speech there is an implication, perhaps wrongly, that as a result of this procedure the price expected may not be obtained. In my experience auctions often attract a higher price than a particular property is worth.

In the Minister's speech there is virtually a reference to conspiratorial activity. Some means must be found of carrying out negotiations quietly, so that the Government can make deals with entrepreneurs and property developers. All of this activity will not see the light of day until the subsequent presentation of the report by the Ministers of the corporation at the end of the year. By then it would be no use closing the stable door because the horse would have bolted, the deed would be done. Although the Ministers would have to take the wrath of the public if they had misbehaved, by then it would be far too late—they might be in Brazil.

The Bill provides that the corporation will not become involved in the land transactions of other departments, such as the Education Department, the Forests Commission and the Housing Commission. Rather piously the Government states that the sole purpose of the corporation is to deal with the provision of modern public offices. Honorable members know the meaning of the word "modern", but what is a public office? I find it difficult to understand precisely how far this term goes. For example, is a police station a public office? Is a school a public office? Perhaps not. Is the control tower from which shipping is controlled at the mouth of the Yarra River a public office? The term could lend itself to many and varied interpretations depending upon the people concerned with administering the legislation.

The position will rest also on the integrity of the four senior Ministers of the Crown who will constitute the corporation. Reference is made to the Treasurer. He is also the Premier at the moment although one never knows what may be the situation in the future. A grave responsibility will be placed upon the four senior Ministers and if a wrong decision is made their heads will roll.

Admittedly, recommendations will come from the State Accommodation Committee which will replace the present *ad hoc* accommodation committee and no doubt these things will be closely scrutinized. In due course, the Ministers, as the Victorian Public Offices Corporation, will give or withhold their consent to transactions.

Negotiations would be entered into secretly with the would-be buyer or seller and the deal would be consummated without information of it necessarily being made available to the public. The honorable member for Moonee Ponds gave examples of a number of areas of Crown land in Melbourne which could well be considered if the Bill were passed in its present form. Certain properties would be extremely attractive to developers and a decision may be made to sell an area, to purchase an area or merely exchange an area in the city. The corporation could well permit a developer to take over some Crown land and erect a 30-story building, part of which would be used for public offices and the remaining sections leased commercially by the developer. A situation may possibly arise such as happens in the United States of America where developers produce schools and rent them to the education authorities. A similar proposition has been made to the Victorian Government.

Honorable members should be wary of the phrase "public offices" and how the corporation would be empowered to act following guidance from the committee. Apparently, the Minister of Public Works believes that the Bill contains sufficient safeguards to ensure that these things will not occur. The Minister relies on clause 8, which provides, *inter alia*—

> (i) The Governor in Council may grant to the corporation any Crown lands which are or have been used reserved resumed acquired or set apart for public offices.

Again we come back to what are "public offices" because honorable members do not know precisely what the expression encompasses. The clause also goes on to provide that any grant under this Act shall have effect notwithstanding anything under the Land Act 1958. As was stated earlier the Land Act has grown up historically over a long period and has many built-in safeguards to protect the national estate. Section 331 (2) provides, *inter alia*—

> When any such certificate has been approved by the Governor in Council, and has lain on the table of the Legislative Council and of the Legislative Assembly for a period of thirty days, it shall be lawful for the Minister of Public Works his successors and all persons by him or them authorized either generally or in any particular case to enter into and upon such land and to take possession and appropriate the same for the purposes mentioned in such certificate.

In this instance, there is a built-in safeguard that the Minister must certify that it is necessary or desirable that any land shall be resumed and that such certificate shall be laid before Parliament for 30 days.

Many people believe a similar safeguard should be built into the Bill before the House. The Country Party is not satisfied that the corporation, acting as a group of four Ministers, should be exposed to this sort of transaction whereby the Ministers handle the purchase or disposal of Crown lands on behalf of the State without any recourse to direct censure from this Parliament or the people represented by members prior to the sale being consummated.

It is a basic tenet that every member of the community feels that he is a shareholder in Crown lands and looks upon it as an inalienable right. The Bill will take this inalienable right away from him. A person may find that the Flagstaff Gardens are being acquired for high-rise public offices.

These are the dangers envisaged by members of the Country Party. My party agrees with the amendment moved by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds because the Bill should be further examined and safeguards built into it. My party would be reluctant to support the Bill without a safeguard such as a 30-day cooling-off period. There is no reason why any purchaser or vendor should take umbrage at that. The confidentiality of the negotiations would be preserved, it would

enable commercial flexibility of the corporation to negotiate, acquire or dispose of a property and, after signing on the dotted line, the documents would be laid before Parliament and a period of 30 days allowed for reflection and for the hackles of the public to be raised if a shady deal is involved.

No reflection is made on the Ministers concerned because they are honorable men. However, honorable members should not be so innocent as to not believe that no matter what his status in life, when temptation is thrown in front of a person his judgment can be at fault. Recently honorable members have read about the responsibilities of directors and stock brokers during the mining boom and only today the newspapers contained some caustic remarks following an investigation into the share transactions of one particular mining company and the profits that accrued to the entrepeneurs involved.

With the power envisaged by the Bill, the Ministers would be exposed to this sort of temptation placed before them by people of less worthy character. Human frailty is such that no one knows whether the present Ministers or their successors may fall by the wayside. The public have an inalienable right to regard Crown lands as their own, and this national estate should not be disposed of without the sanction of the people through Parliament.

The honorable member for Moonee Ponds commented that the Bill represents a fundamental change in the existing philosophy concerning public land and confers some unique powers on Ministers of the Crown. I agree with the honorable member's comments. The disposal of public land or the national estate has in the past been safeguarded by red tape. Red tape is one safeguard against the hasty disposal of land and provides protection for the public and for the Ministers who will be responsible, not the accommodation committee which makes the recommendation. The final responsibility rests upon the Ministers and if one Minister were to fall by the wayside, because of the Ministerial oath the whole Cabinet would be well and truly responsible, and the wrong action by a Minister could well bring down a Government.

The Country Party will not support the Bill in its present form. It is sympathetic to the amendment moved by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds that the Bill should be referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee for examination and report.

On reflection, the proposal of the honorable member for Moonee Ponds appears to be the appropriate action to be adopted by the House. I believe the Statute Law Revision Committee, or whatever body is appointed to thoroughly examine this measure, should consider the principle of writing a waiting period into its provisions so that before any deal is consummated it must be referred to Parliament which should give its approval for the action to be taken and for the sale to proceed.

I have often been in the position in which hustlers and other people have tried to sell me something by claiming that if I did not make my decision there and then I would miss out on the purchase. This is a pretty common tactic in selling methods. However, I have never missed out on anything simply by ignoring the sales talk along those lines.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I remind honorable members that there are some rules which apply in this Chamber, one of which prohibits sitting in the aisles. I ask honorable members to refrain from doing so for the purpose of conducting meetings on the front benches.

Mr. McINNES: I would give the corporation the right to negotiate confidentially. This principle is pretty much a fact of life nowadays and

there is some truth in the statement that the corporation needs this power. However, having concluded the deal or the transaction, I believe it must come back to receive the final stamp of approval from Parliament. I would recommend on behalf of the Country Party that a waiting period of 30 days be written into the measure or any future legislation of this nature concerning the sale of public buildings.

Mr. McCLURE (Bendigo): Honorable members have heard tonight about consummation, gestation periods, births and so on. I suggest that if there were any birth pains with this Bill, it was merely because the delay was born of necessity. The Bill has been introduced because of the necessity and the desire of the Government to provide additional public offices.

Mr. WHITING: Is that a reflection on the present Government?

Mr. McCLURE: It is not a reflection on the Deputy Leader of the Country Party. There appears to be broad agreement between the two opposition parties that the only real bone of contention is that the proposed corporation will have the opportunity to sell land without having to go through the process of receiving approval for the sale from Parliament. The reason why this principle is incorporated in the measure is, I believe, quite clear.

I am happy that sufficient attention has been paid to providing safeguards so that the four Ministers involved, as the honorable member for Gippsland South claimed, would not be able to conspire together to dispose or sell land which belongs to the Crown.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Where is that safeguard?

Mr. McCLURE: Taking up the interjection from the Leader of the Country Party, I suggest that it is to be found in the Bill under the definition of "Public Offices". For the benefit of the Leader of the Country Party, that definition reads—

> "Public Offices" means any building or other structure used or to be used for or in connexion with administrative executive, technical or professional functions performed by officers or employes of the public service.

The Teaching Service was mentioned, and the question was asked whether the Government would enter into agreements with builders or others to provide schools on a lease-back basis. However, teachers do not come under the Public Service Act; they come under a separate Act of Parliament. The same applies with statutory corporations, where the employees are not public servants. It is absolutely necessary for the proposed corporation to have the authority to negotiate the sale of land.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: You say that there are safeguards but now you cannot find them.

Mr. McCLURE: If the Leader of the Country Party chooses not to listen, that is his problem.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: But you cannot find them in the Bill.

Mr. McCLURE: I believe the flexibility that is required is merely a reflection on the modern methods of doing business. It is painfully obvious that in some areas there could be certain areas of land which were unsuitable by themselves for the development of public offices and next door there could be a privately-owned piece of land which was eminently suited for the development of office accommodation.

Mr. WILKES: Where could this happen?

Mr. McCLURE: It could happen in the central business district of any town.

Mr. WILKES: Why could the land not be sold at public auction?

Mr. McCLURE: I will come to that. It makes a lot of common sense to dispose of the land under terms and conditions which can be negotiated.

Mr. WILKES: It is well known that where there is room for negotiation there can also be graft and corruption.

Mr. McCLURE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition probably knows a lot more about graft and corruption than I do, and I concede that. I believe it is imperative to have flexibility to enable the corporation to enter into arrangements with building firms on the basis that when Crown land is available and it is not sufficient, adjoining land can be the subject of arrangements entered into so that the Crown has the right to buy the adjoining land or make its land available under whatever terms and conditions are deemed satisfactory by the corporation.

The honorable member for Moonee Ponds suggested that if the corporation makes a decision, the decision will be binding for all time. The honorable member for Moonee Ponds is suggesting that the Government should hesitate to make decisions at all. I believe the decisions have to be made and must be made in the light of what business is available at the time, and accordingly the corporation would be guided by the best principles which can be applied. It is true that posterity can prove that a decision is either right or wrong. Parliament can make decisions which in future could be found not to have been as wise as perhaps they should have been. There have been fairly recent examples of turn-arounds.

A question was asked why the land should not be sold at auction. I do not believe there is anything wrong with that and the corporation may decide to sell land by auction or tender or other means. I do not think honorable members should try to work out all the things that might happen. It is common knowledge that if there is going to be graft and corruption, it will find a way regardless of what forms of protection are provided. Honorable members must have sufficient confidence in the Ministers of the Crown in matters of this type.

To suggest that the activities of the corporation will not be scrutinized by Parliament, as was suggested by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds, is not correct. The corporation will be required to submit its annual accounts for scrutiny by the Auditor-General's Department. I refute the argument that its operations will never come before Parliament for scrutiny. I suggest that they will.

The opposition parties have, I believe, little to fear concerning the Bill. I was rather amazed at the suggestion that a long time was involved in the preparation of the measure because if that is correct it escaped my notice. This is an important Bill if the Government is to provide the type of office accommodation that it believes is necessary in Victoria, particularly in some areas, such as that which I represent. It is obvious that the State does not have the financial resources to build adequate office accommodation quickly enough for those public servants who need it. I believe it is necessary for the corporation to enter into arrangements with private developers and this measure is the answer to the problem.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): I have a high regard for the Premier and Treasurer of this State and I cannot understand why he would be a party to a measure of this nature because the honorable gentleman, above everybody else in this place, would know that it represents a departure from what is considered to be the normal procedure for the disposal and purchase of Crown land in Victoria. The Premier and the Government would know that certain guidelines have been laid down which I have supported and will continue to support whereby every piece of Crown land or property that is to be sold must be disposed of by public auction. There is no fairer way for the disposition of public property than by public auction. That principle was debated in this Chamber over twenty years ago. Since then honorable members have been able

to expose sales of property and land by the Housing Commission. The Government stated that the best way would be to dispose of that land by public auction so that there could be no doubt or impropriety. Impropriety has existed only when land has been disposed of by negotiation, and that should never occur.

Neither the Government nor the Premier would allow local government to dispose of land by negotiation. This policy is correct as every piece of land or property should be disposed of by public auction. What will the Bill do? It will set up what will be called, for convenience, a corporation. Who will be the members of the corporation? They will be the Minister of Public Works as chairman, the Treasurer, the Minister of Lands and the Minister for State Development and Decentralization.

These four Ministers will be responsible for the disposal and purchase of millions of dollars worth of public property without reference to Parliament. Can honorable members imagine that whatever this corporation of Ministers decides shall be done without reference to anyone? The only safeguard is that the Auditor-General shall audit the transactions after they have been completed. The Government has not a good record with land and property transactions and the proposed corporation will make things worse than they were before.

The corporation will have perpetual succession, a common seal and shall be capable in law of suing and being sued and in leasing and taking on lease exchanging and disposing of real and personal property for the purposes of the Bill. It shall do and suffer all such acts and things as bodies corporate may by law do or suffer. The corporation is to be all-powerful. If the Premier had any experience at all he would know what the former Board of Land and Works tried to do in Victoria. That was a corporation of Ministers and a former Government, in its wisdom, was forced to disband the board because the four Ministers who comprised it could not agree on anything.

Mr. MACLELLAN : That was a coalition Government.

Mr. WILKES : Perhaps it was. The proposed corporation will be very little different from the Board of Land and Works and that board got into more trouble than one cares to mention. It got into so much trouble that the Bolte Government introduced legislation to abolish it. I venture to suggest that after the proposed corporation has been in operation for much less time than the Board of Land and Works a Government—whether it be this Government or another—will have to introduce legislation to abolish the corporation and replace it with an organization capable of doing the job on behalf of the people of Victoria. It certainly will not be an organization of four Ministers who have the right to sell and purchase public property. The fact that they can sell property is important because not one of the Ministers has had any experience in real estate. Is it any wonder that the people of Victoria would be alarmed if they knew what was proposed in this Bill? They do not know because very little publicity was given to it in the press. Suffice to say that not one of these Ministers—these geniuses—has had any experience in the purchase and sale of real estate.

In Victoria there is an Estate Agents Committee and a Valuer-General but they are not to be represented on the State Accommodation Committee which is to be appointed to support the corporation. It is provided in clause 10(2) that the committee shall consist mainly of persons appointed by the Ministers. That in itself is questionable but in addition there are no guidelines to determine who shall be appointed. It is proposed that one person shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister of Public Works and

another shall be appointed on the nomination of the Treasurer. There is no indication of the qualifications that these people should have. The Teasurer can appoint whom he likes, as can the Minister of Public Works. These people need not have experience in the purchase or sale of real estate. There is nothing in the Bill to say and it is not intended that the Ministers will not be able to appoint a person who will do what they want done to ensure that the corporation does exactly what it wants with the property of the people of Victoria. The Minister of Health is interjecting and I inform him that the Opposition is concerned about what happens to public property in Victoria.

Mr. SCANLAN: I am also concerned about it.

Mr. WILKES: The Opposition is concerned because under the Bill this disreputable Government will have unlimited power to dispose of Government property. Another member of the State Accommodation Committee shall be an officer of the Public Service employed in the office of the Public Service Board and he shall be appointed on the nomination of the Premier. That means the Premier and Treasurer will have two nominees on the committee. Another shall be the Chief Property Officer of the Public Works Department. Presumably the Minister of Public Works will have two nominees. Finally, not more than three members of the committee shall be persons who have special qualifications in the management of property. Who will they be? In other legislation, and in particular in the Valuation of Land Act 1961, the Government went to great pains to point out how it was necessary to have expertise and experience on bodies concerned with the valuation of land, but on this occasion there is no suggestion that a person from the Real Estate and Stock Institute of Victoria should be appointed to the committee. No one could have more experience in the sale of property than a person from that institute. On occasions the Government has had to do business with agents who are members of the institute, so it should know of the experience of these men.

There will be no nominee of the Valuer-General on the committee. That means there will be nobody with any direct experience in the purchase and sale of property on the committee. Where will the expertise come from? Members of the Opposition do not accept the concept that four Ministers should be entrusted with public property in this way. If anybody is to be entrusted with public property in this State it is the Parliament of Victoria; certainly not four unqualified Ministers.

Mr. SCANLAN: Will the Deputy Leader of the Opposition guarantee that a new building will be purchased for the Department of Health?

Mr. WILKES: I will guarantee that the Opposition will oppose the Bill. I am amazed and surprised that the Premier has allowed himself to be associated with the Bill. He is a prominent lawyer in Victoria and would know the pitfalls in disposing of property other than by the normal methods. There is nothing in the Bill to prevent the Ministers from entering into private negotiation over property. What is there to stop a person from putting pressure on any of these Ministers? Honorable members should not think for one moment that there are not people in Victoria who would not put pressure on the Ministers in an attempt to convince them that they ought to buy certain buildings at a predetermined price. What would these Ministers or the corporation know about the price of a building? They would not know whether they were paying too much for it. What would they know about the value of public property that they are disposing of?

There has been a good deal of disputation in the past on the Government's actions over the disposal of property. What is the record of the Government on the purchase of property? Recently honorable members asked questions about the intentions of the Government concerning the purchase of properties and even with the best advice at the disposal of the Government and without the aid of the corporation proposed in the Bill things have got into a mess. The Government was offered the building in Flinders Street belonging to the Commercial Travellers Association. It was offered the Savoy Plaza Hotel and the Windsor Hotel.

Mr. SCANLAN : It was also offered the Chevron Hotel.

Mr. WILKES : I thank the Minister for that information. What was the advice that the experts gave the Government on which of these properties it should purchase? The Government decided, on the advice of its experts, to purchase the Savoy Plaza Hotel for the Police Force, despite the fact that it was offered the Windsor Hotel, even though that was for a different purpose, and the building belonging to the Commercial Travellers Association. It is quite obvious that the Goverment was " sold a pup " when it agreed to purchase the Savoy Plaza Hotel.

I am sure that neither the Premier nor the Chief Secretary would have the temerity to suggest that senior officers of the Police Force approved the purchase of the Savoy Plaza Hotel. These are the transactions being carried out by the Government with expert advice so what will happen when this coterie of four Ministers—this real estate branch in the Cabinet—are responsible for the purchase and sale of public real estate in Victoria? Will they continue with this futile attempt to purchase buildings for the Police Department in the same way as the seminary at Glen Waverley and the old tobacco factory in Collingwood were purchased? Those buildings were purchased with expert advice, so how will the Ministers operate when they have no expert advice? What is proposed is disgraceful and is unprecedented in the annals of the Victorian Parliament—that four Ministers should have the power to dispose of and purchase property at will without reference to Parliament.

The Government is always " bellyaching " about the importance of the Victorian Parliament but if anybody has done anything to denigrate its importance it is the Premier and his three colleagues who want to be all-powerful. This Government does not want a properly representative Parliament. It wants a Parliament that it can manipulate. It wants to legislate by Executive Government and to have control without reference to anyone.

I sound a note of warning to the Premier. If anything will destroy this Parliament it is that sort of attitude and the Premier should realize that. He should not be prepared, and he would not be if he had any political sense and any responsibility to Victoria, to be a part of or countenance an organization in which he and three others Ministers have so much power that they are beyond the Parliament. If public property is to be disposed of it should be sold at public auction so that everybody would have the right to bid according to his means and in this way a fair market price for the property would be determined.

If they so desired the Premier and the Minister of Public Works could appoint some of their friends who have no experience in real estate to this committee, and they could act with impropriety because they would not have the advice of the Valuer-General or a member of the Real Estate and Stock Institute. There have been those types of transactions before in this State. In debates in this Chamber the Opposition has pointed out painlessly that this

Government should have stuck to the public auction system. A former Minister of Housing, Sir Horace Petty, was prepared to concede that point and after that all property disposed of by the Housing Commission was sold by public auction. The tender system failed because of impropriety. Now there is a proposition before the House for the establishment of a corporation consisting of four Ministers which can act without reference to anybody else. The Ministers are honorable gentlemen, of course. I do not question their honesty or ability, but I do question their knowledge of real estate in Victoria, the means of its disposal, and their knowledge of the value of real estate. When these Ministers rely on people whom they appoint, nothing but futility can result in the sale of real estate.

Mr. SCANLAN: Does the new Department of Health building satisfy you?

Mr. WILKES: The Minister of Health is concerned about a new Department of Health building, but he is not concerned about how much is to be paid for it, nor is he concerned about whom the present building is to be sold to or whether there is a National Trust sticker on it. All he is concerned about is getting out of it. The Opposition is concerned about the Crown land assets of the people of Victoria. I should be interested to hear the Premier say what is to happen to unalienated Crown land. Has this coterie of Ministers the same power to dispose of Crown Land and to permit freeways to be cut through Crown land? There is nothing in the Bill to suggest that they have not that power, and if they have it they are all powerful.

There have been examples where bulldozers have gone into parks in Victoria and the Minister for Local Government has not known what was happening. Now these powers are being extended to a coterie of four Ministers with no safeguards whatsoever.

This is one of the worst pieces of legislation that has been introduced into this Parliament in the past twenty years and is in the worst interests of the people of Victoria. The Premier accepts it as another piece of legislation which gives him absolute power, and that is all he is interested in. He is not interested in what happens to public lands, who buys them or who sells them. I do not want to say what can happen. I am sure the Premier knows and I do not want to put on the record what can happen because I am sure the Premier knows that also.

I finish by issuing a warning to the Premier that if he allows this proposed legislation to go through in its present form, he will be letting the State down. He should agree to have the Bill referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee, as proposed in the amendment, so that a proper, responsible body can propose a safeguard which will eliminate the risks that I have pointed out tonight.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party): The principle contained in this most important Bill worries many honorable members. I was interested in the statement of the honorable member for Bendigo that there are two opposition parties. There is only one Opposition party in this House. The Labor Party is the official Opposition; the Country Party is a third party which gives general support to the Government. The statement was a misrepresentation by the honorable member for Bendigo, and I am putting the record right.

I will be very brief and constructive in my summing up. This Bill does not concern only four ministers who are to form a committee; there may be 50 years of other Governments ahead and other types of men may hold office in the future. The worry is that land can be sold and contracts entered into, and honorable members may not know what has happened for more than twelve months. According to my own interpretation of the Bill it will not be until the annual

report of the proposed corporation is presented that this House will have an opportunity of knowing what land has been sold. All honorable members know that from time to time reports from Government departments and instrumentalities are delayed, but it would be reasonable to assume that honorable members will have to wait for periods of up to eighteen months for the report to be presented.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Bill specifies that the report is to be made available not later than 31st October.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: That means that there could be a maximum delay of sixteen months. This is a long time for honorable members not to know what has happened. All members, including members of the Opposition, must realize that dealings in land have become much more complicated today because from time to time it is essential to exchange pieces of land, to add to land one already has, and to acquire and dispose of land. It is not an uncommon situation—I am sure the Treasurer has this in mind—for private developers to construct a building on Government land and in return to give free accommodation of part of the building to the Government; after a period of years the Government will acquire the freehold of the building. This has happened in Sydney in particular, and is a means by which a landowner who does not have cash can develop his land. It is not easy to negotiate, but I commend the Government for taking this initiative.

I can think of many pieces of land in Melbourne for which, in better financial and business times, a deal could be done with the developers. Some system should be devised whereby honorable members are advised what lands have been sold, and what deals are being negotiated. I suggest to the Minister of Public Works that consideration should be given to how this can be done. It may be necessary to have agreements tabled and arrangements made for a debate within a reasonable period. This is a minimum request. I suggest to the Minister that the debate be adjourned, and perhaps a conference called within the next 24 hours to devise some safeguards. Once a contract has been entered into, the matter could remain in abeyance for a period.

Mr. WILKES: Would that not happen if the Bill was referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee?

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: I am not decrying the honorable member's suggestion.

Mr. WILKES: Is this in addition to it?

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: The Statute Law Revision Committee might bring forward some worthwhile suggestions, but I am assuming that the Government will press on and put this Bill through. If that is the intention I want to make sure that some safeguards are provided so that honorable members will know immediately a contract is entered into, and what the details of that contract are. Then they would not read it for the first time in a newspaper, or hear a rumour that "I have entered into an arrangement. I am going to build a multi-story building on the Department of Health land in Queen Street." I do not want to read in Jennings's annual report that the Government is to erect a building, when we as members of the Victorian Parliament have no idea what is happening. I ask the Minister to give further consideration to this suggestion before the Bill is committed.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): I do not want to delay the House unduly, but I seek an assurance from the Minister of Public Works along lines not dissimilar to those suggested by the Leader of the Country Party.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Along the lines?

Mr. HOLDING: That is right. Following the passage of a previous piece of legislation, not dissimilar to this proposed legislation—I refer to the Victorian Development Corporation; the establishment of which the

Opposition supported—the Opposition has found that in a large number of transactions public moneys have been advanced to applicants. The Government has refused to make the files available, or give details of those transactions on the ground that the agreements and arrangements are confidential. Once bitten twice shy! When, as Leader of the Opposition, I went to Portland, I was told by local residents—people in prominent positions in the community—about a transaction which ran into hundreds of thousands of dollars. The money was advanced to one hotel in the town for extensions and renovations.

Honorable members have been told by the Minister of Public Works that that is the responsibility of the Ministry for Tourism. The local community asks why a particular complex should be treated differently or regarded preferentially, particularly at a time when interest rates are high? Why should that applicant receive large sums of money to build extensions to his hotel at an interest rate of 7 per cent? It is suggested quite openly and publicly within the community that the funds were advanced because the gentleman concerned is a well-known supporter of the Liberal Party.

I am bound, when the matter is raised, to say that I will investigate it, but the Government is not prepared to provide the details even though the money advanced is public money, and the terms given are generous and place the recipient of the loan in an advantageous position compared with other motel or hotel proprietors. I am unable to discover the reason for this because the file is not available to me to ascertain what inquiry was made, what were in essence the real terms and conditions of the loan and whether, as is suggested, some particular patronage was involved, or whether that was in fact a scurrilous suggestion.

I can give three or four other examples. Another loan was granted by the same body to a large contractor and within six months of receiving $250,000 the company was in financial difficulties. What examination was made before such a large sum of public money was made available at a low interest rate? Again the Opposition was told by the Government that the file would not be made available because it contained information which ought not to be made available to the community. It has been drawn to my attention as Leader of the Opposition that a road construction manager—again a prominent member of the Liberal Party—received substantial funds to promote decentralization. He happened to have a quarry in a nearby country town that needed development. A quarry cannot be moved from Richmond or Footscray; it must be developed on the spot. When inquiries are made, it is found that large sums of money are being made available to this company on terms and conditions which are more than advantageous and could not be obtained on the commercial market. When one inquires whether this is a decentralized industry, the number of people who will be employed there, and whether they will be employed locally, no satisfactory answer can be given.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! How is this related to the Bill?

Mr. HOLDING: The Bill before the House establishes another corporation which will deal with public funds in the same way, and I am seeking an assurance from the Minister of Public Works because it is a critical matter. I want to know whether the Minister and the Government will regard the transactions which the proposed corporation will deal with as matters which are privy only to the parties to the contract, namely, the Government and the vendor on the one side and the purchaser on the other. Will this information be made available for public scrutiny? That is the critical question on which I seek assurance, because on a previous occasion I pointed out that I strongly supported the legislation to establish

the Victorian Development Corporation, for which large sums of public money were made available.

Mr. STEPHEN: It is not quite the same.

Mr. HOLDING: Of course it is the same. An unsuccessful applicant for a loan in a country area may complain that a prominent Liberal Party candidate received hundreds of thousands of dollars at 7 per cent interest to develop a quarry which is outside the Melbourne metropolitan area to service his road-building company. The complainant may think the deal is "crook" and that the person obtained the money because he was a prominent supporter of the Liberal party. In such a case does the Minister have a duty to investigate the complaint, does the complainant have the right to see the file, and has the Minister the responsibility to make the information available to him?

On no fewer than four occasions I have pointed out to the Minister in writing that when the Government says, in effect, "These things are essentially private, we are not going to make that sort of information available", inevitably allegations of impropriety are made and there is always a cloud of suspicion, even if the transactions on their face appear to be perfectly normal, proper, and made on the best judgment. That situation is thoroughly unsatisfactory when dealing with public money.

If a person wants to borrow money at a cheaper rate of interest, he is entitled to have this information because he receives the benefit of a low interest rate, and as he is dealing with public money, he cannot expect the same degree of privacy as if he were dealing with a merchant banker and paying 14, 16 or 18 per cent interest.

A situation is being created in relation to the Mainline corporation whereby considerable responsibilities are vested in the Ministers of the Crown. It is absurd not to look at the realities of the market place. At the present time, because many developers are in trouble, when one goes to Canberra—and I do not necessarily recommend this course—one must beat one's way through the developers who are trying to offload their problems. The Minister of Housing confirmed that he recently had this experience.

