DUNOLLY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 823)

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

1. What is the reason for the delay in providing class-room and office furniture to the Dunolly Primary School?

2. Whether the furniture will be supplied without further delay; if not, why?

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

1. and 2. Furniture on order for the Dunolly Primary School was despatched on 4th December, 1974.

(Question No. 824)

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

Whether he will investigate the problem of cost and health risk involved and ask the Education Department to reconsider its decision not to accept the full responsibility for carrying out site works in the western corner of the Dunolly Primary School grounds; if not why?

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

The question of site works in the western corner of the Dunolly Primary School site will be taken up with the Public Works Department. Responsibility in regard to the cost of the work will be further considered when the report comes to hand.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, December 10, 1974.

The PRESIDENT **(Sir Raymond Garrett)** took the chair at 3.12 p.m., and read the prayer.

HEALTH (CONTRACEPTIVES) 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.

EDUCATION (TEACHER REGISTRATION) 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.

RAILWAY WORKS AND SERVICES 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.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. V. T. HAUSER (Boronia Province) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that sodium fluoride should not be placed in our public water supplies until a referendum is held to determine the wishes of those who pay for the water.

He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 83 signatures.

The Hon. V. T. HAUSER (Boronia Province): I move—

That the petition do lie on the table.

I present the petition as a duty on behalf of electors in my province and I wish to inform the House that I disagree with its contents.

The motion was agreed to.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE.

PORT RULE (DANGEROUS GOODS AND OIL IN PORTS) 1974.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS (Western Province) presented a report from the Subordinate Legislation Committee on the Port Rule (Dangerous Goods and Oil in Ports) 1974 (Statutory Rule No. 251/1974).

The Hon. K. S. GROSS (Western Province): I move—

That the report do lie on the table.

I refer honorable members to clause 9 of the report in which members of the committee again direct the attention of the House to the disallowance provisions which apply under the Act. This rule was examined by the committee and quite a long time elapsed from the time when the first opinion was obtained until finally the opinion of the Solicitor-General was sought. In

the meantime the provision allowing the committee to disallow the rule under the twelve sitting days provision had well and truly expired. I direct the attention of the House to that point.

The motion was agreed to.

STATUTE LAW REVISION COMMITTEE.

MAGISTRATES' COURTS (JURISDICTION) ACT 1973.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province) presented a report from the Statute Law Revision Committee on the Magistrates' Courts (Jurisdiction) Act 1973 (No. 8427), together with extracts from the proceedings of the committee, appendices and minutes of evidence.

It was ordered that they be laid on the table, and that the report, extracts from the proceedings of the committee and appendices be printed.

PAPERS.

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

Aboriginal Affairs Ministry—Report for the year 1973–74.

Consumer Affairs Council—Report for the year 1973–74.

Country Roads Board—Report for the year 1973–74.

Decentralized Industry Housing Authority—Report, together with revenue account and balance-sheet, for the year 1973–74.

Health—Report of the Commission of Public Health for the year 1973–74.

Ombudsman—Report for the quarter ended 30th September, 1974.

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 234 and 235) (two papers).

Railways Board—Report for the year 1973–74.

Statutory Rules under the following Acts of Parliament—

Consumer Protection Act 1972—No. 490.

Explosives Act 1960—No. 494.

Game Act 1958—Nos. 496 and 497.

Marine Act 1958—No. 495.

Melbourne Harbor Trust Act 1958—No. 498.

Motor Car Act 1958—No. 493.

Police Regulation Act 1958—No. 491.

Scaffolding Act 1971—No. 492.

Stamps Act 1958—No. 489.

Teacher Housing Authority—Report, together with revenue account and balance-sheet, for the year 1973–74.

Town and Country Planning Act 1961—

Shire of Maffra Planning Scheme 1965—Amendment No. 9, 1973 (Maffra Township).

Tyers Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 3.

Tramways—Report and statement of accounts of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board for the year 1973–74.

Victoria Law Foundation—Report for the year ended 30th September, 1974.

HEALTH (CONTRACEPTIVES) BILL.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is introduced to establish a more relaxed form of control over the sale and advertising of contraceptives. Before the submission of the Bill to the House, discussions have taken place with any interested persons, church authorities, and members of various women's organizations as well as persons who present a case from the health viewpoint.

The opinions obtained as a result of these discussions naturally have ranged from conservative to radical and although the Bill now presented to the Parliament can be said to be a step in the right direction, it may easily receive criticism from the more radical elements. However, the Minister of Health would like to give an assurance at this stage that if the provisions incorporated in the Bill are unduly restrictive, after a period of trial he will seek approval to bring down further legislation to ease any unnecessary restrictions and to ensure that no undue difficulty is placed on the sale and reasonable advertising of contraceptives.

In Victoria, the sale of contraceptive contrivances or appliances has been controlled, for many years past, by legislation administered by the Chief Secretary's Department, first under the Police Offences Act and

subsequently under sections 39 to 41 inclusive of the Summary Offences Act 1966. These latter provisions are still in force and, as will be realized, were inserted in legislation long before the development of modern techniques of contraception.

Because of the great advancement in medical science in the areas of contraception, it has become more and more necessary to provide adequate control over a much wider group of devices and substances used for the purposes of contraception. At the same time, present-day thinking has made it desirable to provide considerably less restriction over the sale and exhibition for sale of contraceptive devices and substances.

For some years past, some control of contraceptive substances has been exercised by their registration as proprietary medicines under Division 3 of Part XIV. of the Health Act 1958 and of course some are controlled as scheduled drugs under the Poisons Act 1962. Control under Part XIV. of the Health Act 1958 has been obtained by requiring the manufacturer or importer of some substances to register them as proprietary medicines and this has enabled advertising matter, both on packaging material and included with the substances when sold, to be closely supervised. Following a number of representations made from bodies such as the Family Planning Association, the Commission of Public Health was asked to submit a report and make recommendations on the form that legislation to control the advertising and sale of contraceptives should take in this State.

In the preparation of the legislation two aspects were borne in mind: Firstly, the need to lift the total restriction against advertising of contraceptives which was contained in the Summary Offences Act 1966 and substitute for it a control of approval of suitable advertising; and secondly, the need to ensure that as far as possible women taking the various anovulant substances, known commonly as the pill, do not suffer from side effects which are possible when such substances are used without proper medical supervision.

In regard to the second point, I direct the attention of honorable members to a recent report of the Danish Board of Health concerning the ill-effects of uncontrolled use of the pill during a five-year period from 1968 to 1973. It drew attention to 22 deaths over a period of five years which are alleged to have been caused as a result of birth control pills, although in the same report it was pointed out that these 22 cases were only a portion of the total of 106 people who probably or certainly died during the same period from side effects produced by a variety of medicines or medical treatments.

Various forms of control were considered by the Commission of Public Health but its final recommendation was that there be added to the Health Act a completely new division—Division 3B of Part XIV. of the Health Act 1958. This new division will be based substantially on Division 3 of the same part which was brought into health legislation many years ago to control the advertising and sale in Victoria of proprietary medicines. Some of these proprietary medicines are prescription medicines and others may be freely sold by a pharmaceutical chemist over the counter of his shop.

The new Division 3B will consist of fifteen new sections numbered 270B to 270P inclusive and seeks to establish a practical and simple code of control governing the sale of contraceptives and contraceptive substances. The provisions will be read as in aid of and not in derogation from the Poisons Act so that where a contraceptive substance is a controlled drug under the Poisons Act it will still be controlled by the provisions of that Act.

Although I do not propose to explain in great detail all the new provisions to be inserted in the Health Act at this stage, a brief summary

of those provisions to be added by clause 4 may be of assistance in understanding the legislation.

Proposed section 270B sets out certain definitions which will be specifically applicable to the new division. Special attention is called to the wide definition of contraceptive. As will be seen, it covers any contraceptive contrivance and any chemical or biological substance to prevent or reduce the likelihood of conception and the only items that are excluded from this wide definition are those specifically dispensed by a medical practitioner or those which conform exactly to a standard formula set out in specified books of pharmacology and where the item is sold under the name ascribed to it in those books. This means that the exemptions cover only contraceptive substances prescribed by a medical practitioner for a particular case and any particular drug sold under its pharmaceutical name. Of course, in the latter case if it were a drug scheduled for restricted sale under the Poisons Act, its sale would still be subject to conditions imposed by that Act and regulation made under it.

Proposed section 270C establishes provisions for control of contraceptives by requiring the wholesale dealer, defined as the person who is primarily responsible for placing a contraceptive on the market in Victoria, to register the contraceptive he proposes to sell. With his application for registration he must submit a statement setting out the composition of the drug if it is a chemical or biological substance or, where such contraceptive is not a chemical or biological substance, a description of the contrivance together with a copy of all advertising matter that is to be used in association with its sale.

To protect any secrets of manufacture that may be involved, the new section 270D will restrain officers of the Department of Health from disclosing information that may be contained in any application for registration by a wholesale dealer.

Proposed section 270E gives the Chief Health Officer authority to determine whether an application for the registration of a contraceptive shall be granted. Proposed section 270F will permit the registration of the contraceptive to be effective for a period of at least five years after which time the Chief Health Officer may review the registration and reconsider the application and determine whether or not the registration should be cancelled or varied. Before cancelling or varying the registration after the five-year period, the Chief Health Officer must give the wholesale dealer an opportunity to be heard before such variation or cancellation is made.

New section 270G sets out the action the Chief Health Officer must take if he determines that a contraceptive shall not be registered and the actions that flow from that determination. He must notify the applicant within seven days of his determination and the grounds on which it is based, thus enabling an applicant who is aggrieved by any refusal to register to appeal to a judge of the Supreme Court. Such a judge is required to inquire into and decide the appeal and his decision is final and must be given effect to by the Chief Health Officer.

The eight sub-sections of proposed section 270H deal with the register of contraceptives which is required to be kept by the Chief Health Officer to keep a record of contraceptives which are registered after application by a wholesale dealer. It will be seen that these provisions closely parallel the existing provisions of section 265 of the Health Act 1958.

Proposed section 270I provides for samples of a contraceptive for analysis or examination to be given on request to the Chief Health Officer by the wholesale dealer or other vendor. It has been considered desirable that advertising associated with the sale of contraceptives should be fairly closely controlled and should not publish any statement which indicates or denotes that it is a contraceptive which is approved by the

State Government, by the Department of Health, by the Chief Health Officer or by any other governmental authority. Consequently, the only reference to approval which can be shown on the outer wrapping is the expression "registered in Victoria" and a serial number or some abbreviation of this expression to the same effect. Sale or attempt to sell a package containing a registered contraceptive which is in contravention of this restriction will attract a penalty of $250.

Under the provisions of proposed section 270K a similar penalty may be imposed on persons who sell unregistered contraceptives or sell substances or devices as registered contraceptives where those substances or devices are not in accordance with the description recorded in the register. The same penalty will be applicable to wholesale dealers who circulate advertisements which are known to be false or misleading. To be included in this section is a provision which will enable the Chief Health Officer in his discretion to cancel the registration of a contraceptive where the wholesale dealer concerned has been convicted on more than one occasion of an offence in respect of that contraceptive. The cancellation will be effective on publication of an appropriate notice in the *Government Gazette*. The cancellation will be effective for at least twelve months.

Proposed section 270L (1) contains provisions similar to those now existing in section 41 of the Summary Offences Act. These provisions, however, are made subject to sub-section (2) of the section which sets out a number of exceptions. By reading these two sub-sections together honorable members will see that registered contraceptives may be sold by retail or exposed for sale by retail in a pharmacy or in a place where a medical practitioner carries on his profession, or in a family planning clinic or in another place approved for the purposes of this section by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Commission of Public Health.

It will be noted that the approval of places for sale of contraceptives by the Governor in Council may limit to some particular class or classes the contraceptive that may be sold. Where under the Poisons Act it is considered necessary that particular substances may be sold only on medical prescription, for example, this provision will not be used to override that restriction.

It is not intended to permit the exposure of contraceptives in any chemist shop where they are readily in view of persons in a public street or outside the area of the pharmacy itself. Sub-section (3) will enable the Governor in Council by notice in the *Government Gazette* to declare places to which the exemption granted by sub-section (2) of the section will apply, although under the provisions of sub-section (4) such approval may be subject to any terms and conditions specified in the notice and may be revoked or varied by the Governor in Council when notice of such revocation or variation is published in the *Government Gazette*.

Proposed section 270M will permit advertising of contraceptives provided that the contraceptive advertised is registered and provided that the statements to be included in the advertisement are approved by the Chief Health Officer. Proposed section 270M (2) (3) and (4) of this new section 270M establish the machinery whereby the Chief Health Officer may give his approval to an application or revoke that approval.

The provisions of proposed section 270M (5) are inserted to enable manufacturers and particularly retailers to dispose of stocks of any contraceptive which has lost its registration for a period of three months after cancellation.

Proposed section 270N, consisting of seven sub-sections, seeks to ensure that in so far as is necessary,

advertising matter of an unsavoury type is not placed in the daily press or any magazine, periodicals, hand bills and so on, circulated throughout Victoria. These provisions set out the persons who will be regarded as being responsible for the publication of any such statement.

Proposed section 270N (6) names the various exemptions from this restriction on advertising. For example, statements published in bona fide medical or pharmaceutical periodicals or hand bills sent to medical practitioners, registered pharmacists or family planning clinics are not considered to need the same sort of control as those published for consumption by the general public. These provisions cover both newspapers which are printed in Victoria and newspapers printed outside Victoria which are distributed in this State.

Proposed section 270O is the regulation-making provision.

Clause 5, together with clause 3, provides for the removal from the proprietary medicines register of any contraceptive substance which comes within the meaning of contraceptive under this new legislation. In the first instance, any such substance which is of a contraceptive nature and which is registered as a proprietary medicine will be automatically transferred by the Chief Health Officer to the register of contraceptives and its registration as a contraceptive will remain in force under the provisions of this new Division 3B of Part XIV. of the Health Act until it is varied or cancelled as provided for in that division.

Clause 6 is a transitional provision whereby persons selling contraceptives will have a period of three months to enable applications for the registration of contraceptives to be dealt with and before they are required to comply fully with the new legislation. Clause 7 provides for the consequential amendment of the Summary Offences Act 1966.

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

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

RAILWAY WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It authorizes the expenditure of $48·185 million by the Victorian Railways and the Railway Construction Board from the Works and Services Account for the period from September, 1974, until it is cancelled by a further Works and Services Act in 1975. It thus provides for expenditures until December, 1975. Honorable members are familiar with the form of the Works and Services Bill and explanatory notes are attached to the Bill.

I wish to draw the attention of honorable members to a number of major matters associated with the expenditures authorized by this measure. Substantial amounts are included in the Bill for new urban rail projects and for the continuation of projects commenced last year to upgrade urban rail transport services. This is a further step in the Government's programme to improve public transport services and to decrease the community's reliance on the motor car for major commuter movements.

Provision is made in the Bill for new transport improvement projects to upgrade urban communication facilities, to construct additional tracks between Ringwood and Bayswater, and Ringwood and Croydon, to enable more express running of trains and reduce travel times for rail patrons on these lines.

Amounts have also been provided for upgrading the Melbourne–Glen Waverley line, for improvements to the Geelong line, and for other improvement projects currently being evaluated.

Honorable members may recall that in my introductory speech last year on the 1973 Railway Works and

Services Bill I referred to the financial straitjacket imposed upon the States by the Commonwealth. The State provided $6·26 million last year for specific urban rail transport projects for which Commonwealth financial assistance was promised.

The Premier and Treasurer on 3rd June, 1974, signed the agreement with the Commonwealth for financial assistance for our transport improvement projects, and one would have expected that Commonwealth funds would be available quickly to achieve the maximum benefits by improving public transport facilities as soon as possible.

However, we have been faced with a wall of administrative procedures as part of the task of getting the funds promised. The Commonwealth demands have greatly increased the administrative work of the railways at a time when their efforts would have been more profitably spent in getting ahead with the projects.

To date, no funds have been received from the Commonwealth for the 1973–74 public transport improvement projects—funds which have been approved by the Commonwealth Parliament. Despite the lack of Commonwealth funds, Victoria has gone ahead with work on these projects. However, progress has been slowed by not having the Commonwealth funds and, in some cases, by shortages of labour and materials.

Of particular concern is delay by the Commonwealth in providing funds for new trains. The Urban Public Transport Agreement indicated that the Commonwealth would provide $9·66 million for Victoria for 1973–74, including $3·63 million for new trains. However, discussions with officers of the Commonwealth Department of Transport now indicate that the Commonwealth may provide only a share of funds for trains delivered after an initial delivery of five trains a year to be paid for wholly by the State.

This will mean a considerable shortfall from the promised Commonwealth contributions. Such a stand by the Commonwealth would be contrary to the whole spirit of the agreement and if maintained would have serious repercussions on railway finances. I hope the Commonwealth Minister for Transport will recognize the implications of this situation.

Clearly, the Commonwealth has the financial resources to make a proper contribution to the train replacement programme. Indeed, in these times of rising unemployment a strong case can be made for additional grants, without strings attached, for all transport improvement projects.

I turn now to provisions in the Bill for works outside the metropolitan area and I express my concern that to date the Commonwealth has not been prepared to look at financial assistance for improvement programmes in country areas. The measure makes provision for the purchase of additional locomotives and a continuation of the wagon replacement programme to assist the railways to provide a better freight service, to take advantage of the additional goods traffic available, and pursue its commercial objectives.

Ten 2,000-horsepower, diesel-electric locomotives are on order from the Clyde Engineering Company Pty. Ltd. The contract provides for the delivery of the first locomotive in August, 1975, and then one locomotive every four weeks until the completion of the contract.

The programme of track relaying on main and subsidiary country lines will continue during the currency of the Bill. Three major mechanized gangs are at present engaged on this work. The gangs are operating between Barnes and Balranald, Ouyen and Underbool, and St. Arnaud and Watchupga.

In addition, it is proposed to carry out a major rearrangement of the Horsham rail area to provide better working conditions and train crossing facilities. The work is being

designed to provide for the proposed installation of centralized traffic control on the Serviceton line and the establishment of Horsham as the first regional freight centre.

The Bill provides the necessary financial authority for the railways to get ahead with many projects for improved transport facilities. I commend it to the House.

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

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until later this day.

ELECTORAL PROVINCES AND DISTRICTS BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 4) on the motion of the Hon. A. J. Hunt (Minister for Local Government) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province): I begin by congratulating the Minister for Local Government on his second-reading speech on this Bill. I liked the straightforward way in which he dodged the issues.

Of all the dirty tricks practised by Governments to ensure their own re-election and the rejection of the Opposition, the manipulation of Parliamentary seats is the most deadly and despicable. This is a Bill to enlarge the rotten boroughs of Victoria and to destroy its Parliament. Tonight the Government and the Country Party will be well pleased.

Once again we are following a scandalous tradition. In 1965 Sir Henry Bolte proposed the introduction of a State income tax. Everyone fell for it, and Sir Henry walked around like a man with the ague until he ran into his dear friend, Sir Percy Byrnes, who said that the Country Party would not throw out his Government provided that he brought in a redistribution, and Sir Henry said, "I will do anything." In the 1920s we had what became known throughout the world as the Argyle Blot. So we have never really had democratic government in Victoria.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Does it exist anywhere in the world?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Yes. In all the States of the United States of America, as a result of the courts inquiring into gerrymanders, there is an insistence on one vote, one value. But in Victoria we have government not by democracy but by conspiracy.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: You were not behind the door in the 1950s during the two-for-one conspiracy.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I had omitted to mention that. In 1952 the Victorian seats were in a scandalous state of rotten boroughs. Mr. Cain said that Victoria would take the Federal electorates and for every Federal seat we would have two State seats. There was a short campaign and the Labor Party came in as the Government. Of course, the Country Party was not satisfied because that gave a fair chance to the voters. That obtained until two years later.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Whom did you organize that with? The Labor Party did not have a majority in this House.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: I was not taken into anybody's confidence, but the Labor Party was returned with 52 per cent of the vote. It must be stated at once that this Bill is a shattering blow to the prestige of the Hamer Government. The voice is certainly the voice of Mr. Hamer, but the hand is that of the Country Party. The Country Party was too strong for Sir Henry Bolte and it has proved to be too strong for Mr. Hamer. It will get its way, but this Bill will be passed at the cost of Parliamentary government.

Over the years I have observed, as I regret to say most honorable members must have, the growing dissatisfaction with the Parliamentary

institution of this State. It pains me very much, but that is the truth. The Parliament of Victoria is no longer a public forum debating the great issues of the day.

I pause for a moment to direct attention to the number of private members' Bills standing in my name on the Notice Paper, which the House has been most reluctant to debate. I introduced a Bill on electoral redistribution two years ago, but it was scarcely debated by members of the Government party. We are just a gathering of funeral directors murmuring obsequiously as Parliament is slowly laid to rest.

The measure I introduced two years ago was intended to redistribute the electorate on the basis of one vote, one value, and to set up a permanent judicial commission on the electorate. During the short debate on that Bill it was, I think, the Minister for Social Welfare or the Minister for Local Government who said that he had an objection to a judicial commission. I asked what the objection was and I was told that that was not a judicial function. But the mother of all Parliaments has a judicial commission of which a distinguished judge is a member. It is headed by the Speaker of the House of Commons and includes a number of distinguished persons. That commission is a continuing one.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: But that does not distribute the electorates on the basis of one vote, one value.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Is Mr. Swinburne saying that it distributes the electorates on the principles laid down by the Country Party of Victoria? I am comforted by the fact that there are members of the Liberal Party just as keen as I am to preserve Parliamentary government —I am sorry that Mr. Nicol is not present—to make one vote, one value a reality, and to reject the ridiculous claims of the Country Party for a rural bias. That is what it asks.

Members of the Government party have been defeated in the party room, but the victory to the other side will be short-lived. Today, with better education and active, lively news media, everything is under challenge. Parliament cannot survive unless it has the respect of the populace. Too many young people, I sadly reflect, look upon the Victorian Parliament as a museum of modern graft.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: You have your chapels mixed up; surely you are speaking about the Government in Canberra.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: One of the first acts of the Government in Canberra was to introduce a fair redistribution Bill. In the interests of his health, Mr. Hamilton should retire, not only from this Chamber but from Parliament. Every time the Federal Government is mentioned, he is in danger of having a cerebral haemorrhage. He has a young family and I ask him to be careful. Young people regard the Parliament of Victoria as an empty ritual. It is of no interest because the issues which concern people are not debated.

The one advantage which members of Parliament have is not their wisdom in public affairs, but their integrity. If they lose that, they have lost everything, and sadly, I think the integrity of the Parliament has been lost. In the next session of Parliament I will introduce a Bill to guarantee the fundamental principle of equal representation for equal numbers of people without regard to race, sex, economic status or place of living—in other words, to guarantee under The Constitution Act (Amendment) Act the right of one vote, one value.

Liberty is too precious and too sacred to leave to government. The principle which I enunciate is not a novel one. The House may remember that in 1970 a Mr. Walsh was elected to the Legislative Council of Victoria, and Parliament referred the question of his ability and right to take his

seat to the Court of Disputed Returns—the Full Court—under The Constitution Act (Amendment) Act. Mr. Walsh was thrown out. If he stood for Parliament again now and was elected, he would be eligible to take his seat, because he was prevented from entering Parliament owing to his previous convictions in the Children's Court.

The principle of a court being able to reject a person who has been elected to Parliament by the populace ought to be enlarged and a short amendment should be made to enable Parliament to use powers which have been exercised by the courts in the United States of America for the past ten or fifteen years. Hundreds of cases have been heard and can be referred to in the Parliamentary Library where it has been claimed that a gerrymander has occurred and the weight of one person's vote has been diluted. It has been laid down that such attempts by the legislators to encompass their own continuance in office are to be deplored.

On one occasion I offended Mr. Swinburne by saying that it was not acres of land, herds of cattle and so on which returned people to Parliament, but the right of a citizen to do so. The gerrymander has been wiped out in the United States of America, but it has disgraced the Parliament of Victoria for well nigh 100 years. I have never been able to understand the philosophy upon which this rule bias is made—this claim that it must be written into the law. I believe the right to vote is a personal one and cannot be made to depend on whether a person lives on the eighth floor of a block of Housing Commission flats in West Melbourne or on 5,000 acres of land in the Western District. It ought not to depend on whether a man is a reputed millionaire or a council worker living in Richmond and earning the basic wage.

Under the terms of this Bill, of course, it does matter. The Government endorses the principle that people who live in the country should have more say in electing the Parliament than those who live in the city, and the more inaccessible the voter, the greater say he should have. Presumably, those living near Parliament House should have no vote at all. No democratic country in the world would attempt to defend such a constitutional outrage.

The practical difficulties of a member of Parliament in serving a large country electorate are well understood. One is painfully aware of their problems of getting to and from Parliament House. Those members are here early in the week and return to their homes later in the week. This involves some hardship, but the practical difficulties of serving the electors can easily be overcome.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: Tell us how.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Give the member representing a country electorate a secretary in every haystack, a telephone in every wool shed, but do not garrotte Parliamentary government—that is the principle. The difficulties facing representatives of country electorates can be readily understood, but why should the elector pay for it?

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: He is the man whom one is serving.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Nonsense! I should be pleased to hear any member of this House explain why, because a person lives in the country, his vote ought to have twice the weight of that of a city dweller.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: Nobody is saying it should have twice the weight.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Rubbish! Mr. Clarke should go back to the Melbourne Club to see whether he can obtain any support there. Not one of the members of that club would support him. The Country Party has tied a stone around our necks for years. Give them anything

they want, but for God's sake do not destroy the Parliament of Victoria. One would think that a man living on the land could not pick up a telephone or write to his member of Parliament.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: What about the expense of telephones?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: He pays for that, not you; I know most members representing country electorates are mean; they try to keep honorable members in the House until after midnight so that they can obtain another $10. They have been doing that for years.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Why should the honorable member for Richmond have less than a third of the number of voters in his electorate that there are in the electorate of the honorable member for Scoresby?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: He should not; that is what my Bill will avoid, as I pointed out. The honorable gentleman should not have introduced this Bill but should be on this side of the House, if he makes such a statement.

I receive letters from people all over Australia. When a member of Parliament is well known, people write to him—they do not ask in what subdivision they are enrolled—and he answers their letters. That is the task of a member of Parliament, but because one lives in the country, it is a different matter. Where is the country in Victoria? I am proud of my Gippsland origins. My people were on the land down there—they did not make as much money as some members of this House!

Liberty is far too precious and too rare all around the world today to be left in the hands of any Government. The constitutional right of equality of citizenship must be guaranteed by the Constitution of Victoria. I am not a brave upholder of the written Constitution; I am an admirer of the Westminster system of government, where there is no limitation on what can be done. In my view, it is the only Parliament in the world that knows anything about Parliamentary government. Unfortunately one cannot begin *de novo* to create a Parliament here with unlimited powers. Therefore, these safeguards should be written into the Constitution. One of them is the right to equality of voting. The nonsense that honorable members have been listening to from the Country Party for years ought to be thrown out of the door; I am sick and tired of it.

A great leap backwards has been taken and the Government may one day regret it, because democratic Parliamentary Governments do not last long anywhere. The home of democracy was in ancient Greece, and that democratic Government did not last long. Republican Rome conquered the world, but it was sacrificed and destroyed by its own vices. The vice in the present Parliamentary system is the rule bias, and I am ashamed to be a member of the House which is going to pass this Bill tonight.

An amendment to the second-reading motion was moved in another place. I adopt it and do not intend to speak to it. I move—

> That all the words after "That" be omitted with the view of inserting in place thereof "this Bill be withdrawn and that a new Bill be introduced to provide for (*a*) the appointment of an Electoral Commission; (*b*) the establishment of the principle of 'one vote one value'; and (*c*) the abolition of the Legislative Council".

The electoral commission would be along the lines of the judicial commission which I have long advocated and to which, regrettably, the House has given only the most cursory consideration.

The Bill will create another four seats and provide for an additional eight members. The Legislative Council was set up at a time when the two-House system was the only Parliamentary system in Australia. In those days it was thought that there should be a House of the aristocrats and patricians and a house of the plebeians—or, in Anglo-Saxon

English, the House of the rich and the House of the poor—to provide a system of checks and balances. It has not really worked out that way.

It has always seemed odd to me that whereas all the members of the other House stand at one election, the members of this House are elected for a fixed term, and only half the number of members are elected at each election.

The other criticism I have is more weighty. It is to ask why it is necessary to have two representatives for each province in the Legislative Council. This is out of touch with the times. Older members of the House will recall Bills which I introduced to abolish the Legislative Council and the good debates that were held, Sir Arthur Warner leading for the Government. However, I shall not weary the House with a repetition of the arguments I then used. It is obvious that this Bill will pass, but that does not mean that we should not voice spirited opposition to one of the fundamental freedoms of the Parliamentary system being slowly destroyed in Victoria. If it lasts until the end of the century, I shall be much surprised.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! Mr. Swinburne will be speaking to the amendment and to the Bill.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): I have listened with interest to Mr. Galbally. I must say that I was agreeably surprised at his moderation because I know he has fixed views on the principle of democratic government as seen by the Labor Party, of which he is a loyal member. I hope to give him some examples of what the Labor Party has done elsewhere in Australia and throughout the world in the allocation of seats and the number of voters in electorates.

Members of the Country Party support the Bill, mainly on the basis that it gives a reasonable representation, although on a reduced percentage, to country interests throughout the State. I believe that in any House of Parliament every sphere of activity in the State should be represented. If the principle laid down by Mr. Galbally in his Bill—which he has again enunciated—were adopted, there would be practically no representation for the vast areas of Victoria. It is not possible to deal adequately with legislation in this Parliament unless all spheres of activity are represented in both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. For that reason, I make no apology for any representations that members of the Country Party, and members of other parties who represent country areas, have made on this Bill.

We consider that it is important that the vast area of Victoria should be adequately represented, particularly if we believe in the development of the country areas; if they are to have any future there should be representatives in Parliament who are conversant with the local problems. It is not a question of counting wool sheds, haystacks, trees and cattle and so on, which Mr. Galbally seems to think are all that exist outside the metropolitan area. I know that some members who represent the metropolitan area would like to see the whole of the Parliament represented by metropolitan members. If the principle of one vote, one value is taken to its logical conclusion, about 90 per cent of the representatives in Parliament would be from within the metropolitan area. I do not advocate that system, and while members of my party and I remain in this Parliament we will endeavour to ensure that the country areas of Victoria are developed.

I realize that members of the Government party who represent country areas, and members of the Country Party, have made a major contribution to this Bill to ensure that it achieves some balance. Although the Country Party will lose some of the advantage that it has at present, because there will be increased numbers of members from the metropolitan

area in both the Assembly and the Council, I believe we have retained representation for country people irrespective of which party wins the seats. One has only to look at the Country Party benches to be aware that at each election the Liberal Party or the Labor Party is taking seats from us. However, that does not concern members of the Country Party in relation to this Bill; we hope that at the next election we will win back some of them, or, if not at that election, the following one. At least, whichever party wins the seats the members will be country representatives. Although at times we differ with some of the views held by our worthy friend, Mr. Kent, a Labor Party member and one of the representatives for Gippsland Province, he at least is a country representative, and we want to see that representation retained.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Do you want to see Mr. Kent retained?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: We want to see the country seats retained; we are not concerned about who wins them, whether it is Mr. Kent or someone else. If he can win a country seat, good luck to him. At present 9 country seats in this Chamber are held by the Liberal Party, 6 by the Country Party and 1 by the Labor Party. Efforts have been made by the Labor Party for many years, without great success, to reduce Country Party representation.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: We will not stoop to blackmail.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I hate to hear anybody use that word because it is completely out of context with the procedure adopted. I shall quote some figures to illustrate the position elsewhere, and Mr. Trayling can call it blackmail if he wishes. Mr. Galbally spoke about the principle of one vote, one value, and the establishment of a judicial committee to draw up boundaries to obtain equal representation. He quoted the United Kingdom as an example. If ever there was a racket or blackmail the Wilson Government's redistribution is it. The Antrim South seat in Northern Ireland has 117,834 electors, being the largest, and Glasgow Central with 25,516 electors is the smallest. Mr. Galbally speaks about gerrymanders. If that is not a gerrymander, I have never seen one.

I shall quote a few other examples. The Whitlam Government brought in a new Legislative Assembly for the Northern Territory in place of the Legislative Council, which was half nominated and half elected. This allows for a variation of up to 57 per cent in the numbers of electors in the Northern Territory seats. The Labor Party was annihilated, although it drew up the boundaries.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER: It will be more careful next time.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: It may not have the opportunity. Shortly prior to the last State election in Western Australia the Tonkin Labor Government made a redistribution. The members of that Government are loyal members of the Labor Party and, I presume, believe in the principle of one vote, one value, and do not believe in gerrymanders. The election was held in 1972. The greatest number of electors in a city seat was 16,659 and the lowest was 14,433. In what is termed the agricultural, mining and pastoral area, the maximum number of electors in one electorate was 8,061 and the minimum was 7,015. In the North-West-Murchison-Ayre area of four seats the largest number of electors was 6,133 and the smallest of Murchison-Ayre was 1,835. Other electorates had 3,417 and 3,329 electors. In other words, the greatest number of electors in a city electorate was 16,659 and the lowest in a country electorate was 1,835.

There was no need for the Government to have a redivision if it did not want to do so, but it did. In the Legislative Council of Western Australia, four or five Assembly seats in the metropolitan area were combined to make a province with a maximum number of

electors in the metropolitan area of 79,173, and in the agricultural, mining and pastoral area the lowest number was 23,403.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: It is a scandal.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I know; the Labor Party brought it in. Mr. Galbally ridiculed the Country Party. I will give Mr. Galbally all he wants.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Be accurate.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I am being accurate.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Who controls the Legislative Council in Western Australia?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: I am not concerned about that. I point out to Mr. Trayling that a Government does not have to make a redivision. However, the Western Australian Government wanted to do so, and this is what it brought in. Unfortunately, it lost the election. Some years ago a Labor Government was in office in Queensland, and it brought in a redistribution, and it eventually lost an election. Everyone knows what happened in Queensland last Saturday!

I think I have said enough to demonstrate that the hoax that the Labor Party attempts to perpetuate in this House in Mr. Galbally's Bill is not in conformity with what is done in other countries or in other States of Australia. Mr. Galbally brought in his Bill a few weeks ago, as he has for several years past. He has given notice already that he will introduce it again next year. That is not in line with the principle of one vote one value because his Bill allows a 10 per cent variation in the number of electors in the various seats. By allowing any variation, the principle of one vote one value is broken down. If Mr. Galbally wants to be logical and to introduce the principle of one vote one value, let him do so.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: It is mathematically impossible.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Under this Bill a maximum variation of about 20 per cent will be permitted. If there is to be representation of the country areas some variation must be permitted.

I suppose all honorable members have tried to draw up redivisions over the years; I have had a hand in a few in the past. The representation of the country area has gradually diminished so that there are many fewer seats than there were in the early days. It is not an easy matter to draw up a redivision. The schedule attached to the Bill indicates that in an endeavour to allow for a variation of about 20 per cent in the numbers of electors there has been great difficulty and it has been necessary to come practically into the metropolitan area to ensure that there are sufficient numbers of electors in the country area to retain the percentage at a reasonable level. In the Port Phillip District for the Legislative Assembly and Southern District for the Legislative Council the country areas encroach practically into the city to retain a balance.

I shall be honest and say that the proposed redivision does not favour the country area as it might have if the Country Party had drawn it up. The country people of Victoria are entitled to representation. It has been said that there are certain problems about representing country areas because members have to travel to Melbourne but I do not consider that there is any worth-while difficulty in that regard. If Australia is to be developed in a proper manner, efforts must be made to reduce as far as possible the concentration of population in two great centres—one in New South Wales and one in Victoria. If this Parliament wishes to accept the principle of developing the State on a wide basis, it should be frank about it and should reject Mr. Galbally's principle. If 90 per cent of the members in the two Houses of Parliament represent the metropolitan area, before very long there will

not be any representatives of the country people. If that is what Mr. Galbally desires, it is not what the Country Party desires. At the next election I cannot see Mr. Galbally, or any other member of his party, winning many country seats on that principle. Over the past few years in the whole of Australia country people have been out-voted, out-numbered and out-marshalled in every respect. This was extremely evident in Queensland on Saturday. Queensland is a real country State which does not have as much concentration in the cities as do the other States and the people of Queensland overwhelmingly voted against the principles being dealt out to country people today.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Twenty-six per cent dominated the State.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: When a country party which calls itself a National Party in Queensland can tip out the Labor candidates from the heart of Brisbane, there must be something wrong with the Labor Party's policy. Mr. Trayling ought to grasp the opportunity of a free air trip to Brisbane as soon as this House rises, to see what the problem there is, because I am sure at present he does not understand it. When the honorable member returns he should tour around Victoria to see whether he is any more popular than he was when he left for Queensland. He will find the same story in the country areas of Victoria. The voice of the people in Queensland was the voice of country people all over Australia today. The Country Party makes no apologies for voicing the people's views in this place or another place or in any Parliament in which it is represented. As long as the Country Party is represented in this House, it will continue to do so.

If this House ever reaches a stage where it does not contain country representation, the many measures that come before the House will not be adequately debated. Some members may say that this will never happen but if the weighting of city votes against country votes is increased by another 10 per cent, Victoria will end up with only three country provinces—the western part of the State; the north and north-east; and Gippsland—and the rest of the voters of the State will be in the metropolitan area. Does any honorable member desire to see that happen?

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: It should not happen if the Government decentralizes.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: It could happen under this system of allocating seats. Labor Party members know that as well as I do. The Labor Party has introduced into this House a proposal to achieve this result, namely, one vote, one value. If that system were introduced, there could possibly be only two country provinces—four Country Party members in this Chamber out of the 44 seats. The Labor Party may think that is equal representation for the people of Victoria but the Country Party does not. It will not stand for it and will never support that type of Bill in this Chamber.

The fundamental principle of the amendment moved by Mr. Galbally is interesting because Mr. Galbally calls for the abolition of this House. I noticed that he was not too enthusiastic on that point. I can imagine Mr. Galbally crossing the floor on the vote for the abolition of this Chamber. I have watched Mr. Galbally for 25 years as a member of this House and I believe the greatest loss he could sustain would be the opportunity to speak in this House. He has tried to convert honorable members by every means, by private members' Bills and by speaking on various pieces of legislation before the House as well as on adjournment motions—he has brought forward more of those than any other member in the history of this place, and he has enjoyed doing so. There is no doubt in my mind that the greatest loss Mr. Galbally could sustain would be the abolition of this place.

When I first came into this House and a Bill was being debated, I said, "If we are going to carry on in this way, we ought to abolish the place". Mr. Fraser, who was later Judge Fraser, tapped me on the shoulder when leaving the Chamber on the way to dinner and said, "For goodness sake, you should not start advocating the abolition of this House. It is all right for us to advocate it, but we shall never have the numbers to implement that policy". This is the psychology Mr. Galbally applies with regard to the abolition of this Chamber. I believe, in spite of our differences of opinion in respect of this Bill, it would be a great loss to the House to lose Mr. Galbally from this Parliament.

We shall eliminate the last portion of the amendment. The other part of Mr. Galbally's amendment deals with the principles which I have already shown are not really Labor Party policy throughout the Commonwealth or throughout the world. Every time a redistribution has been carried out in Australia or overseas, it has been brought in on a balanced basis, according to the provisions which are necessary in the country involved.

The Hon. W. G. FRY: It is a gerrymander when we do it.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: If it is a gerrymander once, it is a gerrymander twice. I do not see how it can be called anything else. Earlier Mr. Trayling interjected about blackmail. If Country Party members are termed blackmailers because they have made representations to keep a reasonable balance of country people in this Chamber, Mr. Trayling had better go and tell his confederates in the other States that they are greater blackmailers than the Country Party because their actions in Western Australia, Northern Territory and the other States have been worse. In the Federal sphere representation in the Senate is not determined on a population basis. It has always contained ten members from each State. When one considers that there are ten members from New South Wales and ten members from Tasmania, the situation appears to be farcical; but I have not heard the Labor Party worrying about it.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: It was the policy of the Labor Party to abolish the Senate.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Although there has been much talk in the House of Representatives about redistribution, the number of seats in Tasmania has not been reduced below five. That would be suicide for the Labor Party, because all five seats are held by Labor Party members. If the Federal Government redistributed Tasmania back to four seats, on the figures it could lose them all. The number will not be reduced, as Mr. Trayling knows. One can tell that by the way he is smiling. That is not considered to be blackmail but it is blackmail when the Country Party makes representations in order to achieve fair government in this place!

This Bill increases the number of provinces from eighteen to twenty-two with two members representing each province. Mr. Galbally has raised objection to two members representing one province. Two members might get in each other's road in Melbourne but in country areas that is not the case. There is plenty of space for them to get around one another.

In the Assembly the number of seats will be increased from 73 to 81. There will be 49 seats in the Port Phillip area with 28,000 voters each and 32 seats in the remainder with 24,500 each. I do not think that is a gerrymander.

However, in country areas, in the set-up of having 32 seats, provincial seats have been lost. This is a tragedy and the only part of the Bill which I do not like. The provincial seats set out in the previous legislation were not true country seats and a certain amount of balance will be

lost. They served a purpose. They were a barrier between the metropolitan area and the principal country areas. The Country Party believes those seats should be retained.

The Country Party is not 100 per cent in favour of some provisions in the Bill. However, no Bill has ever come before this House of which every honorable member was in favour. No honorable member yet knows where the boundaries will be. This Bill states that there will be electoral districts and provinces but it does not say where they will be. When trying to work out where the boundaries will be, all honorable members would have a different idea of what is happening. The Country Party has decided that, having advocated that it should have a percentage of seats on a basis of retaining a reasonable balance within the country areas of Victoria, it is prepared to accept the risk, if there is one, and I suppose every party runs one, as to where the balances and boundaries will be. Some of the Labor Party members are worried as to whether they will still be in the same place. Some Country Party members are worried where their provinces will be, if they still exist.

The Country Party supports the measure. I trust that when the commissioners draw up the boundaries they will remember to retain some community of interest in the areas which they allocate to each member of this and another place, and that they will take into consideration the proportions commensurate with the area which might be involved, especially in the far flung parts of Victoria because there are many difficulties involved. At present a variation of 15 per cent is allowed in those areas. I believe it is necessary to retain this because of the difficulties to members, especially in the provinces of this House. The Country Party supports the Bill.

The House divided on the question that the words proposed by Mr. Galbally to be omitted stand part of the motion (Sir Raymond Garrett in the chair)—

Ayes	..	24
Noes	..	6
Majority against the amendment	..	18

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Long	Mr. Kent
Mr. Ward	Mr. Thomas

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

Ayes	..	23
Noes	..	6
Majority for the motion	..	17

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Fry	Mr. Tripovich
Mr. Long	Mr. Kent
Mr. Ward	Mr. Thomas

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

CONSUMER AFFAIRS BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 5) on the motion of the Hon. F. J. Granter (Minister of Water Supply) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province): This Bill makes several amendments to the Consumer Protection Act, which is subsequently to be called the Consumer Affairs Act. That is the first amendment in the Bill. The Government considers that the words "consumer protection" have an unfair connotation and show some sort of bias towards consumers as against those who are selling wares. I cannot understand the need for the change. There is a need to protect consumers but rarely is there a need to protect vendors. Changing the name of the Act is meaningless and of little consequence. What is important is that if the Government intends to have an organization to protect consumers it should ensure that the organization has sufficient finance with which to operate. On many occasions honorable members have told the Government that the Consumer Affairs Council did not have sufficient money with which to operate, and repeatedly the Government has denied this. A report was tabled in this House tonight by the Consumer Affairs Council of Victoria. I quote from the report what the council had to say in respect of finance—

> It desires to draw attention to the tremendous growth in the volume of complaints lodged with the Bureau. Despite an increase in the staff early in 1974, there was a considerable backlog of complaints not actioned during the period ending 30th June, 1974, and despite special efforts which have been made to reduce the outstanding work subsequent to 30th June, 1974, it is the view of the Council that a review of the staff requirements of the Bureau should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

The council goes on to give some comparisons of the staff of similar organizations in other States, and Victoria does not come out favourably. The report proceeds—

> Not only does this apparent staff deficiency affect the ability of the Bureau to service the Council, more importantly, it impedes its ability to give a satisfactory service to the consumers, who have taken the time and trouble to register formally their dissatisfaction with some particular consumer transaction. Very often, time is the essence of the complaint and in too many cases, the Bureau has been unable to action the complaint in a timely fashion.

Although the name of the organization is being changed, it is still not being given any additional money with which to carry out its duties. Whether the name is changed back to Consumer Protection Bureau or keeps its new name Consumer Affairs Council is meaningless. I ask the Government when it is considering further legislation, or a further allocation of funds, to seriously consider giving money to the Consumer Affairs Council of Victoria.

The Bill makes it an offence to use the old trick of bait advertising. As most members of this House know, this is a common practice. Only yesterday I received a complaint from one of my constituents who was first to attend a shop in the City of Coburg which had advertised a particular article of fruit for sale at a certain price. When he asked where this particular article was, the people in the store had no knowledge of it and he was referred to the manager. The manager had no knowledge of it, and when told that an advertisement had appeared in the local newspaper regarding this article, he said that he had no knowledge of the advertisement. Fortunately this consumer was not put off. He went home and brought a copy of the advertisement to the fruit shop and showed it to the manager. The manager said, "No, it is not my advertisement". The advertisement clearly stated the name and the address of the store, and

the product, but the manager said that they did not have that product. The consumer knew that the store did not have any of these articles because he was there when the shop opened in the morning.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: He did not put the advertisement in the paper himself?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: The paper contains a conglomeration of advertisements of a particular group of shops. This store's advertisement appeared in the left-hand corner, and if this man was the owner or manager of that particular store, he would have been the one who put the advertisement in the newspaper. That is only a small case concerning the sale of bananas.

Bait advertisements are put in newspapers daily. This Bill will place greater responsibility on the Consumer Affairs Council, and the council will need additional staff to police these activities in the future. I believe it is right that this should be corrected, and the proposal has my blessing.

In this measure the Government proposes to outlaw the use of box numbers in the selling of goods unless the advertiser also supplies his name and address. I believe that to be proper. In the past box numbers have been used in advertisements for particular products, and people would send off a cheque, together with an application form and the necessary order, and perhaps there would be no result. What can such a person do if there is only a box number? By the time a complaint is made to the post office, and the post office makes an inquiry, the box could be closed. There is no prohibition on somebody having a post office box today and cancelling it tomorrow. In this way many business firms have made a quick "buck" on occasions. There are those who do not want their proper business premises to be known, and they, too, use post office box numbers. In future people have to supply the name of their firm, and address, when advertising from a box number.

The next clause deals with referral selling. Most of this kind of selling has related to house cladding. Unfortunately, this seems to have developed into an industry about which there are many serious doubts. Many could be considered to be dishonest, and people have paid money for work which has not been done on their properties. Others have had a job only partly completed. The Bill will prohibit referral selling, one of the baits used on people to induce their custom. It will apply not only to house cladders but also to other types of businesses.

Another clause gives the Governor in Council power to make regulations with respect to the packaging of goods. I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that a lengthy section in Division 4 in the Weights and Measures Act deals with the control of packaging. If under this Bill the Governor in Council is empowered to make regulations, there could be conflicting powers under the two Acts. The Weights and Measures Act could be amended to include what is desired under the Consumer Affairs Act, but to have two bodies working under similar provisions on the size of packages, seems to me to be asking for trouble. If the Minister looks into this he will see that what I say is true.

The next clause refers to invoices being supplied on request by a customer. A customer may, on the purchase of goods, ask for an invoice stating the name and quality of the goods to be supplied. That is quite reasonable, but it could be construed to mean—I believe it could happen under this clause—that a person could go into a shop and demand an invoice for a box of matches. No limit is placed on the value of the product on which an invoice is to be supplied. If a difficult person wanted an invoice for a box of matches, it would result in a shopkeeper selling his products at a loss. There are

people who would do that sort of thing. The provision should be restricted in some way, and should set a minimum price on the article sold, so that a shopkeeper—this is one way to protect a shopkeeper against a consumer—is not asked to write out an invoice for something of a trivial nature.

The following clause requires repairers to return replaced parts to customers. Most members of this House have experienced grave doubts at times whether the parts charged for on repairs have been put into the product being repaired. This applies to motor cars and certainly to television sets, and other intricate equipment which need repairing and on which it is difficult for the ordinary person to make a check. One does not know whether the valves in a television set have been changed; they look exactly the same when the set is returned as when the set was taken away, and unless one is able to stand and watch the repairer carry out his work and see new parts replaced, the same set of valves could be in the television set when it is returned.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: My repairer sends the old ones back with the set.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: He is already conforming with what is contained in this Bill, but even then a dishonest man could get over this. Firstly, he is required only to offer to return the parts, and many consumers would say they do not want them. It would be easy for him to collect a stock of worn out parts from consumers who did not want them returned.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: That is the dishonest chap.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: That is what laws are about, to control dishonest people. Laws would not be needed if there were no dishonest people. In the television repair field, from year to year the Consumer Affairs Council has mentioned a certain firm which, to this very day, is fleecing the public and carrying out dishonest acts.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: I was thinking more of the motor car repairers, the mechanics.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: That might well be. While the Bill has the support of the Opposition, I point out that one or two provisions might prove to be unworkable or valueless when it comes to the crunch. There are ways of getting around them. I cannot give an answer to this problem. The Bill is a move in the right direction, and it will not be long, with the assistance of those in the practical side of business outside, before further suggestions can be made on how to further amend the legislation to prevent people from carrying out dishonest practices.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): The Country Party welcomes the introduction of this Bill, even though it may not close some of the loop-holes that are available for unscrupulous people who try to exploit various members of the general public. At least it is a step in the right direction to further amend the Act. Probably this legislation will be further amended by Parliament from time to time. As some trade practice or particular misleading form of advertising or business rears its ugly head, amendments will be required to give the Government power through the Ministry of Consumer Affairs and the Consumer Affairs Council to deal with it.

As the State becomes more developed the stage is being reached when a great deal of expertise in advertising techniques is exercised, and a great number of business people are constantly trying to devise ways of getting around the law in order to make a quick dollar out of the unsuspecting public. It is right that the Government should protect people. It is difficult to protect them

because, regardless of what legislation is passed, people will make mistakes and will be taken in by misleading advertising and misleading business propositions. Unfortunately, it appears to me that the people who can least afford to pay are the ones who are exploited. Dishonest people seem to prey on these who are unaware of these things; they seem, particularly in some fields, to approach widows or elderly people with a proposition to do some work on their house or to induce them to buy a particular item of equipment. Frequently they approach a housewife when she has not the support of her husband. This is becoming restricted to some degree by the action that has been taken in the past by the Government with the support of this Parliament.

I was interested to read in the report of the Consumer Affairs Council that since the Act was first proclaimed in 1964 it has been expanded on quite a number of occasions, to prohibit various practices. Until last year, action has been taken on trading stamps or coupons, false or misleading advertising, misleading marking of prices, mock auctions, door-to-door sales, unordered goods and services, merchandise marks, footwear regulation, furniture regulation and safe design and construction of goods. These types of activities have come under surveillance since the legislation was passed in 1964. The 1973 Act related mainly to pyramid selling and provided for a penalty of $5,000 for an infringement. As the report has just been released it might be interesting to refer to comments made on pyramid selling. At page 18 it is stated—

> The council notes that the various pyramid selling schemes as outlined in the previous annual report have ceased to exist in the course of the year under review. In the early months of the year some complaints were received by the Consumer Protection Bureau which were fully investigated. The council feels that the subsequent publicity given to pyramid selling schemes as well as the introduction of pyramid selling legislation in December, 1973, have resulted in the fact that no further complaints have been received by the Consumer Protection Bureau.
>
> Nevertheless, the council feels that such insidious practices may crop up within the community at any time. Intending promoters of pyramid selling schemes are specifically warned that legislation exists in this State prohibiting such schemes and that the penalties are severe: $5,000 or imprisonment for one year or both.

I have no reason to doubt that the legislation passed by this Parliament had the required effect in forcing unscrupulous selling schemes out of action.

I was concerned that the activities of the Consumer Affairs Council were being limited by a lack of staff. During the year, the membership of the council was increased to the maximum permissible under the Act, namely, ten, five of whom are women, which is only fair and reasonable as women feel the full impact of advertising and sales techniques. A staff of only 22 officers are provided throughout Victoria. They had to deal with 5,832 complaints last financial year, which is a large task for 22 people and the ten members of the council.

The report also refers to a growth of 48 per cent in the number of complaints received. This is probably brought about by a combination of two things: More persons are being affected by such activities and there is a growing awareness within the community that a consumer has somewhere to go to obtain justice when a wrong has been done. I hope the council will not be limited in its work by a lack of funds or lack of staff.

The Bill proposes to close a number of loopholes and to clamp down on certain unscrupulous practices. The Country Party agrees wholeheartedly with the proposals. The change in the title from the Consumer Protection Bureau to the Consumer Affairs Bureau is reasonable.

Clause 5 widens the power of inspectors to investigate, perhaps in greater depth, complaints which are submitted, while clause 6 relates to bait advertising. For some time I have been concerned with bait advertising which has been used far

more widely than many honorable members may imagine. A firm will advertise an article, such as a motor car or a television set, at a low price to attract people into the establishment. Once a person enters the store, he is told that the article has been sold or is not available, then he is pressured to look at another article. The advertisement misleads the public into visiting the place of business. On many occasions, people come out of the store with goods which they had no intention of buying. The penalty for misleading advertising will be $500.

A further proposal clamps down on the use of box numbers in advertisements. This is a sensible provision. A glance at the advertising pages of many newspapers will indicate how many intending customers are referred to box numbers. No notification is given of the vendor and there is no way of tracing the individual. Moreover, the consumer has no redress. The Bill will make it necessary that such an advertisement shall include the name and address of the place of business or residence of the person by whom the private box number is rented or obtained. The information will appear in the advertisement and thus identify the individual who is endeavouring to dispose of goods or services through the advertisement. The Bill also includes provisions concerning misleading marking of prices.

Under clause 9, referral selling is outlawed. A large portion of the Minister's second-reading notes related to house cladding, although only a small part of the Bill is devoted to the field. I hope the types of restrictions that are necessary are already contained in the Act to limit this activity to those reputable companies which produce work of a high standard. I have been concerned for some time with the house cladding craze in the community which seems to be catching on throughout the State.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: It saves painting.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: That claim is made but many of the operators need scrutinizing. The Minister said that the attention of the Minister for Local Government had been drawn to the need for building inspections and other controls on the basis of building permits. That might be one way of tightening up on the type of workmanship involved.

Many people have fallen for the traps laid by house cladding operators. As the Minister explained, a person will sign a contract and before the work commences, raise money from a finance company to pay the operator. As has been said in this House many times, widows and such people have had to mortgage their homes to pay for house cladding. Often, once the operator obtains the money, if he does not work for a reputable company, he disappears and the person who has entered into the contract has little redress or little chance of getting the work done when he wants it done or having it carried out to the required standard. I am concerned that people are being taken in by operators of this sort.

I shudder when I drive through a country district where a team of roof painters have been through. Goodness knows what widows and other people have paid for the job, and I often wonder whether the job will last. Warnings have been issued by the police in my area to people to beware of some of these operators. Often they paint over peeling paint work or apply paint on poor surfaces. I mention widows only as an example.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL: A person will get only what he pays for.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: One can undertake to have some roof painting done and the majority of painters would do a sound job, but there have been cases where exorbitant prices have been charged; the painters have received payment but there is no guarantee about the standard of the work. An elderly widow is not in a position to climb on to the roof to inspect the paintwork.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL: Surely she can see that from the ground, and how many coats of paint are put on; my wife could do that.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: It might be all right for Mrs. Campbell, but she is not an elderly widow.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL: My mother could do that.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I am not suggesting that all elderly widows are gullible but a percentage of them are.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL: I do not know how the Government can protect everyone.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I said earlier that one cannot protect people from themselves in every instance, but the Government should endeavour to help them. Mr. Campbell apparently believes this sort of restriction is not necessary.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL: I am not saying that, but one has to consider the position of the man who is doing the job.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I agree, but it should be possible to ensure that any job which is carried out is done to the required standard and, using roof painting as an example, if the paint starts to lift after a year, the person concerned should have some way of making a complaint and the Government should be prepared to take action.

The Hon. W. G. FRY: Often the bird has flown and left Australia with the profits.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I am aware of the problems and I am not criticizing the Government for lack of action. The Government has done a good job in consumer affairs but there is a long way to go. There needs to be a tightening up in fields other than those with which the House is dealing at the moment. The need for an invoice to be supplied on request is a provision which meets with Country Party approval. Referring to the return of replaced parts, we in the country are more inclined to know the people with whom we are dealing. There is a television repair centre in Warracknabeal and if it did wrong by some people it would not be long before it was blacklisted by the public in general. However, I can understand what is happening in the city where the consumer is not constantly dealing with the serviceman. On numerous occasions only a minor adjustment may be made to a television set but the consumer, to his detriment, could be charged for the replacement of a major part.

I have mentioned a few provisions covered by this measure. The Country Party, which supports the Bill, will encourage the Government to take necessary action to protect the consumers of Victoria from unscrupulous businesses.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL (Monash Province): Probably much of Parliament's time could have been saved if the Bill had been couched simply in terms of regulation-making powers. When I looked at the provision on packaging, I was completely bewildered because it means, more or less, that regulations can be made about regulations. It appears to be distinctly odd that proposed section 61A (2) (c) should provide that in a prosecution for an offence against the regulations, the proving of specified matters is a defence to the prosecution. If it is intended that certain matters shall be a defence to a prosecution, this should be clearly stated in the Bill. The Bill simply provides that the Governor in Council may make certain regulations. This is a typical example of the fondness of the Department of Labour and Industry for making regulations and I register my disapproval of the procedure.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 8276 s. 2).

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): I thank Mr. Walton, Mr. Dunn and Mr. Nicol for participating in the debate. Mr. Walton has an immense knowledge of consumer affairs and has made a study of this subject over the years. I congratulate him sincerely on his contribution. I agree with Mr. Walton's initial point that the consumer should be paramount in any dispute. Perhaps the consumer should receive a little extra than the retailer or the seller because he is always at a slight disadvantage.

I will draw to the attention of the Minister of Consumer Affairs the comments of Mr. Walton and Mr. Dunn on the funds made available to the Consumer Protection Bureau and the staffing of the bureau. The points made by the two honorable members were well taken. Although the Consumer Protection Bureau might receive credit for its work, it is still handicapped by a lack of funds and staff.

I have personal experience of bait advertising. I believe it is a poor practice that is carried on by some business people. The Government, which is thankful that not many business people engage in bait advertising, believes it should be stamped out.

Mr. Walton referred to a possible conflict with the Minister for Local Government, under whose portfolio the weights and measures legislation is administered, and its effect on packaging as it is now detailed in the Bill. I will certainly draw his comments to the attention of the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Referring to invoices, it was suggested that if a person purchased a box of matches, he could request an invoice. That is taking it to the very end but, if a person sincerely demanded an invoice, I suppose he would be entitled to it as the Bill imposes no limit on the transactions for which invoices must be given. Mr. Walton and Mr. Dunn referred to the return of replacement parts on repaired television sets and repairs performed in garages. Mention was made of some television repairers who did not return the replaced parts. The garages with which I deal in the country usually return the parts that have been replaced. They are usually placed on the floor in the back of the vehicle. It can be taken for granted that parts have been replaced because they are no longer serviceable.

On the question of referral selling Mr. Dunn cited the example of house-cladding firms. This example was also used in my second-reading speech when I referred to referral selling. House cladding in country districts is a big business. I know that house-cladding firms have visited my home town of Heathcote and have asked residents to supply the names of other people to whom they might offer a contract. The Bill does not specifically refer to house cladding but house cladding is the typical example which was used in the second-reading notes.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Mr. Dunn mentioned roof painting as another example.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: Yes; that is another example. The public should be aware of the operations of roof painters and house cladders who operate on a referral basis.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: It is all right in the case of an honest tradesman.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: That is quite true.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Many people have the idea that all tradesmen are villains, and this often applies to Parliamentarians.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: Yes. It is all right with the reputable firms but I believe many people get caught by unscrupulous firms which go to country towns and ask a person to recommend another person who might be interested in having the roof of his house painted or the house

clad. It can be a dangerous practice and some widows and single people fall for these traps much more than others.

Mr. Nicol mentioned the regulation-making powers contained in the Bill. I know that Mr. Nicol is well versed on this subject and I will refer his comments on the regulations to the appropriate Minister.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 3 to 8.

Clause 9 (Amendment of No. 8276).

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): I agree with the comments of the Minister of Water Supply on referral selling, a practice which I find objectionable because it virtually amounts to persons being asked to "dob in" their friends for their own benefit. It involves not only their friends but other people whom they know. These people are being asked to supply names of prospective clients by unscrupulous companies which often promise some type of personal reward. As I said earlier, in his second-reading speech the Minister went into some detail about house cladding.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Order! It is not customary during the Committee stage for an honorable member to reply to comments made during the second-reading stage of the Bill.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I did not intend to reply to the comments of the Minister of Water Supply. What I am saying is that the inference has been drawn that clause 9 deals with house cladding. I do not know whether clause 9 goes far enough in clamping down on house cladding businesses. Admittedly provision can be made for inspection of buildings, and finance companies could be urged before lending money for the purpose of house cladding to ensure that the work is completed. I hope under other provisions the operations of house cladders and roof painters can be tightened up. However, I believe clause 9 does not go far enough as it clamps down only on the referral selling aspect of house cladding or similar practices.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 10 (New Part IV.A).

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province): The Minister of Water Supply indicated that clause 10 might be in conflict with the weights and measures regulations to which I referred during the second-reading debate. The honorable gentleman also indicated that I might be right on the question of invoices being requested for small and trifling amounts. The Minister stated that he would discuss these matters with the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

When this measure has been passed by the Legislative Council, I assume it will become law as it has already been passed by the Legislative Assembly. I believe there is a deficiency in the measure and perhaps the proper course would be for clause 10 to be deferred until later this day while the Minister of Water Supply confers with the Minister of Consumer Affairs to ascertain whether the allegations I have made on this measure are correct. After all, this is a House of review and if it is necessary the Committee should amend the clause.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): I remember a discussion taking place between the Minister for Local Government and the Minister of Consumer Affairs on this clause. However, if Mr. Walton would like the matter to be further clarified, I am prepared to report progress and I shall advise Mr. Walton further later this day.

The clause was postponed.

The remaining clauses were agreed to.

Progress was reported.

WATER SUPPLY WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 5) on the motion of the Hon. F. J. Granter (Minister of Water Supply) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province): This Bill provides honorable members with an account of the activities of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission during the past year and outlines proposals for the forthcoming year. I am greatly impressed with the operations of the commission, and with its engineers. I have seen the commission's operations and was closely associated with it before entering this House. I make a plea that more money be allocated to enable the commission to carry out its urgent water supply and sewerage reticulation works.

I refer to the impact studies and environmental surveys. In an aside to the Minister of Water Supply, I referred to the problems confronting the Sunbury and Melton areas with the proposed sewerage plants in the area. I hope some money can be allocated to carry out environmental impact studies in the area. I am pleased with the amount of money that has been allocated to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works—my old friends in adversity at Spencer Street—to carry out the work that was set in train when it took over the Werribee Water Trust, with which you will be familiar, Mr. President. The work is now progressing satisfactorily. I hope the new dam will be built and service the expanding area of the Werribee plain, as it is known. Members of the Labor Party wish the Bill a speedy passage.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): The Country Party supports the Water Supply Works and Services Bill which seeks legislative approval for the expenditure of $39 million on water supply, irrigation, drainage, sewerage, flood protection and river improvement works in Victoria. The Minister's introductory speech was brief. This is understandable in view of the excellent explanatory memorandum attached to the Bill. I do not intend to refer to the clauses of the Bill in detail. Members of the Country Party support the Bill, because obviously the works outlined on water supply, drainage and sewerage, are necessary and desirable.

We are disappointed that the appropriation under the Bill does not keep pace with inflation or with the allocations to other State instrumentalities. If one compares the amounts authorized every year under a similar Bill to the total State Budget one will find that the amount being expended on water supply and associated works tends to diminish as time goes by. The Country Party is concerned at this trend, and believes it should be reversed.

Clause 15 refers to the works of the River Murray Commission. The proposed provision is $3·5 million. An amount of $2·8 million is Victoria's share in the construction of the Dartmouth dam. Victoria is the construction authority, through the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, for the new dam, which we are pleased is proceeding satisfactorily. The other works in the clause relate to a proposed provision of $700,000 for the operation and running of the River Murray Commission and its associated responsibilities.

Some weeks ago, in the Address-in-Reply debate, I referred to the need to amend the constitution of the River Murray Commission to give it responsibility for the control of the water quality of the river. Only last week a deputation from the Country Party consisting of the honorable members for Mildura and Murray Valley in another place, and myself, met the Premier to submit our points of view to him, which were mainly that the States had to be extremely cautious in agreeing to

any changes in the River Murray Commission's constitution so that the States still maintained their basic rights in this field. I am pleased that our views were accepted by the Premier and he agreed to our submissions.

Various clauses of the Bill refer to the allocation of finance for drainage. There are three items relating to this. The first is a sum of $1·775 million allocated for drainage works to be carried out by the major construction branches located at Rochester and Tatura. An amount of $195,000 is allocated for drainage works to be constructed by district branches. In addition, a special allocation of $700,000 has been made available for drainage and the removal of groundwater. I am pleased at this last provision because, as the Minister is well aware, this has been a serious problem in northern Victoria during the past winter. I inform the Minister and honorable members that the installation of groundwater pumps under this project has been extremely successful, and is having a beneficial effect on the height of the water table in the affected area.

The other two matters to which I wish to refer relate to the relationship of the future water supply of Melbourne to irrigation areas, and to the announcement last week to increase the cost of irrigation water. Earlier this year a Bill was introduced in another place for the purpose of establishing a water resources council in Victoria. I have been reliably informed on the Parliamentary grapevine that this Bill will not be proceeded with. The second progress report of Sir Henry Bland, which was released last week, refers to the Water Resources Bill and no doubt that is why the Bill is not being proceeded with. Members of the Country Party are disappointed that the Bill is not being proceeded with in this sessional period because it would have provided an opportunity of debating the future water supply of Melbourne, and the controversial issue of whether in the future water should be diverted from the Goulburn system to serve Melbourne. In recent months the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works released a report of an environmental study into the Yarra Brae–Sugar Loaf and Thomson River proposals put forward by the Public Works Committee. The report clearly revealed that the future planning of the Board of Works involves the diversion of water from the Goulburn system. Figure 2.5, which is an augmentation-time diagram contained in the report, indicated that in 1988 the board proposes to divert 38,500 million gallons a day, and in 1997 to divert 35,500 million gallons a day from the Black River.

The Minister of Water Supply is now responsible for the administration of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and consequently some important issues are involved. I believe there should be no diversion of the waters of the Goulburn tributaries until the resources of the Lower Yarra are fully developed. These include the Yarra Brae and Watson's Creek proposals. I have studied and inspected the Yarra Brae proposals on the site, and it is evident that the Board of Works is moving towards full chemical treatment of the metropolitan water supply. Therefore, I believe the current restrictive catchment policy should be reviewed in the Board of Works catchment areas, and the potential to harvest additional water should be realized. There should certainly be a great deal more investigation into and incentives provided for the reuse and recycling of water, particularly in industry.

Recently I was in Perth where I had the opportunity of inspecting the Midland Junction abattoirs, which are the largest abattoirs in Western Australia. One of the most interesting developments at that meat works was that the board responsible for the abattoirs has installed a water treatment and recycling plant at a cost of

$1·2 million. When this is completed and fully operative no water will leave the works. I will not go into the matter in detail, but I was most impressed by the economical process. When it is realized that in the near future it is likely that money of a similar magnitude will be spent on upgrading the effluent from the Melbourne abattoirs and the Newmarket sale-yards, merely to make the water quality suitable to drain into the Maribyrnong River, it is evident that much more should be done in this field.

In recent years the *per capita* consumption of water in the metropolis has been increasing. I suppose that is inevitable with a more affluent people and a more industrialized society in Melbourne. If the trend continues, an educational programme on the rational use of water for domestic and industrial purposes will be needed. In the long run it may even be necessary to introduce penalties or disincentives for the increased use of water.

My final point on the metropolitan water supply is that water should not be diverted from the Goulburn system until all other avenues have been explored.

The State Rivers and Water Supply Commission recently announced a 25 per cent increase in water rates and charges. This follows a similar increase in 1973. There were two reasons given. The first was that the commission is affected by the inflationary trend in the same way as other Government departments and commercial organizations. That is true. Like companies and individual businessmen, it is affected by the increased costs of labour and materials.

The second related to the effects of the excessively wet autumn, winter and spring in 1974. Last season, water sales were low and revenue fell by $600,000. Section 67 of the Water Act which gives the commission authority to set water charges provides that a deficit cannot be carried forward from one year to the next. However, sub-section (3) (*f*) provides that in the case of a district, if its requirements are exceptional because of natural disaster or other special causes—and what I have referred to is a disaster or special cause—the Governor in Council may authorize a subsidy towards the cost of the maintenance and the management of the district.

In 1967-68, when increases in water charges were under consideration, the then Treasurer, Sir Henry Bolte, deferred an increase until the following year because of the economic situation. The present economic situation is as bad or worse than that of 1972. I shall not go into detail on that, either as it affects primary industry in particular or the nation generally, because it has been debated in the House and it is not under the control of either the Government or this Parliament. But irrigators are suffering highly unsatisfactory economic circumstances.

I should not protest unless I endeavour to be constructive. Unfortunately, my attitude is not shared by some honorable members and organizations which protest about water charges. I found it amusing to read in the Swan Hill paper of 28th November that Mr. Wood, the M.L.A. for Swan Hill—

had failed in repeated requests to the Government not to increase irrigation charges.

Mr. Wood indicated that he had made incessant representations to the Minister of Water Supply and the Premier on this matter.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: But he has not spoken against them in Parliament.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: That is true. Like some other Liberal Party members representing country areas—I do not suggest there are any in this Chamber—he roars like a lion in his electorate but in the Parliament he is transformed into a mouse.

I put forward three suggestions on the setting of water charges and I hope the Minister accepts them as being constructive. It is essential

that consideration be given to changing the system. There is no doubt that the inflationary trend will not diminish in the foreseeable future but will increase. If there are further seasons of heavy rainfall we will have the same conditions which we have had this year. Consideration should be given to whether revenue can be increased and whether costs can be reduced in irrigation districts.

The first suggestion I make relates to expenditure. With the approval of the Minister, in recent years the commission has embarked upon a programme to increase the efficiency of delivery of water. This has been most successful and all honorable members will agree that it was necessary. But it may have resulted in greatly increased costs. I do not suggest that the commission is inefficient in many ways but I point out that when the present Minister for State Development and Decentralization was Minister of Public Works the Government saw fit to engage an outside management consultant to review the procedures of his department. It would be a good idea, not only for the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission but also for other departments, to have outside management experts investigate procedures regularly to find ways of increasing efficiency and so decrease costs.

The second suggestion I make relates to revenue. Consideration should be given to revenue raised from water rights as distinct from that raised by water sales. This revenue could be increased by increasing the water rights allocated to individual farmers. The Minister of Water Supply and previous Ministers have fairly regularly received deputations which suggested that the Government should take a less stringent attitude on the allocation of water rights. If this were done, revenue would be increased because, as the Minister is well aware, those charges must be paid irrespective of the amount of water used.

The final suggestion I make on water charges again relates to section 67 of the Water Act. Subsection (2) provides that the irrigation charge for each district shall be fixed by the commission subject to the approval of the Governor in Council and that notice of the amount of the charge, the period for which it is made—which, in the case of an irrigation district which has been divided into irrigation areas, may be a different period for each area—and the time and place at which the charge is payable shall be published in the *Government Gazette*.

I suggest that the Act should be amended so that Parliament has the opportunty to consider increases in charges. That opportunity would be available if charges were set under the regulation-making powers of the Act. If Parliament so desired, it could debate the issue of whether a particular regulation increasing charges should be disallowed. I know that the Minister will not have sufficient time to consider my three suggestions before the Bill is enacted, but they could be taken into consideration later.

I compliment the Minister for finally having introduced into Parliament the long-awaited drainage Bill. I assure the Minister that had he not informed me personally that the Bill had been introduced, or if I had not seen the Bill on the Notice Paper in another place, he would have received a great deal more criticism than he has during this debate. I do not know what is in the Bill but I commend the Minister for its presentation to Parliament during this sessional period. The Minister has honoured an undertaking given earlier this year. I assure the honorable gentleman that the Bill will receive serious consideration by honorable members representing irrigation areas, municipal councils, and others concerned. No doubt, when the Bill is debated during the autumn sessional period, the Country Party will be able to put forward constructive suggestions.

The Country Party supports the Bill. It believes that water supply, sewerage and drainage works are important. I repeat that it is disappointed that the funds appropriated for these purposes in recent years have not kept pace with inflation. I hope that trend will change in the future.

The Hon. H. R. WARD (South-Eastern Province): I compliment the Minister on the assistance he has provided in relation to the area of land around the Devil Bend reservoir which must be extended. Problems arose for people whose land had to be acquired. Both the Premier and the Minister deserve to be complimented on the action they took to assist the various landholders affected by the extensions to this reservoir, which will be sorely needed in the next few years. Another area of concern in the south-eastern district which affects the Mornington peninsula and other areas where pollution is a problem and involves the Dandenong Valley Authority is the construction of new sewerage schemes at Cranbourne and Pakenham. The town of Cranbourne is developing and criticism has been levelled because effluent drains into areas as far to the west as Kananook Creek. The State Rivers and Water Supply Commission and the Dandenong Valley Authority have been concerned about this problem. It is hoped that within a short time the effluent will be drained off into areas such as the south-eastern trunk sewerage system, from where it will flow into Bass Strait instead of Port Phillip Bay.

Another problem which has received favourable attention concerns the Mornington Sewerage Authority. General approval has been given for the construction of its new purification plant. Concern has been expressed about effluent draining into areas, particularly the Balcombe Creek catchment. In the future all sewerage authorities along the south-eastern trunk system will be required to drain into the trunk system and thence into Bass Strait. This project will require the expenditure of millions of dollars, and the taxpayers and ratepayers will have to pay for it.

The State Rivers and Water Supply Commission ought to be commended for its planning and the manner in which it has obtained funds to have the projects completed. I congratulate the Minister of Water Supply and the Water Commission on their efforts in support of sewerage authorities and waterworks trusts.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Issue and application of money from Works and Services Account for purposes specified in the tables to the sections).

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): Mr. Knight, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Ward congratulated the officers of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission on their work. I agree with those statements and record my appreciation of the work of the commission's officers and the advice they have given to me as Minister of Water Supply and to members of Parliament and citizens whenever requested to do so.

Mr. Knight referred to Sunbury, Melton and the Werribee River. Those areas concern me. The sewerage installations at Melton and Sunbury have caused concern, and I trust that the problems will be resolved shortly.

Mr. McDonald covered the ambit of water and sewerage in Victoria. There are many matters on which I should like to comment. I had pleasure in attending the deputation to the Premier, headed by the honorable members for Murray Valley and Mildura in another place, on the control of the River Murray. I agree with everything that the deputation put before the Premier. The Premier also agreed, and he instructed the Government representative on the River Murray Commission—Mr. Bromfield—along the lines suggested by the deputation.

Mr. McDonald referred to the work that is being done on drainage, both surface and groundwater, in the Shepparton area. This project, which is in its infancy, will be a success.

Recently the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission was contacted by people from India who asked what Victoria is doing about its salting problem and whether it could offer any advice. They were told about the work being undertaken in Shepparton and what has been done in the Swan Hill and Kerang areas. The work being carried out by Mr. Bill Williamson of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, Mr. Arch Paul and Mr. Riley of Shepparton will be of benefit and will save the area for horticultural use. Unfortunately, it will be too late for some people. If the work which I have already inspected continues along the same lines, this area will be saved. It is of importance in the fruit growing and canning industries and many people are employed there throughout the year.

Mr. McDonald referred to the Water Resources Bill. Although that measure has not been proceeded with in the current sessional period, I hope it will be proceeded with in the autumn sessional period because a Ministry of Water Resources under the control of one Minister is vital to Victoria.

At present it is difficult for me to administer the Ministry of Water Resources with the advice of a director and some specialist staff. I receive good advice from the Water Commission's officers, but because the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is located at the other end of Melbourne, its officers can only send papers up to me. I do not have the advice of someone well versed in water supply administration to assist me. The advice of a strong director would be helpful to me and of advantage to Victoria.

Reference was made to the possibility of the Board of Works taking over the Big River or Black River. I state categorically, as the former Premier often said, that not one drop of the water from the Big River will come to Melbourne. The Government has not changed its stand on the subject.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I accept that, but what will happen if a Labor Minister of Water Supply is elected?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: The Liberal Party and the Country Party would combine in the Upper House to defeat any move like that. I am sure that this House will be here for a long time to prevent the country areas of Victoria from losing the water from the Big River or the Black River. It would be a tragedy if the Goulburn–Murray Valley was deprived of the water from that area, either for horticultural or dairying purposes, because it is vital to its survival. The Goulburn area will be well served by water for many years to come when the construction of the Thomson dam is completed. It will be about the same size as the Dartmouth dam.

Mr. McDonald also referred to water treatment. The Board of Works will eventually have to undertake water treatment. I believe this is also the view of the board, and the increase in population will leave no doubt about it.

Several years ago the State Government sent Mr. Lang of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, and Mr. Barnes from the Board of Works overseas to study the recycling, treatment and re-use of water. Their report has not yet been produced, but when it is released it will be of value to the State.

The question of increases in rates was raised by Mr. McDonald. Because I represent a country electorate, I assure him that it is no pleasure for me to increase rates, especially for the rural population and particularly farmers. This action

was taken only after long consultations and many conferences with officers of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission.

The sitting was suspended at 6.28 p.m. until 8.11 p.m.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: As I said prior to dinner, the increases in rates and charges to irrigators caused me a great deal of concern and the decision was not taken lightly. I consider that the main cause of this goes back to the 1971–72 period when rates were not increased, largely because of the drought in 1972. Since 1971–72 the actual costs incurred have increased from $5,558,254 to an estimated total of $8,950,870 in the year 1974–75 for all districts. That is an increase of 60 per cent.

As Mr. McDonald has already stated, owing to lack of sales our irrigation districts maintenance equalization and renewals accounts for water supply and depreciation ran down considerably last year. There is a likelihood that there will be virtually no sales this year because the irrigation period is well on the way. Initially no water at all was distributed.

The First Mildura Irrigation Trust is the only irrigation body that competes with the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission. The trust increased its rate by 30 per cent.

Sharp rate increases have occurred in the New South Wales irrigation areas. As Mr. Tripovich pointed out earlier, the Board of Works has increased its rates by 30·7 per cent. A general rise of approximately 30 per cent has taken place throughout the State. The Government does not like having to take this action but it is a fact of life in the inflationary period in which we live.

One aspect which I am taking into consideration is the depreciation funds held by water trusts and sewerage trusts throughout the State. There appears to be a great deal of money invested by these trusts in savings bank accounts that are virtually unused. This money has been unused for a long period of time.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: That is fascinating. Does the Minister have any idea how much money has been invested?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: Off hand, I cannot advise the honorable member. Some of the accounts total $280,000.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: The trusts are receiving over 3¾ per cent or 4 per cent interest on the invested money.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: I do not know what interest rate is involved. However, it is money that is not being used and that is not good business. Although the majority of businesses may have a depreciation fund, they use this money for development. This morning I discussed this matter with the finance officer of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission. I intend to have further discussions along these lines.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Only for the maintenance and development of old mains.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: That is right. This could be necessary in some cases at some time during the year. The Government changed the First Mildura Irrigation Trust over to an Irrigation Districts Maintenance Equalization and Renewals Account so that this money could be used.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: This is sensible because the money has been lying there for many years.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: That is correct. If it is necessary to use money out of a depreciation account to purchase equipment, it could be done by means of a bank overdraft which, at times, the Government authorizes. Finally, Mr. McDonald mentioned the Drainage Bill. This Bill is vital not only for the northern part of Victoria, but also for the

whole of Victoria. I hope the Bill will be introduced tomorrow in another place. Unfortunately, it could not be introduced into this House and this was one of my great regrets. As one who has followed the investigations in the course of drafting the Bill, I should have appreciated the opportunity to introduce it in this House.

I again thank honorable members who participated in the second-reading debate and, in particular, Mr. McDonald for his constructive suggestions. I shall refer those suggestions to the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission.

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.

PUBLIC SERVICE 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.

WODONGA AREA LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) 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.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I think all honorable members will agree that this must be one of the most important Bills that have been introduced in this sessional period. It contains the first complete revision of the Public Service Act for more than 40 years.

The Victorian Public Service is an essential component of the machinery of government in this State. As an element of the Executive arm of government, it must play its proper part with the legislature and the judiciary in seeing that the welfare of the ordinary citizen is provided for; that essential services are economically and efficiently administered; that the rule of law is safeguarded and the basic rights of every person are protected.

Our service has a long and creditable record in public administration. We have been well served by many able and dedicated people at all levels. Several officers have gone from Victoria to other States, to the Commonwealth service and even overseas because of outstanding qualities which were first developed in this State from their experience in the various departments.

In recent years, however, there have been signs that some changes in the organization, structure and staffing procedures of the Victorian Public Service are necessary for it to continue to adapt successfully to new demands and new initiatives of our times.

The role of government has changed significantly in the last decade. New areas of involvement include the realization of the environment as something to be protected by laws and enforcement of regulations; the need for conservation of our natural assets and our national estate; and the increased development of Government interest and involvement in the arts, in recreation, in the welfare of all the people and in the over-all development of the State. These are new and expanding areas. In short, a great interest in enhancing the quality of life has added new and complex tasks to the already onerous responsibilities of the Public Service.

In addition, new initiatives emanating from the Federal Government in Canberra have increased the workload of the Victorian Public Service. The Commonwealth Government has available to it large numbers of highly qualified officers for the advancement of its programmes, most of which

must be carried through in conjunction with the States. If Victoria's interests are to be effectively served in these joint exercises, it must also have available adequate numbers of qualified and competent officers. Our existing officers serve us well in all these fields, but many are overworked and there are certainly insufficient reserves. As I have already said, there have been signs of severe strain in many departments.

The Government therefore decided late in 1973 that a board of inquiry should be set up to inquire into and report upon the role, organizational structure, management and staffing of the Victorian Public Service and to recommend action necessary to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of the service.

Special attention was to be given to the organization, co-ordination and control of departments; improving the efficiency of the use of human and allied resources; and possible changes in conditions of recruitment, employment and accommodation of public servants.

The Government was fortunate in obtaining the services of Sir Henry Bland to act as the board of inquiry. Sir Henry, a distinguished former State and Commonwealth civil servant, has already contributed for this Government a comprehensive inquiry into land transport in Victoria.

Sir Henry Bland perceived early in his inquiry that several separate reports would be needed to encompass the whole of his terms of reference. He also suggested, and I agreed, that his first report should be devoted to recommendation for the reform of the Public Service Act because, without such reform, it would not be possible to give the maximum effect to later recommendations for improving the whole machinery of Government in Victoria.

The first report of the board of inquiry was presented to the Government on Monday, 30th September, this year. This very comprehensive document followed many submissions to the board by officers and organizations such as the Victorian Public Service Association, discussions with Ministers—on many occasions in some cases, members of Parliament, officials in other States and in Canberra and detailed consideration of the comparable legislation in other parts of Australia. The report contained over 150 conclusions and recommendations and can fairly be described as the first comprehensive report on the Victorian Public Service since 1926—before I was born—a period of nearly 48 years.

The Government endorsed virtually all of the major recommendations—save one—of the report and agreed that the most suitable method of bringing it into effect would be the preparation of a completely new Public Service Act. The Bill now before the House is the result of that work.

The principal aims of the Bill are—

to provide for the Public Service Board to strengthen its effectiveness as the central personnel and management agency for the service by relieving it of some time-consuming tasks which can be carried out as effectively elsewhere;

to provide for increased responsibilities for permanent heads in staff selection and to generally strengthen the role of permanent heads;

to increase opportunities for more efficient use of staff by changing the divisional structure;

to improve the over-all quality of recruits by providing for increased graduate recruitment at initial appointment;

to increase management and specialist capacity by providing for increased lateral recruitment from outside the service;

to reduce the time taken to give effect to recruitment, transfers and promotions;

to increase staff participation in appropriate areas of personnel administration; and

to provide overall for the most effective use of the total manpower resources of the service, and to ensure that these resources will be of the highest possible quality.

I do not propose to discuss each clause of the Bill in detail at this time. An explanatory memorandum has been prepared for the information of members and to assist in explaining the inter-related effects of some of the clauses, many of which are somewhat involved. It must be expected that a completely new measure concerned with the administration of the Public Service will be complex and that it cannot contain all of the detail set out in the remarkable report of the board of inquiry. Indeed, it will be essential for future public service boards and future permanent heads to interpret the new Act in the spirit of Sir Henry's report if full value is to be obtained from his comprehensive work.

I do wish to comment on some of the major changes proposed in the Bill in relation to the present Act and to the report of the board of inquiry. The first of these relates to the structure of the Public Service Board. Sir Henry Bland recommended that the present arrangement of an independent chairman, a Government representative and an elected representative be replaced by a board of three members with no representative status chosen by the Government after informal consultation with the Victorian Public Service Association.

The Government decided that it would be inappropriate to remove the concept of an elected member in view of the increasing trend overseas towards employee participation in similar boards. The elected member has therefore been retained on the board. Reference to representative status has been removed for all members because it is believed that the whole board should operate as a unit independent of outside influences and pressures once it is appointed. For the same reason, the special quorum provision in favour of the elected member has been removed.

The Government has also decided to retain, in essence, the existing provision for a person elected by the permanent officers of the Mental Hygiene Branch of the Department of Health in the new third division to act as a member of the board in lieu of the elected member when the board is considering wage and salary or other special matters concerned with members of that branch. Provision is made for deputies to be elected for the elected member and the persons representing the Mental Hygiene Branch officers.

The second major change to which I wish to refer relates to the divisional structure of the service. It has been clearly demonstrated that the present delineation between the administrative and professional divisions has become increasingly artificial with the spread of new disciplines and the increasing development of management skills in the professional area. At the same time, it has militated against the efficiency of the service because of the restricted entry conditions for the Administrative Division and the near impossibility of lateral movement into it. The Administrative Division is clearly unable to produce the required numbers of top-level administrators for present and future tasks. The new structure provides for the permanent heads to remain in a separate group as at present.

A new First Division will be created which will comprise those officers of the existing administrative and professional divisions who exercise the more important administrative and professional responsibilities of the service and who can be expected to produce the permanent heads and senior executives of the future. Virtually all remaining administrative and professional division officers will form a new Second Division; and the

remaining officers, mostly Technical and General Division officers, will form a new Third Division.

The next major change is concerned with recruitment. In future, the Public Service Board will aim each year at filling some 10 per cent of the expected clerical and administrative vacancies with graduates, thus allowing the service to reflect eventually roughly the educational distribution of the population.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: It would have been a good idea to aim at a higher percentage.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: I agree. We must crawl at first. It must have shocked honorable members to note the figures of the low intake of graduates over a period of many years, despite the fact that the State paid for the education of those graduates. The 10 per cent will make a tremendous difference.

In addition, increased opportunities will be provided for recruitment at all levels from outside the service where the need exists. This provision is not intended to lead to massive recruitment from outside the service, but merely to provide for the necessary recruitment into the Public Service in present areas of need where deficiencies cannot be made good from within the service for some years. There is no appeal against appointments made in this manner but, as the board makes the appointment, it will obviously do so only when it is firmly convinced that no serving officer is as capable as the person recommended. The requirement to report all such appointments to the Governor in Council will keep the extent of use of this provision before the Government.

The fourth major feature is the provision for new and flexible procedures for transfers, promotions and appeals. Permanent heads will be given increased power to select from the whole of the service when filling vacancies on transfer or promotion, subject of course to appeal.

A Promotions Appeal Board will be set up to relieve the Public Service Board of its present function in respect to officers of the new second and third divisions. This will free the Public Service Board of an essentially administrative task which at present occupies the whole board for at least one day each week and often longer, and will enable it to devote this time to its prime functions. The Promotions Appeal Board will consist of a chairman experienced in service procedures, a departmental member, and an officer member nominated by the Victorian Public Service Association or the Hospital Employees Federation according to the section of the service in which the appeal lies.

A further major change is concerned with discipline. Provision is made for an appeals tribunal to hear appeals by second and third division officers against other than minor penalties imposed by permanent heads. A statutory tribunal is proposed to investigate charges against permanent heads and officers of the First Division, which can be laid by any person.

The final feature to which I draw special attention is the provision for one comprehensive set of regulations to be made by the Public Service Board, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. This will replace the present system under which there are two sets of regulations, one made solely by the board and the other made by the Governor in Council. Nothing in this change will alter the existing exclusive power vested in the board to make regulations relating to salaries, wages, and terms and conditions of employment.

The Government has also included in this Bill revised long service leave provisions. A draft Bill containing these provisions was in preparation, but honorable members will agree that it was preferable to bring both measures together in this form. The long service leave changes are in

accordance with undertakings made by the Government recently following amendments to long service entitlements for the Commonwealth Public Service.

The Bill reduces the qualifying period for long service leave from fifteen to ten years and makes consequential changes in the method of computation of leave entitlements in respect of completed years of service. The *quantum* of leave for each unit of service remains unchanged at one-tenth of three months for each completed year of service.

The existing discriminatory provision relating to female officers in respect of the taking of pay in lieu of leave prior to termination of appointment due to marriage is removed because female officers are no longer required to terminate their employment in such circumstances. Several other changes are described in the explanatory memorandum.

The successful implementation of the new Act will be dependent very largely on the Public Service Board. Many matters such as counselling and career planning, which are dealt with in Sir Henry Bland's report, cannot be set out in legislation, but they will have to be taken up by the board as envisaged by the inquiry.

One main thrust of the new Act is aimed at relieving the board of functions which can be performed equally well by others and so allow it to devote more time to functions which can be carried out only by the board. In this way, the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the whole service will be improved. Permanent heads will also have a major role to play in the implementation of the Act. They will be given additional delegations and responsibilities consistent with their status and they will, in turn, be expected to interpret the Act in the spirit of the board of inquiry report.

The Government believes that this new Public Service Bill will provide the necessary and, indeed, essential framework for the Victorian Public Service to meet the challenges of the present and the future. It will lead to increased opportunities for satisfying and rewarding careers through improved recruiting procedures and more flexible mechanisms for transfer and promotion through the whole breadth of the service.

I reiterate that we have been well served in the past, but that changes are necessary if we are to continue to be well served in the future. I also want to make it clear that the Government's endorsement of the board of inquiry's report does not imply any criticism of the past or present members of the Public Service Board. Certainly the present board deserves the Government's praise for so cheerfully and thoroughly meeting the demands made on it by the board of inquiry over the past twelve months whilst carrying out its normal tasks.

Finally, the Government wishes to express its gratitude to Sir Henry Bland who, as the board of inquiry, carried out his onerous task with his customary style, diligence and alacrity, albeit with a certain amount of caustic humour. We look forward to his later reports. Thanks are also due to Mr. John Finemore, Chief Parliamentary Counsel, for the speedy preparation of this complex Bill. This is a most important measure, not only for the many thousands of public servants directly affected by it, but for all the people of Victoria. I commend it to the House.

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

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

MOTOR CAR 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.

EDUCATION (TEACHER REGISTRATION) BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): 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 second objective is to enable teacher aides to be appointed to assist teachers in schools.

Honorable members will recall that early in 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 qualifications 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. The Minister of Education has paid 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 Schools 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 Schools 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. 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 "three" for the word "four". This allows for the appointment of a fourth Assistant Director-General. The senior officer will act as deputy to the Director-General.

Clause 3 deals with the power of councils to employ staff. The proposed new section 14AA (*a*) gives to technical schools the power to employ staff that has been exercised under the regulations for many years. Paragraph (*b*) of that new section gives for the first time to primary school committees and councils of high schools, consolidated schools and group schools, after considering any recommendations of the school principal and staff, 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 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 teachers' organizations and parents' organizations.

Clause 4 recognizes the recent changes in the system of teacher training in Victoria. Clause 5 provides for one deputy instead of three. 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 proposed regulations 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.

Clause 7 deals with provisional registration and for the first time gives to the boards the right to impose a set period of time for which provisional registration should apply.

Clause 8 enables a board to register category teachers, such as music teachers and language teachers but not as teachers to teach every conceivable subject. 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 registration provisions of the Act teachers operating under the Council of Adult Education, part-time teachers employed by technical school councils, teacher aides and non-teaching ancillary staff. The main aim of the Act was to enable the boards to register teachers employed by the Education Department. It was not considered desirable to intrude into the other fields of teacher employment, such as teachers operating under the Council of Adult Education and part-time teachers employed by technical school councils on a sessional basis who teach in evening classes and in specialist areas.

Clause 11 adds to section 82 of the principal Act the right to lay down by regulations promulgated by the Governor in Council 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.

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. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

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

WODONGA AREA LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is of an extremely simple nature and of the three amending clauses contained in it, two have the effect of reinforcing the authority of the Victorian Government and local government on the Victorian side of the border. Briefly the purposes of the clauses are—

(1) To reduce the area over which the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation has control from the original Wodonga area referred to in the principal Act to the much smaller designated area referred to in this amendment.

(2) To give municipalities all rights in their urban areas to which they are entitled under Victorian legislation, and

(3) To extend the currency of the principal Act, that is the Wodonga Area Land Acquisition Act 1973, for an additional twelve months.

At the time the Wodonga Area Land Acquisition Act was introduced in this House, the area which the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation was investigating for its development was some 5,100 square kilometres in extent, approximately 3,100 square kilometres being on the Victorian side of the border—the Wodonga area referred to in the principal Act. The corporation has been under considerable pressure to reduce this area to the minimum area necessary consistent with effective planning and this has resulted in the designated area being reduced to aproximately 6 per cent of the original area.

The municipalities within the designated area are bounded by an urban area and the second point raised, accords the responsible municipality the same power over the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation, when involved in development projects in these areas or any other part of the municipality outside the designated area as any Victorian local government body has over a private developer. The third part extends the period of acquisition for a further period to ensure that the Government continues to have the power to acquire the land required for the growth centre for a further twelve months to 31st December, 1975.

In view of the fact that, under the terms of the agreement entered into, loan moneys for the purchase of land will be made available annually over a period of three years, and as it would be administratively impossible to acquire all land needed in the time allotted this, legislation will need to be reviewed towards the end of 1975 and probably for some years thereafter. It can be seen, therefore, that these amendments are of a minor nature and in no way abrogate any of the State's rights or those of local government. It is further pointed out that when the original legislation was introduced, it was intended that it would be re-presented to Parliament when the boundaries of the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation's area were known. That was my suggestion. It is my intention that the plans should be made known to members of Parliament and to the community.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : Will this amendment allow the private developers to walk in?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : No. If this Bill is not passed quickly, they will be able to.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: Is the area being redefined?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Yes, but use of the land is being controlled or planned. If this did not happen the developers could take advantage of the money that has already been spent on work in this area. If these amendments are not ratified, an injustice would be caused to those landholders in Victoria who have either sold their land or are presently negotiating its sale, as this would undoubtedly lead to a period of land speculation in the area. Further, it would be a negation of the agreement entered into with both the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments and any agreements I have made on behalf of the State.

In accordance with this agreement, the Government of New South Wales has already passed the necessary legislation. New South Wales has, however, gone much further than Victoria in the terms and conditions it imposes on the purchase of land in that—

(*a*) all land designated in that State will be subject to acquisition;

(*b*) all land purchased is acquired and held by the Albury-Wodonga (New South Wales) Corporation;

(*c*) under the legislation various covenants are attached to the land; and

(*d*) the legislation in New South Wales accords the New South Wales corporation acquisition powers until October, 1977, with a Ministerial option to extend these powers for a further five years from that date.

It should be noted that in Victoria, all industrial and commercial land will be retained as Crown land, except in exceptional circumstances, and all residential land will be held on a freehold basis, subject only to normal zoning requirements. This accords with accepted Victorian practice.

The initial period of Wodonga's development has not been an easy one and has been marked by the uncertainties and difficulties which one would expect in a development of this magnitude. However, I believe that without the dedication, loyalty and tenacity of many members of my own department, the Treasury, Parliamentary Counsel and of local members, many of the problems which we have faced could well have proved insurmountable. It has been a most difficult and trying time for everyone, and I am personally grateful for the remarkable loyalty and the sense of responsibility of those concerned. It would have been easy for local members of Parliament to have got some temporary kudos out of an issue, and to have made the task of the three Governments a lot more difficult, but they did not do that.

The Minister for Local Government is in the Chamber, which gives me the opportunity to thank publicly my Cabinet colleague. There has never been a conjoint effort before in the history of this State where two Ministers have shared Ministries, and shared officers, and worked over a long period of time on a joint project. I am happy that my colleague is here so that I can record my appreciation of his remarkable support and that of his officers.

I wish to pay a tribute to many other people for bringing together three Governments of different political philosophies. I have in mind Ministers, the Ministers' council, where there is a Minister, Mr. Uren, representing the views of the Federal Labor Government, Sir John Fuller, a senior member of the Country Party and originally the New South Wales Minister, and recently Mr. Bruxner and myself. These people were responsible for bringing together the various Government departments, and crossing over the border with municipalities working together. This

has been a unique and difficult task. Again I take the opportunity of thanking the councillors for bringing together the work of councils, and for subjecting themselves, their councils, and all sorts of people in relation to their personal rights on this project. This has not been easy.

I should like to say something about Councillor Les Stone, who was Mayor of the City of Wodonga for two years during the early stages of the project and was elected to represent the State on the corporation. He has been a most dedicated person and has worked consistently with many other people. If one were to examine the value of Albury-Wodonga, one would see that it will not make a great contribution in preventing the growth of Melbourne and Sydney, notwithstanding that it is an ambitious project, or the fact that it is almost as far away in this State as one could get from Melbourne, and on a river and on a border. Nevertheless the effort of attracting some 300,000 people to the area by the year 2000 is a matter of some magnitude.

The real value of Albury-Wodonga is that it represents a first attempt by two Governments and a Federal Government to do something about a growth development outside the metropolitan area; hence it is important that it should succeed. If the Governments do not succeed with the project, the future of balanced development, and of decentralization will be put back a generation. Although there have been great difficulties, and the Victorian Government has had to compromise, and I have had to compromise, the wheel has turned and agreement has been reached. I am satisfied that the project is going to succeed. It would never have succeeded if the Governments had not started off with the goodwill of all the persons concerned.

I commend this small Bill to the House and in doing so I take the opportunity of thanking many people, and all the Government departments, including our State departments, for the contributions and co-operation they have given in this matter.

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

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

MOTOR CAR BILL.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is threefold. Firstly, it increases with one exception motor registration fees generally by 35 per cent ; secondly, it provides for concessional registration fees in respect of omnibuses operated by private buslines, and thirdly, it removes the requirement from the Motor Car Act 1958 that every authorized insurer shall deduct the amount of $1.40 from each third-party insurance premium.

The new Commonwealth Roads Acts provide for the allocation of $232 million to Victoria for this and the following two financial years. The allocations are, however, subject to many conditions, one of which is that Victoria must raise $281·2 million from its own sources during this period for road expenditure if it is to receive the full amount of the moneys available from the Commonwealth. This is a condition which the Government bitterly resents, having regard to the fact that over that period Victorian motorists will pay to the Commonwealth by way of petrol tax well over $500 million.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : This is an old argument that has gone on for years.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT : The amount which the State Government will gain by way of reimbursements will be only $232 million, representing less than one-half of the payments. The condition on which the State Government will receive this money is that it must raise $281·2 million.

In order to raise this amount it will be necessary to increase motor registration fees as soon as possible—these fees are the principal source of funds available directly to Victoria for road maintenance and improvements. At the present level of motor registration fees, the Motor Registration Branch will collect $192 million over the three years to 30th June, 1977. This will be insufficient to meet the Commonwealth's "quota" requirement of $281·2 million.

The Bill provides with one exception for a 35 per cent increase in motor registration fees to raise a further $56·2 million over the three years for road improvements. Of this amount, approximately one-third will be expended on the construction of major road projects approved by the Treasurer under the Roads (Special Projects) Act. The balance will be expended on the maintenance and construction of other roads throughout the State including assistance to municipal councils for improvements of roads under their direct supervision, with a small contribution for tourism and administration costs.

In allocating $232 million to Victoria the Commonwealth has effectively reduced in real terms the amount of funds it is making available to Victoria. The increased amounts to be provided by the Commonwealth are increases in money terms only and do not by a substantial margin match increased costs of road making in these inflationary times, notwithstanding that the income derived by the Commonwealth from the Victorian motorist is increasing every year. The alternative to an increase in registration fees would be to allow the road system to deteriorate to a level from which it would be difficult to recover. This would contribute to unemployment and to a deterioration in the condition of roads, particularly in country areas. The Government is not prepared to accept such an alternative.

I turn to the question of public transport. Honorable members will be aware of the decision already taken by the Government to hold down public transport fares for the railways and tramways to encourage people to make greater use of public transport facilities. The Government has also taken action to provide financial assistance for the private bus sector of public transport to assist operators to hold down fares. This financial assistance for the private bus network is being provided in the form of a passenger fare subsidy, loans of up to $20,000 per bus at 3 per cent interest for the purchase of new buses and exemption from the payment of existing annual licence and registration fees.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: Otherwise, they would have had to take their buses off the road.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: That is so in some cases.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: We told you that six years ago.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: The Government is taking action so that as much custom as possible can be attracted from private cars to public transport, whether buses, trams or trains. The Government recognizes that the omnibus industry needs this support if it is to survive. The Government is subsidising passenger fares as Mr. Tripovich says, so that operators will not have continually to pass on the full effect of cost increases to passengers by charging higher fares. I know Mr. Tripovich would agree with me that the private bus network is an important part of the public transport system, and honorable members will be interested to know that in the metropolitan area alone private buses carry some 17 million passengers per annum.

In many of the developing suburban areas, in Geelong, Ballarat, Bendigo and in some country areas, private bus operators provide the main public transport service. The private bus network also provides an important feeder service to trains and trams. The Government, which recognizes the role of the private bus operator

in the total transport scene, is providing financial assistance over the next two years to assist operators to hold down fares.

The Bill provides assistance to private bus operators by reducing registration fees to a nominal amount. It reduces from $15 to $2 per annum the registration fee payable for buses licensed by the Transport Regulation Board for regular route services as metropolitan, urban or country stage omnibuses. I turn now to the proposed deduction of $1.40 on third-party insurance policies. Before the passing of the Motor Accidents Act 1973, authorized insurers had an administrative arrangement whereby hospitals were paid directly from premium income an amount equal to 80 per cent of the cost of hospitalization of motor accident victims.

That arrangement ceased in February of this year when the Motor Accidents Board, which receives its income by means of calls upon authorized insurers for a portion of their third-party insurance premium income, entered into agreements with hospitals to make payments in lieu.

The Government considers that, because of the operation of the no-fault scheme, hospitals are being reimbursed for motor accident victims and accordingly there is no reason why insurers should continue to be required to deduct the $1.40 from each third-party insurance premium for that purpose. In effect, it covers the same purpose that is now met by the levy under the no-fault scheme.

The Bill therefore makes an appropriate amendment to the principal Act to remove the requirement. I commend the Bill to the House, although all honorable members must naturally regret the increase in motor registration fees.

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 the next day of meeting.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS BILL.

The House went into Committee for the further consideration of this Bill.

Discussion was resumed of postponed clause 10 (New Part IV.A).

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): Mr. Walton questioned the possible conflict between the Minister for Local Government in administering the Weights and Measures Act and the Minister of Consumer Affairs who will administer the provisions of this Bill. As promised, I have consulted with the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Local Government and I have been informed by the Minister of Consumer Affairs that this is only an enabling power for regulations to be made. The Minister of Consumer Affairs will confer with other Ministers—the Minister for Local Government on weights and measures matters, and the Minister of Health who may also come into the matter.

I am assured by both Ministers that there is no conflict. The Department of Labour and Industry has sufficient trained staff to administer the provision without any additions to the staff. I trust that the explanation is satisfactory and I thank Mr. Walton for raising the matter.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: What about the invoicing of small items?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER: The Minister definitely promised to look at the matter. I assure Mr. Walton that no minor items will have to be invoiced. I cannot state an amount, but the Minister is examining the position.

The postponed clause was agreed to.

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

MILK AND DAIRY SUPERVISION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 3) on the motion of the Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister for Social Welfare) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province): Everyone has a keen interest in the milk industry because milk is part of everyone's daily diet. Tremendous development has occurred in the Victorian dairying industry and it is unnecessary for me to repeat what has been said so frequently, that Victoria has the most favoured and most efficient dairying industry in Australia. Despite the natural advantages and other efficiencies, there are aspects which make it difficult for a dairy farmer to make a living.

The Bill deals with amendments to up-date controls on the manufacturing side of the dairying industry. Most of the amendments will allow for the more effective and smooth running of the industry.

The most significant provision relates to the manufacturing of a blend of butter and margarine. Some people may think that the moral standards in our society are declining and even ten years ago dairy farmers would have thought that this was a completely illicit relationship, because the supposed enemy of the dairying industry over many years has been the margarine manufacturers. It has been detrimental to the dairying industry that its attention has been focussed so much on the supposed enemy instead of concentrating on diversity of production and expansion of new markets.

I think I heard something from the fringe about a national party, or perhaps the Kingaroy national party, which has gained effective electoral results with only 27 per cent of the vote and has been able to dominate the whole country. This is the sort of thing that honorable members will have to watch carefully. It has been indicated that the proposed dairy blend will contain up to 25 per cent of margarine.

Mr. McDonald has brought to light once again the dangers that can accrue from domination by a minority. One will have to be careful that the manufacturers of the dairy blend do not claim the product to be margarine when in fact it contains 75 per cent of butter. This sort of principle can be applied in many ways. One matter for concern is that the Bill does not specify the proportions of butter and margarine, only that they will be prescribed by regulation. It has been suggested that the proportion of margarine should be between 15 and 25 per cent.

The dairying industry has been backward in its marketing for too long. Vegetable oil has been produced by forward-looking people and undoubtedly a large quantity of vegetable oil is now being produced in Australia. The advantages of the blended product will be spread over two types of farmers, those who produce the milk and those who produce the vegetable oil. The relationship may result in reducing the antagonism that has existed between the two industries.

Other industries have come to realize the value of a proper relationship and how it can be advantageous to the industry. The wool industry in particular has now accepted blending with other materials and this has been in no way detrimental to the purity of its product. The wool industry can still retain its purity in association with other fibres, which some may regard as being of lesser quality. The Bill represents a tremendous step forward when one recognizes the attitude which has characterized the dairying industry in Australia for so long.

It is important to Australian producers that Australian produced vegetable oils are used in the blended product. The Labor Party would like to see a guarantee to this effect. Admittedly at times it may be difficult, but it should be possible to

obtain sufficient quantities of Australian produced oils. At the moment, the blend is in the experimental stages and it is only an assumption that the product will become popular.

No longer can it be assumed that the product will be manufactured more cheaply than butter, which is contrary to the views expressed some years ago by those who advocated the manufacture of this sort of product and who expected that it may have been possible to produce a blend at a cheaper price which some of the less wealthy nations could have afforded to pay and that this would have assisted in disposing of Australia's butter surplus which it has at certain times and which it will probably have again. It is not particularly relevant now because vegetable oils are selling in Australia at the highest price ever.

The dairy blend will not be a competitor in price with the butter industry. The product will be more readily spreadable, more attractive to some and in this way it may be possible to increase the consumption of butter and thus reverse the downward trend in butter consumption.

I regard the other provisions of the Bill as machinery matters and little objection can be taken to them. The Labor Party regrets that the Bill makes provision for the actual composition of the product to be determined by regulation. There is not a tremendous amount specified on the composition of the product and the Labor Party trusts it will be a development which will be to the advantage of Australian products and the consuming public.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) : Members of the Country Party support the amendment to the Milk and Dairy Supervision Act because it is a forward step and will put into effect agreement reached by the Australian Agricultural Council. As the Minister for Social Welfare outlined in his explanatory remarks—Mr. Kent also referred to this point—it will authorize the production of a blend of butter with edible oils. In doing so, it will combine some advantages of butter with certain advantages of the other products used. In particular, it will retain the attractive flavour of butter and bring about what might be termed an increase in the spreadability of the blend.

Clause 2 provides a definition of dairy blend. It also contains other provisions, one of the most important of which is the provision to provide for the keeping of records. Also production of the new blend will be permitted only in factories licensed for this purpose.

Clause 4 relates to the changes in the power of the Minister of Agriculture to refuse licenses to a factory for certain purposes. The Country Party supports this change. Most of the other amendments and changes are of a legal nature and are also supported by the Country Party. Clause 9 removes the responsibility of members of the Police Force to be involved in the policing of this Act. This is in line with the generally accepted attitude that members of the Police Force should not be involved in extra duties unless there is no alternative available.

Clause 8 proposes a further amendment with which I shall deal in detail in Committee. This relates to the proposal that more control will be exercised over contaminated substances in dairy products, and in particular the Minister for Social Welfare referred to the need to control the use of antibiotics and other chemicals. It appears that there may be a deficiency or a defect in this clause and I shall refer to it at a later stage.

In another place, members of the Country Party put forward an amendment that the maximum percentage of milk fat and the minimum percentage of edible vegetable oil should be defined in the Bill. The

Country Party is still of the same opinion, that the Bill should define in clear terms that in the manufacture of dairy blend there shall be a 75 per cent to 25 per cent advantage in favour of milk fat. The Country Party does not intend to go to the extent of moving a similar amendment in the House, but again puts to the Minister for Social Welfare the point of view that this percentage should have been prescribed in the measure. It can still be done, if the Minister for Social Welfare so desires, and the percentage of edible oil can be limited to a maximum of 25 per cent.

Mr. Kent, by his remarks, indicated that he is wearing his rose-tinted glasses tonight because he advanced the proposition that this Bill would have the magical effect of overcoming some of the differences of opinion between the dairy industry and the margarine industry. It may be appropriate to make some comment on this controversy which has been raging for a number of years. In fact legislation dealing with this subject has been debated on a number of occasions.

I bring to the notice of members of the House an excellent article contained in the journal of the Australian Consumers Association, volume 15, number 9, in September, 1974. It is a journal called *Choice* which can be considered a reasonably reliable and unbiased source of information. On page 287 there is an informative article headed "Butter versus Margarine". I commend to honorable members a study of this article because amongst other things it outlines in clear terms what is meant by the term "polyunsaturated". I venture to suggest that not one person in every 100 who gets involved in this controversy actually knows what the term "polyunsaturated" means? I do not intend to go into it in any detail, but I assure honorable members that the article is worth reading on that score alone. However, the most interesting aspect of the article to which I shall refer is that it brings out some of the weaknesses of the publicity of margarine manufacturers. It also brings out the fact that the Australian Consumers Association considers that the advertising techniques used by the manufacturers of margarine are, to say the least, misleading. The article states, *inter alia*—

> Their advertisements are often unduly emotional and misleading.
>
> Many advertisements imply that everybody should use polyunsaturated margarine. High blood cholesterol levels are an important factor in the development of heart disease, and many Australians have a dangerous amount of cholesterol in their blood stream. But the best way to tell if a particular person is suffering from this condition is to test a sample of his blood.
>
> Before prescribing polyunsaturated margarine for yourself, you should see your doctor for a blood test.

The article then goes on to specify or define the levels of cholesterol which should be considered as the maximum and claims, *inter alia*—

> If the blood test shows that your cholesterol and triglyceride levels are well below the recommended maximums, then you can eat butter and other saturated fats to your heart's content.

The advertising campaign of the manufacturers of magarine tends to indicate that all edible margarine products consist entirely of polyunsaturated fats. This is certainly not correct. In my research I examined Statutory Rule No. 422 issued under the Health Act 1958. This refers to the Food and Drug Standards (Amendment) Regulations 1974. On page 12 there is reference to regulation number 13 of the principal regulations, clause 5 of which provides, *inter alia*—

> (5) Polyunsaturated margarine is table margarine in which the total fatty acids present contain not less than 40 per cent of cis-methylene interrupted polyunsaturated fatty acids and not more than 20 per cent of saturated fatty acids.

That is an important distinction because it means that the polyunsaturated margarine about which we read advertisements does not contain 100 per cent polyunsaturated fatty

acids. That is a point on which many others and I would disagree with the margarine manufacturers because the percentage of polyunsaturated fats is far less than most of us would be led to believe. There are one or two other points on this issue, but I have already shown that in many cases the advertisements of the margarine manufacturers are blatantly dishonest and misleading.

Those who are unfortunate enough to have a high cholesterol level diagnosed certainly find that it is appropriate for medical practitioners to suggest a diet which contains a high proportion of polyunsaturated fat. However, it is worth pointing out that new techniques in the dairy industry, particularly in the production of butter and cheese, have produced dairy products in which the proportion of polyunsaturated fats is almost as high, or just as high as in margarine compounds or products. Certainly it is not available on a commercial basis at present but in the not-too-distant future the position will be reached when those persons who are afflicted with a high cholestrol level will be able to rectify the position by using a diet of dairy products which have been produced with a high level of polyunsaturated fats.

The medical evidence on the effect of polyunsaturated acids on health is by no means definitely conclusive. One can read through the scientific and medical journals and find arguments on both sides. One of the most independent investigations was undertaken in New Zealand by the Royal Society. Most honorable members would realize that the Royal Society in each Commonwealth country is a reputable and most respected society. In New Zealand after carrying out an investigation at the request of the Minister of Science, the Royal Society concluded that the present knowledge did not justify any major changes in dietary habits or a reduction in the incidence of coronary disease. In time, we may have definite and conclusive medical evidence on one side or the other. We have not reached that position yet.

Mr. Kent made some interesting political comments. I am not certain whether they were related to the Bill, but I emphasize that the margarine question has some important political implications. Earlier this year the Federal Government put forward a proposition that margarine quotas would be phased out by 1976. In August, at a meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council, the South Australian Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Casey, dropped a bombshell when he made the dramatic statement that South Australia would withdraw from any agreement relating to quotas. This will have a drastic effect on the dairying and margarine industries. It surprised me that the Labor Party would take this action in South Australia because the end result will be that the production of table margarine will certainly be concentrated in the hands of one multi-national company. I should have thought this would be the last thing the Labor Party would want, because almost every day in the press one reads of the Labor Party's attitude and criticism of multi-national corporations.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: It has changed a bit lately.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: The Minister is right. There have been some notable and dramatic changes in the Labor Party's policy.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! Multi-national corporations do not come within the ambit of the Bill.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I believe the effect of the decision by the South Australian Government to vacate the field of agreements on the margarine quotas makes the matter

relevant. One might speculate on whether this is a pay-off for the fact that the manufacturers of margarine might have contributed to the Australian Labor Party funds before the last Federal election.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: That is not nice.

The Hon. D. E. KENT: The honorable member is speaking from personal experience; that is his problem.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: The Labor Party has often thrown a similar accusation at the Country Party.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! That subject does not come within the scope of the debate. If the honorable member adheres to the Bill, he will complete his remarks more quickly.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I accept your advice, Mr. President. Mr. Kent referred to the fact that the proposed legislation will have a bearing on the Australian oil seed industry. This is true, but it will not have the impact that the honorable member and others may believe. I make that comment because at present Australia is still importing significant amounts of oil seeds and vegetable oils from other countries. In 1973-74 Australia imported 65,000 tons of oil seed, and approximately 39,000 tons of edible oil. Although oil seeds enjoy a substantial tariff protection, it will be some time before the Australian oil seed industry can produce a similar amount of oil seeds and edible oils and remove the need for these importations.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: That is because there is no future for their production here. They are not given any encouragement.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: It is not for me to provide that encouragement. The Government in Canberra should be doing a host of things to encourage them. The Bill gives authority for this blend of edible oils and butter to be produced in Victoria. The provisions outlined in the Bill are satisfactory, although members of the Country Party would have preferred this limitation of 25 per cent to be placed on the maximum percentage of edible oil. Overall the objectives of the proposed legislation are sound and will certainly benefit the producers of dairy products, the producers of oil seeds and the consumer. I shall refer to clause 8 at the Committee stage.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Western Province): One of the problems of dealing with margarine and butter is that the rather indefinite virtues of butter have been forgotten by many people. When people refer to net calories or food values, they tend to forget the many minor properties of a live product such as butter, which contains antibodies and valuable materials which do not represent food value but value to the consumer. In the past many people associated with dairying, milking cows and handling cattle were immune from smallpox because of the antibodies contained in milk, and people associated with cows obtained this degree of immunity from cow pox. Admittedly, this is somewhat irrelevant today when smallpox is under control by innoculation. However, many diseases and disabilities from which human beings suffer are alleviated or people are given a degree of immunity through cows' milk and butter. Therefore, any discussion on the relative values of milk and butter compared with margarine as a food product should not completely ignore this valuable side product which comes from eating butter or dairy produce.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (No. 6317. Dairy blend. S. 4).

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The debate on the Bill has been fairly wide ranging. It has involved criticisms of the advertising of the margarine interests and has included some forays into the political implications of the dairying and margarine industries. I do not wish to tread into these areas, nor do I wish to follow a man with the academic background of Mr. McDonald in the field of chemistry and physics in discussing the chemical properties of polyunsaturated and polysaturated fats, and so on, and the physical properties of a body with high cholesterol levels. The fact that the honorable member did not understand the subject inhibits me more than anything else!

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

Clause 7 was verbally amended, and, as amended, was adopted.

Clause 8 (Contaminated substances).

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): I move—

Clause 8, lines 9-11, omit "greater than any tolerance that may be prescribed" and insert "in an amount greater than the tolerance that may be prescribed for that substance".

The clause seeks to amend section 82 of the principal Act, which is a prohibition on the sale or storage for sale of milk under a variety of circumstances when it is considered that it should not be sold. There are several sub-sections in section 82 which prohibit the milk that is affected in some way from being sold or stored for sale. In his explanatory speech, the Minister indicated that the purpose of the amendment contained in the clause was to give some control over the use of antibiotics and undesirable chemicals in the dairying industry. There is sound reason for this. Some of the cheese manufacturing companies in my electorate have had difficulty with their cheese starters because of the presence of antibiotics. The Country Party accepts the concept implicit in the amendment to section 82 but my objection is technical. Clause 8 (*a*) does not mean anything. My amendment endeavours to make it clear that if a contaminated substance is present in an amount or concentration that is more than a tolerance that has been already prescribed, the dairy product cannot be sold. Clause 8 (*a*) states—

After paragraph (*b*) of section 82 there shall be inserted the following paragraph:—

"(*ba*) any dairy produce which contains any prescribed contaminating substance greater than any tolerance that may be prescribed".

That provision is meaningless because it should in some way relate to the amount or concentration of the contaminating substance.

By interjection a moment ago Mr. Gleeson said that he would take me to task about the drafting of my amendment. I agree with him because I raised the same point with the legal experts. If a person with a knowledge of science or chemistry were permitted to draft the amendment he would do so more explicitly. Parliamentarians are at the mercy of legal experts, and that is the way in which the amendment has been drawn.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Western Province): The amendment does not fully achieve the correction of what is a poor effort at trying to say something.

In the dictionary the term "to tolerate" is defined as an active verb, and tolerance is a particular use of the derivative of a verb in the engineering field to point to a plus or minus variation from the ideal that is acceptable. However, it does not mean anything as used in the proposed amendment, because one is speaking in engineering terms about a substance of which, if one wanted to be ideal, there would be none. In effect, what it says is that a certain amount of a substance in the

butter or milk content will be admitted or tolerated. Mr. McDonald's amendment uses the expression " in an amount greater than the tolerance ". That really means an amount greater than the amount allowable, not the tolerance, because tolerance is an arbitrary expression.

I shall not move a further amendment because the whole clause would have to be redrafted. Most people would understand what is meant, but I deplore the misuse of English in an endeavour to solve a simple problem. The provision simply means that a certain amount of the substance will be allowed in the food according to the rules.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare) : One needs to relate the term " substance " to the term " tolerance " in a way which is not specified in the amendment. The regulation apparently intends to use the word " tolerance " in a different sense from that which Mr. Gleeson has described as an engineering or physical term, to describe variations above and below a certain mean.

Although the amendment proposed by Mr. McDonald will not entirely satisfy those who look for perfection in English, it may satisfy them when they examine the way in which the word " tolerance " is used in the regulations. I hope the legal fraternity will be able to sort that out. I accept the amendment.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) : I am pleased that the Minister has accepted the amendment. I omitted to say that previously I discussed it with Parliamentary Counsel and the department, and they agreed with me. The reason I raised the matter is that I am certain that any prosecution based on the wording of clause 8 (*a*) would not stand up in court. Although it may not be an important matter, it must always be ensured that legislation is as effective as it can be made, particularly in a case such as this where it may be subject to court action.

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

The Bill was reported to the House with amendments, and passed through its remaining stages.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 3) on the motion of the Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister for Social Welfare) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province) : Although the motion for the adjournment of the debate on this Bill was moved by Mr. Kent, I will be leading the debate for the Opposition because we were not sure whether Mr. Kent would be able to be present in the House tonight. Mr. Kent will make a further contribution to the debate if necessary.

The Bill is a complementary measure relating to the marketing of wheat and the stabilization of the wheat industry. The present five-year agreement has concluded and a new agreement has been arranged between the States and the Australian Government. A new principle has been introduced, whereby the stabilization price replaces the guaranteed price.

In the 1930s and 1940s I was involved in fighting for wheat stabilization. At that time the farmers would have been satisfied with equalization. It meant that when the price exceeded a certain amount, the amount by which it exceeded the cost of production, plus a reasonable amount for profit, would be paid into a fund from which money would be paid to the growers when the price fell below the cost of production.

The late Mr. Scully, the then Federal Minister for Commerce, suggested that the growers work on a

price of 4 shillings as the cost of production. He suggested that they include a marginal profit, so the first price was based on the equivalent of 43 cents.

The fair average quality is now being replaced by the Australian standard white; this is a new method of grading wheat. Top quality, general purpose and other qualities will be covered in the gradings. The scheme will still cover 200 million bushels as a maximum amount. No party can argue against that because no Government—after 23 years of Liberal-Country Party Government—would guarantee beyond a maximum amount, because Australia's potential was to produce more than that amount and it may have embarrassed the Government if prices collapsed.

The contribution to the stabilization fund will be fixed on a new formula, and when the stabilization price moves one-third of the difference up or down in terms of the formula, the amount shall be added to or deducted from the stabilization fund. The fund, which operated when the export price was more than five cents over the guaranteed price, is standing in credit at roughly $45 million. At the conclusion of this year's marketing it is claimed by representatives of some wheat organizations that it could amount to as much as $70 million or $80 million. The Government should not have to contribute when prices are high.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: But over the whole term it might pay out only $30 million a year.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: That could be so. All parties support the measure because it is complementary legislation and everyone is agreed on continuing stabilization.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: We are forced into it.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: When the Labor Party was elected in 1972, the first advance was only $1.10 a bushel, but my party increased it to $1.20.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: It is only a loan from the Reserve Bank of Australia and growers pay interest, so the Government did not give us anything.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: That might be true. I have seen wheat grown under the same conditions as Mr. Dunn is attempting to grow it, carted to the Ouyen railway station and sold on the open market for one shilling and eight pence a bushel. It could not be grown at that price. Those were the days when everybody agreed that stabilization ought to be introduced. At that time farmers said that if they could average 35 cents a bushel they would be millionaires. Today the Opposition and the Country Party in the Federal sphere talk about a first advance of $1.50 a bushel. The first advance is only a first payment; there are final payments, and the pool is eventually wound up. The first advance was lifted from $1.10 to $1.20, and it will be raised to $1.50. Possibly for the 1975-76 wheat crop it could rise to $1.75. What Mr. Dunn says is true; the Government may not have to provide any money associated with those five years. If it does not, that will be a good thing for the wheat industry. I hope the Government never has to provide finance, but in my time in the country I saw farmers reduced to slave conditions. I should hate to see them return to such conditions if the price of wheat drops. That is why I am so keen on stabilization.

The Bill will give greater powers to the Australian Wheat Board to make inspections on farms. There is a problem with weevils in wheat. I hope the day may come when there will be one grain authority because at present there are a lot of weevils in oats and when the same trucks handle both oats and wheat the

weevils spread to the wheat. There will also be greater powers of access to farms and to farmers' books to see what action is being taken to control weevils. This will be an advantage.

An attempt has been made to control the blackmarketing of wheat. When a first advance is made, perhaps of $1.20 a bushel, it is not unusual for certain people to offer farmers $1.60 to $1.80 in the paddock and to pick it up. Under section 92 of the Constitution no action can be taken if the wheat is taken interstate. This legislation is complementary and has been agreed to by the States and the Commonwealth; therefore, sections 10, 11 and 12 of the Bill will effectively control the blackmarketing of wheat.

I lived with wheat farmers for a number of years; in fact, when I went to school my family lived on a wheat farm. If a farmer is short of liquid funds and he is offered $1.60 or $1.80 a bushel when the first advance is only $1.10, there is a tendency to accept the offer. Orderly marketing can be effective only if all the farmers are in it and there is no breaking away from the system.

Clause 8 of the Bill provides that the Commonwealth Minister may give directions to the board concerning the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers, and the board shall comply with those directions. Ministerial direction in this regard has been used on few occasions. I was associated with the Labor Party when the New Zealand wheat agreement was signed. Government to Government agreements may be advantageous in certain circumstances. The Government may sell wheat to another country below the price fixed by the board because of the advantage to be gained in obtaining goods from that other country.

In 1943 a severe drought was experienced, particularly in Queensland and New South Wales, and thousands of cattle died. Because Australia was involved in a war and needed military boots, leather was an essential commodity. It could be obtained from New Zealand more cheaply than from elsewhere. Australia could obtain leather from New Zealand at a reasonable price provided that that country obtained our wheat at a reasonable price. Therefore, the New Zealand wheat agreement was signed, and the price agreed to was approximately 52 cents a bushel. Australia sold New Zealand wheat at the home consumption price and obtained leather from New Zealand at its home consumption price. It is essential that in Government to Government agreements the Minister should have authority to step in.

A later example occurred in relation to the sale of wheat to Egypt, but I am not aware of the details. That was negotiated by a Liberal–Country Party Government. Another instance in which the Minister exercised his authority, or tried to do so, concerned the sale of wheat to the Government of India. That Government wanted to buy wheat from Australia in about 1948 when the world parity price was about $1.85 a bushel; it was prepared to pay only $1.70 or $1.75 a bushel. The country was facing a famine. I was present at some of the negotiations and asked one of the Indian delegates what he deemed to be a famine. He replied that a famine means 3 million dead within fourteen days. That is a serious situation. The Minister at the time suggested to the Australian Wheat Board that it should sell wheat to the Indian Government. The board refused, and instead of exercising his discretion, the Minister accepted the board's recommendation. The Indian Government paid $1.85, but it immediately applied an export tariff on hemp with the result that Australia paid the additional 13 or 15 cents for hemp which was required for bags. I only mention that fact to illustrate that Ministerial direction is essential so that the Minister may

have control over Government to Government agreements in relation to the disposal of wheat.

I commend the Bill. The stabilization scheme, or the equalization scheme, if the Government cares to call it such, is good. It is not quite as generous to the farmer as the guaranteed price was under stabilization. In the war years there was some discussion about the found costs of production in the dairying industry and in the wheat industry. Honorable members would be astounded if they read some of the claims that were made about the costs associated with production. It was shown that in the dairying industry efficient farmers with 45 cows were earning more revenue than inefficient farmers with 134 cows. The same position applied in the wheat industry. Wheat can be grown in various areas, and, with subsidies, it can be produced in marginal areas which should not be growing wheat. All of these factors are taken into consideration in determining the found costs of production. I firmly believe that the present agreement is better than the previous one; it is on a sounder basis and will do more for farmers than they received under the old agreement. The Opposition therefore supports the Bill.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): This Bill is of paramount importance to the wheat industry of Australia, which is made up of 55,000 wheat growers and is Australia's largest single export earner at present—that is, from the sale of wheat as an individual item. I am pleased that Mr. Tripovich commented on the Bill and certainly supported the need for it. Anyone who has had anything to do with the wheat industry will support the principle of stabilization or equalization. Although from time to time members of the Country Party may be accused by various members of the Labor Party of bleating in this House, I believe our bleatings, if they can be called that, are justified when we are dealing with an industry that is of such importance to the economy of Australia. We are certainly prepared to continue to put forward the views of that industry without fear of abuse or comments that may be thrown at us.

The wheat industry is in a period of high prices and short supply. Perhaps the greatest difficulty confronting the wheat growers is whether they can grow sufficient wheat. As Mr. Kent would know from his long-gone association with the Wimmera-Mallee wheat areas, the wheat growers have to withstand fluctuations in income and in crop returns.

At present world wheat stocks are at their lowest level for twenty years, which is an alarming situation, because such a shortage of wheat and grain in stores puts the world in a difficult and dangerous position so far as its food supplies in general are concerned because grain is the basis of the world's food requirements. If one looks at the population and the food situation and considers that the world is resting on such a small quantity of wheat in store, one realizes that the position is alarming. Wheat production in Australia during the last financial year was 86 per cent above the production in 1972 but it was well below the 1968-69 record year of about 500 million bushels. Australian stocks of wheat have been drawn down progressively since 1968-69, and quotas have limited production. All sorts of statements could be made now and we could be wise in retrospect, but I do not intend to go into that aspect. Australian stocks are reduced to ·49 million tonnes, which is a small amount for Australia. Stocks of wheat held by the principal exporting countries such as the United States, Canada, the European Economic Community, Argentina and Australia have fallen to their lowest level for twenty years to 28 million

tonnes. That is the basic amount of wheat that these major exporting countries have.

This Bill is complementary to the measure introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament by the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture in the House of Representatives, Dr. Patterson, on 17th July this year. The Bill had a rather long history of negotiation and debate by the wheat industry. If I remember correctly, there was a stop-gap extension of the existing plan for another year so that this agreement could be decided upon and debated. While there are a few provisions in the Bill with which the Country Party disagrees, I point out that before it was introduced the measure was in a much different form. It was only through tough fighting with the Commonwealth Minister and the Commonwealth Government that perhaps some degree of reasonableness was achieved in the Wheat Stabilization Bill.

The Victorian Minister of Agriculture, Mr. I. W. Smith, undertook some of these discussions. Perhaps the basic point was that the Commonwealth was not prepared to back the scheme in any real money terms and the $80 million maximum cost of the scheme would be built up and allowed to phase down, and if it ran into deficit the amount would be met by the wheatgrowers themselves at the end of the term. At least now the Commonwealth Government has agreed that if the fund is in deficit at the end of the term of this agreement, the Commonwealth Government will stand the loss.

The Bill lays down the basis for stability, equalization or whatever it is called for the next five seasons, beginning with this season. To some degree it departs from the old Wheat Stabilization Act and it sets a price of $2 per bushel for the 1974-75 season which will be adjusted from season to season by the application of a formula. It is a complicated formula into which I do not wish to go in detail because it would only confuse the issue even further. That price of $2 will be the basis and adjustments will be made from there.

The stabilization fund which will back this movement either side of that $2 price will start with a credit balance of $48 million. When the average price of all exports of one season is above the stabilization price set for that season, growers will contribute up to 15 cents a bushel to the stabilization fund. The maximum amount which they will be required to contribute in any one year is $30 million.

Once the fund is built up to $80 million there will be no further need for payments to be made into it and the excess will be refunded to growers. When the price of an export season is below the stabilization price of $2, growers will receive payments from the fund up to 15 cents a bushel, up to a maximum of $30 million a year unless the fund runs down below the amount required to make payments from it and then the Government will contribute to the fund. At the end of the plan, if there is an amount outstanding the Government will cover it.

This is a major breakthrough because initially the Federal Government did not intend to have a bar of that commitment. As I said by interjection when Mr. Tripovich was speaking, there appears to be little danger of the Commonwealth Government being called upon to contribute anything and I think the average wheat grower, if possible, is prepared to stand on his own as much as he can. However, it must be remembered that few other industries in Australia stand completely on their own economically, compete on the export market in a completely individual way or compete on the home market without some degree of protection.

The stabilization fund will have $48 million in it for a start, and this year wheat growers will contribute at least another $30 million because the price of wheat is high, which will take the stabilization fund almost up to

its maximum level of $80 million and that should almost provide sufficient funds to meet any needs for pay outs in perhaps the next three or four years of the plan.

I am glad Mr. Gross is in the House tonight because I know his connection with the wheat industry. I was amazed that under this Bill the setting of the home consumption price is arrived at by the Minister representing the Commonwealth of Australia after consultation with the various State Ministers. I thought the Commonwealth Minister would announce any adjustment in the home consumption price but in the *Wimmera Mail-Times* on Friday, 29th November, the following appeared—

> Farmers will get more for wheat. Mr. Ken Gross, MLC and Mr. Jim McCabe, MLA announced the rise from Melbourne last night after talks with the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Smith. Their joint statement said: Good news for the wheat industry—

That certainly got front page cover in the *Wimmera Mail-Times* but according to this Bill it is the Minister of the Commonwealth Parliament who announces the fact. At that time I do not believe the Commonwealth Minister did announce it. I do not know how it ran back down through the Minister of Agriculture in Victoria to Mr. McCabe and Mr. Gross to get into the Friday issue of the *Wimmera Mail-Times* as the No. 1 lead story. Frankly, I do not think I would have announced it if I had heard that information because under the Bill it is the Federal Minister's responsibility to announce this price and I would say it is not within the responsibility of the State Ministers to do so until the Commonwealth Minister has made his decision and notified the people accordingly.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: When did the Minister make that announcement?

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: That is the question I asked. I certainly did not see any indication from Senator Wriedt prior to that statement in the *Wimmera Mail-Times*.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: The Victorian Minister must be playing in Senator Wriedt's team.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Somewhere along the line the information got back down through. It surprised me because I had been studying this Bill which states that it is the Commonwealth Minister's responsibility. Perhaps that is something that honorable members will have to watch in the future; I hope there has not been a breach of ethics, if there are any in this business, or of a trust of any kind in this announcement being made.

The price has been increased by 33·5 cents a bushel, according to my information, to $2.27 a bushel for home consumption and this is to apply from 1st December. That is a fair rise when one considers what wheat is bringing on overseas markets. Even at that price the Australian wheat grower is making a massive contribution to the consumers of Australia. This year the wheat growers will be subsidizing the consumer by approximately $107 million by selling wheat in Australia at a price far below what could be obtained on the overseas market on ruling prices. I hope Mr. Tripovich and any other critic of the support that is provided for farmers will acknowledge that in this case the farmer is actually providing support for the Australian community.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: It was nothing to the support that he used to provide for the wheat markets when wheat was sold on an open market.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Mr. Tripovich is going back to the dark ages.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: Would Mr. Dunn have it back on the open market altogether?

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I think it could be well established that the wheat grower has made a contribution over the years to the Australian public. This Bill adjusts the definition

of top quality wheat from fair average quality or f.a.q., as it is commonly known to Australian standard white, which is a new definition. Mr. Kent said we have heard all about that. I should like to ask the honorable member to rise and give an outline of the actual limits per pound of that wheat and the amount of unmillable materials which it is supposed to contain—foreign seed and so on.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Order! I think Mr. Kent could take Mr. Dunn into a corner outside the Chamber and give him that information.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I was going to pass on the information here and now for Mr. Kent, to save any discussions between us outside the House. Australian standard white will have to have a test weight of at least 59·3 lb. an imperial bushel. It must have a moisture limit of not higher than 12 per cent. In these days the requirements on delivery of wheat are stringent and each load is tested with a moisture meter. Wheat will not be accepted when the moisture level rises above the set level. It can contain only a reasonable quantity of white heads, chaff, straw and so forth. White heads are really unthreshed grain still in the shell. Wheat can contain only up to 1 per cent of small foreign seeds, such as barley, oats, spear grass, rye, lucerne, curl and so on and it can contain only up to 5 per cent of screenings. I wanted to get that right for Mr. Kent's information. I am referring to top quality wheat.

General purpose wheat must weigh between 59·3 lb. and 57·7 lb. per bushel. From then on dockage is incurred for a decline in weight or an increase in the maximum weight allowable in foreign seeds, whiteheads, screenings and so on, but generally wheat growers would agree that the standard of wheat must be improved if the number of markets in which they sell is to be maintained and increased.

Clause 13 provides power for the Government to direct sales. The Commonwealth Government has sought this power over the Australian Wheat Board to direct sales and conditions of wheat even if the board does not agree with it. However, clause 13 provides that in such cases the Commonwealth Government will have to bear the full risk of non-payment. That is reasonable. If the Commonwealth Government wishes to make wheat available to a country perhaps on extended terms or on terms which are a little shaky, it could do so but the wheat grower should not be expected to carry the loss if the country to which the wheat is sold does not make the payments when they are supposed to be made.

We have recently learned that wheat quotas will be dispensed with from the next season, 1975-76, although legislative machinery will be retained in case they are needed again. This resulted from a decision made by the Wheatgrowers Federation in August. A couple of weeks ago I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture on what would happen in Victoria. The reply was that the Minister was seeking, from the Grains Division of the Victorian Farmers Union, an indication of what it wanted on the quota legislation. I shall not debate that tonight but it is obvious that a hard look must be taken at the quota system. If it is lifted for next season, the position of growers who do not have quotas but who wish to deliver wheat must be considered. At present, they cannot deliver wheat unless they buy or lease a quota.

Clause 24 of the Bill replaces a provision in the existing Wheat Industry Stablization Act which requires the consent of the occupier of any premises for an inspection of a property and also confines the inspection to a reasonable time. The clause will allow any person authorized by the Wheat Board to enter premises at any time for inspection or search, or to make extracts from

or copies of books, documents, or papers. It will allow an authorized person to take possession of or remove any wheat and make any inquiry he considers necessary about wheat on the property. It provides that the owners shall not in any way obstruct or hinder the inspector or fail to produce account books and so on, or make any false or misleading statements in relation to an inquiry.

This gives the Australian Wheat Board wide powers. There is no need for a warrant. An inspector can enter a property at any time of the day or night and demand to inspect sheds, books, documents, and so on. The purpose of the clause is to stamp out black-marketing of wheat. I do not know if a prosecution would succeed in a court but the clause will be enough to scare people who trade in wheat outside the Wheat Board. However, it departs from what I thought was a common principle of law, that a warrant was needed before people could enter a property to make an inspection.

Previously, inspectors could enter properties, at a reasonable time. That could be taken to mean during daylight hours. If that provision was retained, an inspector could tell an occupier not to ship any wheat during daylight hours because the inspector could take action but that, at night, he could do what he liked because the inspector would have no authority.

The Commonwealth Act does not go as far as the provision in this Bill. It provides for a more restricted entry onto properties. It provides that an authorized person, who would be a Commonwealth police officer or a member of the Police Force of a State or Territory, may make application to a justice of the peace for an order to enter a property. Apparently the provision in clause 24 has been requested by the Grains Division of the Victorian Farmers Union. If it helps to stamp out trading in wheat outside the board, the Country Party must support it.

We have already been told that farmers in the Wimmera and Mallee areas have been negotiating with merchants to sell wheat on the property for cash at about $1, $1.50 or $1.70 a bushel. Those prices may be attractive when the outlandish rail freights which must be paid in Victoria are taken into consideration—22 cents a bushel from Warracknabeal. Despite what Mr. Gross suggests, the freight could not be any higher in other States.

The first advance payment on wheat was $1.10 from either the late 1950s or the early 1960s. The Commonwealth Government big-heartedly raised the advance by 10 cents a bushel. I have pointed out to Mr. Tripovich that this is not of great significance because the money is a loan from the Reserve Bank to the wheat industry on which the growers pay interest. The Commonwealth Government has recently increased Reserve Bank interest rates by 2 per cent. This will significantly add to the interest paid by wheat growers and will offset much of any advantage coming from the increased first advance. When the wheat is sold overseas and the money comes in, the Reserve Bank will be paid its $1.20 a bushel, plus interest, and from then the wheat growers will have some return sifting back to them.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: There is nothing new about that. The Fadden Government worked on the same principle.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I do not think that the interest rate was the same. The point is that no great contribution is made by the Federal Government.

Mr. Gross said that the price offered for wheat on properties is not high enough, but it would be attractive to a farmer who wanted cash in hand. He might be able to

obtain $1.70 a bushel for the wheat on his property. If he delivered the wheat to a silo, after deducting 20 cents a bushel for freight, he would receive only $1 a bushel on the first advance. Of course, he would have to cart the wheat to the silo, too. So at that price, he would immediately have an extra 70 cents or 75 cents a bushel.

Eventually, he would receive probably $1 a bushel less than those who sold to the Wheat Board in the normal way, but I can understand people being so hard pressed for cash that they would take such a price on a property. There is a need to increase the first advance substantially. The Federal Minister for Agriculture, Senator Wriedt, announced that the first advance would be increased to $1.50 for the next season. Many wheat growers thought he meant this season, but he was referring to the 1975-76 season. The wheat industry asked for $1.80 a bushel but that request was not acceded to. A higher first advance should have been introduced this season, particularly to combat the amount of trading in wheat outside the board.

In its 1971-72 report, the Wheat Board points out that when it finalized the pool for 1968-69 the interest paid to the Reserve Bank amounted to $26·6 million. That averaged 5 cents on every bushel of wheat delivered. Wheat growers have cash owing to them from pools not wound up. This goes back to the time when wheat was sold on extended credit because of the limited market throughout the world. Mr. Cass, the Wheat Board chairman, pointed out that growers were owed $718 million for wheat held in pools.

Wheat farmers receive no interest on that money and they cannot raise loans on it from banks because banks will not lend money on wheat outstanding in pools. Many farmers borrowed at high overdraft rates to meet their expenses although thousands of dollars were owing to them. Admittedly, under the pool system, that must be accepted to some degree, but delays in the payment of the second advance on last year's wheat were caused by shipping problems and industrial action which resulted in a strike of more than five weeks. The wheat growers were relying on the payments which were held up.

Growers are still awaiting final payment of 7 cents a bushel from the 1970-71 season. It is expected that they will receive that payment in April. They are waiting for a payment of 10·5 cents a bushel for the 1971-72 season; 10·7 cents for 1972-73; and 116·6 cents for the 1973-74 season.

All the wheat growers in Australia are concerned with this Bill and complementary measures. Unfortunately, many decisions being taken on the wheat industry are doing it more harm than good. It is just good luck for the Federal Government that the wheat market around the world is buoyant.

One of the greatest worries in the wheat industry at present is weevil infestation. I asked Mr. Kent earlier if he could tell the House about the breeding habits of weevils. The weevil will not survive at a temperature under 50 degrees.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT: The wheat should be left out for a while.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: That is called aeration. The position is that weevils will not survive under 50 degrees and will not multiply under 65 degrees.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: They have to use the rhythm method.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Mr. Dunn should ignore the interjection.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I was going to comment on it and relate similarities between Mr. Elliot's comment and aeration, but I shall not do so. For growth and development

the ideal temperature is 80 or 90 degrees Fahrenheit. It would be enlightening to spend some time in this House talking about the problem of 55,000 wheat growers. Honorable members sit in this House day after day and get involved in debates on adjournment motions.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: A debate is supposed to have some content.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I look on it as enlightenment; if some of Mr. Galbally's colleagues in Canberra could only be enlightened, the wheat growers would be in a better position. Perhaps some of the State members could be co-opted into having a look around the wheat-growing areas.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Would Mr. Dunn put me up at his place for a day or two?

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Yes, provided that there was no politics.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: If Mr. Dunn tells us what he is trying to say we will be more understanding.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: The wheat industry's position might not sound bad but, as I said before, it is Australia's largest export earner. The weevil problem must be controlled. It should be realized by Mr. Galbally and other learned members of this House, that if there is only a small number of weevils in a shipload of wheat when it arrives at its overseas destination, the wheat can be rejected by the country concerned and the loss becomes a loss to the wheat growers.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: That is not fair.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I am not growling about that but it threatens our exports.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: There should not be weevils, least of all in this House.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Mr. Galbally gets his own way sometimes in this House, but the Country Party is going to have its way tonight. The Country Party will not be talked out of this Bill by Mr. Galbally or anybody else. Big storages are involved which are very costly, and this cannot be applied to various storages throughout the country. There is an urgent need to introduce technical research into weevil control in wheat. Perhaps the State Government could examine this. There is a continual need for more wheat varieties and improved wheat qualities, and attempts should be made to breed rust-resistant strains of wheat, and to produce chemicals and methods with which to control weevils.

Perhaps the Bill could go further in some ways, but at least it is a start. It could be termed a hard-fought piece of legislation. Wheat growers in Australia have been renowned to be a strong force when negotiating with Governments on wheat and they will continue to act with strength. The Country Party believes the wheat industry is of great importance to Australia and is making massive provision to the consumers of this nation, and also to the export earnings of the Government.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): The honorable member for Northern Province. I hesitate to make such a suggestion, but did the House know that Abraham Lincoln made his Gettysburg address in four and a half minutes flat?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): It does not greatly concern me whether Abraham Lincoln took four and a half minutes or four and a half hours for his famous address. Mr. Dunn has taken about 40 minutes and, to oblige Mr. Galbally, I shall take only 35 minutes. My colleague, Mr. Dunn, has quite capably and comprehensively outlined the measure before the House. I have read and studied the debate on a similar measure in this House on 27th November, 1968, when the late Sir Percy Byrnes was the Country Party spokesman on legislation of this type. His successor, Mr. Dunn, has just as capably put

forward the case for the wheat industry and the wheat grower as honorable members used to expect from the late Sir Percy Byrnes. Honorable members who have the time and inclination should study the debate on the Wheat Industry Stabilization Bill in 1968 and note how the attitude of the members of the Labor Party has changed. On that occasion the stabilization proposal included some changes. One was to vary the cost-of-production factor and another was to introduce a two-price, instead of a single-price, concept. Members of the Labor Party were strong and loud in their criticism of the proposed changes in the legislation and of the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Anthony. It is natural that when more drastic changes concerning growers are proposed in the stabilization scheme, the Labor Party should protect its Minister for Agriculture, Senator Wriedt.

Clause 19 refers to the methods by which the home consumption price shall be established. In recent days two significant decisions were made and announced. It has been announced that the home consumption price of wheat for this season will be $2·27 a bushel. In the press on Saturday there was an announcement that there would be a significant increase in the price of bread. A number of complaints and criticisms have been voiced about this.

Mr. Dunn referred briefly to the fact that the consumers of wheat in Australia, whether it be wheat for flour, for bread making or for any other purpose, this year will be subsidized by the growers to a greater extent than previously. This is a situation that the growers are prepared to accept in return for having the degree of stability in the industry. I concede to Mr. Tripovich that his party was the first political party in 1948 to bring about this kind of plan. I hope it will long continue.