Less than ten days ago I made a suggestion in respect to the Windsor Hotel. I suggested publicly, in view of the situation that existed, that the Government should consider buying the hotel. Yesterday I was told by a stockbroker that, on the basis of the report of my comments in the newspapers, the share values had doubled. If I had known that such an effect would be caused, I may have broken a long-standing rule by buying some shares. One must look at the reality in which the business community operates.

It may be to the Government's credit or discredit, but if it is made known that the Government is likely to buy a property the value of the shares on the market rises. This happened in relation to the Geelong Gas Company Ltd., and it is probably true because Governments in our community bend over backwards wherever possible to try to avoid accusations that they are depriving the citizen of his rights. Governments often tend to pay more generously than private buyers in the market place. Therefore, as soon as it is known that a Government department is a potential buyer, the price of the shares rises. That is a matter of public knowledge and realistic practice. How does one overcome problems of this type and avoid the imputation that is constantly made—although not always properly founded—that somewhere along the line political patronage is involved?

It is a question not merely of protecting Parliament but also of protecting the Minister. Parliament should not allow its Ministers to be placed in a position where those sorts of accusations, many of which are made

recklessly without regard to the facts, can be made under any circumstances. In recent years there have been a number of examples where it has been suggested clearly and openly that graft and corruption have been involved. In view of the large number of transactions which have taken place in recent years, the people of Victoria might be more fortunate than those of other States. This raises the question of the whole system of democratic government.

One must read the history of Parliament, of the land booms and the records of this place. Many of the limiting provisions were inserted in the Constitution in an effort to clean up Victoria. That is the unfortunate legacy of this State ; there is no point in denying it.

In introducing legislation of this kind, one must be careful not to turn back the clock. Even admitting the integrity of the intention, one should not lightly create a situation where it can be suggested that abuses can take place. That is the weakness of the proposed legislation. The point has been more than adequately covered by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Although I support and adopt the views expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I seek an assurance from the Minister that under no circumstances will the files dealing with any one of these transactions not be made available to any member of the Parliament who requires them, because if people have that protection, it goes at least some way towards providing both Parliament and the Ministers with protection.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : I assure the Leader of the Country Party, who asked first, and the Leader of the Opposition, that the file containing details of each transaction of the corporation will be tabled in Parliament for scrutiny and debate by honorable members. I suggest that progress be reported on clause 2 so that I may discuss with Parliamentary Counsel a suitable amendment to be included in the Bill.

The Government will not agree to the motion before the House that the proposed legislation be referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee for examination and report. It is not that I do not have the highest regard for the Statute Law Revision Committee ; a number of members of this House have served on that committee and know its value. It is simply that the measure has followed the normal course, having been drafted by a Minister and taken to Cabinet, then referred to the Parliamentary Liberal Party and to a party committee which reported back to the party. I admit that the Bill was improved along the way and safeguards were included in it which were not originally included.

I agree with those honorable members who have said that improvements have been made. The legislation was then formally introduced without undue haste. Suitable time was given on the adjournment of the debate for the Country Party and the Opposition to examine the Bill thoroughly, so the three parties of the Parliament and all honorable members who have taken sufficient interest in the Bill have had the opportunity to examine it thoroughly. From that thorough examination have come constructive suggestions by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Leader of the Country Party, who in effect have said, " We do not want to see Parliament's role as a watch-dog being reduced or whittled away ; Parliament should not be deprived of that role ". I agree with that view, as I am sure all Government supporters do.

I repeat that I cannot agree to the Bill being referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee. It forms a new concept and a new initiative, but no more than the Historic Buildings Bill which was before the House during the last sessional period of Parliament. It was not suggested then that that Bill, which was just as unique in concept as this one is, should be referred to the Statute Law Revision Committee.

Therefore, in order not to weary the House any further, I give that assurance to the Leader of the Country Party and the Leader of the Opposition and will report progress on clause 2 so that suitable amendments can be drafted. The Government cannot agree to the amendment.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I wish to raise a number of matters. There has been considerable debate on whether sufficient safeguards have been included in the Bill. I point out to the Minister and to honorable members that many Acts relating to other corporations and organizations which report to Parliament contain similar provisions. That does not mean that they get their reports into Parliament with great rapidity. The Parole Board and other boards that are required to report to Parliament are years behind; the Adult Parole Board is three years in arrears.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Do you want that clause taken out of the Bill?

Mr. ROPER: No; I am pointing out that the requirement to report to Parliament is not a particularly good safeguard. I draw the attention of the Minister to clause 5, which provides for the establishment of a four-member corporation.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): In view of the lateness of the hour I point out that the honorable member is referring to a particular clause which can be dealt with at the appropriate time.

Mr. ROPER: The Minister states that he intends to refer this Bill back to a Parliamentary Counsel. When he does so he could have the two matters dealt with, and that might save time. The Minister would then be able to give an explanation when clause 2 is being considered.

A four-member corporation will be established, the chairman of which will be the Minister of Public Works. However, no provision is made for the chairman to have both a deliberative and a casting vote. Clause 12, however, specifically provides for the chairman of the advisory committee to preside at all meetings and to have a deciding as well as a casting vote.

A problem which I visualize and which could easily be remedied is that unless there is provision for the chairman to have a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote, the situation might arise where the corporation ties two-all and is deadlocked. There might be a simple explanation, but one wonders why two committees would have different approaches. When the Minister consults Parliamentary Counsel he might be able to provide an explanation.

The House divided on the question that the words proposed by Mr. Edmunds to be omitted stand part of the motion (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler in the chair)—

Ayes	..	47
Noes	..	15
Majority against the amendment	..	32

AYES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Baxter	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Reese
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Ebery	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Stephen
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Hamer	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Hann	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Jona	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Vale
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Whiting
Mr. McClure	Mr. Williams
Mr. McInnes	Mr. Wiltshire
Mr. McKellar	Mr. Wood
Mr. McLaren	*Tellers:*
Mr. Maclellan	Mr. Billing
Mr. Meagher	Mr. Chamberlain

NOES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Lind
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Roper
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Holding	*Tellers:*
Mr. Jones	Mr. Fogarty
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Stirling

PAIRS.

Mr. Burgin	Mr. Ginifer
Mr. Guy	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Lacy	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Doube

The House divided on the motion (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler in the chair)—

Ayes	47
Noes	15
Majority for the motion	32

AYES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Baxter	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Reese
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Ebery	Mr. Smith
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	(*Bellarine*) Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Stephen
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Hamer	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Hann	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Jona	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Vale
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Whiting
Mr. McClure	Mr. Williams
Mr. McInnes	Mr. Wiltshire
Mr. McKellar	Mr. Wood
Mr. McLaren	*Tellers:*
Mr. Maclellan	Mr. Billing
Mr. Meagher	Mr. Chamberlain

NOES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Lind
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Roper
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Holding	*Tellers:*
Mr. Jones	Mr. Fogarty
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Stirling

PAIRS.

Mr. Burgin	Mr. Ginifer
Mr. Guy	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Lacy	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Doube

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Progress was reported.

VALUATION OF LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

GLOBAL READERS — CLEELAND HIGH SCHOOL — BRUNSWICK TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): I raise a matter with the Minister of Consumer Affairs regarding the activities of a company known as Global Readers, whose postal address is Box 588, Darlinghurst, New South Wales. It has come to my notice that at present in northern Victoria young men are calling at household front doors claiming to be tourists from New Zealand on a tour of Victoria interested in obtaining the history of the locality in which they happen to be at the time. These young people are able to gain the confidence of the householder and in conversation it transpires that they are engaged in a competition to win a trip to South Africa through gaining so many points. In actual fact, they are selling magazine subscriptions. The competition to win a trip to South Africa may be genuine, but the ploy is nothing but an avenue to get into householders' homes and sell magazine subscriptions.

I understand that the Consumer Protection Bureau has already had thirteen complaints about this company. I also understand that the acti-

vities of the salesmen do not come within the provisions of the Consumer Protection Act regarding door-to-door sales because the sales are made on a cash basis, not a credit basis. Therefore, the normal ten-day cooling-off period does not apply. Furthermore, the company disclaims responsibility for the methods employed by its salesmen because it claims that they are not employed by the company but are sub-contractors. I am informed by the honorable member for Evelyn that saleswomen as well as salesmen are involved in the practice. I recall a similar organization under another name operating about ten years ago in Sydney. Unfortunately, in those days I also fell for the trap. As the honorable member for Gippsland East says, I was only a boy then. The magazines failed to arrive. I ask the Minister to investigate the activities of this company in particular, and to consider in general an amendment to the Consumer Protection Act to bring this type of salesmanship within the section which deals with door-to-door sales.

Mr. LIND (Dandenong): I direct to the attention of the Minister of Education a matter of extreme importance in my electorate of Dandenong. I refer to the plight of 80 boys attending the Cleeland High School. Sixty more boys will commence at the school at the beginning of 1975. Two years ago the council of the school which was then the Dandenong Girls High School, having previously been the Dandenong Girls School, agreed to the school becoming co-educational. The former Director of Secondary Education, Mr. Schruhm, assured the school council that full facilities would be provided for boys at the school. The secretary of the school council, in a recent letter to the department, stated that nothing practical has been done to this day. A small portable toilet has been supplied for the 80 boys who attend the school and a needlework room has been converted to a woodwork room. The small portable toilet must be used by 80 boys as a changing room for both physical education and sporting periods. The parents of the children are very much up in arms about the position. They believe the arrangement is unhealthy, unhygienic and most unsatisfactory.

Some months ago the school council asked for a shelter shed to be converted to a changing room. The Public Works Department inspector estimated that the electrical requirements would cost approximately $130 and the structural alterations would cost about $180. The structural alterations merely entail covering the cyclone wire doors of the shelter shed with hardwood of some type to ensure privacy, and supplying shelving. The secretary of the school council was asked to supply three quotes and a supporting letter. The query from the school is why at this late stage, with Christmas only six weeks away, this matter cannot be treated urgently and attended to by a works order. The only amenities supplied in the school so far for the boys have been the small portable toilet and the conversion of one room in which to do their woodwork.

After the request that the shelter sheds be made available as a change room for the boys, the officers of the Public Works Department have come up with a proposition that one of the girls' toilet blocks be converted for boys and another one of the girls' toilet blocks be extended for the use of the girls. There is much confusion about the matter and the council of the school has asked me to ask the Minister when this will be done. In six weeks' time the builders will be on holidays for a period of three or four weeks. This necessary new toilet block and change room amenities, as well as other facilities for boys who will number at least 140 next year, will not be provided. The school council desires the Minister to give the matter his urgent consideration and confer with the Minister of Public Works, if necessary, to ensure that these urgent jobs are put in hand immediately.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I wish to direct an urgent matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, but as the honorable gentleman is not present, I will direct the question to the Minister of Education as it concerns a matter on which he will have some knowledge. I refer to a migrant portable class-room at Brunswick Technical School. There was considerable difficulty in obtaining access to the site because of the parking of Brunswick council vehicles around it. Some time ago that difficulty was overcome and the vehicles were moved. Some weeks after the street was blocked off, the migrant portable class-room was moved onto the block. This was a difficult operation. The portable was originally due for delivery last February and is still not operational. The Public Works Department—presumably the Education Department is connected with this—has not supplied the electrical works, water connection and drains, nor has anything been done to make the site adequate for people to walk on and off.

The matter of the delivery of the migrant portable has been dragging on from February and then from July. Firstly there was the difficulty of obtaining a site for the portable at Brunswick Technical School. Finally, after great difficulty, that was achieved. The building was delivered, and it is still not usable. A similar situation occurred at Brunswick High School. It took three months for the Public Works Department to find the metal tabs that are placed between the foundation blocks of the portable and the portable itself. The teachers and the students at Brunswick Technical School do not want to wait three months for these small works to be carried out. Can the Minister persuade his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, or officers of his department, to ensure that the migrant portable class-room is open for inspection and possible use before the end of the school year?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Consumer Affairs): I thank the honorable member for Murray Valley for raising a matter concerning certain young salesmen. I will have it examined.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): In reply to the honorable member for Brunswick West, I shall be happy to discuss the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, to ensure that there is no delay. Regarding the matter raised by the honorable member for Dandenong of the application by the school council for the conversion of a shelter shed, the council can have permission to undertake the work immediately. I realize that is only one of two or three things that need to be done, and I will take up with the Public Works Department the matter of speeding up the necessary toilet accommodation at the start of the new school year.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.44 *a.m.*

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated—

STUDENT CONCESSION FARES.

(Question No. 402)

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

Whether eligibility for student concession fares on the Victorian Railways is not subject to an age limit but that tram fare concessions offered by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board have an age limit of nineteen years for students; if so—(*a*) what is the reason for the different policies; and (*b*) whether he will recommend to the Tramways Board that the age ceiling for student fares be abolished?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

Student travel concessions granted by the railways are not subject to an age limit.

Student travel concessions granted by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board are restricted to students under nineteen years of age.

A standard approach to a number of concessions given on public transport has been implemented. The question of bringing student travel concessions on to a uniform basis is being examined as part of the total review.

KANGAROO GROUND–CHRISTMAS HILLS ROAD.

(Question No. 450)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Minister of Transport—

Whether substantial new works, including construction of a major new cutting are being undertaken on the road between Kangaroo Ground and Christmas Hills; if so—(*a*) what is the estimated cost of such works; and (*b*) whether the site of these works is scheduled for inundation by the Watson's Creek dam and, in that event—(i) whether the works are a preliminary part of the dam; (ii) whether the dam will not now be built; or (iii) whether the Country Roads Board is operating in isolation from other areas of Government forward planning?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

The road concerned is the Eltham–Yarra Glen road which is a main road declared under the provisions of the Country Roads Act and which is under the care and management of the Healesville Shire Council. The cutting referred to by the honorable member is included in a contract for 1·15 kilometres of reconstruction and realignment for which the Country Roads Board recently approved the acceptance of a tender by the council.

(*a*) $84,000.

(*b*) Yes.

(i) No.

(ii) The Premier in a statement dated 7th October, 1974, said that the Watson's Creek dam would not be required before 1992.

(iii) The plans for this project were prepared by the council and approved by the Country Roads Board after consultation with officers of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. The Country Roads Board and council know of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works' proposals for the dam but the proposed road improvements are necessary to provide adequate safety standards for traffic until the dam is built.

JOHNSON STREET, SOUTH MELBOURNE, RIVER CROSSING.

(Question No. 471)

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

1. What stage has been reached concerning the proposed construction of the Lower Yarra crossing known as the Johnson Street bridge?

2. When it is expected that construction will be commenced and completed?

3. What plans there are to divert the traffic flow from this bridge away from the cities of Port Melbourne and South Melbourne?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

1. Preliminary work associated with acquisition of property and relocation of services has commenced and the Country Roads Board has now accepted a tender for the construction of the Johnson Street bridge and associated roadworks.

2. It is expected that work will commence in November, 1974, and be completed within three years.

3. The board is conducting a detailed investigation to determine the improvements which may be required to cater for the increased traffic which will arise from the opening of the West Gate bridge and the Johnson Street bridge. The results of the investigation are expected early in 1975 and will be considered in consultation with the councils concerned.

HEYFIELD WEIGHBRIDGE.

(Question No. 505)

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) asked the Minister of Transport—

Whether, as the only weighbridge available at Heyfield has now come under the control of the Country Roads Board, he will authorize the use of this weighbridge by local transport operators until such time as an alternative weighbridge is installed?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

Should the Heyfield weighbridge be used by local transport operators for trade purposes the weights and measures regulations would require that:

(*a*) the weighbridge be registered as a public weighbridge;

(*b*) the weighbridge be operated by a licensed weighman;

(*c*) prescribed weighbridge tickets be used;

(*d*) the weighman weigh all vehicles brought for weighing within the capacity of the weighbridge and on payment of a fee.

The Country Roads Board is not empowered under the provisions of the Country Roads Act to operate a public weighbridge. However as this weighbridge was previously a registered public weighbridge the board would be prepared to lease it for this purpose under certain conditions.

AIR POLLUTION IN NEWTOWN NORTH.

(Question No. 529)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister for Conservation—

1. When officers of the Ministry for Conservation were sent to the Newtown North area in 1974 to consult with householders and interview representatives of industrial firms on complaints of excessive fall-out in this residential area?

2. Who were the officers concerned, indicating their office with the authority?

3. How many householders and representatives of industrial firms were interviewed?

4. Whether a report of the investigation was compiled; if so, what were the findings and recommendations?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation): The answer is—

1. An officer of the Environment Protection Authority visited the Newtown North area on 2nd July, 1974, and 8th July, 1974, to investigate complaints relating to fall-out of dust.

2. An inspector air/land—Mr. N. Gross.

3. Three householders, one representative of an industrial firm.

4. A report on the investigation was prepared by the inspecting officer. It reveals that representatives of a manufacturing undertaking in the area who were interviewed advised that there was no plant malfunction at the time, but the fall-out was aggravated by weather conditions. Improvements in emission control equipment are being proposed by the manufacturer concerned.

SPOTSWOOD RAILWAY WORKSHOPS.

(Question No. 544)

Mr. STIRLING (Williamstown) asked the Minister of Transport—

Whether it is intended to close down the Spotswood railway workshops; if so, when, and what is the proposed use of the area now occupied by the workshops?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

Plans are in hand to transfer the functions at present being carried out at the Spotswood workshops to the Newport workshops as part of our programme to rationalize departmental manufacturing and repair facilities.

The transfer is expected to take some years to complete.

The present thinking is that this land could become available for the consolidation of rail depot activity including use by industries primarily needing rail loading facilities.

PORTABLE CLASS-ROOMS.

(Question No. 550)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

How many portable class-rooms were, are or will be in use by the Education Department at—(*a*) the start of the 1974 school year; (*b*) the present time; (*c*) the start of the 1975 school year; (*d*) the start of term two, 1975; (*e*) the start of term three, 1975; and (*f*) the start of the 1976 school year?

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

(*a*) 1,726 portable class-rooms were in use at State schools at the start of the 1974 school year.

(*b*) In October 1974, 2,084 portables were in use.

(*c*) (*d*) (*e*) and (*f*). Due to the uncertainty of the building industry in completing works to contract dates it is not possible to predict the number of portable class-rooms that will be in use in 1975 or 1976 at this stage.

Surveys are regularly conducted to determine the schools with the greatest need for portable accommodation and rooms are reallocated accordingly as permanent rooms are completed. However it is the aim of the Government to phase out the construction of additional portable class-rooms.

WEST COBURG TRAMLINE.

(Question No. 553)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Transport—

Further to the answer to question No. 348 asked on Wednesday, 23rd October, 1974, in respect of the West Coburg tramline, whether he will make available to the member for Brunswick West the report prepared on the feasibility of extending the tramline?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

The Metropolitan Transportation Committee's plan to provide for an extension of the West Coburg tramway was based on computer analysis of the passenger traffic likely to be attracted to an extension.

The Tramways Board proposes to commence a feasibility study of this extension early in 1975.

WATER POLLUTION.

(Question No. 565)

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

In respect of the water pollution analyses referred to on page 8 of the Mines Department report for 1972—

1. What groundwater areas tested were found to be polluted?

2. Which municipal rubbish tips and mining dumps, respectively, mentioned in the report were subject to leaching by water?

3. What action has been or will be taken to prevent such pollution?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines): The answer is—

1. The only positive evidence of groundwater pollution in the areas tested has been in the aquifers underlying the industrial areas of the western and south-western suburbs.

2. Old municipal tips being monitored up to the end of 1972, because they had been used for the disposal of industrial wastes, were at Keilor, Spotswood and Williamstown.

During 1972 water pollution investigations were carried out in areas adjacent to mining dumps at the A1 Consolidated Mine at Gaffneys Creek and the Morning Star Mine at Woods Point.

3. Under the licensing requirements of the Environment Protection Act, most industrial waste disposals have stopped or are being controlled.

Through a network of observation bores and regularly sampling, the Mines Department is studying the dispersion rates and changes in composition of the groundwater near pollution centres.

Where necessary dams have been constructed adjacent to mining dumps to prevent the seepage of polluted waters into nearby waterways.

SCHOOL MEDICAL SERVICE.

(Question No. 569)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Health—

1. How many—(*a*) primary schools; and (*b*) post-primary schools, will not be visited in 1974 by a school medical officer for the purpose of conducting medical examinations of students?

2. How many grade I. students will have a complete medical examination by the School Medical Service this year?

3. What procedures exist for the further medical assessment of those children found at the routine medical examination, or suspected by their teachers, to need further examination?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): The answer is—

1. By the end of the current school year it is anticipated that (*a*) 938 primary schools and (*b*) 399 secondary schools will not have been visited by a school medical officer for the purpose of conducting medical examinations of students.

However it is School Medical Service policy to examine schools which have less than 100 pupils enrolled, only once each two years. On these occasions children in grade I. and grade II. are examined.

In addition to visits by school medical officers, 53 primary schools were visited by school nurses to carry out routine hearing and vision screening on grade I. and grade IV. pupils. A number of secondary schools not visited by medical officers received routine visits by school nurses.

These nurses receive special in-service training for this work and seek help from medical officers when required.

2. It is anticipated that the member of grade I students who will receive a complete medical examination by the school medical service during 1974 will exceed 46,000.

3. School medical service staff at subsequent visits review children found in routing grade I. examinations to have conditions needing treatment. While this is usually done at the time of the next annual visit to a school, special cases are followed up earlier if indicated. The service also encourages referrals from teachers of children who are not progressing at school if exclusion of a medical cause is thought desirable. Follow-up reviews and examination on referral by teachers are part of the scheme which replaced the three medical examinations during school life previously attempted.

CRIME IN MELBOURNE ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 571)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Chief Secretary—

How many crimes have been reported within the electoral district of Melbourne in the twelve months ended 30th October, 1974, to the Criminal Investigation Branch and/or police at stations within the electoral

district, indicating the number and nature of the crime, and at which station or branch each crime was reported?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

Statistics are not kept of the different categories of crime reported to each police station but are compiled on a police district basis. The crime statistics in respect of the total number of offences reported in the electoral district of Melbourne during the twelve months ended 30th October, 1974, is as follows:

Nature of crime	Number of offences reported
*Theft (formerly "larceny")	3,630
*Motor car theft (formerly "larceny of motor car")	452
*Burglary other than of a dwelling (formerly "breaking" offences)	478
*Burglary of dwelling (formerly "house-breaking")	119
*Theft by deception (formerly "false pretences")	455
Assault	325
Robbery	70
Drug offences	71
Sex offences	39
Other offences	1,056
Total	6,695

* The changes in the names of these types of crimes have been made in accordance with the provisions of the Crimes (Theft) Act 1973.

PRESTON GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL.

(Question No. 572)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether the zone regulating the intake to Preston Girls High School has been extended in a northerly direction; if so—(*a*) what is the new zone; and (*b*) whether the zone change is applicable to students in all forms?

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

(*a*) Yes. The zone has been extended north from Murray Road to Tyler and Regent streets between Plenty Road and the railway line.

(*b*) The change in zoning applicable only to students in form I.

SCHOOL MEDICAL AND DENTAL SERVICES.

(Question No. 581)

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine) asked the Minister of Health—

1. Which schools in the electoral district of Sunshine have been visited by medical and dental units during the past two years for the purpose of checking the sight, hearing, and teeth, respectively, of pupils?

2. What were the results of such checks and what problems were highlighted?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): The answer is—

1. No schools in the state electoral district of Sunshine were visited by a school dental unit during 1973 or 1974.

The following schools were visited by the School Medical Service in 1973—

Primary—
Altona Gate 4825
Sunshine technical
Altona North 4931
Kingsville 3988
Tottenham 4707
Brooklyn 4710
Tottenham North 4703
Sunshine East 4645
Sunvale 4818
Our Lady's, Sunshine
St. Augustine's, Yarraville
Christ the King, Braybrook
Corpus Christi, Footscray West

Secondary—
Sunshine technical
Footscray high
Tottenham technical
St. John's, Braybrook

A total of 1,541 vision tests were carried out in these schools and 669 full medical examinations (not included in the figure for vision tests). In addition 1,053 children were either reviewed following previous visits or as a result of referral by members of the teaching staff. Hearing tests are included in this figure. In total, 3,263 children attending the above schools were seen by the School Medical Service. Of this total, 480 were referred to family physicians for further examination and attention.

The following visits were made by the School Medical Service in 1974—

Primary—
Altona Gate 4825
*Sunshine 3113
*Altona North 4931
*Kingsville 3988
Tottenham 4707
Brooklyn 4710
*Tottenham North 4703
*Sunshine East 4645
Sunvale 4818
*Christ the King, Braybrook
Corpus Christi, Footscray West

Secondary—
Sunshine technical
Footscray high
*Tottenham technical

Schools marked thus* are in the process of being visited or will be seen during the remainder of term III. The following figures do not include results from these schools.

A total of 927 routine vision tests and 240 vision reviews and referrals were carried out in these schools, together with 231 full medical examinations (not included in figures for vision), and 59 hearing reviews and referrals. In addition 229 children were either reviewed from previous visits or referred by teaching staff, for reasons other than vision and hearing. Of a total of 1,686 children seen in the above schools so far this year, 119 have been referred for action.

2. At present this organization does not have the facilities to develop statistical analysis of the results of examinations so that particular local problems might be highlighted.

LIQUEFIED GASES REGULATIONS.

(Question No. 594)

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

1. Why additional staff were not employed to assist in the drafting of regulations pursuant to the Liquefied Gases Act 1968 as reported in the Mines Department report for 1972?

2. Whether these regulations have been drafted as yet; if not, why, and when it is expected that the regulations will be drafted and gazetted, respectively?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines): The answer is—

1. It has been difficult to obtain staff with the necessary background in the field of liquefied gases, however, one officer has been appointed and his duties include assisting in the drafting of regulations. The other vacancy has been advertised without success seven times since June, 1973.

2. Meanwhile officers have been members of committees of the Standards Association of Australia drafting standards for liquefied petroleum gas, anhydrous ammonia and cryogenic fluids generally. Such standards will be the basis of regulations under the Liquefied Gases Act which are currently being drafted and are expected to be completed early in 1975. It is intended that the draft regulations be circulated to interested bodies for comment before they are gazetted.

ROAD-WIDENING, YARRAVILLE.

(Question No. 599)

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine) asked the Minister of Transport—

Whether it is the intention of the Government to acquire properties for road-widening purposes adjacent to the corners of—(*a*) Williamstown Road and Francis Street, Yarraville; and (*b*) Williamstown Road and Somerville Road, Yarraville; if so—(i) what properties are involved; and (ii) when the Government intends calling tenders for the proposed road-widening works?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

Williamstown Road, Francis Street and Somerville Road are unclassified roads under the control of the Footscray City Council.

In view of the importance of these intersections in relation to access requirements to the West Gate bridge and Lower Yarra Freeway the Country Roads Board, with the knowledge of the Footscray City Council, has prepared preliminary proposals for improvements to the intersections. Until the proposals have been finalized and agreement reached between the board and the council, it will not be possible to state which properties will be involved and when tenders will be called for the works.

VALUER-GENERAL'S VALUATIONS.

(Question No. 645)

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

Whether it is intended that the Valuer-General will make valuations in the future for all statutory purposes?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister for Local Government is—

No. There is no intention of altering the present procedure under the Valuation of Land Act whereby all taxing and rating valuations are made by valuers in the direct employ of councils, with the Valuer-General acting as co-ordinator.

The Valuer-General carries out valuations for Government department and statutory authorities as provided for in section 3 (5) of the Valuation of Land Act. This same section authorizes the Valuer-General to carry out valuations for the owner of a property "where the valuation is required for the purpose of assessing duties under the Probate Duty Act 1962 or—for the purposes of the Stamps Act 1958—".

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, November 14, 1974.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. K. H. Wheeler)** took the chair at 11.6 a.m., and read the prayer.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I have been advised that the Minister of Agriculture has been delayed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the claims made by the Minister for State Development and Decentralization about the success of his decentralization programme, can the Minister for Fuel and Power expedite the answer to question No. 14 which has remained on the Notice Paper for a considerable time and is simply directed towards proving the veracity of some of the claims of the Minister for State Development and Decentralization? Could I receive an undertaking that the question will be answered in the very near future?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): I agree that question No. 14 has remained on the Notice Paper for a considerable time. On four occasions I have asked my assistant to check with the Department of State Development and Decentralization and I have been told that a good deal of statistical information is required. I will endeavour to obtain a reply for the Leader of the Opposition as soon as possible.

MISSING PERSONS BUREAU.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): Is the Chief Secretary aware that the Missing Persons Bureau of the Victoria Police Force is understaffed, that an increasing number of young people are being reported missing, particularly teenage girls, and that the bureau is unable to cope? Will the Chief Secretary examine the situation and ensure that sufficient policemen are provided to enable the bureau to cope with its increased responsibilities?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer to the first two questions is "Yes" and I will discuss with the Chief Commissioner of Police the proper staffing of the Missing Persons Bureau.

ROAD TRANSPORTS.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North): I presume the Minister of Transport would be concerned at a statement made in recent days by the Chief Secretary that 83 per cent of road freight transport drivers are exceeding the speed limit. Has the Minister considered the introduction of the system which applies in many overseas countries of having a large sign displayed on the rear of the vehicle, near the number plate, showing the maximum speed allowable for the vehicle, so that when such vehicles are exceeding the speed limit other motorists and the public at large will know what the vehicles are doing?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): I have not given consideration to this matter, because it comes under the Motor Car Act, which is within the jurisdiction of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North): Perhaps I could readdress my question to the Chief Secretary and ask: If he has considered the matter what are the results of that consideration; if he has not, will he give it consideration?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): That is a different question. I have given consideration to it, and I will be happy to discuss the matter with the honorable member.

HUME AND WESTERN HIGHWAYS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas): Can the Minister of Transport advise the House what is the nature of the alleged takeover of the Hume and Western highways by the Commonwealth Department of Transport?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): At a meeting of the State Highway Ministers last year, at which a report by the National Association of State Road Authorities recommending a system of national highways was considered, I suggested that a national highway system was desirable, and should be the subject of a separate agreement between the Commonwealth and the States, apart altogether from the rest of the road system. That idea was adopted by the Commonwealth Government, and I support such a system.

However, my proposition was that it should be the subject of a negotiated agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. No such agreement was reached, and my complaint about it is that the amounts of money to be spent on the national highway system have largely been deducted from the amounts which would normally have been available for the rest of the road system.

As I say, I have always been a supporter of this concept. My only complaint is about the way in which it is being carried out, and I hope that at the conference of Ministers to be held in Brisbane tomorrow, I shall be able to further my negotiations in that respect and perhaps obtain a better deal.

RAILWAYS BOARD CHAIRMAN.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. The honorable gentleman will be aware that Mr. A. G. Gibbs, Chairman of the Railways Board, has been appointed to replace the late Sir Arthur Petfield on the board of the Overseas Telecommunications Commission (Aust.) What proportion of his time will Mr. Gibbs be giving to the work of the commission, and will there be any diminution in the salary which he receives from the State?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The Chairman of the Railways Board has been appointed to this position in an interim capacity to assist in the organization of the Post Office and the Overseas Telecommunications Commission. This has been done with the consent of the Victorian Government. It is expected that Mr. Gibbs will attend one meeting a month for the next few months, and he is doing so without salary from the Commonwealth. Therefore, his Victorian salary will not be affected.

DRILLING IN BASS STRAIT.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): I ask the Minister for Fuel and Power whether the Government has given any consideration to the possibility of drilling off shore in Gippsland for oil or gas and, if so, which department would carry out this drilling?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): At this stage, I believe the correct answer would be, "No". However, the honorable member for Gippsland South and other honorable members are no doubt aware that there has been some publicity in the press about the likelihood of the Gas and Fuel Corporation applying for some leases which have become available, will be advertised, and are free to be taken up. The Government is not opposed to this course. It has happened in other parts of the world. However, the proposal has to be properly considered, so at present my answer to the honorable member is, "No".

SUPREME COURT CASE.

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine): I direct a question to the Minister of Labour and Industry. A case is listed for hearing by the Supreme Court on 26th November, referred from the Industrial Appeals Court, concerning the Hospitals Senior Medical Officers Board. The outcome of this case may

have some effect upon decisions of wages boards made since the national wage flow-on. In view of this, is it the intention of the Minister of Labour and Industry to be represented at the Supreme Court hearing?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry): I think that question was asked about a fortnight ago.

Mr. FOGARTY: No, it was not.

Mr. RAFFERTY: The matter that is coming on for hearing could have a bearing on the actions of future wages boards. Consideration will be given to the wages boards matter after a decision is given. At present the case is listed for the Supreme Court and the Minister may be represented, but that is not certain yet.

DRILLING IN BASS STRAIT.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): Further to the question asked of the Minister for Fuel and Power by the honorable member for Gippsland South concerning drilling in Bass Strait, can the honorable gentleman inform the House whether a licence has been issued for what is known as Snapper Well? If a licence has not been issued, will the Government consider the matters raised by the Minister for Fuel and Power, and give further consideration to the granting of the licence to the Gas and Fuel Corporation?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): A licence for Snapper Well has been issued.

ACCELERATED GROWTH CENTRES.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party): I refer the Premier to a report that the Government has decided not to proceed with the development of another accelerated growth centre in Victoria. If it is correct, can the Premier advise whether it is the intention of the Government to concentrate its financial resources on various regional centres rather than on one accelerated growth centre?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I have not seen the report to which the Leader of the Country Party refers. All that has been done so far is this: Two growth centres as such have been approved, one being Albury–Wodonga and the other Geelong. No other centres have been approved nor are they, in my view, likely to be approved in the immediate future. As the Leader of the Country Party will be aware, all incentives which are available to decentralized industries are available generally and are not confined to any particular centre.

In certain larger country centres, the Government is attempting, so far as it can, to concentrate its efforts on decentralizing its own administration and on providing educational facilities up to the tertiary level and other facilities. The Government is trying, in the first instance anyway, to make those available in the larger country centres. That does not mean that other centres are not open to receive a decentralized industry. The Government will encourage industries wherever they want to go. That is the present position. No other decision has been made. Victoria has only two accelerated growth centres.

DRIVERS' LICENCE TESTS.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Is the Chief Secretary aware of the considerable delay in booking for tests at drivers' licence testing stations and that at some it is impossible to obtain a booking before Christmas? If the honorable gentleman is aware of this, what action has he taken to make more staff available at licence testing stations so that applicants can be tested before the Christmas holiday period?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I am not aware of the delays indicated by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but I will make inquiries to find out if there are delays. I understand that there is now an accelerating demand for these services, and I will discuss the problem with the Chief Commissioner of Police.

RODENT PLAGUE.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura): In view of the serious mouse plague which is at present invading Western Australia, will the Minister of Agriculture take steps to ensure that his department is geared to face such a challenge if it should arise in Victoria?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The Vermin and Noxious Weeds Destruction Board has prime responsibility, but naturally the Department of Agriculture has an interest. Not long ago a good research programme was mounted by a couple of people in the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization but that programme was, for want of a better expression, hit on the head by the Federal Government. This project very much concerned the wheat industry, and the Chairman of the Grain Elevators Board, Mr. Turnbull. made a special plea for the project to be continued because he is aware of the problem that rodents can cause to grain. I am pleased to say that when it was approached, the Victorian Government was happy to give a considerable grant towards supporting the research programme of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. It is hoped the programe will ultimately provide better control and eradication of rodents.

DRIVERS' LICENCE TESTS.

Mr. SKEGGS (Ivanhoe): I ask the Chief Secretary: Is it a fact that restrictions have been imposed by the police on the use of certain vehicles for licence testing? Is it also a fact that two-door vehicles are restricted to a certain few and that small four-door vehicles are similarly restricted for testing purposes?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I ask the honorable member to place the question on the Notice Paper.

YOUTH, SPORT AND RECREATION GRANTS.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I ask the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation whether the new guidelines for applying for grants and for the administration of grants from the Youth Fund and the Sports and Recreation Fund have been prepared. If not, when will they be prepared? If they are ready, will they be circulated to members of this House so that we can see the conditions under which grants are being made?

Mr. DIXON (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation): The final draft of the guidelines will be approved today. The guidelines will be released on Monday and honorable members will receive them through the letter distribution service in this Parliament either on Monday or first thing Tuesday morning.

RAILWAYS LAWYERS.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East): I ask the Minister of Transport whether the services of Victorian Railways lawyers are provided to private companies which are lessees of Victorian Railways land in hearings before the Town Planning Appeals Tribunals? If so, is the cost of the services of those lawyers reimbursed by the companies, or are the services provided free of charge?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): I am not aware of the services of railways solicitors being made available to private companies except perhaps in consultations between the companies and the railways on legal matters. If the honorable member will put his question on the Notice Paper, I shall give him a more detailed answer.

TEACHER HOUSING.

Mr. HANN (Rodney): In view of the serious financial situation of the Teacher Housing Authority, and the fact that for two years an inquiry has been conducted by the Teachers Tribunal into the rent structure generally for teacher housing, can the Minister of Education indicate when the

tribunal's report will be brought down? If not, will the Minister ensure that an early report is brought down?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I am aware that some time ago the Teacher Housing Authority approached the Teachers Tribunal for a revision of teacher rentals in order to build up the funds of the authority to provide better services for the housing of teachers in the country. In recent times the tribunal has been concerned with hearing applications for a new award. The determination for the new award was made at the end of October. I expect and hope for an early decision by the tribunal in relation to housing rentals for teachers.

DRILLING IN BASS STRAIT.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): I ask a supplementary question of the Minister for Fuel and Power. To whom and when was the licence issued for Snapper Well in Bass Strait?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): The licence was issued to Esso-Hematite. I am not sure of the exact date, but it was late in October.

MARGARINE.

Sir EDGAR TANNER (Caulfield): Can the Minister of Agriculture inform the House whether the margarines which are advertised as polyunsaturated are completely polyunsaturated? If not, what is the approximate percentage of polyunsaturated content?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the honorable member for his question. There has been a great deal of advertising of polyunsaturated margarine which has led consumers of that product to believe the margarine they eat contains no saturated fats, and therefore that they can "eat their heads off" and it will do them no harm. That is not true. The majority of polyunsaturated products advertised as such contain two-thirds of saturated fat. So effectively one can eat a third less butter and be just as healthy, and I recommend it. However, a couple of products have a higher percentage of unsaturated fats, and these have recently gone on the market. To the best of my knowledge no product is totally polyunsaturated or anything like it.

PRIMARY SCHOOL GROUNDS.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray): Has the Minister of Education given further consideration to the request of authorities and officers of his department for an increase in the size of primary school grounds in the future? If so, what is the result of those deliberations, and will there be an increase in the size of primary school areas?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): A proposal is under consideration to increase the size of primary school grounds from 5 to 8 acres. At the moment the decision is that preference should be given to the many primary schools established in the early years of this century and last century which are on sites varying from 1 to 2·5 acres. In the electorate of Prahran there are five primary schools on 9 acres. Honorable members will be able to cite similar instances, particularly in the inner-suburban areas. At this stage we intend to give priority to the expansion of schools existing on abnormally small sites.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Is it a fact that the abolition of the superphosphate bounty by the Commonwealth Government at the end of December will place a severe strain on the Victorian Railways in transporting quantities of superphosphate during December which could affect the movement of the State's wheat crop? What steps have the Victorian Railways taken to facilitate this heavy delivery of superphosphate, and is the Minister in a

position to negotiate with the Commonwealth Government with a view to extending the bounty on the superphosphate that is ordered before the end of December but which is unable to be delivered by the Victorian Railways?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): Some time ago the Premier wrote to the Commonwealth Prime Minister on this subject. We are still negotiating in the hope that we will be able to offer some relief.

PRIVATE BUS OPERATORS.

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara): Can the Minister of Transport inform the House when private bus operators can apply for fare subsidies?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): We hope to have that detail worked out in the next week or so, and the subsidy will operate as from 1st October of this year.

MELBOURNE UNDERGROUND RAIL LOOP.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): Is the Minister of Transport aware that in the construction of the Parliament station for the Melbourne Underground Rail Loop Authority, blasting is still occurring during the night hours? Is he aware that as recently as 7th November severe blasting occurred at 9.53 p.m.? Will he make representations to ensure that blasting is confined to normal working hours so that residents of the area are not disturbed? Will he give consideration, as requested by neighbouring residents, to the facade of the buildings which have been soiled by dust arising from the explosions, being cleaned at the expense of the authority?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): On the date mentioned by the honorable member a blast did take place at approximately 9.50 p.m. The reason was that earlier blasting during the hours of daylight had been unsatisfactory and the tunnel was in an unsafe condition. In order to render the tunnel safe it was necessary to have that additional blast at night. My information is that although the blast was louder than normal, the amount of vibration was considerably less than normal. I have received representations from a resident in Spring Street on this matter. I have explained this to him, and I have also told him that the contractors have been asked to avoid any further blasting at night time as far as possible.

I suggest to the honorable member that the amount of dust raised by workers on the underground rail loop is considerably less than that raised by a north wind on any day in Melbourne.

DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray): Can honorable members take it from the reply given by the Minister of Education earlier today that the Victorian Government is applying more of its funds to the expansion of school sites as distinct from extra moneys that are being made available by the Australian Government for the disadvantaged schools programme? If so, can the Minister outline what is the allocation of Victorian funds to the estates branch for this financial year?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): The allocation will be $3 million. The Government is trying to build up a total programme and is using some funds from the disadvantaged schools fund under the Commonwealth States' Grants (Schools) Act 1973. It is using those funds for the purchase of sites adjacent to disadvantaged schools such as Debney Park High School, and also for the improvement of Brunswick Technical School.

COMPANY PROFITS.

Mr. RAMSAY (Balwyn): Is the Attorney-General aware that the Prime Minister recently wrote to the Chairman of the Prices Justification Tribunal asking him to give particular attention to the problem that

companies are having in making adequate profits to ensure that they carry out a programme of reinvestment and development which will assist under the present economic circumstances? Will the Attorney-General write a similar letter supporting the Prime Minister on behalf of Victoria and the many companies which are now finding it difficult to make a profit?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I am aware only through the newspapers that the Prime Minister wrote to the Chairman of the Prices Justification Tribunal, and, if I read the newspapers correctly, the chairman told the Prime Minister to keep his nose out of it. I would be very hesitant to enter into the matter, although I appreciate what the honorable gentleman said about the disastrous situation of many companies and businesses operating in Victoria, brought about by some of the activities of the Prices Justification Tribunal, and brought about entirely otherwise by the quite tragic economic policies of the Government in Canberra.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, the question asked was whether the Attorney-General would write to the Prime Minister on behalf of the Victorian Government. The Attorney-General now wants to talk about Commonwealth economic affairs.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I uphold the point of order. I ask the Attorney-General to come to the answer.

Mr. RAMSAY (Balwyn): The Leader of the Opposition incorrectly stated that I asked whether the Attorney-General would write to the Prime Minister. I asked whether he would write to the Chairman of the Prices Justification Tribunal in support of the Prime Minister's submission.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): As usual, I shall take your advice, Mr. Speaker, and come to the point, but I thought it was only fair to honorable members that they should understand the background.

I would have to give careful consideration to whether I should write to the Chairman of the Prices Justification Tribunal. I would be very careful in coming to that decision because the establishment of the tribunal is one of the many things done by the Commonwealth Government which appear to have no constitutional basis.

PETITIONS.

Fluoridation of Water Supply.

Mr. McCLURE (Bendigo) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to amend existing legislation to ensure that fluoridation of any public water supply is not undertaken unless requested by a majority of voters in a referendum held in the area administered by the water trust concerned. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 1,851 signatures.

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

Mr. MacDONALD (Glen Iris) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to amend existing legislation to ensure that fluoridation of any public water supply is not undertaken unless requested by a majority of voters in a referendum held in the area administered by the water trust concerned. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 101 signatures.

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

Mr. JONA (Hawthorn) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to amend existing legislation to ensure that fluoridation of any public water supply is not undertaken unless requested by a majority of voters in a referendum held in the area administered by the water trust

concerned. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 191 signatures.

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

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to amend existing legislation to ensure that fluoridation of any public water supply is not undertaken unless requested by a majority of voters in a referendum held in the area administered by the water trust concerned. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 369 signatures.

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

Mr. EBERY (Midlands) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to amend existing legislation to ensure that fluoridation of any public water supply is not undertaken unless requested by a majority of voters in a referendum held in the area administered by the water trust concerned. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 2,136 signatures.

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

PAPERS.

The following papers, pursuant to the directions of an Act of Parliament, were laid on the table by the Clerk—

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—

Barrabool Planning Scheme 1966, Amendment No. 15 (Shire of Barrabool).

Geelong Planning Scheme 1959, Amendment No. 8 (Shire of Barrabool).

Geelong Planning Scheme 1959, Amendment No. 11, 1972 (City of Newtown).

Town of Stawell Planning Scheme 1963, Amendment No. 7, 1973.

FAMILY COURTS BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 10) on the motion of Mr. Wilkes (Northcote) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. MACLELLAN (Gippsland West): The difficulty that I face in approaching the debate on this Bill is to know how private private members' Bills are. Although that is the name used for such measures, it seems to have been a general assumption in all the rather acrimonious discussions that have gone on about when the debate would be resumed, that the Opposition and the Government have pre-empted the right to decide by arrangement between themselves on the date of resumption. As I have been given no consideration at all, I presume that private members' Bills are not really private, but that they are Opposition Bills. I have no quarrel with that, and if honorable members can consider this measure as an Opposition Bill they can begin to understand the atmosphere in which it was created.

I sympathize with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the difficulties that he faced in presenting the Bill. He could not presume to get a Governor's message to justify the expenditure of money. The Family Courts Bill ends up today as a sort of compulsory conference Bill, and it does nothing more useful. The tragedy is that it is using the concept of a family court with a decorative name.

The Bill proposes little more than to bring the parties before a Magistrates Court if a family situation arises from matrimonial relations or some domestic dispute, to confer, to adjourn, and then to confer with people or with the magistrate. Like private members' Bills which are not private, the name of the Bill in fact becomes a fraud. It is not a Family Courts Bill; it is just a compulsory conference Bill.

If one went around all Magistrates Courts in Victoria and placed a sticker over the word "magistrate" to rename it "Family Court", one would achieve the same result. It does nothing of substance to the court other than that. There would still be magistrates, the building would be

the same, the situation would be the same, the parties appearing would be the same, and the representation would be the same. The family court would be the same and the only thing the court could do is to say, "Let us confer; let us adjourn; why do you not go away and confer with this, that or the other organization?" It is nothing but unfortunate propoganda.

Clause 1, which contains the title, is a fraud. Clause 2 contains a little propaganda to make it sound as though the Bill will achieve something useful. The clause reads—

> For the better determination of disputes or matters tending to disrupt family life in the community there shall be established Family Courts as hereafter in this Act provided.

The Bill does nothing to determine these disputes. In fact the family court would have no power to determine anything other than the length of an adjournment or with whom the parties will confer. If the period of adjournment expired and the parties remained unreconciled the court could do nothing about it. The court could not even make an order because it would be confronted with parties who had irreconcilable differences and were simply at arms length. The court would then have no sanction or no weapon. It is like the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission under Labor control: It makes an order for workers to return to work, but if they do not the commission cannot punish them. The family courts would be in a worse position than that.

Clause 3 empowers the Governor in Council by proclamation to make the Magistrates Courts magically convert to family courts merely by using the name "Family Courts". The provision does nothing more useful than that.

Clause 4 is interesting; it provides that each family court shall have exclusive jurisdiction in all matters concerning complaints with respect to the maintenance of wives and children or summary proceedings between spouses or between parents and children. I do not know why Parliamentary Counsel drafted the clause in this form. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition provided no explanation in his second-reading notes. To my surprise I discovered that, under this provision, a 95-year-old father and his 70-year-old son may be forced to confer or to have matters adjourned and dealt with in a family court because they are father and son.

In addition, any summary matter arising between a father and son or mother and daughter, whether illegitimate or not, is to be dealt with by family courts. Clause 4 reads—

> Each Family Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine or to adjudicate upon all complaints or applications arising within the area in respect of which the Family Court is established—
>
> (*a*) under the Maintenance Act 1965 with respect to the maintenance of wives and children (including illegitimate children) and the custody of children; and
>
> (*b*) all summary proceedings of any nature between spouses or between any parent and his or her child (including any illegitimate child or adopted child).

No age limit is imposed, so the provision means that children remain the children of their parents while the parents are alive. If the two parties exist, the family court has exclusive jurisdiction. The purpose of this clause is a mystery which is best left to the knowledge of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Parliamentary Counsel. Why the Parliamentary Counsel left the clause in this position, I cannot imagine, but he has left the poor Deputy Leader of the Opposition right out on a limb. It means that any family dispute must be dealt with in this wretched family court. As I said, the title is a misnomer.

Clause 5 provides—

> For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act each Family Court shall have and may exercise all or any of the powers conferred upon a magistrates' court by or under the Justices Act 1958.

The clause achieves nothing. It simply says that the Justices Act has "done up" the Magistrates Court as a family court.

Clause 6 relates to conciliation, and this is where the only new material appears. The clause provides that the family court may order an adjournment of the proceedings to give the parties a chance to arrange a compromise or reconciliation; it may arrange a conference or it may direct the parties to confer with some outside organization. This is a most worth-while objective, but I am afraid that the name has been abused and misused.

In clause 7 even greater difficulty occurs because the family situation of father and son, mother and daughter, parent and child and husband and wife is used. This could encompass claims for workers compensation and testators' family maintenance claims. Everything that arises between a parent and child is to be shoved into the family court—for what purpose I do not know, other than that there shall be a conference.

If a father employs his son and a workers compensation claim arises because of an accident, what earthly use is there in saying that the father and the son must confer about the claim? Is it so that they can cook up the evidence to make it even better? What is the purpose of the conference? Why must they go for family counselling? Is it so that the father may be persuaded not to leave a brick on the edge of scaffolding which might fall off and injure someone, or is it to persuade the son not to lose his temper and hit his father on the head with a brick?

Honorable members have not received the slightest inkling of what this is about and why parents and their children, no matter what their age may be, so long as the parent and child are both alive, must confer before any legal proceedings can be commenced. The clause means that before any legal proceeding are commenced with respect to any dispute or issue between spouses or between parents and children, one can rush off to the family court to try to prevent his son's workers compensation or motor accident claim from being heard, or to hold up a testator's family maintenance claim. All these matters are thrown into the family court, which is totally inadequate, despite the talents of the magistrates, in its jurisdiction, and in the training and approach of magistrates to handle these matters. The magistrates have no special training in areas of equity and property, and they work in a limited jurisdiction even in normal cases.

The case of a contested will would have to be referred to a family court because it is between parties if more than one member of the family is concerned. If only one member of the family is taking action against the executor, it would not have to go to a family court, but where two members of the family are involved it would go to a family court. In other words, if an only child were contesting a will against a stepmother, I understand from my reading of the situation that the family court jurisdiction would not be involved because there is no direct relationship between the two people, but if a brother and sister were involved in a claim against the stepmother, because there are two of them and it involves a family relationship, the case might have to go to the family court first. The magistrate dealing with the case would not be familiar with the contents and interpretation of the wills and it would be a whole new jurisdiction for him.

Clause 8 provides that the family courts may use community facilities for providing guidance to married persons and that information regarding such consultations shall not be disclosed. It would be a worth-while and sensible clause if the Bill achieved anything, but as it does not achieve anything the clause does not do anything except to provide that people

who are involved in compulsory conferences must, like priests, not disclose what they hear at those conferences.

Clause 9 is a contempt provision, providing that any person who misbehaves and treats a family court as an informal court can be punished for contempt. Clause 10 relates to the rules of family courts.

I can only conclude that this Bill, after its long gestation, was never intended to see the light of day; that it is an embarrassment to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and that somehow the tactics of this place forced the Opposition to introduce the Bill, which crept out from under a pile of rocks and is now exposed in all its nakedness. I am afraid that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was not given a fair go. He should have been given the message not to introduce this private member's Bill, or, if it were to be introduced, money should have been provided by the Government. If the family courts are to be involved in solving domestic difficulties, money must be provided to help them do so.

In order to bring the national situation into consideration, I refer to the report of the Standing Committee on Constitutional Legal Affairs from the Australian Senate. That report refers to the law and administration of divorce and related matters in the Family Law Bill. The matter of the one ground for the dissolution of marriage—irretrievable breakdown—has attracted a great deal of attention. A whole chapter of the report, commencing at page 16, is devoted to family courts. It is an all-party report and the Attorney-General would be horrified at the way in which the report suggests that the Commonwealth could get around the Constitution. The Federal Constitution requires that Federal judges must be made judges for life so that they will not be subject to influence, directions or letters from Prime Ministers or other people. In order to remain completely independent, the judges must be appointed for life. The committee feels that these ageing judges might still continue to sit on family courts, and that would not be satisfactory.

There is another philosophy about this, which is that older people make better arbiters; that grandfathers are much better at settling issues in family situations than members of the middle generation. That aspect has not been considered in this report. It has been suggested that to get around the constitutional requirements which bind the Commonwealth, the States and the people of Australia into one united nation, without amendment of the Constitution, the State should appoint the judges whom they recommend and that they should be given different jurisdictions so that they will not be appointed for life.

It is incredible the lengths to which people will go to impose their philosopohical beliefs about the nature of judges and people who have to adjudicate on matters of this kind. I find it most unsatisfactory that the subject of family courts can, in this House, come to us in this form. It is nothing but a travesty. In the Senate report, the same concept is abused and some snide, little efforts are made to get around the constitutional requirement because the members of that committee did not like judges to keep on judging until they were 72 years of age.

There is a need for family courts, but I do not believe it will be achieved by the measure before the House. All that the Bill does is to point up a lot of little defects, and its passage will not really achieve anything. I believe people are constantly seeking to impose their own particular views on family courts, which could have a role to play. I do not presuppose what that role might be.

I believe the measure introduced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition simply amounts to a misuse of the words " family courts " and does nothing more. I also believe the Senate report sought the introduction

of family courts by the back door, by trying to use judges appointed by State Governments, vesting them with Commonwealth jurisdiction and asking them to use that jurisdiction when dealing with matters relating to family problems.

If honorable members could have time to have another look at the principles embodied in the Bill, something might be achieved. Time to have another look implies that honorable members will have to make up their own minds on this matter. I do not believe any amendment can be moved to save the measure. It should be withdrawn and redrafted. I am sure that if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had had time to rethink the matter before it came into the House, he would have done so, and the Bill now under consideration would have been entirely different. It is unfair to judge the measure on the form in which it has been presented. We should defer judgment on it until some future time.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party): This is an almost unique occasion because it is the first time, in my experience in this Chamber, that a private member's Bill has been debated. It is certainly the first time that that has occurred for many years, and I congratulate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for bringing in the Bill.

I disagree with the criticism made by the honorable member for Gippsland West, who criticized out of hand the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Bill. There are shortcomings over matrimonial problems and family disputes. These are very real and have to be faced up to. As it is not possible for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to propose amendments to the existing law, the only effective method available to him to bring the subject-matter before the House and the public of Victoria is to introduce a private member's Bill.

I indicate that the Country Party will not support the Bill. However, it does support the spirit behind it and some of the ideals which led to its introduction. I agree with the honorable member for Gippsland West that there are problems which cut across the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. In my view matters which are technical and have a far-reaching effect should be left to the Supreme Court. That court should have nothing to do with domestic disputes in the normal way.

I ask the Government to consider the introduction of substantial amendments to the Magistrates Court legislation to enable more matters to be referred to marriage guidance counsellors and social welfare officers. In my own area, the Government is building up a much stronger social welfare organization than has existed. The Minister for Social Welfare announced in Shepparton a few weeks ago that the staff of the regional headquarters of the Social Welfare Department would be increased from two to sixteen. That gives an indication of the importance the Government places on social welfare. Social welfare officers concentrate a tremendous amount of their efforts on the family unit. Members of Parliament are approached by dozens of deserted wives every month, and this aspect is becoming a tremendous social problem in the community.

I feel rather than having the cold, brief legal proceedings in a Magistrates Court, where a wife's claims are brushed aside, the magistrate should be able to refer the problem to a marriage guidance counsellor, a social welfare worker or some other person to try to achieve a solution. In my view the magistrate has not the time or perhaps the background to be an arbitrator to resolve the differences.

I am grateful to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the opportunity he has provided honorable members by introducing his private member's Bill. In future I hope private members' Bills will come from the Government party, from the Opposition party and from the third party. There

must be members of the Government party who for years have wished to introduce private members' Bills. Honorable members continually hear of the tremendous fights that they put up from time to time in the party room. Now there is an opportunity, if they have been sincere in those battles, for them to introduce private members' Bills. I am sure the Government would give a free vote on such a Bill. This procedure could give some of those long-suffering, frustrated back-bench members of the Liberal Party the opportunity of making their mark in this Parliament.

The House divided on the motion (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler in the chair)—

Ayes	..	17
Noes	..	42
Majority against the motion	..	25

AYES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Roper
Mr. Doube	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Stirling
Mr. Fogarty	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Ginifer	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Holding	*Tellers:*
Mr. Jones	Mr. Bornstein
Mr. Lind	Mr. Kirkwood

NOES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. McLaren
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Maclellan
Mr. Billing	Mr. Meagher
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Chamberlain	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Reese
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Ebery	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Stephen
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Guy	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hann	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Jona	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Vale
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Whiting
Mr. McInnes	*Tellers:*
Mr. McKellar	Mr. Baxter
	Mr. McClure

PAIRS.