The Country Party is occasionally criticized because producers in various industries are being subsidized in an unjustified manner. If one goes back through the years of the wheat stabilization plans from 1946-47 to the present, one sees that in the early years of the plan the Australian wheat growers made a significant contribution to the consumers of wheat in Australia. For example, in 1948-49, the loss to the wheat growers, because the home consumption price was lower than the world market price, was $42·72 million and in 1950-51 it was $60·45 million.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: Do not interrupt him.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I am interested in Mr. Galbally's interjection. On many occasions members of the Country Party have sat through the debates on terrible adjournment motions put forward by Mr. Galbally. One such motion last week was demolished successfully by the Minister for State Development and Decentralization and Mr. Swinburne. I am sorry if Mr. Galbally gets bored sitting through this debate on the wheat industry, but members of the Country Party are equally bored by some of his remarks. The state of his liver cannot be good after the passing of the redistribution Bill earlier tonight.

In the early years of the wheat stabilization plan, the grower made a significant contribution to the wheat consumers. Later, particularly in the 1960s and early 1970s, quite substantial contributions were made to the industry by the Australian Commonwealth Government. If the amounts lost or gained by the growers in each year were converted by using the percentage charge in the consumer price index, and they were brought to present-day monetary terms, it would be found that the wheat growers are still about $519 million behind.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Has Mr. McDonald ever thought what difference it would make if there was no stabilization?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: I am endeavouring to point out to the House that in the past 23 or 24 years the wheat grower has made a contribution amounting to about $519 million to the consumers of wheat in Australia. By interjection, Mr. Elliot asked what would have been the result if there was no stabilization plan. That is a valid question. The point I intended to make was that the wheat industry is quite prepared to make this contribution provided that in return, when the marketing situation changes, the Government is prepared to do what it has previously done and support the wheat industry. That is the essence of the stabilization plan and is what the Country Party would like to see continued.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Commencement).

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): I thank honorable members for one hour and ten minutes of agreement to the Bill.

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

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and the report was adopted.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): During the second-reading debate I omitted to mention the retirement of Mr. Cliff Everett, who has been the growers' representative on the Grain Elevators Board. I have been associated with Mr. Everett for more than 30 years and I am grateful for his friendship. I take this opportunity of paying a tribute to his contribution on behalf of the wheatgrowers of this State. He has been diligent and done everything that could be expected of a growers' representative and I pay this tribute to him on his retirement.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read a third time.

LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 5) on the motion of the Hon. F. J. Granter (Minister of Water Supply) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): The Bill proposes four or five amendments to the Land Act. Clause 2 is the most important provision because it will give the Minister wide powers of compulsory acquisition. Proposed section 22F provides—

(1) The Minister on the recommendation of the Minister for Conservation may purchase by agreement or compulsorily acquire for and on behalf of Her Majesty—

(*a*) any land which he considers should be reserved for any of the following purposes—

(i) the preservation of an area of ecological significance;

(ii) the conservation of an area of natural interest or beauty or of historical or scientific interest;

(iii) the preservation of species of native plants;

(iv) the preservation or management of wildlife or the preservation of wildlife habitat; or

(v) a national park; and

(*b*) any easement right or privilege over any land which he considers necessary or desirable for providing access to or for the development protection or improvement of any land reserved for any purpose specified in paragraph (*a*) or for any purpose similar thereto.

This section will give the Minister complete power to compulsorily acquire land for any one of those purposes mentioned. It is frightening to think how this power could be exercised. Honorable members have sufficient confidence in the present Minister and the present Government to know that it will not be misused

and that the right amount of discretion will be exercised; that the Minister will only compulsorily acquire land where it is absolutely necessary. However, the Bill will remain on the statute-book for some time and members of the Country Party hope that a future Minister or a future Government will not exercise the power irresponsibly and to the detriment of any person.

Compulsory acquisition is always a difficult decision because no one really likes compulsory acquisition of anything by the State. There are times when it is necessary and the Country Party can envisage occasions when it may be necessary to acquire land to protect wildlife or an area of great significance and so on, as set out in the section. Admittedly, the power of acquisition applies in other Acts and therefore it can be argued that there is no reason why it should not be included in the Land Act. Under the present Minister and the present Government, the Country Party believes the power will be used responsibly, but the opportunity will be there for it to be used in any way that any Minister feels fit. I should like to see some safeguard included but the difficulty is that sometimes safeguards can go too far and defeat the whole purpose of the legislation.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: What does Mr. Dunn suggest?

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I understand that two amendments have been foreshadowed and members of my party and I are prepared to examine them at the Committee stage. At the moment, the Country Party will not propose any amendments but will examine with interest those that have been foreshadowed.

When explaining the Bill, the Minister said that compulsory acquisition was used only as a final resort, but where there was danger of the extinction of any native bird or animal, or of the destruction of an area of natural beauty or historical significance, surely the Government should be able to acquire land to prevent such a catastrophe. The Country Party agrees with that need but at this stage I express some concern about the extensive powers being conferred on the Minister.

Clause 3 will allow the Minister to increase from $2.50 to an amount not exceeding $10 the fee for an apiary occupation right. Under clause 4, the Treasurer will be enabled to guarantee a loan to a sporting body which occupies an area of land leased from the Crown. It is proposed that the guarantee will apply only to loans in excess of $100,000. I cannot see anything wrong with that provision if it helps in providing sporting facilities on the land, and after all it will only be a guarantee by the Treasurer.

The Country Party has a close affinity with rural Victoria and recognizes the need to preserve areas for parkland and the need to conserve our wildlife which is so vital and important to the State. Only a week or so ago, I was in the Little Desert, which is well known to honorable members, and I was amazed to see the amount of wildlife there. The Country Party can see the need to protect some of these areas of natural beauty and significance. If it is to be done by compulsory acquisition, we trust that the present Government or any future Government will exercise the power responsibly.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (New s. 22F).

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): I thank Mr. Galbally, Mr. Hider and Mr. Dunn for their contributions to the second-reading debate. All honorable members appreciate Mr. Galbally's concern for conservation. Mr. Galbally has spoken on this subject in the House on several

occasions. Probably I appreciated his remarks more last week as he is a former Minister of Forests, and now I hold that portfolio. I remind Mr. Galbally that his photograph is still in the office of the Ministry of Forests and although he was younger looking in those days, the same characteristics are evident on his face today as they were then. The photograph has been set on a blackwood board and looks magnificent—Mr. Galbally must come over one day to see it.

Mr. Galbally referred to the tea-trees on the Mornington Peninsula and expressed a sentiment close to my heart, that these trees should not be destroyed. Mr. Galbally said that people drove in and out through the tea-tree scrub and destroyed the regrowth. It is a shame that in recent years some of these areas have been closed off in order that regrowth may take place. I spoke to officers of the Forests Commission who advised me that the tea-trees are regenerating in a number of areas and this has probably been brought about by the two wet seasons.

The area should be protected. I am not sure whether it is unique to this country but as I believe it is, the tea-tree areas should be preserved and although this action does not come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Forests, I shall certainly make suggestions to the Minister for Conservation, who I believe now controls this aspect.

The main argument in this Bill revolves around clause 2, which refers to the compulsory acquisition powers given to the Minister for Conservation. The authority which will be given to the Minister for Conservation will be very carefully guarded by him and will not be abused. I am sure no Minister of the Crown would abuse any power given to him and would carefully guard it.

I know that in the Ministry of Water Supply when on rare occasions I have an order for compulsory acquisition placed before me for decision for an area to be resumed for a small reservoir or a tank or an easement in order that a water supply might be rightly provided to an area, I question the officers very thoroughly to the best of my ability to make sure that every avenue has been explored before this final action is taken.

Mr. Galbally would be aware, that section 38 of the Forests Act provides for the acquisition of land for forestry purposes. Section 38 (2) (*a*) provides for the acquisition of land "for the due conservation and proper working of State forests and plantations". I asked the Chairman of the Forests Commission whether compulsory acquisition had taken place in recent years. I was advised that it had occurred only on rare occasions. When it had been impossible to negotiate, acquisition had occurred on three occasions; there was a fourth occasion when there was a title difficulty and a further occasion concerned a deceased's estate. Those transactions cover the period from 1966 up until 1973.

Mr. Galbally also referred to the purchase of land in the Dandenong Ranges during the period 1963 to 1974. An amount of $378,039 has been expended on repurchasing 557 acres plus approximately 250 lots in various subdivisions in the Dandenong Ranges. So, honorable members can see that the Government is purchasing land by agreement and this policy will continue. I hope there will not be a need for compulsory acquisition. However, the Minister for Conservation is firm that this provision is needed and I ask the Committee to accept it. I know that Mr. Galbally and Mr. Hider have circulated amendments.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province): I move—

Clause 2, page 1, lines 12-18, and page 2, lines 1-12, omit all the words and expressions on these lines and insert—

"22F. (1) Where the Minister on the recommendation of the Minister for Conservation considers that—

(*a*) any land should be reserved for any of the following purposes—

(i) the preservation of an area of ecological significance;

(ii) the conservation of an area of natural interest or beauty or of historical or scientific interest;

(iii) the preservation of species of native plants;

(iv) the preservation or management of wildlife or the preservation of wildlife habitat; or

(v) a national park; or

(*b*) any easement right or privilege over any land is necessary or desirable for providing access to or for the development protection or improvement of any land reserved for any purpose specified in paragraph (*a*) or for any purpose similar thereto—

he may certify under his hand to the Governor in Council that the land easement right or privilege concerned should be purchased or acquired for and on behalf of Her Majesty and the certificate shall specify the purpose for which the same is acquired.

(2) Where 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 30 days the Minister may for and on behalf of Her Majesty purchase by agreement or compulsorily acquire the land easement right or privilege to which the certificate relates."

I thank the Minister of Water Supply for the information that he has given the Committee. The late Sir Gilbert Chandler, who lived in the Dandenong Ranges most of his life, should receive most of the credit for the action of the Government in buying back so much land in the Dandenong Ranges.

The Labor Party believes the Government ought to have the power of compulsory acquisition. It would be unthinkable if areas of land, which were of ecological significance, should escape being retained and for this reason the Government ought to have power to compulsorily acquire the land. However, compulsory acquisition is a drastic step and the Labor Party believes it would be in the public interest if the proviso was included that the Minister of Forests should act on the recommendation of the Minister for Conservation so that two Ministers of the Crown would be involved. Further, the certificate of acquisition should lie on the table of Parliament for a period of three days.

If Parliament wanted to intervene, then the appropriate motion could be moved. With these areas of land possibly no inordinate speed is required so the delay of some 30 days would not interfere with the long-range purposes of the acquisition.

My amendment is moved for consideration by the Committee, and it would also be appropriate to refer to the proposed amendment to be moved by Mr. Hider. His amendment is to omit the word "considers" and to insert "is satisfied on reasonable grounds". This is further protection but the question it suggests to me is: Who is to be the judge of the reasonable grounds? The Minister merely certifies it, and in those circumstances the Labor Party prefers the amendment which I have moved to the amendment to be moved by Mr. Hider.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER (Monash Province): Perhaps it is appropriate for me to speak at this stage because I disagree with Mr. Galbally. I suggest that the amendment moved by Mr. Galbally simply adds delays to a procedure which may well need to be undertaken for urgent reasons thus requiring speed. In some circumstances the production of the certificate may have to await the sitting of Parliament, but even if the Parliament was sitting, a delay of 30 days could possibly lead to permanent and irreparable damage.

I suggest that the amendment moved by Mr. Galbally gives no protection in any event. He contends that if something is laid on the table of Parliament it can be debated. It does not necessarily mean that because the Minister for Conservation would not be compelled to accept anything even though the Legislative Council may have debated the proposition and decided to do something. I should have thought a Minister is very rarely persuaded by Parliamentary debate to change his mind. For those reasons I reject the amendment proposed by Mr. Galbally and prefer the amendment which I have moved.

The reason I have suggested my amendment which has been circulated is that it gives to the Minister for Conservation an indication and a direction that he must do something, namely, make his decision on reasonable grounds. It gives protection to the individual who, if faced with a Ministerial decision, has a remedy open to him, which is to satisfy a court that the Minister for Conservation has not decided on reasonable grounds. I believe the onus of proof should rest with the Minister for Conservation who would have to appear in court if challenged by an aggrieved citizen.

My amendment would allow the Minister for Conservation to act promptly but would also allow the citizen to have the decision reviewed in the court on the ground that the Minister for Conservation had perhaps not acted on reasonable grounds by not taking into account all the facts which a reasonable person should have taken into account. My amendment therefore protects the public and the individual citizen. It is an action which I would expect to be taken very rarely because there is expense involved. However, in many cases it is a matter of providing a remedy where one would normally not be available. For that reason I believe it does offer some protection and at the same time allows the Minister for Conservation to act diligently and in some cases with some urgency.

I might add that I do not believe any of the Ministers of the Crown have acted in other than a reasonable manner in the past. As Mr. Dunn indicated, no one knows what might happen in the future, and I believe as a matter of principle, where compulsory acquisition is involved one should not have to rely on the goodwill of the Minister but the protection should be written into the legislation.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): It seems to me the amendment moved by Mr. Hider does nothing more than to indulge in semantics, in determining how the Minister for Conversation can act as an individual. It is the Minister's judgment and rules cannot be defined for a man's judgment on the issue of acquisition. The amendment merely desires to place trust in the Minister for Conservation who should exercise his right to decide arbitrarily what he considers to be a proper case for acquisition. It is all right to have the Minister for Conservation satisfiied on reasonable grounds, but in subsequent dealings with the owners of the property it does not alter the situation that the land may be urgently required and should therefore be subjected to compulsory acquisition.

No one would disagree with the contention so often advanced by members of the Government that this place serves a wonderful function of reviewing decisions that have been made or taken in another place. Where legislation localizes the decision to one person, surely it is important to provide opportunities for judgment to be made on the individual consideration by adopting the propositions contained in the amendment moved by Mr. Galbally. It seems to me the Government is escaping the protection it so often espouses in this place, protection against hasty decisions or any decision at all, when decisions are made to take land. I cannot see how the amendment moved by Mr. Hider can be preferred to the amendment moved by Mr. Galbally.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province): I support the amendment that is to be moved by Mr. Hider for this reason and this reason alone. It provides a definite criterion by which the Minister's decision can be determined in the courts. Without the words proposed to be inserted by Mr. Hider's amendment, the Minister would be able to make whatever decision he wished, and it would not be possible to challenge it in the courts. If Mr. Hider's amendment is

carried, the Minister must have reasonable grounds to come to his conclusion, and that is something that can be challenged in the courts. It is desirable that in the case in which a small piece of land may be involved and where the circumstances would not merit the consideration of a full House of Parliament, there should be the possibility of some review of the decision.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): The Country Party has now had the opportunity of examining both amendments. The power of acquisition could possibly be debated all night because, regardless of which side of the fence one is on, it is a grey area. The need may be there but people generally do not like to see the power of acquisition exercised.

Members of the Country Party believe Mr. Galbally's amendment perhaps goes too far. In certain cases there may be a need for urgency. Clause 2 provides for the acquisition of land for the preservation of species of native plants. That is one reason that can be put forward for urgency. Mr. Galbally's amendment would certainly remove the possibility of urgent and quick action being taken.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: There are other procedures for the acquisition of land, such as the preservation of wildlife and the ecology.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: That may be so, but Mr. Hider's proposed amendment at least comes part of the way towards what the Country Party would like to see in the Bill. I accept the legal opinion of the learned gentlemen present that this will allow the reasonable grounds aspect to be challenged if ever the need arises. For those reasons the Country Party is disinclined to support the amendment moved by Mr. Galbally and is more favourably disposed to Mr. Hider's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Order! I should like the Committee to be perfectly clear on the existing situation. Mr. Galbally and Mr. Hider have circulated proposed amendments to clause 2. Mr. Galbally's proposed amendment, *inter alia*, seeks the omission of sub-section (1) of proposed new section 22F with a view to its replacement. Mr. Hider's proposed amendment seeks a change in that part of the clause which Mr. Galbally's amendment seeks to omit. Mr. Galbally's amendment comes first.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province): Perhaps I can simplify the matter by saying that I propose to test the feeling of the Committee on my amendment. If the amendment is not carried, the Labor Party will support Mr. Hider's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): The same problem still exists because in putting Mr. Galbally's proposed amendment the question will be that the words and expressions proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause. If that motion is negatived, Mr. Hider will have no opportunity of moving his proposed amendment.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER (Monash Province): I am happy with that course, Mr. Chairman, if that should be the result.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): The Committee is then faced with another possibility. If Mr. Galbally's amendment is negatived, it is not competent for an honorable member to move an amendment to that part of the clause.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): On a point of clarification, as I read it, Mr. Galbally's motion is that all the words—I emphasize the word "all"—in a whole segment of the measure be omitted. Surely the defeat of such a motion will not preclude a motion that some of the words starting at a later point in the measure than Mr. Galbally's amendment be omitted.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): I am afraid that it would, because the question would be that

the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause. Mr. Hider is seeking to omit one word amongst all the others. I believe the problem will be overcome. I propose to test the Committee's view on Mr. Galbally's proposed amendment by putting the question that the words and expressions on lines 12 to 14 inclusive stand part of the clause.

The Committee divided on the question that the words and expressions proposed by Mr. Galbally to be omitted stand part of the clause (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	..	23
Noes	..	7
Majority against the amendment	..	16

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Hauser	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Long	Mr. Thomas

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER (Monash Province): I move—

Clause 2, line 15, omit "considers" and insert "is satisfied on reasonable grounds".

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as was clause 3.

Clause 4 (Amendment of No. 6284. New s. 224A).

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province): The clause provides that the Treasurer may, on the recommendation of the Minister, execute in favour of any person a guarantee guaranteeing the repayment of any loan in excess of $100,000. The Opposition believes a guarantee of this kind should be authorized by Parliament. The same procedure was followed in regard to the Melbourne Cricket Club, although the amount guaranteed was much higher.

When public moneys are involved, Parliament should exercise its traditional role and a guarantee of this nature ought to be brought to Parliament for consideration and authorization.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): The Government is firm in its belief that the provision is necessary so that it may guarantee amounts exceeding $100,000 to organizations for the construction on Crown land of amenities for the public. The amount will be guaranteed by the Treasurer, as Mr. Galbally said, on the recommendation of the Minister. The Government believes this is reasonable and wishes to proceed with the Bill.

The Committee divided on the clause (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	..	23
Noes	..	7
Majority for the clause	..	16

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Hauser	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Long	Mr. Thomas

The remaining clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House with an amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

The sitting was suspended at 12.13 *a.m.* (*Wednesday*) *until* 12.35 *a.m.*

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS (CONTINUATION) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 3) 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. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province) : Ever since 1967 when legislation similar to this was introduced by the then Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, there has been a contested view between the Government and the Opposition about what assistance should be given to church schools and private schools. In the first instance the *per capita* grant was $10 for primary pupils and $20 for secondary pupils. The attitude then adopted by members of the Opposition, which is still maintained, was that this grant rewards the more materially advantaged schools to the disadvantage of schools that are not so well placed. We have adopted this attitude each year when the *per capita* grant has been increased. This Bill raises the grant for primary students from $62 to $80 and for secondary pupils from $104 to $135.

About three years ago an inquiry was conducted into education on an Australia-wide basis. It was found that to bring schools up to date throughout Australia, with assistance from the Australian Government, expenditure of about 1,400 million pounds or $2,800 million was required. One cannot think of that sum being expended on education in any one year; if it was financially possible, the work could not be done in the one year. The programme must be a ten-year plan. Until all schools have been brought up to a certain standard it is not possible to make *per capita* grants to apply fairly to each school.

As I have said previously, the schools that are suffering mostly in my province are Catholic parish schools.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS : Are they getting assistance from elsewhere?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : The assistance that is coming from elsewhere is now more limited. In certain areas in my province people who send their children to those schools are, in the main, European migrants who are not prepared to pay. Therefore, the assistance that is forthcoming to support the schools is not so great. I move, as an amendment—

That all the words after "That" be omitted with a view of inserting in place thereof the words "this Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide for the establishment of a Needs Commission to examine and determine the needs of schools and students in Government and non-Government education and to recommend to the Government of Victoria on a continuous public basis the level of expenditure necessary to meet the requirements of Victoria's school children on the basis of needs and priorities, educational experimentation and regionalization".

It could be said that the *per capita* grant money is pledged and that the Bill should not be altered at this stage. Year after year the Government has provided *per capita* grants, although it knows the views of the Opposition. The Government was forced into making these grants as a political bribe and the system has continued on that basis without any effort to allocate the money proportionately where the need exists. The Bill should be withdrawn and re-examined and the finance provided according to need. That is the only decent way of dealing with the proposal—not using such grants as a sheer political weapon.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province) : This Bill provides money, through the Budget, for independent schools at the rate of $80 for each primary pupil and $135 for each secondary school pupil. The total amount to be paid in 1975 will be approximately $20·3 million. I think all honorable members are aware that the independent schools are going through a hard struggle to make ends meet. Fees have risen

considerably, and a number of representations have been made to me by parents who are endeavouring to send their children to Catholic and other schools. The fees are frightening. The Federal Government withdrew a large part of its tax concession for education expenses, reducing it from $400 to $150 as a maximum.

I do not think the opponents of the independent school system realize what will happen if that system folds up because approximately from one-fifth to one-quarter of Victorian students are being educated in independent schools. The saving to the State in terms of the provision of money for education in the Budget runs into many millions of dollars—probably in the vicinity of $80 million a year, or more. According to the report of the Minister of Education for the year 1973-74, the number of students in independent schools is 193,437, and the figure for the combined State schools is 605,644. If the 193,437 children who are being educated at independent schools all entered the State system, it would be overwhelmed and would collapse. There would not be nearly sufficient teachers or buildings.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT: We could use their buildings and their teachers.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: On what basis would Mr. Knight take over the school buildings? Would he expropriate them from the independent schools? That would not be beyond the Socialist Government in Canberra. As for taking over the teachers, the payment of the 9,000 teachers involved would mean an enormous addition to the Victorian salary bill. I believe the independent system should continue and I commend the Government for the allocation that it has made. It is certainly not a large allocation and by no means will cover the cost of education but it will be of some help to enable the independent schools to survive. I hope when there is a change of Government in Canberra, there will be a rethinking there and the allocation of money will flow back to the independent schools as it did under the previous Federal Government. The Country Party does not support the amendment moved by the Labor Party.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): In relation to the amendment, after all these years Mr. Tripovich has not convinced me and Government members have not convinced Mr. Tripovich. Therefore I do not intend to canvass all the debates that we have had here year after year on this subject. The Government has approached this matter on different principles and has reiterated its position clearly on other occasions. The schools have committed themselves as a result of an undertaking and an agreement by this Government, other States and the then Commonwealth Government in respect of this matter which largely took it out of the realms of politics. There are problems of implementation and I know that at least one Labor State, Tasmania, has reverted to the original agreement. For those reasons and the others which have been debated on many occasions, the Government does not support the amendment.

The House divided on the question that the words proposed by Mr. Tripovich to be omitted stand part of the Bill (Sir Raymond Garrett in the chair)—

Ayes	..	23
Noes	..	7
Majority against the amendment	..	16

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Hauser	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Long	Mr. Thomas

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

OMBUDSMAN (EXEMPTION) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 4) on the motion of the Hon. Murray Byrne (Minister for State Development and Decentralization) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province): When this Bill was introduced into the House the Minister adequately explained it. He has been gracious enough to forward to me a copy of his proposed amendment following representations made in respect of it. The Labor Party is in agreement with the amendment and does not propose to oppose it.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): The Minister has given notice of an amendment to this Bill and I would prefer to hear his remarks in the Committee stage before commenting fully. At this stage the Country Party has no objection to the Bill. It is obvious that the Ombudsman's jurisdiction must be tailored to the office and it was never intended that he should review a judicial decision. The Country Party expects that the Minister will explain the amendment which takes the matter further than the words at present contained in the Bill and I shall await that explanation.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 8414 s. 13 (3)).

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

Clause 2, lines 15–17, omit all words and expressions on these lines and insert—

> '"(*aa*) by a board tribunal commission or other body presided over by a Judge magistrate barrister or solicitor presiding as such by virtue of a statutory requirement and appointment;"; and'

The rationale of the Bill in its original form was simply that where the law requires the chairman of a statutory body to be a judge, it was quite inconsistent with his status that the decisions of the board over which he presided should be reviewed by the Ombudsman. The requirement that a judge preside is clearly designed to avoid any such necessity. One could hardly expect judges to preside in circumstances where the determinations of their boards would be reviewed by an Ombudsman.

During the second-reading debate I explained that a possible error of draftsmanship had emerged and that in curing one problem we may well have created another. By providing that boards, tribunals or commissions presided over by judges should be exempt from supervision by the Ombudsman we were creating the inference that tribunals, even when set up in a semi-judicial function as are many tribunals, even where the law provides that their decisions would be final, would henceforth become subject to the Ombudsman's jurisdiction. Clearly, that was not intended. Consultations have taken place with Parliamentary Counsel and the provision has been reworded.

The new form makes it clear that when a judge, magistrate, barrister or solicitor is required to and does preside over a statutory body—normally, of course, a tribunal, although not necessarily so—its decisions will not be reviewable by the Ombudsman. It is clear that when such a person is appointed to preside over a body by Parliament, the purpose is to ensure that his legal knowledge is available so that error will be avoided, and it is not intended

that the Ombudsman should suddenly begin to supervise the activities of such bodies.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): I thank the Minister for his explanation. A good many of the bodies to which he refers would be connected with his department, and I imagine that he has checked carefully with them. I also imagine that a number of the bodies referred to have appeals to the Supreme Court or some other court. That would automatically exclude the intrusion of the Ombudsman.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: That would not have been so if the Bill had been passed in its original form.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: If that is so, the amendment is even more important. The Ombudsman should not be able to intervene between a decision of a tribunal and an appeal to a court. The Country Party has no hesitation in supporting the amendment and the Bill, although it wonders whether the term " or other body " will prove to be too wide in practice. However, it will not object to the Bill on that score.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted.

The Bill was reported to the House with an amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNALS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 4) on the motion of the Hon. F. J. Granter (Minister of Water Supply) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): This small, amending, machinery Bill is welcomed by the Opposition which for a long period had a keen interest in the establishment of a small claims tribunal. I could remind the Government that a private member's Bill on the subject in the name of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition appeared on the Notice Paper in another place on a number of occasions. Mr. Wilkes had seen the Small Claims Court in operation in Brisbane and he thought that it worked excellently. However, the honorable member never had a chance to debate any of the Bills which he presented. Finally, the Government introduced its own measure.

The Minister reported that the tribunal has settled over 270 disputes and that more were listed for determination. He also stated that the use of the tribunal was increasing and that during November 61 cases were heard and an additional 89 were lodged for hearing.

Mr. Walsh, a former public servant, is now acting as registrar. He is well known to all honorable members. Apart from making a valuable contribution to the work of the State in the department in which he worked, his present work as referee has been extremely valuable.

As the Minister reported, Mr. Walsh has been able to suggest several ways in which the functioning of the tribunal can be improved. The Government agrees with him, and so does the Opposition, which wishes the Bill well.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): The Country Party supports this Bill. Consumer affairs were debated earlier tonight and I shall not repeat what was said then. The Small Claims Tribunal is one part of consumer protection which has the whole-hearted support of the Country Party. People can go to it for assistance with their claims against businesses and, if they are justified, some settlement will be forthcoming.

The most important part of the Bill sets up a special account. In the past, the consumer had to pay the account from the trader before the tribunal could settle a dispute. Once the dispute was settled, problems arose about what had been paid by the purchaser to the other party. Now, a special account will be kept

by the Registrar. As the Minister said, if the tribunal finds for the claimant, the money can be repaid to him and, if it finds for the trader, the money can be paid to the trader. This is a good principle.

The Country Party supports this amendment to the Act and hopes it will further strengthen this tribunal which is already performing excellent work.

The motion was agreed to.

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

CEMETERIES (PIONEER MEMORIAL PARKS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 3) on the motion of the Hon. V. O. Dickie (Minister of Housing) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province): This small measure will allow disused cemeteries to be turned into pioneer memorial parks. Nothing is more certain than that we will all finish up in one of these places. Sooner or later, cemeteries become disused. They then become a charge on the local community to keep them tidy. In many cases they become derelict.

I am acquainted with two of the three cemeteries mentioned in clause 4 of the Bill. I have a particular acquaintance with the old Fawkner Cemetery which, a few years ago, was handed over to the trustees of the New Melbourne General Cemetery. It will now be closed and turned into a pioneer memorial park. I have wandered through that cemetery from time to time and I can remember seeing old wooden crosses carved out of tree stumps. That gives an indication of the age of the cemetery. Apart from a general interest, I could not imagine that, today, anybody would be the least concerned with those buried there.

It might be a good idea if the tombstones were kept, as was done in the case of the cemetery which formerly occupied the site of the Queen Victoria market. The headstones from that cemetery were removed to the New Melbourne General Cemetery at Fawkner. No doubt, anybody who wanted to, could see them there.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: The Bill makes provision for that.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: If that is so, I applaud it. I know that the Bill provides that the records be kept but, very often, what is written on a tombstone is as important as the record of the burial. We do not bother much about it in these days of cremation and lawn cemeteries but, previously, there was often the witty saying, a poem, or terms of endearment and particulars of the death inscribed on a tombstone. The tombstones should not be destroyed. The Bill gives power to the trustee to remove monuments so that lawn areas may be created. It is natural that this power must be given to them.

Trustees of cemeteries have great problems with the upkeep of graves which have become disused. It was once believed that graves went on indefinitely, but some cemetery trustees have set a limit on the period for which they will maintain a grave. Alternatively, cemeteries may be turned into memorial parks. I support cremations and/or lawn cemeteries. I believe the days of tombstones, memorials and big mausoleums have long since passed. Purely for the sake of economy, health and cleanliness, cremations and lawn cemeteries are preferable. The task of cemetery trustees is made much easier. All cemeteries cannot have crematoriums, but lawn cemeteries can be kept in an orderly fashion; the grass can be mown straight over the plates in the ground, fire hazards and noxious weeds are eliminated, and it is not necessary to spend hundreds of man-hours on

the upkeep of the cemetery. The Labor Party does not oppose the Bill.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): At this late hour I should like to gladden the hearts of honorable members by saying that this is a dead issue, that the Country Party therefore supports it, and sit down. However, to be serious, the Bill is important in that it authorizes the change which the Minister and Mr. Walton have outlined. It will authorize the conversion of parks and old cemeteries into special parks to be known as pioneer memorial parks. This provision is desirable and should be supported.

The second change contained in clause 5 gives the trustees of cemeteries additional powers in the removal of monuments which are dangerous or in a state of disrepair. This change is also necessary and desirable. Some years ago there was a fatality in the cemetery at Maldon. A lad who was with a group playing in the cemetery was killed when an unsafe tombstone collapsed and fell on him.

Mr. Walton referred to the keeping of records. This is important. In his explanatory remarks, the Minister said—

> To make doubly sure, the Minister has already issued an instruction that if this legislation is approved by the Parliament the Commission of Public Health is to establish a register of the inscriptions on all monuments or tombstones that are removed by cemetery trustees so that no written records will be lost as a result of the provisions of this Bill.

That is a sensible instruction for the Minister to issue, but it would be more appropriate and satisfactory if it were possible to include this in the amendment.

Clause 2 relates to the setting up and authorization of the pioneer memorial parks. The Minister outlined three options that are open to the trustees of cemeteries. It will be interesting to note which of these options will be exercised. The other important provision in the Bill relates to cases where over a long period the perpetual right that can be exercised by a person can be resolved in one way or another. The situation has occurred in which these exclusive rights have continued for many years, and the trustees are not in a position to contact or correspond with the person concerned because of a variety of circumstances. The proposed legislation will enable the matter to be resolved. The Country Party supports the Bill.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province): I am a cemetery man myself. One of the most fascinating pastimes is wandering around cemeteries.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON: Mr. Elliot will want a double plot.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Mr. Walton's interjection has a lot of substance in it. I believe in pioneer memorial parks. I wonder whether honorable members have seen the magnificent gardens adjacent to the Hobart Town Hall and post office in which the tombstones of the pioneers have been utilized to construct the walls of the cemetery. They make interesting reading. One can discover much of the history of Victoria by looking at tombstones in cemeteries. The Minister of Housing will agree that the cemetery on the outskirts of Bacchus Marsh should be preserved. In Smythesdale there is a large and interesting cemetery. There are dozens of such cemeteries in Tasmania. On numerous occasions what might be called a pioneer cemetery has been created, grass has been planted and the more delightful trees preserved. This is an excellent idea which has been adopted in many countries. The tombstones are preserved as part of the walls and it is amazing what an attraction that can be.

The motion was agreed to.

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

PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 3) on the motion of the Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister for Social Welfare) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): A similar Bill is presented annually. It is associated with the Budget and authorizes expenditure on public works and services for the ensuing year. My first comment on the Bill concerns its presentation. The table in the Bill sets out the various items on which it is proposed to spend the stipulated amounts of money. Up to Item 38 it is associated with the Public Works Department. From Item 39 onwards it refers to miscellaneous advances such as to public officers for purchase of motor vehicles for office duties. Item 40 relates to assistance to country art galleries. Item 41 is loans and grants to the council of trustees of the National Gallery of Victoria. These items have nothing to do with the Public Works Department. They are a miscellaneous group and most of them are concerned with the Treasury. Item 42 makes contributions totalling $4·5 million to the Victorian Arts Centre Trust Fund. Item 43 makes grants towards approved capital projects for the performing arts in country centres. They are all Treasury items.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: They are all public works.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: They do not affect the Public Works Department in any way. They should be shown separately in the miscellaneous section as other services. Item 49 concerns advances and grants to the Teacher Housing Authority for the purpose of the authority. Why should items such as item 52—grants to the Geelong and Western District Ladies Benevolent Association towards the cost of works—be included with public works? They should be separate. The items associated with public works should be together.

The Bill has been dealt with by the honorable member for Deer Park in another place. I support his remarks. I wish to supplement his comments on the evaluation data processing computer for use by the Public Works Department. The Director-General of Public Works recommended to the Minister that the department should have its own computer. This recommendation has been rejected by the Public Service Board. The Government should closely examine this rejection. Why should the recommendation be rejected when thousands of contracts are dealt with by the Public Works Department?

Outside consultants are employed by the department and, with the large number of projects and the amount of monitoring that is required, a computer could be used full-time with advantage by the department instead of the department being pushed off to the central data processing centre when it is established. I do not know when this will take place, but consideration should be given to the provision of a computer for the sole use of the Public Works Department.

The Bill provides for a total expenditure of $274·821 million. I do not know whether all the money will be spent in the one year, but provision is made for the allocation. If the Public Works Department is associated with the monitoring, direction, building and supervising of the expenditure of $274 million, this is a further argument in favour of the department having its own computer. Manual recording is always subject to the usual faults of human error, whereas a computer storage of information is quick and accurate.

I wish to refer to certain items concerning my own electorate and then commend the Bill to the House. An amount of $150 million is provided

for school buildings and similar works. Under this allocation I hope that more permanent schools can be provided in the northern part of the Doutta Galla province. Some schools have been established in portable class-rooms such as the Broadmeadows North-West Primary School, the Gladstone Heights High School and the Gladstone Heights Primary School. Also a series of schools has been established in the Thomastown area. Even with the additions now being made to the Lalor High School, which will come into service in May next, overcrowding will still exist.

I strongly support the request by the Whittlesea Shire Council that an additional secondary school should be established at Epping and a further one later at Whittlesea. Whittlesea is not situated within my province, but children from the area are transported by bus to the Lalor High School, and children from the Lalor area are transported to the Merrilands High School.

With the additional moneys which have been made available for housing, further development will occur in the Thomastown–Epping area and the growth rate could easily reach that of six or eight months ago when 250 houses were occupied within four months which means an additional 500 or 600 children requiring school accommodation. This type of development will occur and I hope that some new schools will be provided in the northern areas of the province, and that portable complexes will be dispensed with.

Under item 6, I support the request of Mr. Eddy and the honorable member for Moonee Ponds in another place for the rebuilding of the Moonee Ponds police station. The existing station is situated in a 70-year-old home which has been converted for the purpose. A community centre, including a new courthouse, has been developed in the area. The old courthouse will be pulled down and a new police station is planned for erection on that site. The need is urgent because it is proposed that the new station will be the centre for a region.

The Chief Secretary recently visited Broadmeadows to examine what could be done about providing proper police and courthouse facilities at Broadmeadows. I thank the Minister for the visit and hope that something eventuates. I also plead a case for the construction of a police station at Lalor. Land was acquired from the technical school site for the purpose but nothing further has been done. There is an urgent need for the construction of a new police station at Lalor.

Under Item 78, an amount of $32 million is provided for hospitals. At the moment, the Essendon and District Memorial Hospital, which to date has been use only as a maternity hospital, is being extended into a general hospital with an additional 200 beds. Admittedly that resulted from some political negotiations but the local people are still happy that the hospital is being extended. It meant a lot to the honorable member for Essendon in the last State elections. The Government can play politics as well as anybody else and honorable members representing the area are pleased that the Essendon hospital will be extended.

Some twelve years ago, the Government acquired land at Broadmeadows for the construction of a hospital. The City of Broadmeadows is the largest in the metropolitan area and one of the fastest growing suburbs. To date, the Government has taken no action to provide hospital facilities at Broadmeadows. The nearest hospital for local residents, apart from the extensions being made to the Essendon hospital, is the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital at Bell Street, Preston. Although that hospital has been extended, it cannot cope with the development in the northern suburbs. The Government ought to provide a hospital at Broadmeadows.

I could say a lot more on the Bill but the lateness of the hour precludes me from doing so. I again direct attention to the loyalty and devotion of the 2,185 officers of the Public Works Department from the Director-General, Mr. Gordon Serpell, down. I resent the comments which are often made about alleged failures in the department. I have made many investigations into complaints and although the department makes some mistakes in nine cases out of ten the responsibility has not rested with that department. I have invited my colleagues, whenever they have problems with the department, to fully examine the situation. The responsibility for many of the delays in Education Department works lies with that department for not making up its mind on whether funds will be provided.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE : And the Public Works Department does not know what to do.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : That is so. The department has done an excellent job despite a shortage of staff. The department has not the number of professional officers it would like or even the number approved by the Public Service Board. The department should not always have to approach the Public Service Board when it wishes to appoint specialist staff. Although approval has been given for the appointment of additional staff, the department has not been able to obtain them.

Many officers of the department have been involved in the development of the Albury–Wodonga complex and they have done a good job there. No doubt Mr. Jenkins will be pleased when they move to Geelong to assist with the development of the Geelong region. I pay tribute to the officers for their work and their loyalty to the department. As the shadow Minister of Public Works, I publicly thank them for their efforts over the past twelve months.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province) : It is unfortunate that at this late hour the House should be debating one of the most important measures to be presented. All honorable members are interested in items covered by the Bill, but they are unable to do justice to the measure. If time would permit, undoubtedly every honorable member would speak on various aspects covered by the Bill.

The Country Party supports the Bill. One of the principal items which should interest all honorable members is education. For the financial year 1974-75, an amount of $107·2 million has been allocated for expenditure on the general school building programme. Of that amount, $65 million will come from State sources and $42 million from the Commonwealth Government. Although there is an increase of $18 million in the State allocation over last year, with rising costs due to inflation, it is doubtful whether much headway is being made. The additional $18 million may not really mean that more works will be undertaken. Honorable members have no control over many of these things and they can only hope that the money will be spent wisely.

My only criticism of the expenditure relates to the $42 million that is coming from the Commonwealth. The Country Party applauds the allocation of the money, but it does not subscribe to the method by which it is being made available to the States. The amount of $42 million is a lot of money but are we who are closer to the education needs of the States sure that the money is being spent in the best interests of the State and of the education system?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : That is the only way schools are provided in the northern suburbs.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY : I do not doubt that, but to a large extent it is necessary to look at priorities and ascertain where the needs are most urgent without having tied grants being made by the Commonwealth Government. Surely the State Government is competent to determine its own priorities.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: But the Government spends the money in areas held by the Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: That may be so and I will not argue the matter. As members of Parliament, if we consider that the money is not being spent in the best interests of the State, we still have a say. I do not subscribe to remote places such as Canberra directing where and how money should be spent. Honorable members have a responsibility to the taxpayers and to their electors. If they do not spend money wisely sooner or later they will have to account to the people whom they represent. For that reason I oppose the methods by which the tied grants are being given. I have been on many deputations to the Minister of Education on matters in which he has had little room to manœuvre. Although in some directions considerable sums of money have been made available, the Minister has not been able because of circumstances to use them to the best advantage.

Honorable members are indebted to you, Mr. President, for your efforts in having the upper floor and stairway on the Legislative Council side of Parliament House redecorated. This section of Parliament House has needed attention for a long time and now honorable members have an upper floor and stairwell of which they can be justly proud. Because you have used your influence on the House Committee and with the Treasury to have the money made available, the job has been completed. We are happy that renovations are also taking place on the other side of Parliament House. There will be a big improvement to this beautiful building of which all honorable members are proud.

It is pleasing to note that progress is being made with the north wing of Parliament House. This extension has long been desired so that honorable members can work in congenial and proper circumstances which uphold their positions as members of the Parliament. We look forward in the future to when the detailed planning for the new wing is completed so that the calling of tenders may take place. Temporary accommodation is well advanced for those who will have to be temporarily moved whilst the north wing is being built.

Under the Bill an amount of $284,000 is being allocated this year towards alcoholism and drug-dependency services. Alcoholism is one of the State's greatest social problems. I hope honorable members will not misunderstand me because I am not a drinker. Honorable members read daily in the newspapers of the number of deaths that occur on the roads, particularly at the week-ends. The great percentage of road deaths is caused by alcohol. Many unfortunate individuals in the community have become complete alcohol addicts and it is pathetic to see them. It is hoped the allocation will provide some relief to those who have been caught up by this unfortunate drink problem.

An amount of $26·3 million has been allocated this year towards hospitals and charities. This is an increase of $6·3 million over the previous allocation. However, it is questionable whether the increase is keeping pace with inflation. Because of the rapidly increasing rate of inflation, the amount of work being done is not greater than the amount that was done a few years ago for a smaller sum of money.

An amount of $1·5 million is to be spent on mentally retarded children's centres, kindergartens, workshops and so forth. No one deserves more thought, consideration and understanding than those unfortunate people in the community. Some of them are currently receiving great comfort, love and a degree of education in our centres but when their parents pass on what will happen to these mentally retarded children? Are there sufficient homes available in which they can be placed and cared for at that time? It is proposed in

the Wodonga growth area to establish a new intellectually handicapped centre to be known as the Murray Valley Intellectually Handicapped Centre. Tenders were called but again because of the escalation in prices, the project was unable to proceed. We are now endeavouring to negotiate for a reduced contract price for the centre. Many children are being turned away from the present centre because of its inadequate size.

Item 80 makes provision for kindergartens. Wangaratta is badly in need of a new kindergarten. The James Tilson kindergarten at which there will be a young and attractive new manageress next year, is housed in an old Army hut. It was originally in the Bandiana camp and was transferred there. Like many other buildings it suffered badly in the flood of May this year. We are hoping to build a new kindergarten for the James Tilson people who are doing a magnificent job in Wangaratta.

I should like to conclude by paying tribute to Mr. Serpell, Director-General of the Public Works Department, for the co-operation which I am sure every member in this House has received from him and his staff. As was mentioned by Mr. Tripovich, these people are under great pressure. Frequently honorable members are told by the Education Department that matters about which they are inquiring have been referred to the Public Works Department but because funds have not been allocated for the projects, the Public Works Department has not been able to proceed with them. Despite all the inquiries and chasing up by honorable members, I am sure they received the greatest courtesy from Mr. Serpell and his staff. I pay them tribute for the understanding and co-operation which they give to all honorable members.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Issue and application of money from Works and Services Account for public works).

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I should like to thank the two honorable members who have spoken on behalf of their parties on this Bill, for their generous and kind words of appreciation of one of the State's largest departments—a department that undoubtedly has the most dedicated staff. I have mentioned this before. When I became Minister of Public Works, I remember saying to Mr. Serpell and some of the senior officers that I wanted to be disillusioned about my views of the department, and before long I said that I had to apologize to him.

The Hon. H. R. WARD: Did Mr. Serpell ever answer your letter?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: I wrote a nasty letter to the Public Works Department and Mr. Serpell said, "Now you can sit down and answer it". I remember inviting honorable members over there and, if I did nothing else, I gave them an opportunity of seeing what went on in that department. The shadow Minister is a first-class shadow Minister. He has given wonderful support, loyalty and encouragement to members of the department and I assure him that the officers appreciate it. The same applies to Mr. Bradbury. The matters that have been mentioned will be noted by the department. Every time a member speaks on a Bill, his comments are noted by the department, recorded, and an answer is given to the member.

I am particularly interested in one matter raised by Mr. Bradbury—the strong and consistent representations that he intends making and which I now have to make in respect of the rebuilding of a kindergarten for a charming and talented young directress. I hope that work happens. I should like to thank Mr. Bradbury and his wife for all the

kindness that they have shown that young person who is going up into the area. I thank honorable members generally for their contributions to the debate.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT.

TRACTOR SAFETY REGULATIONS.

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

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until later this day, at a quarter to eleven o'clock.

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. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): Although it is late, probably another opportunity to raise the important matter I wish to refer to will not present itself this sessional period. I refer my query to the Minister of Water Supply, who represents the Minister of Labour and Industry in this House. It relates to the tractor safety regulations. I am informed that the Government is considering amendments to the existing regulations concerning the installation of roll bars and safety cabins on agricultural tractors. Although tractors weighing less than 1,232 lb. or more than 8,500 lb. are excluded from the necessity of having protective roll-bar frames fitted to them, I am informed that the Government is proposing that the regulations will apply to tractors between 8,500 lb. and 17,640 lb. thus increasing the number of tractors which will be subject to the regulations.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: The safety devices should be fitted to them all; 90 per cent of fatalities occur on flat ground.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: That is what Mr. Hamilton may find when he looks at the figures at first glance, but he should study the figures more closely.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! No debate is allowed on matters raised on the adjournment.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Mr. Hamilton threw in a misleading statement. If tractors up to 17,640 lb. are to come within the regulations, this will include broad acre tractors of 100 or 120 horse power capacity and the fitting of roll-bars and safety cabins on those machines will be costly.

I ask the Minister of Water Supply to dispel my concern about this. If the honorable gentleman cannot do that tonight, and I can understand that the honorable gentleman would possibly like to consult the Minister of Labour and Industry, I should like some indication whether or not my suspicions are correct. This would mean a large increase in the number of tractors which would come under the regulations and I warn the Government that strong opposition would be forthcoming from the broad acre farming communities, such as those in the Mallee and Wimmera areas.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister of Water Supply): I cannot answer Mr. Dunn tonight but I will draw his remarks to the attention of the Minister of Labour and Industry and endeavour to give the honorable member an answer as soon as possible.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.5 *a.m.* (*Wednesday*).

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN.

(Question No. 237)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister of Health—

What immediate financial assistance, as recommended in the report of the consultative council on pre-school child development at paragraph 10.39, has been made to voluntary organizations where services to disadvantaged and socially vulnerable children are in jeopardy; namely, Forest Hill Emergency Residential Kindergarten, Moira Hospital for Children, Advisory Council for Children with Impaired Hearing, and Rossbourne House?

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

The following additional financial assistance for the year 1974–75 has been granted to the voluntary organizations named—

Forest Hill Emergency Residential Kindergarten—$15,490.
Advisory Council for Children with Impaired Hearing—$13,424.
Rossbourne House—$8,634.

In regard to the Moira Hospital for Children, the question of an emergency grant is being considered at the present time by the Treasurer.

FAMILY AND CHILD WELFARE.

(Question No. 240)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) What is the policy of the Social Welfare Department in regard to the co-ordination of the services for families and children with—(i) the voluntary welfare agencies; and (ii) other Government departments concerned with the family?

(*b*) What grants were made to welfare agencies for the purpose of assisting families in financial difficulties in each of the financial years, 1971–72, 1972–73 and 1973–74, indicating how this money was expended by the agencies, what kind of assistance was given to families, and how many families were assisted?

(*c*) How many private children's welfare agencies are caring for wards of the department, and which of these agencies provide a professional social work service to families of the children in their care and to families who seek to place their children, indicating in each case—(i) the name of these agencies and those offering a professional social work service; and (ii) which agencies have eligibility requirements based on religious affiliation?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) The Social Welfare Department is represented on the recently established Victorian Consultative Committee on Social Development which has membership from the Commonwealth, social welfare and other State Government departments, the Victorian Council of Social Service and a number of other organizations operating in Victoria on a State-wide basis.

The committee is concerned mainly with the development of procedures for social planning and development in Victoria and with making recommendations in respect of existing or contemplated relevant legislation.

The department was pleased to support the establishment of such a committee, the composition of which enables governments at all levels and agencies involved in the delivery of welfare services to co-ordinate their various activities.

(*b*) A list of grants, including those made to welfare agencies for the purpose of assisting families, has been published as appendix 2 in the annual report of the Social Welfare Department for each of the years 1971–72, 1972–73 and 1973–74.

No information is available concerning the disbursement of money by the agencies, the kind of assistance given or the number of families assisted.

(*c*) There are 52 private welfare agencies caring for wards of the State, they are—

1. The Mission of St. James and St. John.
2. Antonian Children's Home, Richmond.
3. Ballarat Children's Home, Ballarat.
4. Australian Jewish Welfare and Relief Society.
5. The Salvation Army.
6. Baptist Social Services.
7. Beth-El.
8. Burwood Boys Home, Burwood.
9. Christian Brethren Family Care.
10. Diocesan Mission to the Streets and Lanes.
11. Glastonbury Children's Home, Geelong.
12. The Gordon Homes, Highett.
13. Legacy.
14. Presbyterian Social Services.
15. Lutheran Children's Home, Kew.
16. Melbourne Family Care Organization, Glen Waverley.
17. Menzies Homes for Children, Frankston.
18. Nazareth House, Camberwell.
19. Nazareth House, Sebastopol.
20. Nazareth House, Mills Street, Ballarat.
21. Methodist Department of Child Care.
22. "Providence" Children's Home, Bacchus Marsh.

23. Children's Protection Society, Melbourne.
24. St. Aidens Children's Centre.
25. St. Anthony's Home, Kew.
26. St. Augustine's Boys' Home, Geelong.
27. St. Catherine's Children's Home, Geelong.
28. St. Cuthbert's Children's Home, Colac.
29. St. John's Homes for Boys and Girls, Canterbury.
30. St. Joseph's Home, Surrey Hills.
31. St. Vincent de Paul's Children's Home, Black Rock.
32. St. Vincent's Boys Home, South Melbourne.
33. Sutherland Homes for Children, Diamond Creek
34. The Children's Protection Society, Gippsland
35. The Central Methodist Mission
36. Victorian Children's Aid Society, Black Rock
37. Berry Street Babies Home, East Melbourne
38. Bethany Babies Home, Geelong
39. Churinga, Greensborough
40. The Spastic Children's Society, Victoria
41. Marillac House, East Brighton
42. Northcote Children's Village, Bacchus Marsh
43. Queen Elizabeth Hospital for Mothers and Babies
44. Salem House for Handicapped Children
45. St. Joseph's Babies Home, Broadmeadows
46. Tweddle Baby Hospital
47. The Victorian School for Deaf Children
48. Woodbine Centre, Warracknabeal
49. Yarra View, Lilydale
50. Yooralla Hospital School for Crippled Children
51. Hartnett House, Brunswick
52. St. Mary's School for the Deaf, Delgany, Portsea

The following private agencies provide professional social work services—

Australian Jewish Welfare and Relief Society
Baptist Social Services
Diocesan Mission to the Streets and Lanes
Lutheran Children's Home
Melbourne Family Care Organization
Methodist Department of Child Care
Presbyterian Social Services
The Salvation Army
St. Aidens Children's Centre
St. Anthony's, Kew
St. Catherine's Children's Home, Geelong
St. John's Homes for Boys and Girls
St. Joseph's Home, Surrey Hills
St. Vincent de Paul's Children's Home, Black Rock
The Central Methodist Mission
Berry Street, Babies Home
Churinga, Greensborough
The Spastic Children's Society
St. Joseph's Home, Broadmeadows
Hartnett House, Brunswick

A number of the above agencies, when asked, said they prefer people applying to be of the same religion as that under whose auspices the agency operates, however, only one agency—Australian Jewish Welfare and Relief Society—said its clients should be of the same religion.

PRISON SEWERAGE.

(Question No. 242)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) What prisons within Victoria have no sewerage connection?

(*b*) What provisions are available in these institutions, and are these provisions available in each cell?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) Cooriemungle, Dhurringile, McLeod, Morwell River and Won Wron.

(*b*) Cooriemungle—Septic system, huts are not connected.
Dhurringile—Septic system, dormitory accommodation.
McLeod—Septic system, cells not connected.
Morwell River—Septic system, huts are not connected.
Won Wron—Septic system, cells are connected.

CATTLE.

(Question No. 245)

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare, for the Minister of Agriculture—

(*a*) How many head of cattle are at present de-pastured in Victoria?

(*b*) How many beef and dairy cattle were depastured in each of the past four years, indicating in each case the number of breeding stock, steers and calves?

(*c*) How many cattle have been slaughtered in Victoria in each of the past four years, and in 1974 (to date)?

(*d*) How much meat is at present in store in Victoria, and how does this amount correspond with holdings at the same period in each of the past four years?

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

(*a*) The Department of Agriculture estimates that there are up to 7·5 million total cattle on farms in Victoria at present. This estimate is based on the numbers of cattle recorded to be on farms as at 31st

March, 1974, and on the level of slaughterings recorded since that date, considering also the natural increase estimated to have occurred.

(*b*) Numbers of beef and dairy cattle in each of the past four years are given in the tables which follow.

TOTAL CATTLE NUMBERS—VICTORIA 1970–1974.

'000s

As at March 31	Cattle kept for meat production	Cattle kept for milk production	Total cattle
1970 ..	2,488	1,975	4,462
1971 ..	3,086	1,974	5,061
1972 ..	3,508	1,949	5,457
1973 ..	3,488	1,977	5,465
1974 ..	4,072	2,012	6,085

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

CATTLE KEPT FOR MEAT PRODUCTION BY CLASS—VICTORIA—1970–1974.

'000s

As at March 31	Cows and heifers older than one year	Calves under one year	Others (steers, bullocks, etc.)
1970 ..	1 222	809	379
1971 ..	1,517	992	481
1972 ..	1,703	1,098	606
1973 ..	1,730	1,055	599
1974 ..	1,972	1,199	796

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

In addition there were in 1974 approximately 100,000 bulls and bull calves kept for meat production.

Numbers of cattle kept for milk production have varied little from about 2·0 million as shown in the first table. Of this number about 1·6 million are cows and heifers older than one year of age.

Numbers of cattle kept for meat production have increased by more than 60 per cent in the four year 1970 to 1974.

(*c*) Numbers of cattle and calves slaughtered in Victoria and the volume of beefs and veal produced are shown in the tables which follow.

CATTLE AND CALVES SLAUGHTERED—VICTORIA—1969–70 TO 1973–74.

Year (ending June)	Cattle slaughtered ('000)	Calves slaughtered ('000)	Cattle and calves slaughtered ('000)
1969–70 ..	1,256	453	1,709
1970–71 ..	1,382	464	1,846
1971–72 ..	1,516	559	2,075
1972–73 ..	1,895	665	2,560
1973–74 ..	1,675	555	2,230
Three months ended			
Sept. 1973	502	369	871
Sept. 1974	353	360	713

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

BEEF AND VEAL PRODUCED—VICTORIA—1969–70 TO 1973–74.

Year (ending June)	Beef produced (tonnes carcase weight)	Veal produced (tonnes carcase weight)	Beef and veal produced (tonnes carcase weight)
1969–70 ..	245	9	255
1970–71 ..	295	13	309
1971–72 ..	322	15	337
1972–73 ..	397	19	416
1973–74 ..	364	14	378
Three months ended			
Sept. 1973	111	8	119
Sept. 1974	76	8	84

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

These figures are given for years beginning in July and ending in June.

Slaughterings of cattle during 1973–74 were 220,000 less than during the year previous. A further reduction of 150,000 is shown for the three months from July to September, 1974, when compared to the same period a year previous.

(*d*) The total volume of all meat in store in Victoria and in Australia is shown in the table following. All meat includes beef and veal, mutton, lamb, pork and fancy meat and is that meat which has been passed for export.

VOLUME OF MEAT IN STORE—VICTORIA AND AUSTRALIA—1971–1974.

Last Saturday in October	Victoria (tonnes)	Australia (tonnes)
1971	19,509	62,301
1972	20,659	73,360
1973	17,547	80,689
1974	17,668	71,563

In respect to beef and veal only the volume passed for export in store in Victoria on the last Saturday in October in each of the last four years is—

1971	8,167 tonnes
1972	11,411 tonnes
1973	10,531 tonnes
1974	10,495 tonnes

These figures were supplied by the Australian Meat Board.

It is interesting to note that contrary to many reports the volume of meat—and beef and veal in particular—in store at present is no higher than in previous years.

SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT.

(Question No. 251)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province (asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

What is the current staff position in the family and youth welfare divisions of the Social Welfare Department?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

YOUTH WELFARE DIVISION

Classification	Authorized staff	Vacancies
Youth Officer, Principal	3	1
Youth Officer, Chief	12	1
Youth Officer, Senior	35	4
Youth Officer	252	14
Class "B1"	1	..
Class "C2"	2	..
Class "C1"	6	2
Class "C"	7	1
Class "E"	5	1
Stenographer, Grade I.	6	1
Stenographer, Grade II.	4	1
Stenographer, Grade III.	1	..
Typist, Grade I.	1	..
Welfare Officer	5	..
Liaison Officer	1	..
Advisor, Youth Welfare Services	1	..
Assistant, Grade I.	1	..
Assistant, Grade II.	3	..
Assistant, Grade IV.	1	..
Cook, Grade I.	2	..
Cook, Grade II.	1	..
Cook, Grade III.	1	..
Cook, Grade IV.	1	..
Cookery and Home Management Instructress, Winlaton	1	1
Carpenter	2	..
Commercial Subjects Instructress	1	..
Mechanic	3	..
Chauffeur	1	..
Sister	1	..
Sister (exempt)	1	..
Patrolman	2	..
Assistant (F), Grade I., Part-time, Turana	1	..
Relieving Reception, Part-time	1	..
General Reliever	4	1
Motor Driver and Assistant	1	..
Fireman	3	..
Gardener, Assistant	1	..
Kitchenman	1	..
Gardener and General Assistant	1	..
Laundryhand, Grade I.	2	..
Laundry Foreman	1	..
Laundryman	1	..
Mechanic, Senior	1	..
Laundry Instructor	2	1
Seamstress, Senior	1	..
Seamstress	1	..
Storekeeper	2	..
Storeman, Grade I.	2	..
Trade Instructor, Dressmaking	1	..
Trade Instructor	18	..
Nurse	2	..
Ivanhoe Hostel Supervisor	1	..
Ivanhoe Assistant Hostel Supervisor	1	1
Ivanhoe Hostel Assistant	1	1
Sunshine Hostel Manager	1	..
Farm Manager, Langi Kal Kal	1	..
Domestic	5	..
Physical Education Instructress (exempt)	1	1
Director of Youth Welfare (special)	1	..
Supervisor of Classification and Treatment "W-7"	1	..
Superintendent, Class "W-3"	3	1
Superintendent, Class "W-4"	4	..
Superintendent, Class "W-5"	1	..
Deputy Superintendent, Class "W-2"	5	2

YOUTH WELFARE DIVISION—*continued.*

Classification	Authorized staff	Vacancies
Supervisor, Community Treatment "W-5"	1	..
Assistant Superintendent, "W-1"	8	4
Supervisor of State Wards	1	..
Social Worker, Class "SW-4"	2	..
Social Worker, Class "SW-3"	2	1
Social Worker, Class "SW-2"	9	4

FAMILY WELFARE DIVISION

Classification	Authorized staff	Vacancies
Director of Family Welfare (special)	1	..
Deputy Director of Family Welfare (W-8)	1	..
Superintendent, Allambie	1	..
Superintendent, Baltara	1	..
Assistant Superintendent, Allambie	1	..
Deputy Superintendent, Baltara	1	..
Social Worker, Class "SW-5"	3	..
Social Worker, Class "SW-4"	4	1
Social Worker, Class "SW-3"	7	2
Social Worker, Class "SW-2"	37	12
Social Worker, Class "SW-1"	3	..
Class "A", Administrative	1	..
Class "B1", Administrative	2	..
Class "B", Administrative	2	..
Class "C2", Administrative	10	..
Class "C1", Administrative	11	1
Class "C", Administrative	14	2
Class "E", Administrative	14	2
Assistant, Grade I.	5	..
Assistant, Grade II.	1	..
Welfare Officer	16	2
Field Officer	3	..
Field Officer, Senior	2	..
Inspector	4	..
Typist	9	..
Stenographer, Grade I.	14	..
Stenographer, Grade III.	2	..
Storeman, Grade III.	1	..
Seamstress	3	..
Painter	1	..
Kindergartener	2	..
Nursery School Teacher	5	..
Maintenance Foreman	1	..
Assistant Matron	1	..
Deputy Matron	1	..
Matron	1	..
Laundryhand, Grade I.	11	..
Laundry Supervisor	1	..
Labourer	1	..
Kitchenman	1	..
Housekeeper	1	..
Activities Officer	2	..
General Reliever	4	1
Gardener and General Assistant	10	..
Domestic	45	1
Cottage Mother	89	23
Cook, Grade II.	2	..
Cook, Senior, Grade IV.	1	..
Motor Driver and Assistant	1	..
Carpenter	1	..
Child Care Officer	222	1
Cook, Grade I.	3	..
Cook, Grade III.	3	..
Child Care Officer, Senior	20	..
Assistant Superintendent	6	..
Superintendent	7	..
Gardener, Grade I.	1	..
Gardener, Grade II.	3	..
Nurse, Grade I.	1	..
Chief Child Care Officer	1	..
Principal Child Care Officer	1	..
Ward Sister	20	1

FARM MILK TANKS.

(Question No. 252)

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare, for the Minister of Agriculture—

(*a*) What are the fees for measuring farm milk tanks, and on what basis are these fees calculated?

(*b*) How often are farm milk tanks measured?

(*c*) How many such tanks are measured each year?

(*d*) How many inspectors carry out these duties?

(*e*) What is the total amount of fees paid each year?

(*f*) What is the cost of carrying out these measurings?

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

(*a*) The fees are prescribed in the weights and measures regulations and are dependent on the capacities of the tanks, currently as follows—

If reading in gallons, $4.50 for every 50 gallons or part thereof.

If reading in pounds of milk, $4.50 for every 500 pounds of milk or part thereof.

If in the metric system, $4.90 for every 250 litres or part thereof.

When four or more tanks are submitted together, as at a factory where the tanks are made, the rates are reduced by approximately 22 per cent.

(*b*) The Weights and Measures Act requires that the tanks be submitted for re-verification at least once in every two years. In practice, the period between verifications is usually approximately in compliance with the statutory requirement.

(*c*) The number of tanks verified for the year ended 30th September, 1974, was 4,771. This included 1,007 verified at the manufacturers premises prior to sale as well as 3,764 re-verified on site. Of this latter number, 387 were rejected, requiring further re-verification after correction.

(*d*) For the year ended 30th September, 1974—ten.

(*e*) The total amout of fees paid for these verifications for the year ended 30th September, 1974, was $108,000.

(*f*) No separate figures of costing are kept for the verification or re-verification of farm milk tanks as a separate operation of the Weights and Measures Branch, but an estimate of cost for the year ended 30th September, 1974, is $150,000 including allowance for depreciation and replacement of vehicles and testing equipment.

GRAIN ELEVATORS BOARD.

(Question No. 257)

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

What salary and allowances are paid to, and made available to, the member of the Grain Elevators Board representing the wheat and barley growers?

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

The remuneration paid to the member of the Grain Elevators Board representing wheat growers and barley growers is $3,500 per annum. When travelling on board business, the member is paid travelling expenses in accordance with the conditions and rates prescribed for travelling expenses for officers in the Public Service of Victoria.

AUSTRALIAN WHEAT BOARD.

(Question No. 258)

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

Will he ascertain and inform the House what salary and allowances are paid to, or made available to, elected members from Victoria on the Australian Wheat Board?

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

The fee paid to each elected member from Victoria on the Australian Wheat Board is $3,850 per annum. Each member is also paid a travelling allowance at the rate of $28 a day when travelling on board business and it is necessary for him to be absent from his residence overnight.

AGRICULTURAL COURSES.

(Question No. 259)

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

Is there a demand for the introduction of correspondence courses on technical aspects of agriculture in Victoria; if so, would the Minister of Agriculture be prepared to introduce such courses?

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

There is a steady, unsolicited demand for correspondence courses on technical aspects of agriculture in Victoria.

The Department of Agriculture is looking at ways in which agricultural education programmes for farmers can be expanded and has developed some initiatives in the area indicated by the question.

This year a pilot programme offering correspondence courses to ten external students was started at Glenormiston Agricultural College. It will be offered to a further twenty students in 1975. After this time experience gained in the programme will be evaluated for future decisions about such courses.

PENTRIDGE GAOL.

(Question No. 260)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

Having regard to the recent increase in violence at Pentridge, when does the Government propose to increase the available psychiatric and treatment services?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

Approval has been given for the creation of the following staff positions at Pentridge—

Superintendent—W.7 (filled).
Deputy Superintendent—W.5 (filled).
Assistant Superintendent—(two positions).
Social Worker (SW4).
Social Worker (SW2).
Psychologist Grade I.
Welfare Officer—(six positions).
Activities Officer.
Probation and Parole Officer (P.O.4).
Probation and Parole Officer (P.O.3).

The unfilled positions have been advertised and recommendations will be made before the New Year.

PRISONS ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(Question No. 263)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) When was the Prisons Advisory Council formed, and how often has it met?

(*b*) What recommendations has the council made, and will these be made public as is the case with the United Kingdom Prisons Advisory Council?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) Membership of the council was announced on the 28th May, 1974, and the council has met on six occasions.

(*b*) The functions of the council are—

(i) to advise the Minister concerning the policy to be undertaken from time to time in relation to the custody, care, education, discipline, training and treatment of persons imprisoned or detained in prisons; and

(ii) to report on any matter referred to it by the Minister, or on any matter on which it is authorized by this Act to report.

It is not proposed to make public any recommendations made by the council.

FAIRLEA FEMALE PRISON.

(Question No. 264)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

When is it proposed to close Fairlea Female Prison, as foreshadowed by the Director-General of Social Welfare in the last report of the Social Welfare Department and, when closed, what action will be taken in respect of females committing serious crimes?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

The proposal to close Fairlea Female Prison is currently the subject of departmental discussions. As yet it has not been decided that the prison will be closed.

REHABILITATION OF PRISONERS.

(Question No. 265)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) As the social welfare regulations indicate that rehabilitation is the major objective of the Prisons Division of the Social Welfare Department, why are such matters as letter writing and family contact visits so severely restricted?

(*b*) If it is recognized that a lack of family contact visits and letter writing hamper a prisoner's rehabilitation and affect his morale, does the Government intend to initiate reforms in this area?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) The matter raised in the honorable member's question cannot be said to be "severely restricted". In a number of prisons, family contact visits are encouraged and provision has been made for prisoners to be visited by their families in a garden setting where tables and chairs and playground equipment create a picnic atmosphere. The number of letters written by prisoners is a matter that is left to the discretion of the prison governor. Very often, letter writing by prisoners is encouraged.

(*b*) At present, a departmental committee under the chairmanship of the Superintendent of Pentridge, Mr. John Dawes, is meeting with the purpose of making recommendations regarding the revision of prison regulations. The regulations concerning letter writing and visits to prisoners will receive the committee's due consideration.

PAROLE BOARDS.

(Question No. 266)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) Do Parole Boards meet only on Friday mornings; if so, does this enable the boards to give full consideration to the considerable number of prisoners eligible for parole?

(*b*) Are full-time parole boards under consideration?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) The Adult Parole Board meets each Friday morning. The Youth Parole Board meets on alternate Monday mornings. Yes, the boards are able to give full consideration to each eligible prisoner.

(*b*) Full-time parole boards are not under consideration. However, in July of this year, Mr. Richard Lucas was appointed the first full-time member of the Adult Parole Board.

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL WELFARE.

(Question No. 267)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) Does he propose to raise the educational status of the Institute of Social Welfare to that of a college of advanced education; if so, will the institute be affiliated with other tertiary institutions; if not, why?

(*b*) What are the qualifications of lecturers (both full-time and part-time) at the institute?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) As its present functions relate to the training of persons in matters relating to social welfare, it is not necessary for the status of the Institute of Social Welfare to be so raised.

(*b*) Qualifications of full-time lecturers at the Institute of Social Welfare are as follows—

Mr. E. U. Rogers, B.A., Dip. Psych., Cert. Ed. (A.T.T.I.), Registered Psychologist.
Mr. G. N. Clarke, B.A., Dip. Soc. Stud.
Miss N. Hillas, B.A., Dip. Soc. Stud. (Melb), Dip. Psych. Social Work (London)
Miss J. Aitchison, Dip. Inst. Man., T.T.I.C.
Mr. W. McIntosh, B.A., R.P.N., Registered Psychologist
Mr. G. Walsh, B. Com., Dip. Ed.
Mr. B. Chatley, B.A., Dip. Soc. Stud.
Mr. M. Clark, Dip. Soc. Stud.
Mrs. L. Gates, G.A. (Arkan.), M.S.W. (Wash.)
Mr. H. Law, Dip. Soc. Stud.
Mr. R. Rowton, T.P.T.C., A.C., D.A.
Mrs. H. King, Dip. Art. Ed.
Mrs. W. Jackson, B.A. (Hons.) Monash
Mr. B. McGowan, Dip. Phys. Ed. A.A.I.M.
Mr. D. George, Dip. Soc. Wk. (Qld)
Mr. D. Knoop, B. Phil.

It is estimated that in excess of three hundred part-time lecturers are employed each year.

An inordinate amount of time and effort would be required to research and list their qualifications. They range from lecturers with the highest university qualifications to people with no formal qualifications but vast experience in their respective fields.

ABATTOIR AND MEAT INSPECTION ACT.

(Question No. 269)

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare, for the Minister of Agriculture—

Has the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973 been proclaimed in full; if not, what parts of the Act are not yet proclaimed?

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

All of the provisions of the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973 have been brought into operation by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, December 10, 1974.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. K. H. Wheeler)** took the chair at 3.5 p.m., and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

SEAT BELTS FOR CHILDREN.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): In answer to a question last week the Chief Secretary stated that the Government did not propose to introduce, during this sessional period, a measure for the compulsory use of harnesses in motor cars to restrain children, and that he was awaiting advice from the Australian Standards Association. Is the honorable gentleman aware that the Chief Commissioner of Police has now approved of twelve types of harnesses to restrain children in motor cars? If so, is the Minister now prepared to introduce a Bill on this subject before the important Christmas holiday period to force motorists to restrain children in motor cars in harnesses which have been approved by the Chief Commissioner, in order to prevent serious injuries?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): Like most honorable members, I am aware of the statements of the Chief Commissioner of Police on the announcement by the Australian Standards Association of its approval of certain types of child restraints for motor cars. But I am not prepared to rush into this for the Christmas period, desirable as that may be. An evaluation must be made of the different types of restraints for children of different ages and weights. I do not go back on what I said; this is a difficult problem, the solution to which will be produced after proper examination.

TEACHER-PUPIL RATIO IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura): I ask the Minister of Education whether the teacher-pupil ratio in primary schools, excluding principals and librarians, is smaller than 1 to 35 at present. If that is so, what action is his department taking to increase this to a more reasonable figure?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): The over-all teacher-pupil ratio in the Primary Schools Division is 1 to 20, but most of the additional teachers are used in the smaller country schools. The schedule for staffing the larger schools is 1 teacher for 35 pupils. As I mentioned in the House last week, in 1961 the ratio was 1 to 44; it then became 1 to 40; and in 1967, on the basis of phasing in the new ratio over a three-year period, it was improved to 1 to 35.

The argument now is whether the ratio of 1 to 35 should be replaced by a ratio of 1 to 33. I have explained to the House and to the Government representative on the Teachers Tribunal that, counting specialist staff, the ratio could be quite readily improved from 1 to 35 to 1 to 33, and even further. But the enrolment for next year and the placement in the various schools must be confirmed before the ratio is improved to more than 1 to 33.

MALE OBSTETRIC NURSES.

Mr. AUREL SMITH (Bellarine): I address a question to the Minister of Health. Now that the Victorian Nursing Council has recommended to the Government that discrimination against males being registered as obstetric nurses should be dropped what does the Minister intend to do in what has become known as the Christopher James case?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): The Victorian Nursing Council is constituted by statute to advise the Minister on the co-ordination of nursing activities. The council has recommended that this

discriminatory provision should be removed from the legislation. This is consistent with the attitude of the Government that discrimination on the grounds of sex should be removed from the statutes. The necessary instructions have been given to Parliamentary Counsel to draft a Bill to remove the provision and, after consideration by the Liberal Party, it will be introduced into the House during the autumn sessional period.

BREAD PRICES.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister of Consumer Affairs aware that in the past twelve months the price of bread has increased by 32 per cent? Has his attention been drawn to the fact that at a hearing before the Prices Justification Tribunal a Victorian producer indicated that there was a wastage of up to 27·5 per cent in bread production? In view of existing practices in marketing, will the Minister establish an inquiry into the bread industry similar to that recently carried out in New South Wales and South Australia in order to prevent the monopolistic practices which are taking place and which are adversely affecting the price of bread to consumers?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Consumer Affairs): I know some little detail only of the matters to which the Leader of the Opposition adverted; I have read something in the press. I have not seen the details of the cases before the Prices Justification Tribunal. In South Australia fairly recently there was an investigation. In New South Wales I believe an investigation has not yet been fully carried out. The Consumer Affairs Council in Victoria, to whose attention this matter has been drawn, has given an indication of its present thinking in the matter, and its view will be conveyed to honorable members later this afternoon in a document that will be laid before the House.

I should like to mention one point because I think it is relevant. In South Australia the price of a 2-lb. unwrapped unsliced loaf is 37 cents, in New South Wales it is 39 cents, and in Victoria it is 36 cents. The two major bakeries in Victoria—Sunicrust Bakeries Pty. Ltd. and Tip Top Bakeries Holdings Pty. Ltd.—are subject to prices approved by the Prices Justification Tribunal. The honorable member's suggestion that an investigation be conducted in Victoria will be considered after I have discussed the matter further with the Consumer Affairs Council.

MALE OBSTETRIC NURSES.

Mr. SKEGGS (Ivanhoe): I ask the Minister of Health: In view of his reply to the question of the honorable member for Bellarine, is the Minister prepared to give an assurance that women will not be subjected to the indignity of having male midwives attend them in childbirth, without their approval?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): The honorable member's question is a very profound one. A number of issues affecting the nursing profession which have been raised relate to morality including that of male nurses participating in certain surgical operations in hospitals. The Victorian Nursing Council has laid down procedures that are to be established if somebody is not prepared to participate in an operation. I recommend sincerely to those who might feel some concern on this point that they express this concern to the hospital so that the necessary arrangements can be made. I remind the honorable member that, in obstetrical and gynaecological operations in this State, if there is a complication and a surgical procedure has to be administered, it is invariably done by an obstetrician or a gynaecologist.

Mr. WILTON: Would taxi drivers be thought capable of coping with this?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member has been asked a question. The Minister is doing his best to answer, and I ask that he be heard in silence.

Mr. SCANLAN: The honorable member who has interjected has not understood the nature of the question.

Mr. BILLING: He has his labour problems.

Mr. SCANLAN: I entirely agree with that statement.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I again appeal to the Minister to ignore the interjections and to answer the question.

Mr. SCANLAN: I remind the honorable member for Ivanhoe that the administration of delicate procedures in obstetrics and gynaecology is carried out by obstetricians or gynaecologists, who are usually male doctors. Therefore, the doubts of the honorable member regarding the application of normal surgical procedures to female patients will in large measure be removed, and the problems he is worried about will not occur.

ROYAL PARK PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East): Is the Minister of Health aware that the out-patients clinic at the Royal Park Psychiatric Hospital has been closed for more than a fortnight because of the absence on annual leave of the sole clerical assistant attached to the clinic? If so, why has the honorable gentleman allowed the situation to continue, and if not, will he undertake immediately to investigate the position to ensure that the clinic is reopened tomorrow?

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): I am not aware of the position which has been referred to by the honorable member. However, the Government is aware of the importance of the Royal Park clinic in the over-all parameters of psychiatric care in Victoria. The development of the psychiatric clinic at the Western General Hospital will ameliorate much of the pressure on the Royal Park clinic. However, if alternative arrangements can be made by the Mental Health Authority to overcome this problem by referral in other directions, I shall be happy to do so. I am not aware of the situation mentioned by the honorable member, but I will call for a report on it.

NEWPORT POWER STATION.

Mr. HANN (Rodney): I ask the Premier what attempts have been made by the Government to settle the dispute which has arisen with the unions over the construction of the proposed Newport power station. Furthermore, have any offers of a cash settlement been made by the Government to the unions concerned or requested by the unions? It has been suggested that the amount of the offer was $30,000.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I have no knowledge of any such offer having been made. Certainly no offer has been made to me, and none would be considered.

NOISE POLLUTION.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): I ask the Minister for Conservation whether the Environment Protection Authority has appointed a committee to investigate noise pollution in Victoria. Further, was a report on the subject made and referred to a committee of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, which rejected it?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I do not think the latter part of the honorable member's question is in order.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, if a report is prepared by a Government authority and referred to a Minister, who in turn refers it to a group of people such as a committee

of the Liberal Party, surely it is proper to ask the Minister what has happened to that report? Has it been rejected or has it been accepted? If the Minister refers that sort of document to a Liberal Party committee, in my view a question can still be properly couched in terms of Government administration. I submit that the mere fact that it is referred to such a committee, if the facts are as implied by the honorable member, does not make the question out of order.

The SPEAKER: As I said, the first part of the honorable member's question is in order, but the second part sought the Minister's opinion. To ask what has happened to it within a party committee is going a little too far. About nine-tenths of the question was in order.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): I ask the Minister whether the committee was appointed, whether it made these recommendations and what has happened to the recommendations; have they been referred to another committee, and, if so, what is the name of that committee?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation): Once again, the honorable member for Albert Park has demonstrated his ability to become confused over some incorrect information. To my knowledge there has been only one draft policy report by the Environment Protection Authority and that related to a Richmond survey. The report has not been referred to any committee. Indeed, it has not been brought up to the Government as a recommendation concerning policy on noise.

It is true that in recent months the Government, which is the only body which can initiate legislation, has been endeavouring to draft new legislation concerning noise.

Mr. HOLDING: Without the help of the Environment Protection Authority.

Mr. BORTHWICK: Not without the help of the Environment Protection Authority at all. At present the Government is examining proposals for legislation.

Mr. HOLDING: That is a slimy answer.

Mr. BORTHWICK: It happens to be true.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY.

Mr. MacDONALD (Glen Iris): In view of the congestion at the outlet of the South-Eastern Freeway and the effect on adjacent streets, too, can the Minister of Transport advise when the report of the Country Roads Board or some similar authority will be presented so that a decision may be made and the work undertaken to solve the unbelievable problem?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The report which I have asked for from the Country Roads Board is in its final stages of preparation. I hope to receive it before Christmas and to be in a position to put some proposals before the Government early in the New Year.

POWERS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.

Mr. LIND (Dandenong): As Children's Court proceedings are supposed to be private, I ask the Minister of Education under what authority or regulation a school principal can ask the parents to remove a child from a school; has the principal any authority to ask for such removal even before a case comes before the court and the facts are only rumoured?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I am not familiar with the case that the honorable member is obviously referring to. I shall be grateful if the honorable member will provide me with all the details. The matter has not been brought to my attention although I doubt whether any such power exists. The best course would be for the honorable member to supply the details.

STATE ELECTION.

Mr. MACLELLAN (Gippsland West): Does the Premier intend to hold an early State election and, if so, will he invite the Prime Minister to participate in it?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I did not hear the question. Will the honorable member repeat it? Then I shall rule whether it is in order.

Mr. MACLELLAN: It is not really worth repeating. I was asking whether the Premier intended to have an early State election and, if so, was it his intention to invite the Prime Minister back to participate in it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have to rule that question out of order; it is not a matter of Government administration.

LATROBE VALLEY DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): I direct a question to the Minister for Fuel and Power, who represents the Minister for State Development and Decentralization in this House. Can the Minister confirm that the Minister for Fuel and Power is a member of the committee for planning co-ordination established by the Government in early September for Latrobe Valley development? Can the Minister inform the House on how many occasions this committee has met, and what planning considerations have been examined by the committee? If the committee has not met, can the Minister explain to the House why; and why his colleague, the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, has attached so much importance to this committee whose work can be done, and is being done, by the State Planning Council and the Ministry for Planning?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): The committee which the Minister for State Development and Decentralization announced in Morwell some time ago was to co-ordinate Government works. Because of some press comments, and so forth, the Minister was rather loath to go on with it. However, as I understand it, the Minister proposes to proceed and to appoint a committee. The names of the members of the committee are not yet available, but I believe their job will be one which at this stage is not undertaken by the bodies which the honorable member named.

RENTAL INVESTIGATIONS.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): In answer to a question on notice last week the Attorney-General informed the House that 711 cases were investigated by the Rental Investigation Bureau. The answer indicated that in the past twelve months no fewer than 42 complaints had been investigated in South Yarra and that there had been many rental abuses in other inner suburbs. Having provided that information, is the Attorney-General prepared to instigate a public inquiry into rental abuses in the inner suburbs of Melbourne?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I do not believe the figures which were given fully and freely to this House require any such investigation.

CARRONBANK SCHOOL FOR PARTIALLY SIGHTED CHILDREN.

Mr. SUGGETT (Bentleigh): I feel like a pop-up toaster! I direct a question to the Assistant Minister of Education as the Minister administering the Special Services Division of the Education Department. Has the Minister given sympathetic consideration to my request that Carronbank School for Partially Sighted Children, in Marshall Avenue, Kew, should remain open?

Mr. DIXON (Assistant Minister of Education): I answer the first part of the honorable member's question by saying that no one could agree that he looks like a pop-up toaster; after all, he acts independently, not automatically.

In answer to the second part of the honorable member's question, I repeat what I said before, that Carronbank will remain open. It previously had an attendance of 35 chil-

dren, and this number was reduced to six as children went into normal schools with proper back-up services. All the parents of the children have since been interviewed, and of the remaining six children one child, with the consent of the parents, will be transferring to a normal school with back-up services, and the remaining five children will be continuing at Carronbank. In addition, another five children who are partially deaf and blind will be admitted to the school. Carronbank will definitely be remaining open and as long as there is a need for it to exist to provide care for children who are handicapped it will remain open.

BINGO.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): Has the Chief Secretary yet decided to recommend the introduction of bingo in licensed clubs and, if so, when will the necessary legislation be introduced?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): This is a matter of Government policy and should not properly be the subject of a question.

SEAT BELTS FOR CHILDREN.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): Further to the question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, can the Chief Secretary give the House a definite date when legislation or regulations will be introduced to provide for child harness restraints in order that young children will be protected in cars?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is "No".

BREAD PRICES.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir): In view of the answer given by the Minister of Consumer Affairs to the Leader of the Opposition, that the price of bread is 36 cents for a 2-lb. loaf in Victoria, and 39 cents a loaf in South Australia, will he be good enough to advise the House the source of that information and where housewives can purchase bread at that price, in view of the fact that in my electorate a 1½-lb. loaf is selling for 42 cents?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Consumer Affairs): Yes. The information I supplied to the House was provided by the Consumer Protection Bureau. I said unwrapped and unsliced bread. The honorable member for Reservoir is obviously talking about wrapped and sliced bread, which is priced at 42 cents in Victoria, 42 cents in New South Wales and 41 cents in South Australia.

ABOLITION OF DEATH PENALTY.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): Can the Premier advise the House whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to bring about the abolition of the death penalty in Victoria and, if so, has the actual form of legislation been determined? Further, will it wait for a comprehensive change in the provisions of the criminal law? In any case, when is it expected that such legislation will be introduced?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): The question of the honorable member for Melbourne relates to Government policy, and it will be answered at the appropriate time.

CHILDREN'S COURT CONVICTIONS.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East): Can the Premier inform the House whether the Government accepts the principle that a person who suffers a conviction in the Children's Court should not have that conviction held against him in later life, particularly in relation to his employment? If so, why is an applicant for a taxi driver's licence required to furnish to the Transport Regulation Board details of any prior convictions, including convictions in the Children's Court?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): It is certainly my impression from what I know of the Children's Court Act that convictions in the Children's Court of children under seventeen years of age are not published and, in fact, subject to their being of good behaviour for a certain period they are entirely extinguished from the record. I am not aware of the particular case to which

the honorable member for Brunswick East refers, but if I am given sufficient information I shall be happy to investigate it.

PETITIONS.

Fluoridation of Water Supply.

Mr. RAMSAY (Balwyn) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 133 signatures.

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

Mr. McCLURE (Bendigo) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 95 signatures.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS (Box Hill) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 43 signatures.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 133 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 ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 71 signatures.

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

Mr. TEMPLETON (Mentone) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 131 signatures.

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

Mrs. GOBLE (Mitcham) 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. She stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 395 signatures.

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

Freeway F19.

Mrs. GOBLE (Mitcham) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to abandon plans for the extension of Freeway F19, to improve existing road systems and to upgrade the present public transport system. She stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 25 signatures.

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

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

UNPAID ACCOUNTS.

Mr. REESE (Moorabbin) presented a report from the Public Accounts Committee on unpaid accounts for the year 1973–74.

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

STATUTE LAW REVISION COMMITTEE.

MAGISTRATES' COURTS (JURISDICTION) ACT 1973.

Mr. A. T. EVANS (Ballaarat North) presented a report from the Statute Law Revision Committee on the Magistrates' Courts (Jurisdiction) Act 1973 (No. 8427), together with extracts from the proceedings of the committee, appendices and minutes of evidence.

It was ordered that the report be laid on the table, and that the report, appendices and extracts from the proceedings of the committee be printed.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE.

PORT RULE (DANGEROUS GOODS AND OIL IN PORTS) 1974.

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong) presented a report from the Subordinate Legislation Committee on the Port Rule (Dangerous Goods and Oil in Ports) 1974 (Statutory Rule No. 251/1974).

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

PAPERS.

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

Aboriginal Affairs—Report of the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs for the year 1973-74.
Consumer Affairs Council—Report for the year 1973-74.
Country Roads Board—Report for the year 1973-74.
Decentralized Industry Housing Authority—Report for the period from 19th April, 1973, to 30th June, 1974.
Health Act 1958—Report of the Commission of Public Health for the year 1973-74.
Legal Profession Practice Act 1958—Report of the Victorian Law Foundation for the year ended 30th September, 1974.
Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board—Report and statement of accounts for the year 1973-74.
Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended—Nos. 234 and 235 (two papers).
Railways Act 1958—Report of the Victorian Railways Board for the year 1973-74.
Statutory Rules under the following Acts—
Consumer Protection Act 1972—No. 490.
Explosives Act 1960—No. 494.
Game Act 1958—Nos. 496, 497.
Marine Act 1958—No. 495.
Melbourne Harbor Trust Act 1958—No. 498.
Motor Car Act 1958—No. 493.
Police Regulation Act 1958—No. 491.
Scaffolding Act 1971—No. 492.
Stamps Act 1958—No. 489.
Teacher Housing Authority—Report for the year 1973-74.
Town and Country Planning Act 1961—
Shire of Maffra Planning Scheme 1965 (Maffra Township) Amendment No. 9.
Tyers Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 3.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The question is—

That the reports of the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, the Consumer Affairs Council, the Country Roads Board, the Commission of Public Health, the Victorian Railways Board and the Teacher Housing Authority be printed.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): I refer to the report of the Consumer Affairs Council. Can the Minister inform the House why the contents of the report were published in the daily press yesterday? An article that I read clearly indicated that someone had access to the report. The article foreshadowed what was contained in the report, and what the criticisms were to be. Section 7 of the Consumer Protection Act sets out that the council shall prepare an annual report and submit it to the Minister, who then is required by the statute to lay it before both Houses of Parliament. For many years the Opposition has drawn the Government's attention to the practice by which the subject-matter of annual reports or even the contents of second-reading explanatory speeches are published in the press before they are presented to Parliament.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member was perfectly in order in asking a question in the first instance, but he is now debating the matter.

Mr. WILTON: I am referring to the question that the report be printed. It seems to me that the Government is treating Parliament with complete contempt.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the House is that the report be printed. Therefore, this is a narrow debate. I ask the honorable member not to go beyond the question before the House.

Mr. WILTON: Why should the House entertain these motions when the contents of reports can be read in the daily press the day before Parliament meets? I want to establish that point. Obviously, the Government treats Parliament with complete contempt.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Consumer Affairs): I saw the article in the press. I give the House a clear undertaking that the reports were not released until a few minutes ago in the House. As I read it, the article in the daily press was sheer guesswork. It was written on the presumption of the events of past years, and it was a forecast by the writer of what might be the situation. I repeat that no information on the report has been handed out.

It was ordered that the reports be printed.

SCAFFOLDING (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Scaffolding Act 1971.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MARINE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Marine Act 1958 to increase the maximum charges for pilotage and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SHIRE OF BACCHUS MARSH) BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to approve ratify and validate the acquisition of certain land at Bacchus March by the Shire of Bacchus Marsh and to authorize the sale of certain land at Bacchus Marsh by the Shire of Bacchus Marsh, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

NATIONAL PARKS BILL.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It re-enacts with amendments the provisions of the National Parks Act 1970. The passing of the National Parks Act in 1956 provided for the first time in the history of the State a means of achieving unified control of development of national parks. The Act established the National Parks Authority and provided for the development of the administrative machinery and the recruitment of the necessary personnel to give effect to the objects of the Act.

The principal objects of the Act were to protect and preserve the various features which collectively comprise the environment and ecological associations of the areas which had been designated as national parks and, at the same time, to provide for the education and enjoyment of visitors to national parks and to encourage and control such visitors.

Over the years, as funds became available, the authority developed a scientific-administrative nucleus of highly-qualified officers who, with the encouragement of the authority, began to develop the particular expertise required to deal with the many aspects of national parks management.

The improved service provided by the former National Parks Authority, and continued by the National Parks Service, has attracted increasing numbers of visitors to our national parks. The statistics for visitor attendance in our parks are both interesting and challenging. In 1958-59 the total number of visitors to Wilson's Promontory National Park was approximately 28,000. In 1968-69 the number of visitors had risen to 84,000 and for 1973-74 it was 150,000. Visitor figures at other national parks have increased at a similar rate. Overall, the annual visitor intake to our national parks is increasing at a compound rate slightly in excess of 10 per cent.

The desire of the people to escape from the pressures of urban living is manifest. Some of them go to the national parks to study the intrinsic features of the national park—the bird life, the animal life, the wildflowers, the trees, and so on. Some like the peace and quiet of the atmosphere which prevails there; others like the spectacular scenery of the beaches. But many others desire merely to escape from the city, to have a quiet picnic or to ramble through the bush with their families. As citizens of the State, they are just as entitled to enjoy the outdoor environment as those who thrive on the atmosphere of the traditional national park.

In the past many urban dwellers had direct association with relatives living on farms or in country areas. This situation no longer exists to the same extent and many of the urban population have less contact with and understanding of the countryside. Consequently, these people look to the natural bushland areas set aside by the Government in the form of national parks, forest parks and other reserves to provide that countryside experience.

Investigations carried out by the Resources and Planning Branch of the National Parks Service and other private bodies also indicate that there is a growing need for a type of park which can provide outdoor recreation in an attractive bush setting which need not possess all the features of a traditional national park. It is against this background that the Government has decided to legislate for two types of parks—the first will be the traditional type of national park in which the special features which constitute the Australian bushland environment, will be preserved. The second type will be multi-purpose parks where people will be able to enjoy themselves in a natural setting, but where preservation of the natural environment is less important.

These parks will have attractive natural features and a high capacity for recreation where relatively large numbers of people can picnic, walk, swim, fish or enjoy other forms of outdoor recreation. The latter type of park will also include those parks which will be used to demonstrate man's effect on the environment and to re-establish contact and promote understanding between the urban population and the man on the land. For example, Haining, a dairy farm, is being administered by the National Parks Service and will be used to promote a feeling for rural pursuits in a young developing generation.

The existing legislation does not provide the National Parks Service with sufficient flexibility to manage parks for various purposes. The Bill retains the concept of the traditional type of national park but, in addition, makes provision for the management of the other types of parks according to the purposes for which each park is being established.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill.

PART I.—Preliminary: Clauses 1 and 2 cite the short title and contain the machinery provisions providing for the commencement of the legislation and the continuation of all persons, things, and circumstances created or existing under previous legislation.

It should be noted that the interpretation of "park" in clause 3 includes all types of parks.

The objects of the Bill in relation to national parks are stated in clause 4 (*a*). At the Fourth Minister's Conference on National Parks held in Melbourne in August, 1970, the characteristics of a national park were defined as follows—

> A national park is a relatively large area set aside for its features of predominantly unspoiled natural landscape, flora and fauna, permanently dedicated for public enjoyment, education and inspiration, and protected from all interference other than essential management practices, so that its natural attributes are preserved.

Obviously some of the existing national Parks in Victoria do not meet these criteria and one of the first tasks of the National Parks Advisory Council will be to advise me which parks should be so classified. Appropriate amendments will then be made to Schedule Two and Schedule Three which appear in the Bill.

The objects of all other types of parks are described in clause 4 (*b*). These parks will include areas which may have significant eco-systems but are not large enough to be classified as National Parks; areas of natural bushland which are set aside for recreation and enjoyment by the people; areas which may include a number of uses such as boating, fishing, swimming, hunting, and which are zoned according to the use; and areas for environmental education or areas for scientific reference or study.

Clause 4 (*c*) provides for parks to be used by the people for enjoyment recreation or education and for the encouragement and control of each use.

PART II.—Administration: Clauses 5 to 9 relate to the appointment of the Director of National Parks and, subject to the Public Service Act, such other officers and employees as are necessary for purposes of the Act. Provision is also made for the appointment by the Director of National Parks of authorized officers who, apart from their normal duties, will be responsible for enforcing the regulations in each park.

Clause 10 provides for the appointment of a National Parks Advisory Council consisting of the Director of National Parks and six other members appointed by the Governor in Council. Those members will be—a representative of the Conservation Council of Victoria; a representative of the Victorian National Parks Association; a professor or teacher of ecology biology or earth science at a Victorian University; a representative of the Municipal Association of Victoria; and two persons with experience in matters affecting the interests of the community.

One of these persons would need to be conversant with the requirements of recreational activities which would be permitted in some parks, and the other will be a person who has been involved in community activities and may have a particular skill which is not present in the other members, management or a professional discipline such as sociology.

The functions of the council, which are stated in clauses 11 and 12, will be—

(*a*) to advise the Minister generally on the administration of the Act and on any particular matter on which the council's advice is sought by the Minister;

(*b*) to act as a committee of management of any land acquired for the purposes of a park for a maximum period of two years or until an Act of Parliament has reserved that land as a park during that period.

The council will be required to submit to the Minister an annual report on the performance of its functions will be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Under existing legislation, provision is made for the appointment of committees of management of national parks and some existing parks have been managed by committees of management for a number of years. The members of these committees have carried out a valuable and onerous task and I pay tribute to their devotion in sticking to their honorary tasks in at times somewhat difficult circumstances due to lack of financial and staff resources.

There is no doubt that Victoria owes a debt of gratitude to these men who in the early years of the history of the National Parks Service supplied the management skills which the State did not have the financial resources to provide. However, that day has passed and it is now time for the National Parks Service to assume control over all parks established under the legislation. But the Government recognizes that it should continue to avail itself of the experience resting in the members of the present committees of management.

Therefore provision is made later in the Bill for these committees to become advisory committees as provided in clause 14. The function of an advisory committee will be to make recommendations to the Director of National Parks in relation to the care and control of the park for which it is appointed. It is expected that these committees will continue to maintain the contact between the parks staff and the community surrounding the park.

Clause 16 continues existing provisions which permit a member of Parliament and so on to be a member of the National Parks Advisory Council or an advisory committee and receive a fee or a travelling or other allowance therefor.

PART III.—National Parks and other Parks: Clause 17 establishes national parks as those areas described in Schedule Two to the Bill. It also describes the duties of the director in relation to his stewardship of national parks. Likewise, clause 18 establishes other parks as those areas described in Schedule Three and again states the duties of the director in relation to these parks.

Clause 19 places a charge on the Minister to do all things necessary to achieve the objects of the Act but in particular to initiate or investigate proposals for the acquisition of land; the promotion of research studies or investigations; and the authorization of expenditure from the National Parks Fund for these purposes. At this point I should state that land cannot be added to a national park or a national park cannot be established unless by an Act of Parliament.

The clause also provides for the Minister to accept gifts, devices and bequests of real or personal property or land and to act as an administrator of an estate or trustee of moneys or other property when necessary. In national parks and other parks it is necessary to provide certain services and sell commodities to the public. Clause 20 provides for the Minister to grant long-term tenancies and clause 21 provides for the director to grant short-term permits to satisfy these needs. Provision is also made for permits for apiarists.

Management of a park will often involve providing for a number of uses which are mutually incompatible. With this in mind, it is proposed to zone the parks for various types of use as part of the master plan for each park. For example, a small section of a national park may be zoned for recreation and accommodation whereas a large area may be zoned for preservation of a part of the environment. The name of the zone and its location may be declared by the Governor in Council as provided in clause 22.

Clauses 23 and 24 provide for permanent works to be carried out to provide facilities for visitors and for the maintenance of those works and the park generally.

In accordance with clause 25, the National Parks Service, with the consent of its Minister, the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Public Works, may construct a building, jetty, launching or landing place, or other structure on a foreshore or in any Victorian waters adjacent to a park. Provision is made for the costs of the works and of tracks and roads to be paid out of the National Parks Fund.

In a park of the type similar to Haining Farm it is important for the manager of the park to have the flexibility to operate in the same way as a farm manager. Clause 26 gives the service that flexibility.

Clause 27 defines the rights of public authorities in respect of works which they may wish to carry out in a park and ensures that the significant values of any park will be adequately protected.

Clauses 28, 29, 31 and 32 continue existing special provisions relating to various parks whilst clause 30 contains special provisions concerning the Lower Glenelg National Park and in addition authorizes the Forests Commission to manage the Princess Margaret Rose Caves for a period of five years.

PART IV.—General: The National Parks Fund is established by clause 33, which defines its sources of revenue and the types of expenditure which may be charged to the fund.

In addition, clause 34 provides that moneys may be expended for the costs of purchase or acquisition of land which is bought for the purpose of a park or for other costs in the administration of that land by a committee of management appointed under the Land Act. The clause also provides for the Minister to enter into agreements for occupation of the land or grant a tenancy or permit to manage and occupy a building or facility on such land.

Clause 35 requires the Director of National Parks to submit an annual report each year. The provisions of clause 36 are the same in principle as the provisions in section 28B of the Firearms Act 1958, and permit an authorized officer or a member of the Police Force to seize a gun or other weapon carried by a person in a park when the use of such gun or weapon is not authorized. The clause will not prevent the use of guns or other weapons for hunting or shooting when the owner is using them lawfully in a zone of a park in which their use is permitted.

Clause 37 allows the Director of National Parks to authorize the use of a gun or other weapon in a park where such use is not normally permitted.

Clause 38 empowers an authorized officer appointed under clause 9 to request a person's name and address, to request him to leave the park or to produce for inspection a licence permit or authority if the officer believes on reasonable grounds that such person is contravening the Act or regulations.

Pursuant to clause 39, the provisions of section 188A of the Land Act are applied to parks to enable the removal of any unauthorized building structure standing crop or improvement found in a park.

The provisions of clause 40 are designed to prevent the issue of mining leases and licences for operations in a park without the consent of the Minister. In such cases the Minister must first obtain the advice of the National Parks Advisory Council. Provision is also made for an appeal to the Governor in Council by any person who is aggrieved by the refusal of the Minister to grant consent. Where consent is granted by the Minister, either House of Parliament may revoke the Ministerial consent by passing a resolution to that effect.

Clause 41 continues the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the present National Parks Act in a simpler form. However, trespass rates will now be prescribed by regulation subject to the maximum rates stated in the clause.

PART V.—Offences and Proceedings: It is unfortunate that, in a Bill designed for education and recreation purposes of the community, there must be penalties for breaches of certain rules. However, it must be recognized that in every community there is a small element which takes advantage of any neglect to provide penalties for non-observance of those codes of conduct which are cheerfully obeyed by the majority of people.

In these cases, the National Parks Service will continue its policy of attempting to educate this element but where sterner measures are required, this Part provides the power to take them. Clauses 42 and 43 are designed to prevent the use of national parks for commercial gain without proper authority. Clause 44 provides the penalty for unauthorized use of a gun or other weapon in a park.

Clause 45 relates to the penalties in cases where a person fails to comply with a request of an authorized officer as stated in clause 38. Clauses 46 and 47 relate to offences against the Act or regulations and enable authorized officers to appear on behalf of the director or to produce charts or maps which shall be accepted as prima facie evidence if a certification is signed by the director to the matters so certified.

PART VI.—Regulations: Power is sought under clause 48 of the Bill to make regulations in respect of the usual formal and machinery matters, the management of parks and the control of persons and vehicles in parks.

PART VII.—Transitional Provisions Consequential Amendments: Clause 49 provides for the continuation of the appointment of the present Director of National Parks.

For a number of years rangers have been employed as employees exempt from the provisions of the Public Service Act and some have been subject to the direction of the National Parks Service whilst others have been subject to the direction of committees of management. Clause 50 will enable rangers to be appointed to the Public Service and for the Public Service Board to take account of their previous "exempt" service in determining their emoluments and other conditions of service. This proposal has the support of the Victorian Public Service Association.

Clauses 51 and 52 revoke the appointments of members of the present committees of management and appoint them as members of advisory committees in respect of the parks for which they were previously responsible.

Clause 53 revokes all orders and proclamations under the Land Act which apply to lands that are now included in the parks named in Schedule Two or Schedule Three. Some lands which are proposed to be included in the Lower Glenelg National Park and Mount Richmond National Park have the status of reserved forest. Clause 54 revokes that status.

Clause 55 contains a number of consequential amendments to various Acts to provide for the commencement of this Bill, the two categories of parks or the altered status of committees of management. I commend the Bill to honorable members.

On the motion of Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, December 24.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SHIRE OF BACCHUS MARSH) BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Country Party and the Opposition for granting leave for the

explanatory second-reading speech to be made so soon after the first reading. The Bill meets a request by the Bacchus Marsh Shire Council for legislation to put beyond doubt the validity of the council's actions in connection with the purchase of certain land being part of an area known as the old Lifeguard factory land in Main Street, Bacchus Marsh.

The council required part of this land for an off-street car park and the Bacchus Marsh Dairymen's Co-operative Association Ltd. was also anxious to acquire part of the Main Street frontage for a retail store. Late in 1972 the council and the co-operative agreed to purchase the land jointly. Part of the land was held under a general law title and it was proposed that the council should, with the consent of the vendor, carry out compulsory acquisition proceedings to bring the land under the Transfer of Land Act. This is being done at present.

The council offered the owner of the land—W. D. & H. O. Wills Distributors (Queensland) Pty Ltd.—the sum of $50,000 for the land, and this was accepted and a contract of sale was signed on 20th December, 1972. The council proceeded to borrow $15,000 for land acquisition and establishment of a car park and, in the following August, obtained from the co-operative its share of the purchase money and paid for the land. Subsequently the council and the co-operative agreed to take different portions of the land from that originally agreed upon.

Doubts have been expressed as to the validity of the council's actions in this matter. It has been contended that—

(*a*) A council may purchase land only for the purpose of executing authorized works and undertakings but in this instance land was purchased for resale to another body.

(*b*) The general power of a council to sell land is limited to the sale of land no longer required for the purpose of any undertaking for which it was purchased but in this case the land proposed to be sold was purchased for resale.

(*c*) The council acted as an agent or trustee for the co-operative but it is not within its power to do so.

(*d*) If the transaction is beyond the council's powers then moneys borrowed to carry it out have not been lawfully borrowed.

The Bill will validate the council's purchase of the land and authorize the transfer to the co-operative of the agreed portion in consideration of the moneys paid to council by the co-operative. It will also validate the borrowing by the council for the undertaking.

There is no question but that the council has acted completely honestly—and with the best interests of the township in mind—in all its dealings in the matter. The only point at issue is whether or not it exceeded its statutory powers in so doing. In the circumstances, it is most desirable that its actions be validated and the transaction completed to the satisfaction of all parties. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows), the debate was adjourned.

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

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

The debate (adjourned from November 21) on the motion of Mr. Hamer (Premier and Treasurer) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) : As the Premier indicated, this Bill is important because for the first time in many years it involves revision and considerable alteration to the Public Service Act, with changes in both the structuring and staffing of the Public Service.

It goes without saying that an essential arm of government is the implementation of decisions made by Parliament, and Parliamentary democracy, as we understand it, rests very heavily on an independent, dedicated and talented Public Service.

The Bland report, which was referred to by the Premier in his second-reading speech, was a precursor to the Bill, and was presented to the House on 30th September. The report is an impressive document in its scope, conclusions and recommendations in that it draws a large number of conclusions and makes a large number of recommendations.

Paragraph 14.9 of the conclusions and recommendations of the board of inquiry state, *inter alia*—

> As of the moment, the Public Service is ill-prepared to master the challenges that lie ahead : it cannot be said to be adequately responding to the demands currently being made on it.

Paragraphs 14.15, 14.17 and 14.18 are critical of the intake into the Public Service at the lower level and point out, *inter alia*—

> Of the 533 net intake of secondary school appointees to the present Administrative Division from the Public Service Board's October, 1973, competitive examination, i.e., allowing for separations to 1st April, 1974, 290 or 54 per cent had marks in that examination that fell within the bottom 40 per cent of passes of successful candidates. Of the 183 net intake from the 1973 competitive examination with higher school certificate qualifications, i.e., allowing for separations to 1st April, 1974, nearly 79 per cent were in the bottom 40 per cent of the pass scale.

The examination results are, by themselves, no conclusive indication of either a man's talent or capacity. Some people perform brilliantly in examinations and acquire a very high degree, but when they come to perform particular tasks for which their profession qualifies them, they are often a complete failure. Others are described as late developers. For a variety of personal reasons they do not necessarily aquit themselves well in an examination, but nevertheless ultimately develop in a way which makes them first rate in their chosen field of endeavour.

The same type of comment could also be applied to the statement that only six graduates were appointed in the year 1969. It is fair enough to say that graduation is some mark of talent, but recently I said publicly that it seemed to me that one of the problems that Governments experience in Commonwealth-State relations is the number of highly-qualified theorists operating in senior positions in Canberra who, by virtue of their position, are able to give advice, but because of the social structure in Canberra they are so far removed from the mainstrings of business life and life in Melbourne and Sydney that much of the advice given is essentially academic and theoretical and bears very little relationship to the problems on the ground.

In making a judgment on the quality and calibre of the people taken into our Public Service, I hope we will not simply regard academic qualifications as the ultimate criteria but will look to see that the Public Service has people with wide-ranging skills and adaptability who can carry out the very high demands to be made upon the service in this State in the future.

As the Premier pointed out, the Bill covers matters under about five separate headings. One deals with the Public Service Board. Originally concern was felt in the Public Service about the possibility of a reduction in representation in that the Public Service would not continue to have a member on the board. Proper concern was also felt that appointments to the board were not for a fixed duration. The former fear was related to a recommendation contained in the Bland report, but the Government did not accept that recommendation. The second fear came from the Public Service, and it is good that the Government has seen fit to amend the Bill.

The Bill then deals with the divisional structure and the problems which have been created in the past in the administrative and professional divisions. I hope the proposals contained in the Bill represent a significant forward step. The Bill deals also with promotion, with procedures for transfer and promotion, and finally with regulations, which will be promulgated by the Governor in Council.

Of all Bills which come before this Parliament, this is a very important measure, because it deals with the relationship which exists between the Public Service on the one hand and the Government and the Parliament on the other hand. Because of that special relationship, it is a Bill about which the Government must take higher responsibility than it does with other pieces of proposed legislation, because Ministers of the Crown are, by virtue of their experience, in a favourable position to make a judgment which has to be made for ensuring that the Public Service structure works. In this State we still have the concept of Ministerial responsibility, although from time to time—debates on this subject have been held—attempts have been made to dilute that responsibility. In the final analysis the Parliamentary system can work only if a Minister accepts responsibility for the actions of his servants. That being so, by its very nature the Bill has to be wide-ranging. I would be presuming upon your charity, Mr. Speaker, and upon the past traditions of the House, if I were to try to elaborate an argument which can be made much more properly during the Committee stage.

Members of the Opposition will not oppose the Bill. We make it clear that it is the Government's responsibility to accept or reject the recommendations contained in the Bland report. I caution the Premier and the Government that ultimately improvement in the quality of the Public Service and the method of its operations will not be resolved by legislation. The proposed legislation will simply provide the skeletal framework upon which a proper structure can be based. Ultimately the strength of the Public Service will depend on the quality of the people who come into it, and the effective working relationship that can be established, within the framework of the proposed legislation. This will require tolerance, understanding and prudence by Ministers and public servants.

Having indicated that the Bill is very much the responsibility of the Government, I will reserve further detailed criticisms until the Committee stage. I hope the Bill, subject to the amendments that the Government in its prudence has been wise to accept, will provide the legislative structure upon which the Victorian Public Service can function and carry out its high responsibilities to Parliament and the State.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): I confess that I face a difficult task in adequately contributing to the debate on the Bill and the detailed subject of the Public Service. I have had limited experience with this organization because I have not long been a member of Parliament. I thank the people who have assisted me in my research on the Bill, particularly Mr. Green, the Secretary of the Premier's Department, and Mr. Andrews, the Secretary of the Public Service Association. Everyone agrees that the existing legislation is a hotch-potch. The Act has been amended from time to time over the years, sometimes as a result of earlier inquiries and sometimes as a result of a situation which applied at the time but which may no longer be applicable in this day and age. Most honorable members have studied the Bland report. Sir Henry Bland is to be commended on producing a clear, detailed and well-written report. One might not agree with all his conclusions but the report makes interesting reading.

I was a little intrigued originally as to why the Government was apparently introducing the Bill with such haste, because Sir Henry Bland presented the report to Parliament only a few months ago. I could not understand why it was necessary to introduce the Bill until Sir Henry Bland had completed all his reports. Honorable members will recall that one report was presented last week. However, after discussion and inquiry I realize that the subject is so important that it is probably advisable that the Bill should be introduced now. Sir Henry Bland was of the opinion that it was necessary for a new Act to be put into operation before he made further recommendations.

The people of Victoria have been well served by the Public Service for many years. It is regrettable that a significant section of the community holds the Public Service in low esteem. That attitude is unwarranted. Some members of the Public Service are inefficient and perhaps do not gain sufficient job satisfaction. This may be because much of the work in government is repetitive and mechanical and does not provide a great deal of interest. There are probably inefficient people in private enterprise, too. The difference may be that inefficient people tend to be cleaned out more often in private enterprise than in the Government service. However, by and large the people of Victoria can be proud of the service rendered by the Public Service over the years, particularly by some permanent heads who have made tremendous contributions to the running of the State and its well-being. The contribution by officers right down the line is commendable.

It appears that a reasonably good relationship exists between the present Government and the Victorian Public Service Association. It apparently existed also with governments since the second world war. I do not know whether that good relationship has always existed. From some of the stories that one hears, perhaps it did not. The fact that the Government and the Premier have agreed to make amendments suggested by the association is indicative of the good relationship between the association and the Government.

There appears to be only one radical departure from the recommendations of Sir Henry Bland. Sir Henry recommended a three-member Public Service Board, which would not include a member elected by the Public Service Association. The Government has seen fit not to adopt that recommendation and has decided to continue the present procedure. That is fair enough. Throughout the world there is a move towards worker participation in management. That situation does not appeal to me in private enterprise. I cannot see why one needs people from the factory floor in the board room. They may not have the ability to make decisions and produce profits. However, the situation is different with the Government service.

Mr. EDMUNDS: What is the difference?

Mr. BAXTER: The Government service employs a large number of public servants and is not operating a business such as the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. It is probably wise that the Public Service considers that it has sufficiently close contact with the Public Service Board through its elected member. It might be considered that without an elected member there could be grounds for exploitation by the Government. That probably does not apply in this day and age. It may have applied in the past, but the fact that there is still to be an elected member should be an adequate safeguard against exploitation. The reconstituted Public Service should be able to devote itself to the principles contained in the Bill and to the efficient operation of the service, because a few of its functions have now been removed. A separate appeal board will be set up to relieve the Public Service

Board. At present the board is occupied with appeals for at least one day a week. Obviously, that should not be a responsibility of the board. The board's responsibility should be the efficient running of the service as a whole.

I notice that the Victorian Public Service Association requested the Premier to ensure that a quorum of the board required the elected member to be present, particularly when dealing with items which come within the jurisdiction of clause 42 of the Bill, which deals with industrial matters and salaries. On the surface it appears a reasonable request by members of the service that while the board is dealing with industrial matters their member is bound to be present, but in practice I believe this is not practical. As I said, I do not believe there are grounds for believing that exploitation of employees by the employer will take place, especially in the Government service. It would be unwise to give one member of the board a power which is not given to other members. If one member was given the power of making or breaking the quorum, that would upset the entire operations of the board.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the academic qualifications of members of the Public Service and quoted some paragraphs from the Bland report which pointed out that the service as at present constituted is probably sadly lacking in academic qualifications to meet the challenges facing the State today. Honorable members will concede that government has become more complex. There are many more issues that certainly did not apply 30 years ago, such as conservation, consumer affairs, and growth centres. Obviously, if the Public Service is to function efficiently it needs to attract adequately qualified personnel. Sir Henry Bland and the Premier said that it should be the target of the board to appoint 10 per cent of graduates. The justification for this proposition was that there are approximately 10 per cent of graduates in outside employment. I am afraid the logic of that escapes me. It would be preferable to ensure that adequate numbers of graduates are taken in to do the work that is required, whether or not more than 10 per cent are required. However, perhaps it is a fair target to set that the Public Service should be looking at an intake of approximately 10 per cent of graduates.

There has been disquiet among members of the service on the issue of outside appointments and the fact that there is no appeal against an outside appointment. The Bill provides an adequate safeguard. The board will not appoint an outside person unless it is satisfied that there is no one within the service who is capable of doing the job efficiently and satisfactorily. Surely the board is entitled to appoint an officer who is capable of carrying out the job better than merely satisfactorily. It should be looking for people who will provide the impetus for the most efficient type of Public Service possible. If that means attracting people from outside the Public Service, well and good. An added safeguard is that before an outside person is appointed, the position must be advertised. There is no provision for saying to a person, "We want you in the Public Service. How about applying?" The position must be advertised. That will provide the opportunity for any person who is interested in the position to apply through the proper channels.

Mr. GINIFER: Does that apply to retired teachers who work as temporary clerks in the Education Department?

Mr. BAXTER: I do not propose to become involved in the subject of retired teachers. No one claims that the Bill is perfect. The Act will probably need amending after it has been in operation for a short time and the House has had the opportunity of ascertaining how it operates. The Bill

is a reasonable attempt to reconstitute the operations of the Public Service on a more efficient basis than they are on now. The people of Victoria can be proud that there has never been an attempt, certainly in my time, to politicize the Public Service, such as is taking place in Canberra today. I hope that type of activity never takes place in Victoria. The Public Service should serve impartially whichever Government is in office. One cannot have faith in the Public Service if the Government of the day, of whatever political complexion it happens to be, appoints its friends to senior positions.

The Country Party considers this Bill to be a good start to revitalizing the Public Service, and supports it.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Repeals and amendments).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I commend the contributions to the debate made by the Leader of the Opposition and the honorable member for Murray Valley, particularly their bipartisan support of the Bill. Although the Bill is important to all of us in the Government and the Parliament and, indeed, to the community, it is not a party-political Bill.

To the extent that the Bill is largely based on the recommendations of Sir Henry Bland, it is a tribute to the quality of his report. The last way in which the Bill should be regarded is as any kind of criticism of the Public Service or of the structure of the Public Service as it is now. Nevertheless, it is evident that after many years some streamlining of the structure is desirable, and some review of the powers and functions of the Public Service Board, the heads of departments, and so on. I thank Sir Henry Bland for the way in which he went about his inquiry, his thoroughness, and the obvious validity of many of his recommendations.

As it said very promptly, the Government was not able to accept his recommendation to abolish the position of the elected member on the Public Service Board. Apart from the long record of great success with an elected member, there was the fact that there are elected members on many Government authorities, including the Teachers Tribunal and the Police Service Board, which fixes police wages and conditions, as well as the whole system of wages boards which is peculiar to Victoria.

In Victoria, the principle of the two sides being present with an arbitrator or adjudicator has won acceptance. It is being increasingly accepted in overseas countries. When the Chairman of the Public Service Board was in Geneva recently, he was able to tell the many people gathered there how these things operated in this State. He aroused a great deal of interest and found commendation for the notion of direct participation by elected members. So it did not take the Government long to dispense with that recommendation, not to weaken the board but to maintain its strength.

I have found in practice that the stereotype of the normal public servant is in no way justified in Victoria. Those of us who have anything to do with the Public Service know that most of its members are devoted people who very often work long hours. The quality of service which they give and the willingness with which they give it is exemplary. I can say that quite positively because, having known several departments, I have found it to be true.

Given that quality of service, it behoves us to make sure that the organization, the recruitment, the training and the promotion system are suitable for a service imbued with that kind of feeling and ambition. And so this Bill is before Parliament. Like all other honorable members, I hope the Bill will not lead to revolutionary upheavals in the Public

Service but rather to improvements which will make themselves manifest over the years.

I congratulate the Victorian Public Service Association and the Hospital Employees Federation for their contributions to the Bill once it was drafted. They made what I regard as responsible suggestions for its improvement. As will be seen, many have been adopted and are now enshrined in proposed amendments to the Bill.

I commend their attitude of responsibility and their evident desire to make whatever improvements may be possible in the Public Service with a view to its better operation. That has been their sole motive and they have pursued it extremely well. I congratulate them and thank them for the help they gave from the time the report on the Public Service was first publicized, on 30th December, 1973, right up to now, in discussions on the Bill and its preparation, and to the debate in Parliament.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 3 to 5.

Clause 6 (Constitution of the board).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 6, sub-section (3), line 35, omit "a person" and insert "an officer of the Public Service".

This amendment relates to a submission made by the Hospital Employees Federation that the person elected to the board to represent the interests of the officers of the Mental Hygiene Branch, in the new Third Division, should be an officer of the service. Obviously, an officer of the service would have a far better and more comprehensive knowledge of the interests and requirements of the service than would someone from outside. Indeed, for the Public Service as a whole, it is provided that the elected member must be a member of the service.

The provision resulted from an oversight in the first place and the Government moves this amendment to bring the two services into line with each other and to ensure that everyone who is elected, by free election, will be a member of the service that he represents.

The amendemnt was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted.

Clause 7 (Term of office of members).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 7, sub-section (1), paragraph (*b*), sub-paragraph (i), lines 37-39, omit "such term, not exceeding five years, as is fixed by the Governor in Council on or before his appointment" and insert "a term of five years".

Sub-clause (1) refers to the term of appointment of members of the Public Service Board. Submissions were received from both the Public Service Association and the Hospital Employees Federation that the term should be fixed from the beginning so that those offering themselves for election would know what the term of service would be. It was suggested that, if it were known, the field of potential candidates would be increased and improved.

As the Bill is drafted, the term of office would be fixed by the Governor in Council before the appointment and could be anything up to five years. The Government accepts the proposal that the term should be fixed, and the amendment is designed to give effect to it. It will provide that, apart from the chairman, the members of the board will hold office for a fixed term of five years. As that will be known in advance, potential candidates will know the period for which they will serve, subject to voluntary withdrawal, of course.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) : The Opposition welcomes this amendment. Indeed, in examining the Bill it was at a loss to understand how a provision effecting an appointment of this kind could be put forward in this way. The term would have been subject to the

pleasure of the Government. The Government has now moved an amendment to provide for a fixed term and I have only one objection. As a matter of principle, I would expect the term to be specified in the Bill rather than be left to the discretion of the Governor in Council.

This principle has been criticized by other honorable members. More and more, matters which should properly be decided by Parliament and set out in legislation are referred to the Governor in Council. This is an important appointment, and if Parliament specified the term in the Bill there would be even greater certainty.

I ask the Premier to consider this position while the Bill is between here and another place. Important principles are involved. If the Public Service Board is to be entirely independent, Parliament should adopt for it the same legislative standard which it adopts for the judiciary. Judges' appointments are not made for a fixed term, but neither are they subject to variation at the will of the Government by order of the Governor in Council.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I am willing to consider anything that the Leader of the Opposition puts forward for consideration, but I am not sure that I understand him. If the amendment is carried the clause will state that each of the members of the board, other than the chairman, will hold office for a term of five years and then be eligible for reappointment. If that is the position, the only way that the office could become vacant would be under the terms of clause 11, which sets out a number of conditions for this, such as the expiration of the term, death, if the member is removed from office, if he resigns, and so on. But, apart from that, the term would be fixed. That is what the association suggested and what the Government agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 8 to 11.

Clause 12. (Deputies).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 12, line 15, insert the following sub-section to follow sub-section (1) :—

"( ) In addition to the powers conferred by the last preceding sub-section in the case of the temporary illness or temporary absence of a member referred to in sub-section (2) or sub-section (3) of section 6 and at the request of such member the chairman may by writing under his hand appoint, subject to sub-section (4), a person to be the deputy of such member for such period not exceeding seven days as he thinks fit and such deputy may exercise the powers and perform the duties of such member accordingly."

I do not think this amendment was submitted by either of the associations. It is intended to cover the temporary absence of a member representing the service when it is desired to avoid disruption of the board's affairs because of his absence. A period of seven days is laid down in the amendment. The Committee will notice that a temporary appointment under the hand of the chairman can be made only at the request of the member himself, so that there is nothing arbitrary about the provision. It is meant to ensure that the business of the board can be carried on.

A similar provision exists in the present Act, and it has worked very well on the rare occasions when it has been necessary to invoke it.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 13 to 29.

Clause 30 (Qualifications for appointment).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 30, sub-section (1), paragraph (*b*), sub-paragraph (iii), line 21, after "or" insert "an affiliated college of the Victoria Institute of Colleges or a constituent college of the State College of Victoria or".

Under the provisions of the clause, which laid down the qualifications for appointment to the First Division and the Second Division of the Public Service, an alternative qualification is that the officer should have been admitted or be eligible to be

admitted to a degree course of a university. It was pointed out, in some dudgeon, by the Victoria Institute of Colleges and the State College of Victoria that there are now other forms of tertiary institutions besides universities which grant or intend to grant degrees.

The amendment is designed to put those institutions on the same basis as universities, for qualification for appointment to the first and second divisions of the Public Service. In other words, the Government is aware that there are tertiary level degree-granting institutions in the Victoria Institute of Colleges and the State College, and they will be placed on the same basis as the universities.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): Clause 30 (1) (*a*) (i) states—

> Subject to this Act a person is not eligible for appointment.
>
> (*a*) to any division of the Public Service unless—
>
> (i) he is an Australian citizen or a British subject.

That matter was referred to directly at page 52 of the Bland report.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): Order! Is the Leader of the Opposition relating this matter to the amendment? It might be preferable to deal with the amendment first and then relate it to the clause.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): I direct the attention of the Premier to what I regard as an unnecessarily restrictive provision which prevents a person from becoming eligible for appointment to the Public Service unless he is an Australian citizen or a British subject.

Probably no nation in the world has undergone such a transformation over the past decades as Australia. People of diverse cultural and racial backgrounds have been accepted, encouraged and welcomed into the community. Australian society has been enriched, but problems have arisen, especially in places such as my electorate, where 80 per cent of the children attending any school are not of Australian origin, and 60 per cent to 80 per cent of the people in any one street are not of Australian origin. People who have made their homes here have just as many problems as anyone else—probably more, because of language difficulties—in dealing with the Public Service structures.

The Government should approach the matter more flexibly and consider recruiting people into certain sections of the Public Service which are specifically designed to deal with the problems of different communities. At page 52 of his report Sir Henry Bland specifically referred to this matter when he said—

> The nationality problem has engaged the erudite attention of the Crown law authorities. The practice of the Public Service with candidates who are not natural born or naturalized British subjects and are not eligible to apply for a certificate of Australian citizenship is to appoint on probation and confirm only when the certificate is obtained. If a candidate within six months of becoming eligible to apply fails to do so, and to obtain his certificate, his probationary appointment is annulled.

He goes on to say—

> It might be wise to legitimize this practice.

Not only would it be wise to legitimize the practice, but having regard to the diversity of cultural and community interests, Parliament ought to extend the scope of the section. I foresee that it will be necessary for the State to have a permanent pool of interpreters and translators to service Government departments. The best people to acquire to do that quickly are those who come from other countries and intend to settle in Australia.

If the Government is not prepared to go as far as I would go, at least it should legitimize the practice or extend it. Certainly the reference in the report is direct and should be acted upon.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I am prepared to examine the problem. It had not occurred to

me that the provision was discriminatory; if it had, I would have reacted strongly against it because Government policy is entirely opposed to discrimination of any kind against any person.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, in his report Sir Henry Bland did not advocate the elimination of this qualification; he said that the current practice of placing on probation a person who is entitled to a certificate of naturalization should be legitimized. I am not sure whether I like that provision either, but I should like to have time to consider the whole question. It might be that the restriction could be removed entirely. In most public services there is such a requirement based on the assumption that a person who wants to enter the service or take part in the Government structure should at least have taken the step of obtaining a certificate of naturalization when he becomes entitled to do so. There may be reasons why the gates should not be opened altogether.

It will require consideration, and I should like to discuss the matter with representatives of the services involved into whose ranks these people would come, if the restriction were removed. I undertake to do that and, if necessary, later to move an amendment to the Act to make changes in the light of those discussions. The suggestion is worth considering, and I thank the Leader of the Opposition for raising it.

The clause, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 31 to 33.

Clause 34 (Advertisements).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 34, sub-section (1), line 21, omit "Except in the case of appointments under section 32".

The amendment, if acceptable to the Committee, will mean that first appointments to the Public Service at any level will have to be made from people who have applied for positions in response to public notices. This matter was mentioned by the honorable member for Murray Valley, and the Government agrees with the submissions which have been made on this point, that everybody who seeks an appointment should do so in response to an advertisement so that everyone will know about the vacancy and will have a chance of applying for it.

This will assist the permanent head of a department to evaluate the field of applicants from outside the service in particular cases, and to decide whether to recommend an outside applicant under section 32 of the Act. It will also assist the board in dealing with applications. Officers within the service will be reassured that all persons being considered for the position will meet the stated requirements.

The Government is happy to make this amendment to ensure that all those positions will be advertised and brought to the notice of those who wish to apply for them.

The amendment was agreed, and the clause, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 35 and 36.

Clause 37 (Transfers and promotions).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 37, sub-section (3), line 19, after "vacancy" insert "or he may cause the vacancy to be advertised or he may request the Board to cause the vacancy to be advertised".

Clause 37 (3) provides—

Where an office in the First Division is vacant or is about to become vacant the permanent head may after consultation with the Board transfer or promote a qualified officer to fill the vacancy.

The proposed amendment will give the permanent head a further discretion to advertise a vacancy, or ask the board to do so, in addition to his existing discretions to transfer or promote a qualified officer. It widens the options available to the permanent head, and to that extent I think it is an improvement.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 37, sub-section (4), line 22, after "vacancy" insert "or he may cause the vacancy to be advertised or he may request the Board to cause the vacancy to be advertized".

This is a companion amendment to the one which the Committee has accepted, and applies to any officer other than officers in the First Division. It is consistent with the first amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 37, page 20, line 17, insert the following sub-section to follow sub-section (12) :—

"( ) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Board may at any time cancel a promotion or transfer if it is satisfied that the person promoted or transferred does not possess the qualifications prescribed for the office."

This was a proposal by the Public Service Board and states that the board has the last say to ensure that the qualifications for every position are established by the board. It makes for uniformity in interpretation of qualifications, and the board is the obvious and appropriate authority for this task. The whole purpose is to make sure that there is uniformity so that there cannot be any feeling of injustice or inequity, and it makes the board the final arbiter as to qualifications regarding particular positions. Therefore, I think this is a further improvement to the Bill.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted.

Clause 38 (Appeals).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 38, page 21, lines 4 to 6, omit sub-section (6).

This sub-section purports to require every member of the Promotions Appeal Board to take an oath or to make an affirmation. A revision of the Bill shows that this provision is unnecessary. The requirement to make an oath is incorporated already in clause 38 (4) (*b*), and therefore this is simply repetition and is unnecessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 38, page 21, line 42, insert the following sub-section to follow sub-section (14) :—

"( ) Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Division, the permanent head or the Board (as the case may be) may defer the confirmation of a promotion for such period as the permanent head or the Board specifies and at any time before the end of the period specified by the permanent head or the Board the permanent head or the Board may confirm the promotion or cancel the promotion."

The effect of this amendment is to provide for a promotion to be on probation at the discretion of the board or the permanent head, as the case may be. There is such a provision in the existing Act. It is resorted to when appropriate, and again it widens the discretions available either to the permanent head or to the board. Obviously, in some cases it would be desirable to make an appointment on probation. I believe it was probably an omission from the Bill because it is a provision in the present Act which, although it has not been objected to, has been found useful.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was adopted.

Clause 39 (Efficiency).

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) : The Premier and Treasurer might like to give consideration to replacing the word "officers" with the word "persons" in sub-clause (1) which provides—

In the selection of an officer to fill a vacancy and in determining any appeal regard shall be had first to relative efficiency and in the event of an equality of efficiency of two or more officers then to the seniority of those officers.

In other portions of the Bill provision is made for the selection of people from outside the Public Service. It seems to me that there

should be a uniformity of standard. If two officers are seeking the one position, regard has to be paid to relative efficiency. It seems to me by this fairly simple exercise in drafting one of these persons could be from outside the service. If it was desired to appoint persons from outside the service regard should be paid to their relative efficiency. This result could be achieved by substituting the word "persons" for the word "officers".

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I should like to consider what the Leader of the Opposition has raised. I do not believe this clause is meant to apply to persons applying from outside the service. There might be some difficulty in making it so apply because there are questions of relative efficiency, and I do not know whether that would be easy to judge in the case of someone from inside and another person from outside the service. I will undertake to consider this clause with the Government's advisers to see whether there are any difficulties about it. I do not want to appear to hold up the Bill; however, I can see that this clause is probably drafted with another purpose in mind, only considering competition between existing officers. I should like to obtain some idea of the ramifications if the word "officers" were changed to "persons". However, I give that undertaking.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 40 to 56.

Clause 57 was verbally amended, and, as amended, was adopted, as were clauses 58 to 62.

Clause 63 (Determination of charges against second and third division officers).

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Clause 63, sub-section (1), line 14, after "charge" insert "including the penalty to be imposed".

This is a clarifying amendment. The section refers to charges of misconduct against second and third division officers and empowers the permanent head or his delegate to hear and determine a charge. There is no direct reference to the penalty. The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that not only can a charge be heard and determined, but that the appropriate penalty can be enforced.

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

Schedule One was verbally amended, and, as amended, was adopted, as were Schedule Two to Schedule Four.

Schedule Five.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

Schedule Five, under the heading "*Cities*", after "Altona" insert "Berwick".
Schedule Five, under the heading "*Cities*", after "Collingwood" insert "Croydon".
Schedule Five, under the heading "*Shires*" omit "Berwick".
Schedule Five, under the heading "*Shires*" omit "Croydon".
Schedule Five, under the heading "*Shires*", after "Mornington" insert "Pakenham".

Schedule Five is simply a list of cities and shires which are referred to in the body of the Bill. The amendments have been made necessary by the fact that the former Shire of Berwick has been divided into the City of Berwick and the Shire of Pakenham, and Croydon has become a city. All of these amendments make the situation factually correct.

The amendments were agreed to, and the schedule, as amended, was adopted.

The Bill was reported to the House with amendments, and passed through its remaining stages.

WODONGA AREA LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 4) 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 is essentially complementary to the Act passed by Parliament for the establishment of the Albury-Wodonga complex. The provisions of the Bill have been adequately explained by the Premier. They are to extend the period of the principal Act from 31st December, 1974, for a further period to 31st December, 1975. The reasons have been given.

The second amendment substitutes the phrase "Designated area" for the term "Wodonga area". This amendment is to ensure that the rights of people in the areas concerned are not adversely affected.

The third amendment is designed to ensure that the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation and the Albury-Wodonga (Victorian) Corporation will be bound by the terms of the Local Government Act. The Bill is not opposed by the Opposition.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): Honorable members will recall the passage of the original legislation through the House at about this time last year. Honorable members will further recall that the first Bill introduced was withdrawn after considerable pressure from local members representing the area and that the Wodonga Area Land Acquisition Bill was subsequently passed by both Houses.

The original Bill set the date 31st December, 1974, as the end of the period in which the corporation could exercise its powers and acquire land within what is known as the Wodonga area. The Bill extends that deadline by twelve months only, to 31st December next. I understand that the original idea of the corporation was to extend the time to 3rd October, 1978, which would have brought the Victorian legislation into line with that applying in New South Wales. There was a good deal of disquiet in the Wodonga region over that aspect, particularly from the Landholders' Association, the Wodonga City Council and other municipalities within the Wodonga region. Representations were made by a number of members, including my colleague the Honorable Keith Bradbury and myself, and the Premier has seen fit to alter the date to 31st December, 1975.

I am the first to concede that there is no hope of the corporations acquiring all the land necessary within that twelve months. Perhaps it will be necessary to bring in another amendment next year, but that synopsis will give Parliament the opportunity of examining the corporation's activities again, and it will probably hurry the corporation up a little. I am not accusing the corporation of laxity, but during the past twelve months it has tended to allow some things to drift on. Any honorable member who has visited the Wodonga area and talked to the people there has found that there has been heartburning arising from actions of the corporation. The amendment will require the corporation to act with a little more diligence, but I do not want it to mean that the corporation will adopt a harder or tougher line with landowners whose land is being acquired. There is danger that corporation members may feel they have not achieved what they wanted and that they should therefore adopt a tough line. I hope they will not do so and I have confidence that they will see the error in that way.

Notices to treat have not yet been issued ; all acquisition has been done by negotiation between the owner and the corporation via the property branch of the Victorian Public Works Department. Almost without exception the prices arrived at have been acceptable and quite generous. At present agreement has not been reached in all cases regarding price, but I am sure those issues will shortly be resolved.

The Bill includes a clause which makes it clear that within the Wodonga City Council area and other

municipal areas not within the designated areas but in which the corporation is exercising some of its powers, the corporation must come within the confines of the Local Government Act and it must not override the particular municipality. There is much fear within the Albury-Wodonga area that the future of local government may be surpassed by an all-powerful corporation. I reject that concept and want to keep control of the development of the area as much as possible in the hands of the people who live there, in accord with local aspirations.

On a number of occasions I have made suggestions on how the composition of the corporation might be extended to include more part-time local representatives so that the executive members would not have the power to do what they like, which they have at present. I have also made a number of suggestions recommending operations of the consultative council. I believe the chairman of the corporation, whoever he may be from time to time, should not also be chairman of the consultative council. It would be too much like a school master telling the children what to do. I hope that in due course the amendments which I have suggested to the Minister for State Development and Decentralization will be incorporated in legislation.

I should like to pay tribute to the work done by Councillor Les Stone, who is grievously ill at present. Mr. Stone, a dedicated man, was Mayor of Wodonga for three or four years and carried out that office excellently. He was appointed part-time member of the corporation and served very well in that capacity. He was loyal to the corporation and did not criticize it publicly when he was under tremendous pressure to do so. I admire any man who is prepared to stick to his guns the way Councillor Stone did on this issue. Councillor Stone and I have argued on many occasions but we have always agreed to differ amicably. As the honorable member for Deer Park indicates to the House, Councillor Stone and I contested preselection for the electorate of Murray Valley. It is unfortunate that the honorable member for Ballaarat North has had on the Notice Paper in the past few weeks questions which by inference have cast aspersions on Councillor Stone's integrity. As Councillor Stone is so ill at present, that is indeed unfortunate.

The whole concept of Albury-Wodonga is beginning to bear fruit. A dead hand was placed on the area for quite a while while the corporation was organizing itself, while land was being acquired and while personnel were being appointed. That time is past. The corporation ought now to be in a position to take positive action. Industry is being frightened away. It is easier to go to Wangaratta, Benalla or somewhere else where industries know what they will be doing when they get there. At present they do not know what they will be doing in Albury-Wodonga because the corporation does not know for sure what it plans to do. It ought to be getting down to definite planning.

Regardless of what Canberra is doing, there is still not enough definite information available from the corporation on how it proposes to industrialize the area. The Country Party supports the amendment embodied in the Bill for an extension of twelve months. It will probably be necessary to bring forward a further amending Bill in twelve months' time because I do not think the corporation can finalize acquisitions within that time. However, that will give Parliament the chance to scrutinize the activities of the corporation. This is the first corporation that has been set up and Parliament should take the opportunity of looking at it carefully.

Mr. A. T. EVANS (Ballaarat North) : The original legislation to bring about the Albury-Wodonga growth complex was a radical change in the approaches of this Parliament

and this Government to decentralization and also a radical change in the method of compulsory acquisition of private freehold land. This I consider to be an experiment, which I supported in the hope that it would achieve two important points. One was to give a greater incentive and take another step forward towards decentralization; the other was to make available to young couples residential blocks of land at reasonable prices.

I am shattered at some of the results of the legislation. I agree only on one point with the honorable member for Murray Valley, that there will have to be further amendments as a result of this experiment in Albury-Wodonga. It was suggested, and a campaign was launched in Ballarat, that Ballarat should ask Mr. Uren to approve of it as a growth centre. There are already fifteen growth centres throughout Australia. As a result of the publicity campaign I went to Albury-Wodonga to study what was taking place in relation to their growth complex. The reactions which I received were disappointing to the high ideals I had had regarding growth projects. When I explained what was happening in Ballarat, the people stated that they had been full of similar high hopes when the project commenced. But now most people say that Ballarat should not allow to happen what had happened to them.

This opinion was confirmed in the *Age* of 4th November when the result of a local Gallup poll was published. Sixty per cent of the people were against the scheme. This 60 per cent is contrary to the statement made by the honorable member for Murray Valley in the Ballarat *Courier* during the publicity campaign. He said, "Albury-Wodonga people are happy." I hope he gains a closer awareness of what the local people think before his next preselection.

I had the courtesy when I visited Albury-Wodonga to refuse invitations to comment in the press. Later a foreign legion from Albury-Wodonga invaded Ballarat. Its members came by aeroplane and one stated that there was a fixed date for handing back the powers of the corporation to the local council. I ask honorable members to read the legislation and to read both the Albury-Wodonga agreement with the Commonwealth and the Albury-Wodonga Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill. No such date is specified.

I regret the comments that have been made regarding Mr. Les Stone. He was one of those quoted in the newspaper in Ballarat. I placed the question on the Notice Paper and was immediately told by an honorable member in another place of the state of Mr. Stone's health. I withdrew the question; it appeared on the Notice Paper only once. The honorable member for Murray Valley has condemned himself as being a poor student of the Notice Paper of this House.

There are several questions on the Notice Paper and I intend to place more on it because I believe that eventually the development corporation must be reconstituted. The questions which I have asked seek information which should be readily available at all times to members of this House.

I direct attention to the Commission of Inquiry into Land Tenures, First Report, November, 1973, known commonly as the Else-Mitchell report. At page 66 of the report it is stated—

> It will be necessary to provide maximum scope for private initiatives in order to ensure that the development corporations do not degenerate into powerful agents of bureaucratic and monopolistic control.

From the reports I have read this is exactly how the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation has developed over the past twelve months. I agree that the time for acquisition of land should be extended for twelve months so that the corporation will have to answer to this House. I had hoped that cheaper blocks of land would have been made available for young couples, but from the inquiries I have

made in the area I am certain that land will not be cheaper under the monopolistic control. One has only to examine the large number of staff employed and the high salaries paid by the corporation to realize this. Locally this is referred to as "jobs for the boys". It is common knowledge that when a Government tries to take responsibilities from private enterprise the result is inefficiency with a Government monopoly and eventually the people whom the Government is trying to save are the ones who suffer.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Who are the people who are giving jobs for the boys?

Mr. A. T. EVANS: I direct the attention of the Leader of the Country Party to the answers to the questions I have asked—when I get them. The report to which I referred earlier continues—

> Appropriate appeal procedures will need to be established to enable decisions by the development corporations to be reviewed by courts or impartial tribunals.

It will be necessary to consider widening the rights of appeal of landowners. When a landowner knows that his land is in an area designated or under consideration for acquisition by the corporation he should have the right to ask the corporation to issue a notice to treat so that he can be paid up to 80 per cent of the value of the land and can negotiate for the balance. The landowner could then purchase land in another area. Hardships have been created because deals have been entered into and not proceeded with. One of the many cases of hardship relates to a widow who was told by the corporation that her land would be acquired. This meant that nobody else would buy it, but she could not raise the money with which to pay probate and estate duties. She was told by the corporation that she would have to borrow the money and pay at least 10 per cent interest on it for up to ten years.

Another disturbing aspect affects Ballarat, if a development corporation is set up for that area. Close to Ballarat there are some of the richest agricultural areas in Australia. In the Albury-Wodonga area the designated area was 52 kilometres from the Union Bridge and a similar distance from the centre of Ballarat would embrace all this rich agricultural land. The concern in Ballarat is that a corporation would take over this land, as it has in Albury and Wodonga, and until it is developed it would be leased back. Honorable members know that a man who is leasing land does not get the same productivity or put in the same effort as he does if he has the freehold to the land.

One often wonders what assistance the Commonwealth Government has given to these growth areas. I advise the House that most of the growth centres are being paid for by the local ratepayers and taxpayers. Money has been made available as a loan repayable over 40 years and in the future it is to be a grant of one-third and a loan of the remaining two-thirds repayable over 40 years at the current bond rate of interest. The Commonwealth Government is only using these funds to get its sticky fingers on to valuable areas of land in Victoria.

I direct the attention of the House to an article published in the *Bulletin* of 5th October, written by Mr. William Wentworth, and headed "People Planners Maths Flop". The Cities Commission in Canberra had estimated that by the year 2000 the Australian population would increase to 25 million. Apparently the commission has not adjusted its thinking along the lines of that of the Minister for Urban and Regional Development, who, when he visited Portland recently, told people that the population growth rate was now between 1·2 per cent and 1·3 per cent and was still falling. Based on those figures the population of Australia by the year 2000 will increase by only 5 million to 18 million,

according to Mr. Wentworth, yet the Cities Commission, with its proposal for fourteen or fifteen growth centres, has planned for an increase to 25 million or 7 million more than Mr. Wentworth's estimate for the whole of Australia. These commendable ideals to redistribute the population have met with many disappointments. An article that I read yesterday relating to the establishment of new towns in England indicated that in twenty years they have managed to attract only a population of 1 million into those areas. Sacrifices will have to be made by some people to permit these schemes to proceed.

Victoria will be surrendering rights to the Commonwealth Government to enable growth centres to be developed, but what will the people of Victoria receive in return? If the population is not available to go to these growth centres it will be necessary to recast our thinking about them. Certainly we should aim at establishing growth centres, but we should not give away anything that we cannot get back because I am certain the promises of the Commonwealth Government and its planners will not be fulfilled.

The honorable member for Geelong North referred to the fertility rate, which is a major contributing factor the decline in our population, but I also refer him to the findings of people who have made more recent research on population growth. One of the main reasons why our population is not increasing as rapidly as it was is that we are not breaking even with migration. Another reason is that until a few years ago there was some incentive for people to come to this country because there was an inflow of overseas capital and overseas industries were being established here. The position is now reversed. Australian companies are establishing in overseas countries. This supports the prediction that there will not be sufficient population to fulfil the ideals of growth centres.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Designated area).

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): It is interesting to note that the honorable member for Ballaarat North has left the Chamber just when the Committee was getting to the heart of the debate. He said that there were no questions on the Notice Paper referring to Councillor Stone, but I refer him to questions Nos. 816 and 832, which by inference refer to Councillor Stone. Both are still on the Notice Paper. The question directly relating to Councillor Stone has been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): Order! The honorable member must restrict his remarks to clause 2. At the moment they are not appropriate.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 3 (Amendment of No. 8518 s. 3).

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): Proposed new sub-section (6) of section 15 of the Albury-Wodonga Agreement Act 1973 makes it clear that the corporation comes within the confines of the Local Government Act. The honorable member for Ballaarat North made some reference to the fact that the corporation might override the provisions of the Local Government Act. I make it perfectly clear, and I have expressed this view on a number of occasions, that the development of the Albury-Wodonga area needs to be watched closely and the principal Act needs to be amended from time to time. The proposals contained in clause 3 go some way towards allaying some of the fears I have about the development.

The honorable member for Ballaarat North also referred to the result of an opinion poll taken among

the people of Wodonga, but the honorable member failed to state the questions asked in that poll. If he had indicated the questions asked, perhaps other honorable members could produce results of other opinion polls that give a different result. The honorable member also referred to a statement made by me and published in the Ballarat *Courier* of 8th October, 1974, in response to a query from the Ballarat newspaper. I am not concerned that the honorable member for Ballaarat North and the Minister for State Development and Decentralization are having a personal vendetta, but I do not want him to misrespresent me in this House. I have a copy of the statement which appeared in the Ballarat *Courier* but I shall not read it to the Committee. However, it is available to any honorable member who wants to read it, and it makes my position perfectly clear. I have nailed my colours to the mast and I stick by what I said as reported in that paper.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 4 (Amendment of No. 8518 s. 8).

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): Clause 4 deletes from section 8 of the principal Act the expression "1974" and substitutes in lieu thereof the expression "1975" so that the operative date will be changed from 30th December next to 30th December, 1975. As I said in my second-reading speech, I do not believe the corporation can complete this job in twelve months. Certainly, it will make every effort to do so and will go a long way towards getting there, but probably some amendment will be needed. Some honorable members expressed disquiet about when the corporation intends to take up more land.

The honorable member for Ballaarat North said—I was not in the Chamber at the time—that some lady could not raise the money with which to pay for probate. I invite the honorable member for Ballaarat North to name that lady concerned because on five occasions when a hypothetical case has been raised at meetings with the Premier and Mr. Douglas Anthony, the Federal Leader of the Country Party, I have asked for details. I would then make representations to have the case finalized but the details have not been supplied. It is nothing but a hypothetical case in the minds of a number of people in Wodonga.

Mr. A. T. EVANS (Ballaarat North): The honorable member for Murray Valley need not get so upset. The matter is already in more capable hands than his.

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

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

MOTOR CAR BILL.

The debate (adjourned from November 28) on the motion of Mr. Rossiter (Chief Secretary) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North): The Opposition is opposed to any measure which substantially increases motor registration fees without justification. The Opposition, therefore, will oppose the provision in the Bill which relates specifically to motor registration fees. There are three main proposals in the Bill. We will not oppose the other two provisions—that which will grant a substantial reduction in registration fees for motor buses operated by private bus lines, and that which will eliminate the outdated procedure whereby third-party insurers are compelled to deduct $1.40 from each third-party insurance premium. The stated reason for increasing motor registration fees is the high cost of roads to Victoria. However, the Government blames the Commonwealth Government for the load imposed on it. It is biased by the fact that for the first time in Victorian history the present Federal Government has

made substantial grants to the railways which, in the past, were ignored by the Liberal Party Government. These grants have relieved, to a certain extent, the over-all transport costs incurred by the Victorian Government. The Federal Government, which has provided grants for urban transport, is, to a large degree, reducing the costs of road works. The Opposition opposes the provision in the Bill which makes motorists provide a substantial proportion of the cost of the State's railways.