Mr. Curnow	Mr. Lacy
Mr. Mutton	Mr. Burgin

SCHOOL DESIGN AND PRACTICES.

The debate (adjourned from October 31) was resumed on the motion of Mr. Fordham (Footscray)—

That this House takes note of the Ministerial statement relating to inter-departmental liaison and school design and building practices.

and on Mr. Wilkes's amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—"and deplores the failure of the Government to meaningfully involve local school communities in the school building programme."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas): When I began my speech on 31st October I gave an example of situations which are fairly typical of the meaningful discussion that takes place between school committees, departmental professional officers and local members of Parliament. I stated that in company with one of the members who represent the Western Province in the Legislative Council, I sought the services of officers of the department to look at some schools in the electorate, and that request was readily granted. A tour was arranged, with plenty of notice, and the co-operation of the schools. Members of Parliament and officers of the Education Department and the Public Works Department, together with local school committees, inspected a school, discussed desirable improvements, considered plans and arrived at a fair consensus on what should happen at that school.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: Was only one school inspected?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: No, three schools were seen in two days. The result was that a promise was made that plans incorporating the fairly consensus view, guided by the professional expertise of the departmental officers, would be drawn up. For two of those schools the plans have been produced, approved by the school councils and accepted. The plan for the third school is still being considered.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: How long did it take?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The visit took place at the end of May, and the plans had arrived by late July or in August.

In his statement on this aspect of involvement of the community, the Minister pointed to certain reports which stated that the process of consultation with the committee could involve extra time, and therefore extra expense, but due weight must be given to the fact that the department is prepared to do it and has the expertise. The Minister said—

> I might finally mention that my department is willing, and would welcome the opportunity, to co-operate with school committees and other community organizations in planning projects associated with schools.

All that is required is to open the lines of communication. They are there but are not always availed of. This point has been overlooked by the Opposition. Many school committees and local members forget that this help is readily available.

A situation occurred at the George Street, Hamilton, Primary School, which is in the programme to be upgraded so that it will obtain a library, staff facilities and additional class-rooms. A plan was presented to the school, and it was disagreed with. The school considered that the configuration suggested was completely unworkable and nonsensical. I arranged for officers of the Education Department and architects from the Public Works Department to visit the school. A letter to me dated 7th November, 1974, from the secretary of the George Street Primary School committee states, *inter alia*—

> The visit of Messrs. Crowe and Seaton was a great help and gave the principal and committee the opportunity to discuss many points of concern, contention and misunderstanding.
>
> The net result is that the job will be done their way rather than ours, but we now understand why.

That is the important point. It emphasizes what I have said. The lines of communication exist, but in some cases they must be opened. Sometimes the individual members of school committees may believe they are being ignored in the planning process. The liaison channels are available, the possibilities of co-operation exist, and it is a matter of taking the first step.

When difficulties are encountered the Director-General of Public Works has been more than willing to help and more than courteous in his dealings with members of this House.

One cannot give too much attention to the local community's desires. Over the years considerable detailed standards and planning have evolved, and those standards must not be watered down by the individual whims of a local community. It is important to keep the matter in balance. There is no substance in the amendment. It is an indictment of members of Parliament who fail to take advantage of the avenues of assistance available to school committees if they care to make the effort to obtain it.

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong): The case that can be put in favour of the amendment can be put more easily than the case for the motion. It is far easier to justify opposition to the amendment than the statement regarding the inter-departmental liaison in school design and school building practices. That statement may be open to improvement. A system in which many people are involved departmentally in an activity will never be perfect. It will never work as smoothly when a series of departments are involved, as it will in one department and preferably in one building.

An examination of the history of the Public Works Department and the Education Department would probably reveal a graph of troubles rising at roughly the rate of the vast expansion of building that has occurred during the past couple of decades. There is more scope for difficulty with a vast building and development programme than there was 30 or 40 years ago when a new school was a rarity. That fact must be faced. Therefore, the Minister, the Government and the departmental heads

must dedicate themselves to eliminating the problems which arise from time to time and do their best to ensure that liaison operates at the highest possible level.

Local school committees and advisory councils operate reasonably effectively in the school building programme. This is why I strongly oppose the amendment. I sit on only one advisory council. I am aware that other honorable members have seats on more than one advisory council, but I prefer to do the job thoroughly. I devote considerable attention to the advisory council of the Geelong High School in preference to being a phantom member of a number of committees. I can recall nothing but endeavours and involvement by the advisory council of the Geelong High School in all programmes involving alterations and extensions. The council has found the Public Works Department and the Education Department most cooperative in this regard. It is no effort to obtain involvement. School committee involvement has increased considerably in the past decade or so. I am sure that there is a high degree of local school committee and local school community involvement in discussions and preparations that involve building contracts, the extension of buildings, the upgrading of buildings and the general sporting facilities that accompany a modern school.

I refer to certain developments that occurred about twelve months ago. The Minister of Education opened a $1 million extension to a very old school—it may be the oldest in Victoria—which is still being used for education; it is the Matthew Flinders Girls High School, the old Geelong Common School with an 1851 date over the front entrance. It is the original building, which is now preserved for historical purposes, with a $1 million extension along the back street, Myers Street. For about two years I was involved with the school community and the school committee in the preparation of plans. Every step was taken in liaison, firstly with the Education Department, and secondly with the Public Works Department.

Two different Ministers were in office during that time. Mr. Murray Byrne, when he was the Minister, called regularly at the Matthew Flinders Girls High School. He wore a path to the school with plans under his arm, and he kept the school committee thoroughly informed. Consequently no antipathy developed. Everything went smoothly. School councils and committees always want their work carried out at the drop of a hat. That is natural. All are eager to get these matters through quickly. However, there was no lack of liaison with the local school community in that instance.

I refer now to the Geelong Technical School, which at present is a twin campus. Next year half the school will be transferred to Belmont, 3 or 4 miles from the existing school site. This transfer has been difficult to organize. It is one thing to open a new school, and another thing to transfer in pieces a school of 700 or 800 pupils to a new site. The new stage one is now being completed and may well open in time in February. Lengthy negotiations have taken place with the school committee. Three or four years ago an agreement was thrashed out, because at that time the assembly hall grant was available. A big argument took place between the school committee, the Public Works Department and the Ministers — particularly the Minister of Education—on whether the $150,000 building would be put on a small 1·5-acre site at the Geelong Technical School.

As plans were in hand for the building of a new school at Belmont and for the closing of this school as a technical school, arrangements had to be made. The committee, the school community and the staff were involved in the negotiations. An agreement was thrashed out that if we held our hand with the assembly hall the Education Department would try to reduce the building time from

seven or eight years to about four years. Therefore, if we waited a few years both the assembly hall and stage one of the new school could be built together. This work is taking place at present. A new school is being completed at Belmont. Although there have been problems in hammering out these agreements, the point I make about the amendment is that the local school committee has been involved to the hilt in every step. My correspondence files are quite thick on the subject. They can be produced to show the total involvement of the school community in this case, as with others.

On the Notice Paper today there is a question in my name directed to the Minister of Education concerning the Belmont Primary School facilities such as art and crafts centres, a new library and improvements to staff and administration facilities. The members of that school committee met privately last Thursday night in Belmont, and I had a long talk with them. I placed a question on the Notice Paper to elicit information. This sort of thing is going on continually. I do not know of one school in my electorate that does not have a school committee which is not totally involved—not just on the periphery—in the planning of building programmes.

Mr. DUNSTAN: And meaningfully!

Mr. BIRRELL: It is a meaningful involvement. When the involvement becomes meaningful, it generally becomes argumentative too. There seem to be no great problems with school communities being involved in these programmes because they like to be involved. School committees' involvement in building programmes is probably the most interesting part of their work. My experience on the Geelong High School Advisory Council indicates that this subject is among the most important matters discussed in detail at advisory council meetings month after month. It entails the inspection of sites for new buildings, the relationship of the total school site to that part occupied by new buildings, the priorities of new buildings over existing tennis courts and so on. Those aspects are deeply discussed and fair decisions are arrived at.

The amendment does not seem to be even 10 per cent correct. If there have been shortcomings they are probably the school community's fault and they have not been caused by any antipathy by the Minister or the department. Therefore, I oppose the amendment. The motion is—

> That this House takes note of the Ministerial statement relating to inter-departmental liaison and school design and building practices.

The wording leaves enough ice to skate on. It is expected that this position can be improved, just as it is expected that building costs next year will be higher and the Education Department will need more money to carry on. There is always room for improvement.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Particularly in the Opposition.

Mr. BIRRELL: Yes. Generally speaking, this aspect of public administration in Victoria has improved. There have been specific appointments made for officers to undertake the administration of finance. The Government is endeavouring to clear these hindrances so that there will be a smooth working arrangement between the Education Department and the Public Works Department. It is realized that this is not an easy task, and a close liaison is not easily achieved. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition moved this amendment—

> That the following words be added to the motion:—" and deplores the failure of the Government to meaningfully involve local school communities in the school building programme ".

I unreservedly and totally oppose the amendment. If there are any shortcomings the fault lies completely with local school committees.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton): The amendment to the motion that the House take note of the Ministerial

statement advocates increased community involvement but at the same time censures the Government. I have had experience in Parliament and with the Public Works Department, not only in the building of schools but in the local government area in the planning of public works and buildings. I have also been involved in other departments in the construction of a pre-school centre and a public health centre.

When we speak of community involvement, we all know from experience with local committees, and particularly with school committees and advisory councils, that the same few people always become involved. These people are dedicated; they pursue with interest what they consider to be their hobby. They are interested in education for education's sake; and this keeps them involved in the community.

However, in this instance criticism by the Opposition is levelled at a department. The problems of the Education Department over the past few years have been unprecedented and this flows on to the Public Works Department. Any reasonably observant citizen would note the concrete and brick multi-storied structures that have been erected in Melbourne in recent years and the construction of many schools and public buildings needed to cope with the public demand. However, building in the public sector runs a bad second to building in the private sector. Many contractors in the private sector often have little stability in a time of inflation, but they often have up their sleeve a nice comfortable cash job to be carried out for the Government. That is common knowledge.

One should now look at the present position. The Public Works Department will be starved because of the economic position foisted on the community by a centralist Socialist Government in Canberra. Companies are closing down, and building contractors are going broke. These people come to the Government—the Housing Commission in particular and the Public Works Department—to see what the Government can do. What can the Government say? It can say that Canberra is not providing the money. Even if the money is available it is often difficult for material to be obtained.

Some buildings have been completed on time by the Public Works Department but they have remained vacant because furnishings could not be obtained or carpet installed as the carpet company at Dandenong is closing owing to the textile industries difficulties arising from actions by the Government in Canberra.

Mr. FORDHAM: The honorable member is talking nonsense as usual.

Mr. BILLING: It is not nonsense. If the honorable member for Footscray goes to the Dandenong and Heatherton electorates and talks about nonsense to the unemployed textile workers he will receive a reply.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member is getting wide of the motion before the chair.

Mr. BILLING: Regrettably, I was carried away by the stupid interjection. A year or more ago a contract was accepted for the construction of a technical school in Springvale South. To get the school going, and by agreement with staff and with parents, a portable complex was placed adjacent to the fine 20-acre site. Contracts were let and the first stage of the building was to be completed in March this year, but work has been delayed because of the economic conditions and the unavailability of labour resulting from industrial strife. On one day the contractor would have carpenters but no bricklayers; on another day he would have bricklayers but the plumbers would be on strike.

Mr. RAFFERTY: Who caused this?

Mr. BILLING: I will give the Minister two guesses. The Public Works Department has a good record of achievement under difficult

conditions. No member of the House can deny that in his approaches to officers of the department he has not been received courteously, given every consideration and obtained the information he has required. Seldom can a person obtain information over the telephone from the managing director of a private company. Any honorable member can walk out of the Chamber, telephone the Director-General of Public Works and in a few moments obtain up-to-date information on a school project in his electorate. I did that yesterday afternoon, and I would be in no different position from any other member. A person in the position of the Director-General of Public Works would not give preference to certain honorable members; therefore, the co-operation is available.

It is easy to select a set of circumstances at a particular school and magnify them out of all proportion, even to the extent of introducing a motion of want of confidence or a motion for the adjournment of the House. Any honorable member who wishes to waste the time of the House and the Public Works Department can create that sort of stir over a minor matter.

As an indication of community involvement, I refer to the proposed building of a primary school in Coomoora Road, Springvale South. There has been the usual agitation from teachers that they will not teach in a portable class-room, and from parents who say that they will not send their children to school if they are to be taught in portables. With a little co-operation between the Education Department and the Public Works Department a school will be built on the Coomoora Road site. The land has been acquired, and a vegetable grower has gone out of business. Melbourne can ill afford to lose this magnificent 20 acres of vegetable-producing land. Other areas which have been used for food production have been acquired for the erection of buildings.

Negotiations for the purchase of land for the school to which I have referred were conducted; the land was not acquired compulsorily. The owner is satisfied with the price, but one problem has arisen from the point of view of community involvement in the building of the school. The department is allowing the owner to continue to grow vegetables on the remaining 15 acres until the department builds a high school on the site, perhaps next year. However, the owner needs water, and community involvement is involved in his obtaining this commodity. The Board of Works was approached and today I have been notified that the water supply will be connected. This has resulted from the co-operation of the Public Works Department, the Education Department, the local member, the landowner, parents at the school and the Board of Works. Community involvement appears all along the line.

The Dandenong Branch of the Victorian Teachers Union said that teachers would not teach in portables and parents contended that they were paying for the school in their taxes but that they were getting a lousy deal from Canberra. The students are spread over two or three schools because the new school has not been erected. This morning the teachers have changed their mind because they do not like the school being split up and they want to establish the school with community involvement. Now members of the Victorian Teachers Union are happy to teach in a portable complex, provided that the permanent building is constructed. This will happen and it is proof of community involvement.

The Public Works Department has to contend with problems caused by shortage of money, escalation in costs, non availability of materials, and industrial strikes. The amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition indicates his limited knowledge of community involvement in these matters over the years, particularly with regard to high schools and primary schools.

Regular meetings of people interested in school affairs are being held, and they are attended by persons who are so busy that they can scarcely afford the time. However, because they are dedicated and interested in the community, and in their student children, they devote time to being members of advisory councils and school committees. They also assist the Government and the Public Works Department by raising money for special school projects such as tennis courts, swimming pools and other amenities for the advantage of the children. It is noteworthy that this co-operation, through another Ministry, is involving not only the parents of students but the municipalites in using school facilities in buildings which have been erected at considerable cost for the co-operative use of all the community. This is a feature of a Government policy which involves not only the Public Works Department but many other avenues of community involvement.

What is lacking in such areas is an appreciation by a large section of parents of the work of the dedicated few who are members of school committees and advisory councils. The majority of parents who do not take part in these activities should appreciate and publicly acknowledge the work done by members of school committees. If anything needs publicity, it is the need for all parents who can do so to take an interest in what is going on in the buildings where their children attend school. Many children attend school from the age of 6 years up to the tertiary level, when they are aged 24 or 25 years, and spend one-third of their lives, and sometimes more, in the education buildings. The majority of parents who do not take an interest should do so and find out what is going on inside those buildings.

In some areas people would hesitate to send their children back to school. Fortunately, those activities by teachers which have recently received adverse publicity are carried out by a minority of the Teaching Service and do not diminish the value of the community involvement by members of school councils.

I commend the Ministerial statement. I regret that a long row about the Brunswick Girls High School has prompted it, but even if the statement and the amendment have achieved nothing else they have brought to the attention of Parliament the fact that a vast number of dedicated people who are interested in promoting education in their areas are prepared to give up their time and money to assist the Public Works Department in the task of carrying out the physical work of providing the school buildings, which is becoming increasingly difficult owing to the shortage of funds, the escalation of costs and the shortage of materials.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Box Hill): I wish to refer to another rapidly growing outer-metropolitan area. I fully support what was said by the honorable member for Heatherton. I have been doing my homework, and I am satisfied that the Public Works Department is efficient, that it has an able Minister who is philosophically in line with the times, and that he has a good staff. I deplore the actions of the honorable members for Footscray and Northcote, for whom I have the greatest respect, in engaging in weak, carping criticism of a department which is operating under tremendous difficulties. I suppose one could blame departments for weakness in education, and I admit that there are weaknesses in this field in Victoria, as there are in all rapidly growing communities throughout the Western World.

One ought to go back 40 years to 1935, when the Labor supported Dunstan Government was formed. For almost a decade Victoria was starved of funds for education, social welfare, and practically everything.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! Honorable members are debating the Ministerial

statement and the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I cannot see any relevance between the 1935 Government and the present situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am endeavouring to show that it is sheer hypocrisy by intellectual members of the Labor Party, such as the honorable members for Brunswick West and Brunswick East, to cause strife about the Brunswick Girls High School. They ought to read a famous book called *Power without Glory* written by a man named Hardy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honorable member must confine his remarks to the contents of the Ministerial statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am endeavouring to show that the problems faced by the Minister of Education and the Minister of Public Works today originated four decades ago. For many years this State was starved of funds for education; the Ministers in charge boasted that they had never read a book in their lives. They were members of the Labor Party and of the Country Party.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Unless the honorable member adheres to my ruling, I will not hear him any further. Honorable members are debating a Ministerial statement and community involvement, which is referred to in an amendment. The honorable member may not go into history and refer to other matters.

Mr. FORDHAM: Tell us about the Box Hill Technical School.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am grateful for the communication in Box Hill between the Gas and Fuel Corporation, the councils in the area, the Public Works Department and the Education Department. This is community involvement. In the near future I hope there will be substantial progress and encouraging news about the future of the Box Hill Technical School.

It is regrettable that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was so slighting in his terms about the ingenuity and progressiveness of the architects in the Public Works Department. Their new primary school design is being proceeded with in a number of communities, including Bulleen, in my electorate. It will cost $500,000 and the Housing Commission and the Education Department are building this radically new school design.

Mr. WILKES: How many portables are there?

Mr. WILLIAMS: There are no portables on the site. In June, 1973, the Public Works Department completed the preliminary design for a new standard primary school. This cluster design, comprising four learning units and four special purpose buildings, is the first new design to be developed for a standard primary school since 1952. The Public Works Department completed in October, 1973, the feasibility study for the new primary school, based on an educational specification prepared by the Education Department.

Honorable members have heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition casting aspersions on the co-operation which exists between those two departments. I am quite satisfied, after the discussions I have had with officers from both the Education Department and the Public Works Department this morning that there is very close liaison between the two departments. This liaison is to the benefit of children residing in the electorate of Heatherton and in the rapidly growing areas of Box Hill.

I discovered to my dismay this morning that this new design prepared by the Public Works Department will now cost $1·1 million to complete. The increase from $660,000 to $1·1 million is due entirely to the escalation of building costs, aided and abetted by Socialist members of the Opposition.

This radical new design prepared by the Public Works Department is based on modern educational philosophy, concepts and standards and makes use of the open area concept. I am referring to notes which I have prepared from information accumulated over the past few days as a result of personally talking with people for whom I have the highest regard and who know what they are talking about. If members of the Opposition took the time and trouble to visit the Public Works Department and the Education Department and talked with the officers and obtained the information that is on the files, they would not come into this House and waste its time with foolish trivialities. I owe a debt of gratitude to the honorable member for Footscray because until he rose in this Chamber and started talking, I was inclined to believe some of the descriptions. I am delighted to pay a tribute to the Public Works Department and the Education Department and their respective Ministers for the close co-operation which does exist between the two departments.

I know that those departments are confronted with problems. The school at Bulleen is now to cost $500,000 and it will accommodate only 360 pupils. Had it been possible to contain building costs the expenditure of that sum of money would have allowed more pupils to be accommodated. As I understand the situation, the school will not have a separate library building or a separate administration building because those facilities will be included in one of the learner units. Instead of accommodating 560 pupils, the new school will accommodate only 360 pupils.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The time allowed for General Business has expired. Government Business will commence after the luncheon adjournment.

The sitting was suspended at 1 *p.m. until* 2.4 *p.m.*

PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I move—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon complaints of breach of privilege referred to it by the House; such committee to consist of Mr. B. J. Evans (Gippsland East), Mr. Holding, Mr. McLaren, Mr. Suggett, Sir Edgar Tanner, Mr. Wilkes and Mr. Wiltshire and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records; to hear evidence on oath; to sit on days on which the House does not meet; to move from place to place; and to report the minutes of evidence from time to time; four to be the quorum.

The purpose of this motion is to establish a Select Committee comprising senior and experienced members of this House to deal with matters of privilege referred to it by the House.

Over the years when questions of privilege have arisen the procedure has been that, if the necessary provisions could be made for their priority in the conduct of the business of the House, they were dealt with expeditiously. From time to time criticism has been made that the important question of privilege has been dealt with in a cursory manner because of a necessity to proceed with the business of the House. It is important that justice should not only be done but should be seen to be done. The leaders of the House who have been discussing this question believe it would be preferable to have a Select Committee of the House to which questions of this nature could be referred from time to time when they arise. I stress that the committee would deal only with matters referred to it by the House. The House would decide in the first instance whether the question was one which should be referred to the Select Committee, even though it related to privilege. The Select Committee would have the same powers as other Select Committees, to call witnesses, to hear evidence and to examine documents.

I also emphasize that the function of the committee would be not to impose penalties but merely to report on the case referred to it in the light

of traditions, the law and the rules of this Parliament. It would then be the prerogative of the Legislative Assembly, after considering the report of the committee, to impose any penalty if this were necessary. This course of action is certainly not without precedent. An almost identical committee exists in the House of Commons and in each House of the Federal Parliament. I understand that on eight occasions in the last century Select Committees of this House were set up to deal with questions of privilege.

As The Constitution Act Amendment Act is largely based on the rules and procedures and government practices of the United Kingdom, the same powers, immunities, and rights were virtually conferred on this Parliament. We therefore have a set of background rules and laws that should enable a Select Committee of this Parliament to operate as efficiently as does the Select Committee in the United Kingdom. This is a new step but I believe it will create a potentially valuable committee which can be called upon to deal with important questions of privilege as they arise. I therefore commend the motion to the House.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): One of the most important matters that can be raised in this Parliament is that of privilege. The Standing Rules and Orders of the House amplify how important that matter of privilege is and provide guidelines for how it should be treated. The motion moved by the Deputy Premier stems from a statutory committee that functioned in this Parliament and examined matters to which the question of privilege was related in many ways. I refer to the committee that dealt with the rights of Ministers to hold shares in companies and the pecuniary interests of members of Parliament. It was raised on no fewer than six occasions by that committee when deliberating—the committee's report has since been delivered to this Parliament—that a necessity existed for a Select Committee to deal with matters of privilege referred to it by the House. The committee took the view that perhaps it was unjust that a person or member could be charged by another member raising a matter of privilege without a prima facie case being established, whereas if the matter were referred to a Select Committee, it might find no justification for privilege.

Under the proposal put forward by the Deputy Premier, it appears that the Privileges Committee will hear matters that are referred to it concerning privilege where a prima facie case has already been established by the House. The prima facie case having been established, the matter will be referred to the committee for consideration.

Mr. Campbell, the Clerk, assisted the committee in many ways by explaining to it the procedures in the British Parliament and the experience he gained while there on behalf of this Parliament. There is no doubt in my mind, nor in the minds of members of the Opposition, that if few cases are referred to the committee by this Parliament it will indicate that Parliament is above the matters that are concerned with privilege. I certainly hope the committee will have no work to do. As pointed out by the Deputy Premier, cases have been discussed in this Chamber under the Standing Rules and Orders of this House and that, because of pressure of business, it could be deemed that they were dealt with in indecent haste. That would be difficult to prove but perhaps more time could have been given to fully investigating those matters. However, the matters of privilege that have been debated in this Chamber have alerted honorable members to their responsibility to Parliament. The debates themselves have been worth while, even leaving aside the reason for their coming before Parliament.

Under this proposal by the Deputy Premier, a prima facie case having been established, I believe it will be handled even more efficiently by a

committee of experienced members of Parliament who can avail themselves of all the facts and evidence and report back to Parliament. In the interests of Parliament, I sincerely hope it will not be necessary for the committee to meet on many occasions.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura): Members of the Country Party strongly support the proposal moved by the Deputy Premier. In common with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, we hope the committee will not be called into operation too often. It is an excellent idea and a safeguard for the committee to be appointed and be ready to operate at any time. Senior members of the House, with long political experience, have already been nominated for membership of this committee. They should be eminently suited to investigate and report on any complaints of breach of privilege which are presented to them.

The motion was agreed to.

EDUCATION (TEACHER REGISTRATION) BILL.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The major function of the Bill is to overcome some of the difficulties that have arisen in the operation of the teachers' registration boards and the Teacher Registration Council, which Parliament set up in 1971. The secondary objective is to provide school committees and councils with the power to appoint teacher aides.

Honorable members will recall that in the middle of 1971 the Southwell inquiry was set up to inquire into various aspects of the State education system. One recommendation which immediately found favour with teacher organizations was the proposal to set up teacher registration boards. Three boards were created —a secondary teachers' registration board, a technical teachers' registration board and a primary teachers' registration board. Over and above the boards was the Teacher Registration Council, consisting of members of the three boards, and this had certain appeal functions. The aim of the legislation in setting up the boards was to defuse the teacher registration problem which had bedevilled a number of high schools during the years prior to that date. There had been frequent arguments over what qualications teachers in the various divisions should have. These arguments moved out into the schools and caused disruptions and strikes.

By and large it can be said that the teachers registration board system, adopted by Parliament, has worked very well. I pay tribute to the departmental representatives and the teacher representatives on these boards and the council for their effective and untiring work. One of the surprising aspects of the system has been the amount of time that members have been required to spend making inquiries into applications and determining whether the applicants are suitably qualified for registration. Frequently they must deal with qualifications which have been obtained in various parts of the northern hemisphere, some in well-known educational institutions, and others in most obscure educational institutions. It is not an easy task to compare the qualifications of overseas applicants with those obtained in institutions in Victoria.

Over recent years there has been a significant improvement in pupil-teacher ratios. In 1960 in the primary division the ratio was 1 teacher to 29 pupils. In 1970 the ratio was 1 teacher to 22 pupils. This year it is 1 teacher for 20 pupils. In the secondary division in 1960 the teacher-pupil ratio was 1 teacher to 23 pupils. In 1972 it improved to 1 teacher to 17 pupils, and this year it is 1 teacher to 14 pupils, in round figures. This significant improvement in the teacher-pupil ratio has enabled teacher registration boards to fix a relatively high level of

registration for teachers with a resultant improvement in the general standard of teaching in the schools.

Clause 2 of the Bill provides for the substitution of the word "four" for the word "three". This allows for the appointment of a fourth Assistant Director-General. The senior officer will act as deputy to the Director-General. Another officer will be in charge of buildings, another will be in charge of curricula and research, and the fourth will be in charge of planning. At present there are only three Assistant Directors-General because of the recent resignation of the Assistant Director-General in charge of buildings.

Clause 3 deals with the power of councils to employ ancillary staff. Proposed new section 14AA (*a*) gives to technical schools the power that is always exercised under the regulations in employing all types of staff to assist in the official management of the school. Paragraph (*b*) of that new section gives for the first time to school committees or a council of high schools the right to employ teacher aides to assist in class activities. With increasing funds being allocated by the Commonwealth for disadvantaged schools and special schools, it is considered that this money can properly be used in the employment of teacher aides. These people will perform a variety of functions.

Handicapped children need special attention, and in the normal type of high school many useful functions can be performed under the general supervision of a teacher. As has been heard often in this House, many schools have a high proportion of children born overseas. These children have language difficulties during their education in this country. Some of the teacher aides employed will be experts in the language field. This is regarded as a progressive move, which is welcomed by teacher organizations and parents' organizations.

Clause 4 recognizes the recent changes in the system of teacher training in Victoria. Under the co-ordination of the State College of Victoria, the designations used for the various types of representation on the Teacher Registration Council from the teachers' colleges have to be changed in the light of the development of the State college system. Not only have the designations to be changed to refer to representatives of State colleges, but also to teachers' colleges. There is now a mixture of trainees in the one institution. In the State College of Victoria, Melbourne, secondary and primary teachers are being trained. To overcome this difficulty, this clause provides for the election of teacher representatives from the teacher-training sectors of the primary and secondary divisions. However, provision is made to ensure that a person is entitled to be involved in only one division, and to vote in one division.

Clause 5 provides for three deputies instead of one. When the legislation was enacted it was thought that one deputy was sufficient. This was found to be inadequate and under this Bill it would be possible to elect three deputies.

Clause 6 removes the obligation placed on the Divisional Registration Board to meet once in each month other than in January—unless it wishes to. This is a generous concession.

Clause 6 also deals with the manner in which registrations shall be sent from one teacher registration board to another teacher registration board to decide whether there are any objections to the regulations made and also determines how the Teacher Registration Council shall deal with those objections. The power of the council is not to reject regulations but to ask the Teacher Registration Board to reconsider or make possible amendments to the regulations submitted. The final decision rests with the Teacher Registration Board.