Honorable members have been told by the Minister of Transport that the railways have an increasing debt, which at present totals $80 million. By contrast, the railways are not imposing increased costs directly on the passengers. The railway deficit is being financed by the State as a whole. The increased costs in education are not directly related to the charges imposed on people whose children attend the schools. Therefore, the Opposition contends that increased road costs should not be imposed solely on the motorist.

Naturally any Government, whether it be State or Federal, must find the funds needed for various works—in this case roadworks—but when a Government, which has not tapped its full financial resources, seeks to impose the costs on the motorists, the Opposition opposes it. The State Insurance Offices could be used to raise much of the finance that is needed for the purposes of this Bill. On many occasions in the past members on this side of the House have asked, but not received a satisfactory answer from the Government, why the State Insurance Offices which at present deal mostly in unprofitable sections of insurance, should not compete in this so-called free enterprise State under the Liberal Government with the more profitable insurance companies in the fields of fire and other insurance. If the State Insurance Offices could compete in these more profitable fields, they could provide a great deal of finance which could be devoted to roads.

I noticed in the press recently that the registration fees on a normal six cylinder sedan in Victoria have been increased by $45 per annum. According to the press—it was the same correspondent—in Queensland, where the State Government Insurance Office creates finance for the State, the registration fee for a six cylinder family car has been increased by only $29·90. This is a considerable difference. Until the Government is prepared to use its own resources to generate finance for roads and other services, the Opposition will continually oppose any Bill which puts the cost directly onto the motorist.

I want to put on record that, with the majority of my colleagues, I believe the 50 per cent of petrol tax which Victoria gets back from the Federal Government is inadequate. In recent years the Minister of Transport has said that it is now the policy of the State Government for all kinds of transport in this State—that is, road and rail transport—to be under the one umbrella. Therefore, the Opposition believes, if adequate public transport was provided, the need for people to have motor cars would be decreased greatly. At present everyone does not want to buy a motor car. This applies particularly to young families who are building homes in new areas and have large financial obligations over their heads. However, they are forced to contribute more of their weekly income towards paying off motor cars. If they do not do this, they are left with no transport with which to travel to and from their places of employment, or to places of recreation at week-ends. This applies particularly to people living in the outer urban areas of Melbourne, and in the provincial cities around Victoria. Until the people have an alternative choice of travelling by train or tram, apart from the motor car, on a regular service, it is wrong

that they should have the added burden of paying extra registration fees on their private motor cars. The Premier and the Minister of Transport have said recently that, notwithstanding increased costs to the State each year for the railways, train travellers will not have to pay increased fares. In fact, in many areas rail fares have been decreased.

Although the Opposition opposes the increase in motor registration fees, it is a strong supporter of public transport and therefore does not oppose the second proposal in the Bill. The Opposition will oppose any proposal which will put an inflationary cost on motorists until the Government uses its own resources, such as the State Insurance Offices, to increase its revenue. The Government could also renegotiate the Esso-B.H.P. agreement which provides only a small return. This was brought up by the Opposition some years ago and has been emphasized by the honorable member for Gippsland East on many occasions in this House. Until these two courses of action are taken by the Government, and until the person who must now travel by his own car has the choice of using public transport, the Opposition will have no option but to oppose any measure which puts an inflationary cost on the motorist, as this Bill does.

Therefore, we will oppose the second reading of the Bill because of an objection to the increased costs to motorists ; but we are not opposed to concessional registration fees for omnibuses operated by private bus lines, or to the third proposal.

The sitting was suspended at 6.13 *p.m. until* 8.4 *p.m.*

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) : The Bill will substantially increase motor registration fees to meet the demands which will be made upon the State to meet its share of funds for expenditure on State roads following the passage of the Commonwealth roads legislation. There seems to be a great deal of confusion and difference of opinion on the overall problem of road finance and how the State and Federal Governments should set out to finance an adequate road system.

The background of the measure goes back many years. At one stage the Commonwealth Government collected petrol tax for the States because it was not within their constitutional powers to collect an excise. For many years that was the basic reason for petrol tax collections. A number of years ago the then Commonwealth Government dissociated petrol tax deductions from the amount allocated for road works in the respective States, and that tax became another method of raising Commonwealth revenue.

Mr. CURNOW : Which Government was that?

Mr. B. J. EVANS : It was a Liberal-Country Party coalition Government. I have never said that that Government was perfect ; it made many mistakes but not nearly as many as the present Labor Government.

Over the years I have demonstrated an interest in the allocation of road funds, particularly to the Country Roads Board.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) : I rise to a point of order. I do not want to inhibit the honorable member in his interesting remarks, but I ask whether they are related to the Bill because many members of the Opposition would like to address the House on road funds. I should be interested to hear how road funds are related to the Bill. If this subject is within the scope of the debate, many Opposition members would like to take issue on the matter.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) : On the point of order, I refer to page 2957 of the current issue of *Hansard* where, in explaining the Bill, the Minister is reported as saying—

> The action of the Commonwealth in framing the new roads legislation in the present terms has, during a time when it will take

well in excess of $500 million from Victorian motorists in petrol tax and return less than half for roads, forced the State to further burden motor vehicle owners with increased registration fees.

That is the kernel of the argument and is the whole reason why motor registration fees are to be increased.

Mr. WILKES: It is not.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: In the Minister's terms it is, and therefore I submit that the points I have been making are relevant to the Bill.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): When explaining the Bill, the Minister said in his opening remarks—

The purpose of this Bill is three-fold. Firstly, it increases with one exception motor registration fees generally by 35 per cent; secondly, it provides for concessional registration fees for omnibuses operated by private buslines; and thirdly, it removes the requirement from the Motor Car Act 1958 that every authorized insurer shall deduct the amount of $1.40 from each third-party insurance premium.

The new Commonwealth Roads Acts provide for the allocation of $232 million to Victoria for this and the following two financial years.

This is a Bill to increase, in some instances, motor registration fees for specific purposes. Honorable members should not engage in a full-scale debate on roads, road hauliers, contributions and so on for these specific purposes. I ask the honorable member to keep within the ambit of the Bill.

It is in order to make a passing reference without getting into a full-scale debate on the matter. The Bill sets out quite clearly that it relates to proposed new registration fees. I should not like a full-scale debate to develop on road finance in Victoria.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): It was not my intention to embark on a full-scale debate on the subject. I was referring to the confusion that exists in some people's minds about the reason for the proposed increase, and this must be relevant to the debate.

In this context, I refer to an undated telex message which was addressed to the Municipal Association of Victoria, 15 Queens Road, Melbourne, by the Federal Minister for Transport and the Federal Minister for Urban and Regional Development. In referring to increases in road funds being made available by the Commonwealth, the telex message states—

This increase in funds, together with the increase in State Government expenditure required under the proposed matching quotas will make a major impact on road problems in urban and rural areas.

In that statement, the Federal Minister for Transport clearly indicates that the States will be obliged to increase funds for road works from their own resources.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I raise the same point of order as previously. I seek a ruling whether road funds are covered by the Bill. If a ruling is given in that way, members of the Opposition will debate the subject, but the Bill is narrow and deals quite specifically with a number of points. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule specifically whether a discussion on road funds and the sorts of references being made by the honorable member for Gippsland East are in order.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I do not want to stop any honorable member from making a passing reference to a specific matter on this Bill, which is of special interest to him. I ask the honorable member for Gippsland East and other honorable members who will be participating in the debate to keep strictly within the ambit of the Bill, to make only references to these matters and then to return to the measure.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): I am endeavouring to point out certain points that have been made by various people on increasing funds for road works. The Minister made it clear that this was the purpose of the Bill. I should have thought

the Leader of the Opposition would appreciate my referring to a press statement of 22nd August, 1974, in which it is stated that the Government will make every effort possible to ensure that sufficient funds are available for road purposes.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) : I raise a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, and refer to the notice of motion under General Business in the name of the honorable member for Gippsland East relating to the Ministerial statement on Commonwealth roads legislation. In my view, the honorable member, in the light of past rulings, might well be infringing the rule of anticipation with respect to the item on the Notice Paper in his name.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! Honorable members have to be reasonable in this matter because it is quite unlikely that the item referred to by the Leader of the Opposition will be reached today or tomorrow.

Mr. HOLDING : Has the Chair some prior notice of this matter?

The SPEAKER : No, there is no argument about that. If the honorable member makes only a passing reference, the problem will be overcome. I ask that a little common sense be used without restricting the debate as much as it could be at this late stage of the sessional period.

I undertand clearly the rule of anticipation that has been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. The honorable gentleman knows as well as other members and I do that the House will not be in a position to debate the item and I suggest that I do not need to go into details about that.

Mr. HOLDING : I find that a fascinating ruling.

The SPEAKER: If the Leader of the Opposition wants a ruling, I shall have to rule that he is in order. I ask the honorable member for Gippsland East to keep to the Bill. However, in his second-reading speech, reported at page 2957 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Transport stated, *inter alia*—

> This Bill provides, with one exception, for a 35 per cent increase in motor registration fees to raise a further $56·2 million over the three years for road improvements.

Therefore, it is in order for a member to make a passing reference to that aspect without engaging in a full-scale debate. That is what I was trying to advise the House to do.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): I can well understand the Leader of the Opposition not wanting to get involved in a debate on road finance after what happened in Queensland last Saturday. The Opposition is trying to gag discussion on an important subject. I confess that I am at a considerable loss in trying to debate the subject-matter of the Bill without making some reference to the reason why there has to be an increase in registration fees. It seems to me to be a fundamental principle of the Bill that the State Government has to find extra money, so surely the House has to examine the reasons why that is so before it can argue whether or not the Bill is justified.

It is reasonable to argue that there may be alternatives to an increase in motor registration fees. In order to establish that argument, once again the House has to examine the over-all question why the increase provided for in this measure is proposed. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and will not make any more reference to the Federal Minister for Transport, who does not seem to know whether the Commonwealth Government is consistent in supporting an increase in fees because he has made two contradictory statements on that score.

As I have said in the past, I have been much concerned about these funds. I am prepared to discuss what happens to them after they are raised, because it is proposed that they will

be passed on to the Country Roads Board. In the past I have shown an interest in the expenditure of the board, and I refer honorable members to *Hansard* of 23rd April, 1974, where on page 4711 they will find detailed information on where the board has spent its funds during the past twenty years. I further refer honorable members to remarks I made earlier in this sessional period and to a graph I presented which demonstrated how these funds were spent in various divisions in the State. It is interesting to examine the trend of expenditure of roads funds, and to see where this money was spent in 1972–73 compared with where it is to be spent in 1974–75.

In the Bairnsdale division the expenditure has increased from $825,000 to $930,000, which is a fairly typical increase for a country division. However, in the metropolitan division expenditure has risen from $2·943 million to $12·435 million. That is the point I was trying to make, as I believe it is relevant to the Bill. Enormous amounts are being spent on the metropolitan road network. For the benefit of honorable members I should state that I am referring to expenditure on unclassified roads, not total expenditure, which is a vastly greater sum again.

I recommend to the honorable member for Bendigo, who is interjecting, that he should study the figures in *Hansard* which show where road funds have been spent over the past nine or ten years. The honorable member will find that funds have been poured into the metropolitan area and that in this year alone the Country Roads Board will be spending $46·376 million.

The Dandenong division will receive $26·186 million and Bendigo division $14·635 million; most of the latter amount will be expended on the Broadford bypass on the Hume Highway—the work is situated on the outer extremity of the Bendigo division. Geelong division will expend $8·596 million, the bulk of it on the Western Highway, in the Pentland Hills area. I come to the "also-rans"—Warrnambool, Traralgon, Ballarat and Bairnsdale divisions, which have expenditures in the vicinity of $5 million or $6 million.

It is a sad story when honorable members compare those figures with the massive increase of $10 million provided for the metropolitan division this year and consider what the metropolitan division received in the past financial year. That is taking into account roads under the control of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works which are now under the Country Roads Board.

Mr. TREZISE: What is your answer?

Mr. B. J. EVANS: The question is much wider than that which I would be allowed to embark on at this stage. If the Government has any real interest in preventing the growth of Melbourne, why is it spending such large sums of money in the metropolitan area? This must surely encourage more people to live in Melbourne.

It is apparent that not one of those honorable members who are interjecting has ever spoken to people who are engaged in the occupation of carting logs out of the forests to provide timber for homes for people who live in the metropolitan area. If they did, they would learn of the shocking condition of the roads on which they have to travel, where the potholes shake the trucks to bits. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may laugh. I invite him to go to East Gippsland and see for himself. I could take him to Lakes Entrance and show him the condition of the roads in that popular tourist resort. The roads have to be maintained by a small municipality and during the holiday period they are swamped by four or five times and often approaching ten times the normal traffic.

The funds allocated for forest roads and tourist roads are included in the amounts I have indicated for the various divisions, but those funds do not go very far.

One of the steps taken by another State to meet this problem has been to introduce a petrol reseller's licensing fee. I understand that that measure was considered by the Premier and Treasurer of this State but that the honorable gentleman decided it would be better to increase motor registration fees. The attitude of the Country Party is that it accepts that the State Government requires additional revenue for expenditure on roads, and that this form of increase is the lesser of the two evils. However, I understand that in New South Wales the petrol reseller's licensing fee is on a sliding scale so that the metropolitan motorist pays an extra 6 cents a gallon and as one travels closer to the borders of the neighbouring States no additional charge is made. I favour that principle because if metropolitan people want vast sums of money spent in providing them with beautiful, smooth roads surely they must pay for them, not the country people who have to put up with potholes, broken edges and dangerous highways.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is continuously interjecting, does not seem to understand that I probably drive around the city as much as he does, but only rarely does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition venture into the country. From now on he will do so even more rarely.

I have endeavoured, within the limitations placed on this debate, to express the general views of the Country Party on this measure. The Country Party does not want to go so far as to say that it is supporting the measure, but it does not intend to vote against it.

It is realized that the State Government has to obtain money to meet the offer of the Federal Government because if it does not find extra money it will not receive Federal funds. The Federal Minister for Transport has made it clear that he will blackmail the States into agreeing to his terms on road funds. The States are lucky that the Federal Minister for Transport did not get his way completely because fortunately the Senate amended the Bill that the Minister introduced. The States are probably getting out of it a bit better than if the Federal Minister for Transport had had his way entirely. I hope what occurred on Saturday in Queensland will be the forerunner of better things to come from the Federal Government.

The House divided on the motion (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler in the chair)—

Ayes	..	49
Noes	..	16
Majority for the motion	..	33

AYES

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Burgin	Mr. Jones
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Roper
Mr. Templeton	Mr. Ginifer

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

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

The debate (adjourned from October 17) was resumed on the motion of Mr. Chamberlain (Dundas)—

That the following Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor to both Houses of Parliament be agreed to by this House :—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY.

We, the Legislative Assembly of Victoria in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

and on Mr. Holding's amendment—

That the following words be added to the proposed Address—" and respectfully desire to inform Your Excellency that this House rejects the concept of Melbourne's growth being unlimited, and Government departments and statutory authorities acting on a population figure of 5 million by the year 2000, and expresses the view that Melbourne's growth should be limited and that a population for Melbourne in excess of 3·5 million is socially and economically undesirable."

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): When His Excellency the Governor opened the second session of the Forty-sixth Parliament and delivered a Speech on behalf of the Government to those people who were interested enough to attend, he said, among other things, that the objective of the Government was to promote the happiness and well-being of the people of Victoria, with special emphasis on the quality of life. The Governor also said that several offers had been made to the Commonwealth to introduce complementary legislation for the purpose of controlling inflation, and that the State Government had co-operated with the Federal Government to the full in the development and implementation of programmes and projects which involved both Governments and which were for the benefit of Victorians.

On behalf of the Government, the Governor also said—

The Government is looking ahead to the energy requirements of Victoria in the future. Accordingly, the Ministry for Fuel and Power is preparing for presentation to Parliament a White Paper on the expected needs of the State and the resources available from fossil fuels, solar energy, nuclear power and elsewhere. It is also proposed that a Select Committee of the Parliament be set up to inquire into means of conserving energy.

The Governor said also that a new scheme was to be proposed for improved supervision of school crossings. Finally, Sir Henry Winneke said that the Government intended to do something about a new Constitution Act for Victoria. Not one of these proposals has been carried out.

I do not wish to weary the House on these matters except to refer to the energy requirements of Victoria. The Government and its Ministry for Fuel and Power have been involved in the dubious exercise of spending public money to coerce the public into accepting a set of circumstances, but the public is not convinced. The White Paper that the Government is proposing to present should have been brought forward in this sessional period. Nothing has been heard on the matter. It is possible that a prejudiced White Paper will be produced, designed to sell the Newport power station in a public relations exercise similar to that of the attempt by the State Electricity Commission to sell the proposition to the public in the past few months.

Mr. WILCOX: It has been very successful.

Mr. EDMUNDS: It has not. If it had been successful the Attorney-General would have done something about the matter, but he has done nothing. His only contribution during this sessional period of Parliament has been one of the most ludicrous Ministerial statements ever presented to the House. It has been laughed out of Owen Dixon Chambers, where his colleagues rest, and no more has been heard of it. The Government is not prepared to put the Ministerial statement on the Notice Paper to be debated.

Mr. WILCOX: Any time!

Mr. EDMUNDS: There is a challenge. The Attorney-General, with all his influence in the Liberal Party, could not get the matter debated tonight. He is not game. However, it is not my role to introduce that matter, because the debate on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply is a formal debate.

I congratulate the Government on the appointment of Sir Henry Winneke as Governor of Victoria. That is a good appointment. It is long past the time when Victoria should have had an Australian born Governor. I am sure Sir Henry Winneke will carry out the job successfully.

The Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment to the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of the Governor, and I base my argument on the relevant part. The amendment states—

> That the following words be added to the proposed Address—" and respectfully desire to inform Your Excellency that this House rejects the concept of Melbourne's growth being unlimited and Government departments and statutory authorities acting on a population figure of 5 million by the year 2000 and expresses the view that Melbourne's growth should be limited and that a population for Melbourne in excess of 3·5 million is socially and economically undesirable."

The Leader of the Opposition based the amendment on a great deal of research that has been undertaken. There is ample statistical evidence to prove that Melbourne is being planned for a population increasing to 5 million. The Opposition genuinely believes this is wrong, and there is ample evidence to support its view, not the least of which is a reply given on 18th September, 1974, to a question that was asked. Speaking on behalf of his department, the Minister of Public Works said—

> The metropolitan planning scheme has been framed to provide for (but not to encourage) a population of up to 4·7 million people by the year 2000.

Another authenticated document was produced by the Town and Country Planning Board of Victoria. Its submission, entitled " National Population Inquiry—Submission on Population Distribution in Australia, with Special Reference to Victoria ", states—

> The most likely projections would give 18 to 20 million by the year 2000, and something of the order of 24 million by 2030... the forecast to 2030 cannot be more than a reasoned guess.

The document then states that the population figure for Victoria is expected to be well in excess of the 4 million that was projected at the time.

Therefore, there is evidence to indicate that Government departments are planning for this type of growth. I now refer to a report to the Minister for Local Government on the future growth of Melbourne entitled " Oganization for Strategic Planning ". This report states that—

> By the year 2000, the Melbourne-Geelong-Yallourn complex could contain not 4·9 million, but 5·6 million people. They indicated that a substantial redistribution campaign could conceivably be successful in holding this area down to a population of 4·9 million by the year 2000.

The basis of the argument put forward by the Leader of the Opposition was that Melbourne's population should be contained and that every encouragement should be given to keep it at a certain level.

Government supporters have mainly based their case on the findings of Dr. Birrell of the Department of Sociology of Monash University. In his paper, Dr. Birrell said many things but in essence his argument was that on projections on the fertility rate and the migration rate, as well as the general expansion of our community, he did not believe Melbourne's population would increase to anything near 5 million by the year 2000. But his conclusion was based on nothing more than educated guesses.

There is no way in which population trends can be projected except from statistical material of the kind

carefully gathered at a Commonwealth census. But there has been no such gathering of statistics since the 1970-71 census. So the basis of the argument of the Government and its back-bench supporters is only what Dr. Birrell imagines will happen. Dr. Birrell used the material to make a proposition to the Government and the Government is prepared to reject the amendment of the Opposition by the devious device of suggesting that his projections are correct although its departments are planning for a population of 5 million in the metropolitan area by the year 2000.

Dr. Birrell relies on an assumed mortality rate, an assumed immigration figure and an assumed fertility among women of child-bearing age—it is a brave man who will enter into that field but Dr. Birrell goes into a great deal of detail.

The Chief Secretary has been captivated by the logic of my argument and may even be persuaded to support the amendment. He is not the only member of the Government benches who realizes that the Leader of the Opposition put forward a logical case. In his usual way when dealing with a subject as important as that of Melbourne's growth, the Leader of the Opposition wrote to all country municipalities in Victoria. He asked what they thought of limiting Melbourne's growth. In the main, those which replied endorsed the proposition of the Opposition to limit the growth of Melbourne.

But honorable members supporting the Government vote in one way in the Parliament and speak in a different way to municipalities. Some 50 or 60 municipalities replied to the Leader of the Opposition. One reply came from the City of Hamilton and was signed by the Deputy Town Clerk, Mr. Wormland. Attached to the reply was a photostat copy of a letter sent on 5th November to the Town Clerk, Mr. Neville, by the honorable member for Dundas. It covers three foolscap pages.

In that letter the honorable member thanked the city council for a letter it had sent to him in which it had indicated the council's support for the proposition on decentralization put by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that a few general comments should be made on that proposition. His first was that in a democratic country such as ours it was not possible to fix a limit on the growth of any city or metropolis. He said that such a concept would be possible in a totalitarian society but not in Australia. The honorable member made his second point by asking how, in the light of that, 15,000 people a year could be moved out of the metropolitan area. He said that people should surely have some choice in these matters.

His third point was that State planners were not basing their plans on a population of 5 million in the metropolitan area by the year 2000. He referred to the sharp decline in the birth rate and the immigration programme.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN : Read the rest of the letter.

Mr. EDMUNDS : It would take too long to do that. However, it shows that Government supporters are prepared to vote in this House on one basis and write to municipalities on another. In his letter to the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Town Clerk of the City of Hamilton pointed out that the council supported the proposition as outlined in the correspondence. But although the council of the City of Hamilton supports the proposition of the Opposition on limiting Melbourne's growth, the honorable member representing the area does not. He said that it was not possible to control that growth.

The Minister for State Development and Decentralization goes to no end of trouble to persuade families to move to the country. He provides champagne and conducts a continuous public relations exercise. In his letter to the Leader of the Opposition the Deputy Town Clerk of the City

of Hamilton said that the points made by the honorable member for Dundas indicated that not only were serious and strenuous efforts being made by the State Government to encourage decentralization and check the uncontrolled development of Melbourne, but that the State Government would welcome any suggestions which would more effectively bring about the aims of decentralization.

A series of complexities are associated with this single item of correspondence. If the honorable member for Dundas was serious he would support the Opposition's amendment. The file contains many letters written in a similar vein from such municipalities as the shires of Omeo, Ballarat, Dimboola, Wycheproof, Strathfieldsaye, and so on. No honorable member would doubt the authenticity of the documents.

Irrespective of what the Government and its supporters say, Government departments are planning on the basis of the population of Melbourne being 5 million by the year 2000. But, at the same time, they tell people in the country that that will not be so. A report of the Cities Commission for the year 1973-74 makes certain projections about the population of Australia. It is expected that 14 million persons will be in the principal capital cities by the year 2001. The report, tabled in the Federal Parliament on 24th October, 1974, also envisages the population of Melbourne in the year 2001 to be no less than 4 million.

So the planning authorities consider that Melbourne will have a population between 4 million and 5 million. Yet Government supporters claim that it is decreasing because of the decline in the birthrate, the immigration rate and so on.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas): Mr. Speaker, will the honorable member table the letter of mine to which he referred?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I think the honorable member has already indicated that it would be available.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): What the Government will not recognize is that, in the metropolitan area, there is already approximately sufficient land to provide accommodation for the 5 million people for whom Government departments are planning. Accommodation for approximately 250,000 people is available in areas of the Dandenongs at present designated as residential areas. That is what the Government has decided is right for the Dandenongs, that there will be a further quarter of a million people there.

What is important is whether the Government is sincere or insincere. The Opposition believes it is not sincere because it says one thing in Parliament and another in the public arena. Because of the basis used for planning for the future it is obvious there will be an increase in the population of Melbourne, not a decentralization of its people to rural areas.

Other honorable members supporting the Government have said very little, but the honorable member for Box Hill and the honorable member for Ringwood took part in the debate. The honorable member for Box Hill, with his usual penetrating examination of the affairs of the nation, said on 19th September that he was disturbed to hear that more than half the people interviewed in a survey were disappointed with the alternative Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition. At page 451 of *Hansard* the honorable member is reported as having said—

> The only leader in this country who, in my opinion, could command the support of the overwhelming majority of the Australian people, which is the essence of democracy, and the Gallup poll confirms my opinion, is the Premier of Victoria. The recent Gallup poll demonstrated that he could command the support of about 80 per cent of the vote. The nation's problems are so grave that the Victorian Premier may be the only man who can bring unity to the nation. I should hate to lose him as our Premier but I am prepared to make that sacrifice if he would become Prime Minister.

The Billy Graham of this Parliament—the honorable member for Ringwood—gave the House one of his

usual sermons. The only good thing about it was that he did not take around the plate and ask honorable members for an offering! The honorable member absolutely refuted the propositions contained in a speech of the honorable member for Box Hill.

On the back benches of the Liberal Party a wide variety of opinions are held by ambitious members who will not act in the interests of Victoria to limit Melbourne's growth by supporting the Opposition's motion, but will only put arguments to support their ambitions in this place. The Opposition wants the House to vote on the amendment, which has substantial support from all the shires in Victoria. The file contains 50 or 60 letters on the subject. No more pressing problem than Melbourne's growth is associated with Victoria's development. Members on the corner bench have talked about it endlessly, but whether they are prepared to support the proposition is another matter.

The motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor gives all members the opportunity of confirming their loyalty to the Crown and of participating in a number of other stylized formalities, such as congratulating the Governor on his appointment. However, it is an important debate because it can be pointed out that the Government speaks with two voices. Firstly, with the Governor as its mouthpiece, it proposes certain things which do not transpire; secondly, its members say other things outside the House. I urge the House to support the amendment moved by the Opposition.

Mr. SKEGGS (Ivanhoe): I compliment His Excellency the Governor on his initial term as Governor and Her Majesty's representative in Victoria. I convey the sentiments of loyalty of constituents of the Ivanhoe electorate to Her Majesty, who is truly a sovereign of whom we can be proud. Our Queen is the symbol of one of the most successful monarchical systems in history. The constitutional monarchy embodies the symbol of the separation of power between the State and the Constitution on the one hand and the political system on the other. The Crown is the guardian of the Constitution of the Commonwealth and its constituent elements.

In his Speech His Excellency said—

> First priority will continue to be given to education, particularly in the provision of additional teachers and ancillary staff, the improvement of disadvantaged schools, and the provision of libraries, science blocks and art and crafts rooms.

In my electorate there has been a particularly good response to the Government's action in providing important maintenance and works grants to the schools.

During the year the Banyule High School experienced casual teacher shortages in mathematics, art, biology and science and I am pleased to say that following personal representations, the Minister provided staff to relieve these shortages. The Minister and the Director of Secondary Education also received deputations from the school on staffing and a number of related subjects, and considerable progress has been made in reaching a better understanding between the Education Department and the school's advisory council and teaching staff. Remedial action has also been approved to correct faulty re-asphalting of the school grounds at Waterdale Girls High School and in providing a new entrance and car park.

Work has been undertaken on acoustic suspended ceilings in eight rooms, together with extensions, repairs and renovations at the Heidelberg High School. There have been alterations to the roofing and ventilation, and this has done a lot to improve conditions at the school. As I mentioned recently, the school needs a security patrol because vandalism has occurred during previous school holidays. The school also

requires the appointment of a permanent caretaker. I hope the Education Department will provide these necessary services.

At Heidelberg Technical School a tutorial room for senior students has been arranged but plans are needed for long-range extensions to provide buildings for meteorology and a learning centre for remedial work. Concern has been expressed at the school at delays in receiving school maintenance grants. Commonwealth Government funds for the reimbursement of technical school fees reached the State Treasury on 25th November. I understand these funds will be paid out as soon as the basis of distribution has been determined. I am informed that any technical school which has been embarrassed by the delay in payment may apply for a cash advance against future monthly maintenance payments.

I refer now to primary schools in my electorate. Over the year I have directed attention to the need for improvements and replacements of old toilet blocks at primary schools. The Minister has agreed to provide a new toilet block at the Ivanhoe Primary School, and the Public Works Department has been asked to prepare plans and specifications so that tenders may be let as soon as possible. This is particularly welcome, as the toilet blocks at the school are 50 or 60 years old, and the children have had to walk some distance from the school building in all weathers to use the toilets. The Public Works Department has also effected the replacement of broken windows, wash basins, troughs and spouting at the school.

The Minister has approved a tender for works totalling $2,725 to provide repairs to the toilet block at Heidelberg Primary School and $2,750 for renovations at Heidelberg West Primary School. The Minister has also approved remedial site works amounting to $11,750 to correct a drainage problem between Heidelberg Heights Primary School and Waterdale Girls High School. The provision of a service road to avoid the need for deliveries being made through play areas of the school is also under consideration.

I requested the Minister of Education to reconsider this school's eligibility for grants under the disadvantaged schools programme. The Minister has replied that this application is being considered by the Supplementary Grants Committee and that funds will be provided to the school as they are made available by the Treasury. It is to be hoped that this will come about in the near future.

In the field of pre-school education, I am pleased to see that the Speech of His Excellency stresses that the Government intends to proceed towards its objective of providing at least one year's free pre-school education for every Victorian child who wants it. Already there are 936 kindergartens and play centres, providing for some 65 per cent of Victorian pre-school children. This year a further 50 new centres will be built and staffed.

The establishment of the new Division of Early Childhood Development within the Department of Health is welcomed and it is to be hoped that the two pilot projects in the City of Knox and in the country will pave the way for similar integrated complexes with full community involvement.

Pre-schools in my electorate have been very much concerned by the Commonwealth Government's withdrawal of free milk to schools, pre-school centres and day nurseries. The Minister of Health has made representations to the Commonwealth to have this service reinstated, but so far this has not been done. He has also vigorously pursued the broader question of meals for children in necessitous circumstances. I hope that in the future the Commonwealth Government will at least see fit to restore the important provision of milk to pre-schools.

One of the most vital pre-school centres in the Ivanhoe electorate is Pixieland, which administers two centres—one in Wimbledon Grove, Ivanhoe, catering for 35 children, and the other in the Lloyd Street Presbyterian Hall in West Heidelberg, also catering for 35 children. Pixieland was founded and has been operated during the past eight years by Miss Cynthia Munro, one of the most dedicated young women it has been my pleasure to meet. She has made the Pixieland service available to disadvantaged children from migrant families, single, deserted and incapacitated parents, and those in the low-income group for as little as $1 a day. However, rising costs made her position extremely difficult and after having received some assistance from the Heidelberg City Council, she has now formed an advisory committee and has sought registration as a charity to enable children at Pixieland to qualify for a recurrent grant from the Commonwealth on a *per capita* basis. It is important to needy families of the area that Pixieland is able to continue its good work and that assistance is expedited.

In the field of health, I should like to refer to something in which both the Commonwealth and State Governments have worked in a spirit of co-operation. I refer to the establishment of the West Heidelberg Community Service Centre.

The Hospitals and Charities Commission recommended to the Commonwealth Government that an amount of $365,000 should be approved for capital purposes, for land, buildings and equipment and $200,000 for operating costs for the purpose of the West Heidelberg Community Service Centre. This recommendation was made to the National Hospitals and Health Services Commission, and the grant has now been approved. This will be of great benefit to the people of West Heidelberg in particular.

The Victorian Housing Commission is to make available flats in the vicinity of Hansa Walk in West Heidelberg for the use of the West Heidelberg Community Service Centre. This will make rooms available on a sessional basis for community consultation with doctors, nurses, dentists, social workers, representatives of the District Nursing Service, the Social Welfare Department, marriage guidance, family planning and legal aid organizations and many other services which would normally be rather inaccessible but which are essential to the West Heidelberg area.

In his Speech His Excellency the Governor stated—

> The Government intends to drive ahead with the current five-year programme to improve mental health in Victoria. There are now 56 day-training centres for intellectually handicapped children, providing for 2,762 children, and four more centres are planned for this year, catering for an additional 102 children.

As part of the West Heidelberg Community Service Centre there will also be a local community mental health service available. It has been operating for some time in the West Heidelberg area, but will now be integrated with the West Heidelberg Community Service Centre to provide a community psychiatric service.

Dr. Colin Scott, who is a psychiatrist at the West Heidelberg Community Service Centre, has made a submission to the Mental Health Authority recommending the appointment of a consultant psychiatrist, a clinical psychologist, two social workers, a charge nurse, three ward nurses, two occupational therapists, two craft supervisors, one stenographer, two clerical assistants and one mothercraft nurse. The advantages of having a mental health service at the community centre are that in being part of an over-all community centre it will avoid the stigma that some people see in attending a purely psychiatric clinic; it will avoid duplication of work and services; it will provide greater flexibility of staff in

the sharing of facilities; and will allow co-ordination of planning to provide a comprehensive service.

I also wish to mention the excellent work of the Helping Hand Association in the field of mental health in the area. The construction of additions and improvements to the Ivanhoe centre of Helping Hand has been approved for works totalling $7120. A capital grant of $155,688 for this financial year has been approved towards the construction of stage 1 of the new centre at Macleod and stage 2 of the centre has been placed on the priority list, probably for the financial year 1976-77.

Despite the fact that the State supplies about 84·15 per cent of subsidies in this area, I hope the parents and friends of this centre might be relieved of having to provide about 16 per cent of the total income of the centre for operating costs and 20 per cent of capital expenditure. The recognition of the Government of the need for greater assistance in mental health has certainly been dramatic but the personal burden of parents of retarded children is great enough without having the added worries of financial responsibility.

In the field of youth, sport and recreation, it was good to note that His Excellency commented that the activities of the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation will be extended through continued regionalization and the provision of subsidies for municipal recreation officers. I wish to refer to the commendable work carried out in the Heidelberg and Ivanhoe areas by a centre known as Open House. The recent decision of the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation in assisting to provide the salary for an additional youth worker to expand the staff at this Christian centre was very encouraging.

Open House assists underprivileged people and persons with problems and is led by a dedicated person in Mr. George Farrington who is assisted by a small staff and a band of voluntary workers. The grant will enable Open House to develop other experimental projects and also open up a new means of training youth workers. Open House particularly services people with problems in the areas of Heidelberg, Ivanhoe, Heidelberg West and Heidelberg North and about 75 per cent of the people who come to Open House are from areas largely recognized as disadvantaged by the Federal and State Governments and are subject to Government relief programmes in the fields of health, social welfare and education.

Open House has achieved much in providing spiritual guidance, opportunities for wholesome fellowship and recreational interests for the young people of these areas. Open House still relies on donations from church groups, service organizations and citizens for the bulk of its support, but Government assistance is naturally a very welcome addition.

Earlier this year I also referred to the Scouts Association, which is very active within the Ivanhoe electorate. Assistance should be given to encourage scouting and there is a need for the appointment of a full-time development commissioner in the Yarra-Batman district to cover the areas of Ivanhoe, Heidelberg, Eltham, Collingwood, Diamond Valley, Doncaster East, Doncaster West, Kew, Latrobe, Melbourne, Northcote, and Whittlesea. This area comprises 110 groups involving 5,131 scouts. There is certainly a need for a development commissioner and the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation should assist with a grant to enable such an appointment to be made.

In his address His Excellency the Governor referred to the fact that the Historic Buildings Act was passed last session and is being brought into operation, and that an amending measure, based on experience to date, would be introduced. New legislation would also be proposed to give protection to whole areas of historic or architectural interest.

I was pleased that not long ago the Premier purchased for Victoria the historic Banyule homestead in the Heidelberg area. This homestead was originally occupied by James Hawdon, one of the original overlanders. This stately homestead overlooks commanding views of the entire Yarra Valley and it will provide a natural home for a district extension of the National Gallery where paintings from the Heidelberg School will be on exhibition and where period costumes of the Schofield collection will be preserved for posterity. Original furnishings and interior decorations from that period will also be displayed. This acquisition will certainly be of great benefit to the people of Victoria and in particular to the residents of the Yarra Valley.

The Governor's Speech also referred to the fact that the Government regards the Yarra Valley, the Dandenongs, and the Mornington Peninsula as the most sensitive and vulnerable areas in the State, calling for special protection. He went on to say—

> Each is covered by a Government Statement of Planning Policy directing that it be preserved primarily for recreation and conservation.

Although we have seen the beginnings of what His Excellency foreshadowed in his Speech, in that authorities will be created to afford special protection for the Dandenongs, Mornington Peninsula and the Upper Yarra, it is also to be hoped that consideration will be given in the future by the Government to the establishment of a similar authority to protect the interests of the Lower Yarra regions, and also that provision will be made for the early removal from the planning scheme of road reservations on land previously reserved for freeways. These areas can be used with great effect in the interests of conservation. It is hoped the Government will act speedily to remove those road reservations where they exist unnecessarily.

One area of interest in the conservation field is Rockbeare Park. I am concerned that land between the Darebin Creek and Yarana Road should be conserved. A substantial part of this land concerns the City of Northcote tip. There is a need to restore this area to its natural beauty. The area in general includes Rockbeare Park and Darebin Creek and is one of real potential for recreational purposes. These are the feeding grounds of several rare species of birdlife. By restoring the lovely billabongs and with tree planting, this beautiful spot can be properly preserved as one of the truly natural river areas accessible and close to the city. Valleys and banks of Melbourne's creek systems generally should be restored to their former beauty in order that they may be appreciated and enjoyed by all.

Finally, in the area of transport, His Excellency said—

> It is intended that a proper scheme of priority roads will operate throughout Victoria as soon as possible.

I know expenditure in excess of $1 million for work on main roads and unclassified roads in the City of Heidelberg has been approved for the 1974-75 financial year. However, I believe more money should have been made available to Victoria for road works. Until all the money that is raised by the Commonwealth Government in Victoria from petrol tax is returned to Victoria, this State will get less than its fair share of funds for road works.

One of the vital areas of His Excellency's Speech to Parliament was his statement—

> Reference was made at the last opening of this Parliament to the threat of inflation. The reality is now with us, and inflation, coupled with increasing industrial unrest and rising unemployment, is the greatest single threat at present to growth and production, and the living standards and well-being of every Australian family.
>
> The Government has made several offers to the Commonwealth to take action in concert aimed at halting or slowing down the vicious spiral of wage and price increases now threatening the whole economy of the nation. These offers have not so far led to positive action, but the Government stands ready to introduce any necessary complementary legislation this session.

I believe we have to take close regard of the effects of Commonwealth Government policies on the people of Victoria. The facts are that since the Labor Government came to power in Canberra we have seen massive inflation, record unemployment, a failure to produce any co-ordinated plan to cope with the economic crisis, a loss of confidence everywhere, particularly in business ; the eclipse of the Federal Treasurer and the crowning of the " pretender " to the throne of fiscal control, Dr. Cairns. There has also been the farce of the mini Budget which immediately discredited the annual Commonwealth Budget brought down earlier. We have seen a Labor Party caucus that continually calls the tune to the Cabinet and an administration that surreptitiously grants recognition to Russia's control over the Baltic States.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member is going beyond the Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr. SKEGGS: The Prime Minister abdicates his responsibility by leaving this country at a time when every Australian, certainly every Victorian, expects national leadership.

Every Victorian is concerned about the effects of the Commonwealth's actions, particularly its fiscal actions, during the first two years of its term of office. The results have been shown in public reaction to some of those policies. All States are affected by these fiscal policies and public reaction was seen in the results of the Queensland election last Saturday. Two-thirds of the Labor Opposition has been removed from the Opposition benches in Queensland. In the Northern Territory there is not one Labor member on the Opposition benches. In the Australian Capital Territory Legislative Assembly Labor representation has been cut in half. These occurrences show that the Whitlam Government has clearly lost the confidence of the people of Australia and should abandon its centralist policies of frustrating and attempting to bypass State Governments. Australia and certainly Victoria are in a fiscal impasse through the machinations of the Federal Labor Government. This State Government has had to take initiatives it normally would not have to take to ensure that the people of Victoria are given a " fair go ".

The Whitlam Government is in incredible disarray, it is coming apart at the seams and it has precipitated an economic crisis in Australia causing unemployment to rise at a rate of 1,000 jobs a day. In Victoria the wage earners, like their counterparts in the other States, can see their jobs threatened by growing unemployment. The disadvantaged and the unemployable alike are receiving hand-outs that the economy in the long term cannot sustain while all the incentive has been drained out of the business life of this nation causing a serious downturn in confidence and productivity.

To stimulate growth and competition our people as a whole must once again find it rewarding to work. That is the keynote. One hundred and ninety thousand people have been turned out of their jobs. They must once again find that they will receive value for the work they perform, but business needs to be healthy to provide the rewards which the work force seeks. With the proper incentives from Government and business the work force can again supply the goods which will generate employment and job satisfaction and which in turn will create the conditions for sensible restraint within the trade union movement and in time restore economic and industrial sanity to this country.

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine): The Speech of His Excellency the Governor was delivered on 10th September, 1974. Much water has flowed beneath the bridge since then, and much legislation has passed through this House and another place. Since that time the Opposition has debated

at length the various Bills that have come before the Parliament and it has opposed most of them. It has not opposed some of the Bills but in the main it has offered constructive criticism and has acted as an Opposition should act.

The debate on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech is usually conducted on parish politics. However, during the past three months, as the representative for the electorate of Sunshine, I have related the main points at issue in that electorate—lack of tertiary education, lack of a teachers' college, problems regarding underpasses, technical schools, and so forth. I have related to Parliament problems within Sunshine electorate as well as I could under the circumstances. I shall therefore use the Address-in-Reply debate to concentrate on one issue only—increased workers compensation, which was referred to in the Speech by Sir Henry Winneke.

I congratulate the Governor on his elevation to that important post. In offering the loyalty of the constituents of Sunshine I do so in the same manner as loyalty is offered to the Governor-General Sir John Kerr, in the Federal arena. The Sunshine electorate contains people of many different nationalities. I speak on behalf of the electorate as a whole, and I believe the unnaturalized people in the area also convey their loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, and to her representative in Victoria, Sir Henry Winneke.

After the rousing speech by the honorable member for Ivanhoe, I bring the issues back to Victoria. One of the most important issues that I expected to come before Parliament was that of workers compensation. I did so with the knowledge that many thousands of people in this State receive workers compensation. In answer to a question, the Minister of Labour and Industry has said that each year some 6,000 people suffer deafness and other hearing illnesses. On another occasion the honorable gentleman stated that a record number of fines would result from inspections by Department of Labour and Industry staff of unsafe machinery and from other factors. This means that not all factors which contribute to workers compensation are brought about by negligence of the workers; there are other contributing factors.

As a former representative of employees I believe that, regardless of political differences, members of Parliament should aim to have the best Workers Compensation Act in Australia. At one stage the Victorian Workers Compensation Act was the best; at present it is not. One of the main factors in recent times has been the acceleration in wages. The honorable member for Ivanhoe referred to inflation. All honorable members know the inflation that exists today, and as a result of it people receive higher wages. The worker has received increased wages, as has the director, and in the past six months even Parliamentarians have seen fit to raise their wages.

During the past two years there has been no increase in workers compensation, whether in weekly payments or in lump sum payments. In Victoria the Labour and Industry Act is administered by a Minister who is a likeable person if not a good Minister. There are 210 State wage determinations, and not all of them are effective, but 121 contain a clause which guarantees an employee's normal weekly earnings during periods when he is injured and receiving workers compensation. If an employer or individual person wishes to challenge a decision of a State wages board, he may do so through the Industrial Appeals Court, but at no time has there been any challenge to any one of the 121 State wages board determinations which have been amended to provide average weekly earnings to an employee during periods when he has received workers compensation

I quote from the Butter Factories and Condensories Wages Board determination about which I have some knowledge because I helped to redraft much of it. The definitions on page 9 set out the amounts payable and periods for which they are payable when a person receives his normal earnings during periods on workers compensation. Clause 4 sets out the qualifications for payment and clause 5 specifies the maximum period for payment.

I am trying to amplify the point that 121 State wage determinations contain the clause that a person shall receive his normal earnings during periods on workers compensation, yet the Workers Compensation Act at present provides only $43 a week for a single person receiving workers compensation. If he is married and has children he receives $63 a week. While honorable members have been dilly-dallying and talking about rowboats on the bay and things like that for hours on end, we have let slip by during this sitting of Parliament a most important matter that affects the livelihood of many thousands of Victorians. On Thursday of last week the honorable member for Reservoir was able to show the House that certain assurances had been given by the Chief Secretary about when he would bring down a Bill dealing with workers compensation.

Unfortunately wages have risen. The key case which is usually considered by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission is that of the fitter and turner. At present his award rate is $106.10 a week. Under the Butter Factories and Condensories Wages Board determination, a buttermaker also receives $106.10 a week but if he is unfortunate in being hurt at work he will receive $43 or $63 a week.

I have pointed out previously to the Minister of Labour and Industry —I think it should have been pointed out to the Chief Secretary—that a person aged eighteen years who is not covered by the section of the wage determinations to which I have referred, and is injured at work at a time when he is receiving full salary and there is no saving clause in the determination—such as that in the butter factories and condensories determination—will receive only $32 a week. These are definite anomalies that I relay to the Chief Secretary who, with respect, may have a rough exterior but perhaps a heart of gold. I hope he will take notice of some of the things which have been learned from experience.

A person may be injured while going from one job to another. He may have two jobs, one as a cleaner in one place and a similar position elsewhere. If he is unfortunate enough to be injured while moving from one job to another, he is not eligible for compensation. I direct attention to a case before the Workers Compensation Board of Victoria, *Kazantzas* v. *Australian Motor Industries Ltd. and Browns Office Cleaning Services Pty. Ltd.* The report I have is date stamped 10th April, 1973. The headnote says—

> Travelling workers injured in interval between two employments—whether on a journey protected by the Act—Section 8 (2).

The report is headed—

> Reasons for Decision.

It states, *inter alia*—

> It possibly underlines the absence of " cover " for the worker journeying from one employment to the other.

It was proved that a person with two jobs who is injured while travelling from one to the other is not entitled to workers compensation. I ask the Minister to give consideration to this decision before introducing his projected Bill next year, because this situation could arise again.

I will not stress my personal opinions on workers compensation because it is possible that they may

conflict with future Labor Party decisions. However, one thing I emphasize is that, at any stage, an employer may give 21 days' notice of the cessation of ordinary weekly workers compensation payments. I ask honorable members to imagine what hardships this could cause if that notice were given now. A person on compensation would have to get a medical certificate and consult a solicitor. Payment should continue during any period of litigation, and not be stopped on 21 days' notice. This should apply whether a man has "Mediterranean" back or some other illness.

A medical practitioner may certify that a person is fit for light duty. A buttermaker, for instance, would earn $106.10 a week but, as a result of a decision by a medical man, without knowledge of the work being done, he may lose $20 or $30 a week. When the Minister examines this situation he should give consideration to ensuring that any person on workers compensation who is required to resume work should do so at his normal wage.

My own belief is that no one should lose money or earnings because of being injured at work. There may be many contributing factors. The Minister of Labour and Industry has referred to faulty machinery and excessive noise. I could mention many other factors which contribute to workers being injured, not all of them the fault of the employees concerned. I cannot understand why any person trained in a particular occupation should lose money because he was injured at work. A fitter and turner who earns $106.10, because of a great deal of training including a period of apprenticeship, could have his income reduced to $43, if he was a single man, because of injury.

It is the responsibility of the employer to ensure that the wage the employee receives is maintained. Under determinations made by wages boards set up under the Labour and Industry Act, the State of Victoria accepts this principle in a number of cases. Victoria should lead the way as it did in the past.

When introducing the Bill on workers compensation, the Minister should consider various aspects which I shall enumerate. In New South Wales the compensation payable is 85 per cent of the average weekly earnings, with a maximum of $43 for an adult. There is an allowance of $11 for a spouse and another allowance of $5 for each dependant under 21 years of age. In Victoria the compensation is $43 for an adult and $32 for a minor. To prove that we follow democratic principles, it is one of those sums or the average weekly earnings, whichever is less. An amount of $12 is paid for a spouse and amounts of $4 for children under sixteen years of age. The total for a married man with children could be $63.

In Queensland the compensation is $46.60 for a male and $36.70 for a female. In South Australia it is the average weekly earnings over a period of twelve months immediately preceding the incapacity. In Western Australia it is the average weekly earnings based on the ordinary wage or salary plus over-award payments which the worker would have received for the ordinary hours he would have worked if he had not been incapacitated. In Tasmania the compensation is the average weekly earnings for a period of twelve months prior to the commencement of incapacity.

Victoria is now so far behind other places that the Chief Secretary must produce something substantial to provide what should be regarded as common justice to injured workers. I ask the Chief Secretary to take notice of what I have said when his Bill is being drafted and also to consider the workers compensation Acts throughout Australia and New Guinea.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) : I regret that this debate is taking place so late in the

sessional period. I make this remark in the hope that, at some time in the future, the Government will take note of it. Early in the sessional period, the House was rising at 9.30 p.m. and 10 p.m. There was ample time for the debate on the motion for an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech but, despite pleas and requests, no action was taken. A group of primary school children could not have made worse arrangements for the debate.

As a member representing a country area I must support the amendment moved by the Opposition. The Country Party believes some effort must be made by the Government to limit the size of Melbourne. Force is not necessary ; this objective should be accomplished by providing help to country towns to grow.

I express my personal loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I am joined by the electors of Shepparton and by members of the Country Party of Victoria. I extend my good wishes to the new Governor, Sir Henry Winneke. and to Lady Winneke. Sir Henry is a distinguished Australian and I am confident that he will carry on the high standards of his predecessors.

In recent weeks I have been disturbed to learn of plans by the Federal Government to institute a new system of honours in Australia. I understand that the Prime Minister plans to do away with the bestowing of the traditional Royal honours as we know them in Australia. I believe it is suggested that a single body will be set up to receive recommendations and make decisions on who should be honoured by the Government of Australia. Presumably, that would be the Federal Government ; there would be one central system.

How this could happen in a Federation, I do not know, because honours have been recommended by all Australian Governments, both State and Commonwealth. I hope the Premier of Victoria will make representations to Her Majesty to counter this move by the Federal Government. I am sure that he would receive support from the other anti-Socialist Premiers, particularly Mr. Joh. Bjelke-Petersen. Opposition members may laugh, but I remind them that the people have had their first opportunity since May to show what they think of what is happening in this country, and they have shown it clearly.

Mr. WILKES : That is the people of Queensland, not the people of Australia.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : The people of Queensland comprise 1 million Australians and represent a substantial proportion of the Australian public. I repeat that they have shown what they think.

If the proposal to do away with Royal honours was an isolated move, it would not be so disturbing, but the Federal Government seems determined to destroy our traditional way of life, and to do away with our association with the Crown and the other members of the Commonwealth of Nations. The Government of Victoria has an obligation to make its views known throughout Australia and to make representations to Her Majesty.

I regret that the Deputy Premier is not present at the moment because I pay tribute to him for the honour bestowed on him today by the Royal Humane Society, which awarded him a Bronze Medal for the part he played in the Faraday incident. We who know him so well take his courage and dedication for granted. However, this is an appropriate opportunity for me, on behalf of members of the Country Party and myself, to pay tribute to this distinguished Australian.

I regret that I must now move on to the subject of education. To some, this may seem to tarnish what I have already said, but I certainly make no attack on the Minister.

Quite rightly, the Government allocates a major portion of the Budget expenditure to education—something in excess of 40 per cent. This allocation has the wholehearted support of members on all sides of the House, but it is recognized by all that Victorians are not getting value for money spent. The administration of the Education Department has deteriorated. The Government should realize that it could well stumble and fall on the performance of the Education Department. I have the highest regard for the Minister for his competence, intelligence and hard work, but why he is burdened with a third three-year term I shall never understand. To serve six years as Minister of Education with the mental and physical demands that are entailed is more than any man can stand. I can only conclude that the honorable gentleman has been retained in this portfolio because the Government has no other Minister who has the capacity to do the job. The State is expecting too much of the Deputy Premier in asking him to continue his duties as Minister of Education.

What this State needs is, firstly, a Minister who acts as Minister of Education for only three years, or six years at the most. Secondly, he must have a full-time Assistant Minister of Education. Time and time again in the past eight or nine years there have been Assistant Ministers of Education who have been given other portfolios, and they have spent about one-fifth of their time on education. It is a stupid state of affairs. Education needs two full-time Ministers, and the Assistant Minister should be working six days a week in the department sorting out the confusion that exists there today. No honorable member in this House would contradict those statements. The present position continues month after month, and the Government will not make a change.

Mr. MACLELLAN : You sound like the *Age*.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : The *Age* is sometimes right. For the Government to pretend that all is well in education in Victoria is a sign that it is a dire and complacent Government.

Mr. WILKES : It is not a matter of money.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : The money is available. The Government lacks enthusiasm and leadership. Changes that should be made are not being made. The Government is sitting on a time bomb. A few years ago a bomb went off and it caused enough trouble. Today similar symptoms exist, but the people are doing nothing about the matter. I warn that unless something happens, it is inevitable that in the New Year a debate on education will take place in this House which will be of great embarrassment to the Government. The warning is given, and if it is not heeded the Government will stumble and fall. The only reason that the Government may not fall is that there is not an Opposition equipped to take its place. The Government has been depending on that for too long, but it will not last for ever.

Finally, I appeal to the Premier and to his Ministers to show much greater strength in dealing with the Federal Government. Weakness is deplored, and the Federal Government will recognize only strength.

Mr. HOLDING: Bjelke-Petersen—Ross-Edwards, 26 per cent.!

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : The one person who has read the free enterprise clause of Federalism is the Premier of Queensland. The Leader of the Opposition should remember that the Premier of Queensland——

Mr. HOLDING : He polled only 26 per cent of the vote. A Fascist—that is what he is.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler) : Order! I appeal to the Leader of the Opposition to cease interjecting.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : The Premier of Queensland commands 64 per cent of the vote in Queensland.

The figures can be twisted and distorted in any way that the Opposition likes.

Mr. HOLDING: Twenty-six per cent!

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not ask the Leader of the Opposition again to cease interjecting.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: In Queensland 64 per cent of the people made their position very clear. The Opposition can distort the figures, but 64 per cent of the people voted against the Federal Labor Government. Let us be honest; the Labor movement in Queensland was sacrificed. The vote on Saturday was a vote on Federal issues, and the people of Queensland made it clear what they felt about the Socialist Federal Government. The lesson must be obvious to all Australians. I ask the Victorian Government to show greater strength when dealing with the Federal Government in Canberra.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South): I shall endeavour to confine myself to matters contained in the Governor's Speech. I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply, and I offer my congratulations to Sir Henry Winneke on his elevation to the high office of the Queen's representative in Victoria. On behalf of my constituents I offer Sir Henry Winneke and Lady Winneke every good wish for a long and successful period at Government House.

The first subject to which I should like to refer is decentralization. It is an interesting subject when one has regard to what has happened in the Commonwealth field. Every single action of the Victorian Government in its desire to promote decentralization has had the skids put under it very quickly and effectively by actions of the Federal Government.

I refer to the hypocrisy of the Opposition in moving the amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion. It states—

> That the following words be added to the proposed Address—"and respectfully desire to inform Your Excellency that this House rejects the concept of Melbourne's growth being unlimited and Government departments and statutory authorities acting on a population figure of 5 million by the year 2000, and expresses the view that Melbourne's growth should be limited.

It does not say by how much. The amendment goes on—

> and that a population for Melbourne in excess of 3·5 million is socially and economically undesirable.

It is interesting when one takes up an occasional reference here and there which gives the Opposition's lie and points out the hypocrisy of the Opposition's amendment. I quote from the *News Weekly* of 23rd October.

Mr. HOLDING: Santa's songbird, that is what the honorable member for Ballaarat South is.

Mr. STEPHEN: It does not really matter how many interjections are made. I have a programme and I am going to go through with it. An article in the *News Weekly* headed "Canberra observed" reads—

> The phony nature of the Whitlam Government's regional policies is the result of many pressures. In many respects it is just old-fashioned pork-barrel politics dressed up to sound respectable.

Mr. HOLDING: By Bob Santamaria. He would be objective!

Mr. STEPHEN: The article continues—

> As we pointed out in these columns last week, it is with the sole exception of Albury-Wodonga, a matter of support for suburban development on the fringes of or within easy commuting distance of existing and overcrowded metropolitan cities.

Mr. HOLDING: In 1938 Santamaria supported Adolph Hitler.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order!

Mr. HOLDING: We want to get the reference right.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is interjecting. I have appealed to him. Surely he will accede to my request.

Mr. STEPHEN : I hope you do not put him out, Mr. Speaker ; I am enjoying it. I continue with the quote from the *News Weekly*—

It is therefore yet another case of buying the votes of the outer suburbanites the classic swinging voters.

Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of Opposition members is obvious. They come in here and make statements which they do not even believe in, and which their colleagues in Canberra do not support. The article goes on—

Regional and urban development——

The SPEAKER : Is it necessary for the honorable member to continue reading?

Mr. STEPHEN : Yes, it is.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) : Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would the honorable member identify the source and the author of the document?

The SPEAKER : Order! I think I heard the honorable member quote the source of his quotation.

MR. JONES: Not the author.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South) : I stated that I was quoting from *News Weekly*, of 23rd October, 1974, at page 5. The article was written by " Observer ".

Mr. HOLDING : That is Bob Santamaria.

Mr. STEPHEN : I do not know whether it is Bob Santamaria or anybody else.

Mr. HOLDING : " Observer "! Come on! The honorable member for Ballaarat South knows better than that.

The SPEAKER : Order!

Mr. STEPHEN : The article goes on—

Regional and urban development is the fastest single category in the recent Budget and a major contribution to the taxation explosion.

Expenditure this year is budgeted to rise from $167 million to $433 million, or 160 per cent.

As I am upsetting the Leader of the Opposition so much, I shall not quote any further. The article goes on to say that the Federal Labor Government is not the slightest bit interested in anything that goes on outside the suburban area. Let us not delude ourselves ; that is a fact of life.

Speaking of decentralization, and of how successful the Minister for State Development and Decentralization had been until 1974, when the skids became slightly greased by the Socialists in Canberra, I point out the action that the State Government has taken, and I commend the Government for the mention of decentralization in the Governor's Speech. The Government has given concessions in pay-roll tax and land tax, assistance with buildings and factories, freight concessions, loans on favourable terms, and help with retraining, and the cost of removing people going to country areas to work in industries. When we talk of decentralization, we talk of some of the major industries on which the Government relies for decentralization. One is the textile industry, and another is the footwear industry—major industries which the State Government has endeavoured to promote to bring about decentralization.

What has happened to the State Government's efforts in this field? Some honorable doctor by the name of Cairns got on the job and created unemployment. When the Government, through the Premier, constantly pointed out to Dr. Cairns and the Prime Minister that the removal of tariffs on imports would create some diabolical unemployment in the textile industry, according to the *Sun News-Pictorial* of 5th June, Dr. Cairns is reported to have said, " No hardship for textile workers ". Last night, I noticed a *Herald* headline that 95,000 textile workers could be retrenched within the next six weeks. Yet Dr. Cairns had the audacity to say there would be no hardship.

Mr. HOLDING : Whilst listening to the pearls of wisdom and infantile comments by the honorable member, I draw attention to the state of the House because at least the honorable member should have an audience.

A quorum was formed.

Mr. STEPHEN: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his courtesy. In the *Sun News-Pictorial* of 18th July, Dr. Cairns was reported as saying that unemployment of textile workers at the end of June was insignificant and was carefully under control. If unemployment was carefully under control at the end of June, something must have gone drastically wrong because it has got virtually out of control since then. The article also referred to a statement by Dr. Cairns that 7,363 of those who were retrenched in Australian industry to the 28th June were in the textile industry. Apparently, this figure indicates that to 28th June unemployment was insignificant and was carefully under control.

The textile and footwear industries were amongst the major problems when the Federal Government put the skids under the Victorian Government's excellent record on decentralization. Other industries were affected, such as the clothing and electrical industries. Every action taken by the Federal Government has led to massive unemployment in rural areas, which will continue to feel the significant adverse effects for the next six months.

The Federal Government has done a great disservice to the decentralization efforts of the State Government and has also sapped the confidence of the rural areas. Despite the fact that the Federal Government is receiving a 40 per cent increase in taxation revenues, only a 23 per cent increase has been made to the State Government. This money belongs to the people of Victoria, not to the Federal Government. There is also a lack of confidence in rural pursuits within the country areas.

Regard must be had for the industries which are being put in jeopardy. The industries on which this nation relies for much of its export earnings are being jeopardized. In 1971-72 exports from rural industries were responsible for 48·9 per cent of export earnings; in 1972-73 the proportion was 52·8 per cent and again, of equal significance, in 1973–74 exports from rural industries accounted for 51·2 per cent of export earnings. The moneys received have been successfully applied for the benefit of the nation although they have been provided by a mere 7·3 per cent of the work force. It is important to note the few votes involved in that work force, which is why the Federal Government has disregarded so much the plight of rural industry and has been concerned only with the metropolitan areas.

There is no need to expand on the colossal increase in the burden which has been heaped on to the rural producers since the advent of the present Federal Government. On agricultural pursuits, His Excellency said that more will have to be done by the State Government, more extension services will have to be provided, more research work will have to be undertaken and more advice made available to rural industries in general. I regret that the debate has been brought on so late in the session because it restricts one in making a full contribution.

One must be concerned when responsible people like Sir Norman Giles, Chairman of Elder Smith-Goldsbrough Mort Ltd. says that graziers have been set an impossible task. I shall not read the whole article, but it is soundly based.

Despite all these problems, honorable members have heard no complaints from the Opposition about unemployment. I do not recall any member of the Opposition, particularly the honorable member for Geelong North, during this session demanding that something be done about unemployment. A great deal of effort and co-operation has been offered by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government to employ people with the minimum of cost and delay but the Premier has received only a rebuff from the Prime

Minister. The Commonwealth Government has shown a complete indifference to the re-employment of people cheaply, quickly, and in the interests of those who are unemployed.

Today, inilation is the greatest scourge. His Excellency said that it was a most worrying thing for the community today. Although I do not always accept public opinion polls, I am bound to take some notice of an opinion poll which indicates that 94 per cent of the population are worried about inflation. This poll was referred to in the *Herald* on Saturday 23rd November, under the headline "Government Should Do More Says the Public".

Within the Labor Government in Canberra and in other areas, no one has yet decided that some good might be achieved by an increase in productivity. Without this, everybody knows that there is no chance of extracting Australia out from the current mess. I regret that I am upsetting the Leader of the Opposition but I should have liked to develop a little further the subject of inflation because it is so frequently claimed that inflation is something that occurs overseas, that it is some sort of disease which probably the Prime Minister has brought back from one of his overseas trips. I do not concede that it is an overseas disease.

I doubt whether the Prime Minister could accurately contend that this is so because he does not deal with the deep and gutsy figures; he floats on the surface and is inclined to be a little insincere. Obviously one of the greatest problems in the world today is inflation. We have it in Australia and other countries have it, but those countries which have the highest rate of inflation are dominated by left-wing unions.

Mr. HOLDING: Look at the United States of America.

Mr. STEPHEN: I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the United States of America. The inflation rate in the United States of America is not nearly as bad as it is in Australia.

Mr. HOLDING: What are the figures?

Mr. STEPHEN: It is about 10·8 per cent. The unemployment rate, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, has always been greater. We in this country have had the privilege of having the lowest unemployment rate of any country in the world. We possibly almost still have that privilege, but not by much.

Mr. RAFFERTY: What has created the bad position now?

Mr. STEPHEN: The extraordinary demands of the Australian Labor Government. It is about time we forgot this juvenile Federal Government and started calling a Communist a Communist. I have heard honorable members opposite interjecting and saying that I find a Communist under every bed.

Mr. HOLDING: Two under every bed.

Mr. STEPHEN: I suggest that they are no longer under the bed; they are on top of the bed for everybody to see.

Mr. TREZISE: Name a couple. The honorable member is always making assertions.

Mr. STEPHEN: I do not like mentioning names but as I have been challenged so severely, I mention the name of Mr. Halfpenny, who will be very pleased I have done this because I have seen him on numerous occasions on television and he has said he is a Communist—perhaps he is paid by some overseas Communist régime. It has happened before and it could happen again. But of course not all of the writings and not all the interjections——

Mr. TREZISE: What about your Democratic Labor Party papers?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I will not rise to my feet again to call for order with-

out naming someone. The honorable member for Ballaarat South without interjection.

Mr. STEPHEN : The Federal Government could endeavour to overcome the problem of unemployment by making a generous amount of money available to the State for employment purposes. The dignity of man is to have a job. It is not to be receiving handouts and this is where the philosophy of honorable members opposite and their friends in another Parliament is specifically wrong. They do not recognize this very salient point. In 1969 Australia suffered a small unemployment problem—I can refer to it as a small problem because Dr. Cairns claims that Australia is now facing a major problem as it has 3·5 per cent unemployment and in those times it was only 2·4 per cent. However, the Liberal-Country Party Government was quickly off the mark and was prepared to make available moneys to the Victorian State Government to institute a very worth-while scheme for rural relief. The scheme was responsible for the performance of beneficial work in rural areas. The Premier of Victoria has offered to make this system available to the Commonwealth Government again and has said on numerous occasions that he would be prepared to employ 1,000 people within a week, but still no response is forthcoming from Canberra.

That is a true indication of the efforts of the State Government to alleviate the problems of this State and the community, in particular the rural provincial community which I have the honour to represent.

It is a pity that the leader of this nation thinks he is the greatest. It is really pathetic to think that he has so little concern for the community in this State. He has said that he is the greatest. He has provided the greatest number of strikes.

Honorable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler) : Order! I shall read the relevant Standing Order—

> No member should presume to make any noise or disturbance whilst any member is orderly debating, or whilst any Bill, order, or other matter, is being read or opened; and in case of such noise or disturbance, Mr. Speaker should call upon the member making such disturbance by name and every such person will incur the displeasure and censure of the House.

I am reluctant to name any honorable member, and I have not had need to do so up to this point. If honorable members continue to interject I shall have no alternative but to carry out the Standing Order I have just quoted.

Mr. STEPHEN : I shall help you considerably, Mr. Speaker, by concluding. I regret that the leader of this nation claims to be the greatest. We have had the greatest number of strikes, the greatest unemployment, the greatest inflation, the greatest shortage of homes and the greatest shortage of finance. Of course, we have also the greatest interest rates and it is amazing how the leader of the nation can be so devoid of responsibility because the Federal Government is taking away the opportunity and the desire of the citizens of this nation to own their own homes.

Over the past few months honorable members have also witnessed the greatest misleading statements they have heard for a long time. I would not speak at this late hour if the matter was not of grave or major concern to those who represent the people who reside in rural and provincial areas.

The State Government has a remarkable record in its efforts to decentralize people from the metropolis. There is no compulsion about it. The Government has tried to achieve it by encouraging and by attracting people, but every effort of this State Government has been undermined by the Federal Government. I regret this most sincerely just as I am sure my constituents regret it. I hope

action will be taken by the Federal Government in the near future with a view to correcting this ghastly situation which it has imposed on the community and in particular on the constituents whom I have the honour to represent.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): The House has just been subjected to a diatribe, unprecedented in this House, from the honorable member for Ballaarat South. I can understand the honorable member apologizing for the lateness of the hour, but his speech was full of inaccuracies and did not offer one solution to the problems he claims confronts the nation.

Honorable members should remember that the debate was first introduced into this House early in September and was not reintroduced until today. The honorable member for Ballaarat South instead of apologizing for the lateness of the hour should have been apologizing to His Excellency the Governor for having the Address-in-Reply presented to His Excellency tomorrow, on the last day of the sessional period. It may be the old story but of course the remarks of the Premier are on record that he wanted to conclude this debate as soon as possible and get the Address-in-Reply to the Governor. What has happened is that the debate has been allowed to drag on, and the backward back-bench members of the Liberal Party have come to life only since Saturday. A week ago when Mr. Snedden's leadership was challenged they were very quiet and had little to say and did not want to get on with the debate, but, of course, since Saturday, they have gained some solace from the fact that the Country Party Government in Queensland, propped up by the Liberals, was able to win an election.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: That is the understatement of the year.

Mr. WILKES: It is the statement of the year, that the Country Party Government was able to win an election, propped up by the Liberals in Queensland. The Country Party received 26 per cent of the votes, 31 per cent of the votes went to the Liberal Party and 36 per cent went to the Labor Party. That is an illustration of the gerrymander perpetuated in that State, and an example of the gerrymander that has been introduced into this Parliament to perpetuate this Government on the Treasury benches. The honorable member for Ballaarat South cannot talk about democracy on the one hand and on the other hand justify the actions of this Government in respect to the gerrymander that was passed in this Parliament recently and which is no different from the position in Queensland.

However, the Opposition apologizes to Sir Henry Winneke on behalf of this Government, firstly because he was asked to read out the diatribe contained in the Governor's Speech. His Excellency must have been embarrassed in the Legislative Council Chamber to read this stuff on behalf of the Government. To compound that embarrassment, and not being satisfied to ask Sir Henry to read out this tripe, the Government then waits until the second last day of the sessional period before it will allow the debate to continue on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to be completed and taken to His Excellency.

The Government, in the Speech read by His Excellency, claimed—

> The Government is pursuing a firm policy of encouraging the use of public transport and reducing the dominance of the motor car, especially for commuter travel. This policy requires continuing action on several fronts.

What have honorable members seen? We have seen no policy suggested or definite guidance given on the Government's proposal-nothing other than a continuance of the dominance of the motor car on Victorian roads.

Mr. Dixon: What about the bike track along the Yarra River?

Mr. WILKES : I will come to the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation later. One of the suggestions contained in the Speech of His Excellency was the provision of new, faster, and more comfortable trains, trams and buses. Where are they? One new tram was mocked up to carry the Minister of Transport and the Premier before the last election but it broke down in Bourke Street and embarrassed the two honorable gentlemen.

Since that time the same old buses, trams and trains are running in the northern areas and more cars are on the roads. There has been no attempt by the Government to do anything about the situation. The Governor said the Government would take action as follows—

> Preventing fare increases. In spite of inflation the Government actually reduced rail and tram fares last year, which led to a substantial increase in patronage.

The figures do not indicate an increase in patronage. I invite the Minister to read the report of the Tramways Board. His Excellency continued—

> Construction of the Melbourne underground.
>
> New stations, express tracks, and automatic signalling.
>
> Building of car-parks at suburban stations, and modal interchanges. Planning for the first two, at Box Hill and Frankston, is well advanced.

Mr. RAFFERTY : There is a bonus there.

Mr. WILKES : There is a bonus, and the Minister would not want to hear what the bonus is. In a debate in this Chamber on the Railway Works and Services Bill, the honorable member for Melbourne pointed out that he had previously asked the Minister of Transport in a question on notice—

> How many carriages are comprised in the system, indicating the number constructed mainly of (*a*) wood; and (*b*) metal?

The honorable member for Melbourne then continued—

> The answer was that 580 carriages are made of wood, and 499 are predominantly metal. When I asked when the wooden body carriages had been built, even more striking was the answer that, between 1891 and 1900, 271 carriages were built.

The Government is humiliating His Excellency by expecting him to read this tripe. The Governor continued—

> A new scheme is to be proposed for improved supervision of school crossings, requiring joint action by State and local governments along the lines of the scheme operating in Great Britain.

When is the new scheme that was promised in September to start? On 11th September when the honorable member for Balwyn attempted to adjourn the debate, the Opposition opposed the motion for the adjournment because it believed the debate on an important matter such as the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech should be continued through and then presented to His Excellency. The Government voted against a continuation of the debate at that time. It is no wonder it wanted the debate adjourned. This is what His Excellency said in a Speech which was obviously written by the Chief Secretary—

> The Government is not satisfied with the present organization of the Road Safety and Traffic Authority, and legislation will be presented to make substantial changes.

No legislation has been introduced to make substantial changes over the control of traffic signs, road signals and road markings. Honorable members will need no reminding of the mess the Government got into with rocket signs. These signs will be pulled down next year, regardless of the expense. The Government cannot guarantee that the give-way-to-the right rule will be phased out by Easter of next year, in spite of the desire of the Premier, because of the muddling of the Government and its inability to do anything about the Road Safety and Traffic Authority.

Chaos can be expected at Easter of next year when the new priority road rule comes into operation. If the Government's programme is so important, why are its promises not

fulfilled? The Government believes it will be in office as long as it wishes because it is redrawing the electoral boundaries of the State to ensure that it will stay in office. Therefore, it believes it has a licence to say what it likes, when and how it likes. Whether it carries out its promises does not matter because if 52 per cent of the people want to change the Government they cannot do so. The Government has all the licence, but sooner or later it will meet a sticky end.

The Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation said that the Government would put a bike track around the Alexandra Gardens. Great strides have been made! There is a bike track there. The Minister also stated in the House and in the press that he was receiving $1 million to promote a fitness campaign.

Mr. DIXON : Over five years.

Mr. WILKES : Yes, over five years, although other areas in Victoria are starved for funds. If that is the extent of the Government's planning and attention to the priorities and needs of the State, is it any wonder that people are starting to query the Government?

Mr. DIXON: What have I done in five years for the honorable member?

Mr. WILKES : The honorable gentleman has not been a Minister for five years. He has done nothing in my area.

Mr. DIXON : That is not true. What about the bike velodrome?

Mr. WILKES : Not a penny has been received from the Minister for the bike velodrome in Northcote, although money was sought. In his Speech, His Excellency also said—

> During this session of Parliament a heavy programme of legislation will be introduced on a wide variety of subjects. In addition to those measures I have already mentioned, the programme will include—
>
> Commercial fisheries, with increased involvement of fishing interests.
>
> A completely new National Parks Bill, reorganizing the service and providing for additional national parks.

The National Parks Bill was introduced today. It got in by the skin of its teeth.

Mr. JONA : When does the honorable member think the session closes?

Mr. WILKES : In May of next year. The Governor's Speech continues—

> Cluster titles, to provide a new form of subdivision.
>
> Registration and advertisement of contraceptives.
>
> The Liquor Control Act.
>
> Increased workers compensation.

Mr. RAFFERTY : Increased workers compensation will be coming in before next May.

Mr. WILKES : The honorable member for Reservoir has a letter from the Minister which states that increased workers compensation will be introduced in the spring session of Parliament. The Minister and the Government have deliberately deprived families of injured workers in the State of 57 per cent of the average earnings that should be paid to them between now and Christmas. The suffering of these people does not matter. The figures speak for themselves, and the actions of the Government are undeniable. If the Government had not had pressure put on it from the insurance companies and other bodies, there would have been nothing to prevent it from introducing the workers compensation legislation which was promised. That is a responsibility that it must accept. It has made the decision, and if it considers that that action will induce proper industrial relations in the State, it has another think coming. I am mindful that the Government is not doing too well at Newport. The actions taken by the Opposition in this matter are supported by the authoritative evidence that has been disregarded by the State Electricity Commission, which is spending public money on advertisements.

The honorable member for Ballarat South asked what the Labor Party is doing about unemployment.

I shall quote from a local newspaper the latest unemployment figures in the northern suburbs. Under the heading "Payouts to 897 Workless" the newspaper states—

A total of 897 persons—678 male, 219 female—is listed as receiving unemployment benefits in the northern region of Melbourne on October 18.

Figures from the Department of Social Security are as follows—

	Male	Female	Total
Northcote	89	20	109
Thornbury	53	14	67
Preston	143	43	186
Reservoir	128	44	172

Mr. RAFFERTY: That is two months ago.

Mr. WILKES: The newspaper article states that the figures were as at 18th October. The Government has been telling us of the extremity in these areas of unemployment.

Mr. RAFFERTY: Does the honorable member think it does not matter?

Mr. WILKES: It matters if there is one person out of work. The actual figures on unemployment do not resemble the hypocrisy that has been outlined by the honorable member for Ballaarat South on the numbers of people unemployed. I rely on the departmental figures to tell how many people are in receipt of unemployment benefits. I do not believe as many people are unemployed as the Government has announced over the past three months in this Chamber. Unemployment is a matter of concern in this country, particularly in Victoria. The Government has done little about it. It has talked a great deal and continually exaggerated the situation. It has done little to relieve it. There are plenty of avenues by which the Government could relieve unemployment. The Victorian Railways are still advertising for railway workers and station hands. The Minister of Transport would probably be interested to know that the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board is still advertising for tram crews.

Mr. MEAGHER: You said that the Government is not doing anything.

Mr. WILKES: It is advertising. Work could be created for those people who are unsuited for this type of employment. If one listened to the Government it would appear that the economy and the state of prominent companies in Victoria is very bad. Honorable members receive the publication from the Victoria Promotion Committee.

Mr. MEAGHER: That is not a Government body.

Mr. WILKES: The Minister should know that the Government heavily subsidizes this body.

Mr. STEPHEN: Is that also in the *News Weekly?*

Mr. WILKES: No. An article in the *Sun News-Pictorial* of 29th October states under the heading "Burns Philp improves—$9.199 million"—

Diversified trading group Burns Philp & Co. Ltd., yesterday reported an improved profit of $9,199,000 for the June year.

In the same issue another article appears under the heading "Boost for Vulcan Australia". It states—

A massive lift in earnings of Vulcan Australia was the major reason for a 34 per cent profit increase by Vulcan Industries in 1973-74.

That company is not going down the drain.

Mayne Nickless Ltd. has restored confidence in the measures taken by the Australian Government to the extent that it is now prepared to spend money on plant renewal instead of taking the restrictive action which it took last year.

I invite honorable members to examine the section entitled "Business Briefs" contained in the publication *News from Victoria Australia.* Under the heading "Paper" the following article appears—

Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. and its subsidiaries made a profit for the year ended 30th June, 1974, of $14·4 million compared with $13·8 million the previous year. Sales were $212·4 million ($172·6 million in 1972-73).

Under the heading "Aluminium" the article states—

> Comalco Ltd., Melbourne., is to undertake a joint venture with Loxley (Bangkok) Ltd. to manufacture and market aluminium window frames and other building products in Thailand.

The raw material has to be produced in this country.

Mr. WILCOX: Why are so many people out of work?

Mr. WILKES: Because of the effect of the Government's policy on tariffs. The people who were mainly affected by that policy were employed in the textile industry, and in a lesser degree, in the motor industry. That position will be corrected over the next three months. Under the heading "Business Briefs" in the *Australia Newsletter* of September 1974 it is stated—

> Western Mining Corporation will purchase the nickel concentrates produced from ore at Selcast Exploration Ltd.'s Location 3 mine at Spargoville. . . . A new $655,600 terminal, built by Mayne Nickless Ltd. at Webb Dock, Port of Melbourne, came into service earlier this year to handle coastal shipping. . . . Total group sales for Australian Consolidated Industries Ltd. was $558 million, an increase of $93 million on the previous year. . . . Total clothing imports jumped by 60 per cent and imports of outer garments by 75 per cent in the September 1973 quarter.

No matter where one looks, one sees a healthy picture, not the history of gloom which the Government has tried to put before the House since the session began in September.

The commercial interests of Australia have confidence, irrespective of what the Victorian Government says. It is only the multi-national groups which desire to get rid of the Labor Government in Canberra because their profits have been restricted to an unprecedented extent. If that means that other industries—particularly Australian and Victorian based industries—are to be promoted, the Opposition supports those policies. If sufficient time is allowed, the policies of the Australian Government will prove to be correct.

If there were a change in the Federal Government it would be interesting to see whether the new Government would continue with the initiatives established by the Australian Government in providing $260 million to Victoria, for which it has received no credit, and whether it would continue to supplement local government to the extent of $69 million, as the Australian Government has done. I venture to say that these initiatives would continue and would be given approval by the Victorian Government provided that they were given by other than a Labor Government in Canberra.

If the Victorian Government were sincere in its legislative programme it would have taken initiatives to put it into effect. The Premier stated on a number of occasions that he would co-operate with the Commonwealth Government, and would even consider introducing price control, but only if he could assist his supporters by implementing wage control.

Mr. DIXON: Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition support conciliation and arbitration?

Mr. WILKES: Of course I support it and I also support consent agreements because they have been successful in Australia and other countries. Unless the arbitration system is geared to meet the needs of the modern community, consent agreements will usurp the arbitration system.

I have no objection to unions accepting consent agreements with employers instead of undertaking the costly exercise of going to court where they will be restricted.

Mr. BIRRELL: Is the honorable member making an attack on Charlie Jones?

Mr. WILKES: If I wanted to attack the Federal Minister, I should attack his legislation, not the honorable gentleman personally. What he proposes to do about the air employees' agreement is a matter for himself.

The Premier and the Victorian Government should have done more to relieve the present industrial situation than they are prepared to do. The Opposition cannot understand why the Premier does not take action to do so. He is continually reported in the press as complaining about the Commonwealth's refusal to provide money to relieve unemployment, and claims that his administration could disburse the funds and get the scheme going quickly. There must be something wrong with the Premier's system because it was geared to handle only small pockets of unemployment in rural areas. If the figures quoted by the Government are correct, the present system which the Premier wants to apply for the disbursement of those funds would be totally inadequate, as the Premier ought to be the first to admit.

It is a disgrace that the Address-in-Reply debate should be concluded tonight to be presented to His Excellency tomorrow. The Opposition makes it abundantly clear that it accepts no responsibility for the humiliation and embarrassment this will cause to His Excellency. His Excellency's predecessor complained to the Government about the very thing which the Government is now doing to the new Governor. He said it was unethical and unfair that the Address-in-Reply debate should be concluded in the dying hours of the Parliament.

Mr. JONA : He also complained about members of the Opposition not attending the presentation.

Mr. WILKES : He may well have done so, but we are complaining about the incompetence of the Government in the conclusion and presentation of the Address-in-Reply. We accept no responsibility for the Government's action and apologize to His Excellency.

Mr. GUY (Gisborne) : The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has demonstrated adequately the depths of absurdity to which this debate has now sunk. I agree with the honorable member's final comments. However, he took advantage of the fact that he still held the floor to criticize, many months after that Speech of hope and aspiration was made by the Governor, things that the Parliament has not achieved, while stating how absurd it was at this late hour to be still debating the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. That is the height of hypocrisy, which is not in contrast to the Opposition's approach to Parliament, so one should not be surprised.

I agree with the comments of several members that it is ridiculous to be debating the statements made by the Governor some time ago. The debate should have been concluded months ago. It should have given, as it usually does in every session, the opportunity to members on both sides to express their feelings on comments made by the Governor and to be as parochial as they like. Government supporters have few opportunities to participate in debate on various issues, mainly because of the structure of their own party committees and Parliamentary party meetings. It is no secret ; that is how our system operates. The system does not need changing because it works efficiently, but certain things within it need modification.

One is that the adoption of an Address-in-Reply needs to be debated and concluded at the beginning of the session so that honorable members can express their feelings then and not months after the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. Everyone has hindsight in abundance, but it is another thing to comment objectively at the time when an opinion is expressed by some other person. This Address-in-Reply debate could have been a worth-while debate if it had been conducted and concluded much earlier in the sessional period because His Excellency's Speech expressed many worth-while hopes and

aspirations that the Governor held for the Government of this State at that time.

On behalf of my constituents in the electorate of Gisborne I tender to Sir Henry Winneke and Lady Winneke our sincerest congratulations. We will be delighted to see Sir Henry in the electorate at any time he is prepared to make his time available. He is a warm person, and he and his wife are worthy successors to Sir Rohan Delacombe and his wife. I know he has expressed great hopes for this State and I trust that, regardless of which Government is in power, it will do its best to fulfil those hopes and aspirations.

This could have been a fine debate because the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition focuses our thinking on an enormous problem on which this Parliament must concentrate in the near future and which, as a Parliament, we are in grave danger of ignoring. The Leader of the Opposition moved as an amendment—

> That the following words be added to the proposed Address:—
>
> "and respectfully desire to inform Your Excellency that this House rejects the concept of Melbourne's growth being unlimited and Government departments and statutory authorities acting on a population figure of 5 million by the year 2000—

that is a valid point to debate, but he went on to say—

> and expresses the view that Melbourne's growth should be limited—

that is fine—

> and that a population for Melbourne in excess of 3·5 million is socially and economically undesirable".

No honorable member has debated that point lately; no one has taken time to look into that question. I regret that this debate has been left until now because the question of the growth of Melbourne should have been fully debated. Many factors must be taken into consideration. I have listed seven which must be considered before any conclusion is arrived at. Firstly, we have to plan for the unavoidable growth of the metropolis.

Mr. DIXON : What do you think is unavoidable growth?

Mr. GUY : People having babies is unavoidable; the Government cannot legislate to prevent people from having children. As a bachelor I hope to avoid that for some time; however, even that may not be possible.

Mr. DIXON : People die as other people are having babies.

Mr. GUY : Secondly, we have to project the extent of the overflow considering all the necessary factors. The Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation has raised one factor—that people die, regrettably. Thirdly, we have to plan for the accommodation of the maximum overflow in and around the metropolitan area. In that connection I speak of Sunbury and Melton. Fourthly, we have to overlay a servicing potential on those areas. Fifthly, we have to plan for the servicing of those areas taking into consideration the servicing potential. Sixthly, we have to overlay some environmental and social study on those areas of growth. Seventhly, we have to rationalize the situation to a potential population figure.

All of those matters must be considered. Honorable members have probably taken into consideration two or three of them in the course of this debate, but they certainly have not considered all seven of them, or others that need to be taken into consideration when assessing whether or not the population should reach 5 million persons. It is presumptuous for members of the Opposition to say, without expert knowledge, what Melbourne's growth should be, when one examines the position in London, Los Angeles and San Francisco with populations of upwards of 10 million. Much mention should have been made of those cities in this debate, but this did not occur.

That raises one question with respect to the Governor's Speech to this Parliament, that is, that the

planning processes and procedures of the Government need urgent reappraisal. I have said this before and do not want to go into it in detail now. If we believe in open Government, we should believe in open planning. From our point of view as a State Government there should be more open planning processes and procedures. Quite often in the past some Government departments have gone their own way, planned their own programmes without consideration of any other department's needs or requirements and certainly without much consideration of Victoria's overall needs and requirements. That position must be rectified. I do not consider that our planning processes and procedures meet the demands of the 1970s, let alone the demands of the 1980s.

The basic problem is that not enough comprehensive planning has been undertaken in regard to the seven points that I listed earlier, and there has not been enough consultation between all bodies concerned in planning, which include an element of almost every Government department. When plans for growth are being formulated every Government department and its planning elements should be drawn together to formulate such plans for new areas. I refer to places such as Melton. The new Ministry for Planning has appointed a Secretary of Planning. We are not really sure what powers he will have, but to be effective he must have full power to control and coordinate all the planning elements of all Government departments.

In His Excellency's Speech Melton and Sunbury were nominated as satellite towns, and it was said that a development corporation would be appointed for each. We are entering a new era of planning, but what will the new development corporations consider? What will be their guidelines, and to what are they going to refer? Under whose jurisdiction will they be? Are they to be autonomous bodies established to administer the growth of those areas without any reference to Government departments such as the Housing Commission?

Mr. BORNSTEIN : You are a member of the Government party. Do you not have a say?

Mr. GUY : It is obvious that some members of the Opposition do not understand how the system works. Of course I have ample opportunity to air my opinions to the Minister, to my party, and on the odd occasion when time permits to express my opinion in the House. That is what I am doing at present. Members of the Opposition should take time to write to Ministers now and then so that they would not waste so much time of the House.

This debate at this time of the session is an absolute farce because it has delayed my opportunity to speak about matters that concern me, although they may be somewhat parochial. There are other matters which concern the general welfare of this State on which I should have liked to make some observations. They are important to my electorate. As I said before, there are many opportunities available to me that are not available to members of the Opposition, and I appreciate that position. I do not wish to take up time that members of the Opposition would like to use to air their views.

It is worth while repeating that it is fine for us to talk about planning, to recommend that certain areas ought to grow to a certain point, but it is another thing to back those hopes with the necessary action which ultimately means some sort of financial ramifications which again requires working in some harmony with the Federal Government, whichever party happens to be in office. The growth of Melbourne depends to a large extent on the finance that is made available to the State Government by the Federal Government. I should hate to see areas such as Melton and Sunbury, and other growth centres in my electorate,

prejudiced by any confrontation that might take place simply because of political expediency. I want to see them grow, and the Governor expressed that hope in his Speech.

In conclusion, I hope that in future the hopes and aspirations as expressed by the Governor in his Speech will be debated at an appropriate period in the session instead of our statements being clouded with hindsight which we are all capable of compiling. Every member of this House has a contribution to make when the issue is fresh, especially on such important matters as are contained in the Governor's Speech and as are proposed in the amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): I regret that my rising has been met with such general disapproval. I trust that it is on account of the late hour rather than the quality of my speech making. I wish to associate myself with the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply which was so ably moved and seconded so long ago. Once again, on behalf of the people I have been elected to represent in East Gippsland, I reaffirm our loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I also congratulate our new Governor, Sir Henry Winneke and Lady Winneke on their appointment, and trust that they have a happy and successful term of office, which I have no doubt they will.

This debate has given rise to a great deal of comment on a wide range of subjects. One matter which has been canvassed particularly in the past few days, and certainly over a great period of time, is the question of representation and the form of government that we have in this country. I believe the whole concept of our representative government is being thwarted or distorted by reference to the percentages of political parties in election campaigns. I do not think it has any relationship to the representation within a Parliament. It is of academic interest only, to give some guidance as to how the support for one party has risen or fallen over a period of years.

Mr. JONES: There used to be the old-fashioned concept of majority rule.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: The honorable member is talking about a majority of people over the whole State. If he wants to argue proportional representation, let him do so. That is a different subject, but that is not the sort of governmental system we have in this State. If the honorable member wants to argue the toss, I am prepared to accommodate him on the pros and cons of that system. I am prepared to argue the Hare-Clark system and the value of it and whether it can provide a system whereby one party has complete control. I remind the honorable member once again that the Hare-Clark system is regarded as one of the best systems of proportional representation but even in that system one member of Parliament can control the Parliament, as was demonstrated in Tasmania in recent years. It is quite possible in this Parliamentary system that on a perfectly balanced one man, one vote system, with every electorate absolutely equally divided, for 0·61 per cent of the voting population to control the Parliament.

I appreciate that I am making a hypothetical case, but I wish to substantiate this by reference to figures. I refer to an analysis of the figures which were made available recently in relation to legislation recently before this Parliament. It shows that the total voting population in Victoria was 2,167,425. If that figure were divided by 81 to give every seat exactly the same number of votes, there would be 26,756 voters in every electorate. To win one of those seats it would be necessary for one candidate to poll 13,379 votes. This would be accentuated even more if there was one seat in the State in which there were perhaps four or five fairly

equally supported candidates and by a preference election a person with much lower than a 0·61 per cent of the total State vote was representing that electorate in a House which was equally divided. He might be an independent member in a House equally divided between Liberal and Labor party members. This is quite possible under any Parliamentary system. It might even be one Country Party member. It could result in one of the best Governments ever because one Country Party member is equal to twenty of any other party.

Mr. JONES: In Queensland the franchise confirms it.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: I defy the honorable member to prove me wrong that under a one man, one vote system 0·61 per cent of the population can control the Parliament and therefore determine who will be the Government of the day. After all, an independent member controls the Senate in the Federal Government, allegedly under a proportional system which is supposed to be one of the fairest systems of voting. Yet this situation can occur where a small percentage of the population can control the Parliament. That obviously must be the consequence where two major political parties are evenly divided and a third party has the balance of power.

Mr. DOUBE: The answer is to gerrymander, as Bjelke-Petersen does.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: The honorable member for Albert Park thinks of gerrymander as being an imbalance of numbers within electorates. I disagree with that. That is not the origin of the word, "gerrymander". It was a deliberate distortion of boundaries to encompass in an electorate a group of people who would throw the political flavour of that electorate out of balance. It could be possible, for example, to draw the boundaries of Victoria by radiating them from the metropolitan area and the few square miles from the apex of the triangles would dominate the whole of the State. Nobody could argue that it was not perfectly balanced. It might be difficult but it could be done.

Similarly, a situation could occur where a large country town could dominate an electorate. For example, in Western Australia, Kalgoorlie dominates a massive electorate and all the rest of the area becomes unrepresented. The one town has domination over the whole of that population. The honorable member for Melbourne, when he spoke many weeks ago in this debate, tried to argue that the Country Party was destined for oblivion because farmers were becoming a smaller proportion of the total work force.

Mr. JONES: That was my Budget speech, actually.

Mr. B. J. EVANS: I apologize, but at least I did listen to the honorable member for Melbourne with a great deal of interest. The honorable member does not appreciate the balance which exists in country electorates at present. If I relied on the farming community in my electorate, I should have little chance of being returned as the honorable member for Gippsland East because the farming community is only 16 per cent of the work force in East Gippsland. All the talk about Country Party members representing farmers is so much nonsense. The farming community, we regret and concede, is becoming a decreasing percentage of the work force and the total population, but the honorable member for Melbourne has another think coming if he believes the Country Party is supported purely and simply by farmers. Country people will realize, as they have done in Queensland, how important it is to their interests to maintain an influence and a power base, as the honorable member for Gippsland West has interjected. It is important that they have representation in the places where decisions are made. This is one of the most important factors of our whole system.

If people consider that they are not represented and heard, they realize they must take other steps, which

often are not pleasant for the rest of the community. Many people in the farming community are thinking seriously about the possibility of denying their produce to the city in order to register their point of view and in order to get through to the city people how serious things are in the rural areas and industries.

As other members have pointed out during the debate, the situation on farms is becoming desperate. I realize that it is not a pleasant prospect for somebody to be out of work and to lose his wages for a period of time, but in most cases those people receive unemployment benefits and although they are not happy about it and it is not a desirable situation in the main, at least they receive some income. However, many farmers see a whole lifetime's work going to wrack and ruin. In many cases they have worked for years to pay off properties and mortgages and have started to reach a degree of security, only to find that the ground is cut from underneath their feet. On this basis the rural community must look seriously at what steps are open to it in order to make its point of view heard and felt and to get the right reactions from Governments to meet its problems.

In the past on a number of occasions I have made reference to decentralization and have endeavoured to illustrate my point with facts and figures. It is best to prove something by facts and figures rather than to make bald statements about what a situation might be. I refer again to the electoral enrolment figures that were produced by the Chief Secretary. I referred to them in a prior debate and some honorable members asked that I should give more figures than I had available at the time.

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General) : I take a point of order, with reluctance because this is a wide-ranging debate. The honorable member seems to be guilty of tedious repetition. He has been round and round the mulberry bush on electoral figures. It seems to me that it is not in order for a member to discuss matters which are quite pertinent to a Bill that has already been dealt with and passed by this House—the Electoral Provinces and Districts Bill—during this session. The honorable member has been over that aspect and is about to launch on it again. In the interests of the House it is a point of order which should be considered.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) : On the point of order, the Attorney-General is anticipating my comments because I was referring to decentralization and the addendum which was moved to the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply. I had simply started giving some figures to indicate how the population within the State has moved in the past twelve months and they have nothing whatsoever to do with the figures I was quoting five minutes ago.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler) : The only relevant Standing Order could be—

> No member shall allude to any debate of the same Session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion except, by the indulgence of the House, for personal explanations.

The honorable member for Gippsland East has stated that he is not referring to any other debate before the House and the point of order raised by the Attorney-General was, if I remember his words, that he was about to make reference to a particular debate. Until I have heard that, I would not be in a position to rule. Therefore, I could not uphold the point of order at this time.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): I appreciate that the Attorney-General may feel weary at this late hour of the night. However, I claim the right to express my opinion as I have been elected to do. The figures to which I refer were made available in the Library. They were not figures available in *Hansard* or figures used during any debate, except by members who cared to take advantage of them. I have made some calculations

for each of the country electorates to give some indication of how population trends have moved in those electorates in accordance with the figures produced by the Chief Secretary on that occasion. They are really interesting figures which I shall run through quickly. I shall compare the enrolment figures of May, 1973, with those at October, 1974. The percentage increases during that time were: Gisborne 16·24, Dromana 15·18, Bellarine 11·49, Evelyn 8·73, Gippsland East 7·20, Gippsland South 6·68, Murray Valley 6·48, Gippsland West 5·97, Narracan 5·75, Morwell 5·37, Shepparton 5·28, Mildura 4·38, Ballaarat North 4·36, Benalla 4·12, Geelong North 3·93, Benambra 3·89, Warrnambool 3·76—the State average was 3·75 per cent—Bendigo 3·32, Rodney 3·10, Ballaarat South 3, Dundas 2·54, Hampden 2·52, Swan Hill 2·31, Portland 2·13, Polwarth 1·98, Lowan 1·77, Kara Kara 1·62 and Geelong 0·81.

These figures show an interesting trend to which I have referred over a number of years. The two country electorates which are growing quickest are those of Gisborne and Dromana, but their growth is a direct reflection on the growth of the metropolitan area. It will not be long before they are encompassed by the metropolis. The electorate which is growing next fastest is Bellarine, with an increased enrolment of 11·49 per cent. But that growth encompasses almost the whole of the growth of the three Geelong electorates, the average growth of which is only the average for the rest of the State. The metropolitan area also has some influence on the growth of the electorate of Evelyn.

In 1967 the Government selected five centres for accelerated development. It could be expected that in a period of seven years there would be some response to Government policies. The electorate of Murray Valley does show some response with an increase of about 6·48 per cent, and Morwell has an increase of 5·37 per cent. But the populations in the electorates of Bendigo, Ballaarat South, and, in particular, Portland, are not increasing as quickly as the State average, so there must be something seriously wrong with the Government's policy.

As I have said before and will continue to say until it is proved otherwise, the fundamental factor which leads to the centralization of people in the metropolitan area is the level of Government expenditures there. The Government spends hundreds of millions of dollars on metropolitan roads, tramways, and railways, including the underground rail loop. This expenditure creates employment and keeps people in Melbourne; they are not persuaded to move to the country.

It is extraordinary that, when there are about 200,000 people out of work in Australia, farmers are screaming for people to cart hay but cannot find them. Where are all these people who are supposed to be out of work? The Forests Commission has a tremendous amount of work which should be done and the Lands Department has work in the destruction of vermin and noxious weeds, but there is nobody to do these jobs. There is something seriously wrong with the system when so much work needs to be done but either people cannot be found to do it or funds cannot be provided for their employment. Our priorities are out of kilter.

Obviously, if the countryside is to be maintained in the condition in which the Government says it wants it to be, if the environment is to be preserved and national parks are to be created and improved, something must be done. National parks are no good if they are full of blackberries. But many of the beautiful streams in East Gippsland are covered by blackberries. With all this work needing to be done, why are people not employed on it?

The Chief Secretary quite rightly says that he was at Lakes Entrance the week-end before last. The Minister for Local Government was there

last week. The people of the area are delighted to see Ministers but most of the places I am speaking of would be 100 miles or more from Lakes Entrance. They cannot even be seen from the highways. Ministers must use four-wheel drive vehicles to get to the creeks and reserves and into the remote mountain country.

Some time ago an environmental study on the site for the proposed dam on the Mitchell River was begun. But those concerned abandoned the attempt to make the study because they could not get through the blackberries. Although this was reported to the Minister for Conservation, he did nothing about it. The Government says it is doing a lot to protect the environment but it is allowing vast areas to be covered by noxious weeds and infested with vermin of all types. Yet it expects the people in the country to believe it is interested in decentralization and the environment. It is all talk and no action.

I must support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition but I cannot see any evidence that the Labor Party has any interest in the country.

For some time I have been aware of a situation at Lakes Entrance which demonstrates the shortsightedness of decentralization policies. For some years a transport firm has been located at Lakes Entrance and it has grown into a large undertaking. It has carted almost the entire fish production of Lakes Entrance to the Melbourne and Sydney markets. But it is now facing bankruptcy because it must meet a bill of $23,000 a year for telephone and telex charges. These high charges accrue because the business is not located close to its clients at either end of its operation.

It must also pay $10,000 a year in pay-roll tax. This industry employed 160 people, some 40 of whom were based at Lakes Entrance. But, like other transport industries based in the country, it will be swallowed up by a large city transport organization.

Mr. WILCOX : Why?

Mr. B. J. EVANS : Because the Commonwealth Government does not recognize the cost of operating a business in a country town remote from its clients. Many of the firm's trucks still operate between Sydney and Melbourne. Some cart goods between Lakes Entrance and Melbourne and some between Lakes Entrance and Sydney. But, because its headquarters are at Lakes Entrance, it has this mammoth telephone and telex bill.

Mr. WILCOX : Are its headquarters still at Lakes Entrance?

Mr. B. J. EVANS : They are at present, but that situation will not continue for long unless the Government assists dramatically. I hope that assistance will be provided. The business is a long-established, family transport organization and it will be a tragedy for Lakes Entrance if the company is lost to it.

Mr. WILCOX : Did the company sell out?

Mr. B. J. EVANS : As I understand the situation, a receiver has been appointed. I was to obtain detailed information tomorrow, but I could not wait until then.

Mr. WILCOX : It is a pity that you could not wait for it.

Mr. B. J. EVANS : I will be happy to move that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow so that I can amplify my remarks then if that is what the Attorney-General wants. This case effectively demonstrates the shortsightedness of Governments, not just the Victorian Government, because the Commonwealth is involved with the telephone and telex charges, which constitute a major part of the company's problems.

All businessmen in the country, not only the approved decentralized industries have the same problems. Even solicitors in the country must

engage others in the metropolitan area to undertake work which they would do themselves if quicker communications were available. Why should retail stores in the country not receive assistance? They provide employment for sales staff and office workers. They must compete with the mail order departments of large city stores. The Government must consider these things much more seriously if it is sincere about decentralization.

Although the Country Party supports it, the Opposition's amendment rings hollow when its attitude on funds for country roads is taken into consideration. I have referred to that previously and shall not repeat what I said.

If a proposal for a low-level deviation of the Omeo highway to provide better access between the Albury-Wodonga area and the Gippsland coast was accepted, not only Gippsland but also north-eastern Victoria would benefit. I shall not go into its merits, but I am concerned about a publication which I received only this morning.

The question of a low-level road deviation was canvassed with the Premier by a deputation in February of this year. At that time the Country Roads Board made a clear recommendation that the existing highways should be upgraded rather than that a similar amount of money should be spent on a deviation which might prove to be more beneficial in the long run. It considered that the right thing to do was to maintain the road on the existing alignment.

About six weeks ago, a conference was called at Wodonga to discuss this question further and determine what other action could be taken. As a result, I approached the Premier to receive another deputation so that he could know of the degree of support for the proposal. That support comes not only from Gippsland and the north-east of Victoria but also from a considerable part of New South Wales where people are looking for access to an alternative seaside area. They believe a low-level road to Gippsland would give them access to such a place.

But, having made the request to the Premier, I find that the Country Roads Board has now circulated a document entitled *Investigations into a Possible Road Link between Omeo and Mitta Mitta.* The document is well presented and uses about four or five colours in its centre pages. It concludes with the statement that the decision—meaning the decision to stick to the existing route—was conveyed to municipal councils and other interested bodies in January, 1974. The question I ask, and which I should like the Minister of Transport to take up, is why, eleven months after the decision was conveyed to municipalities, the Country Roads Board has produced this publication.

Is it simply that it has heard that the people are not satisfied and want to give more evidence in support of this proposal, and therefore it is getting in first to counter this, and is trying to pre-empt the right of people interested in this proposal to talk to the Premier and perhaps convince him that the whole project is desirable in the interests of decentralization, and for whatever purpose the advocates of this scheme may care to think up? This is an attempt by the Country Roads Board to stop a group of people from putting their case. I am disappointed that the Country Roads Board should adopt such an attitude. I can find no other reason why, eleven months after the final decision was announced by the Country Roads Board, it should come out with a publication like this. It smacks of trying to pre-empt the right of people endeavouring to make their case.

I conclude on another issue which is small in itself but is one which could have many ramifications. It

relates to a court case concluded in Sale fairly recently in which a farmer, who lives not far from my home, had cattle on agistment in the drought of a couple of years ago. The farmer failed to pay the agistment fees and the owner of the property took him to court. The owner of the cattle counter-sued the owner of the property for damages because he claimed that the cattle had not been properly looked after. No written agreement was entered into, or no undertaking made that the cattle had to be kept to a particular standard. The case was based mainly on the fact that the owner of the property put a few sheep in with the cattle. The result of this decision was that the owner of the property was ordered to pay $20 a head damages to the owner of the cattle, and he got nothing for the agistment.

This will create grave misgivings in the minds of people in future droughts, floods or fires, when agistment is being sought, if the owners of property who have feed on their places find themselves liable for deterioration in the condition of stock. The owners of property are not to know when relief is coming, and they might find themselves short of food, and if this decision is taken as a precedent it would become impossible to get agistment for stock, particularly during periods of drought.

I should like the Minister of Agriculture to look at this case to ascertain whether any action should be taken to protect landowners who are prepared to accept cattle on agistment from action which may be taken to claim damages for loss in the quality of the cattle during the time they are being agisted. I appreciate the attention that has been given to me by the House this evening. I do not wish to delay it any further.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura): A great deal has already been said about the timing of the winding up of this debate for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech on opening Parliament this session. This point has been put on other occasions. I can remember a similar comment being made last year during that debate, and the Ministers indicated that this situation would not be allowed to occur again. However, honorable members are in the same situation and I believe, as do other members, that it is deplorable.

However, I wish to extend my congratulations and the congratulations of my constituents to His Excellency, Sir Henry Winneke, and Lady Winneke on their appointment to this position. They have already paid a visit to the electorate of Mildura and have created history by visiting one of the very remote parts, the township of Werrimull, where Sir Henry Winneke opened a refurnished infant welfare centre. To a very small community that is a big day in their lives and, despite the remarks of the honorable member for Broadmeadows, they were very grateful indeed that His Excellency should have been prepared, so early in his career, to come to their small community and perform this important task. His Excellency referred to decentralization of Government departments in his Address to the Parliament, particularly with respect to social welfare and education.

Honorable members are well aware of the regional directorates that have been provided so far for education, and it is hoped that they will continue to improve, both in number and in the administrative ability they are able to perform. Little of the activity of the Social Welfare Department has been seen as yet. This gives concern to members of the Country Party, particularly those whose electorates are in the more remote parts of the State. The distances required to be travelled by the social welfare officers in those areas is most time-consuming, as

well as being costly. Honorable members will be aware of the cost of running motor vehicles over long distances. The cost of fuel and maintenance charges that are levied by motor mechanics nowadays make it a very expensive operation. The sooner that decentralization, particularly of the Social Welfare Department, is extended throughout the rest of this State, the sooner service to the people of the State of Victoria will improve.

I am concerned with a couple of items relating to local government. I have a letter from the Secretary of the Shire of Mildura dated 7th October, 1974. It refers particularly to home-help subsidies that have been provided by the Government. The letter states *inter alia*—

> However, the latter service—

This is a reference to the home-help service—

> continues to be a problem for the Shire of Mildura, particularly in regard to travelling costs. The basis of subsidy for salaries has increased by such a large amount, that you can see that it must have been inadequate for quite some time. But the tremendous escalation in salaries over the last twelve months has thrown a great burden on to municipal councils. If salaries continue to escalate in this financial year, the new basis will soon be outdated and Councils will continue to bear any of these increases. The Shire Council believes that there should be no limit placed on the subsidy basis, and that the State Government should meet four-fifths of the total net cost of the service.
>
> As far as travelling costs are concerned, you are only too well aware of the problems faced in this intensively developed irrigation area which is not served by public transport.
>
> The Home Helpers are forced, by this lack of public transport and by the odd hours they work, to use their own private transport in getting to their jobs. In the financial year 1973-74, these Home Helpers were paid a total of $4,251.88 in travelling expenses, and Council received a subsidy of $2,075.10.

This council has made a strong case for assistance and all honorable members would be aware that there are many municipalities in Victoria which are prepared to give a great degree of help to this type of service which municipalities are now called upon to perform. It is not essential that they do so but, in the interests of ratepayers they provide the services. However, unless they get sufficient subsidies from the State Government they will not be able to continue with this type of assistance.

I refer now to the increase in library subsidies that was provided earlier in this session. The Secretary of the Shire of Mildura in a letter stated—

> The increase in library subsidies is most welcome, and this Shire, which has always spent heavily on the service, will continue to match the government subsidy. This will result in expenditure of about $51,000 on library services in this Shire in 1974-75. At one time the Shire's contribution was very much greater than the State's, but because of the increased demands upon Council's finances, the Shire of Mildura regrets that it can now do no more than match the State subsidy.

Here is an instance of a municipality doing more than its share in assisting its ratepayers, but has now found itself in a position that it can no longer provide this excellent service. It has to match the subsidy that the Government provides. Although municipalities are prepared to do that, the amount of assistance they can give to the residents of the area is limited.

The other issue to which I refer is the very vexed question of regional tourism as proposed by the Minister for State Development and Decentralization. The Governor in his Speech claimed that tourism was an important decentralization industry. I do not think any honorable member would disagree with that statement. His Excellency stated—

> Tourism is an important decentralized industry, and the Government has been active in promotion activities, in conjunction with regional tourist committees. Legislation aimed at further encouragement of tourism will be presented to Parliament this session.

Any progress in this area, particularly in the area I represent will have to be finalized in the very near future.

Only yesterday I received a copy of a letter addressed to one of my colleagues in another place dated 5th December, from the Minister for Tourism. It is a six-and-a-half page letter which endeavoured to set out the problems that had beset what has come to be known now as the "Mallee" region. Already three different proposals have been put forward for the region and the Minister is no nearer to finding a solution to this problem. Unfortunately, some municipalities in the area have gone ahead, virtually on their own, and set up promotional facilities. This leaves the other municipalities in the proposed region in an acute position. Until there is a proposal to get all these municipalities together to thrash out the situation and to arrive at a satisfactory solution, then the Minister, and all his letters will do no good. They may have the result of inflaming the situation to such an extent that no satisfactory solution can be arrived at.

In the circumstances, I do not know what happens to regional tourism but it will be a sad day if this situation should prevail. I trust that the Minister or some of his officers can attend to matters in these areas, try to find out the real problems involved, and then call a meaningful meeting to arrive at an early solution.

On behalf of the constituents in my electorate, I again congratulate Sir Henry and Lady Winneke and trust that they will be spared for many years to serve this State in the capacity for which they have been appointed.

The House divided on Mr. Holding's amendment (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler in the chair)—

Ayes	27
Noes	40
Majority against the amendment ..	13

AYES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Baxter	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Roper
Mr. Doube	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Stirling
Mr. Fogarty	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Ginifer	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Hann	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Holding	Mr. Wilton
Mr. Jones	*Tellers:*
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Curnow
Mr. Lind	Mr. McInnes

NOES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Meagher
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Billing	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Rossiter
Mr. Crellin	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Skeggs
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Ebery	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Stephen
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Guy	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Vale
Mr. Jona	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. Lacy	Mr. Williams
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Wood
Mr. McCabe	*Tellers:*
Mr. McClure	Mr. Chamberlain
Mr. McLaren	Mr. McKellar
Mr. Maclellan	

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): I am gratified that the Government has finally caught up with the rest of Australia and selected a Victorian citizen to fill the post of Governor of this State. In the past, I have been critical of the Government for passing over citizens who I considered would have been highly suited to fill this important office. Now, one of Victoria's leading citizens is the Governor of Victoria.

One area in which the Government deserves criticism relates to the handling of grains. In this connection, as a further amendment, I move—

That the following words be added to the proposed address—" and respectfully desire to inform Your Excellency, that this House, in view of the report of the State Development Committee on the bulk handling of all grains in Victoria, is of the opinion that the Grain Elevators Board should be vested

with the authority to control and administer all bulk handling of all grains in this State ".

The sitting was suspended at 12.28 *a.m.* (*Wednesday*) *until* 1.2 *a.m.*

Mr. WILTON : I regret the lateness of the hour and the stage in the sessional period when this debate has been resumed. However, that is a matter for the Government, which controls the debate on the motion; I accept no responsibility for it. I appreciate the fact that Government supporters realize that one of the most stable sections of primary industry in this State is facing its most crucial period and yet those honorable members believe it is a joke.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South) : I raise a point of order. The honorable member for Broadmeadows has moved that the following words, *inter alia*, be added to the proposed Address-in-Reply—

and respectfully desire to inform His Excellency that this House, in view of the report of the State Development Committee on the bulk handling of all grains in Victoria—

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to indicate whether the amendment has been moved on a false premise. I inform the House that the State Development Committee did not present a report recommending that the Grain Elevators Board should be the one handling authority for all grain. However, the seventh recommendation of the State Development Committee, which appears on page 11 of the report, recommends that the bulk handling of oats should be under the control of private enterprise. I therefore suggest that the amendment is based on a false premise and I do not know whether it should be allowed to proceed.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H Wheeler) : Order! The matter raised by the honorable member for Ballaarat South is his own opinion, and therefore I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows) : As I was saying, one of the most stable sections of primary industry at present is facing its most crucial period, but to some honorable members supporting the Government it seems to be a joke. Everybody connected with this section of the industry—not only the Grain Elevators Board but also the Victorian Railways and the Grains Division of the Victorian Farmers Union —has placed evidence before the State Development Committee which shows that one of the most serious problems confronting the grain industry is infestation and cross-infestation. Yet the Government has refused to take any action to establish a single authority. Honorable members on the Government side of the House consider that proposition to be a joke.

All this evidence was placed before the State Development Committee a long time ago and it has been spelt out in some detail. If honorable members who claim to have regard for the welfare of the industry consider the evidence given by witnesses who appeared before the State Development Committee, it is clear that they should be prepared to take action in this Parliament on behalf of the grain growers of the State, but Parliament has heard nothing yet.

Mr. STEPHEN : Read the report.

Mr. WILTON : The report is so inconsistent that it argues against itself. The honorable member for Ballaarat South talks about cross-infestation problems confronting the grain industry and then refers to the report, which recommends that the handling of oats should be left to private enterprise. The honorable member for Ballaarat South supports that recommendation, and honorable members know why—it is because of the vested interests involved.

Mr. STEPHEN : It is in the report.

Mr. WILTON : As for the report, I pay a tribute to the honorable member for Reservoir and to the Honorable A. W. Knight, of another place,

who were prepared to take notice of the evidence placed before the committee by producing a minority report. The report of the State Development Committee on the bulk handling of all grain in Victoria was presented to His Excellency the Governor and subsequently laid before both Houses of Parliament. Page 9 of the report contains this statement—

> Efficient pest control in the post-harvest sector of the grain industry is vital to continued success of the industry's export trade.

That is the point everybody concerned with the industry has been making in the evidence presented to the committee. Now it is claimed to be a real problem, and everybody accepts that. What is concerning all sections of the industry is that the Government will not do anything about it; it is prepared to sit in this Parliament in silence and allow the situation to continue. The report continues—

> Less reliance would have to be placed on the use of toxic chemicals for pest control in the future with the result that physical control measures and complementary treatment with fumigants would have to be accepted.

The State Development Committee first makes the point that efficient pest control in the post-harvest period is of vital importance to the future of this multi-million dollar industry. The committee also made the point that Victoria must rely on the use of toxic chemicals in controlling the one single pest that is causing the grain industry the gravest of problems, and I refer to weevil infestation.

The physical treatment mentioned by the State Development Committee refers to the evidence given before it relating to the use of transport facilities which involves the Victorian Railways, the Victorian Grain Elevators Board and the Victorian oats marketing pool, which is the one body concerned with this matter.

Not only was the Government or the State Development Committee apprised of the situation which now exists in the grain industry, but also the members of the Grains Division of the Victorian Farmers Union prepared a special report on behalf of its principals and submitted it to the Victorian Parliamentary Liberal Party's rural committee. The report traversed the history of this industry and pointed out the type of people who were supporting the establishment of a single authority for the handling of all grain in this State, as is the case in other States of Australia. Here again Victoria is dragging behind. It never seems to be able to be the initiator —it is always the follower—and in this instance it is following all the other States.

The bodies which supported the Victorian Farmers Union in its submission to the State Development Committee included the Australian Wheat Board, a body charged by statute to market wheat on both the home and the overseas markets. The Grain Elevators Board of Victoria, a statutory authority charged with the responsibility of handling grain other than oats in this State, supported a single handling authority. The Department of Agriculture submitted evidence on this subject to the State Development Committee. The Victorian Railways also presented submissions. The views of entomologists employed by the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry and the Australian Wheat Board were also submitted. All those organizations advanced arguments in favour of a single handling authority and submitted evidence to show that there could be distinct advantages to the State and to the industry if the Government would enact a simple amendment to the Grain Elevators Board Act to make it the sole handling authority for all grain in this State.

The Victorian Farmers Union was so concerned about this matter that it wrote a long letter dated 19th April, 1974, to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : 19th April, 1974?

Mr. WILTON : What is so significant about that?

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : You work it out.

Mr. WILTON : So far as I am aware, the Victorian Farmers Union is still of the opinion that it was in April, 1974.

Mr. STEPHEN : Wait until the next annual meeting.

Mr. WILTON : I daresay the honorable member for Ballaarat South would dearly hope that it changes its mind. It would let him off the hook.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS : It would not be the first time.

Mr. WILTON : I invite the Leader of the Country Party to say that at the next meeting of the Grain Elevators Board. I have looked at the question very closely and have examined all the evidence put before the committee, and I support my colleagues, the honorable member for Reservoir and Mr. Knight. The only way in which this industry can be preserved is by having a single marketing authority. If the Deputy Leader of the Country Party wants to bury his head in the sand, that is his privilege. It has been buried in the sand for so long that one must accept this reactionary attitude which is the stock-in-trade of the Country Party when it comes to doing something for the farmer. The letter to the Leader of the Opposition was signed by the Chairman of the Grains Division of the Victorian Farmers Union.

Mr. STEPHEN : What Commonwealth appointment does he hold?

Mr. WILTON : I do not know. I understood that he was a member of the Liberal Party. His name is Mr. Miles Bourke, and the letter he signed states, *inter alia*—

> The Grain Elevators Board instructs all their receival officers to apply 12 parts per million of malathion grain protectant to all wheat and barley received into its storages and never knowingly loads insect infested grain into rail trucks. Unfortunately, this practice is not always adhered to by handlers at some oats storages. Indeed the State Development Committee bulk handling report stated that the antiquated oat storages and stockpiling methods of oat handling used by merchants is detrimental to the hygiene standards of the industry.

That is the point that the State Development Committee makes in its report. Now the honorable member for Ballaarat South wants to make the point that the majority of the members of the committee were of the opinion that the handling of oats ought to be left to private enterprise. Mr. Bourke goes on to say—

> Unless there is a single authority to control the export of bulk grain from Victoria (as exists in every other State in Australia) the full development of Portland as an export grain port will be retarded.

Mr. STEPHEN : Why?

Mr. WILTON : The honorable member for Ballaarat South does not know now after having been told by the witnesses of the Australian Wheat Board and by witnesses from the Grain Elevators Board, who included the Chairman of the board, the Honorable Keith Turnbull a former Minister of this State. He went before the committee and spelt out in clear terms the situation in Portland, the attitude concerning the terminal at Portland, and what the prospects of that terminal would be if all the grain in this State was handled by one authority. Mr. Bourke supported the point made by the Chairman of the Grain Elevators Board when he said that which I have just quoted. Mr. Bourke went on to say—

> If the Grain Elevators Board owned and operated the Portland grain terminal for all grain, the Australian Wheat Board would be encouraged to declare Portland as an export grain terminal and if more grain was shipped through the port, greater employment opportunities would be provided at the terminal and in associated railways and other services.

I should be interested to hear the comments on those points by Government supporters who represent this area and who talk about employment opportunities and decentralization, as would many other people in this State.

The other important point Mr. Bourke makes in his letter—I understand that a copy was sent to the Premier—was that he was concerned about the attitude of members of the Liberal Party and of the Country Party, reflected in the report of the State Development Committee. He also said—

> If the Grain Elevators Board owned and operated the Portland terminal, in years of maximum grain exports greater over-all revenue could be obtained for the Victorian Railways and the ports of both Portland and Geelong by shipping through Portland large quantities of wheat with a slight advantage to Geelong and utilizing Geelong for shipping some millions of bushels of Southern Riverina wheat with a substantial freight advantage to Geelong against shipments through Sydney.

When one goes through the evidence submitted by the Victorian Railways, one sees that Mr. Bourke is taking up the main point of the Victorian Railways evidence. It was pointed out that if a single handling authority were to come into operation, and the authority were to acquire the storage facilities of Portland and bring them under its control, distinct advantages would accrue to the Victorian Railways in the shipping of grain from the Southern Riverina. The honorable member for Ballaarat South spent weeks sitting on the State Development Committee hearing expert witnesses trying to drive into that tiny mind of his the distinct advantages that everybody else can see, and at this late stage he is saying, " How? " I leave it to the House to draw its own conclusions on that matter. It is futile to labour the point if the honorable member for Ballaarat South is unable to comprehend the point Mr. Bourke makes in the letter. The honorable member must have fallen asleep on the committee or else disregarded the evidence put before him, and made up his own mind.

I should like to make another point. I refer the House to the evidence which was reported on page 542 of the transcript of 23rd August, 1972. The witness was again the Honorable Keith Turnbull, Chairman of the Grain Elevators Board.

Mr. CURNOW : He has a son-in-law in another place.

Mr. WILTON : He is a former Minister of this Government, and he was so concerned about the situation that, first of all, he gave evidence on behalf of his board to the committee and he was quite firm as to what the board was prepared to do in acquiring storage facilities which are now operated by the private enterprise section of the oats industry. Dealing with the evidence to establish what would happen if the Grain Elevators Board was to acquire facilities at Portland, Mr. Turnbull, stated—

> I wrote to the Secretary on the 11th August, rebutting evidence given by several people within the Portland zone including members of the Portland Development Committee and others, one of the others was the Town Clerk of Portland whom I have known for many years, which gave the impression that if the Grain Elevators Board operated the Portland silos the total tonnage of all grains through the terminal would be reduced and, as a consequence, employment opportunities for terminal and railway staff would diminish to the detriment of the local citizens and the whole district.
>
> This fear would not materialize because I conscientiously believe that more shipping through the port would result under the Grain Elevators Board ownership. With the lower handling costs under the Grain Elevators Board control grain from outside the Portland zone with a marginally higher freight rate to Portland than to Geelong could, with advantage to the Australian Wheat Board, be shipped at Portland, and more New South Wales wheat with a much lower freight rate to Geelong than to Sydney could be shipped through Geelong. This would result in substantial overall savings to the Australian Wheat Board, and provide extra grain traffic for the Victorian Railways plus increased wharfage revenue to both the ports of Portland and Geelong Harbor Trusts.

Mr. Turnbull made three significant points, namely, increased revenue to the Victorian Railways, increased revenue to the Portland Harbor Trust and increased revenue to the Geelong Harbor Trust. Does any member in this House want to argue against that? Does any member in this House challenge the facts put forward by the Chairman of the Grain Elevators

Board, a former Minister of this Government? I am not prepared to challenge it; I am prepared to accept it because the first thing this gentleman said was that he conscientiously believed what he gave in evidence. It was not an off-the-cuff statement, not a hearsay statement; it was a carefully thought-out statement made on behalf of his board and made in rebutting evidence put forward by the town clerk of Portland.

There is also a question concerning the revenues that could accrue to the producer. I turn to the evidence of Mr. McManus, who is listed as being a farmer, Chairman of the Hay and Oats Committee and grants executive member of the Victorian Farmers Union. He is a very experienced farmer.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: Do you know him?

Mr. WILTON: He holds an important position in the Victorian Farmers Union.

This gentleman was sent by the Grains Division of the Victorian Farmers Union to give evidence before the committee for growers. He estimated that the costs of the Grain Elevators Board in 1971-72 averaged 7·5 cents a bushel of wheat and barley received. He stated—

> If oats had been received by the Grain Elevators Board, the average per bushel would have dropped to 6 cents a bushel, showing a saving over wheat and barley receivals of $1,125,000.

Mr. STEPHEN: Tell the truth for a change.

Mr. WILTON: I am quoting verbatim from the reported evidence of a sworn witness. If that is not truthful, I challenge the honorable member for Ballaarat South to say so instead of making snide interjections, implying that Mr. McManus deliberately misled the committee. What I have just read out appears on page 206 of the transcript of the hearing on 15th February, 1972. Mr. McManus went on to say—

> Had oats been received by the Grain Elevators Board, oat growers would have enjoyed a 2·6 cents a bushel saving or a total of $288,400 over 14 million bushels. Had oats been handled by the Grain Elevators Board in 1971-72 grain growers would have been better off to the extent of almost $1.5 million, and this during a period of rural economic stress.

What is the Leader of the Country Party going to do about that? Is he content to say nothing and support the Government's silence on this sort of evidence? I am sure Mr. McManus and his colleagues and the other grain producers of Victoria will be interested to hear what the Leader of the Country Party has to say.

Mr. McManus goes on to make the point made by other witnesses before the committee, except those who were supporting the private enterprise operation of oats handling.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South): On a point of order, I have always understood that a member could refer to copious notes but was not allowed to read a transcript of evidence during a debate. The honorable member for Broadmeadows is reciting the evidence as tendered and could go on to read 700 pages of it.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The honorable member for Broadmeadows is referring to a report which he has. There is no point of order.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): Mr. McManus restated the monetary returns which could accrue to all sections of the grain industry and the protection which the industry could derive from having a single authority. One can see from the evidence that the witnesses for the various bodies including the Victorian Railways, the Grain Elevators Board, the Victorian Farmers Union and the Department of Agriculture all said that one of the most serious concerns of the grain industry is the weevil problem. Even the Minister of Agriculture must admit that his department is concerned about the problem and almost acknowledges that it is unable to cope with it.

In the *Victorian Farmer* dated 3rd December, a publication produced by the Victorian Farmers Union, is cited

one of many cases concerning producers whose grain is infested with weevils because there is no single handling authority. The article is headed " Weevils by rail : Who owns them? " It states that a primary producer had superphosphate delivered to his farm by rail. The rail trucks had previously been used to cart weevil-infested oats, and the weevilly oats had inadvertently been transferred onto his property together with the superphosphate. The farmer had spent $185 on pest control in response to the campaign mounted by the Department of Agriculture, but suffered re-infestation of grain, for which no one takes responsibility. The Victorian Railways and the superphosphate distributors washed their hands of the matter and the farmer was left holding the bag. The Minister of Agriculture did nothing. It is obvious that grain buyers are becoming more demanding and selective. They are setting rigid standards and exercising controls which must be met by the Australian Wheat Board. The board must ensure that these controls are imposed so that the market will not be at risk.

Victoria is the only State in Australia where the serious problem of cross-infestation occurs. The departmental officers made the point strongly in their evidence to the State Development Committee. The Minister of Agriculture ought at least to have supported his officers.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler) : Order! I think I heard the honorable member make this point earlier in his statement. I ask him not to repeat matters over and over again.

Mr. WILTON : The point I am trying to stress is that a multi-million dollar industry in Australia is under direct threat because of the lack of action by the Government. Everybody concerned with the industry has pointed out this threat and the Government has ignored it. Parliament ought to carry the amendment I propose if it has any regard for the future of the grain industry. It is embarrassing for the Government to have to listen to the fact that its own departmental officers supported everybody in this industry, but the Government is not concerned. It is a disgrace that I have to move an amendment to the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor in the hope of getting some action from the Government on this important matter. If the motion is not carried and the situation is allowed to continue, the future of the industry will be threatened and repercussions could be detrimental. This will be on the Government's head because the Opposition has done everything in its power to try to persuade the Government to take action.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education) : The Government believes it is singularly inappropriate to be dealing with this matter in the form of an afterthought as an amendment to the Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. It therefore intends to vote against the amendment.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) : In moving his amendment at this hour of the night, the honorable member for Broadmeadows has shown contempt for the House and the grain producers of Victoria. This illustrates clearly the complete irresponsibility of the Opposition. Is it any wonder that the Opposition is in permanent occupation of the Opposition benches in this House? It has no support in the country areas of Victoria, in the same way as was demonstrated in Queensland last Saturday when the Labor Party was rejected by the people of that State.

The Opposition has had ample opportunity in recent months to debate this question. If it had been sincere it would have moved to have the matter debated weeks ago, but it is not sincere. The amendment was moved without notice to the Country Party, and I understand without

notice to the Government. It was moved in the middle of the night and is purely a gimmick. The Country Party does not intend to get involved in this stunt and will oppose the amendment.

The House divided on Mr. Wilton's amendment (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler in the chair)—

Ayes	.. ..	18
Noes	.. ..	47
Majority against the amendment	..	29

AYES.

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

NOES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Maclellan
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Meagher
Mr. Baxter	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Billing	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Chamberlain	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. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Hayes	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Jona	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Lacy	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Vale
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Whiting
Mr. McClure	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. McInnes	Mr. Williams
Mr. McKellar	*Tellers:*
Mr. McLaren	Mr. Hann
	Mr. Wood

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 Speaker and members of the House.

MILK AND DAIRY SUPERVISION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was returned from the Council with a message relating to amendments.

It was ordered that the message be taken into consideration next day.

LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was returned from the Council with a message relating to an amendment.

It was ordered that the message be taken into consideration next day.

OMBUDSMAN (EXEMPTION) BILL.

This Bill was returned from the Council with a message relating to an amendment.

It was ordered that the message be taken into consideration next day.

ADJOURNMENT.

MEDICAL SERVICES—ROADS IN HEYTESBURY SETTLEMENT — DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ABORIGINE — SUBSIDIES TO PRIVATE BUS OPERATORS—YOUNG FARMER MOVEMENT —WORKERS COMPENSATION — ADDITIONS TO SCHOOLS—STAFF FOR ROYAL PARK PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until this day, at half-past ten o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to raise a matter for the attention of the Minister of Health who, on many occasions, has made himself a proponent for private medical practitioners and has endeavoured to indicate the extent of the medical services that

are being provided by private practitioners. I want to draw his attention specifically to two items which I had occasion to have checked and which first appeared in the weekly newspaper, the Melbourne *Truth*. It deals with the type of treatment that can be dealt out to residents by private medical clinics in Victoria.

This week there was the story of a four-year-old boy named Alan Wilkinson of Ellesmere Crescent, Tullamarine, who was attacked by a dog and taken to the Glenroy Clinic, in Pascoe Vale Road, Pascoe Vale. The boy was bleeding from deep gashes in his face, and yet on his arrival at the clinic, according to one of the neighbours, Mrs. Ann Rendell, a nurse said, "The doctors would like their money before giving treatment". The nurse said that the fee would be either $35 or $45—apparently depending on the number of stitches to be inserted in the boy's face. While one of the neighbours rushed back to the neighbourhood to raise money to pay the doctors, the boy's face was washed and the wounds dressed but no tetanus injection was administered. The owner of the dog provided $60 to pay the doctors and the neighbour rushed back to the clinic.

Then, according to the report given to the newspaper reporter, a Mr. Jenner, Mrs. Rendell said, "When my friend got back to the clinic with the money, we were told that the boy would not be treated until 2 p.m.—some hours later—because the doctors had to go out."

The newspaper published a photograph of the gashes in the boy's face, and they were quite alarming. The neighbours then decided the boy needed immediate treatment, so they telephoned the Queen Victoria Hospital and he was taken straight in. A nurse and a doctor were waiting for the boy, and as soon as he arrived at the hospital they were asked if the boy had been given a tetanus injection. The nurse was very surprised when she was told that the boy had not. The boy was given an injection almost immediately and admitted, and was in hospital for two days. He had fifteen stitches inserted in his face, and it may well be that he will require future plastic surgery.

Mrs. Rendell told the newspaper reporter—

> At the clinic we were told the doctors couldn't do anything because the boy had eaten breakfast and a general anaesthetic could not be given. When I told that to the doctor at the hospital he said they wouldn't have been able to give a general anaesthetic at the clinic because the boy would have to be admitted to a hospital first.

What is alarming about this is that when the doctor was asked by the newspaper reporter who was concerned to question the veracity of the story, the reporter had the telephone slammed down in his ear. Although this is obviously not always the case, the Australian Medical Association has refused even to comment on the matter. I seek from the Minister of Health an assurance that he will cause a full investigation to be made into this matter and into other similar cases.

I refer to another case, which was reported in the same newspaper, of a pensioner, a Mrs. Florence Whitton of Gerbert Street, Broadmeadows, who injured her back while doing housework and was barely able to move. A neighbour, who says that Mrs. Whitton was in agony at the time, telephoned the Broadmeadows Medical Group's clinic in Camp Road. The neighbour asked whether a doctor could come to Mrs. Whitton's home, and she was told by the clinic's receptionist that Mrs. Whitton would have to come to the surgery because it was not the group's policy to make house calls on pensioners. The neighbour says that Mrs. Whitton was in acute pain as she hobbled to the clinic. She was examined by a doctor and then taken by ambulance to the Royal Melbourne Hospital where it was discovered that she had a slipped disc in her spine. After treatment at the Royal Melbourne Hospital, Mrs. Whitton was taken home by ambulance.

In this case, the clinic admitted to the newspaper that Mrs. Whitton had been refused a house call because "it was policy not to make house calls in accident cases because all the facilities for diagnosis and treatment were at the surgery". It appears that this pensioner was forced to walk to the surgery under considerable pain and difficulty.

I ask the Minister of Health to cause a full investigation to be made into both matters. I do so particularly because the Minister has, on many occasions, allied himself with private medical groups and indicated to the public at large what a high standard of service it can expect.

Mr. HANN (Rodney): I direct a matter relating to the Heytesbury scheme to the attention of the Premier and Treasurer. Apparently, five years ago, the then Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, gave the people in the area a promise on behalf of the Government that three main roads through the settlement would be sealed. Now, four years after the promise was given, less than half the programme has been completed. I ask whether it is the intention of the Government to provide the necessary finance to complete the programme in this the last year of the five-year period.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): I direct this matter to the attention of the Chief Secretary although it may also be of concern to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Mr. Dan McGrath, a vocational adviser with the Commonwealth Department of Labour and Immigration informed me that he works in close contact with the Aboriginal people of Gippsland. On 14th November he was involved in some counselling work with an Aborigine named Frank Marks. At about 7.30 p.m. they decided to go to the Royal Hotel at Drouin for a drink. Mr. McGrath states that the woman behind the bar, whom he subsequently found out was Mrs. Budge, refused to serve Mr. Marks. He asked her why and she referred to Mr. Marks as a trouble-maker saying that she did not want to have "them" there, that they were trouble-makers. He then asked if she knew Mr. Marks by sight or name, either as a trouble-maker or otherwise, but she refused to answer or to serve either of them.

Mr. McGrath said that no criticism could be levelled at either Mr. Marks or himself for their dress, speech, or manner, so that the sole reason for refusing to serve Mr. Marks could only be that the management considered Aboriginal people to be trouble-makers. Mr. McGrath states that this situation should not and cannot be tolerated in Australia and asked me to look into it with a view to having any possible action taken. He reports that the information on the licence plate outside the hotel was—

Budman Investments Pty. Ltd.
Wallace C. Budge, Licensee.

I should be grateful if the Chief Secretary would look into this matter to see if there has been a breach of the licensing law or an overt act of discrimination.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister of Transport. I have recently had answers to a number of questions I asked about the Government policy of providing assistance to private bus companies to maintain and, hopefully, improve their services. Last week, in answer to question No. 805, I was informed that 7 out of 8 private bus routes in the City of Brunswick had been subsidized to the total extent of $20,000 and that, in the City of Coburg, the sum of $20,000 had been applied to 5 of the 10 routes. The actual numbers are immaterial. What is important is the answer I received today to question No. 856 in which I asked which bus lines had received the grants or which services.

The answer stated that it would not be appropriate to disclose this information without the agreement of

the bus companies concerned as it related to the financial position of individual businesses. I put it to the Minister that subsidies paid by the Government and moneys approved by the Treasurer for that purpose are very much matters of public interest. A number of constituents have asked me whether a certain company has received grants. They wanted to know because the company was talking about discontinuing the service on one of its routes.

The failure to disclose which companies have received subsidies means that they are not accountable to those who use their services or to members of Parliament. Honorable members are not in a position to judge their performance in the light of the subsidies. They are therefore in a difficult position when considering the needs of particular routes. Progress associations concerned with improving transport facilities are at a disadvantage if they cannot obtain this information because the Minister believes it to be private.

I ask the honorable gentleman to reconsider whether the information is private and whether members of Parliament and the public are entitled to know which bus companies receive subsidies.

Mr. MITCHELL (Benambra): I direct to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the insensate and sadistic sacking of three of the leading organizers of the Young Farmer Movement by a dictatorial action of the Director of the Royal Agricultural Society of Victoria, Mr. Clappison. These three men were sacked arbitrarily. It is not the rights or wrongs of the case which is of concern but the fact that they were given no chance to defend themselves. Mr. Shirley, who was respected and revered in the movement, had fifteen years service.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The honorable member referred to Mr. Clappison, the Director of the Royal Agricultural Society. This is not a matter of Government administration.

Mr. HANN (Rodney): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I point out that the salaries paid to these men came from Government money through the Department of Agriculture. I therefore suggest that this is a matter of Government administration.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I inform you that the State Government makes a grant available to the Royal Agricultural Society, with no strings attached, for administration of the Young Farmer Movement. The Government is not involved in any way in the employment of personnel by the Royal Agricultural Society.

The SPEAKER: The matter is out of order.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir): I direct to the attention of the Chief Secretary the consequences of the failure to amend the Workers Compensation Act and what will be the position of many injured workers and their families unless the Act is amended before the House adjourns until the next sessional period or, alternatively, the honorable gentleman does what his predecessor did and announce a date for the operation of new rates.

The case of a Mr. Frank Smith could be typical. Three years ago a roll of paper fell off the back of a truck at the Australian paper mills and crushed his head. Since then, he has been in the Mont Park hospital. His wife and four children are dependent on workers compensation paid at rates set in 1972 when average weekly earnings were $88 per week.

The *Sun News-Pictorial* of 30th July reports a statement by Mr. King of the Chief Secretary's Department who said that the Government would amend the Workers Compensation Act in accordance with the rise in average weekly earnings. Today, average weekly earnings are of the

order of $138 and an increase of 57 per cent is necessary to restore workers compensation payments to the value they had two years ago.

Many families are totally dependent on compensation because the breadwinner has been severely injured and so are many single persons. A similar position applies to those people who are dependent on lump sum payments which were fixed at the same time as the amount of $15,000 was fixed, and those people are forced by circumstances to accept settlement based on that legislation. Unless there is a clear and conscious statement by this Government about its intentions, they will be forced in the coming weeks to accept lump sum settlements of $5,000, $6,000, or $7,000 less than they would be entitled to receive. The Chief Secretary has an obligation to do this because on three occasions he indicated that he would take some action. If the Government continues, as it has in the past, my description of it would be that it is a Government that can outscrooge Scrooge in his outlook on Christmas.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The honorable member is debating the information he is seeking. Is the honorable member finished?

Mr. SIMMONDS: I am not trying to debate the issue or whether certain action should be taken. I ask the Chief Secretary whether he is prepared to tell Parliament what his intentions are in respect to this matter.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): I wish to refer to the Minister of Public Works a problem concerning additions to schools. On most occasions, plans of proposed additions are not shown to principals, who have no access to them. Although I realize that the act of taking school councils and principals into confidence is pregnant with possibilities and problems, and there is the risk of too many fingers getting in the pie, I wonder if a more sympathetic approach could be adopted in the long interval that occurs after the Education Department decides on a matter and the Public Works Department carries it into effect. This would allow more consideration to be given to the views of school councils and principals concerning plans.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East): I wish to raise a matter for the attention of the Premier. Earlier today, during question time, I raised with the Minister of Health the question of the closure for more than a fortnight of the outpatients' clinic at the Royal Park Psychiatric Hospital owing to the absence on annual holidays of the clerical assistant attached to that clinic. I wish to point out that approximately 18 months ago the Royal Park Psychiatric Hospital dispensed with the services of two gardeners at the hospital and sought from the Public Service Board the appointment of two clerical female assistants in their place. It took almost eighteen months for the Public Service Board to send an inspector to the hospital to investigate the case put by the Royal Park Psychiatric Hospital for the two clerical assistants, and their case was rejected outright.

Following the rejection of that request the clerical assistant, who is important in the outpatients' clinic, and who, I believe is heavily overworked and should be assisted by at least one other clerical assistant in that clinic, went on annual holidays for four weeks. She is in her third week of holidays now, and unless special action is taken by the Minister of Health, who I understand is calling for a report from the Mental Health Authority on this, the outpatients' clinic will remain closed for the full period of four weeks.

The Royal Park Psychiatric Hospital is a major psychiatric hospital and I think the Premier will agree that it is not good enough that that clinic should remain closed for four weeks. I urge him, therefore, in view of the fact that the clinic is a busy one, and its services are vital to the mental well-being of the community, to take up, as a matter of urgency with the Public Service Board, this rejection of what I believe to be a legitimate request by the Royal Park Psychiatric Hospital for the creation of two additional positions of clerical assistant, female, for this hospital.

Mr. SCANLAN (Minister of Health): I did not hear all the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, unfortunately, because he was speaking softly in the initial stages. If I remember correctly he alluded to at least one, if not two, reports from the *Truth* newspaper in regard to treatment given by doctors to certain patients. In the first instance cited by the honorable member it would appear that alternative methods of obtaining primary care may have been more desirable. In the latter case the pensioner was not fully aware of her privileges and rights as a pensioner in obtaining primary care.

I shall examine the matters raised by the honorable member and I would appreciate it if he would hand me the documents. I am prepared to look into them fully for him.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): The honorable member for Rodney raised the matter of road construction in the Heytesbury settlement. The Government has been providing special funds for the construction of these roads for several years. Without being able to give an exact figure from memory, I do know the amount was raised substantially this year. It is administered through the Country Roads Board with the full approval and agreement of the Shire of Heytesbury Council. Whether the sum will be sufficient to complete the roads this year is another matter. The costs of road construction have risen so much that I should think it is doubtful, but certainly the undertaking will be honoured and the special grant will be continued until the roads are fully sealed.

The honorable member for Brunswick East raised with me the question which he formerly raised with the Minister of Health about the outpatients' clinic at the Royal Park psychiatric centre. I have no knowledge of what the Public Service Board may have considered to be the reasons why it rejected the claim for two clerical assistants. I did hear the Minister of Health say earlier today that he would call for a report on the temporary closing down of the clinic while holidays are taken, and I will confer with the Minister of Health to see what can be done to reopen it, if possible, next week.

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I will certainly ask the Liquor Control Commission for a report whether there has been any breach of the licensing Act in the case referred to by the honorable member for Melbourne.

The honorable member for Reservoir raised the question of Workers Compensation Act amendments, and drew attention to the fact, if I remember correctly, that one of the predecessors of the Chief Secretary had in some similar circumstances declared a date from which some amendments would be operable. I shall have a look at that. I cannot understand the reference but I will investigate it.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The honorable member for Brunswick West has requested detailed information as to payments made to certain bus companies under the Government assistance scheme to keep bus operations viable. To supply the information that the honorable member requests would be tantamount to providing a detailed

accounting of the business which the bus company was doing. The bus company might well consider that it should keep this information from its competitors. I assure the honorable member that contrary to his belief the bus companies concerned are completely accountable for these moneys as they must prove their fare-taking figures to the Transport Regulation Board, and the payments are reviewed quarterly. For these reasons it would be improper for me to give details of the amounts paid to an individual bus company. I presume that if a bus company had no objection to giving the information, it would be prepared to give it to the honorable member. However, if the honorable member requires a certain piece of information for his private use, I shall consider that on his request.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The honorable member for Gippsland South referred to the availability of plans of the Public Works Department for proposed new schools or extensions to existing schools. If the honorable member will contact me regarding the plans of a new school or extensions to the school, I shall be pleased to make the plans available to him.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.22 a.m. (Wednesday).

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated—

JOINT SITTING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENT.

(Question No. 141)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Attorney-General—

In respect of the Bills presented to and enacted by the joint sitting of the Commonwealth Parliament—

1. In relation to which Acts the Government has sought legal advice and from whom such advice was sought?

2. What fees were paid for such advice and for any court appearances as a consequence of advice received?

3. On whose advice the Government applied for leave to appear before the High Court to challenge the validity of the joint sitting?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The answer is—

1. All such Acts have been considered by the Government's legal advisers.

2. Mr. D. Dawson, Q.C., who has since become Solicitor-General, and Mr. J. D. Merralls appeared with me before the High Court and, apart from procedural matters, this is the only court appearance to date. I received no fees, the other counsel received appropriate fees the payment of which was shared with the State of Western Australia for whom they also appeared.

3. Its legal advisers.

COMMITTALS FOR TRIAL.

(Question No. 149)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Attorney-General—

1. In respect of committals for trial in each monthly period since October, 1971—(*a*) how many cases were committed; (*b*) how many cases were dealt with, showing the figures for jury trials, pleas of guilty and *nolle prosequi;* and (*c*) how many cases were not dealt with and were remaining, for the Melbourne County Court and Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively?

2. How many cases remain not dealt with by the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively, and for what reasons?

3. How many persons are in custody and on bail, respectively, pending the hearing of cases?

4. In relation to each person in custody—(*a*) what was the date of committal; and (*b*) how long such person has been in custody?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The answer is—

The statistics kept in respect of committals for trial are related to persons committed for trial and it has not been practicable, having regard to the period covered by the question and to the numbers of matters involved, to provide information other than as to numbers of persons.

In this answer, (i) except when furnishing particulars of the number of persons in custody awaiting trial, a person who has

been committed for trial on more than one occasion is, for the purpose of counting persons committed for trial, counted as a separate person for each of those occasions; (ii) the number of persons shown as committed for trial is the number who were committed for trial at a sitting commencing in a particular month; and (iii) the number of persons shown as dealt with in a particular month is the total number dealt with at a sitting commencing in that month.

1. The following tables supply information in relation to the Melbourne County Court and Melbourne Supreme Court respectively, for each monthly period since October, 1971, as follows—

Column (*a*) shows the number of persons who were committed for trial during each month;

Column (*b*) shows the number of persons dealt with each month;

Column (*c*) shows the number of persons not dealt with at the end of each month.

In the tables the expressions "S.C." and "C.C." mean the Melbourne Supreme Court and the Melbourne County Court, respectively.

Year 1971.

	(*a*) Committals		(*b*) Persons dealt with								(*c*) Persons not dealt with	
			Trials		Pleas of guilty		*Nolle prosequi*		Totals.			
	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.
October ..	8	133	3	38	4	135	..	1	8	173	39	654
November ..	15	142	7	30	10	123	1	9	18	162	36	625
December ..	12	156	4	38	2	87	..	5	6	130	42	643

Year 1972.