Clause 7 deals with provisional registration and for the first time gives to the board the right to impose a set period of time for which the registration should apply. Clause 8 enables the board to register category teachers such as music teachers and woodwork teachers, but not as teachers to teach every conceivable subject. Paragraph (*b*) of this clause is important. For the first time it gives to the board the power to take into consideration previous teaching and industrial experience. There have been a number of instances where teachers have taught for more than twenty years. In one case a teacher had taught for seven years and had trained as a teacher in the Associated Teacher Training Institute—a forerunner of Mercer House. The board had some reservations whether it had the power to consider those long years of teaching experience as a factor to be taken into consideration when determining whether the applicant had the necessary qualifications to teach. This amendment will remove that doubt. The board has also the right to take into consideration industrial experience, which is an important factor with technical teachers.

Clause 9 deals with classification of temporary and permanent teachers and gives to permanent teachers the rights that were given to temporary teachers at the time when the original Act was passed. Clause 10 (*b*) exempts from the provisions of the Act teachers operating in the field of the Council of Adult Education and teachers employed by technical school councils. The main aim of the Act was to enable the board to register teachers employed by the Education Department. It was not considered desirable to be registering teachers employed by technical school councils or employed by the Council of Adult Education.

Clause 10 (c) is of some significance because it gives the right to the board to register teachers to teach in more than one section of a school—for example, central schools staffed by primary and secondary teachers. It is often desirable for trained primary teachers to take over form I.—the seventh grade, as it used to be known. This is more important since in recent years current high schools have developed technical wings. This will enable teachers to continue to teach in all sections of schools staffed by more than one division. Previously teachers were prohibited from teaching in both sections of the school.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: Would it apply to central classes too?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes, across the board. In the past there have often been primary-trained teachers teaching in central schools, and they have been the best teachers in the service. That standard would have come from the primary service. The same would apply to consolidated schools, higher elementary schools and group schools. I merely gave the two illustrations of the high school and the technical school wings. It will apply across the board where two sections of the Education Department are represented in the one school.

Clause 11 adds to section 82 of the principal Act the right to lay down by Governor in Council regulations the conditions under which grants can be paid to schools, and the conditions governing the payments of such grants. As honorable members know, the Government is endeavouring to extend the system of giving direct grants to schools, including money from the Commonwealth for disadvantaged schools. In the past three years the total sum paid in direct grants has grown from $3 million to $13 million. The Government would like to continue to encourage this trend and see that schools are given more opportunity to undertake local projects, and improvement works, and to employ staff of various types so that more decisions can be made on the spot in a decentralized fashion

without the need to write constantly to headquarters for approval or advice.

Paragraph (c) will empower the Teacher Registration Council to deregister a registered teacher. No regulation-making power appeared in the previous Act and it is considered desirable to give the council the right to make regulations concerning deregistration.

By and large, the new teacher registration system has worked well, and there are signs that other States are moving in a similar direction and to some degree copying the Victorian legislation. With the operation of the registration scheme, it became evident that further amendments to the Act were necessary and this Bill fulfils that purpose. It will facilitate the operation of the system and will bring continued benefits to the education system.

On the motion of Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray), the debate was adjourned.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Thursday, November 28.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray): The Bill relates to a complex matter and, although it may not prove extremely difficult, I should like an assurance from the Minister that if two weeks does not prove sufficient for the Opposition or the Country Party, consideration will be given to an extension of the period of adjournment. A number of Bills relating to education have been introduced in the past few days and I hope the Minister will extend that latitude if it is required.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) (*By leave*): If the honorable member becomes bogged down in registration complexities, the Government will be happy to extend the period of adjournment.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until Thursday, November 28.

HOUSING (COMMONWEALTH-STATE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT) BILL.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the appropriate sections of the Housing Act 1958 to give effect to the operation and implementation of amendments to the 1973 Housing Agreement following discussions and recommendations at conferences of Commonwealth and State Ministers of Housing held in May and October of this year.

The amendments have been formally agreed to by the Commonwealth and the States by a Supplemental Agreement which will be signed on behalf of Victoria by the Premier as soon as the Commonwealth legislation is passed. They cover several matters, including distribution of loan advances under the 1973 Housing Agreement between the Housing Commission and the Home Builders Account—that is dealt with in clause 9.

Clause 9 (2) of the 1973 agreement preserves in Victoria the principle established in the financial year 1956–57 that loan advances for public housing shall be distributed so that the portion available through the Home Builders Account for use for the provision of loans for home building by co-operative housing societies shall not be less than 20 per cent or more than 30 per cent of the whole.

Loan advances for 1974-75 sought by Victoria at the May conference were Housing Commission, $58,564,835—70 per cent; Home Builders Account, $25,099,215—30 per cent; making a total of $83,664,050. Allocations approved were — Housing Commission, $43 million—70·04 per cent; Home Builders Account, $18·4 million—29·96 per cent; making a total of $61·4 million.

As in other States, experience since 1st July, 1974, has demonstrated that with the curtailment of loan credit

for private housing development through normal channels, increased demands have been made on the terminating co-operative housing societies to assist the lower middle income groups of the community for family housing. In addition, because of rising costs it was necessary to increase the advance limit allowed through the Home Builders Account as has now been authorized in separate legislation by this Parliament.

Accordingly, in seeking a review of the May allocations at the October Ministerial conference Victoria sought for the Housing Commission, $58,564,835—65·1 per cent; for the Home Builders Account, $31,358,600 —34·9 per cent; making a total of $89,923,435. Agreement on the allocation of an additional $75 million approved by the Federal Government for distribution to the States fixed the 1974–75 loan at this juncture for Victoria as Housing Commission, $49·804 million—61·4 per cent; Home Builders Account, $31·359 million; 38·6 per cent; making a total of $81·163 million.

It will thus be noted that the percentage allocation to the Home Builders Account exceeds that allowed by clause 9 (2) of the 1973 agreement. This has arisen by circumstances which may or may not continue in future years, for example, the need to direct additional funds to the private sector of the home building industry as a result of the current economic conditions at present prevailing.

The Housing Commission is experiencing better response to tenders and commitments and building construction rates are improving. There is to be a further review of the loan allocations sought by Victoria in May, 1974, early next year, and Victoria is confident that on present performances the commission will require the full $58,564,835 to complete its building programme during the current financial year.

Mr. Meagher.

However, the amendment to clause 9 of the principal agreement by the insertion of clause 9 (3) (*b*) will permit the Commonwealth Minister for Housing and Construction to approve allocations to the Home Builders Account in excess of 30 per cent of the whole upon a submission of a special case by a State Housing Minister.

Amendments also cover reviews of loan advances during a financial year. Clause 10 of the principal agreement has been amended with the addition of a sub-clause (3) to establish beyond doubt that advances initially determined may be reviewed and altered by consultations between the Commonwealth and State Ministers at any subsequent time during a financial year.

A further matter covered by the amendments relates to " Eligibility of borrowers—Home Builders Account —Exclusion of overtime from weekly earnings of the family breadwinner ". This is a much needed amendment sought by all States at the May Ministerial conference and agreed to by the Commonwealth Minister at the October conference. Concerning home purchase by the lower income community groups, historically the aim has been to use Home Builders Account advances for applicants just beyond the upper income level of Housing Commission eligibility.

This principle has been basically preserved in the agreement in that income eligibility for co-operative housing society loans is higher than that for housing authority assistance. However, the inclusion of overtime in assessing the incomes of co-operative housing society applicants negated the intention, and experience showed that, in many cases, applicants for assistance from either source were the one and same person.

It is also considered that it is not in the best interests of a borrower to encourage him into a long-term contract based on insecurity of maintaining overtime earnings which may be

seasonal. This amendment will ensure that the ability of a borrower to repay a loan will be more correctly based on an assured and stable income. This amendment is to take effect from 1st November, 1974, and Victorian applicants for loans through the Home Builders Account are now being assessed on this basis.

Although there are other amendments to the agreement desired by the Victorian Government which have not yet been agreed to by the Federal Government, the amendments covered by this Bill are necessary and I commend them to the House.

On the motion of Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Thursday, November 21.

LAND TAX BILL.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill prescribes the rates of land tax for 1975 as required by section 6 of the Land Tax Act. The rates are the same as in 1974 and are contained in clause 2.

The Bill also amends section 91A of the Land Tax Act, which provides for postponement of payment or remission of land tax payable by persons in necessitous circumstances, including persons in receipt of pensions payable at the maximum rate. However, a change in 1973 in the Commonwealth Social Services Act provided for the payment of the maximum rate of pension to persons who have passed a specified age regardless of means.

This Bill amends section 91A to refer to pensioners receiving the maximum rate of pension and holding a medical services entitlement card issued by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. As a result section 91A will apply to those persons to whom it applied before the Commonwealth Act was changed. It is also consistent with the definition of pensioner in the Municipalities Assistance Act, which provides Government assistance to municipalities for rate rebates to pensioners.

Clause 3 of the Bill makes a technical amendment to the definition of taxable value to include a reference to the exemption provided by section 7A of the Act, which was introduced into the Act last year. 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 Thursday, November 21.

CEMETERIES (PIONEER MEMORIAL PARKS) BILL.

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is the first introduced to the Parliament for many years which will establish new principles in relation to the operation of cemeteries, and its provisions could have far-reaching effects upon the development of cemeteries in this State.

The Bill contains provisions which will deal with three different matters. The first, covered by clauses 2, 3 and 4, provides for the conversion of old cemeteries or parts of old cemeteries to special parks to be known as pioneer memorial parks. The second is contained in clause 5, which will give the trustees of cemeteries additional powers in regard to the removal of monuments which are dangerous, ruinous or in a state of grave disrepair, and the third, covered by clause 6, is designed to correct a situation which has developed in many old cemeteries where exclusive rights to burial in a particular plot acquired many years ago cannot be used because the original purchaser of those rights can no longer be traced and has died and been buried or cremated elsewhere.

Conversion of old cemeteries to pioneer memorial parks will be carried out in this manner. A new Fourth Schedule will be added to the Cemeteries Act 1958 and in this new schedule will be named the first three cemeteries which are to be converted to pioneer memorial parks. These three cemeteries have already been closed to all future burials. The three cemeteries concerned are the old Seymour public cemetery, which has been closed since 1st September, 1916; the Will Will Rook public cemetery, which has been closed since 22nd April, 1960; and the Oakleigh public cemetery, which has been closed since 31st December, 1960. The trustees of each of the cemeteries named will be authorized to submit proposals for conversion to the Commission of Public Health in the manner set out in proposed section 60B (1).

The commission, after a thorough examination of the proposals, may recommend the approval of the Minister. He in his turn is authorized to approve the proposal in principle and may impose whatever conditions additional to those set out in the proposed section 60C that he thinks fit. After the approval in principle of the Minister is obtained, the trustees of the cemetery where a pioneer memorial park is to be established must publish a notice twice in each of three daily or weekly newspapers circulating in the district previously served by the cemetery with a view to ascertaining objections to the removal of any existing monuments. Should objections be received, it will be a matter for the trustees to negotiate the method by which memorials may be retained.

It is probable that the trustees of a number of older cemeteries throughout Victoria, many of them long unused, will seek to have these provisions made applicable to other cemetery areas as time goes by. Should other proposals be submitted, it will be necessary for the names of the additional cemeteries to be added to the Fourth Schedule by the amendment of that schedule by subsequent legislation.

The proposal to give power to cemetery trustees to deal with memorials which are in a dilapidated or dangerous condition is a natural extension of the existing section 23 of the Cemeteries Act 1958. At present this section provides that every grave and its surroundings, which naturally includes monuments, shall be maintained in thorough repair by the person holding the exclusive right of burial in that grave. This section goes on to say that in the event of the failure by any person to maintain a grave and its immediate surroundings, the trustees may cause the necessary work to be carried out and may recover the costs of that work in a court of petty sessions. In practice a person who applies for and obtains permission to erect a memorial over a particular grave may also be asked to maintain that memorial, as in many cases the original purchaser of the burial right has died.

The amendment to section 23 proposed by clause 5 will give cemetery trustees further options. In the first instance, the trustees may require the person having an exclusive right of burial to repair the grave or monument at his own cost as heretofore. If that person does not do so the trustees may, after giving notice of their intention, either repair the monument or dismantle it if it is in a serious state of disrepair, and subsequently sue the person for the cost of whatever work is done. As has been stated, the existing provisions are quite satisfactory so long as a responsible person is known to the trustees.

The third option which is being introduced by the amendment of section 23 will be most useful in the case of many old cemeteries with graves and monuments in disrepair. The trustees of these cemeteries, even if the person having the exclusive right of burial cannot be found, will be able to appeal to the Commission of Public

Health and receive permission to remove any monument in a dangerous or ruinous state. Such a provision should obviate a repetition of cases where children have been injured and even killed as a result of the collapse of old memorials which have become unsafe by the passage of time but about which action could not be taken because the whereabouts of a responsible person—namely, the person having an exclusive right of burial or the person who is authorized to erect the memorial—could not be ascertained.

The third matter dealt with by the Bill in relation to the proper use of land in cemeteries long held but unused is covered by the three paragraphs of clause 6, which amends the existing section 25 of the Cemeteries Act 1958. Section 25 deals with the maintenance of monuments and so on, authorizes the erection or placing of monuments on graves and states that upon payment of the fees for that purpose the person causing the monument to be established shall be entitled to have the monument maintained forever. Although the point is not specifically covered, this section implies that the acquisition of any exclusive right of burial, even though that right is not exercised, shall be effective forever.

It should be emphasized at this stage that the proposed amendments to section 25 contained in clause 6 of the Bill are not intended to interfere in any way with any rights of burial in a grave in an operating cemetery where those rights have been exercised in whole or in part. Many graves are dug with a view to their being used to bury three persons. Where only one or two persons have been buried in a grave, the new provisions proposed by this clause will not interfere in any way with any future rights that may be exercised by the holder of the exclusive right of burial. However, in a number of cemeteries, and particularly the larger metropolitan cemeteries, rights to bury have often been acquired by persons in anticipation of future need. Many of these persons are now dead or their whereabouts are not known. In such cases the ground is unused and is likely to remain so because the original purchaser either no longer requires it, is buried elsewhere or for some other reason has no further need for or interest in what he acquired many years ago. It is believed there are many hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of grave sites in metropolitan cemeteries which as the law now stands cannot be used.

The intentions of the several additional sub-sections to be added to section 25 of the Cemeteries Act 1958 by paragraph (*b*) of clause 6 of this Bill are as follows—

Sub-section (2): Where an exclusive right of burial has been in existence for more than 25 years and the person holding that right cannot be found after thorough and diligent search by the trustees of the cemetery concerned, the trustees may cancel that exclusive right.

Sub-section (3): At least fourteen days before cancellation the trustees must publish in a daily or weekly newspaper notice of its intention to cancel the right.

Sub-section (4): Following cancellation, if the holder of the original right or his lawful heir at some future time seeks to claim the right, he may either—(*a*) obtain a refund of fees originally paid; or (*b*) ask the trustees to make available an alternative right for his use. It is emphasized that if the holder of any exclusive right to bury is found and still wants to retain that right this proposed legislation will not interfere in any way with his rights in perpetuity. The provision to cancel applies only to rights where the holder cannot be traced and where the right has not been exercised in part. The subsection is to cover what will probably be the rare case where an original owner of a cancelled burial right makes a claim subsequent to cancellation of the right.

Sub-section (5): This provision will ensure that in future years, the original right to burial will be limited to a period of 25 years, that is up to 1999 or 2000 A.D., depending on the date of proclamation, during which the right must be exercised. Once having been exercised, even if only one body has been buried in a multiple grave, the right to bury will not be subject to cancellation. Provision is also made for the original purchaser of the right of burial to have first refusal of a further period of 25 years right on payment of the prescribed fee.

I commend the Bill. I thank those honorable members, municipal representatives and trustees of cemeteries who have assisted in the drafting of the measure.

On the motion of Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Thursday, November 28.

LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This simple Bill to amend the Labour and Industry Act 1958 contains provisions concerning three unrelated matters.

It is proposed that Division 4 of Part V. be repealed. This division relates to the prohibition of work at certain times in factories in which clothing, knitted goods, footwear or furniture are made. A request for the repeal of this division has been put by the Victorian Trades Hall Council —the honorable member for Reservoir has also spoken to me—which considers the provisions to be anachronistic. These restrictions of hours of work were introduced into the legislation during the last century. At the time there were allegations of unfair competition from factories where employees were forced to work long hours. The solution adopted at the time was a prohibition of work at certain times. As these historical reasons now no longer apply, the provisions are inappropriate and ought to be repealed. Awards and determinations of wages boards make adequate provision for penalty rates for work done in excess of the ordinary hours of work.

Recently an example was drawn to the attention of the department where the provisions worked to the detriment of a worker in a furniture factory. A complaint was lodged by a worker claiming that he was not paid for overtime worked at the rate provided in the determination. As the overtime was worked during times which were prohibited under the Act, action could not be taken against the employer. The request of the Victorian Trades Hall Council is supported by the Government, and the repeal of Division 4 as proposed in clause 2 of the Bill will meet that request.

Section 80A of the principal Act provides for exemptions from the provisions in the Act relating to the closing of shops in holiday resorts. The orders are limited to a maximum of fifteen weeks. The City of Mildura has requested that orders be made by reference to the last day of school terms as determined under the Education Department Regulations 1962. Clause 3 will enable the orders to be made by reference to these determinations. Orders thus made can continue from year to year. In other words, it gives elasticity to the making of the order and those who depend on school holidays would know the times when their shops could be open.

The present Government is, of course, one which believes in the free-enterprise system. It takes the view that private enterprise should be left unfettered unless it can be shown that restrictions are necessary for the protection of the public good or the prevention or cure of some social evil. In relation to trading hours of shops, it takes the view that unnecessary restrictions on trading hours

ought to be removed and that each shopkeeper should, where possible, have the right to decide hours of trading to suit his own particular business.

Over the years that policy has been translated into legislation to remove unnecessary restrictions. The culmination of the implementation of the policy was reached when the Labour and Industry (Shop Trading Hours) Bill 1971 was introduced. This removed all restrictions on shop trading hours for the generality of shops during the hours between midnight on Sunday and 1 p.m. on Saturday. There have been subsequent amendments which have removed certain other restrictions and the list of shops in the Fifth Schedule has been extended by the addition of shops for the sale of aquarium fish and art and handicraft galleries.

I have received a petition containing more than 1,000 names from customers of shops selling caravans. The petition requests that restrictions on the hours of trading in those shops should be removed. The application of the Government's philosophy to shops selling caravans, other trailers and boats, and accessories for these items indicates that the present restrictions ought be removed. If the public demand for these shops to be open at week-ends is real enough then those shopkeepers who wish to be open to service that demand should be allowed to do so. Not all shopkeepers will wish to alter their trading hours, but that is their business. Those who do wish to be open should not be restricted from offering service to the public, particularly as shops of these kinds attract the Sunday driver and his family. The addition to the Fifth Schedule proposed in clause 4 of the Bill will achieve this result. 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 Thursday, November 21.

PHARMACISTS BILL.

The message from the Council suggesting at the Committee stage an amendment in this Bill was taken into consideration.

Council's Suggested Amendment.

Clause 4, sub-clause (3), lines 19–22, omit paragraph (*b*) and insert the following paragraph—

"( ) remove any member (including the president) from the Board and may fill any casual vacancy occurring in the membership of the Board."

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): Following debate in this House the Legislative Assembly transmitted to the Legislative Council the Pharmacists Bill. In the Legislative Assembly an amendment to clause 4 (3) moved by the honorable member for Murray Valley was accepted by me to enable the Bill to have a speedy passage into the Legislative Council. In the Council the amendment was examined by representatives of the three parties who consulted with officers of the Department of Health and Parliamentary Counsel. As a result, the amendment submitted by the Legislative Assembly was further amended in the Legislative Council and the amendment now before this House was accepted by all parties in the Legislative Council.

The amendment suggested by the Council will enable provision to be made when vacancies occur on the Pharmacy Board. It has the support of all spokesmen on this measure in the Legislative Council, and I move—

That this House do make the amendment suggested by the Council.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): I endorse the remarks of the Minister of Health. This amendment comes from the Council in response to a debate that took place in this Chamber some time ago in which I moved an amendment that was subsequently accepted by the Minister.

Following that debate, a number of discussions took place between officers of the Minister's Department, Parliamentary Counsel and myself, and it was found to be not possible to insert conveniently in the Bill without going too far an amendment

which would achieve exactly what I desired. I agreed to the procedure decided upon, that my amendment be withdrawn in the Council and one submitted by the Minister substituted. The amendment circulated does not go quite as far as I had hoped. However, because this clause is now identical to what is contained in the Dental Act I am prepared to accept it.

The motion was agreed to.

It was ordered that the Bill be returned to the Council with a message intimating the decision of the House.

APPROPRIATION (1974–75, No. 1) BILL.

(Budget Debate)

The House went into Committee for the further consideration of this Bill.

Discussion was resumed of clause 2 (Application of moneys).

CHIEF SECRETARY.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): I refer to a number of matters relating to the Chief Secretary's office. I seek your guidance, Mr. Chairman. I direct attention to a reference to the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board which is under the jurisdiction of the Chief Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): Order! I am afraid that does not come under Division 160. I suggest that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition speak on another matter, and deal with the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board later.

Mr. WILKES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to address you, Sir, on the appropriation for the Victoria Police Force. I am concerned at the extent to which the Government has been purchasing property for the Victoria Police Force.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Public Works): I rise to a point of order. This subject will be relevant to Division 187—Police.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): I accept the Minister's point of order. I suggest that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition might refer to the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board under Division 510—Local Government.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): I refer to the Motor Car Traders Committee. This committee was set up under the Motor Car Traders Act which has been partly proclaimed. For some reason that I have been unable to discover, the Government has taken no steps to proclaim the whole of the Act. An important section which affords protection to a person in the purchase of a faulty vehicle from a motor car trader, has yet to be proclaimed. When it is proclaimed, if the purchase price of a vehicle is in excess of $1,500 a period of warranty must be granted by the motor car trader.

I have had occasion to refer constituents to the Motor Car Traders Committee. The committee has been unable to operate as effectively as it might have because this section of the Act has not been proclaimed. An appropriation is made to cover the fees and travelling expenses of members of the committee. The State will not receive the full value for this appropriation unless the Government takes the necessary steps to ensure that the whole of the Act under which the committee gets its statutory powers is proclaimed. If this were done, the Motor Car Traders Committee could operate over the whole of its ambit without the restrictions which at present apply to it. The committee is ineffective while sections of the Act remain unproclaimed.

Some weeks ago, in answer to a question that I asked him, the Chief Secretary indicated that the section to which I refer would be proclaimed on 1st November. I made further inquiries, and 1st December is now being suggested as the date of proclamation. The Chief Secretary should make a public statement for the benefit of the community on when the

entire Act will be proclaimed so that this committee can function properly and discharge its responsibility, not only to the motor car trade but also to the community.

The committee has a dual role; it has a responsibility to the motor car trade and to those members of the trade who are licensed to operate. It also has a responsibility to the purchasing public and to adjudicate where disputes arise between a member of the public and a motor car trader. At present it seems that the committee is not able to meet its responsibility completely.

I urge the Chief Secretary to treat this matter as urgent. I am sure the public would appreciate a clear announcement from the Government through the Chief Secretary on where they stand. This can be important to anyone purchasing a second-hand motor vehicle because a warranty has to be provided by a motor car trader when all of the Act is proclaimed. I ask that this matter be treated as urgent.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): I refer to several aspects concerning the purchase of property for the specific use of the Victoria Police Force. The most recently suggested purchase of the Savoy Plaza Hotel in Spencer Street has not yet been finalized, although the Premier said that the contract of sale was ready to be signed. Members of the Opposition believe that this is a most unsatisfactory building for use by the Victoria Police Force.

Mr. STEPHEN: Are you going to tell us why?

Mr. WILKES: Yes, I will inform the honorable member for Ballaarat South. The Government had a choice of buildings. I revert to the previous situation. The Police Force cadets were using the Victoria Police Barracks and associated buildings for training purposes. This was satisfactory because there was a large area where police could be mustered for any eventuality and their training could not be observed by anybody other than the officers in command. The police could be moved from this location at the police barracks to any area which required police protection. In its wisdom, the Government decided to allow the Ministry of the Arts to take over this area when other areas adjacent to the newly-erected Arts Centre could have been used. It was a short-sighted policy on the part of the Government.

Mr. STEPHEN: Get your Leader to make this suggestion.

Mr. WILKES: I am making this speech, not my Leader. It was a short-sighted policy on the part of the Government to allow the Ministry of the Arts to intrude into areas better suited for police services and administration.

Mr. STEPHEN: This is a split in the party!

Mr. WILKES: It does not matter whether or not there is a split in the party. What does matter is that the Victoria Police Force should have a proper area and should be provided with buildings in which to function in the best interests of Victoria. If honorable members were to speak to the Chief Commissioner, they will be told that the most desirable place for training purposes was at the police barracks where mustering areas were available.

When the police moved from these barracks many of them were billeted in the Young Men's Christian Association building. This was unsatisfactory to the Chief Commissioner and to the Police Force in general. Now the answer the Government comes up with is the purchase of the Savoy Plaza Hotel. Because this building is situated in Spencer Street, no area is available for the mustering of police, and it is impossible to get police from point A to point B without taking them through heavy traffic in the city.

Mr. MACLELLAN: They could use the car park.

Mr. WILKES: The honorable member for Gippsland West has great ideas. According to him, anything is good enough for the police. I shall illustrate that the Government also adopts that attitude. The Government purchased the magnificent seminary at Glen Waverley. I was there with the Chief Secretary last Sunday when the chapel was officially opened. This magnificent building ought to be preserved, but it does not lend itself to police accommodation and administration demands of today. Although plenty of area is available on which to build, apparently it is not the Government's intention to do so at Glen Waverley. It will use make-shift buildings and spend the least amount possible on them, to the inconvenience of the Police Force. There are no amenities at Glen Waverley and the paucity of the money provided for improvements will not produce them.

I do not want to take up the time of the House telling honorable members of the disadvantages of Glen Waverley.

Mr. MACLELLAN: Tell us some of the advantages.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): Order! The Committee is dealing with appropriation, which largely deals with administration. I have given the honorable member for Northcote a great deal of latitude in speaking of capital purchases which do not come under the Bill. If the honorable member refers to administration he is in order, but if he goes beyond that point and talks about capital purchases, he is not in order.

Mr. WILKES: I am obliged for your assistance, Mr. Chairman. I am deliberately addressing myself to administration of the Victoria Police Force, particularly to the building at Glen Waverley, and to other buildings that have been purchased by this Government for the Victoria Police Force over the past two years. The Government does not have the intestinal fortitude to do anything forthright. It must have had some doubts about the Glen Waverley property because it is buying the building there on time payment. This might have something to do with the fact that four Ministers are to become estate agents.

The seminary was purchased on $50,000 deposit, with a payment of $250,000 on 21st December 1972, and the balance of $1·625 million to be paid in five equal consecutive annual instalments of $325,000, on 1st July of each of the years 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: What is the interest rate?

Mr. WILKES: Honorable members are not told what interest rate is involved. Leaving that aside, in terms of administration and the advisability of the Government's actions, let me consider the purchase of a cigarette factory in Wellington Street, Collingwood.

Mr. MACLELLAN: Is this administration?

Mr. WILKES: Surely the honorable member does not suggest that the Government would purchase a building for the Police Force unless it were for administration purposes? The condition of the old factory building is incredible, but in this instance the Government again played safe by purchasing the property on time payment.

Mr. STEPHEN: What is wrong with that? Everybody else purchases on time payment.

Mr. WILKES: I can understand a bankrupt Government using time payment but I am demonstrating that there must have been some uncertainty in the mind of the Government. The property in Collingwood was purchased on a deposit of $250,000, on the signing of the contract on 8th January, 1973, a further payment of $100,000, and then the usual annual instalments of $210,000 on 1st July of each of the years 1973, 1974 and 1975. For the benefit of honorable members, this information

appears in answer to a question on notice on 17th September, 1974. I am dealing with these matters under this division on the recommendation of the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): Order! The chair does not take the Minister's view as being correct. A discussion of capital purchases is beyond the scope of the Bill. If the honorable member refers to administration as such he will be in order.

Mr. WILKES: I am endeavouring to indicate some of the shortcomings of the Government in regard to police administration. Chief Commissioners of Police as far back as Mr. Selwyn Porter have issued warnings and given advice to the Government on what was required. The Government does not need the experts from the Opposition because it engaged the services of Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston and Mr. Nicol to advise how the Police Force should be administered. However, the Government has disregarded the advice proffered. Mr. Nicol suggested that the police communications system was in a deplorable state and made specific suggestions which would have cost $1 million to put into operation.

Mr. MACLELLAN: This is not administration, it is communications.

Mr. WILKES: Communications and administration go hand in hand; even you, Mr. Chairman, realize that. Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston made more than 80 recommendations but the Government implemented only those which cost nothing.