	(*a*) Committals		(*b*) Persons dealt with								(*c*) Persons not dealt with	
			Trials		Pleas of guilty		*Nolle prosequi*		Totals			
	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.
From 1971 ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	42	643
January ..	..	88	..	1	..	12	..	..	..	13	42	718
February ..	10	129	5	37	5	108	..	4	10	149	41	683
March ..	6	170	8	46	2	114	1	2	11	162	33	680
April ..	11	170	7	32	4	75	..	5	11	112	33	731
May ..	15	195	9	41	4	97	..	8	13	146	35	774
June ..	20	171	5	46	17	113	..	2	22	161	33	778
July ..	16	200	2	31	3	82	1	1	6	114	42	856
August ..	17	154	3	36	11	148	..	16	14	200	43	791
September	11	175	4	48	5	107	..	2	9	155	45	800
October ..	20	163	5	55	15	109	..	11	20	175	45	779
November ..	10	186	3	34	2	111	..	8	5	153	50	804
December ..	9	175	1	13	9	137	..	4	10	154	48	823

Year 1973.

	(*a*) Committals		(*b*) Persons dealt with								(*c*) Persons no dealt with	
			Trials		Pleas of guilty		*Nolle prosequi*		Totals.			
	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.
From 1972 ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	48	823
January ..	..	159	..	5	..	24	..	8	..	37	48	944
February ..	4	188	6	54	8	132	..	9	14	195	38	933
March ..	8	159	2	36	3	113	..	1	5	150	41	931
April ..	..	195	..	..	..	108	..	3	..	111	41	1,007
May ..	12	155	3	34	..	83	..	9	3	126	50	1,025
June ..	15	171	13	36	15	116	..	2	28	154	36	1,027
July ..	11	161	10	50	1	137	..	8	11	195	35	975
August ..	20	158	3	42	12	118	1	5	16	165	37	949
September	13	196	5	45	7	84	..	12	12	141	38	989
October ..	7	146	16	38	3	113	..	2	19	153	26	970
November ..	14	150	3	52	3	149	..	9	6	210	33	903
December ..	1	139	3	22	15	84	..	2	18	108	15	926

Year 1974 (to 30th September).

	(*a*) Committals		(*b*) Persons dealt with								(*c*) Persons not dealt with	
			Trials		Pleas of guilty		*Nolle prosequi*		Totals			
	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.	S.C.	C.C.
From 1973 ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	15	926
January ..	..	122	..	7	..	17	..	9	..	33	15	1,011
February ..	14	77	4	38	3	109	1	3	8	150	21	922
March	10	136	6	31	..	115	1	7	7	153	23	894
April	18	124	2	30	6	81	..	8	8	119	33	892
May	14	201	5	48	1	122	1	10	7	180	40	901
June	14	198	3	27	18	97	..	5	21	129	33	952
July	21	179	5	35	2	123	..	4	7	162	45	958
August.. ..	6	138	9	49	1	105	1	2	11	156	40	930
September ..	12	135	1	34	1	115	..	8	2	157	50	886

2. As at 30th September, 1974, the numbers of persons committed for trial but not dealt with by the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court respectively, were as follows—

Melbourne County Court	886
Melbourne Supreme Court	50

The number of cases which can be dealt with by the courts is controlled by the duration of the hearing of individual cases and the amount of court sitting time available. For a number of reasons, including the greater availability of legal aid and the greater complexity of many of the cases now being committed for trial, the average rate of disposal of cases per judge per sitting day has decreased. Having regard to these matters and existing resources, the two courts have dealt with as many cases as was practicable.

3. As at 30th September, 1974, the numbers of persons in custody by reason only of committal for trial and on bail respectively pending the hearing of cases for which such persons had been committed for trial to sittings of the Supreme Court at Melbourne and the County Court at Melbourne commencing on or before the 1st September, 1974, were as follows—

	In custody	On bail
Supreme Court	11	29
County Court	11	828

In addition, the number of persons who were already undergoing sentences of imprisonment but who had been committed for trial to sittings of the Supreme Court or County Court in Melbourne commencing on or before 1st September, 1974 was—

Supreme Court	3
County Court	39

4. The following table shows for the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court—

(*a*) the dates of committal of each person in custody.

(*b*) the period each person has been in custody since committal.

(*a*) Date of committal	(*b*) Period in custody from committal
26th January, 1974 (Recommittal) ..	8 months
19th February, 1974	7½ months
29th March, 1974	6 months
28th March, 1974	6 months
29th April, 1974	5 months
31st May, 1974	4 months
11th June, 1974	3½ months
15th August, 1974	1½ months
27th June, 1974	3 months
2nd August, 1974	2 months
13th August, 1974	1½ months
14th August, 1974	1½ months
15th August, 1974	1½ months

(*a*) Date of commital	(*b*) Period in custody from committal
26th April, 1974 (4 cases) ..	5 months
9th May, 1974 (3 cases) ..	5 months
29th May, 1974	4 months
26th July, 1974*	
26th July, 1974*	2 months
26th July, 1974*	
5th August, 1974 (Murder) ..	2 months
6th August, 1974 (Murder) ..	2 months
7th August, 1974	2 months
15th August, 1974 (Murder) ..	1½ months
22nd August, 1974	1½ months

* Co-accused.

PERSONS IN CUSTODY AND ON BAIL.

(Question No. 170)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Attorney-General—

1. In relation to the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively—(*a*) how many cases are awaiting hearing; and (*b*) how many persons are in custody and on bail, pending the hearing of cases?

2. In relation to each person in custody—(*a*) what was the date of committal; (*b*) how long such person has been in custody; and (*c*) whether the Crown opposes applications for bail on the grounds that the applicant is likely to offend against the law?

3. In relation to the persons on bail—(*a*) what were the dates of committal; (*b*) how many of those persons are alleged to have committed further offences while on bail pending determination; and (*c*) how many of those persons have been convicted in relation to further offences committed whilst on bail?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The answer is—

1. As at 30th September, 1974, the numbers of cases awaiting hearing and persons in custody and on bail pending the hearing of cases were as follows—

	Melbourne County Court	Melbourne Supreme Court
(*a*) Cases awaiting hearing ..	639	34
(*b*) Persons in custody ..	11	11
Persons on bail	828	29

The numbers of persons in custody are in respect of persons who are in custody only by reason of committal for trial. There were also in custody as at 30th September, 1974, 39 persons committed for trial in the Melbourne County Court and three persons committed for trial in the Melbourne Supreme Court, but who are undergoing sentences of imprisonment.

2. (*a*) and (*b*) The information sought in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of part 2 of this question is set out in paragraph 4 of the answer to question No. 149 asked by the honorable member.

(*c*) Applications for bail are opposed on the ground that the applicant is likely to offend against the law where that course is considered to be justified.

3. (*a*) The following are the dates of committal of persons on bail who, on 30th September, 1974, were awaiting trial in the Melbourne County Court and Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively—

Melbourne County Court—

24.2.1971 (2 co-accused)
5.4.1971 (2 co-accused)
14.2.1972
17.2.1972
22.2.1972
3.3.1972
8.3.1972 (3 co-accused)
15.3.1972
23.3.1972
25.3.1972
18.4.1972 (2 co-accused)
28.4.1972 (3 co-accused)
16.5.1972
1.6.1972
7.6.1972 (2 co-accused)
27.6.1972
3.7.1972
6.7.1972
24.7.1972
28.7.1972 (2 cases)
8.8.1972
11.8.1972 (3 co-accused)
21.8.1972 (3 co-accused)
18.9.1972
19.9.1972
2.10.1972 (3 co-accused)
10.10.1972 (2 cases)
19.10.1972 (4 co-accused)
25.10.1972 (2 cases)
19.10.1972 (4 co-accused)
14.11.1972 (3 co-accused)
21.11.1972 (2 cases)
23.11.1972 (2 co-accused)
26.11.1972
28.11.1972 (3 cases, two with 2 co-accused)
1.12.1972
4.12.1972
5.12.1972 (2 co-accused)
11.12.1972
13.12.1972
15.12.1972
12.1.1973
16.1.1973
19.1.1973
20.1.1973
24.1.1973
26.1.1973
30.1.1973
31.1.1973
5.2.1973 (2 co-accused)
8.2.1973 (2 co-accused)
9.2.1973
13.2.1973 (2 co-accused)
14.2.1973 (2 co-accused)
15.2.1973 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
16.2.1973
19.2.1973
20.2.1973 (2 co-accused)
21.2.1973
23.2.1973
26.2.1973 (4 co-accused)
27.2.1973 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
2.3.1973
5.3.1973
6.3.1973
8.3.1973
9.3.1973 (2 co-accused)
13.3.1973
16.3.1973
20.3.1973 (2 cases one with 2 co-accused)
21.3.1973
27.3.1973 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
28.3.1973 (7 co-accused)
2.4.1973
3.4.1973 (4 co-accused)
4.4.1973 (2 cases)
10.4.1973 (2 co-accused)
11.4.1973
26.4.1973

1.5.1973
8.5.1973
9.5.1973 (2 co-accused)
15.5.1973
16.5.1973
17.5.1973
18.5.1973
22.5.1973
23.5.1973
24.5.1973 (2 cases, one with 4 co-accused)
30.5.1973 2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
31.5.1973 (2 cases)
1.6.1973 (2 cases, each with 2 co-accused)
11.6.1973
14.6.1973
15.6.1973
19.6.1973
20.6.1973 (2 co-accused)
21.6.1973
23.6.1973
26.6.1973
27.6.1973
3.7.1973 (2 co-accused)
6.7.1973 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused)
10.7.1973
12.7.1973 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
17.7.1973 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
18.7.1973
24.7.1973 (3 co-accused)
26.7.1973
30.7.1973 (4 co-accused)
31.7.1973
2.8.1973 (2 cases, one with 6 co-accused)
8.8.1973 (2 cases)
9.8.1973
10.8.1973
15.8.1973 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
16.8.1973
17.8.1973
30.8.1973
31.8.1973
7.9.1973
11.9.1973
13.9.1973
19.9.1973 (2 cases)
20.9.1973
25.9.1973 (3 cases)
26.9.1973
27.9.1973
28.9.1973
2.10.1973 (14 co-accused)
4.10.1973 (2 co-accused)
8.10.1973 (2 co-accused)
10.10.1973 (3 cases)
11.10.1973
16.10.1973
18.10.1973 (2 cases)
24.10.1973
26.10.1973 (2 cases)
29.10.1973 (3 cases)
31.10.1973 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused)
1.11.1973 (3 co-accused)
2.11.1973 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
8.11.1973
9.11.1973
14.11.1973
15.11.1973 (2 cases)
16.11.1973
19.11.1973 (2 co-accused)
21.11.1973
23.11.1973 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
27.11.1973
28.11.1973 (3 cases)
29.11.1973 (4 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
30.11.1973
3.12.1973
4.12.1973
6.12.1973 (2 cases, each with 2 co-accused)
12.12.1973
13.12.1973 (2 cases, one with 4 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused)
14.12.1973 (2 cases)
17.12.1973
18.12.1973 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
19.12.1973
20.12.1973
7.1.1974
9.1.1974
10.1.1974 (3 co-accused)
11.1.1974
15.1.1974
17.1.1974 (3 cases, two each with 2 co-accused)
21.1.1974 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused)
22.1.1974
24.1.1974
25.1.1974 (4 cases, two each with 3 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused)
29.1.1974
30.1.1974
31.1.1974 (2 cases, one with 4 co-accused and one with 3 co-accused)
1.2.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
5.2.1974
6.2.1974
7.2.1974 (2 cases, one with 8 co-accused)
8.2.1974
9.2.1974
11.2.1974 (2 cases)
13.2.1974 (2 cases, one with 4 co-accused)
14.2.1974 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused)
15.2.1974 (3 cases, two with 2 co-accused)
18.2.1974
19.2.1974 (2 cases)
21.2.1974
22.2.1974 (2 cases)
25.2.1974

26.2.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
27.2.1974 (4 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
28.2.1974 (4 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
1.3.1974 (5 cases, one with 6 co-accused)
4.3.1974 (4 co-accused)
5.3.1974 (2 cases)
7.3.1974 (3 cases)
8.3.1974 (2 co-accused)
12.3.1974
13.3.1974 (3 cases)
14.3.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
15.3.1974
18.3.1974
20.3.1974
21.3.1974 (2 cases)
22.3.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused)
25.3.1974
26.3.1974 (4 cases, two each with 2 co-accused).
28.3.1974 (5 cases, two each with 2 co-accused, and one with 4 co-accused).
29.3.1974 (2 cases).
1.4.1974
2.4.1974
3.4.1974
4.4.1974 (3 cases).
5.4.1974 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused and one with 5 co-accused).
8.4.1974
9.4.1974 (2 cases).
10.4.1974 (6 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
11.4.1974 (4 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
17.4.1974 (7 cases, three each with 3 co-accused and two each with 2 co-accused).
18.4.1974 (3 cases, two each with 2 co-accused).
19.4.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
22.4.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
23.4.1974
24.4.1974 (1 co-accused).
26.4.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
29.4.1974 (2 cases, one with 4 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused).
30.4.1974 (7 cases, one with 4 co-accused and two with 2 co-accused).
1.5.1974 (4 cases, one with 3 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused).
3,5,1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
4.5.1974
7.5.1974 (3 co-accused).
8.5.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
9.5.1974
10.5.1974 (3 cases, one with 3 co-accused and two each with 2 co-accused).
11.5.1974 (2 co-accused).
13.5.1974 (3 cases, one with 3 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused).
14.5.1974 (2 cases).
15.5.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
16.5.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
17.5.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
21.5.1974 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused).
22.5.1974 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
23.5.1974 (4 cases, two each with 2 co-accused).
24.5.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
27.5.1974 (3 cases).
28.5.1974 (4 cases).
29.5.1974
30.5.1974 (8 cases, one with 4 co-accused, one with 3 co-accused and one with 2 co-accused).
31.5.1974 (4 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
1.6.1974
3.6.1974 (2 cases).
4.6.1974 (3 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
5.6.1974 (5 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
6.6.1974 (4 cases, three each with 2 co-accused).
7.6.1974 (4 cases, two each with 2 co-accused).
10.6.1974
11.6.1974 (3 cases).
12.6.1974 (3 cases).
13.6.1974 (2 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
14.6.1974 (2 cases).
20.6.1974 (3 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
21.6.1974 (2 cases).
22.6.1974
24.6.1974
25.6.1974 (5 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
26.6.1974 (3 cases).
27.6.1974 (4 cases, three each with 2 co-accused).
28.6.1974 (5 cases, one with 4 co-accused, two each with 2 co-accused).
1.7.1974 (2 cases).
3.7.1974 (6 cases).
4.7.1974 (8 cases).
5.7.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
8.7.1974 (4 cases).
9.7.1974 (10 co-accused).

10.7.1974 (5 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
11.7.1974 (2 cases).
12.7.1974
15.7.1974 (2 cases).
16.7.1974
17.7.1974 (4 cases).
18.7.1974 (2 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
19.7.1974 (2 cases).
22.7.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
23.7.1974 (3 cases).
24.7.1974
25.7.1974 (3 cases).
26.7.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
29.7.1974 (2 cases).
30.7.1974 (3 cases).
31.7.1974 (2 cases, one with 7 co-accused).
1.8.1974 (4 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
2.8.1974 (3 cases, one with 2 co-accused).
5.8.1974 (2 co-accused).
6.8.1974 (3 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
7.8.1974 (5 cases, one with 5 co-accused).
8.8.1974
9.8.1974 (2 cases).
12.8.1974 (3 cases, one with 3 co-accused).
13.8.1974 (2 cases).
14.8.1974
15.8.1974 (7 cases, two each with 3 co-accused, and one with 2 co-accused).
16.8.1974 (4 cases).
19.8.1974 (2 cases).
20.8.1974
21.8.1974 (2 cases).
22.8.1974 (3 cases).
23.8.1974 (2 cases).

Melbourne Supreme Court—

21.9.1970
20.10.1971
8.11.1973
19.3.1974
27.3.1974
28.3.1974
2.4.1974
9.4.1974
26.4.1974
7.5.1974
22.5.1974 (3 co-accused).
30.5.1974
3.6.1974
6.6.1974
14.6.1974 (2 cases).
24.6.1974
25.6.1974 (2 co-accused).
27.6.1974
5.7.1974 (2 co-accused).
30.7.1974
7.8.1974 (2 co-accused).
13.8.1974 (2 co-accused).

(*b*) and (c) The Law Department does not have the information required to answer these parts of this question, which relate to persons alleged to have committed, or who have been convicted of, further offences whilst on bail.

PENTRIDGE GAOL.

(Question No. 331)

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

1. What is the basis for the Government's decision to appoint three superintendents at Pentridge prison?

2. What administrative relationship the superintendents will have with the Governor of the prison?

3. Whether the superintendents will have divided jurisdiction; if so, on what basis?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare is—

1. There has been no decision to appoint three superintendents at Pentridge. A decision has been made to appoint a superintendent, a deputy superintendent and three governors.

2. The governor will be responsible for the management and administration of a particular ward. The governor will be directly responsible to the superintendent.

3. Governors will have divided jurisdiction. Each governor will be responsible for a particular ward and will be directly accountable to the superintendent.

LAND FOR PUBLIC USE.

(Question No. 378)

Mr. LACY (Ringwood) asked the Minister for Conservation—

1. How many hectares of land have been either bought or set aside by the Victorian Government in the Yarra Valley, the Dandenongs, and the Mornington Peninsula, respectively, for the purposes of—(*a*) conservation; (*b*) public open space; and (*c*) recreation?

2. Where these parcels of land or properties are located, what was the cost of each, and what is the estimated current value of each?

3. What funds have been received from the Commonwealth Government in respect of each area since 2nd December, 1972?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation): The answer is—

1 and 2. I assume that the honorable member is referring to land purchased by the Government during its current "buy back" programme.

Details of land acquired in the Yarra Valley, the Dandenongs and the Mornington Peninsula during the programme were made available to the Library by the Honorable the Treasurer on 5th December, 1974, in conjunction with the answer to question 122.

3. I am advised that no funds have been received to date from the Commonwealth Government in respect of land purchases in these areas.

ADULT EDUCATION IN COUNTRY AREAS.

(Question No. 593)

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

What allocations have been made for continuing adult education purposes in country areas indicating—(*a*) the location of the centres receiving such funds; (*b*) the purpose for which the funds will be used; (*c*) the total allocation to country areas; and (*d*) the total allocation to metropolitan centres?

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

The Director of Adult Education advises that at this stage only estimates can be given on moneys which will be allocated for continuing adult education purposes in the country area. In broad terms $30,000 has been made available to the eleven continuing education centres for their projects. Any administrative and basic costs are not included in these estimates.

(*a*) The centres are in the following locations—

Wangaratta, Benalla, Shepparton, Warragul, Yallourn, Sale, Ballarat, Bendigo, Mildura, Geelong, Wodonga.

(*b*) The centres provide a programme which extends beyond the traditional further education evening courses into liberal adult education, personal enrichment courses, short term studies, seminars, workshop discussion groups, weekend schools and a variety of community developmental exercises.

The Council of Adult Education continues to work actively on behalf of the centres and also in the country area where the centres do not exist.

With the appointment of an assistant director whose main area of interest in country work, council's programme should expand rapidly. The council also intends to make extra funds available to the provincial centres for special programmes, publicity and desires to continue the work of the arts train for which approximately $46,500 has been set aside.

(*c*) Approximately $92,000.
(*d*) Approximately $135,000.

These funds do not include expenses for salaries, rents, or administration costs.

SPECIAL LEAVE FOR PRISONERS.

(Question No. 607)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister for Social Welfare—

In respect of special leave for prisoners at Pentridge prison—

1. What constitutes compassionate grounds for visits to sick relatives?

2. What categories of relatives are considered in approving leave on compassionate grounds for visits?

3. Whether the prison Governor has a discretion in this matter or whether the discretion lies with the Minister?

4. Whether such conditions are laid down by regulation or administrative order; if not, how these conditions are cited?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare is—

1. Compassionate grounds relate generally to the seriousness of the illness, thus leave would be granted to a prisoner whose mother was critically ill provided there were no security risks involved in releasing the prisoner for the visit.

2. Generally close family relatives. Leave however may be granted in special circumstances for a prisoner to visit a non-relative.

3. Section 179 (1) Social Welfare Act gives the Director-General authority to grant leave. The prison Governor does not have discretion in this matter.

4. Section 179 Social Welfare Act sets out conditions relating to special leave for prisoners.

HOUSING COMMISSION LOAN FUNDS.

(Question No. 614)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

What amount of loan funds was received by the Housing Commission in 1973–74, indicating how much was spent?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

Loan funds received by the Housing Commission in 1973–74 amounted to $43,691,253, of which $39,939,211 was spent.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTIES.

(Question No. 669)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Premier—

1. How many freehold properties are held by the State of Victoria within the City of Melbourne, indicating the area and location of each property?

2. What properties within the City of Melbourne are presently under negotiation for purchase by the State of Victoria or any other statutory authority?

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

1. The information sought by the honorable member is not readily available and its assembly 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.

2. Any negotiations in progress are confidential at this stage.

PRIMARY SCHOOL TRANSPORT SUBSIDIES.

(Question No. 670)

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

Whether primary schools lacking sporting facilities were invited to apply for subsidies to transport children to park grounds and swimming pools; if so—(*a*) whether any applications were received from schools in the electoral district of Albert Park; and (*b*) what other schools in the State have applied for and received assistance of this nature within the past twelve months?

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

Yes. Applications were invited in September, 1973.

(*a*) Applications were received from Albert Park Primary School No. 1181 and South Melbourne Primary School No. 1253.

(*b*) The following other schools applied for assistance but none have received any as yet; the provision of finance for such purposes is still under consideration.

No.	School
2608	Ascot Vale
1895	Collingwood
450	Fitzroy
253	Footscray
1467	Hawksburn
2374	Kensington
2784	Montague Special
1401	Northcote
2834	Moreland
2855	Prahran
3709	Wantirna
3113	Sunshine

RENTAL INVESTIGATION.

(Question No. 684)

Mr. LIND (Dandenong) asked the Attorney-General—

Whether the Rental Investigation Bureau informed Mrs. Daffy, of Theyer Street, Doveton, on 29th October, 1974, that a request for rental investigation could not be made until the increased rent from $40 to $52.50 per week had been paid for three weeks; if so, in view of the bureau being advised that the family wages income was $113 per week, why this stipulation was made?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The answer is—

The Rental Investigation Bureau receives over 100 inquiries on various matters each day by telephone, in writing or from persons calling at the office. The usual advice offered to tenants who complain of excessive rent is to lodge a formal complaint with the bureau. There is no requirement that a higher rent should have been paid for three weeks.

The only record kept of inquiries is in relation to formal complaints. Mrs. Daffy has not made a formal complaint to the bureau and there is no record of her inquiry. None of the staff of the bureau is able to recall an inquiry by Mrs. Daffy at the time mentioned by the honorable member.

FUEL AND POWER CONSUMPTION.

(Question No. 703)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power—

What proportion of Victoria's total energy consumption for the years ended 30th June, 1973, and 30th June, 1974, was provided from electricity, briquettes, brown coal, motor spirit, distillate, power kerosene, lighting kerosene and heating oil, black coal, firewood, gas, liquefied petroleum gas, and coke and tar fuel, respectively?

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

The Victorian consumption of primary fuels for the fiscal years 1972–73 and 1973-74 was as follows—

	1972–73 per cent	1973–74 per cent
Black coal	0·2	..
Brown coal	39·6	39·2

	1972–73 per cent	1973–74 per cent		
Petroleum products—				
Aviation gasoline	0·1	0·1		
Motor spirit	19·2	18·4		
Power kerosene	0·1	0·1		
Aviation turbine fuel	1·8	2·1		
Lighting kerosene	0·3	0·3		
Heating oil	2·2	2·3		
Automotive distillate	4·7	4·6		
Industrial diesel fuel	2·7	2·8		
Furnace fuel oil	9·4	8·4		
*Other petroleum fuels (including liquefied petroleum gas and refinery fuel)	7·1	6·8		
	47·6	45·9	47·6	45·9
*Wood			2·1	1·8
Natural gas			9·4	11·8
Hydro-electricity			1·1	1·3
			100·0	100·0

*Estimated.

Electricity and briquettes made from brown coal are secondary energy and cannot be expressed as a proportion of the primary energy consumption.

The consumption of liquefied petroleum gas is statistically included with "Other petroleum fuels" and is not available separately. The quantities of coke and tar sold in Victoria are almost negligible and are not recorded.

SCHOOLS IN MELBOURNE ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 724)

Mr. JONES (Melbourne) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of the electoral district of Melbourne—

1. How many schools are classified as "disadvantaged" in the disadvantaged schools programme?

2. Which schools have had educational briefs prepared by the task force?

3. What works were proposed for each school?

4. Whether any tenders have been called for such works; if so, what tenders and when the remainder will be called?

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

1. In the electoral district of Melbourne there are six schools classified as disadvantaged, viz.: 4980 Carlton, 250 Flemington, 2374 Kensington, 2566 North Melbourne, Debney Park High School, Flemington High School.

2. 250 Flemington and 2374 Kensington have had briefs prepared by the task force.

3. Works proposed for the schools are—

250 Flemington—provision of a library, general-purpose area. art/crafts room, staff and administration upgrade and improvements to the existing building.

2374 Kensington—provision of a library, general-purpose area, art/crafts room, staff and administration upgrade and improvements to the existing building.

Debney Park High School—a site extension is proposed for this school.

4. No tenders have as yet been called for these works. However, as soon as documentation has been completed, and provided that funds are available, the projects will proceed.

OVERSEAS STAFF RECRUITMENT PROGRAMME.

(Question No. 738)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister for Social Welfare—

In respect of the Social Welfare Department's overseas staff recruitment programme in each of the past two years—

1. How many persons have been recruited, specifying the type of personnel, their country of origin, and whether return tickets were made available to such recruits?

2. What has been the cost of the programme apart from salaries paid to such staff whilst in Victoria?

3. How many such officers have left the service of the Social Welfare Department, specifying the level of personnel, the length of service of such officers, and whether such officers paid back to the department the cost or part of their fares?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare is—

1973

1. 24 prison officers from United Kingdom
3 welfare officers from United Kingdom
1 training officer from United Kingdom
10 social workers from United States of America

1974

97 prison officers from United Kingdom

No return tickets were issued or made available to any of the recruits.

1973

2. Fare and daily travelling expenses of officers conducting interviews	$ 3,372.00
Advertising and postage	1,260.00
Travelling expenses claimed by recruits—	
(*a*) Prison officers	4,699.10
(*b*) Welfare officer and training officer	1,334.56
(*c*) Social workers—United States of America	4,768.66
	15,434.32

1974

Fares and travelling expenses of officers conducting interviews	$ 4,626.00
Advertising and postage	1,350.00
Travelling expenses claimed by recruits	22,113.00
	28,089.00

1973

3. Eleven prison officers have left the employment of the department and repaid a total of $113.94.

Length of service—
Under 3 months' service—4
Under 6 months' service—2
Under 9 months' service—2
Under 12 months' service—2
Over 12 months' service—1

Two of the officers who have resigned still owe the department a total of $325.40.

One welfare officer resigned after one year's service and repaid his travelling expenses of $119 to the department.

Four social workers have resigned and repaid $553.34 to the department.

Length of service—
Under 6 months' service—2
Under 9 months' service—1
Under 12 months' service—1

1974

Thirty-one prison officers have resigned and repaid a total of $1,670.71 towards travelling expenses.

Length of service—
Under 1 month's service—17
Under 3 months' service—14

Ten of the officers who have resigned still owe the department a total of $2,230.25.

BENDIGO AND EPPALOCK LIFE SAVING CLUB.

(Question No. 775)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation—

Whether, to enable necessary protection services to be provided, he will consider making available a special grant to the

Bendigo and Eppalock Life Saving Club to enable completion of a club-house at Lake Eppalock?

Mr. DIXON (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation): The answer is—

The Treasury has transferred to my department the responsibility of funding building grants to life saving clubs. $17,500 has been allocated by this department for building grants to royal life saving clubs recommended by the society. A maximum subsidy of $10,000 is available to each club for a building grant. The Bendigo and Eppalock Life Saving Club has received an allocation of $2,500 for building works during the 1973–74 financial year and as yet have not made a claim against this allocation.

The club can make a further application for a subsidy of up to $7,500 but this application must be channelled through the Royal Life Saving Society of Victoria.

RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING ACCIDENTS.

(Question No. 790)

Mr. HANN (Rodney) asked the Minister of Transport—

In respect of each of the past five years—

1. How many accidents have occurred at railway level crossings?

2. How many fatalities have occurred and how many persons have been injured as a result of those accidents?

3. How many accidents have occurred at —(*a*) open level crossings; (*b*) crossings fitted with flashing lights; (*c*) crossings fitted with boom gates; and (*d*) other level crossings?

4. How many of these accidents have occurred in—(*a*) the Melbourne and Metropolitan area; (*b*) provincial and country towns; and (*c*) rural areas?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

1, 2 and 3 as per the following table—

Year	Total accidents	Open crossings	Flashing lights	Boom barriers	Other	No. injured	No. killed
1969	400	80	48	38	234	63	24
1970	405	78	44	67	216	83	31
1971	379	66	48	43	222	86	23
1972	367	83	55	48	181	103	19
1973	366	81	56	60	169	78	22
1974 (August) ..	200	45	30	25	100	55	17
	2,117	433	281	281	1,122	468	136

4. Of the 604 accidents that were either fatal or involved injury, in the period shown above, 428 have taken place in country areas and 176 in the Melbourne and metropolitan area.

SOUTH PASCOE VALE INTERSECTION.

(Question No. 810)

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

In respect of the application of the Coburg City Council and the repeated representations of the member for Brunswick West for the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of Coonans Road, Reynolds Parade and Reynard Street—

1. When a definite reply will be given to either the council or the member for Brunswick West?

2. Whether such traffic signals will be installed; if so, when?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1 and 2. The signalization of the intersection is now being considered in connection with the introduction of the proposed system of metropolitan intersection control. As the honorable member will be aware, the intention of the Government is to proceed with the implementation of the system as a matter of urgency.

TENANTS' SECURITY BOND DEPOSITS.

(Question No. 813)

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg) asked the Attorney-General—

Whether any investigation has been ordered into the question of security bond deposits for tenants in private rental premises and into other related matters under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1958; if so—(*a*) who is undertaking the investigation, indicating the qualifications and interests in this field of such person or persons; and (*b*) whether the report will be made to him and, in that event, when it is expected that the report will be presented?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The answer is—

The Parliamentary Liberal Party has appointed a committee to consider matters arising under the Landlord and Tenant Act, particularly the question of security deposits and the bonding of tenants.

FIRE RISK IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS.

(Question No. 820)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Chief Secretary—

Whether the fire risk has been assessed at Bell, Preston West and Thornbury primary schools, respectively; if not, when such schools will be investigated by the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

The fire risk at the three schools was last assessed on the following dates—

Bell Street Primary School—14th August, 1958.
Preston Primary School—8th March, 1958.
Thornbury Primary School—20th June, 1958.

Under existing regulations, inspections of State schools for fire hazards are carried out at the request of either the Education Department, the principal of the school concerned or the local parents' association. No requests have been received since the dates stated above but inspections of the schools are presently being arranged with a view to providing an up-to-date assessment of the fire risk.

FLOOD DAMAGE TO ROADS.

(Question No. 822)

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

Whether a further claim of $26,500 by the Bet Bet Shire Council for flood damage to roads will be approved; if not, why?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

The Bet Bet Shire Council's application for funds amounting to $26,500 for repairs to damage caused by floods during July-August 1974 was received by the board's divisional engineer, Bendigo on 12th November, 1974. This application together with applications from a number of other municipalities in Bendigo division is currently being examined by the divisional engineer.

The board will consider these applications for funds and submit recommendations to the State Treasury when the divisional engineer has inspected and reported on all works for which applications have been submitted by the councils.

HOUSING FOR DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRIES.

(Question No. 825)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power, for the Minister for State Development and Decentralization—

Whether the Minister is aware that the Housing Commission no longer affords a high priority in housing key personnel of decentralized industries; if so, what action the Minister is taking to reverse this decision?

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

The change in Housing Commission policy has not been apparent in this department's negotiations with the commission.

APPRENTICESHIP SUBSIDIES.

(Question No. 827)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Labour and Industry—

Whether he will ascertain and inform the House of the complete list of subsidies or assistance available from both State and Commonwealth sources to—(*a*) employers or apprentices; and (*b*) apprentices?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry): The answer is—

(*a*) The National Apprenticeship Assistance Scheme administered by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and Immigration provides a subsidy of $454 per year in either of the following circumstances—

(*i*) where the employer's total number of apprentices equals or exceeds 25 per cent of the number of all tradesmen employed by him the subsidy is payable in respect of each first year apprentice employed; or

(*ii*) where an employer has increased the overall level of his apprentice employment compared with that for the preceeding year the subsidy is payable in respect of each first year apprentice employed up to the extent of the over-all increase achieved.

Following a submission which I made to the Commonwealth Minister, in its last Budget the Commonwealth Government announced plans to provide funds to the States which would enable the training potential of State Government departments and instrumentalities to be utilized to the fullest possible extent. Victoria's allocation is 145 apprentices, the cost of whose employment will be met by a grant from the Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth Government is initiating in Victoria a pilot project to provide full-time off-the-job training, mainly in the fitting and machining trades, in certain Department of Manufacturing Industry factories from

the beginning of 1975. The scheme is expected to cater for the training of some 25 first-year apprentices who will be sponsored by private firms having a proven record of training apprentices and training facilities. The apprentices will be additional to the anticipated intake of the sponsoring firm. The Commonwealth will be responsible for the payment of wages and associated costs during this twelve months' period when the apprentices will receive concentrated training in their trade.

Employers who provide full-time off-the-job training to approved standards or who release their apprentices for schooling in addition to the time laid down in the appropriate apprenticeship regulations are subsidized at the rate of $20 per week per apprentice under the National Apprenticeship Assistance Scheme.

Employers whose approved facilities are used for full-time off-the-job training of apprentices indentured to other employers are also eligible for a subsidy under N.A.A.S. The amount of subsidy is determined by the Department of Labour and Immigration on the basis of accepting a proportion of the recurrent cost of the period of training according to the number of "other" apprentices approved for training. Acceptable recurrent costs include salaries of instructional staff and costs of materials used in training.

(*b*) The National Apprenticeship Assistance Scheme provides a living away from home subsidy for apprentices who have to change their place of residence to undertake or remain in apprenticeship employment. The allowance is $12.60 per week during the fist year of apprenticeship and $5.00 per week during the second year.

Country apprentices who are required to undertake continuous courses in Melbourne or Geelong remote from their place of residence are provided with free return rail travel and are paid a subsidy by the Government of Victoria towards the cost of their accommodation in accordance with the following scale—

First year of apprenticeship
$15 per week

Second year of apprenticeship
$13 per week

Third year and thereafter
$11 per week

Apprentices who reside outside a radius of 25 miles from the G.P.O. Melbourne and outside the City of Frankston who travel more than 40 miles per return journey to attend day release classes are paid a subsidy by the Government of Victoria at the rate of 1c per mile travelled with a minimum payment of 50c and a maximum payment of $2 for each such return journey.

The Commonwealth Government provides an allowance through the National Employment and Training System (NEAT) of $20 per week for persons undergoing selected courses of pre-apprenticeship training.

REPAIR AND DEMOLITION ORDERS IN BRUNSWICK WEST ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 828)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

In respect of properties in the electoral district of Brunswick West—

1. How many demolition orders are current?

2. How many repair orders are current?

3. How many of such properties subject to—(*a*) demolition; and (*b*) repair orders, are at present occupied, specifying how many are tenanted?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

In the electoral district of Brunswick West the following number of orders were operative at 5th December, 1974—

1. Demolition orders—5.

2. Repair orders—15.

3. (*a*) Of the premises subject to demolition orders, two are owner occupied and the remaining three are vacant.

(*b*) As far as it can be ascertained from the information available, fourteen of the houses subject to repair orders are occupied, seven by tenants.

ALBERT PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 831)

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

1. Whether plans are being prepared for work to be undertaken at the Albert Park Primary School?

2. Whether these plans relate to the senior school in Bridport Street or to the infant school in St. Vincent Street?

3. Whether the plans relate to alterations or to construction of a new school on either of the above sites?

4. Whether these plans are part of an "upgrade" plan involving Karmel funds; if not, what plan?

5. Whether the plan submitted by the school committee is being considered?

6. Whether the school committee or staff of the school is to be consulted before any plan is put into operation?

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

1, 2, 3 and 4. Following a request from the department in September, 1972, planning for improved staff accommodation

facilities at both the main and infant schools at Albert Park Primary School was initiated. Planning has continued to this time but, as a result of a recent visit to the school by members of the department's upgrade team, it is likely that the brief for staff improvements will be modified and that the scheme will be expanded to include art and library facilities. It is envisaged that some Karmel funds will be involved in this project.

5. Yes.

6. Yes. The school committee and the principal were consulted at the time of the recent visit and will be kept informed of progress.

MIDLAND HIGHWAY.

(Question No. 839)

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

What planning consideration was given to road usage patterns in the Morwell area prior to the closure of the Midland Highway?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

The Country Roads Board planned the relocation of the Midland Highway south of Morwell with due regard to the local road system and in close consultation with other authorities.

The board, prior to the relocation of the Midland Highway, conducted a detailed examination of existing traffic patterns on all major roads which could be affected by the relocation and assessed the anticipated redistribution of traffic.

TRAMWAY ROAD, MORWELL.

(Question No. 840)

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

1. Whether the Country Roads Board and the Railways Board are aware of the increased usage of Tramway Road, Morwell?

2. Whether traffic has increased on this road since the installation of traffic lights on the intersection of Jeeralang West Road and the Princes Highway and the closure of the Midland Highway?

3. Whether more shunting operations involving trains crossing Tramway Road are carried out at night rather than during the day?

4. When flashing red lights will be installed at this crossing?

5. Whether he will take steps to have this crossing on Tramway Road illuminated by overhead lights as soon as possible in order to make the crossing safer?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

Tramway Road, Morwell, is an unclassified road under the care and management of the Morwell Shire Council.

1. No recent traffic counts have been conducted by the Country Roads Board or the Victorian Railways Board on Tramway Road, Morwell. However, the Country Roads Board is aware that traffic usage is increasing on most roads in the Morwell area.

2. As the traffic lights became operational only on the 26th November, 1974, the Country Roads Board has not yet conducted traffic counts to ascertain whether traffic has increased. Traffic counts will be taken when traffic has adjusted to the new conditions.

3. Yes.

4. This crossing is not included on the priority list for the installation of flashing light signals.

5. The installation of overhead lights at the rail crossing is the responsibility of the Morwell Shire Council.

MANUFACTURE OF WIRE NETTING AT PENTRIDGE GAOL.

(Question No. 842)

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister for Social Welfare—

1. When the wire netting plant previously used at Pentridge prison was sold?

2. What was the original cost and what amount was received from the sale?

3. What was the name of the purchaser?

4. Whether he has given consideration to the purchase of new equipment for the purpose of manufacturing wire netting at Pentridge; if not, why?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare is—

1. 11th October, 1972.

2. (*a*) $30,277; (*b*) $8,400.

3. Australian Wire Industries.

4. Due to the drop in demand for the type of product manufactured and the need for the space to be used to expand other industries, it is not proposed to re-establish the wire netting industry at Pentridge.

PROPERTY IN SOUTH MELBOURNE.

(Question No. 848)

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

Whether the State Accommodation Committee has received applications from Government departments or instrumentalities wishing to utilize the site and buildings of the former girls' orphanage in South Melbourne; if so, which departments or instrumentalities have applied and whether any decision has been made as to the future of the building and site?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer is—

There has been no request since the decision regarding the Coroner's Court and Morgue.

The future of the site will be determined by the Public Offices Corporation.

PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS IN ESSENDON.

(Question No. 850)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Transport—

What is the present position regarding the construction of a pedestrian overpass in Buckley Street near the Essendon railway station?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

In answer to question No. 410, the honorable member was advised that a meeting of all interested parties was to be held on 11th November, 1974, to discuss this project. The meeting was held as arranged by the Essendon City Council. Various alternatives were discussed and the Country Roads Board is now awaiting further advice from the council.

GUNDAWARRA BOOMERANGS.

(Question No. 852)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power, for the Minister for State Development and Decentralization—

Whether, as a matter of urgency, the Minister will personally consider the case for assistance from the Victorian Development Corporation lodged by Gundawarra Boomerangs, of Wedderburn; if not, why?

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

The Victorian Development Corporation is a statutory body and has the right and responsibility of making its own decisions. I know that applications are thoroughly investigated and am confident that each receives careful consideration.

REVENUE FROM LIQUOR.

(Question No. 853)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

What additional annual revenue it is expected will be derived from the operation of the proposals contained in the Liquor Control (Amendment) Bill and from what particular areas this additional amount of revenue will be derived?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

The operation of the measures contained in the Liquor Control (Amendment) Bill is expected to provide approximately $59,000 annually in additional revenue. At present, no fee is payable in respect of permits authorizing the consumption of liquor by patrons at unlicensed cafes. The Bill proposes a fee of $50 per permit which is expected to provide revenue to the extent of $55,000 per annum. A further $4,000 is expected to be derived from the increase in vigneron licence fees.

POULTRY PROCESSING ESTABLISHMENTS.

(Question No. 854)

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

1. How may poultry processing establishments are registered for the purposes of providing dressed birds for the export market?

2. What are the names and addresses of the companies so registered?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer is—

1. The registration of poultry processing export establishments is the responsibility of the Federal Department of Agriculture. Information obtained from that Department indicates that there are four poultry processing establishments in Victoria registered for the purposes of providing dressed birds for the export market.

2. The names and addresses of the companies so registered are—

A.B. Oxford, Pipe Road, Brooklyn.

Cester Poultry Supply Pty. Ltd., Spring Road, Springvale.

Golden Poultry Farm Pty. Ltd., Grants Road, Somerville.

David Hyland & Sons Pty. Ltd., 157 Salmon Street, Port Melbourne.

PRIVATE BUS OPERATORS IN BRUNSWICK AND COBURG.

(Question No. 856)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Transport—

Further to the answer to question No. 805 asked on 4th December, 1974, what amount was granted to each of the bus operators providing services in Brunswick and Coburg?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

It would not be appropriate to disclose this information without the agreement of the bus companies concerned as it relates to the financial position of individual businesses.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER.

(Question No. 858)

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): asked the Minister of Health—

1. Which public water supply authorities have been instructed to fluoridate domestic water under the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973?

2. What other authorities have installed or are planning to install equipment for this purpose under the Act?

3. What is the form and name of the fluoride, who are the suppliers, and what concentrations of fluoride have been determined by the Commission of Public Health in each case?

4. What are the names and qualifications of each person licensed under the Act or regulations to operate plant to add fluoride to water supplies?

5. How the "average optimum concentration", referred to in section 5 (3) of the Act, will be determined and what maximum parts per million concentration in any one water supply sample will be applied in calculating the average?

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

1. The following public water supply authorities have been required by the Commission of Public Health to fluoridate under the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973—

(*a*) Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works:

To fluoridate the Melbourne water supply system.

(*b*) State Rivers and Water Supply Commission:

To fluoridate the Mornington Peninsula system.

2. The Wodonga Waterworks Trust is planning to install equipment to supply fluoridated water to the Bandiana Army Camp.

A number of inquiries has been received from other water supply authorities regarding the Act and regulations. Several authorities are preparing submissions.

The Boort Waterworks Trust has proceeded with the installation of equipment for fluoridating its water supply system and is seeking the approval of the Commission of Public Health for reimbursement of the cost under the provisions of section 8 of the Health (Fluoridation) Act.

3.

(*a*) *Boort*

Material Name: Hydrofluosilicic acid.

Form: 20 per cent acid/water solution.

Suppliers: Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilisers Ltd.

Material specifications: Detailed specification provided.

Concentrations of fluoride determined by commission; None determined.

(*b*) *Wodonga (Bandiana)*

Material Name: Sodium silicofluoride.

Form: Fine crystalline powder.

Suppliers: No decision made.

Material specifications: Detailed specification provided for tenderers.

Concentrations of fluoride determined by commission: None determined.

4. No persons have been licensed under the Act or regulations to operate plant. Licensing will be granted under regulation 2 (2) of the Health (Fluoridation) Regulations 1974.

5. Section 5 (3) of the Act restricts a water supply authority to limit dosage so that the average optimum concentration will not be in excess of one (1) part per million, whereas section 6 (2) of the Act allows the Commission of Public Health to determine the maximum concentration of fluoride that may be established in a water supply. This would permit the commission to require an average optimum concentration lower than 1 p.p.m. which may be desirable in a hot climate where the daily consumption of water per person is high.

No method of determining the average concentration has been adopted by the commission as yet. However, it is established practice throughout the world to allow a small fluctuation above and below the optimum concentration so that the average is of the required level.

FLUORIDATION OF BOORT WATER SUPPLY.

(Question No. 859)

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) asked the Minister of Health—

1. What have been the causes of the reported delay in obtaining approval of the Commission of Public Health of fluoridation equipment for the Boort water supply?

2. When such equipment will be put into operation?

3. Whether the commission will guarantee, after fully testing, that the equipment will fluoridate the water supply at Boort within the standards required by section 6 of the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973?

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

1. The delay in obtaining approval has been caused by inadequate information available on the control equipment proposed to be used in this system.

The consultants, acting on behalf of the Boort Waterworks Trust, have submitted to the Commission of Public Health plans and specification for sophisticated equipment to dose, analyse and automatically control the fluoride content of this water supply.

Dosing equipment was installed some time ago. However, the trust was awaiting the arrival of vital laboratory test equipment from America and adequately controlled fluoridation could not be implemented without such equipment.

Advice was received on 29th November, 1974, that this equipment had arrived and that the trust proposed to commence fluoridation on 3rd December, 1974.

The complex automatic equipment proposed by the trust to be used is unknown in Australia and departmental officers have sought unsuccessfully to have the agents import the equipment for observation and trials before installation.

2. Fluoridation of the Boort water supply is shortly to commence following initial trials now in progress.

3. The commission is not able to guarantee that the scheme proposed for the Boort water supply will fluoridate within the standards required by the Act. The consultants have chosen not to propose systems of similar design to those successfully operating in Australia, and the complete system is not available for evaluation and trials.

However, the fluoridation system will be closely supervised by officers of the Department of Health at the time of commencement and should it not meet the standards of the Act, the commission will exercise its powers under regulation 4 (2) of the Health (Fluoridation) Regulations 1974 to direct the water supply authority to cease using the fluoridation equipment.

PATTERSON RIVER OUTFALL.

(Question No. 860)

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park) asked the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister of Water Supply—

Whether the Khuner report of 1962 relating to the Patterson River takes into account the 9,000 cusecs mentioned in the 1957–58 Horsfall report; if so, as the Patterson outfall is designed for a 22,000 cusec capacity —(*a*) what effect this 9,000 cusecs will have on the probability of both Carrum and the Gladesville–Patterson Lakes Project being flooded in the event of a flood of 1934 proportions; and (*b*) whether the 9,000 cusecs are included in the 22,000 cusec capacity?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister of Water Supply is—

1. The Khuner report of 1962 included a detailed estimate of likely floods in the Carrum outfall (Patterson River).

These estimates were as follows—

(*a*) 70-year frequency flood (considered equivalent to the 1934 flood)—18,200 cusecs.

(*b*) 200-year frequency flood—22,700 cusecs.

These figures are the estimated total flow figures between Eumemmerring Creek and the bay. Discharges upstream of Eumemmerring Creek are less (17,300 and 14,000 cusecs respectively).

2. The banks of Carrum outfall were raised to provide basically 6 feet of freeboard above the observed 1934 flood levels.

The freeboard for flood estimates prepared by Mr. Khuner are—

70-year frequency—5 feet to 6 feet.
200-year frequency—3·8 feet to 4·9 feet.

3. It appears that the 9,000 cusecs referred to in the question could relate to original estimates of the 1934 flood as mentioned in the article by N. Black in "Aqua", September, 1957. The original estimate was 27,400 cusecs total flow including Dandenong Creek, Mile Creek, Eumemmerring Creek and eastern contour drain. It was then estimated that 18,000 cusecs flowed in the Carrum outfall and 9,400 cusecs broke out both north and south with the main flooding in the Chelsea area.

Considerable volumes of flood water were ponded between Carrum outfall and Eumemmerring Creek and then flowed back into the outfall and across to the north.

4. The revised total estimates made by Khuner in 1962 are totally inclusive of all tributary flows and these would be contained within the Carrum outfall with some 3·8 feet to 4·9 feet freeboard.

5. It is therefore estimated that, following the works on the Carrum outfall, a flood of 1934 proportions would be totally contained within the Carrum outfall and would not result in any flooding of Carrum and the Gladesville Patterson Lakes Project.

RAGWORT INFESTATION.

(Question No. 866)

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

1. What is the approximate area of ragwort infestation on land owned or under the control of Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. in Gippsland?

2. What is the approximate area of ragwort infestation on Crown land in the Gippsland area?

3. Which of the respective areas of infestation endanger private property?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands): The answer is—

1. 26,333 hectares.

2. 560 hectares.

3. Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. 6,800 hectares
Crown land 20 hectares

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, December 11, 1974.

The PRESIDENT **(Sir Raymond Garrett)** took the chair at 11.3 a.m., and read the prayer.

ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE.

THIRTEENTH PROGRESS REPORT.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON (Higinbotham Province) presented the thirteenth progress report from the Road Safety Committee on aspects of roadworthiness, speedometers, alcohol and road accidents and intersectional management, together with minutes of evidence and appendices.

It was ordered that they be laid on the table, and that the report and appendices be printed.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

The Order of the day for the resumption of the debate on the motion for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

On the motion of the Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization), the debate was adjourned.

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

That the debate be adjourned until the next day of meeting.

If my motion is agreed to, the debate will be adjourned until March of next year, when the House resumes after the forthcoming recess. Perhaps I should explain why I propose to seek an adjournment of the debate until next year. Honorable members will recall that after Mr. Galbally had introduced his Abolition of Capital Punishment Bill for the twenty-first time, following some debate I asked that the debate be adjourned to enable the Government to examine the report of the Law Reform Commissioner who had been requested by the Government, largely as a result of the debate on this issue which was initiated by Mr. Galbally, to report on aspects of capital punishment. I was anxious that the Government should have an opportunity of re-examining the question on the basis of the Law Reform Commissioner's report and also on the basis of a possible change of attitude within the community. Furthermore, I was anxious that this House, as it has on other occasions—certainly, on every occasion since I have been privileged to be a member of it—should for the twenty-first time give serious and responsible consideration to the matter which Mr. Galbally had raised.

Private members' Bills have always been thoroughly examined by this House. This applies not only to Bills on capital punishment but to private members' Bills on various subjects that have been introduced into the

House. All such measures are given responsible and serious consideration by Government supporters in this House, and Government members in another place who have the opportunity of examining the Bills before they are fully debated. This privilege, which is enjoyed by members in this House, is almost unique in Parliaments—certainly, it is unique in the Parliaments of Australia—and I hope this situation will continue.

The Government has re-examined the question of capital punishment in the light of the Law Reform Commissioner's report. On this issue, as with many other important social, moral and sometimes legal issues within the community which have been raised by Mr. Galbally by way of private members' Bills, the community is sharply divided. I know that I will not hurt Mr. Galbally when I say that on most occasions the majority of members of the community have not supported the proposition that he has advanced. However, that is no reason why Mr. Galbally or any other member should not seek to introduce amending legislation on issues of this type. Irrespective of what may be the majority view of the community at a certain time, the support of the majority does not make the view right or wrong. I emphasize these aspects in defence of the fact that in my own party there exist the same divisions on social matters as are reflected in the community.

Members of the Liberal Party have discussed this matter and I can assure the House that all possible views have been fully considered in the light of the Law Reform Commissioner's report and of any possible change of view in the community. Accordingly, I have been authorized on behalf of the Government to say that on the issue of capital punishment the Government is giving to its members a free vote on the understanding that this Parliament has a free vote on the issue on which, without doubt, there is still real division in the community. It is my view and my hope that the matter will be determined in this fashion. On a number of occasions since I have been a member of Parliament, we have had an opportunity to exercise a free vote and the speeches on such occasions have been of a higher standard than those on other occasions. I hope that during the forthcoming recess other parties will have the opportunity of considering this social and moral issue in the light of the Government's stand.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province): The Government's decision to allow an open vote on capital punishment is an unprecedented, sympathetic gesture to get rid of the gallows. The Government's move will receive my ready co-operation and that of my party. However, the Government's decision creates a minor practical problem which I am sure can be overcome by understanding and goodwill. The abolition of capital punishment and flogging is, if I may use an old-fashioned but highly descriptive phrase, a plank of the Labor Party's platform. No one can join the party without pledging support to the platform, nor can any person remain a member of the party and support capital punishment. Over the years, every member of my party has spoken in favour of the abolition of capital punishment and when my private members' Bills on the subject have been defeated, they have voted for the Bills. It can be taken for granted that members of the Labor Party will continue to give me their unswerving support so long as a measure of this type is put forward. Furthermore, since the matter of an open vote has arisen, I have spoken to all members of my party in this House and have been assured by them that they will vote for the abolition of capital punishment also as a matter of conscience.

The attitude of the Premier as an opponent of capital punishment is well known. Some years ago when he was an ordinary member of this House and one of my Bills was defeated, he said to me as I left the

Chamber, "Don't give up; you will get it through some day". Across the field of political battle I now repeat the words to the Premier, "Don't give up; you will get it through some day".

Finally, I assure Parliament that I will vote for any Bill to end capital punishment.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: And so will we!

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: My Deputy Leader has assured me of his support and my loyal colleagues are also nodding their assent. The Labor Party will put no obstacle in the way of the Government if it wishes to introduce its own Bill to abolish capital punishment. Our aim is to get rid of capital punishment, which is not a political but a moral issue.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): Members of the Country Party will support the motion for the adjournment of the debate and will give consideration to the remarks made by the Leader of the House and Mr. Galbally. If and when a Bill to abolish capital punishment is introduced by the Government, we will deal with it in our usual manner.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until the next day of meeting.

WODONGA AREA LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from the previous day) 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. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): This is a small Bill to amend a small principal Act and it results from a great deal of negotiation. It is nevertheless important. Members of the Labor Party give the Bill their support and have much pleasure in being associated, through our counterparts in the Federal scene, with the development of the Albury-Wodonga complex. We commend the scheme and we hope it is developed successfully.

Initially it was a wise move to set aside a large area of land on the Victorian side of the border for compulsory acquisition and to be included in the planning area. It has now been said that this has greatly restricted the councils in the area by taking control of the land out of their hands and that a lot of this land would not be necessary for the development and housing complexes associated with the planning. It was also said that this was prejudicial to the owners of the land in the way in which they could utilize that land. That is fairly obvious and this Bill has resulted from a three Government discussion. The Minister for Local Government, the Minister for State Development and Decentralization and the Federal Minister for Urban and Regional Development had a lot to do with the proposal contained in the Bill. I am confident that that proposal has been the result of most amicable discussions and will help the council and the landowners in the area. It will not detract from the planning objectives of the Victorian Government. Therefore, members of the Labor Party support the Bill commended to us last night by the Leader of the House.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province): This is a Bill of great importance and interest to the people of the Albury–Wodonga growth centre, but more particularly to the people of the Wodonga area, because it deals with the proposed acquisition of land in the Victorian part of the growth complex. The Bill has three purposes. The first is to alter the definition of the growth centre. It is to be changed from "designated area" to the "Wodonga area".

The second purpose of the Bill is contained in clause 3 (3). Members of the Country Party applaud the

Government for introducing this provision. As I understand it, and according to the second-reading notes distributed by the Minister, it alters a Commonwealth–State agreement that was ratified by this Parliament and gives the municipalities their rights under the Local Government Act. It was always intended that the municipalities should exercise these rights and powers under the Local Government Act in the urban area.

It is not an easy provision to understand because in the main it refers to the powers given to the municipalities under the Town and Country Planning Act. I should like the Minister to explain to the House whether this provision is meant to give the local municipalities power to issue permits to the Albury–Wodonga Development Corporation for all buildings to be erected within the urban area of the municipality. My understanding of the provision is to this effect.

I should also like the Minister to explain whether all subdividing of land within the urban area will have to receive the approval of the local municipality. I am extremely grateful to the Premier and the Minister for State Development and Decentralization for the discussions they had on this amendment with the Wodonga City Council.

The third main purpose of the Bill is to make an amendment to the Wodonga Area Land Acquisition Act, which was passed in the spring of last year. The Act was to terminate on 31st December of this year, but because of the magnitude of the job that is confronting the Albury–Wodonga Development Corporation it has not been possible to complete all the necessary land acquisitions. We applaud the Government for including an amendment that is designed to extend the power of acquisition for a further twelve months. The Wodonga City Council and the people in the area concerned greatly appreciate what is being done by this Bill. The people particularly concerned are those whose land will be acquired by the corporation. We have the assurance of the Premier that at least by February the precise area that will be needed for residential, commercial, sport, recreation and other purposes will be clearly defined, because at present there are 32,800 hectares of land in the designated area of Wodonga that are affected. It is the general belief in Wodonga that this area could be considerably reduced to cater for the proposed population of 300,000 for the Albury–Wodonga complex. The Minister for State Development and Decentralization said that the area could be reduced by one third, but I believe the area in Wodonga could be reduced even further.

The Premier gave a public undertaking on 7th November that once the precise area was determined the remainder of the land would be released from the control of the corporation and the controls that apply under the existing legislation would not apply. It has also been stated that ordinances will be placed on the remainder of the land and the farmer will know for certain whether or not his land will be acquired and will be able to determine his future prospects and how he will be affected. We hope the farmers will continue in farming pursuits which they have followed for many years as did, in many cases, their ancestors.

This Bill created a good deal of interest in the area. On 7th November the Premier and the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, who was acting as the member of the Ministerial council on that occasion, because it is another of his functions and in this case supersedes his other portfolios, visited the Wodonga area. I had the pleasure of chairing a public meeting at Wodonga, attended by 700 to 900 interested people. They listened intently to the answers given by the Premier to a series of fourteen written questions which had been posed. Those attending the meeting listened

to the honorable gentleman in complete silence because they were interested to hear what he had to say on this question.

I am trying to indicate the great interest that is being displayed by the people in the area. Those are the real points of this Bill. The people are left with an unhealthy attitude towards this development growth centre because of the delay in receiving payment or settlement. In his second-reading notes the Minister mentions that 293 properties have been purchased at a cost of about $8 million. On Monday I had related to me a case of a farmer who had 319 acres. He signed a 30-day contract of sale on 4th November. An acceptable valuation was negotiated between the corporation and the farmer. After signing the contract the farmer went to Queensland, the State which has been enlightened in the last week, and purchased a property.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: Queenslanders were enlightened before last week.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: They showed their enlightenment. This farmer bought a property in Queensland, again on a 30-day contract of sale. He was assured that within a fortnight of signing the contract in Victoria he would receive 50 per cent of the negotiated price. I give full marks to the Premier. The honorable gentleman stated at the public meeting that these people, on signing a contract of sale, or on having a notice to treat, would receive 80 per cent. Unfortunately, however, the 30-day contract to which I have referred expired on 4th December and the farmer has not received even the deposit paid on his land. He has been threatened with cancellation of his contract in Queensland.

I bring this case to the notice of the Minister to show that co-operation rather than force is needed. The Government should honour its obligations to the people and a man should not be left in the embarrassing situation, after having signed the contract of sale on his property in Wodonga, of finding that the contract which he made in Queensland is to be cancelled because of his inability to honour his undertaking. This sort of thing is causing irritation, misunderstanding, and uncertainty in the Albury-Wodonga growth centre. These cases become public knowledge and they set up a barrier of resistance. This is not in the best interests of the State. I appeal to the Minister to have the Government honour sales of this nature so that the people concerned are assured of receiving their money when their land is ultimately acquired. In many cases land has been in the family for more than 100 years, and they are now to be uprooted. That is bad enough but they should not be embarrassed by not being paid. The area of land should be defined by at least February, and should be reduced to at least one-third of the designated area.

As the Minister knows, honorable members recently made an inspection with the Premier of hundreds of acres of land in this area which should never be settled because it is flood prone. In many instances it is highly valuable grazing land, but it is subject to flooding. At this stage the land is designated. The sooner these people know their future and the land is released from designation the better, and the greater will be the co-operation of the people.

I shall not delay the House much longer, but I point out that the Government owes a debt to those who have been actively associated with this corporation. I join with the Minister in expressing deep regret about one who has played a conscientious part—possibly not always understood—in the development of the Albury-Wodonga growth centre. I refer to the former Mayor, Councillor Les Stone who has been stricken with a very serious illness and possibly will not play any further part in the development of this growth centre. On behalf of the Country Party, and I am sure on behalf of all members, I express to Mrs.

Stone and her family our deep regret for the serious illness which has fallen upon her husband. I hope he will be spared for a long time to give his wife and family comfort. The Country Party supports the Bill.

The Hon. H. R. WARD (South-Eastern Province): I wish to make only a few comments to clear up some of the opposition I had to the initial operation of the legislation, but first I express my sorrow upon hearing of the serious illness of Mr. Stone. He believed in the Albury-Wodonga concept. Some of the reservations which I had with regard to this development were strongly expressed to the Minister. I compliment the honorable gentleman on the work that has been carried out, and his reaction to some of the comments that were made.

I agree with Mr. Bradbury's remarks that a number of complaints are made by individual persons. I have told these people in discussions that they should bring their complaints to the notice of the Minister. In the few cases that have been brought to my notice, I have been surprised to find that this was not done. People tend to say that this is the general pattern of negotiations. However, they suffer hardships, as is well known. I understand that the Minister has advised the people who operate in the interests of the Government and the corporation, that they should bring these matters to his attention and to the attention of members of the staff who operate in the district.

There is a great misunderstanding about the time it takes to finalize negotiations for the purchase of land. In discussions I have had with some people involved in these negotiations, it is apparent that they fail to understand that negotiations cannot be concluded within a week or ten days. They do not understand the problems that face the Titles Office, the surveyors and the valuers, and it is unreasonable to expect finalization within 14 or 28 days. Negotiations can take as long as 3 or 4 months, and even up to 6 months.

My final comment concerns the necessity to look at the surrounding areas. The general pattern of life in the Albury–Wodonga area having changed, other things occur outside these boundaries and within the area known as the "investigation" area. When the area is reduced, a pattern of change is set up. The Minister was good enough to agree to a suggestion that these areas be looked at, particularly in regard to the need for transport services, general recreational areas, and the changes in zoning that might occur. These things can have a reaction on the development of the area and they could affect the areas of Tallangatta, Kiewa Valley, Barnawartha, Chiltern, Yackandandah and fringe areas. The Minister has been kind enough to suggest that these areas might be looked at and a further study done in connection with providing services. This would be a complementary development of the Albury–Wodonga zone.

I thank the Minister and the Premier for the work they have done in regard to this area, about which I have always had some reservations,

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 8518 s. 2).

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I thank the members for their comments and also for their unanimous support. As I indicated last night, and also on a number of occasions when I have brought legislation before the House, this would not be possible unless the Government had the wholehearted support and backing of all political authorities, not only in this State but throughout Australia. For the first time in the history of the nation the

States and the Commonwealth and all the political parties and local government bodies worked to try to achieve a growth centre in a rather remote area of the State and the nation. For the first time plans must be made in advance for a city of 300,000 people in an area where it is hoped that tertiary forms of employment and education will be available. It is an exciting and important project, not only to the people living in the area, but to country Australia, and it will provide hope for those in areas outside Melbourne and Sydney.

The project would not have been possible without the whole-hearted support of the local members. When legislation is introduced to the House, matters of policy are brought to the local members before they are determined. I have discussed the proposed legislation with local members, and I again congratulate Mr. Bill Baxter, Mr. Ivan Swinburne and Mr. Keith Bradbury on their wholehearted co-operation during this difficult time.

Mr. Bradbury queried clause 3 (6), and his assessment was accurate. I hope the position will be clarified. In the urban areas any person's property will be subject to development. That has always been the intention. The side notes on the Bill show that the spirit of the agreement is that the corporation should co-operate with municipalities. For that reason it is advocated—certainly in Victoria—that consultative bodies comprising representatives of municipalities and the community should be set up. Victoria has more councils than New South Wales, which makes it more difficult. The councils in the area are allowed to recommend people for appointment to the consultative body.

When any instrumentality acquires land—and this is a vast area of land; nothing like the project has ever been attempted in Australia—problems, misunderstandings and doubts occur. Many people of substantial means—they may be without young children—do not want their way of life to be interfered with. That is human nature. However, when the results become evident, the situation will change. I agree with Mr. Bradbury that when the physical work can be seen by the community, a tremendous difference will occur. There has been amazing opposition to all the major projects with which I have been associated in country areas, even tourist projects, but when they are completed everyone gets the credit and is proud of the project.

Mr. Bradbury referred to the work done by dedicated people, and I agree with everything he said about Mr. Les Stone. In the future I hope the work of people who have advocated this project will be known. Without the assistance of the local people, agreement between the national political parties would not have been achieved. People in that remote area want a future for themselves and their families, and for that reason everyone is anxious that the project should succeed.

Mr. Bradbury referred to delays, and I am concerned about that because I have always ensured that land owners receive justice and are not disadvantaged because of alleged community progress. I have instructed my officers that the full valuation on properties should be given immediately. My department has only one man associated with the project, and has delegated its work, and the Public Works Department was chosen to carry out this task. It has acted fairly and properly. The Valuer-General has also been of tremendous assistance and, according to overseas information from the so-called experts, unbelievable achievements have come about in a short time. We have been criticized for being too generous and too considerate of the land owners. I see the local members around the department regularly, particularly with respect to the Albury-Wodonga project.

I will ensure that action is taken immediately and will ascertain the cause of the delay in relation to the person mentioned. I have asked for

all stops to be pulled out in land dealings, and in this vast area of land not one property has had to be acquired. There has been total agreement. I obtain satisfaction from reading letters from land owners stating that they have been fairly and properly treated in an expeditious way. I shall investigate the cause of the delay and I reiterate that these matters should be brought to our attention because my officers have firm instructions to deal with the valuations quickly, and I do not want anyone to be disadvantaged.

The Bill will enable the Parliament of Victoria—unlike the Parliament of New South Wales or the Commonwealth Parliament—to have the matter brought before it every year so that members can criticize and advise. It is a physical impossibility to plan for a city of 300,000 people within 1, 2 or 3 years, particularly where the complex is being built on a river. Pollution must be controlled and the environment must be preserved. The needs of future generations must be envisaged in recreational areas. The complex will be a growth area of planned development until the year 2000. I shall move a small amendment to clause 5.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): I raise a minor matter on clause 2 dealing with the designated area. When the agreement was first brought before Parliament the designated area included an area in Victoria within 55 kilometres of the Union Bridge. This includes much land which is not connected with the development project. I have received many representations and have taken the matter up with the Minister and the Premier to ask that the gazettal of the original designated area be removed from the project and placed under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act. Mr. Ward referred to this and said that certain areas would have to be organized in their development. Vast areas outside the immediate precincts of the development area have no association with it. At present the planning ordinance remains in existence and to my knowledge the gazettal has not been withdrawn. Every matter dealing with property now has to be dealt with through the Town and Country Planning Board and the corporation.

I ask the Government at the earliest opportunity to take this area down to a reasonable position within the confines of the development area and to ensure that the balance of the area is placed outside so that people will know that the normal procedures of planning ordinances will be dealt with by the municipalities and the Town and Country Planning Board, which is State-controlled. The complicated procedure which has to be undertaken now must cause extra book work for people associated with the corporation. When this is changed, the project will have the backing of people who are now inconvenienced by the problem.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I am conscious of the problem mentioned by Mr. Swinburne. In Ballarat an interim development order, which existed since before 1958, was only recently removed. In over-all planning one sees the dead hand of the planner. There was an added problem in this area, because the land which was first agreed on was vast. This has reduced it tremendously from Albury to Wodonga. There is now a restriction on the use of land which will probably never be used for urban, industrial and commercial development. It may have to be set aside for parklands, recreational areas and the frontage to rivers and mountain areas which should be preserved.

Problems occurred because of the activities of land speculators in the areas on the fringe of the development. It is estimated that $1,000 million will be poured in by the Governments to develop the infrastructure. It is important not to have a build-up of subdivisional

areas outside, and that is the reason for the delay. We are concerned to finalize the planning so that rural areas will be released and will not be subdivided. Undertakings to this effect were given previously when discussions were held with representatives of the municipalities.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 3 (New sub-section inserted).

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province): I thank the Minister for his clarification of this clause although he said in his second-reading speech that the municipalities in the designated area will retain control over private development. This is possibly the most important provision in the Bill. In the light of the experience gained in the past twelve months the Government has brought in this amendment to the principal Act. I thank the Minister for his assurance that the local municipalities will have full control over the urban areas in respect of subdivisions and permits for building construction. This is one reason why members of the Country Party are co-operating in the passage of the Bill. We hope that from time to time we will have the opportunity of reviewing the position when amending legislation is introduced to further the smooth working of this development.

The clause was agreed to, as was clause 4.

Clause 5 was verbally amended, and, as amended, was adopted.

The Bill was reported to the House with an amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

STATE FORESTS WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 5) on the motion of the Hon. F. J. Granter (Minister of Forests) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province): This Bill provides authorization for expenditure by the Forests Commission for the ensuing financial year. An amount has been approved for expenditure on proposed works for the financial year ending June, 1975. All honorable members appreciate the tremendous significance of the work undertaken by the Forests Commission. Probably all honorable members would agree that there should be a stepping up of the activities of the commission. This is one Government authority which undertakes its task in a highly responsible manner. The officers and employees of the commission are dedicated to their work. This is one calling in which a person needs to have a special interest. There is evidence that the persons engaged in forestry are particularly interested in the work they perform, and they do an excellent job with the resources made available to them.

The activities of the Forests Commission do not engender pressure by the public on the Government to expend more money because the returns are not immediately evident. Generally speaking, they are long-term activities for the welfare of the community of which to a large extent future generations will reap the benefit. Work that is undertaken today will mainly be of advantage to those who come after us. Future generations will pay the price for any errors and omissions.

The scope of the Forests Commission's activities is increasing every year with the public consciousness of environmental needs and the desire to use forest areas for recreation. Therefore, the commission faces an even greater task in preserving the tremendous asset and heritage of the Victorian forests, which could be quickly wiped out by fire alone. The necessity to guard against fire is one of which all honorable members are aware, and it becomes of greater importance with increased public access to the forest areas. Provision must be made for additional roads, clearing work and the maintenance of the fire protection system, which is highly developed and is manned consci-

entiously by commission officers. They are assisted in this regard by commercial interests which are also involved in the harvesting of forest products, such as Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd.

One cannot make much criticism of the activities of the Forests Commission. It may be that at the end of the sessional period one becomes more tolerant than ever, or more mellow. The only possible criticism is that the Government does not give a higher priority to even greater expansion of forestry activity, although I acknowledge that it is not work for which there is great public pressure. Much depends on the far-sightedness and the initiative of Governments to allocate the necessary resources to provide not only for the present but more particularly for the future needs of the State, which cannot be accurately assessed because of the rapidly changing demands for forest products. We cannot accurately forecast the demand for timber for construction purposes and for use in paper and other products. Some honorable members might deplore what they consider to be the wasteful use of paper in our society, but at this stage there seems to be no likelihood of any dramatic alteration in the use of timber for paper products and for construction work.

The Forests Commission is permitted, without any great lobbying from the public, to carry on its work which will yield its rewards for the community of the future. Therefore, I have some sympathy for people in Government who might be aware that a greater allocation of resources should be made to the commission and that forestry activities should be expanded. I realize that, like all of us, they can only go so far as the public wishes them to go and in accordance with the public demand.

Naturally, members of the Labor Party do not oppose the Bill. We take the opportunity of commenting on the activities of the Forests Commission and its employees. This is one activity in which there is close involvement between Government and private industry. The relationship between the two is, generally speaking, working satisfactorily. There is a sense of responsibility on the part of both the Government and private industry, and this relationship is aided by the responsible manner in which the commission undertakes its work. The persons who engage in commercial enterprise and depend for their livelihood upon agreements with the Forests Commission respect the integrity with which the commission performs its functions.

I again commend the Forests Commission on its activities and urge the Government to give an even higher priority to its most essential work. Like the Water Commission, for which the Minister is also responsible, it does not have great demands placed upon it by the public for immediate action. The successful work of the commission depends on the long-range plans and the foresight of those members in the Government and officers of the comission who are laying the foundations for the future. In both areas of activity, forestry and water supply, which are allied in many respects, it is too late to provide remedies when a situation of acute need is reached.

The Labor Party supports the Bill. It expresses the hope that the activities of the commission will continue on the fine basis on which they have been undertaken in the past.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): The Country Party supports this Bill which provides finance for the Forests Commission to carry out the works and services enumerated. They cover four main areas.

The first is the preservation and good husbandry of our native hardwood forests. The second is the planting and maintenance of softwood forests, under the Commonwealth–State agreement, which now cover vast areas so that there will be ample softwood timber available in

the future. The third is fire control. Last, but not least, is the area of forest parks set aside for the benefit of the people.

Fire prevention is one of the most important functions of the commission, not only for its own benefit, but for the benefit of the whole community. The fire protection work of the commission is not limited to areas under its control. It is responsible for fire protection in our immense Crown lands, including national parks. With the Country Fire Authority, the commission plays a major part in protecting enormous areas of the State. I pay tribute to the commission for its fire protection and fire control work.

The commission has a large road network which is used not only for fire work but also for other kinds of emergencies. During the severe winter this year, when parties of people were lost in the mountains, the Forests Commission played a major part in the searches because of its roads and other facilities. In the summer, the commission has a helicopter available for fire prevention and control in its own areas. I have had a close association with officers of the commission over many years. I know that they deserve the appreciation of the community for their outlook and dedication to fire prevention and control. They have made a great contribution to the protection of the assets of our State.