A problem exists with these second-hand buildings and now the Government has purchased the Savoy Plaza Hotel, which is also a fire risk and had a fire order placed on it by the Melbourne City Council a few months ago. An enormous amount of money will need to be spent on it. The Chief Secretary is now having second thoughts about whether he will let the police occupy the building. The Government could easily have bought the Commercial Travellers Association building in Flinders Street which is in a much better condition than the Savoy Plaza Hotel.

Currently, police strength is about 5,800 and the Chief Secretary has not denied that this is 2,700 below the strength recommended by Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston; at the current rate of recruitment it will be well below the figure recommended for 1980. This suggests that the crime rate which has been adverted to by a number of senior police officers must continue unchecked. Recently, Assistant Commissioner Crowley stated that 50 per cent of crimes had been solved although honorable members should note that 50 per cent of certain crimes have not been solved. Less than 50 per cent of larcenies, house breakings, shop breakings and factory breakings are solved.

These matters concern members of the Police Force because they realize that the force has a duty to protect property. The officers also realize that if it were not for the existence of private watching services and private police forces, the incidence of larcenies would be much greater. One matter to be considered is the desirability of the existence of private police forces or whether it is preferable to have a viable and properly equipped Police Force that is able to carry out the duties that are normally expected of it in protecting life and property against the ravages of crime.

These things depend on the Government's attitude towards law and order. I wonder whether the Premier, at Premiers Conferences, has ever inquired whether the Commonwealth Government would be interested in providing money for the Victoria Police Force on the basis of standardizing training and the introduction of standard equipment.

Mr. STEPHEN: The Commonwealth will not spend money on rural industries.

Mr. WILKES: If the Commonwealth Government were to provide money for the Victoria Police Force,

even for specific purposes, it would help the rural sector as well as the metropolitan area. I have submitted a proposition to the Commonwealth Attorney-General that as the Federal Government helps regions and local councils, there is no reason why it should not consider allocating money for the Victoria Police Force or any other police force in Australia. The Commonwealth Government could assist the Victorian Government by providing a Police Force that can cope with the demands made upon it in a modern society. I hope the Federal Attorney-General recognizes that, because not long ago he was talking about establishing a Federal bureau of investigation. Notwithstanding the need for such a bureau, I should prefer to see a strong Victoria Police Force which is well-equipped and capable of doing the job it was designed to do.

Victoria has some of the best senior officers of any Police Force in Australia, and the Victorian Government can be complimented on the quality of those officers. Chief Commissioner Jackson is one of the most experienced policemen in Australia, and he is an administrator of high calibre. He is assisted by the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Braybrook, who is another highly experienced policeman; Assistant Commissioner Crowley, the crime commissioner, and Assistant Commissioner McLaren, the traffic commissioner. These men know what the Victoria Police Force requires by way of financial assistance from the Government and public support. Unfortunately the Victorian public loses faith in the Police Force when it finds that the force cannot cope with some of the problems confronting the community today. This is not the fault of the Police Force. It is physically impossible for it to meet the demands placed on it.

It is of no use for the Premier to provide a few extra dollars in the Budget for police buildings and equipment. The graphs show a steady diminution in the amount spent on basic equipment—not sophisticated equipment—in the Police Force. Three years ago the Chief Secretary was talking about installing a mini-computer—not a standard computer which is badly needed for *modus operandi* and the solving of crime; a mini-computer could be used only for keeping records. It would deal mainly with traffic infringements. The force has not even got to first base with the mini-computer.

Sergeants in charge of some metropolitan police stations have to escort prisoners into the city to be photographed because there is no photographic equipment available in the suburban police stations.

Mr. EDMUNDS: The Moonee Ponds police station is a disgrace.

Mr. WILKES: That is one example. Another is that not long ago policemen were delivering letters by car and motor cycle because they had run out of stamps. It may appear to be funny, but it is a serious matter.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is understandable that they ran out of stamps, because the Commonwealth Government was running the Postmaster-General's Department. The Post Office has not been in such a mess for 50 years.

Mr. WILKES: I shall be happy to debate at any time with the Minister of Public Works the administration by the Commonwealth Government of the Post Office, but not now.

These small matters irritate police in local police stations. In the high-density living areas where the low-income groups congregate, policemen are often asked to intervene in all sorts of circumstances, and sergeants are reluctant to send young policemen to deal with marital problems or domestic rows. It is undesirable to have to send a young policeman, who has been in the force for only one or two years, to deal with people who are much older and more experienced than he is, but this must occur because of the shortage of policemen.

I do not know whether the Chief Secretary ever visits police stations to examine some of their problems. Two years ago the honorable gentleman visited the Bourke Street West police station, and said that it was not fit for rats. However, policemen are still working there and the station is no nearer to being pulled down now than it was then. If one accepts the words of the Chief Secretary, the station is still not fit for rats.

These are some of the problems which exist, and the Government must put its priorities in the right order and treat law and order as an important issue. Every stratum of society is interested in law and order. Families want to be able to walk along the street at night, travel on public transport and serve customers in corner stores with a degree of safety. Bank officers want to be guaranteed a degree of safety in their work, but general safety is diminishing because of the failure of the Government to provide an adequate Police Force to cope with the demands made on it.

It is not a question of money, but of the availability of equipment to train police cadets. At the moment the Police Force is restricted to the number of cadets—if it can get them —which it can train in any one year. This is regrettable because occasionally the Premier raises the authorized strength of the Victoria Police Force, but that does not achieve much unless an appropriation is made for that strength as if it were the actual strength at that date, so that the police may use that appropriation to take up some of the backlog in their cadet training programme.

There are other areas that concern the Victoria Police Force in terms of hard cash. Instead of amounts being paid into the Consolidated Fund, why are they not used for the benefit of the Police Force? The Government receives a $3 million rake-off from learner-driver permits, but that money does not go to the Police Force. The Police Force is a collecting agency for the Government in a number of areas for which it receives no financial consideration. It would be simple for the Treasurer to say, when introducing the Budget, that he cannot appropriate more than he has done for the Police Force, because he cannot keep pace with inflation. However, he could say that the moneys collected by the Victoria Police Force for the issuing of learner-driver permits and drivers' licences ought to be used for the benefit of the Police Force. If that were done there would be an appreciable increase in police funds each year for specific purposes, instead of the Premier saying that this year the Police Force will receive $18 million more, when $16 million is used for salaries and wages. This is where the Police Force is losing ground.

The police have been tolerant. From time to time it has been suggested that police morale is low, but I do not believe that is so. Victorians are fortunate to have a Police Force of such high calibre, but this is largely due to the expertise and dedication of officers who are sick to death of telling the Government what is wrong. However, they receive no consideration.

If one is an educationist and one sings out loudly enough, one can obtain money for education. The Commonwealth Government acknowledges that; but if anybody suggests that more money be provided for the Police Force to enable it to protect people and property, the Victorian Government's answer is that that suggestion is not a vote-catcher. The Government says, in effect, that it will not worry about the Police Force but will allow the police to carry on in their restricted way, but it expects them to do their best and produce results. However, it will not assist them any more than is absolutely necessary.

The commissioners of the Victoria Police Force are entitled to be concerned. The Government ought to be grateful for the way in which they

have tolerated the situation. I sincerely hope that not only the commissioners of the Victoria Police Force but also the public of Victoria can look forward to something better from the Treasury and the Chief Secretary in the way of providing the equipment, which has been promised and talked about for so long.

There are only about 150 personal radios available for use by policemen in the Victoria Police Force. That figure could be trebled and it would still not be enough, if one takes into account the report furnished by Mr. Nicol when he was in this State some years ago. Personal radios provide a policeman with some degree of security and safety, because he can at least call for assistance. However, with only 150 personal radios available, the facility does not go very far. Many of those personal radios are used in rescue operations. Recently a rescue in Victoria necessitated the use of more than 65 personal radios.

Mr. STEPHEN: I am glad the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not in the Police Force, because if he was nobody else would ever get on the radio.

Mr. WILKES: I accept the admonition of the honorable member for Ballaarat South.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I thought it was a compliment.

Mr. WILKES: I accept whatever it was. I ask the Government to consider seriously the problems confronting the Victoria Police Force. I have made a number of speeches on the problems which have been raised with me. I know those problems have also been raised with the Government and individual honorable members, and I know those honorable members are probably just as earnest as if not more earnest than I am to ensure that those problems are overcome. Unfortunately the backbench members of the Government party do not have the same opportunities in this Parliament as I have to put these matters forward. However, I believe they are just as sincere in wanting to see a financial improvement in the estimates of the Victoria Police Force to enable it to maintain its present efficient operation and to make that already efficient operation much more efficient to cope with the present-day needs of society. I ask the Government to make more money available so that sophisticated and specific equipment can be purchased for the Victoria Police Force.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): I take this opportunity of commenting on the police service which is available in part of my electorate. I refer to the Lalor–Thomastown area. For many years, almost from the time I first came into this House some eleven years ago, I have been consistently making representations to the Government for a substantial improvement in the police service in this area. The Shire of Whittlesea has also consistently made representations to the local members for the area to bring to the attention of the Chief Secretary of the day the actual situation that prevails.

Rather than there being a progressive improvement in the service, it has progressively worsened. On one occasion the Chief Secretary of the day got to the point where he was prepared to acknowledge that the office facilities provided for staff was totally inadequate for the needs of the day. The stage was even reached where the department acquired from the Education Department land at the side of the Lalor Technical School. That land was acquired with the intention of erecting a modern 24-hour station on it. However, there has been no further progress.

Recently I asked the Chief Secretary a series of questions regarding the number of new police stations established during the past five years. I also sought the police to population ratio in those areas where those new stations have been established. Some interesting figures have been produced. They reveal that new

stations established in country areas have fared very well. For instance, the police to population ratio at Nhill is 1 to 750. Ouyen did not fare as well; the ratio is 1 to 1,000.

However, a different situation is revealed in the metropolitan area. A new 24-hour station was established at Mooroolbark in 1972 and the police to population ratio there is 1 to 1,416. Nunawading is another area where a new 24-hour station has been established and its ratio is 1 to 2,671. However, at Thomastown, where no progress has been made at all, the police to population ratio is 1 to 3,875. It is obvious from those figures that the Government is guilty of neglect of the Thomastown area. No other conclusion could be drawn from those figures. When one goes through the list of some thirteen stations that have been established in various areas over the past five years and compares the police to population ratio of all of those stations, one finds that they are all substantially below the ratio for Thomastown.

In this area the problem is two-fold. The station is shockingly understaffed and the police officers are overworked. Some degree of efficiency is maintained because the police officers have a sense of duty and responsibility. That is typical of the type of person who goes into the Police Force with every intention of making it a career. They face up to and accept their responsibilities. The station is under-staffed and members are over-worked, but totally inadequate facilities are provided. A new station is needed because if additional staff were appointed there would be nowhere for them to be accommodated.

The officer-in-charge of the station has to wrack his brain to try to juggle what limited accommodation he has to fit his current staff. There is a residence attached to the existing station and as soon as that was vacated on the retirement of the officer who used the residence, it was immediately snapped up by the officer-in-charge and converted into office accommodation. This did relieve the situation to some extent, but honorable members know what temporary or makeshift accommodation means. It means that there is unsatisfactory accommodation. Honorable members have experienced that in Parliament House, when temporary or makeshift accommodation has had to be provided.

In all instances temporary accommodation has been unsatisfactory. The staff is unable to carry out its duties satisfactorily. This particularly applies at the station at Thomastown because the residence which is being used for office accommodation was not designed for this purpose. Police officers using this accommodation cannot be expected to interview the public under these adverse conditions.

Many people who have not been charged with a crime go to a police station. They have no convictions and do not go to the station because of any criminal action. They go to the police station for a variety of reasons. The Police Force provides a service to the community and this applies to all police officers who have a wide variety of duties to perform, in addition to crime detection and prevention. So a considerable amount of business is conducted in the police station, and because of this efforts should be made to provide suitable accommodation for the police officers who have to interview members of the public who go there. It is unsatisfactory to expect police officers to conduct their day-to-day operations under such conditions. It is no surprise to walk into the Thomastown station on certain days of the week and see up to fifteen people waiting to be attended to.

They are not there because they are criminals who have committed a crime or because they are suspected of committing a crime; they are there on legitimate business. Owing to the inadequacy the situation has got out of hand. The Chief Secretary must admit that when a police to population ratio of 1 to 3875 exists, drastic

action ought to be taken to rectify the situation, especially when this area has more problems than, say, Mooroolbark and Nunawading, which have had similar urban development over the same period. The police to population ratio in both Mooroolbark and Nunawading—honorable members representing those areas may argue it is unsatisfactory—is much better than that of Thomastown. I hope the Chief Secretary will heed the many complaints about the Thomastown area that have been made over the years, not only by myself and by other members representing the area but by the Shire of Whittlesea.

Motor vehicles are important in the day-to-day operations of the force. Provision is made for a slight increase in the number of vehicles. In the programming of the Police Force and planning for the future, emphasis is being placed on mobility. This morning the Chief Secretary and I, together with a representative of the Law Department, who was interested in the court house, visited the Broadmeadows police station to see the chronic situation that exists. During the inspection senior officers of the force stated that the trend was towards the establishment of larger centralized stations from which a highly mobile force could operate. Those officers intimated that unless the required number of vehicles was forthcoming, the plan would flounder. The point was made that the answer to the problem at Broadmeadows police station was to build on another more suitable site a complete new complex incorporating the court house. This would overcome the problems of the Law Department which, I was informed, are as serious as those of the Police Department in the area.

There is a desire to move away from the small suburban stations in the district. In view of the size of the area for which the new station will be responsible the number of vehicles available to the force will be of the utmost importance and will determine the degree of service the force will be able to provide. The police at Broadmeadows police station cover an area of 26 square miles compared with 4 square miles at Essendon. The Broadmeadows district extends beyond Craigieburn. Police officers are also required to cope with traffic accidents and other situations on the Hume Highway. The importance of having a sufficiency of vehicles at that station is obvious. If only one vehicle is off the road for a short time, the service the force can render to the district is restricted. The senior officer emphasized that crime was not prevented by police remaining at a station but through the mobility of the force and the vigilance of the officers.

Last year an amount of $1,967,955 was allocated for motor vehicles and for 1974-75 the amount is only $2·066 million. This is not a substantial increase taking into consideration the cost and type of vehicles which are used. It will not allow for a great expansion throughout the State. Therefore, it appears that in the ensuing twelve months the force will still have insufficient vehicles. If we keep plugging away, some progress may eventually be made. I hope there will be an immediate improvement in the Thomastown area, particularly in the number of staff, to reduce the shockingly bad ratio of police to population. On another occasion, I shall have more to say about the building of the new station, which is urgently required.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): I refer the Government to the operations of the Missing Persons Bureau, which is a section of the Victoria Police Force. The police provide a good service to the citizens who go to the bureau and report that someone is missing. The difficulty is that the bureau is understaffed. Problems often arise with the teenage children of migrant families.

Many families have disputes on behaviour and discipline based on European principles and as a result a large number of young people, particularly

teenage girls from migrant families, run away from home for a variety of reasons. Often they are away for only a few days and are barely listed as missing persons, but in some cases the police records show that the runaways seem to disappear entirely. They are put on the missing persons list by the bureau and information is sought about them. The bureau does not have sufficient staff for the volume of work that results.

I put in a plea for this little-known aspect of police activity. The average citizen does not realize the difficulties confronting the police in their search for missing persons until he has to go to Russell Street to report a missing person.

I greatly admire the Victoria Police Force, because in the main its members work under the most arduous conditions possible. The quality and the character of the police commends itself to all citizens. I particularly commend the policewomen, who do a remarkable job. I am not sure whether I should commend the new principle that police will be armed. Generally, Victoria has an excellent Police Force. To retain the present members of the force and encourage recruiting, better general facilities should be provided.

The Moonee Ponds police station is in an old house which has been in existence for approximately 70 or 80 years. It is one of the busiest police stations in the northern suburbs. The Moonee Valley Racing Club is within 200 yards of the station, and honorable members are aware of all the traffic problems that a racing club creates. During the Royal Melbourne Show the staff of the Moonee Ponds police station have the responsibility of controlling the general behaviour of people at the showgrounds in addition to traffic control. There is also the court work that is associated with the station. The general duties that are involved in a developing area place a great deal of strain on the staff. Many vehicles come and go from the station.

During his régime the former Chief Secretary, the late Sir Arthur Rylah, frequently visited police stations, inquired into problems, and made recommendations, though he made none about the Moonee Ponds police station. The present Chief Secretary should adopt that practice; he should inspect police stations without making a great fanfare or seeking press publicity. I do not suggest that the building which houses the Moonee Ponds police station should be pulled down or that anything radical should be done, but eventually it will be necessary to provide better conditions for the police who work there. If it is necessary to demolish the old building, plenty of land is available to build the new and modern complex which obviously will be needed by the turn of the century and perhaps even in the next couple of years.

The Moonee Ponds police station should be updated as quickly as possible. The dedicated policemen who use the building as their headquarters should be encouraged by the Government and should have their difficulties recognized. It is necessary for Governments to ensure that the working conditions of people are as modern as possible.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): I raise a matter with the Treasurer or the Chief Secretary regarding the Northcote police station. I do not often specifically refer to matters in my electorate, but this is one occasion on which I believe the Government should take action. The Northcote police station was built before the turn of the century. It is similar to many other police stations throughout Victoria, but Northcote has an increasing crime rate, a fact which has been drawn to the attention of the Chief Secretary. Nevertheless, the Thornbury police station has been closed. The then Under Secretary, Mr. Dillon, gave an assurance that if at any time the crime rate significantly increased the Thornbury police station would be reopened. On a number of occasions the Northcote City Council has written to the

Chief Secretary asking him to consider reopening the Thornbury police station to protect the property and lives of people in the area. I ask the Chief Secretary to reconsider the proposition that has been put to him by the Northcote City Council to purchase land in the central business district from the council for the purpose of erecting a new police complex. The Chief Secretary inspected the Northcote station and was amazed.

Mr. KIRKWOOD: The Chief Secretary had his photograph in the local paper.

Mr. WILKES: Yes. I had the honour of having my photograph taken with him. The Chief Secretary appeared to be convinced—I do not doubt the honorable gentleman's sincerity—that the Northcote police station was not conducive to proper police administration. He was impressed with the proposal that was put to him by the town clerk and myself regarding the land in the central business district of Northcote owned by the council which could be sold to the department for the building of a new police complex. This land would be more central than the site of the present antiquated and dilapidated police station.

I ask the Treasurer to reconsider the purchase of this land, because recently, in answer to a question, he said that when funds became available the Northcote station would be rebuilt. It is useless building it on the restricted site on which it is at present located. It would be much better for the Government to purchase the land which has been offered to it by the Northcote City Council for the erection of a new police complex similar to that in Ballarat and other major cities throughout the State. If this were done some of the pressure on Russell Street police headquarters and on some of the smaller police stations in the police districts surrounding it would be relieved. It is ideal for police purposes. The Chief Secretary has seen it and I ask the Treasurer to reconsider the decision while the land is still available. The Northcote City Council is responsible to its ratepayers and has to get the best possible value for its assets. This is an opportunity for the Government and the council to get together and arrive at a reasonable valuation for a prime piece of real estate. As the Treasurer, through proposed legislation, is venturing into the area of real estate, he may be concerned to reconsider the proposal I put to the Chief Secretary, in the interests of better police protection and better police services in the important area of Northcote.

SOCIAL WELFARE.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Fairlea Female Prison is located in my electorate. A former Chief Secretary, the late Sir Arthur Rylah, informed this Parliament ten or eleven years ago that it was the intention of the Government to close this prison and build a new female prison. The present prison was built long before the turn of the century. It is a potential fire risk, and it houses only 40 female prisoners at a time. Fairlea Female Prison is situated on the periphery of the Yarra Bend Park and is alongside the new freeway that cuts a swathe through the park. It is not a high security prison and many female prisoners are able to leave and return—that situation is well known to the Chief Secretary. Conditions at Fairlea are not ideal.

The Government has built several blocks at Fairlea to house 1, 2 and 4 prisoners, but they are insufficient in number and do not cover the inadequacy of the buildings, cell blocks and rooms. The cell block is the newest part of the building. The rooms in the building where female prisoners are accommodated, although kept spotlessly clean, are very old and must be very depressing to the staff and prisoners. The equipment in the rest of the building is in conformity with the age of the building.

Fairlea Female Prison can accommodate 40 prisoners but there are never 40 there at one time. I strongly

suggest to the Government that if the plans of the Minister for Social Welfare include rebuilding of Pentridge Gaol, or the building of a new prison, adequate accommodation should be provided for the 40 female prisoners at Fairlea—if it is not the intention to rebuild the prison. This is another prime piece of real estate which belongs to the people of Victoria. Even if $1 million were spent on the prison, it still would not be satisfactory. I suggest that the Government should consider the development of a new female prison as suggested by the late Sir Arthur Rylah years ago, although he did not specifically say where it was proposed to build the prison.

Since that time a prison has been built at Ararat and it is functioning satisfactorily. Doubtless the Government will be compelled to do something about Pentridge because the remand section there has always been regarded as a disgrace in the eyes of most Victorians, particularly prison reformers. At Pentridge the Government is faced with the problem of a remand section and a maximum security section in the one institution. If the plans of the Minister for Social Welfare are to come to fruition, and Pentridge is divided into four separate sections, consideration ought to be given to the inclusion of a new female prison in that institution.

For many reasons, people are concerned about Fairlea Female Prison, particularly because it is not conducive to the retraining of female prisoners. The retraining of prisoners, whether female or male, is important in today's society. This can be done only where proper facilities and properly trained staff are available. This has not been proved to be effective at Fairlea Female Prison because of the age and the design of the building. I urge the Government to consider the construction of a new female prison in the prison rebuilding programme to replace Fairlea Female Prison.

YOUTH, SPORT AND RECREATION.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston): Municipal councillors, like many other people in the community, have an interest in youth, sport and recreation. The Preston City Council's activities have ranged over proposed netball courts, a basketball stadium and other sporting facilities. It became obvious to the council that its simple plans would not obtain a high priority with the Ministry for Youth, Sport and Recreation.

Irrespective of the level of contribution by the municipality, in the case of the C. Sullivan Memorial Park, the department has endeavoured to wield the big stick and say what should be done. The department tried to stand over the council to get it to erect a type of building which is unsuitable for the purpose and will increase the council's contribution by 100 per cent. The maintenance costs will have to be met wholly by the municipality and, with the introduction of a 35-hour working week, the department maintains that the building ought to remain open for at least 102 hours a week. This would require the appointment of three senior officers as managers, and the cost of their salaries would be out of all proportion to the assistance available.

The department should take stock of the situation instead of allowing the youthful officers to determine what experienced councillors and council officers will do and how they will do it. I am concerned that councils have to contend with the situation. It will be interesting to note what occurs in the next twelve months with the money that is allocated to the department. Administration costs are increasing rapidly. I do not know whether it is a case of empire building. Admittedly, some competent officers in the department are prepared to consider the needs of a particular municipality and their consideration is guided by local experience. The Minister should take time to consider the feelings in the community.

EDUCATION.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): On previous occasions, by questions on notice and on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting, I have referred to maintenance grants for technical school councils. These councils submit to the Education Department their estimates of expenditure in April each year but the grant is not received until the following October. By the time the grant is received, the councils face bankruptcy. This year they will be unable to maintain their current education programme unless supplementary assistance is made available.

I do not know whether honorable members understand the difference between a high school council and a technical school council. A technical school council employs all the non-teaching staff at the school and has to meet the cost of salaries from the maintenance grant, in addition to meeting the cost of the educational programme at the school in the form of class materials and various projects which may continue from year to year. Furthermore, the councils have to meet from the maintenance grant fixed charges which include items such as pay-roll tax.

I am associated with two technical schools in my electorate. I am a member of the council of one and the treasurer of the other, and I have an intimate knowledge of their financial positions. The schools concerned are the Broadmeadows West and Fawkner technical schools. The Fawkner school is a large technical school, and that at Broadmeadows West is starting to emerge into a school of some size.

It is ludicrous that a non-revenue earning undertaking which is funded by the State Government should have to pay pay-roll tax to the Government. The Treasury provides funds for the operation of the school and then takes portion of those funds back in pay-roll tax. The maintenance grant is effectively reduced by that fixed charge. At the Fawkner Technical School, the amount estimated for pay-roll tax is $1,800 and therefore the maintenance grant of $86,253 is reduced by that amount.

In the case of the Broadmeadows West Technical School the amount estimated for pay-roll tax during 1974–75 was $1,257. Because of the serious financial situation of the school it has had to reduce pay-roll tax payments to $850. In order to effect the reduction, fewer staff will be employed which means that the school will not be as clean or as well maintained as previously because the council will not have the funds to retain all the present employees. If the council had been employing more than sufficient staff, as the estimates were submitted in April, the department would have had the opportunity of pointing this out to the school. I understand that this applies to all schools, and therefore when the department was examining the school's estimates it should have taken into consideration the staff which the school council is employing.

The audit is carried out by departmental officers, and the school council must pay audit fees. It has been estimated that audit fees will amount to $500 and the audits must be carried out within a specified time. An expenditure of $900 has been estimated for the purchase of periodicals and reference materials, but no funds will be available for that purpose. The estimate for the purchase of library supplies is $315, but no funds will be available for that purpose. It has been estimated that for examination expenses $350 will be required, but no funds will be available for that purpose.

Mr. BAXTER: How will the students do their examinations?

Mr. WILTON: I do not know. The principal and the school council will have to grapple with that problem in the next few weeks to find a solution, unless supplementary maintenance grants are provided. No funds will be available for building repairs, furniture repairs or replacements, equipment or class material, although

$19,730 had been estimated for the latter purpose. That estimate was prepared in a responsible way, and because of the education programme which is operating in that school, the principal and the council considered that they would need that amount to supply class material for the school in the ensuing twelve months. However, no funds will now be available for that purpose. The departmental heads are now going around to the various business houses and industries in Broadmeadows begging and borrowing money and equipment to try to maintain the education programme.

The other school which I shall use as an example is the Fawkner Technical School, whose finance committee recently called an emergency meeting to try to resolve the situation. As a member of the school council, I have been supplied with material prepared by the finance committee to bring the other council members up to date on the situation. One difficulty is that the salaries of the council-employed staff are set by the Public Service Board. I cannot understand the cause of the delay of up to six months between the time a determination is made by the Public Service Board and the time when the school council is notified of the determination. When the determination is made and the date for the commencement of payment of the new salary rate is set down, the school council receives a notification that the salaries have been adjusted, and must make payments back-dated 2, 3 or 4 months.

One example is the case of a clerical assistant in the library. At 1st July, 1974, that person's salary was $170.53 a fortnight. That was increased on 26th April, but the school was not notified until 26th July—three months later, so a back-dated salary payment would have to be made.

Mr. BAXTER: Is the honorable member complaining about the salary increases?

Mr. WILTON: I am not complaining about the increases; they are determined by the Public Service Board. No school council is complaining about the criterion used in determining salaries; what is complained about is the delay between the time of the awarding of the increase and the time the council is notified. It varies between one month and six months.

In the coming school year three new apprenticeship trade courses will be introduced at the Broadmeadows West Technical School, namely, carpentry and joinery, cabinetmaking, and fitting and machinery. They are to be introduced in 1975, when approximately 110 new enrolments are expected in those courses. There will be 60 additional enrolments in the existing trade courses. I referred briefly to these figures the other night when I raised a matter on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting, but on that occasion my time expired.

The serious problem at the school is tooling up and purchasing the necessary equipment to be used by the apprentices at the start of the courses next year. At the moment, under the current maintenance grant which the school has received, no funds are available for purchasing tools and equipment. Unless these tools can be ordered immediately, they will not be available when needed. In August an application for $4,500 for tools was made, but it now appears unlikely that any funds can be expected. A quick decision is needed to determine the future of the school in the next 12 months. Will the Minister assist the schools by way of supplementary maintenance grants later in the year?

This would enable the school council to commit what funds it is going to receive in the next two quarterly payments to enable it to maintain its present situation. If it is not going to receive the funds, it should be informed quickly. If this occurs it will mean that school councils and principals will have to work out which staff employed by the school council can be

dismissed to conserve funds to maintain an educational programme which will only be second best to what the children are receiving at present.

This will apply to the older established technical schools, such as Fawkner Technical School, where the school council and the parents have worked hard over a number of years to provide improvements in the nature of an assembly hall and other facilities. The school has been fortunate to obtain a library under the Commonwealth scheme and a science wing, together with other amenities. Those facilities have been achieved through the hard work of the parents, students and staff—it has been a community effort. Those people have worked hard for many years and are concerned over the present financial emergency or crisis. They are afraid that they will be forced to make a decision which they should not have to make. Nobody likes to make a decision which involves the dismissal of staff. As experienced members of the school council, they know what the end result may be. It is an unsavoury task to tell a person that he is unemployed. School councils will be forced into doing this if funds are not made available. It will also mean that the school building will not be properly maintained or cleaned as it will be physically impossible to carry out these functions.

The staff feel it is unfair to them because they will be placed in the situation where, because of lack of funds, they will have to beg, borrow or steal whatever they require to perform their teaching duties. They will be forced into making all types of emergency arrangements in an endeavour to keep some semblance of an education system in operation.

I hope the Minister of Education will take note of my comments. I am sure that the position I have outlined in relation to the two schools I have mentioned is not an isolated instance. I have made inquiries in other areas and I understand from discussions with principals that it is typical of the general situation which applies throughout the technical education system in this State.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Box Hill): I am pleased that the Attorney-General and the Treasurer are in the Chamber because I am concerned that the legal profession seems to look down on the accounting profession. It is most essential, in the operation of the Corporate Affairs Office, that those persons who prepare financial statements for presentation to the Corporate Affairs Office are persons who can produce a proper financial statement. Under recent legislation I believe it is possible for private companies to submit financial statements to the Corporate Affairs Office without having them prepared or audited by a registered accountant.

I believe it is essential that these statements should be prepared by men of integrity who are members of your illustrious division of the profession, Mr. Chairman, the Victorian Branch of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia, or my less illustrious division, the Australian Society of Accountants. If financial statements are not prepared by a person who is a member of either of those two organizations, I for one would not be prepared to accept them. However, the Corporate Affairs Office is prepared to accept financial statements prepared by persons who are not registered or recognized by reputable accountants.

Any set of figures can be added up on an adding machine. If a statement is not prepared according to proper accounting principles, particularly in relation to valuation of stock, assessment of debtors, assessment of depreciation and many other matters which require a skilled judgment, those statements are not worth anything.

I was most disappointed to read in my July copy of *the Australian Accountant* that the conference of Attorneys-General had again refused the application of both Australian accounting bodies for the registration

of accountants. It is a gross reflection on our profession, Mr. Chairman, that lawyers still do not recognize our standing in the community. I believe it is of basic and vital importance, that businessmen can rely on statements registered in the Corporate Affairs Office.

As the situation now stands, any person can prepare a financial statement and lodge it with the Corporate Affairs Office. I believe such a statement requires a skilled judgment of the type that only a registered accountant can possess and only registered accountants should be presenting financial statements to the Corporate Affairs Office.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): I point out to the Committee that of all the items in the Bill, Division 365 —rent control—is the only item I have come across for which a lesser amount is being provided this year. If the Treasurer examines page 59 of the Bill, he will see that in 1973–74 the amount made available totalled $131,856. The estimate for 1974–75 has been reduced by nearly $20,000.

Mr. HAMER: The difference represents the provision for long service leave.

Mr. EDMUNDS: I understand the point about long service leave and how it applies to a number of individuals who have finally served their time after coming from the Commonwealth service. However, what concerns me is that the funds allocated to this division are not adequate to perform the function that is required in respect to rent control.

Many complaints have been received regarding the administration of the Landlord and Tenant Act. Requests from persons seeking justice under the Landlord and Tenant Act are continuing to be received. There are areas in which there is no legislative power whatsoever for anybody to act and the Committee knows my opinion in respect to this matter.

I have posed a series of questions to the Attorney-General and to the Minister of Consumer Affairs regarding complaints on rental and security bond matters. Complaints are continually being received. Recently I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question on how many complaints his department had received from January up until September in respect to security bonds. It received 35 complaints regarding rent, bonds, and security deposits. Of these, the Consumer Protection Bureau investigated 24 cases and eleven complaints were still awaiting investigation because there were not enough people employed in that section to deal with the complaints coming in from the community regarding the whole area of the Minister's responsibility.

The number of complaints which the Rental Investigation Bureau has received in respect to rent matters has increased considerably in the past few months. The reason, of course, is that the estate agents through their organizations have agreed to jack-up the rents substantially. In Moonee Ponds small weatherboard houses with 17-foot frontages that were being rented for $25 a week are now being offered to the public for $40 a week. It may be that that is justified in relation to those properties—I do not know—but people are complaining about their rents being jacked-up. Some tenants are unable to pay higher rents; many of them are on pensions and restricted incomes. When they contact the Fair Rents Board they are now told in many instances that they have to wait three or four weeks before their complaints can be examined. I suggest to the Treasurer that if Supplementary Estimates are brought down in the New Year, stronger consideration ought to be given to the area of the Rental Investigation Bureau.

It is well known that the bureau does not do anything radical when handling complaints. It can make threats as to what action it may be able to take but in my opinion most of its activities are of an advisory nature; it does not exercise the control which the name suggests it should.

When I last visited the Rental Investigation Bureau last year, I noticed that the staff members were using typewriters that were in use when the bureau was a Commonwealth department. They may have new typewriters this year but they certainly do not have enough staff to handle the complaints. No publicity is given to the work of the department. If it were publicized, there would be an avalanche of complaints about rent increases and particularly about security bond increases.

The Estate Agents Committee and the Registrar of Estate Agents also receive a huge volume of complaints regarding various types of abuse. If ever there was a case of appealing to Caesar about the actions of Caesar it is going to the Registrar of Estate Agents to make complaints about the actions of some estate agents. The registrar does little to discipline estate agents who are stretching credibility in respect to jacking-up rents. It seems that the only way the matter will be fairly and reasonably handled is by providing more money under the Attorney-General's appropriations for the specific purpose of rent control. I urge the Government and particularly the Treasurer to consider that when next going through the estimates in respect to rent control.

CONSERVATION.

Mr. GUY (Gisborne): I wish to make a few comments about the Ministry for Conservation and the departments embodied in it. I refer to the type of finance that will be necessary in the near future to enable the Ministry to meet what I feel will be its ultimate responsibilities, especially in future planning procedures and processes in Victoria. There is no question in my mind that these processes need a complete overhaul. Too often in the past departments such as the Minister for Conservation have been completely left out of planning decisions that will affect the future of this State and the immediate lives of many of its citizens. The time has arrived when we must accept that every department is responsible in some way for planning and must be considered when initial plans are being made for the development of areas, especially where conservation or the protection of the environment is concerned.

Within my electorate the Macedon Ranges are a classic example. Far too often, when the Government makes statements about what it intends to do regarding the environment and conservation, even in terms of purchasing areas of land, the Macedon Ranges seem to be overlooked, and even though it is a small area and does not house many people, its effect on the future of even the city of Melbourne will be quite substantial because it is one of the areas in which the catchment of water is of vital importance.

It was my pleasure several weeks ago to conduct a tour around Macedon Ranges in the company of the Minister for Conservation, the Minister for Local Government and for Planning, and the Minister of Water Supply and of Forests. Also present were representatives of the water trusts in the area, various groups of citizens, ratepayers' associations, shire presidents, and so forth. There were 45 people altogether and we had an enlightening day in the range area. The fact that the Ministry for Conservation and its departments are not involved early enough in our planning processes and procedures opened everyone's eyes. Most of the land in the area is a vital water catchment. However, we still have not answered some important questions regarding that area, namely, what is its capacity to hold water and what is its ultimate responsibility in providing water to the area around the perimeter, and possibly in future down into the growth areas of Sunbury and the Melbourne metropolis. Until those questions are answered we cannot start on square 1 planning regarding this area.

Several months ago a statement was made to the effect that the Ministry for Conservation and its departments would in the future be more

involved in planning processes and procedures. I know that is the hope of the Minister for Conservation. The sooner it happens, the happier I, for one, will be and the better off the citizens of this State will be.

The amount of finance necessary for that department to employ its own planners is not great. Perhaps again it is a matter of having on loan planners who have been involved in environmental issues in the past, and getting them involved in whatever committees need to be set up to investigate the planning problems of these areas in future years. This is important, especially when we are at the stage of developing planning policy for areas like the Macedon Ranges which will be so significant in its future development.

If one studies the types of planning appeals that have been made even over the past couple of months, one finds that the uncertainty that exists as to their future has cost the citizens in that area considerable sums of money. Not long ago the Acting Minister for Local Government and for Planning made a submission to the Town Planning Appeals Tribunal that an appeal be held over until the statement of planning policy was issued by the Town and Country Planning Board; a statement on forward policy is being prepared. To ensure that their point was made in respect to the local environment and planning issues, certain citizens of the area gathered together $3,500 as a contribution to the appeal. It was expensive, notwithstanding the fact that the council was against that basic development, primarily because it was not sure what effect it would have on the environment.

The citizens wanted to make absolutely sure. Planning was deferred until a positive statement was forthcoming. In the interim several thousand dollars have been spent which could have been put to better use in the community. Constant demands are made on the resources of the community for the financing of pre-school centres, and so on. There is a long list of requirements for finance. It comes back to the need to clear up a great deal of uncertainty which exists in the area. The Ministry for Conservation should be involved at the start of the planning processes and procedures, rather than let the matter take its course and perhaps another department then submitting an objection to a plan. Basically, this uncertainty needs to be resolved in sensitive areas such as the Macedon Ranges. This can only be done if the Ministry for Conservation is intimately involved at the very beginning. I am not sure what sort of strain this would place on the finances of the State or how the whole matter would inter-relate with other departments. However, I trust that in the near future the statement made several months ago will come to fruition, because in an area such as the Macedon Ranges, this is absolutely imperative.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I wish to refer briefly to the Environment Protection Authority. No honorable member would doubt that since the authority was established the environment of the State has been considerably improved, but more so in the measuring of the environment in the State. Some time ago I asked a question in the House about the level of pollution in Melbourne. As an explanation of what I will have to say later, I will refer to some of the answers which I received concerning air pollution in Melbourne last year. There were 291 days of what is called clean air, 91 days of light pollution, 11 days of significant pollution and 3 days of heavy pollution. These facts are recorded on page 1391 of *Hansard*. We are now starting to specify periods and days of the year on which there is heavy pollution. In addition, on 29 days last year the ozone level exceeded the World Health Organization's standards. There are substantial differences in various parts of the Melbourne metropolitan area.

I raise this matter because there does not appear as yet to have been a detailed survey of the particular

areas of Melbourne in which pollution of various types is higher than in other areas. I have asked questions concerning the level of various types of pollution in Brunswick and Coburg. I have been informed that the reading of the gauges and the various other methods of measuring pollution in Brunswick and Coburg are carried out on an occasional basis, although the monitoring of sulphur dioxide and suspended smoke by collection is carried out in Brunswick on a 24-hour basis. It has not been possible to compare that figure with the figures for Melbourne which I have quoted. My concern is that in heavy industrialized areas such as Brunswick and Coburg, there appears to be a far higher pollution level than in other areas.

A sample study should be done of the various parts of the Melbourne metropolitan area for comparison with those areas which suffer from heavy pollution, so that the appropriate action can be taken. Until there are devices on site in several parts of Melbourne, that type of analysis cannot be carried out. I repeatedly receive complaints from residents of Brunswick and Coburg about the filthiness of the air, particularly in the winter months, but as detailed figures are not available from the Environment Protection Authority I cannot say whether those areas are worse or better than other parts of the Melbourne metropolitan area. Those who expend that part of the Environment Protection Authority's budget concerned with monitoring air pollution should conduct a detailed survey of air quality throughout the metropolitan area. It can equally be said that the Minister of Health and his department should more closely examine the precautions that might be required as pollution builds up.

The other matter that I refer to the notice of the Committee is noise pollution. In most cases when I have had complaints about noise pollution, the Environment Protection Authority and other instrumentalities of the Government, although helpful, have not been helpful enough, because the various standards and the legal backing to enforce standards in noise pollution are inadequate. I have received serious complaints from people. One can threaten and threaten but it is difficult to do much more. One cannot take the matter to the point of telling people that if they do not remove their machinery or quieten down their operations, they will be fined or put out of business. The residents of Brunswick and Coburg and other citizens would be extremely grateful if the Environment Protection Authority would look at the peculiar problems of heavily industrialized areas, and suggest to the Government and Parliament what steps can be taken to overcome these problems, which affect the quality of life in these areas more than anywhere else. It is bad enough that there is no access to open space, and even worse that what little air space exists is extremely filthy on many days of the year.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston): I direct the Committee's attention to a facility that the Public Works Department should provide in the City of Preston. It is the considered opinion of people in local government and those in business, and also people who reside in the immediate area of the court, that the Government should have provided public parking for those people who attend the court, either as solicitors or as citizens, and have to wait there while someone determines whether or not a particular sentence will be passed. It is ridiculous that the excellent building which is being erected in Preston lacks public parking to facilitate the movement of people in and out of the court and those in the immediate vicinity of the court. I hope the Government will take note of this matter.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): I desire to raise an important matter concerning the fire protection of buildings in the metropolitan area.

Mr. DIXON : I have heard the honorable member on this before.

Mr. WILKES : The Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation is going to hear me again. I ask the Government what it is going to do about these buildings. I might give the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation some advice ; if he is not careful his department will become a bigger headache than the Education Department.

Mr. DIXON : I am not criticizing. I said that I have heard the honorable member before on this subject.

Mr. WILKES : I am not criticizing the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation. I think it has done a good job. The antiquated existing regulations concerning fire protection do not require buildings to have proper fire protection. The only adequate and proven way that this can be done has been shown in other countries to be a proper sprinkler system. Many comparatively new buildings in Melbourne have a sprinkler system only in the basement and the car park. Unless the regulations are amended, any person trapped above 132 feet in these buildings will be in grave difficulties. The Minister of Labour and Industry is aware of some of the regulations, because I have referred to them on many occasions, as the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation quite rightly pointed out. A Liberal Party committee is inquiring into this matter and the chairman of that committee is in the House at present. The honorable member was quoted in the press as saying that he was concerned about this lack of fire protection.

Mr. WHITING : Who is this?

Mr. WILKES : The honorable member for Ballaarat North. I asked the Chief Secretary which buildings in the City of Melbourne were referred to as fire risks by the Chief Fire Officer and for what reasons. In reply the Chief Secretary said that the statements of the Chief Fire Officer were of a general nature, and that particular buildings were not mentioned. That was a brilliant answer. Everybody but the Chief Secretary's Department knows which buildings in Melbourne are fire risks. The Chief Fire Officer and the Melbourne City Council know, but the Chief Secretary does not know.

Mr. JONES : You are not surprised though.

Mr. WILKES : No, I am not surprised. Is it not incredible that the Melbourne City Council and the Chief Fire Officer can state which buildings have fire orders on them, but the Chief Secretary and his department do not know.

Mr. RAFFERTY : What should he do?

Mr. WILKES : He ought to be informed of those buildings. If the Chief Secretary does not know which buildings are potential fire risks in Melbourne, and if he does not know which buildings have fire orders placed on them, he should be told. This is the real problem that concerns the Opposition. On one occasion, I asked the Chief Secretary—

> At what maximum height or floor level the Metropolitan Fire Brigade can deal with an outbreak of fire in these particular buildings?

The honorable gentleman replied—

> There is no limitation as to the maximum height or floor level in dealing with a fire. The time taken to control a fire would depend on the type of fire protection installed in a building, the design and contents of the building, and the height and magnitude of the outbreak.

The buildings to which I have referred do not have a fire sprinkler system. They have only hand extinguishers.

Mr. WHITING: With an old perished hose.

Mr. WILKES : Yes, it is antiquated, as everybody knows. Subsequently I asked the Minister—

> Whether the equipment available to the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board is capable of dealing with fires in any building in Melbourne; if not, in what areas equipment is ineffective?

The honorable gentleman replied—

> The equipment available to the Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board is equal to the best in the world in both range and capacity,

and is capable of dealing with fires in any building in Melbourne subject to the conditions stated in answer 2 above.

The Chief Secretary knows, as his Liberal Party committee knows—it is an expert committee—that if a fire broke out in certain buildings in Melbourne it would be impossible for the brigades to extinguish the fire because of the height and the construction of the buildings. This is the fault not of the Government but of the relevant regulations. When Uniform Building Regulations and fire regulations are promulgated and implemented, they should be brought up to date.

The Chief Secretary said yesterday that he was not prepared to impose restrictions on private enterprise and compel them to place alternative equipment in their buildings to prevent fires. He said that the cost would be too great, but he did not say that it would be cheaper to let people burn than to compel private enterprise to instal sprinkler systems in new buildings. It should be mandatory for every building in Melbourne to have a sprinkler system. Most buildings today are built by companies that can well afford to instal sprinkler systems. Many unoccupied buildings in Melbourne have been built as investments. The classic example is a building at St. Kilda junction. Everyone knows its value is appreciating by 20 per cent a year, if not more. Why could not this building have been fitted with a sprinkler system when it was built?

Mr. A. T. EVANS: How old is the building?

Mr. WILKES: The building has been completed in the past twelve months. This is not the fault of the Government and nobody suggests that it is, but I am drawing to the Government"s attention, and that of the committee investigating this matter, the lack of regulatory power in respect of fire protection in these buildings. The committee was charged with taking too long to bring in its report. The chairman denied that and said that the matter was complex. That is understandable. While the committee is bringing in its report it would be a simple matter to amend the Uniform Building Regulations and the fire regulations to ensure that they are in agreement. That would overcome a number of problems with which the committee is confronted. It has conducted an extensive inquiry into this matter, but fire control is most essential.

Fire drill is encouraged in every hospital in the State. At Preston and Northcote Community Hospital, fire drill is encouraged twice a year, under private supervision. The hospital wants to carry out this drill on more occasions. Other hospitals carry out a similar exercise, but there are big buildings in the city where approximately 5,000 people work and fire drill is not carried out. One could imagine the panic that would occur when it was found to be impossible to get a fire ladder above 132 feet and to operate pumping equipment above that level. The people who work in high-rise buildings should be instructed in fire drill. It should be the responsibility not only of the Government but of the proprietors and the companies which own those buildings to ensure that fire drill is carried out. I sincerely hope this very important matter of fire risk will be dealt with.

A fire risk order has been placed on a building at 561-563 Bourke Street. Orders have also been placed on a property at 525-527 Collins Street and the Hotel Australia at 262-274 Collins Street.

The building situated at 175-177 Collins Street has had a fire order issued against it, as have the buildings at 380-382 Bourke Street. The Savoy Plaza Hotel which is to be purchased by the Government, also has a similar order issued against it and this has been referred to on a number of occasions. I have selected only a few buildings but many other buildings have had similar orders issued by the Melbourne City Council, but they are still being used by people. A municipality would be compelled to take action, and quite

properly. A municipal council is empowered to close a business or other premises and surely it is not too much to ask why people should be placed at risk in the buildings to which I have referred. The cost of adequate fire protection must be measured against the saving of lives. Honorable members have been assured that new buildings will have proper sprinkler systems installed and this will ease the situation.

Mr. A. T. EVANS: The Premier has already taken action in that regard.

Mr. WILKES: I am pleased to hear the interjection from the honorable member for Ballaarat North but this fact ought to be publicized. I have been referring to newspaper reports and relying on published comments of people who are concerned about the situation. It is amazing that some big buildings have no sprinkler systems. Three buildings in Melbourne—the 15-story Eagle Insurance building in Bourke Street, the 41-story B.H.P. building at the corner of Bourke and William streets, and the 22-story National Insurance building in Collins Street—have a full sprinkler system, compared with more than 100 buildings in Sydney which have a full system.

Mr. A. T. EVANS: The B.H.P. building is the best fire-protected building in Melbourne.

Mr. WILKES: That building is one of the best fire-protected buildings in the world but I have been able to name only three such buildings in Melbourne. Admittedly, the people who work in these buildings ought to be demanding that proper fire protection is afforded to them or that at least they should be taught fire drill.

Even before the Liberal Party committee submits its report, the Government ought to amend the regulations to make it mandatory for developers of new buildings, particularly flats, to ensure that adequate fire protection is provided. In some areas, high-density flats are inadequately protected. Melbourne has been very fortunate over the years, whereas cities overseas have been less fortunate. This is not a political matter. People who work and live in high-rise buildings ought to be protected in the same way that factory owners have to provide protection for their employees. It is absurd that buildings which have been recently erected are not properly equipped.

Some buildings in Melbourne have a sprinkler system installed only in the basement car park. Any honorable member will agree that a lift well can act as a flue to carry a fire to the upper floors. People who work or reside on the top floors of buildings deserve to be protected from fire. As well as a sprinkler system, buildings should have some warning device because the sprinklers do not operate until the heat has reached a certain intensity. The installation of a warning system would allow people in the building to receive some indication that there is heat or a naked flame on one of the floors. Without this equipment, a building will always remain a potential danger to the people working in it. If a fire occurred in some buildings, there would be a holocaust. Some are not old buildings but buildings which have been erected in relatively recent times.

Even before the committee submits its report, the Government should take action to remedy the situation. The honorable member for Ballaarat North said that the Premier had issued an edict, but this should be publicized. I am as concerned as are members of the Liberal Party committee and officers of the fire brigade that a fire could break out in one of these buildings.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston): Provision is made for subsidies to municipalities towards the cost of supervising school crossings. The idea is bright and the

Government is providing a subsidy on a $2 for $1 basis. The Budget provision is $500,000 but one has to consider the number of school crossings throughout the Melbourne metropolitan area. The city of Preston has 31 school crossings and to provide adequate supervision would require the attendance of a person for three or four hours a day. At a casual labour rate of $5·05 an hour plus the cost of the uniform which the municipality has to provide. the total allocation of $500,000 would not go very far. Apparently, the Government has adopted this bright idea but, having gained an advantage politically, it is then prepared to dump the whole scheme in the laps of the municipalities to organize and run.

Mr. STEPHEN : Some municipalities already provide supervision of school crossings without subsidy.

Mr. KIRKWOOD : It is not a matter of what some municipalities do. If the municipalities in the honorable member's electorate do not have to seek Government subsidies, the City of Preston will be quite happy to receive the grants that would be available to those municipalities. The Preston City Council is quite happy to accept subsidies because municipalities are being asked to perform many functions which should be undertaken by the State Government. Subsidies are appropriate when one is dumping something in someone's lap. Finance should be provided to cover the Government's ideas.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) : This will be my final comment on these Estimates which I regard as important. The Government seems to be in a dilemma about its regulations concerning swimming pools. Although local government is responsible for the issuing of permits for the construction of swimming pools, the Government has seen fit to make several announcements in relation to the matter.

The first one was made by the Minister for Local Government in a press release on 21st March, 1973, when he said that the State Government had rejected controversial regulations prepared by the Building Regulations Committee for new swimming pools. The draft regulations required 6-ft. walls or fences around all new pools with a capacity of more than 2,000 gallons. The Minister further stated that the Government had four main reasons for rejecting the regulations. The first one was that the proposal was too inflexible and restrictive, and would be quite inappropriate in many cases. That proposal refers either to a 6-ft. wall or a cyclone fence.

The Minister said, secondly, that the proposals related only to pools to be installed in the future and would afford no protection in regard to existing pools. The Minister must know that he can make retrospective regulations for the control of swimming pools, which are potential killers of small children. There has been a 600 per cent increase in the number of deaths in swimming pools.

Mr. BILLING : How many deaths have occurred altogether?

Mr. WILKES : If only one death were caused through lack of regulation, it would be criminal. Children wander around and they can get into a neighbour's backyard and fall into a swimming pool. The press statement of the Minister for Local Government continued—

> The proposals related only to pools to be installed in the future and would afford no protection in regard to existing pools.
>
> "Surely drownings are more likely in pools already there than those which do not exist", Mr. Hunt said.
>
> Information obtained from Commonwealth Statistician showed that the regulations would not in fact achieve the intended result.

The Minister was relying on the Commonwealth Statistician.

> Yet at the same time they would occasion substantial difficulties in complying in many cases and even prevent the construction of pools in others.

Why is that so? It would not prevent the construction of pools provided that local government has the power to approve them. I know of local councils which are exercising this

power without the imprimatur of the Government. This applies not only in Labor electorates such as Northcote, but in other areas where pools may not be built until they are provided with a cover or a fence. If a fence is not considered aesthetically pleasing, a pool cover may be used. The building inspectors approve these protection measures. They approve everything else in relation to buildings, so surely they can approve a cover for a swimming pool.

The statement continued—

The statistician's figures disclosed that there were 31 deaths by drowning in private swimming pools in Victoria during the last five years.

"Twenty-seven of these involved children who lived at the property or were there by invitation and would not have been protected by the proposed regulations", Mr. Hunt said.

"Of the remaining four, two drownings were in pools already protected in the manner proposed under the suggested regulations. The children nevertheless got in", Mr. Hunt added.

The figures also disclosed that 18 of the 31 drownings were in temporary above-ground pools which would not have been covered by the regulations in any event.

The Minister did not mention that the regulations concerned the cover; he only mentioned the wall around the pool, of which he does not approve. The statement continues—

Mr. Hunt said that two-thirds of the drownings were of children under the age of four. "This indicates clearly the need for vigilant supervision by parents of young children," he added.

Of course, there should be supervision by parents, but this cannot occur at all times.

Mr. Hunt said that owners of pools should consider the type of safety provision best suited to their case, particularly when premises were unattended. Safety devices included fences, pool covers and alarm systems.

The Minister said that the Building Regulations Committee had been advised of the Government's views but declined to vary its recommendation. The Government, in turn, declined to implement them, he concluded.

Obviously, there has been a fight between the Government and the Building Regulations Committee over a simple problem, the solution to which could save lives in swimming pools.

On 6th November, in the late extra edition of the *Herald*, the following report appears—

The State Government is to legislate to make covers on swimming pools compulsory.

In the final edition of the *Herald* of the same date, the article was published with somewhat different wording. It stated—

The State Government is prepared to legislate to make covers on swimming pools compulsory.

The final edition came out half an hour later than the late extra edition, and in that time the Government had changed its mind. What does it intend to do? Does it intend to legislate or does it propose to legislate? The following statement illustrates the way the Government treats public safety—

The State Government is to legislate to make covers on swimming pools compulsory.

That is what the Minister for Local Government said, but by the time he saw the article in the late extra edition of the *Herald*, he changed his mind and stopped the press to alter the wording in the edition which was released only half an hour later.

Mr. RAFFERTY: It is a misprint.

Mr. WILKES: I do not believe it is a misprint; the Government changed its mind. It said, "We are prepared to legislate for the cover of swimming pools". In 1973 the Government could not accept the proposition of the Building Regulations Committee. In 1974, on 6th November, the Government said first that it would legislate, and then half an hour later it said that it was prepared to legislate. How could anybody rely on the Government and a Minister who acts like that?

There was certainly no misprint. The type has been taken out and re-set at the direction of the Minister. One could not make that mistake. If it were a mistake, obviously it would have been corrected by the Minister. The only one who made the mistake was the Minister for Local Government when he became carried away and said, "The Government is going to legislate". Then he thought better of it and amended the state-

ment to say that the Government would be prepared to legislate. This occurred half an hour after the publication of the original statement. No legislation has been passed and it is now the middle of November and the summer season is approaching.

I have been advising municipalities to exercise their prerogatives. Pool covers are being built in Victoria, in spite of what the Minister said in that article. The Minister is concerned because he does not want to require anyone to disfigure his property by having to put up a fence where he does not have to or to put a cover on a pool to prevent children falling in.

The Opposition contends that the Government should support local government to the hilt. If local government authorities want to enforce people to make their swimming pools safe by requiring them to erect fences around their pools or to provide a safe cover for them, that action should be publicly supported by the Government.

I ask the Government to take action to prevent the possible death of people in swimming pools this year. The Opposition is tired of waiting while the Minister for Local Government procrastinates. The matter was first considered by the Building Regulations Committee in 1973. The Opposition is also concerned about the Minister's mind-changing exercise which was featured in the *Herald* recently. The honorable gentleman should be more careful about what he says. The Government should make it clear whether it intends to legislate to provide regulations covering the use of swimming pools. If the Government does not intend to legislate, for every child who falls into a swimming pool and drowns, that will be an indictment of the Government for failing to take the necessary action.

The Government can take positive action in this case. Many local authorities will not issue a pool permit to persons who are desirous of constructing swimming pools unless they fulfill certain conditions. However, they cannot force the owners of pools that have already been constructed to cover those pools. This Government has introduced safety regulations before but as this proposal could impinge on the pockets of the people it represents, it does not intend to take appropriate action to make swimming pools safe.

I know it may not be aesthetically possible to erect a fence around every pool or to cover every pool, but I do not want any confusion over what I am asking. Certain metropolitan councils have taken the matter into their own hands. They are demanding that all new pools should be safely protected. They have no power over people who have already installed pools but they can say to people who want to instal pools that a permit will not be issued until they comply with certain conditions. However, they have no legal power to do that. What they are doing could be upset by the Government if it does not back the Building Regulations Committee or the Municipal Association of Victoria.

The Opposition asks the Government to support local government on the stand it has taken over the construction of new swimming pools by requiring them to be covered or fenced. The Government is also being asked to legislate to ensure that existing pools are covered by the same safety precautions. The Opposition believes the Government should take this matter out of the hands of the Minister for Local Government because he cannot make up his mind on what the Government should do.

The Government should be responsible enough to take action before Christmas. There is plenty of time and the Opposition will give speedy passage to any measure introduced which has the object of saving precious lives of children. The Opposition calls on the Government to take this action and to back local government so that lives will be saved during the coming summer period.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South): I refer to the provision in the Budget of the sum of $500,000 as subsidies

payable to municipalities towards the cost of supervision of school crossings. The honorable member for Preston was critical of the Government because it was not prepared to make enough money available, as he put it. However, I commend the Government in making this money available because it will be directed towards a worthy proposition—the manning of school crossings. I commend the Borough of Sebastopol because although only 5,000 people reside in the borough, it accepted the responsibility and provided funds to make elderly citizens available to man the school crossings and was among the first in Victoria to do so.

While commending the Government for taking this action, I mention some of the problems inherent in its operation. For any proposition there must be a beginning. The Borough of Sebastopol met with opposition from unions who wanted to insist on a higher wage being paid to elderly citizens who were prepared to act in the best interests of children in the community. They were prepared to accept this onerous task on a split-hour proposition during the day.

The efforts of the borough were upset by the unions which were not interested in the community or the safety of the children. I believe this matter should be mentioned and brought into the open and given publicity. The amount of $500,000 which has been made available by the Government should not be expended just to allow some of the more avaricious unions to obtain unnecessarily high payments for services which will be of benefit to the community. I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and believe this service could be likened to a safety device—providing safe protection for many children. I hope this money is spent in the best way possible. It will go a lot further if the Government receives support from the Opposition and unions.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir): I should have thought that the Government would have taken up the proposition advanced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about swimming pools because with the approach of the summer season, the safety of children around swimming pools can be of grave concern to those parents who have young children and who cannot make a decision for themselves.

I point to the figures which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition supplied to the House. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that since 1968 there had been nearly a 600 per cent increase in deaths in swimming pools. There were only two deaths in 1968, but with the growing use of swimming pools and the exposure of children to danger, there has been an 800 per cent increase in that eighteen children died last year.

When one analyses the types of accidents which occur, it is significant to note that those pools which are 4 feet or more in depth are not responsible for a high percentage of deaths. The small pools, which children climb over and then fall in, are the most dangerous. The analysis also reveals that swimming pool deaths involve children mainly in the lower age group.

The proposition advanced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was quite clear. There is scope for regulation and a capacity to provide a safety cover. It has been demonstrated by a manufacturer in Coburg that covers can be produced at a relatively low cost. The honorable member for Coburg has mentioned this on numerous occasions and the Government indicated that it would look into the matter. It is time that something was done.

I am speaking on behalf of the twenty or more children who will drown in swimming pools this year unless the Government is prepared to take the necessary action to protect all children, remembering that eighteen drowned last year in similar circumstances. It is simply a question of whether this Government will do something to protect the lives of children and not give into swimming

pool manufacturers who advertise extensively in the newspapers, paying little regard to the fact that the indiscriminate use of swimming pools has led to an increase of more than 800 per cent in the number of drownings that occurred in them since 1968. If that sort of escalation continues in the next five years, more than 100 children will drown in these pools.

Mr. RAFFERTY: It is like inflation.

Mr. SIMMONDS: Yes; it is an inflation of death of young people who are unable to make decisions. If this Government undertook a detailed investigation and took action which would give a measure of relief and save just one life, it would be justified. The Opposition impresses upon the Government the need to do this now and assures the Government of its support in the matter.

Mr. GUY (Gisborne): The title of Ministry for Planning suggests that this department ought to have wide and powerful influence on the future of the State in many ways and certainly that planning for the future would have some fairly important ramifications on the future growth of Victoria. The allocation of $36,500 would seem to belie this but I do not think it is important in this case. It is one of the smallest areas of the Budget but will turn out to be one of our most important departments. However, the Ministry will only be as important as it ought to be if it is given the power to co-ordinate to review and to draw together all the planning elements currently housed in all other Government departments, and I include the Board of Works. All State planning processes and procedures need an overhaul. The time is ripe for this to be done. Since its inception the Ministry for Planning has been laying some solid foundations for the work that it will have to do in the future. I know the hopes and aspirations that the Minister for Planning has for his department. Massive doses of finance will not be required. It is a case of quality rather than quantity. Not long ago an announcement was made of the appointment of Mr. Neville Haynes as secretary of the Ministry for Planning. He is well known to most honorable members and for many years was Town Clerk of the City of Knox. On behalf of most honorable members I wish him great success in his new post. If, however, he is not given the power to co-ordinate, review and draw together all planning elements in all Government departments, he might as well stay in the City of Knox. It is important for the Government that this department should not to be just window-dressing. All present planning processes and procedures need to be reorganized so that the Ministry can provide expertise, advice and if necessary personnel on loan from the various Government departments involved in planning to regional planning authorities, local councils and others for the administration of ideas in their respective areas.

HEALTH.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston): An excellent contribution is being made under the division of general health. In the City of Preston, which contains four elderly citizens' clubs, it will mean an increase of $4,000. There will also be an increase in the home health service field by the subsidy ceiling being increased from $36.20 to $82 a week. The increases to municipalities are commendable.

There is one bitter pill that probably many people in the community swallow. One cannot deny the assistance that will be given to certain elderly citizens. However, the Combined Pensioners' Association should also be assisted. This Government has not made any contribution towards either the construction or maintenance of buildings that the combined pensioners might own or be required to be housed in. I plead with the Minister and the Government, if it is necessary to plead, that serious consideration be given to this side

of elderly citizens' establishments in an area. If the Minister is prepared to set a ceiling price for building or maintenance costs to the Combined Pensioners Association, he will be helping people who have brought the municipalities and the country up to what they are today. They have worked almost 50 years in the community, building it up, and the Government should seriously consider subsidizing pensioners' associations.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I raise two matters under the heading of general health. The first is the grant for research and investigation into maltreatment and conditions affecting the development of young children. This is something that the health authorities in this State and other people concerned have allowed to continue for too long. It is difficult to estimate how many babies and young children die in Victoria annually through the battered baby syndrome and how many are permanently damaged. If British figures are taken into account, it is likely—we were talking of pool deaths before—that in Victoria more than 40 children annually are battered to death and twenty or so suffer some form of permanent brain damage. The Department of Health should undertake more research into this kind of activity and ascertain the incidence of battered babies throughout the State but, more importantly, ways and means of coming to grips with this serious problem.

The Minister of Health, the Attorney-General and other Ministers need to work in close harmony on this matter. The evidence, which is mainly international because the work has not been done in Australia, shows that doctors, social workers, teachers and every professional person who comes into contact with battered or maltreated children is highly reluctant to take the matter further. I am not suggesting that the Minister of Health can provide an easy solution, but it appears that far more research and study should be carried out on the health and legal aspects of this disaster. In my activities in my electorate I have seen a number of cases that may have gone this far but fortunately did not. However, these problems should not be allowed to continue or to worsen.

The other matter I wish to refer to under the ambit of general health is venereal diseases. Last year an allocation of $30,690 was made for the treatment of venereal diseases. This year the allocation has increased only to $31,000. The level of service to the people of Victoria in the notification and treatment of venereal diseases has not improved. If anyone doubts the seriousness of venereal disease it should be realized that it kills, maims, and generally makes uncomfortable, as many people are aware, a large and growing proportion of members of the community.

I quote some British figures because they are not available in Australia at present. In 1962 syphilis killed three times as many Britons as tuberculosis and five times as many as polio. Gonorrhea leads to permanent, crippling arthritic conditions. Comparatively little public health emphasis is placed on venereal disease and far more on tuberculosis and polio. It might be that the treatment of venereal disease is less attractive than the treatment of tuberculosis or polio, but the fact remains that the amount of money granted for the treating of this disease is not growing as the need arises. It is not even keeping up with general increases in wages and costs in the community.

In 1971 the former Minister of Health, Mr. Rossiter, stated in the *Australian* that he had ordered an official inquiry into the problem of veneral diseases in the State. He implied in this newspaper article that great new measures would be taken in Victoria to overcome the problem of venereal disease. As honorable members, and doubtless the experts know, little has been done in this area since 1971.

The whole system of dealing with venereal disease in the State is extremely poor. To illustrate this, I refer to the figures on the number of cases contained in the last available report of the Commission of Public Health for the year ended 30th June, 1973. The report stated that in 1972, 46 new patients were treated for syphilis at the Government clinic, and 1,841 were treated for gonorrhea.

Mr. SCANLAN: What about interstate and international comparisons?

Mr. ROPER: That was the point I intended to make because the report goes on to say—

> The number of cases of syphilis reported is still low and a cause for satisfaction, especially as no cases of congenital syphilis were reported.

One can take two different views from those figures. The report says that this is a cause for satisfaction, but it can equally be said, as most people in general practice would say, that this suggests that there is something wrong with the figures, and that the Government clinic and the system of notification is not picking up and tracing all the cases of gonorrhea and syphilis that develop in the State.

I shall give a comparative example. In 1968-69 New South Wales had 348 cases of syphilis; Victoria had 92. In the following year, there were 401 cases in New South Wales, and only 40 in Victoria. The same general gonorrhea for Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. DIXON: These States have completely different life styles.

Mr. ROPER: That is an interesting view. It would be hard to imagine how one can attribute a 1,000 per cent difference in the rate of syphilis to a different life style between the people living in New South Wales and the people living in Victoria.

Mr. DIXON: Has Victoria got a King's Cross?

Mr. ROPER: It has. It is not as bold and as open as King's Cross, but the honorable member for St. Kilda on many occasions has complained bitterly and has addressed public meetings on prostitution. However, the evidence is that prostitution is not the main cause of syphilis and gonorrhea. There are many other reasons.

Mr. DIXON: The honorable member should talk to Dr. Baytch and the people in the venereal disease clinic.

Mr. ROPER: I have talked with a number of people directly concerned with the treatment of venereal diseases in Victoria.

Mr. DIXON: According to Dr. Baytch, the cause of venereal diseases is mainly prostitution.

Mr. ROPER: If honorable members believe that a different life style can cause a 1,000 per cent difference, they should take another look at the life styles in New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. DIXON: The honorable member should talk to the people in the game.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): Order! The Minister should not interrupt in this way. The honorable member for Brunswick West should disregard interjections and address the Chair.

Mr. ROPER: Certainly. I hear an honorable member saying "Hurry up". Honorable members might not be very concerned about this problem, particularly the young and virile Minister of Labour and Industry. Nevertheless, people in the community are substantially worried. I have no intention of hurrying for the benefit of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

If members of the Government party believe there is a difference in life style, I refer them to a long letter which appeared in the *Age* on 20th April in which a medical practitioner was at pains to point out that there was a disturbing rise in the incidence of syphilis and gonorrhea. He also pointed out that not only homosexuals or prostitutes were the main cause of this increase. Indeed, as has been pointed out, not only in the letter of this medical practitioner but also

in other evidence, prostitutes and homosexuals are far more likely to attend Government clinics than heterosexuals. There is substantial evidence to support this.

If heterosexuals attend anywhere in time they tend to go to their own general practitioner, and do not get into the system. The general practitioner whom they attend is not responsible nor does he have the capacity for doing the required tracing. The point I am trying to make is that this serious public health matter is not being attacked with the vigour that might be expected in the light of the comparatively vigorous anti-tuberculosis and anti-polio campaigns.

If the Government wishes to improve the system, it must devote more money, time and effort, not merely to the medical side of venereal diseases and the tracing of them, but also to the education of young and not so young people to make them aware of the problems of venereal diseases so that if they have any fears they will go straight to someone who can tell them if they have any problem and, if so, what it is, and appropriate action can be taken.

It is too easy for people to say, as the report that I quoted before said, that in Victoria there are very few cases. There is equally more evidence, and I think more reliable evidence, to suggest that the community can be anything but satisfied. The Minister of Health and the Premier and Treasurer should take more active action than they have. Biology courses should be established at schools to enable discussion on these issues. It is far too easy to set this aside as something not really nice for adolescents and teenagers to talk about. I am sure there are many teachers who do not like to talk about it either, but it is a major public health matter and should be tackled in a major way and not in the small way it is under this division.

Progress was reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

HOURS OF SITTING—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—HOOVEX WASHING MACHINE REPAIR SERVICE—EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : By leave, I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next, at half-past two o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

I inform honorable members that it is the intention of the Government that the Legislative Assembly should meet at 3 p.m. effectively on Tuesday and at 11 a.m. effectively on Wednesday. We are approaching the closing stages of the session and it is desirable, and I think helpful, for honorable members to know in advance what the hours of sitting will be.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) : I thank the Deputy Premier for the information he has given, but he did not mention Thursday sittings. Country members are more interested in the finishing time on Thursday than on any other occasion. I assume that the Deputy Premier does mean that on Thursdays the House will meet at 11 a.m. and finish at 6.15 p.m.

Mr. THOMPSON : The honorable member is correct. It is not the intention of the House to meet after dinner on a Thursday.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) : I direct a serious matter to the attention of the Government. I had hoped that the Chief Secretary or the Attorney-General might be present because it relates to both police matters and to the administration of justice. A responsible firm of solicitors, J. N. Zigouras and Coy., has claimed lack of police co-operation concerning two of their clients, Michael Doran and William Hayden Siddall. They have complained by letter to the head of the drug squad, the Attorney-General of Victoria, the President and Council of the Law Institute of Victoria and to some of the members of the Legislative Assembly.

On 11th November, 1974, Doran and Siddall were arrested and taken by members of the drug squad to police headquarters, where they arrived before 3 p.m. Siddall was released at approximately 5.45 p.m. and Doran was held at Russell Street until 7 p.m., at which time he was transferred to the city watchhouse and finally bailed out at about 10 p.m.

I am advised that two solicitors from the office telephoned police headquarters a number of times during the afternoon and on each occasion was told that Messrs. Doran and Siddall were not being held at Russell Street. The telephone calls were made at the following times—3.5 p.m., a call to the drug squad; at 3.12 p.m. a call to the breaking squad; at 4 p.m. a call to the drug squad; and at 4.5 p.m. a call to the armed robbery squad. In addition the two solicitors attended at police headquarters main desk at 3.35 p.m. and asked whether Messrs. Doran and Siddall were being held by the drug squad or elsewhere at headquarters. The desk sergeant made a telephone call, in which he stated, "There are two solicitors here interested in Doran and Siddall", and the solicitors were informed that there were no persons by those names at headquarters.

Zigouras and Coy. contend that members of the Police Force have engaged in prevaricative and mendacious behaviour contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the Police Standing Orders, and they have formally lodged a complaint and demanded an inquiry. They have asked me, as the member for Melbourne, to raise the matter because a serious question of principle is involved. When members of the legal profession are admitted to practice they take an oath to uphold the law and it becomes serious when members of the legal profession ask questions on behalf of their clients and are told by the police what appear to be obvious untruths.

I ask the Attorney-General or perhaps the Chief Secretary to examine the case because a serious principle is involved. I should like an assurance whether the facts stated in the letter are correct. If they are not, the facts ought to be indicated and corrective action taken.

Mr. LIND (Dandenong): I seek the help of the Minister of Consumer Affairs concerning the activities of a man named Spackman through his various companies. I refer particularly to a Mrs. N. Bennett of Noble Park, who informed me by telephone of certain facts and confirmed them by letter.

On 30th September of this year, Mrs. Bennett telephoned Hoovex Washing Machine Repair Service seeking service on a washing machine. She was told by a girl or woman that a man would come on Friday, 4th October. She stayed home all that day but nobody came. A serviceman arrived on the Monday, tipped the washing machine on its side, pulled the belt that goes around the pulleys and then said that she needed a new pump. He quoted Mrs. Bennett $38.50 and said that he would return on the Wednesday. He did not call on that day. Towards evening, Hoovex phoned Mrs. Bennett and said that there had been a delay. She said that she needed her washing machine and would take the work elsewhere. She was told that she was then liable for $9.50 service call charge, which she paid.

Mrs. Bennett then telephoned the headquarters of the Hoover company, where she was told that the Hoovex Washing Machine Repair Service had nothing to do with Hoover (Australia) Pty. Ltd. She was given the address of the correct Hoover service company. A serviceman attended to examine the washing machine, and said that the pump was only blocked and did not need replacing. The Hoover serviceman did the work at a charge of $11.12. Even after having paid to Hoovex Washing Machine Repair Service the service fee of $9.50 and the $11.12 to the Hoover service company, which included the proper service fee, Mrs. Bennett saved

$17.88. I hold the receipts from both companies, I have scrutinized them, and I know that they are correct.

I now refer to the report of the Consumer Affairs Council of Victoria for the year ended 30th June, 1973, which states, at page 14—

> S.S. Appliances Pty. Ltd. who are operating under 14 business names still list such names as Frigicrest, Hooker, Hoovex, and Turnell in the telephone book. As stated in last year's Annual Report, the similarity of the above names with popular makes of washing machines such as Frigidaire, Hoover and Turner must be intentional in order to confuse consumers into believing that they are obtaining the repair services of the manufacturer of their washing machines.

I then examined the telephone directory and found that S.S. Appliances Pty. Ltd. is located at the rear of 5 Aristoc Road, Glen Waverley, and that its telephone number is 560 9133. Hoovex Washing Machine Repair Service is also located at the rear of 5 Aristoc Road, Glen Waverley and its telephone number is also 560 9133. I have taken photostat copies of both those entries in the telephone directory. The report of the Consumer Affairs Council of Victoria continues—

> That the Companies Office should refuse to register companies or business names whenever such names may confuse or mislead consumers or are obviously designed so to do, or are designed to conceal, for the purpose of confusing or misleading consumers, the real identity of the beneficial owners of the business or company being registered.
>
> That the Postmaster-General's Department should not accept such advertisements and greater care should be exercised in respect of advertisements inserted by service firms. At the same time the Registrar of Companies should not register business names of service companies designed to mislead consumers.

I submit that I have clearly demonstrated that Mrs. Bennett has been taken for a ride and slugged for $9.50 by Hoovex Washing Machine Repair Service; that this man Spackman is continuing his nefarious practices even after such a report being issued by the Consumer Affairs Council of Victoria. It is stated in the report that the establishment of a Small Claims Tribunal will resolve many complaints of a similar nature. This may lead to directions being given by the Minister to this unfortunate woman and the taking of steps to study the activities of Mr. Spackman.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): I raise a matter with the Deputy Premier; he would be acquainted with the problem that the Housing Commission does not provide emergency housing. For instance, if a person has undergone a traumatic experience such as being evicted or having his home destroyed, he cannot immediately obtain accommodation.

This week a case has been brought to my notice of a woman with children who has been evicted. She has a bad record of rental payments with the Housing Commission and therefore is not eligible for a Housing Commission home unless she makes restitution of a large sum of money. Her difficulty now is that she will lose control of her children, who will be taken from her because she cannot provide shelter for them. I am not sure what she has done about accommodation.

I ask the Government to state clearly what it intends to do regarding emergency housing. At present the only emergency housing available is that provided by voluntary organizations in the community, and that is over-crowded. The Government should consider providing some emergency housing through the Ministry of Housing, and it ought to be done quickly.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I shall be happy to draw to the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Housing, the matter raised by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds. I will discuss with the Chief Secretary the matter raised by the honorable member for Melbourne.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Consumer Affairs): The honorable member for Dandenong gave me copies of the correspondence to which he adverted. After making a cursory examination of the correspondence I suggest that his correspondent should make a claim to the Small Claims Tribunal, as I believe it would be

worth while. I will take up the matter with the Consumer Affairs Bureau, as suggested by the honorable member. I will also have the matter referred to the Attorney-General and ask him to consider the question of the registration of business names.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.36 p.m. until Tuesday, November 19.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated—

LIBRARIES FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

(Question No. 534)

Mr. LACY (Ringwood) asked the Minister of Education—

With regard to construction of Commonwealth-financed libraries at secondary schools—

1. Where Ringwood Technical School and Maroondah High School are placed on the priority list for this programme?

2. What is the average current cost of the construction of these libraries and what amount is available to the Education Department per annum for this programme?

3. Whether any schools have been taken from the top of the priority list on the basis that they have been told to commence initial planning; if so, which schools?

4. How many schools are expected to have approval to commence construction of libraries in 1974 and 1975?

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

1. The priority list for the provision of Commonwealth libraries is kept confidential. The rate at which the State can provide these facilities is, of course, dependent on the extent of finance for this purpose made available by the Commonwealth Government.

2. The current cost of a Commonwealth library is approximately $200,000.00. An allocation of $5·2 million (total) was made by the Commonwealth Government for calendar years 1974 and 1975.

3. The preparation of plans for the Commonwealth secondary library programme is carried out by the Public Works Department according to the priorities set by the Education Department. No schools have been authorized to engage consultants to plan Commonwealth libraries.

4. It is anticipated that, subject to the availability of funds, the following post-primary schools will receive Commonwealth libraries in the next stage of the library programme—Paisley high, Mooroopna high, Braybrook high, Corryong high, Kerang high, Lilydale technical, Lyndale high, Oberon high, Swan Hill high, Vermont high, Wodonga high, Altona North technical, Ferntree Gully technical, Blackburn technical, Syndal technical, Maryborough technical, Maryborough high, Sunshine West high, Templestowe technical, Preston East high schools.

COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION INQUIRY.

(Question No. 584)

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

Whether the Commonwealth Government is currently conducting an inquiry into the educational programmes conducted at all types of schools in areas of high migrant density; if so—(*a*) what are the aims of the inquiry; (*b*) which Victorian schools are involved; (*c*) how such schools were chosen and by whom; (*d*) when the inquiry commenced; and (*e*) when it is expected that the inquiry will be completed?

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

The Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian education departments are conducting a joint inquiry into the educational programmes of schools with high enrolments of migrant children. A joint steering committee has been established by the Commonwealth Department of Education, the Schools Commission, the New South Wales and Victorian departments of education, and the Catholic education offices in Sydney and Melbourne to oversight the inquiry.

(*a*) The terms of reference are to inquire, in co-operation with the appropriate education authorities, school principals, teachers and persons within the local community into the situation in selected schools of high migrant density for the purpose of identifying factors which impede the school in providing educational programmes structured to meet the needs of all pupils.

(*b*) State primary schools: Bell Park North (Geelong); Brunswick North; Burnley; Springvale; St. Albans Heights.

Catholic primary schools: Sacred Heart, West St. Kilda; St. Ambrose's, Brunswick; St. Brigid's, North Fitzroy.

State high schools: Brunswick; Footscray Girls'; Geelong North; Richmond; Sunshine West.

State technical schools: Altona North; Collingwood.

(*c*) State schools were chosen by members of the Victorian State Education Department, using mainly statistics and related data obtained from schools by the Child Migrant Education Branch of the

Victorian Education Department. The Victorian Education Department's acting officer in charge of migrant education was involved in, and accepts responsibility for, the selection of schools.

Catholic schools were chosen by the Catholic Education Office in Melbourne.

(*d*) The inaugurating committee first met on 13th June, 1974.

(*e*) December, 1974 or January, 1975.

SECONDARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

(Question No. 602)

Mr. HANN (Rodney) asked the Minister of Education—

What is the order of priority of secondary schools to receive Commonwealth-financied libraries?

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

The priority list for the provision of Commonwealth libraries to post-primary schools is kept confidential. However, it is anticipated that, subject to the availability of funds the following post-primary schools will receive Commonwealth libraries in the next stage of the library programme—Paisley high, Mooroopna high, Braybrook high, Corryong high, Kerang high, Lilydale technical, Lyndale high, Oberon high, Swan Hill high, Vermont high, Wodonga high, Altona North technical, Ferntree Gully technical, Blackburn technical, Syndal technical, Maryborough technical, Maryborough high, Sunshine West high, Templestowe technical, Preston East high schools.

WILLIAMSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 609)

Mr. STIRLING (Williamstown) asked the Assistant Minister of Education—

When it is intended to appoint a full-time remedial teacher for the 75 students in need of remedial teaching at Williamstown Primary School No. 1183?

Mr. DIXON (Assistant Minister of Education): The answer is—

The department has no plans to appoint a full-time remedial teacher to Williamstown Primary School No. 1183. With the establishment of the Footscray demonstration unit, remedial facilities available to schools in the western area of Melbourne will receive an impetus.

The department has an opportunity remedial centre at the Williamstown North Primary School and these services are available to children from primary school No. 1183 who are in need of remedial teaching when recommended by a guidance officer from Counselling, Guidance and Clinical Services. Finance for the erection of a special education unit at Altona has recently been committed but the anticipated date of completion of this unit cannot be ascertained at present. Special education units provide consultant remedial services to teachers in regular class-rooms and give direct remedial assistance where necessary to children who have particularly difficult educational problems.

FUNDS FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

(Question No. 652)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Assistant Minister of Education—

Whether the Education Department has prepared a submission to the Australian Schools Commission for additional financial resources to assist with the implementation of the Education (Handicapped Children) Act 1973?

Mr. DIXON (Assistant Minister of Education): The answer is—

The Education Department has prepared a case for submission to the Australian Schools Commission on the matter of capital costing and a further submission relating to needs for recurrent finance is currently being prepared.

WATER CHARGES.

(Question No. 662)

Mr. WOOD (Swan Hill) asked the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister of Water Supply—

In view of the small amount of water sold during the last irrigation season, what steps have been taken by the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission to reduce expenditure and therefore minimize the need for an increase in water charges?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister of Water Supply is—

As would be expected in a period of record and persistent flooding, deliveries of irrigation water throughout the 1973–74 season were quite low. The sales component of 1973–74 deliveries in the Goulburn Murray Irrigation District was only 39,000 megalitres or 2·5 per cent of allotted water rights compared with 660,000 megalitres or 43 per cent in 1971–72. The effect of such negligible "sales" revenue is to depress the funds available for future essential maintenance and stabilization of irrigation charges. This limitation is further worsened by the concurrent dramatic loss of the value of money due to severe inflationary pressures throughout the Australian community; labour costs alone have increased by almost 37 per cent over the last twelve months.

The commission has taken positive steps to ensure that maintenance and operating expenditure are limited to those works which must be carried out this season. Each operating centre has made effective economies in such expenditure in many instances by allowing the work force to reduce to minimal levels; such low levels are regarded as risky but, in view of the severe limitation on funds, are inevitable. It is just as inevitable, however, that significant rises in water charges are needed to ensure that the substantial community asset of storages, distributary and drainage works can be maintained effectively and without deterioration.

The commission is disturbed that the present numbers of staff and employees are less than sufficient for the proper management of the Goulburn Murray Irrigation District. Unless adequate operational and maintenance funds are available, it is likely that significant deterioration of the system will occur with consequent reduced service to the irrigation community.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, November 19, 1974.

The PRESIDENT **(Sir Raymond Garrett)** took the chair at 4.53 p.m., and read the prayer.

SPEECHES ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Honorable members will recall that last week Mr. Tripovich asked a question regarding what may or may not be brought up on the adjournment motion. I indicated that we had prepared a statement on this question, but I suggested that because of the late hour it be not read last Wednesday. I propose to do so today, and I shall now read it—

SPEECHES ON THE ADJOURNMENT.

The nature and content of speeches on the motion "That the House do now adjourn", when moved by a Minister of the Crown at the termination of a day's sitting is based upon custom and practice of the House over many years—there is no Standing Order relating to the matter. Honorable members realize that where a subject-matter is not covered by a Standing Order we refer to *May* and the custom of the House of Commons, or we rely on the customs of the House over a period of many years, which is the situation in this case.

However, the only assistance which may be derived from *May's Parliamentary Practice* is at page 278 of the eighteenth edition and in the House of Commons Standing Orders Nos. 1 and 2, whereby half an hour is provided for debate on this motion. In this Chamber we have not imposed a total time limit.

Some of the guidelines I am now about to offer to honorable members are well known but, for the sake of completeness, I will detail them in their entirety.

The matter raised must relate to an item for which the Government of Victoria has administrative responsibility—an honorable member should not criticize existing legislation as, pursuant to Standing Order No. 130, this is forbidden unless the member proposes to move for its repeal, in which case he should act at the beginning of the day when the Chair calls for notices of motion. An honorable member should not request the introduction of legislation as he should, himself, take the opportunity at the appropriate time to give notice of his intention to introduce a Bill.

Mr. Galbally's private member's Bills have been introduced once or twice in the past few years!

Only one subject is permitted to be raised by one member on any one adjournment motion—and this subject should not be repeated during the same session, unless vastly different circumstances justify a second raising.

An honorable member should not extend his remarks into a set speech; rather should he briefly make known his complaint, state his question, or request certain administrative action. Although no firm ruling has been given in this House, in another place members speaking to the adjournment motion are permitted no more than five minutes.

Honorable members will recall that on a number of occasions lately I have tried to discourage members from making longer speeches than that.

Perhaps this custom could, to the mutual benefit of honorable members, become a practice in this House.

As the matters raised by honorable members usually relate to an incident of recent occurrence, although there has been no set convention in the matter, the question should be one of urgency.