The development of our native forests may be termed good husbandry. As areas are milled out, they are rehabilitated and, in the case of mountain ash types of timber, resown to ensure a continuous growth of hardwood timber for use in the future. Again, the dedication of the officers concerned is to be admired. Most of this work is done in far distant places. Many men and their families must live in remote areas to carry out their duties which they perform in all types of weather and under all sorts of conditions in order to preserve our hardwood forests. They are also engaged on other work such as the building and maintenance of extraction roads, setting up camps and so on. They must ensure that this work is performed efficiently so that reasonable conditions for the work force may be provided.

Large areas of softwood have been developed throughout Victoria. Mr. Kent has mentioned the involvement of the Australian Paper Mills Ltd. with the Forests Commission in Gippsland. But it is probable that the biggest areas of softwood have been planted in the north-east of Victoria. Great developments are taking place in the area represented by Mr. Bradbury and myself. The Koetong settlement and forest are already important and will extend over many years to come. They provide work in the district and, when the forests reach maturity, industry will develop in the area.

This brings me to the developments which have taken place in my home town, Myrtleford. All the sawmills engaged in the harvesting of pine forests in the Ovens area have now been taken over by Australian Forest Industries, a company which undertakes sawmilling and the production of pulp for paper. To date, the mill has cost about $8 million or $9 million. It will be officially opened on Friday by the Premier, assisted by the Minister of Forests. It will be a big day in the development of the area. The opening of the mill will be the culmination of work which has gone on for many years to ensure the maximum use of the pine forests.

Over the years, there was a considerable amount of waste but the quantity has been reduced because what would have previously been waste is now used for paper pulp. A huge amount of pulp is sent to Melbourne each week for the manufacture of paper. It is likely that many people think that much of the paper is wasted, but people in all spheres of activity must put up with the paper war. When the mill began to operate, there was a big shortage of paper

pulp in Australia. However, the company has not only fulfilled its own obligations but has helped out other firms in the production of paper.

I hope that, in future years, the Government will continue to give high priority to the work of the Forests Commission which is basic to the development of the State. The work of the commission provides much employment in country areas and is a major contributor to decentralization.

I pay tribute to the chairman and members of the commission and its officers throughout the State for their dedication to a job which I believe they find interesting. Many good men in the commission have carried out a lot of research and continued to develop our forests, but there are always problems. Some new insect, virus, or something of the like, always seems to be making its presence felt in Australia to the detriment of our forests. Recently, a new disease has been discovered and it must be combated by what might be called good hygiene of the machinery used in forest areas.

The officers of the commission have faced up to all these problems with dedication and they deserve tribute. I wish the Commission well and I trust that its work will always be given full support by the Government.

The motion was agreed to.

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

HEALTH (CONTRACEPTIVES) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from the previous day) on the motion of the Hon. V. O. Dickie (Minister of Housing) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province): We have come a long way from the furtive look at the writings of Havelock Ellis, conveniently and conservatively illustrated. Thank goodness for that. There is a distinct element of sheer hypocrisy in the Victorian concepts of sex and its presentation, and participation in sexual activities. But when one reads of sex during the reign of Her Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria, one finds that sexual depravity was indulged in to a frightening degree. This included the white slaving of children as young as six or seven years of age.

Although it would not be difficult to produce a belly laugh or two in the Chamber on the subject of sex and contraceptives, condoms, French letters, or whatever one wants to call them, I do not intend to do so. It would be easy to quote from the weekly publication of *Truth*, which has about three or four pages of interesting material, and the so-called informative paper, the *Sunday Observer*, which might have more material of that type. The daily press often contains references to sex, sometimes broadminded and at other times narrowminded, depending on the writer. There are the weekly and monthly publications, *Playboy*, and so on. We must accept that sex was indulged in yesterday, and will be today and tomorrow for its plain delight, enjoyment and love, as well as procreation, which of course should contain all those factors. That could be an operative phrase in the contribution I make to the debate. I contend that we as a society should make every endeavour to establish conditions which contribute to a spontaneity which is essential to sexual togetherness. Without it, something is missing.

The proposed legislation reminds me somewhat of the wonderful song from the musical *My Fair Lady*, "With a little bit of luck, just a little bit".

The Hon. G. J. NICOL: And a lot of care.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: That always must be attended to, particularly if the gentleman concerned has consideration for the lady of his

choice. Slowly but surely we are climbing out of this conservatism, just a little bit. That is what classifies the Bill. It is "just a little bit". Overseas slot machines for the sale of contraceptives, not only condoms, are commonplace. Only today, I was speaking frankly to a few ladies on the subject of sanitary requirements. They can remember the time when they would make a quick visit to the chemist shop, or wherever these appliances were available, and make their request in a hushed whisper. A packet with no markings on it would be produced from under the counter, and off they would sprint into the night. How hypocritical!

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE: One could go a little further on the theme of *My Fair Lady* and say, "Get me to the church on time".

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: In response to that excellent interjection by my good friend, the Minister of Housing, one has to find out the street where she lives. I may be a little pedantic, but I do not believe my children have any sexual hang-ups. There have always been frank discussions on the subject in our home and the children have benefited from them. I find my children interesting people, and frankly, I am full of praise for their attitude to the opposite sex and that wonderful pastime, sex. It is a heart-rending experience to look with sympathy, understanding and love at the embarrassed gropings of young people for knowledge or understanding. It still exists in this modern day and age. We are not so progressive in what we are prepared to pass on to these children of a natural event in answer to their unsophisticated questions as they begin to understand what boys and girls are all about; that they are not simply sugar and spice and everything nice, and puppy dogs' tails and snails and so on.

Many people still believe that sex is an unclean habit, particularly as a subject for discussion, and that it should be indulged in only as a method of producing the world to come. I do not know whether that is the old Anglo-Saxon belief, but one often reads that a woman considers her function is to produce children with her husband, and if she is possessed of reasonable sagacity at times she finds her love and real enjoyment of sex anywhere except with her husband. That is shocking, because the ideal situation is perfect love between a man and woman who are joined in the bonds of holy matrimony. Many young people today regard that idea as *passé*. To use a colloquialism, young people believe in the test and try technique, or the shack-up before commitment.

Honorable members are aware that contraceptives in their various forms will be displayed and sold openly in the near future.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: They are already.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: Not as openly as we contend they should be. The sale of contraceptives should be virtually unrestricted except for the common decency required of all advertising, not only from the point of view of health, but also of phraseology. There are inbuilt requirements, not only in the advertising industry but also in Acts of Parliament which will ensure this result. The display of contraceptives in chemist shops only is rank hypocrisy. It is symptomatic of what I said before; it is just a little bit, but it is not far enough. It is a slow but sure emanation from conservatism. In my humble opinion, a man or a woman should have every right to control potency, whether it is a spur of the moment decision or deliberate intent. I leave it to the imagination of each honorable member whether he prefers spur of the moment or deliberate intent. Of course, it applies to the lady as well as the gentleman. It takes two to tango. If the man is truly considerate, which depends on his feelings of the moment, there may be a frantic chase for an all-night chemist, but too often passion takes over with sometimes unhappy results.

I refer to a matter which may provoke laughter, but which I do not consider amusing. This morning I was advised by my daughter, who is a teacher by profession, that the students in the high schools of the State never worry about condoms. The latest technique is infinitely cheaper and they can carry it in rolls. They use "Gladwrap". How hypocritical! Sanitary napkins can be bought in a supermarket, but according to this Government one must still indulge in a little bit of caution or conservatism in purchasing something that will prevent a baby growing inside the stomach of the female of the species when the lady seeks that protection but wants the enjoyment that sex brings, and more power to that enjoyment. I only wish I were young enough to make a practical application of my contention.

Recently I have been visiting the country on many occasions and I have been informed that a chemist is seldom open at night in country towns except in the big provincial areas. I invite the co-operation of members of the Country Party. They may not know much about sex, but the fact is that this measure in a minor but effective way will make second-class citizens of people living in the country. They may have to travel 100 miles or so to find a chemist who will sell them a condom or contraceptive, by which time in 99 cases out of 100 the urge will have disappeared. Members of the Country Party should realize that they have a duty to young or not-so-young lovers, the same as we have to society in general. There is less embarrassment in being charged 27 cents or 57 cents as part of one's general purchases by a girl at a check-out counter of a store than entering a chemist shop and having a beautiful young chemist's assistant asking what one wants. A bashful young man might find it absolutely impossible to ask her for a packet of French letters. It is ridiculous. Frankly, it revolts me to contemplate that this matter is being hidden in a cloak of conservatism or caution. The Government is doing just enough to satisfy the undertakings which I understand were made by the Premier to the Women's Electoral Lobby. I do not know whether the Leader of the House was with him at the time. It is highly possible, because the honorable gentleman has a way with women. This will not prevent extra-marital or pre-marital coitus. In my opinion the Bill is full of unctuous self-righteousness. It is simply a sweeping under the carpet. It goes a little way along the path but it appears almost reluctantly virginal in its over-all concept.

In keeping with the principles which I have endeavoured to espouse on the measure, I foreshadow that I will be moving one or two amendments in the Committee stage. However, although members of the Labor Party will not oppose the Bill, because it goes a little bit, as the song says, we invite honorable members to climb from beneath their cover of conservatism and do something for the lovers, young and old, in Victoria.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): The Bill is the result of representations by various organizations over the years and an undertaking that I understand was given by the Government to introduce certain legislation. In my opinion the Bill is somewhat unspectacular. Some organizations say it goes too far, and others consider it does not go far enough. Perhaps it is a case of too little too late.

The Bill does two main things. Firstly, it eases the control over the sale of contraceptives by allowing the display of such items in an area within a chemist shop which is not readily visible to people in public places, in doctors, surgeries and also in family planning clinics. Secondly, it permits certain advertising such as in newspapers and magazines subject to the permission of the Chief Health Officer. Formerly, there was a total restriction on such advertising under the Summary Offences Act.

I approached the task of leading the debate for my party with diffidence and reluctance. It was only at the last moment that I was asked to handle the Bill. Nevertheless, over the past few months discussions have been held with various people and organizations. It illustrates the changing times that one can discuss these matters with people such as representatives of the Women's Electoral Lobby quite frankly and without embarrassment. This could probably not have been done ten years ago.

It is also worth noting that today certain publications which ten years ago would have been sensational today languish on the shelves of newsagents unable to find a purchaser and unable to raise an eyebrow, as it were.

The Country Party adopts a common-sense attitude to the Bill. Its members feel that they are not being too radical or too conservative. The Bill represents a first step which has my party's support. If the legislation is found not to have gone far enough the Government will propose an amending Bill which members of the Country Party will be prepared to consider.

The matter is serious and members of my party are treating it seriously. It is readily conceded that there is a need for contraception for probably three main reasons. Firstly, it reduces the incidence of venereal disease and the honorable members who have been in the armed forces will have seen the ravages of syphilis which is a very serious disease and usually the innocent party is most hurt by it. Secondly, there is a need for family planning. Discussions on measures in recent weeks have indicated the concern of honorable members in regard to food production throughout the world. There are too many people needing food and, accordingly, there is a need for birth control. Thirdly, there is the need to restrict unwanted pregnancies. It will be evident to all honorable members that in certain instances pregnancy is most undesirable. Therefore, the restriction on the display and advertising of contraceptives may appear to be unreasonable, and I trust that the operation of the Bill will be closely scrutinized.

Various methods exist for preventing pregnancy and these are available from permitted outlets. I shall not detail the available methods except that I recall what a family doctor in my own area when asked about the best method he was quick to reply "don't".

Proposed section 270L (3) refers to vending machines and it is implied that such machines will be permitted in the places mentioned. I place on record that the Country Party has no argument against vending machines. It even agrees that there could be a case for their use in certain places outside those which are laid down in the Bill. I shall reserve any further comments until the appropriate clause is being considered in Committee. The Country Party supports the measure.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER (Monash Province): I congratulate the Government on bringing in a measure which will assist in solving a serious social problem. I will not go through reasons for the necessity of contraception because they have been touched on by Mr. Wright and they are self-evident. Anything that can be done to safeguard the health of the community and to keep at an irreducible minimum unwanted births is a desirable and proper role for the Government to be involved in.

A Bill such as this must go hand in hand with appropriate sex education. I understand that a programme in that field is under way.

I should like to make a few brief comments on what Mr. Elliot has said. I think inadvertently he said that the only places in which contraceptives could be advertised or publicized for sale was in chemist shops.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: No, I did not.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER: I emphasize that wide powers exist within a family planning clinic for contraceptives to be fully displayed, explained and publicized. With regard to chemist shops, there is the prohibition against publicity being seen from the street.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: I believe that they should be displayed and advertised along ethical lines.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER: Mr. Elliot is misunderstanding me. I understood the view that he expressed but I am merely explaining that the Bill does not relate merely to the display of contraceptives in chemist shops, that they can be displayed in family planning clinics and that it is part of the Government's intention, in conjunction with a sex education programme, to ensure a wider knowledge of the use of contraceptives through family planning clinics.

I also point out that proposed section 270L (3) provides that the Governor in Council may approve the sale and display of contraceptives in other places. I emphasize "in other places" because this will be within the discretion of the Government and will enable the Government to proceed in line with community demands and community standards to liberalize, if it is necessary, the availability of contraceptives. At this stage, it is not possible to specify with complete detail where contraceptives ought to be sold. This must be examined carefully having regard to various people's sensibilities and sensitivities and, as the community accepts the position, the availability of contraceptives can be expanded. The inclusion of the phrase "in other places" will enable that to be done.

While some people may suggest that it would be desirable for the Government to legislate today for the sale of contraceptives from vending machines, this is something which the Government should examine after it has had some experience of community views and community acceptance of the liberalization of the availability of contraceptives as contained in the Bill. I was pleased to hear Mr. Wright indicate that the Country Party does not necessarily oppose the use of vending machines for this purpose in future. They can indeed be used under this measure.

My only other comment relates to the necessity for approval by the Chief Health Officer of any proposed advertisement for contraceptives. Whilst it is desirable that some control should be exercised over the form of advertising, I suggest, for the consideration of the Chief Health Officer and the Minister of Health, that the ultimate standard which should be applied should relate to the laws of obscenity. Currently, Victoria has reasonably good laws which are enforced and prosecutions are undertaken if any magazine or newspaper transgresses the laws of obscenity. The same standards should be appropriate in the advertising of contraceptives.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: What happens if it is not a contraceptive and the advertisers claim that it is?

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER: That is a different question. I do not disagree with the need to register contraceptives and for the Chief Health Officer to look at the proposed advertisements or statements. I am suggesting that the standards he must apply are not those of the nineteenth century but those relating to the laws of obsenity in the middle of the twentieth century. Undoubtedly, the Chief Health Officer will apply his powers under this section with some awareness of community standards. I trust that he will be well informed on the use of contraceptives.

I join with other honorable members in congratulating the Government on introducing the measure, which is a worth-while step forward. Ample power is provided in the Bill for the Government to exercise judgment in line with community attitudes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Division into Parts).

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): I do not purport to be an expert in these matters but I make my position quite clear that, as Government Leader in this place, my role is to put the Government's point of view. When I cease to do that, I should not hold the position. The Minister of Housing is a former Minister of Health and is perhaps more expert in these matters. He will be back later in the day and I should like him to have the opportunity of considering some of the matters that have been raised. Accordingly, I suggest that progress be reported.

Progress was reported.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SHIRE OF BACCHUS MARSH) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): I have examined this Bill and am of the opinion that it is a private Bill.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): In another place this Bill was ruled to be a private Bill, but was treated as a public Bill. I propose that a similar procedure be adopted in this House. Therefore, I move—

That this Bill be dealt with as a public Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

On the motion of the Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government), the Bill was read a first time.

The sitting was suspended at 1 *p.m. until* 2.4 *p.m.*

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a small Bill designed to put beyond any doubt what has been argued as being a technical error in the manner in which a transaction to the benefit of local government in Bacchus Marsh within the spirit of the Act was conducted. Certain land known as the old Lifeguard factory in Bacchus Marsh came on to the market. The Bacchus Marsh Dairymen's Co-operative Association Ltd. desired to acquire part of that land. The shire council also desired to buy part of the land for the purpose of creating a car park. Each agreed upon the price it was prepared to pay for the respective portions and together these sums totalled the amount the vendor was prepared to accept.

The proportion of the land which the shire desired to obtain for the use of the municipality was required for municipal purposes and there was no problem about the purchase. The members of the council believed the simplest way to carry out the transaction was for the shire to acquire the whole of the land, to subdivide it and sell back the unwanted part to the Bacchus Marsh Dairymen's Co-operative Association Ltd. In the meantime that association advanced its proportion of the price so that the shire could complete the purchase.

Arguments arose because some people were afraid the shire may not have proceeded correctly. No criticism ought to be directed at any shire officer. In an endeavour to complete what seemed to be a simple transaction, the shire employed no lawyers and what was alleged to be a technical error arose. I frankly had doubts as to whether there really was an error. I was personally inclined to think that the transaction was not only within the spirit but within the letter of the law.

However, advice has been received from a Queen's Counsel that a technical breach of the Act has taken place by the council's buying land which it did not require and selling it back, even though at the same price to the dairymen's association. In those circumstances the council contacted the Minister of Housing, and I gave assurances to the shire that its position would be put beyond all doubt. That is what this Bill seeks

to do. All honorable members will agree it is most undesirable that any lingering doubts about the validity of the transaction should remain. I therefore commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province): I agree with the Minister that there should not be lingering doubts about the action of the shire. I am sure that officers of the shire never at any stage proceeded to the acquisition of that land for any purpose other than an honest intention to do a job which was in the shire's interests. At the same time I believe that perhaps the officers should have been a little more careful in their understanding of the Local Government Act because, quite frankly, as a councillor sitting on a council, I would have immediately furrowed my brow at the intention of the council to take the action that it did. Nevertheless, the Minister's action in introducing this Bill to clarify and validate the action is an appropriate one in the circumstances and the Labor Party certainly does not want to obstruct the course of the Bill in any way. We hope its passage is speedy, and that perhaps a minor lesson is learnt.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): The Country Party offers no objection to the speedy passage of this Bill. The indications are that the Government and the Bacchus Marsh shire have acted with complete propriety in this matter. Apparently there has been some doubt as to whether some error has crept in. This Bill validates the council's purchase. Therefore the Country Party offers no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

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

MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 3) 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 will amend the Melbourne University Act 1958. The changes which the Bill proposes come from the university itself and I understand have the approval also of the Standing Committee of Convocation representing the graduates. With an area of unanimity from that body and the support of the Government, the Opposition would be cautious about challenging the changes that are desired through the implementation of this Bill as an amendment to the Act. The Opposition will in no way oppose the Bill. However, it wishes to make a few points.

The Bill proposes to change the composition of the university council but not to change the number of members of the council. Representation from a couple of bodies is now considered to be redundant and those places will be taken by, for example, representatives from the non-academic staff. That would seem to be a sensible and desirable move and is one which the Opposition applauds. The Bill provides for the appointment of a second Deputy Vice-Chancellor whose special area will be research. The existing legislation will enable this to be done. Some of the amendments in the Bill concern arrangements to bring the various bodies of the University of Melbourne into line with those of other Victorian universities which were established more recently. As with these newer universities, uniformity is introduced under section 32A allowing the university to invest its moneys in any form of investment. This power is given not only to universities, but also to bodies like the zoo, and Government-appointed instrumentalities, and so on. There is no objection to that.

The Bill changes the word "convocation" to "graduates". Apparently there was a lack of

understanding of the meaning of the word. I checked in the dictionary to make sure I understood it. It means graduates, and the council proposes to change the word. There will be consequential amendments as a result of that change in the Act. It would be a wonderful example to follow if new legislation introduced into this House provided for the replacement of some of the present terminology with words which could be understood by people other than lawyers.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): Having served on the La Trobe University Council for some six years, I am well aware of the care and attention that a university council gives to the Act which incorporates the university and governs the council. I am quite certain that at the Melbourne university the present Bill has been the subject of discussion for a long period. It appears that there are no objections to the many amendments that are now being made, although these amendments stem from only a comparatively few changes. The first one is the changing of the expression "standing committee of convocation" in section 3 of the Act to the "graduate committee". It has always been desirable that students who have passed through university should take a continuing interest in that institution. I regret that in secondary education, too often students who have spent five or six years at a high school, leave that school and take no further interest in it. In this amending measure there is provision for graduates to take a continuing interest in the welfare of the Melbourne university.

I regret that the three existing universities—the same situation will apply to the fourth one, Deakin University—have their own Acts of Parliament to regulate and govern their affairs and that these Acts are amended piecemeal in a sort of leap-frog manner. One university has a bright idea which requires amending legislation and a Bill is brought into Parliament and is passed. Parliament must then do the same thing in a different way for the other universities.

Melbourne university, which is perhaps the most conservative of the bodies, has been in existence since 1853, when La Trobe was the Governor of the State; it is taking a big step forward. I would not say it is coming into the twentieth century—it has been there for a long time—but some of its terminology is being brought up to 1974.

There is no objection on the part of the Country Party to any of the proposals in the Bill. I am always interested in the last clause of a Bill. When I was first elected to this House, my Leader said that one should always look at the last clause in a Bill because the sting is often in the tail, and in the last clause something will probably be repealed. When one examines the principal Act, it will often be found that some provision is being repealed which the Government did not want to advertise to the public. Clause 18 of the Bill states—

> In section 43 the expression "But the council may if it thinks fit exclude females from attendance at any lectures, but not from any examination in the University" is repealed.

It is indeed time that this provision was repealed. I do not know when females were last excluded from the lectures at the University of Melbourne.

I have taken a particularly keen interest in the University of Melbourne because my daughter has been a student there for the past four years. In fact, she finished her course yesterday. I have had a fair amount to do with the machinery of the Melbourne university. I find that the examination system has been brought up to date to a surprising degree. There have been complaints that the future of a student is governed by a final examination which occupies a few periods of three hours at the end of

a long period of study. At the Melbourne university it is the practice to assess students during the year and not to count the final examination as the sole and only test. That has been an enormous improvement. It has added to the quality of education at Melbourne university and has been an extremely good innovation. I have suggested that, as one of the solutions to the problems associated with the higher school certificate, there could be a teacher assessment of students during the year. The higher school certificate examination at the end of the year would not then be the enormous hurdle that it is to some who are nervous examinees or who may attend an examination not feeling as fit as they normally do.

A number of difficulties have been encountered at the Melbourne university regarding the site and the size, the provision for graduate studies and the expansion of courses. I propose to refer briefly to the medical course. I have just accompanied a deputation to the Minister of Health concerning lack of country doctors, with particular reference to the situation at Pyramid Hill. It has been found that there are not enough medical men for the State's needs and the universities are not producing enough professional men. This Bill, unfortunately, will not help that situation, but I feel that I cannot deal with the Melbourne university without drawing attention to the quotas that are being imposed, not through the fault of this Government, but because the Canberra Government controls the Treasury and the finances of this State. Be that as it may, more professional graduates are needed urgently in Victoria, particularly in the fields of medicine and dentistry. I do not think the Government recognizes the urgency of this matter, and I hope the position will be corrected as soon as possible.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Eastern Province): I do not propose to go over the aspects of the Bill as enumerated by the Minister, Mr. Trayling or Mr. Clarke. With one exception, I support all the proposals in the Bill. Unlike Mr. Clarke or Mr. Swinburne, I do not consider that the sting is in clause 18, but in clause 16, to which Mr. Trayling referred.

I believe the responsibility of investment of money is most important, and I wonder whether it is correct for the council to give a committee or group which is investing money *carte blanche* powers to invest in any form of investment. I suppose one assumes that they do exercise a certain amount of discretion, but I have always believed in looking not only at the financial returns but at the moral nature of the investment. According to most financiers, this is a strange way to look at it. I shall quote one example which may point to my objection. If the medical faculty decided in the interests of health that it was better that the university should not invest in tobacco, in its manufacture or anything to do with the merchandizing of tobacco or cigarettes, would that not be a justifiable requirement to pass on to the committee?

I do not intend to oppose the Bill. I support it. It will bring the Melbourne University Act up to date in many respects, but I voice my concern that it is proper for a body, such as a university, to set both moral and ethical standards in the view of the community when it possesses such a wide power of investment. Many people in the Chamber could think of a more disreputable type of investment than the one which I have just suggested.

The motion was agreed to.

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

POUNDS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was returned from the Assembly with a message relating to an amendment.

It was ordered that the message be taken into consideration later this day.

HEALTH (CONTRACEPTIVES) BILL.

The House went into Committee for the further consideration of this Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 were agreed to.

Clause 4 (Amendment of No. 6270. New Division 3B of Part XIV.).

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing): The discussion which occurred during the second-reading debate on the Bill indicated that there was agreement from all corners of the Chamber on what was being done, but obviously Mr. Elliot, speaking on behalf of his party, believed it was necessary to move amendments relating to the advertising, sale and disposal of contraceptives because the Government had not gone far enough.

Although it has been highlighted in the debate that there is a degree of acceptance of the suggestions of the Labor Party, and that one must face up to the new approach to contraception, when for the first time such a big step forward is taken in regard to the availability of contraceptives, people tend to think that the only form of contraception being considered is the condom. There are a number of other forms of contraception of which I have been aware since I was Minister of Health. These include the pill, various contraceptive creams, and a device known as the loop which is inserted in the female body. Many forms of contraception are available. The argument has highlighted the condom, its availability, where it should be sold and whether it should be confined to chemist shops, medical centres, doctors' surgeries, family planning centres and so on or whether it should be readily available in gentlemen's toilets, on railway stations or in the foyers of theatres. This Bill is a big step forward, and it would not be wise to include all those provisions in the first step.

Previously there has been no provision for the advertising of contraceptives. It has been said that this is part of the field of sex, and one has only to look at the Sunday papers and magazines to see the types of things that are displayed publicly before people of all ages. One must consider when the advertising of contraceptives is begun whether it is wise to throw the field wide open or whether to take it progressively to test public reaction, and take the second step later.

The amendments which have been circulated to be proposed by Mr. Elliot in Committee show that the Bill must either be accepted as it is or amended to provide the very things that Mr. Elliot has argued for. In its wisdom, the Government has decided that in the initial stage of this controversial area, this is as far as it should go. The measure will be examined because it is breaking new ground and if further steps are warranted later on they can be taken. Mr. Elliot's proposed amendments are the opposite in intention from the provisions of the Bill.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province): I certainly do not agree with the Minister's statement that the amendments are directly opposite to the intentions of the Bill. They go considerably further, but they are not the opposite.

Most of the thoughts of honorable members have been canvassed during the second-reading debate. I shall propose several amendments to clause 4, but if the first amendment is defeated, it would be senseless to pursue the second. Similarly, if the first amendment to new section 270M of the principal Act is defeated, the Opposition does not propose to proceed with the other amendments. I move—

Clause 4, page 10, lines 8 and 9, omit the words and expressions on these lines.

I do not propose to discuss the amendment, because it is self-explanatory.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing): For the reasons I have already outlined, the Government is not prepared to accept the amendment. I accept Mr. Elliot's admonishment that my choice of the word "opposite" was not correct; it is really an extension of what the Government intends to do. The Government does not believe it is wise to go beyond the provisions of the Bill, and for those reasons rejects the amendment.

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province): As I said during the debate on the second reading of the Bill, the measure is a big step. The Country Party is mid-way between conservative and radical. Mr. Elliot said earlier that he would speak seriously about the Bill and that there would be no humour in the discussion. He failed dismally in that respect and provoked quite an amount of laughter. However, Mr. Elliot failed to convince the Country Party to support the amendments, and it will not accept them.

The Committee divided on the question that the words and expressions proposed by Mr. Elliot to be omitted stand part of the clause (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	..	23
Noes	..	7
Majority against the amendment	..	16

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Granter	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Grimwade	Mr. Knight

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province): I shall not proceed with my second amendment. I move—

Clause 4, page 11, lines 17-45, and page 12, lines 1-17, omit the words and expressions on these lines.

One provision in the Bill permits a chemist or a seller of contraceptives, wherever they will be sold, to sell a contraceptive three months after it ceases to be a registered contraceptive. The Minister may be able to give the Committee a good reason for this. A contraceptive would be deregistered if the company concerned went out of business or if it was a poor contraceptive or did not conform in some way to the provisions of the Health Act. I should think that if a contraceptive was deregistered the sooner it was off the market the better. I should like the Minister to comment on that point.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing): For the identical reasons that I expounded for the Government's rejection of Mr. Elliot's first amendment, the Government likewise rejects this amendment.

Mr. Elliot raised the question that the sale of a particular type of contraceptive can be continued for three months after its deregistration. If I recall correctly, the Pharmacy Act applies to therapeutic substances. Although the condom is not, the pill, creams and so forth are therapeutic substances. There may be a good reason why a particular contraceptive is deregistered. If it had an adverse effect on the community, its sale would cease immediately on deregistration. If it were deregistered only because the firm that made it went out of business, or something like that, provision is made in regard to therapeutic medicines that a period may elapse to permit a chemist or any other distribution agency to unload stocks of that substance.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: You are suggesting that immediate withdrawal is possible.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE: Quite so.

The Committee divided on the question that the words and expressions proposed by Mr. Elliot to be omitted stand part of the clause (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	..	23
Noes	..	7
Majority against the amendment	..	16

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Granter	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Grimwade	Mr. Knight

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.

POUNDS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The message from the Assembly relating to the amendment in this Bill was taken into consideration.

Assembly's amendment—

Insert the following new clause 5:—

'A. In section 16 of the Principal Act after the word "nearest" there shall be inserted the words "or most conveniently".'

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

That the amendment be agreed to.

The amendment made by the Assembly added a new clause which, in turn, will add three words to section 16 of the principal Act. The principal Act provides for impounding in the nearest accessible pound. The amendment was moved by a perspicacious back-bencher in another place whose electorate is divided by a mountain range. The nearest pound is around a mountain only a couple of miles away but it is accessible only by a route which takes one a distance of about 100 miles. The honorable member concerned sensibly suggested that the phrase should be "nearest or most conveniently accessible pound". The amendment is clearly an improvement on the principal Act.

The motion was agreed to.

RAILWAY WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

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

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): It is the obligation of the Government to ensure that the report of the Railways Board is tabled in this House in sufficient time so that it can be examined by the Opposition to ascertain what the board has done concerning certain aspects of the railways operations. Year by year the Opposition has had to make the same complaint. I received a copy of the report at 6 p.m. yesterday and I was then asked to be prepared to debate the Railway Works and Services Bill as the third item on the Notice Paper for today.

The Railway Works and Services Bill makes provision for expenditure of $48·185 million which is a magnanimous amount when compared with what the Victorian Railways has received in years gone by. It is a considerable amount as a Victorian contribution until one takes into account the promise of the Australian Government to make moneys available to assist the development of urban transport, and to try to build up railway rolling-stock. There may also be other aspects

which should be queried on what the Railways Board has done. I know that the Minister of Transport received a copy of the report only last week and for what is written in it—I do not want to disclaim it in any way—I suggest that the detail made available in the report should not have taken practically five months to prepare. I cannot understand it.

This is the first year of the operations of the Railways Board. In the many years in which I have handled the Railway Works and Services Bill, or the Railway Loan Application Bill, as it was previously referred to, I have pointed out how hamstrung the Railways Commissioners were to provide proper funds for depreciation, to provide for extension of railway facilities, to operate on a competitive basis with road transport and to have some opportunity of at least functioning as a viable organization.

The same thing has happened this year. The report of the Railways Board was issued yesterday, but the only feature that the press picked up associated with that report was that there was an all-time record deficit. The deficit has increased from $26,484,888 in 1971-72 to $56,422,640 in 1972-73, and it totalled $86,086,361 for 1973-74. The way that amount is featured in the press this morning gives the impression that fixed rail transport is a run-down organization, out of date and needs a lot of attention.

In the debate on a previous Railway Works and Services Bill, I took the trouble to show that a proper analysis of the figures revealed that the railways nearly broke even on their operating expenses. I do not propose to do that exercise again this year. However, it is well known that the cost of the subsidies carried by the railways on behalf of the Government increases the loss. I do not intend to criticize this Government for the position as every Government which has been in office must share the blame.

If honorable members examine the Railways Act they will find that section 83 gives the commissioners the right to charge only such fares and freights as are fixed by the Governor in Council. Therefore if the Government wants to give an advantage to any industry it adds to the amount of the deficit. For instance, the Government has put a load on the railways through its assistance to decentralized industries which I suggest is costing more than $20 million a year. However, that aspect is not featured in the report of the Railways Board.

The Railways Board only has the same rights as the Railways Commissioners under section 83 of the Railways Act to fix charges and rates, such as contract special rates. That provision was introduced some years ago, in the early days of road competition, to give the railways an opportunity to compete, but the fixing of contract rates was a procedure which in a number of instances added further to the losses. I informed the House some years ago of the stupidity of contract rates which were fixed on the basis that the railways would sign contracts for the cheapest rates of carriage that were available at the time. I instanced what had occurred when I was on duty at South Brunswick station one night. A woman brought in a parcel weighing 5 lb. for despatch to Coburg. The freight on the parcel was eight pence, which is roughly equivalent to 8 cents. The next customer was a local manufacturer who had a contract to send bicycles freighted in cardboard cartons to Warrnambool. The freight rate on that article was one shilling or the equivalent of 10 cents. It took me half an hour to explain to the woman why there should be so little difference in the freight charges on the two consignments. I emphasized that it was not my fault, and that it was not the fault of the railways.

All these things have been discussed in the past. However, the Government has placed emphasis on

the fact that the report of the Bland Board of Inquiry into the Victorian Land Transport System is being followed, and I shall refer to the recommendations concerning the Victorian Railways. Before I discuss the report of the Railways Board, I refer to the claim of the Government that it implemented the relevant sections of the Bland report. I contend that it has carried out only those sections which suit itself; it has still not provided the opportunity for the railways to compete as a viable competitor with road transport. In his report Sir Henry Bland recommended that the—

Railways should be given a charter defining the role they are to perform.

I shall skip that recommendation because I believe the Railways Board should have the opportunity to go over its economics following the methods it has instituted. I shall leave that matter to be debated at some later stage which I hope will not be too long. Sir Henry Bland also recommended—

Railways should function primarily as a commercial undertaking.

Sir Henry Bland pointed out—

The present railways administration should be converted to an appropriate type of corporate structure headed by a mixed governing board, comprising men from business and high executives from the railway service, including a chief executive, under a part-time outside chairman.

That is what Victoria now has. I do not decry that because maybe the Railways Board can function satisfactorily. Sir Henry Bland also made the point—

Railways should be given responsibility for :

(*a*) determining fares and freight rates;

(*b*) determining services which should be provided, curtailed or terminated, with flexible response to demand.

That aspect has not been considered, but to do so would require an alteration to section 83 of the Railways Act, and that argument has been submitted to the Government time and again. The attitude of the Government is to utilize the railways as a form of Government social service. Sir Henry Bland also recommended—

Railways should have access to capital funds for development of services, facilities and equipment.

When honorable members refer to the balance-sheet contained on page 19 of the report of the Railways Board it will be noted that the depreciation account provided for by cash appropriations to 30th June, 1973, totalled $112,338,731. The normal depreciation allowed for this year is $8,915,952 less an amount which has been provided by the Government on a regular basis since 1937 when the amount was 100,000 pounds; it is now $200,000, plus an additional appropriation of $31,741 associated with some special item. There is now a total amount of $121 million depreciation which has been debited to revenue. This will increase each year. The next recommendation of Sir Henry Bland was—

An investigating authority should be set up (independent from the Ministry of Transport, railways and Transport Regulation Board) to consider all necessary data, consult local interests and make recommendations to the Government in respect of railway proposals for withdrawal of services or closing of lines and stations.

The report further recommended—

Railways should be recouped the cost of imposed Government decisions to the extent that these conflict with the railways' commercial objectives.

The report of the Railways Board on page 18 reveals that the total sum provided by way of loans from the Treasury is of the order of $403,352,448. The account showed that an amount has been appropriated from revenue to meet losses as at 30th June, 1937—it totalled $38,949,674. That was the amount suggested to be written off when the Elliot report was submitted. Accumulated losses have been written off or are due to be written off by debiting them to the Treasury —one does not write off losses, as funds must be provided somehow to meet them, but the total amount that has been debited to the Treasury at present is $363,235,619.

That is the tragic history of the Victorian Railways. I sincerely hope it will be examined by the Government with a view to giving the Railways Board the opportunity at least to operate the railways as a viable commercial project. I sincerely believe fixed rail transport has a big future in solving the problems, not only of metropolitan transport, but also of decentralization throughout the State. It is one of the major tools the Government can use.

At page 127 of the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30th June, 1974, there is a statement of railway receipts and expenditure; it is a summary of the amounts shown at page 8 of the report of the Railways Board, which reveals a railway deficit of $86,086,361. The ordinary income is shown as $112,257,554, and the recoup for fare concessions granted by the railways—it is the only recoup that the railways receive, with the exception of a recoup under the Kerang-Koondrook Tramway Act—totals $1,915,827. The recoup under the Kerang-Koondrook Tramway Act totals $38,585. I invite honorable members to consider those amounts and how they are made up. I said before that approximately $20 million represented advantages to decentralized industry. That is what it costs the railways to finance the beneficence of the decentralization policies of the Government without any recoupment.

I do not disagree with that, but if these things are to be continued, the railways should be recouped for services which they render. Normal freight concessions inspired at Government level would amount to $18 million or $19 million. Passenger service concessions, over and above those shown in the balance sheet, would be of the order of $15 million to $18 million.

The railways have had to meet the increased wages costs which have applied to all industry. The supporters of the Liberal Party have been just as adamant to obtain better wages and prices for the goods and services as the supporters of the Labor Party have been. The railways have to meet wages of $33 million extra. The supplementary grant will be $7·6 million in a full year. But the sum of all these subsidies should be considered in relation to the report of the board and the $86 million deficit of the railways. When all these things are taken into consideration, it is apparent that the railways go close to meeting their operating costs.

The new Railways Board is doing something about this. I have used previous reports of the Railways Commissioners to attack the operation of the railways year by year, and I am particularly interested in this report of the Railways Board. The board directs the attention of the Government to the Bland report. The railways have the task of providing subsidies for both passengers and freight, which the Government has decided upon. In its report, the Railways Board says that it should comply with the wishes of the Government but that it should be—

> recompensed by the Government for any loss of income, and/or increase of expenditure thereby entailed.

The board recapitulates what Messrs. Brown, Brownbill and Rogan have said and indeed, what I have said from time to time. In relation to subsidies, the board states—

> This objective presupposes that the railways will be operating in a competitive environment in which road operators are required to make a realistic contribution towards the cost of roads and to other State-provided facilities.

That is a fair statement. The railways should attempt to stand on their own feet and so should other transport operators. At page 3 of the report, the board makes a further comment on the question of its financing as a socially orientated service—

> All these objections can be overcome by replacing deficit financing with a system of special subsidies, by way of direct payments into railway revenue, calculated and paid at the beginning of each year as part of the year's budget and designed to cover the net cost to the board.

The Board recommends that new accounting methods be introduced. I hope that they are and that they will present a better picture than that presented over the past 100 years. The accounting procedure for the railways has been set down by the Treasury in order to present the picture of the railways which the Treasury wants to present. The board states—

> When this new accounting and costing system is in operation and subsidies can be made specific instead of being buried in a amorphous "deficit", the way will be cleared for a more critical review of the basic justification for continuation of many of the subsidized operations.

At page 3 the board makes the comment, which I have just made—

> The accounting system, for many years uniform throughout the Australian and New Zealand Railways, is designed essentially to meet Treasury requirements, and does not supply management with the information necessary to calculate subsidies, access costs, or effectively control expenditure through the delegation of responsibility.

How many times have members of the Country Party and members of the Labor Party, including myself, asked how a certain line can be said to be non-paying when so many tons of produce originate in that area? But the Treasury can regard a line as non-paying by debiting it with part of the cost of all the lines over which the goods run before they reach their destination. Operations of this sort must be investigated in a new way.

The board points out that there are many out-of-date railway vehicles. We still have about 600 wooden carriages in operation, the oldest of which were built in 1891. About 117 have already been broken up to provide material to repair those which are still running. I have directed the attention of the Government to this on many occasions. The board points out that present conditions operate to the benefit of road transport operators, despite the recommendations of the Bland report. It states—

> The board also faces serious problems in its endeavours to compete with road operators. In this area the year saw a significant change in transport regulation policy when the Government, acting upon the recommendations of the Bland report, introduced the Land Transport Act 1973. Unfortunately, while implementing Sir Henry Bland's recommendation for introduction of new "as of right" licences within an 80 km radius of Melbourne and Portland the Government did not see fit to adopt in their entirety the recommendations contained in the report concerning licence fees and road user charges, with the result that in many instances the way has been opened for stronger competition from road operators.

How many times did Mr. Brown, formerly chairman of the Railways Commissioners, direct attention to that? His comments were completely ignored because it suited the Government, and the railways had to put up with the effect. The board also directs attention to the seriousness of "border hopping" under the protection of section 92 of the Constitution. I have directed attention to this problem on many occasions but nothing has been done.

At page 5 of its report, the board directs attention to improvements on the Glen Waverley line. It comments on the importance of fixed rail transport as well as the role of containers in the transport of freight. The Labor Party directed attention to these matters last year, the year before, and the year before that. I do not object to the board directing attention to them, but it has not discovered something new.

The board refers to the financial problems imposed on it as a result of continued monetary inflation and the decreasing value of the money allocated to it. How many times has the Labor Party directed attention to this point?

In their latest report, the Railways Commissioners showed that since 1955 the value of the money provided for the railways had decreased by half. In 1955, the railways were allocated $16·5 million. This year, there will be a comparable allocation, plus a special allocation to make a total of $21 million. But that will not be worth as much as the money allo-

cated to the railways in 1955 was worth. The board again directs attention to this point.

Time after time in its report, the board repeats points made in the reports of the commissioners over the years, of which the Government took no notice despite attention being directed to them by the Opposition when railway works and services Bills were debated.

At page 7 the report deals with the works and services programme. I direct attention to different figures relating to this section of the report. Last year, a sum in the vicinity of $32 million was spent. It is expected that this year the sum will be $38 million. Those figures come from page 139 of the Estimates of Receipts and Payments of the Consolidated Fund, for the year ending 30th June, 1975. However, the report of the board shows that expenditure on works and services during the year amounted to $21,537,218. It states that it is expected that a total of $5,092,997 will be reimbursed by the Commonwealth. That sum was provided from the public fund and it must be repaid when the Commonwealth money is available. Then comes the real crux of the board's report. It states—

> The board was extremely disturbed to note that virtually no additional State loan funds were made available, compared with the previous year, to match the Commonwealth grants for urban works. If this policy is continued, an accelerating urban programme will have to be financed by diverting resources from non-urban rail works. The effects of such a policy on the board's endeavours to provide the facilities to handle the growth in non-urban traffic—statewide and interstate—would be serious in the extreme.

That means that the board will have to take away from country and interstate works money which was set aside for them so that it can provide money to match grants from the Commonwealth for the development of urban transport. If the board does not take advantage of these funds, there will be many difficulties in finding the sum of $48·185 million which has been approved for expenditure.

There is a total of $19·325 million in the urban development project. This year the railways expect to receive under two grants from the Government approximately $19 million. If the whole of that amount was used for the development of urban transport, as provided in the Bill, nothing would be left to spend on railway stations, locomotives, and so on. This is what happened last year.

Page 116 of the financial report which accompanies the Treasurer's statement 1973–74, contains items 101 to 115, for which an expenditure of $12·99 million was approved. There was authority to spend $14·715 million. However, during the year only $598,794·56 was paid out which brought the total payments covered by these authorities to $7,428,721·94. Therefore, the actual money paid out of the $14 million allocated for last year was nearly $599,000. The provision for rolling-stock, equipment, machinery and other works was $9·67 million. The actual expenditure during the year was $1,355,809·38, which brought the total of expenditure to $8,895,245 out of an authority to spend up to $13 million. Only the small amount of $110,000 was allocated for the construction of new railway lines, because the railways do not construct new lines. The amount allocated for urban development projects this year is listed as $19·325 million.

In its report, the Victorian Railways Board indicates that these are continuing grants associated with urban renewal—the construction of new suburban stations on the Glen Waverley line, extension of automatic and power signalling and amalgamation of signal boxes. Other development projects include the provision of two additional tracks, and the acquisition of land on the South Kensington-Footscray line; an additional track, including the acquisition of land, on the Caulfield-Mordialloc line; duplication of track and provision of two

additional stations, including the acquisition of land between Sunshine and Deer Park; and duplication of track, including the acquisition of land between McLeod and Greensborough; duplication of track, including the acquisition of land, on the Ringwood-Croydon-Bayswater line. Under item 410, provision will be made on the Melbourne-Glen Waverley line for stations, offices, yards and works. I cannot understand why Glen Waverley was selected for the project. Is it because of the "nice" people who live there and vote Liberal? Why were the Broadmeadows or the Footscray lines not considered? This astounds me. This year, an additional $5 million has to be provided as a matching grant for the provision of new trains.

The Railways Board wants to double the number of silver trains which are to be provided. At present 50 trains have been ordered. They are being supplied at the rate of five trains a year. The idea is to boost this number to ten trains a year. Members of the Labor Party wish the Minister well in his objective, but he will have to find an additional $5 million in matching funds over last year's spending to take advantage of the Australian Federal Government's offer of assistance with urban transport. The Minister should examine that matter. The crux of the report is at page 7 of the report at which the board points out that if it is to take advantage of the funds which are available from the Australian Government to provide the necessary matching grants, it will have to sacrifice the money which has been set aside for some country or metropolitan projects because the money is not available under the allocation.

In conclusion, I pay tribute to the Railways Board generally. It is a completely new board, and I wish its members well. I pay tribute to Mr. Ellis—a member of the board—who has shown a great interest in railway works. I sincerely hope his interest and activities are shared by the members of the board. I commend Mr. Ian Hodges, the General Manager of the Railways, for taking a big stick to the vandalism and pilfering that occurs on the railway system. Action of this type has not been taken previously. Mr. Hodges has established a special branch to deal with the vandalism and pilfering which has taken place in the railways and costs nearly $2·5 million in claims during the year. Apart from that, the cost cannot be registered in dollars of the fear experienced by a person who is molested by two or three louts while alone in a railway carriage. They cannot be called anything but louts. If they were matched up with people of their own size and ability, they would run. I believe for the first time inroads are being made into this problem, and I wish Mr. Hodges well.

With the retirement last year of Mr. Rogan, the General Manager, the last of my era has left the railways. The names of the heads of branches are new to me. They are no longer colleagues of mine. I pay tribute to Mr. E. P. Rogan—Teddy Rogan, as we knew him—as one of the finest commissioners to hold that position and one of the most approachable men in the community. Mr. McCallum is Deputy General Manager; Mr. Rashleigh, Assistant General Manager; Mr. Miller succeeds Mr. Rashleigh as Secretary for Railways, and Mr. Wright has been appointed to the newly-created position of Manager, Personnel. The organization has been broken up into four sections and a head has been appointed to each section. That is commendable. There are many more men and women in the railways who are keen to give service and are giving service than the few who give the railways a bad name. These people are doing an excellent job.

It used to be most depressing to be always told that one worked in a rundown and out-of-date service that should be scrapped. Such an attitude does not encourage good

morale. There is a future for fixed rail transport and for the railways. It will be one of the prime tools in the hands of a progressive Government, not only to resolve the transport position associated with metropolitan transport, but in decentralization of country industry. Decentralization today could be termed a building up of a given region—the centralization of population and industry in a given area. Albury-Wodonga, Geelong, Bendigo and Ballarat should be built up. That is genuine decentralization, rather than poking a small industry and a small population into each little town. It does not work that way because people are no longer interested in living in those places.

I thank the House for the time it has given me. I do not apologize because when the House is dealing with measures which are important in the eyes of the persons who are elected to speak on them, they should be given the opportunity of discussing them.

I believe I have submitted some suggestions to the Government. Earlier, I was sorry for Mr. Dunn. Some years ago I was in a similar position when I wanted to speak at 3 a.m. I hope I have always reserved the right, within the realms of decency, that if I have wanted to say anything I have said it, irrespective of the time. I admire Mr. Dunn for continuing last night on a subject on which he held valid opinions. It is encouraging to see many of the matters that one has argued, believed and fought for, coming to fruition. As I said in a previous debate, the Government has a majority in both Houses and it has, in my opinion, a progressive Minister of Transport who is trying to keep fixed rail transport. I support the Minister, notwithstanding that I may be politically opposed to him on many matters. There are many matters on which we share a common interest. I believe the Bill should be supported.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province) : The Railway Works and Services Bill appropriates $48·185 million for the year 1974-75. I congratulate Mr. Tripovich on the amount of research he does every year on this subject. The House is indebted to him. I am certain the research he does is unequalled. He puts his point fairly and gives compliments where they are due. I do not intend to emulate Mr. Tripovich by traversing the ground which he has so ably covered.

An examination of the schedule reveals that of the amount of $48·185 million allocated for rolling-stock, equipment, machinery and other works, $9·67 million is to be spent for country purposes. Some of the work proposed under the allocation of $12·990 million for ways and works may be spent in country areas. However, the major expenditure under the Bill will occur in the metropolitan area.

I should like some clarification from the Minister regarding sub-item No. 303 under " Construction of new lines of railways, etc. " regarding the provision of $4·5 million for the proposed eastern railway. Currently, the Public Works Committee is conducting an inquiry into the proposed line and I ask whether the money has already been spent or is being allocated for a project which is still under investigation. The committee has not yet completed its inquiry and there is no guarantee, in view of changed circumstances, that it will recommend the construction of the line. I am not suggesting whether it will or it will not make such a recommendation. It disturbs me to think that $4·5 million is being allocated for the project and that possibly some of the money has already been spent when the construction of the line is still under investigation by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Tripovich has referred extensively to the annual report of the Victorian Railways Board for the year ended 30th June, 1974. The report

only became available yesterday and I have not endeavoured to research it as Mr. Tripovich has done. I congratulate Mr. Tripovich on his research. This morning's newspapers carried the headlines " State Rail System $73·2 Million in the Red ". A large deficit is mentioned, but it is encouraging that, had it not been for seasonal conditions, the deficit would have been considerably reduced wholly as the result of income derived from country people.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN : Particularly wheat growers.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY : At page 8, the board states—

FREIGHT INCOME.

On the freight side, the revenue gain from a general 5 per cent increase in freight rates applied on October 29, 1973, was partly offset by a sharp reduction in wheat traffic due to poor seasonal conditions. Had it not been for this factor, a record year for freight movement would have been recorded.

We have heard and read so much in the Bland Report that the railways should operate along purely economical lines. Accordingly, it was recommended that many country lines should be closed. As Mr. Tripovich has said, many spur lines did not receive credit for the amount of traffic which they generate on the main line. The only revenue that is recorded against a spur line is for the actual section of the line itself but how would traffic get on to the main line if it were not for the spur line? It is a misleading attitude to adopt.

For the first time for at least sixteen or seventeen years, interstate and country passenger operations have shown an increase in both numbers of journeys and the revenue derived. Again, according to the report on page 13—

INTERSYSTEM AND COUNTRY PASSENGER OPERATIONS.

Encouraging increases, of 7 per cent and 13·2 per cent respectively, were recorded in country and intersystem passenger journeys, compared with traffic in 1972-73. The increase in country travel was doubtless partly in response to the introduction of " discount " day return fares.

It is encouraging to note that the railways are out chasing business, which should be their job as they have a product to offer. It is gratifying that country people are responding to the sales campaign.

According to the balance sheet, earnings from goods and livestock showed a slight decrease on last year's figures. The earnings last year from goods and livestock were $62,029,342 whereas this year's earnings amounted to $61,973,973, which represents a very small decrease. On the passenger side, revenue from interstate passengers showed an increase over 1973. In 1972-73 $3·476 million was earned on interstate passenger traffic whilst in 1973-74 the income was $4·119 million. On country passenger traffic, the earnings in 1972-73 amounted to $5,672,182 whereas this year the revenue totalled $6,452,262. In comparison, revenue from metropolitan passenger fares showed only a small increase from $27,167,299 last year to $27,704,954 for this year. At least the country is holding its own against the metropolitan area in producing revenue for the railways.

As I said earlier, we look for better times ahead because, as the annual report rightly states, seasonal conditions have affected the financial results and undoubtedly income from country services would have shown a very substantial increase. This year, if weather conditions are more favourable, we are hoping for a larger wheat harvest. This will be reflected in the financial statements of the railways for next year and perhaps increased revenue from that source. I again congratulate Mr. Tripovich on his research and I indicate that the Country Party supports the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Issue and application of money from Works and Services Account for railway purposes).

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare) : Mr. Tripovich has made the sort of contribution which honorable members have become used to on Bills of this nature. I join with Mr. Bradbury in expressing admiration of his depth of knowledge on railway matters and the research that he has undertaken into railways annual reports. Mr. Tripovich will be glad to know that some of the things that he has said for many years are starting to fall on fertile ground.

For his benefit, perhaps I should quote from the Estimates of Receipts and Payments of the Consolidated Fund for the year ending 30th June, 1975. Under Division No. 240—social welfare administration other services —reference is made to the payment of $1,170,827 to the Railways Board for fare concessions for pensioners. This is the sort of item that Mr. Tripovich has been seeking for many years and will in future show up more and more in the accounts of various departments. There is also reference to the payment of $1·031 million to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board for fare concessions for pensioners.

Reference is also made to fare concessions for pensioners on buses and the same thing is happening with other accounts. The contribution to the Hospital and Charities Fund to meet the cost to public hospitals and other institutions of the treatment and care of persons in receipt of social security pensions was $61·7 million. That information was taken out of the accounts of some other department where it was hidden. This is what Mr. Tripovich was talking about and what is happening. In the future honorable members may expect railway accounts to reflect more accurately the yearly operations of the railways and not to be hidden, as they have been to date, from most ordinary people—certainly not from Mr. Tripovich, but from most ordinary observers.

I welcome the change in accounting procedures which will produce this sort of result. Why was the Glen Waverley line chosen for this special development? Was it because it was a Liberal area? Is it a Liberal area? The Latrobe electorate is not far from the Glen Waverley railway station. I am sure it serves a large number of people in the Latrobe electorate and that is certainly not a Liberal electorate.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD: No doubt the Minister hopes it will be.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON: There is not much question about that, but the railways need to service a large number of people not all of whom are on our side of the fence.

Mr. Bradbury raised the matter of the eastern railway and the table to the Bill which provides in sub-item 303 for an expenditure of $4·5 million to the south-eastern railway. Of course that would not go very far towards constructing that railway, but in the construction of the important freeway which is planned to take a railway line—whether it does or not is still a matter for investigation by the Public Works Committee—undoubtedly some funds must be contributed towards the engineering works being undertaken. The design would have to allow for a Government decision finally to put the railway line in the median strip of the Eastern Freeway and would need to make a financial contribution towards the engineering work that may be required in addition to that which is required for ordinary road transport purposes.

The railway deficits, as Mr. Bradbury pointed out, have been affected to some degree by the poor wheat crop and also by industrial problems that existed, especially in New South Wales, where many bogie exchange trucks were held up for a considerable period of time and were not available for use in Victoria.

I have now covered in the main the points raised by the various members. I particularly welcome the suggestion that railway accounts ought not to encompass all things that do not strictly belong to the railways and I applaud the fact that the railway system is used for purposes of social development and not purely as an instrument to make a profit. It is a service industry. It is nice for the morale of those engaged in the service if it cuts somewhere near even in its operations. When the accounts are reorganized in the way that I have indicated, I expect the morale of those working in the service to be improved when they realize that their efforts are meeting with a measure of success and that they are contributing to the social life of the Victorian community.

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.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): I have to announce that His Excellency the Governor has intimated that it will be convenient for the presentation of the Address-in-Reply to take place at Government House, where His Excellency will be pleased to receive the President and honorable members of the Legislative Council on Thursday, 19th December, at 10 a.m. I request that as many honorable members as possible accompany me. Cars will be provided for the conveyance of honorable members and will leave Parliament House steps promptly at 9.35 a.m.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

The debate (adjourned from the previous day) 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. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province) : This is an important measure. The Public Service Act has not been the subject of review for 40 years. The Bill comes into the House now as a result of a report of Sir Henry Bland and of discussions between the Public Service Association and the Premier's Department. It is a long Bill and it would be improper if honorable members were to select certain clauses and say that they did not like the wording of this or the meaning of that. There is nothing more important to the successful working of the Government than an informed, dedicated and virtually anonymous Public Service. Public servants get the blame for lots of things when they should receive only praise. They must remain silent ; they must never answer criticism. In Victoria I believe the Public Service has served Parliamentary government well.

Unfortunately, my memory of public servants, and my relations with them, have grown dim with the passage of years. It is nearly twenty years since I sat on the Treasury bench but, from the little that I have seen of them at close quarters, I do not think they are lacking in the qualities required of them.

Some minor matters in this legislation, in the light of experience, may require amendment or adjustment, but in the meantime members of the Opposition are perfectly confident that it will work well and we wish the Bill a speedy passage.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province) : This Bill is the result of an inquiry that was carried out by Sir Henry Bland into the functions of the Public Service of Victoria. I think every member of the House has read the report, and the several recommendations set out therein, most of which have been accepted by the Government, except one principal one which relates to the composition of the Public Service Board. The Government did

not accept that recommendation of Sir Henry Bland because it did not want to fall out with the Public Service. It wanted to retain the right of public servants to have a say in the nomination of a member of the board, but once a person is elected he is independent of outside interference.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: The Government believes in that principle.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: That is what the Government has done. Whether or not it was done to keep face with the Public Service is a matter of opinion. The board is to be set up on a new basis. It will be a good set-up, and the board will function in a capable manner under the principle of being completely independent.

The second thing that the Bill does is to establish new divisions within the Public Service. There is a division for permanent heads of the various departments. At one stage there were only about five or six but now many divisions have been set up with permanent heads. These people have become the real force within the Public Service. If anything, the status of the permanent heads will be improved by this measure which gives them specific powers to carry out their functions and duties.

There will also be a First Division, a Second Division and a Third Division. Restrictions will apply to the qualifications of members of the first and second divisions. The Third Division appears to be a division for persons who do not qualify as permanent heads or for the first or second division. These persons are probably the workers behind the scene who carry out the various duties which the other divisions set for them. This is a good system because it enables officers for the first time to interchange from one division to another. This could not be done previously, especially in the Administrative Division, which appeared to be a very close preserve; once a person got into it, he would be apprehensive about anybody else being appointed in case he lost some seniority or promotion that might come his way if he stayed there long enough. This position prevailed for some years.

This Bill gives power to the board to appoint people from outside the service to any vacancies within the Public Service where it is deemed necessary. One of the shortcomings in the Administrative Division and the Professional Division in the past was that this was not possible. In many spheres of the Public Service decisions had to be made by a qualified professional officer but there were no professional officers in the Administrative Division. One had to start as a clerk in the Public Service and work one's way up. Decisions were made which were outside the sphere of one's competence. This Bill will make it possible for each division to be more effective than it has been in the past.

The Bill also provides for appeals against promotions or appointments. If there is an appeal it is to be heard not by the Public Service Board but by a separate body. This is a new structure which will enable the board to devote more time to its functions.

Like Mr. Galbally I have no intention of going through the many clauses of the Bill because honorable members reach a stage of complete bewilderment. Each clause interlocks with other clauses, and the measure requires a tremendous amount of study. I found it difficult to follow all the ramifications. I have outlined the main provisions of the Bill which deal with transfers, promotions and appeals.

Another clause relates to temporary employees. In the Public Service, especially in some of the works departments, there are many temporary employees. They will not gain permanency within the Public Service but will continue in employment as temporary employees.

Provision is also made for cadetships which will enable persons who are qualified for training in the various departments to come in as cadets and to proceed through the service as they become eligible for promotion.

The remaining clauses deal with salaries and conditions, restrictions and sick leave, special extended leave, long service leave, retiring gratuities, special conditions and discipline. The point that struck me in the provisions relating to discipline is that the board has power to deduct from a person's wage any fine imposed as a result of a charge.

The Bill covers the whole ambit of the Public Service and the Country Party considers that the subject was investigated and reported upon very effectively.

Country members probably have more association with public servants than most other members because of the many problems that arise in country areas. I know we have been called errand boys and messenger boys, but country members have an association with public servants, not only in the metropolitan area but also in the country areas, in seeking assistance for public works and other activities. I have always found that officers of the Department of Agriculture are willing to assist any member who wishes to learn what is going on in the department's research area, and so forth. Country Party members have had a very close association with the departments.

Honorable members have always found public servants to be co-operative, and if one is prepared to explain one's views to these officers they are always prepared to co-operate. In many cases departmental officers have asked me to look at something because I have been close to it and it would save them sending someone. I have also been asked to give a report on the need for certain works. Country Party members have grown up with the system and have had a very close association with public servants. I have always found members of the Public Service to be dedicated to their job, co-operative, and always prepared to do something a little more than their job requires of them in the service of the community for which they are employed.

On behalf of the Country Party I have much pleasure in supporting this measure and wish the Public Service all the best in the future. I hope this Bill brings about a system that will be better for its future working conditions, and for the service which is dedicated to this State.

The motion was agreed to.

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

PAPERS.

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

Hospitals and Charities Commission—Report for the year 1973-74.

Public Service Act 1958—Public Service (Public Service Board) Regulations—Regulations amended—(Nos. 236 and 237) (two papers).

Teaching Service Act 1958—Teaching Service (Teachers Tribunal) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 294 and 295) (two papers).

Town and Country Planning Board—Report for the year 1973-74.

EDUCATION (TEACHER REGISTRATION) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from the previous day) 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 amends the Education Act 1958 in respect to matters relating to teacher registration. It provides for the appointment of a fourth assistant director-general.

I understand that that position was filled some monthe ago by Dr. Maddocks. He is to be responsible for planning and matters associated with the curriculum.

The most senior of the other assistant directors-general is the deputy director, and the other areas of responsibility include building, personnel and research. The Opposition hopes that in his new position Dr. Maddocks will examine the traditional boundaries within the department affecting primary and secondary teachers in the light of modern conditions in the education field.

The Bill provides for the appointment of teacher aides to assist the teaching staff at schools and relieve them of pressures. Hopefully, the Bill will also allow school councils and committees to assist in the decision-making process on the employment of teacher aides. The Commonwealth Government is making a generous advance for this purpose.

Representation on the teacher registration council is also referred to in the Bill. Teachers may be elected from the primary, secondary and technical fields. A person will be entitled to vote only in respect of one division in which he has been enrolled.

An amendment is made to the section of the principal Act which allows for the appointment of only one deputy for the elected member on the council. Three deputies will now be allowed. In the light of previous experience, that would seem to be a wise move which will ensure adequate representation at council meetings.

The Opposition proposes to move an amendment during the Committee stage referring to categories of teachers. I shall confine my remarks on that aspect of the Bill until the Committee stage.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): Mr. Clarke, who was leading the debate on the Bill for the Country Party, is temporarily absent from the House. Accordingly, I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until later this day.

MOTOR CAR BILL.

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

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province): The Opposition partly opposes this Bill which proposes to increase motor registration fees by 35 per cent, and that is where the Labor Party takes issue with the Government. On many occasions members of the Opposition have said that the motorist is being flogged along and that when the Government is short of money, it takes it out on the motorist. The increase of 35 per cent in motor registration fees is unprecedented. Although it is said that the fees will be used directly for the benefit of the motorist, that does not always occur. Far more money was spent on hospitals than was raised for that purpose.

It is wrong that motorists should have to pay for the upkeep of all the roads in the State, because other people receive benefits from the roads, whether or not they own motor cars. Everyone who uses public transport, taxis, or has goods delivered along the road receives benefit from the roads, even those who only walk along the footpaths. All these things are of benefit to the community as a whole.

As soon as the Government needs to raise additional funds—I shall not go into the argument between the State and Federal Governments—the motorist "cops" it. The motorist cannot be bled indefinitely because eventually he will no longer be able to afford the changes.

The motorist is helping to subsidize private bus operators. The Opposition does not oppose the provisions of the Bill relating to private buses because there is a need for the continuance of private bus operators. Their annual fees will be reduced and they will receive a passenger subsidy.

The Opposition makes the strongest possible protest against the 35 per cent increase in motor registration fees and will oppose the second reading of the Bill. The increase will bring the registration fee for an average motor car to approximately $45. By comparison, in Queensland the motor registration fee is $29.90 for a similar type of car. The Queensland Government has found other means of raising funds than by fleecing the motorist, even though Queensland is far bigger than Victoria.

I do not propose to prolong the argument on the measure other than to oppose strongly the proposed increase of 35 per cent in motor registration fees.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province): This proposed legislation could not be described as other than objectionable for two reasons. Firstly, the Commonwealth Government has forced the States into a tight monetary situation. Secondly, the motorist is being slammed for the whole amount necessary to match the Commonwealth grant.

On other occasions in this House I have expressed concern over the fact that the motorist is the fall guy in the Australian economy. The roads serve more than the family motorist or the person who commutes to work by road; they provide a supply network throughout the State which allows business, commerce and industry to function. The roads contribute considerably to the State's funds and allow it to operate. Why hit the family motorist with this increase of 35 per cent on motor registration fees?

It is no argument to say that the price of everything else is increasing, because the average man who is trying to raise a family and pay off a house and who must have a car because of his business or home location is the hardest hit. Sometimes people become too cold about these matters and forget about the personal effect which these increases have on individuals.

Members of the Country Party are disappointed with the allocation of funds by the Commonwealth Government for road-making purposes. As the Minister indicated, the Commonwealth will receive in excess of $500 million during the period from petrol tax. In return it will make available to this State $232 million which Victoria must match with $281·2 million. I find that to be a disastrous and invidious position into which the State has been forced.

Members of the Country Party do not intend to vote against the Bill because we appreciate that there is a great need for road works to continue.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Particularly country roads.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Yes, and all roads, but certainly we want an allocation for country roads. We find the provisions of the Bill which increase fees across the board by 35 per cent, except in one case, objectionable. We do not like indirect taxing methods such as this which are adding heavily to the motorists' costs.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT: But you are not going to vote against the Bill.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: I do not see how we could. We want to register a protest against the situation into which Victoria has been forced and which has forced members of the Country Party to accept the Bill. If the Bill is rejected and the Government does not raise the requisite amount, the contribution from the Commonwealth will be in jeopardy. Although we dislike the

Bill extremely we want to see road works continue, and therefore, under some sufferance, we intend to support the measure.

The exception to the across-the-board increase of 35 per cent in fees relates to bus operators who will receive a reduction in their registration fees. The Country Party regards them as part of the public transport system which needs to be encouraged and developed. Public transport is the most efficient and effective means of transportation, whether it be by bus or by fixed rail. With those criticisms of the Bill and a protest, we intend not to vote against the measure.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): I am in a somewhat awkward position because the Minister has used this Bill to make another of his attacks on the Federal Government through a stupid Ministerial statement. I should like to argue the question of Commonwealth grants with the honorable gentleman, but I would be out of order on this Bill if I did so.

In regard to the subsidy to bus operators, all that the Government is doing is following the same line that the Labor Party took and which the Government has followed in regard to Housing Commission tenants; the persons who pay their commission rents pay for the subsidies paid to other tenants. The Government does not make any contribution. Under this Bill the ordinary motorist has to pay a 35 per cent increase in fees. Not all of this revenue will be spent on main roads; some of it will provide subsidies for bus operators to keep their buses running.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS: How much will go to the bus operators?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: I do not know, because the Government cannot produce any figures.

On the question of petrol tax, I point out that Victoria occupies only 3 per cent of Australia's land mass. Years ago I pushed through the Labor Party conference the policy that all revenue from petrol tax should be returned to the States for road works. The Labor Party attacked the Federal Government on this issue when the Liberal–Country Party was in office. Of course, we did not get any favourable response. When the Labor Government assumed office in Canberra the matter was again raised and we received an answer. The Commonwealth Government is responsible for providing finance for intercapital roads. Honorable members saw what happened to the Hume Highway between Melbourne and Sydney.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL: How much of the revenue from petrol tax is allocated by the Commonwealth to roads throughout Australia?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: The Commonwealth Government has transport responsibilities for which its sources of revenue include petrol tax. A Liberal Party Treasurer informed me that this tax was never collected with a view to making State roads for the Victorian Government.

I pay a tribute to all Governments, including this Government, for what has been done through the Country Roads Board in providing roads throughout Victoria. Over the past 40 years I have travelled this State as much as any member in the House; I do not do so now, but I have. Wherever I want to go I can now travel on a bitumen sealed road, and I do not necessarily have to travel on a gazetted highway to do that. The so-called second-class roads now have bitumen surfaces.

All the weeping and moaning about petrol tax is a heap of political propaganda because when the Liberal Party–Country Party coalition Government was in office in Canberra for 23 years members of this Government did not raise the matter in the House. The only person who raised it was Sir Henry Bolte, but other members of the Government party did not do so. Now, because there

is a Labor Government in Canberra members of the Government party want to sing songs about it. This is political hypocrisy of the highest order, and I think it absolutely stinks.

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

Ayes	.. ..	23
Noes	.. ..	6
Majority for the motion	.. ..	17

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Dickie	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Granter	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hider	Mr. Kent

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 6325, s. 45.)

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government): I am stung to retort because of Mr. Tripovich's remarks. The fact is that, however one looks at it, Mr. Jones, the Federal Minister for Transport, appears to be one of the least responsive Ministers to the needs of the States and one of the most desirous of imposing his own will, even on questions of detail.

I turn to the question of petrol tax and I take the point raised by Mr. Tripovich. I certainly have no desire to be unfair in any way. It is perfectly true to say that under successive Commonwealth Governments, whatever their political colour, the petrol tax paid by State motorists has never been returned in full to the States; nor have we ever suggested in Victoria that all petrol tax collected in Victoria should be returned to this State. The Government recognizes that needs differ from State to State. However, honorable members will recall that under the formula provided in the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act for many years there was a nexus between petrol tax paid and reimbursement to the States for the simple reason that petrol tax was the fairest barometer available of road needs and demands upon the roads.

The late Right Honorable Harold Holt was the gentleman who broke the nexus when as Treasurer he said in 1956, if I recall correctly, that henceforth petrol tax would be regarded as part of Commonwealth revenue.

Before the 1972 Federal election, Mr. E. G. Whitlam, as he then was, promised that he would return petrol tax to the States in accordance with a formula to be determined. That has not been done, and on the contrary the States are now obtaining a worse proportion than they ever did in the past.

The comparatively large sum of $500 million is to be returned to the States under the new Commonwealth Act over the next triennium and there is a need to more than match Commonwealth grants following heavily imposed conditions. This has been the root cause and the need for this Bill. To achieve this, as I have indicated, there is to be a heavy increase in charges on motorists.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 3 (Amendment of No. 6325 s. 8).

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): I thank the Minister for Local Government

for his explanation and his fairness. When it comes to providing a subsidy, as the Government is proposing in clause 3, the Labor Party is not criticizing the philosophy of private business paying reduced registration fees, but surely it should be admitted by the Government that the provision of subsidies, as proposed in this clause, will mean that substantial payments will have to be paid out of revenue to meet those subsidies. Therefore, that is an aspect to be considered in setting the increased motor registration fees. There is no fairer way of charging a person for using the road than that of charging him through his petrol use. However, a person who has a 4-cylinder car must pay a registration fee, including third-party insurance cover, of more than $100 to put the car on the road. Therefore, he is helping beyond his share to build the roads for the buses and the heavy transport vehicles which also use them. The contribution to revenue from bus registration and heavy transport is not comparable with the damage they do.

That is the reason for the increase and the Government should not be hypocritical about it; it should admit that part of the increase is due to the subsidy being granted to private buses. The Government should make no apology. The Labor Party does not want to apologize because it believes the subsidy is necessary and that the motorist must be prepared to pay for it, but the Government should not try to fool the Labor Party about it.

The clause was agreed to.

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

EDUCATION (TEACHER REGISTRATION) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from earlier this day) 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. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): This Bill, which amends the Education Act with regard to teacher registration, is divided into a number of compartments. The first section of the Bill deals with the authorization for the appointment of a fourth Assistant Director-General of Education. The new appointee will be in charge of planning and curriculum. I understand that Dr. Maddocks has already been appointed and, in effect, the House is a little late with the present measure.

One aspect which I regret at present is that the new Director-General of Education is overseas on a prolonged trip to Paris when he is badly needed here. I know Dr. Shears well; he is a man of great ability who, I believe, will be an extremely successful Director-General of Education. However, it is unfortunate that he has to be absent from the State for such a long period when we face a continuing crisis in education.

It is a matter of considerable regret that the Government has not seen fit to increase the powers of regional directors of education. The Government has appointed further regional directors and now there are eleven after the initial move to appoint three for Ballarat, Bendigo and Gippsland. The quality of the appointees as regional directors of education is excellent, but they have a limited staff and have been severely limited in the action they can take.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Do they know what their powers are?

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: They have been most frustrated. I have discussed the problem with the regional directors of education and they are concerned that the Melbourne office wishes to retain its central power. It is unfortunate that those in power in Melbourne show a reluctance to decentralize the Education Department.

I hope the Minister for State Development and Decentralization, who is in charge of the Bill, will convey to his colleague, the Minister of Education, the message communicated by officers in Melbourne.

The Bill also covers the employment of ancillary staff and teacher aides by school councils. It specifically refers to technical school councils. Clause 3 provides, *inter alia*—

> A school committee or a council of a high school, consolidated school or group school may, after consideration of any recommendation of the principal and staff of the school, employ teacher aides to assist teachers in class activities of the school.

I shall make two comments on the proposal. The first is that the Government has given no consideration to the employment of ancillary staff or teacher aides in special schools. Members of the Country Party have been fighting for a long time for more special schools for handicapped children. We have been asking in particular for more remedial teachers. The special schools have been left out of this Bill. Perhaps the Minister for State Development and Decentralization can explain why, in the employment of teacher aides and ancillary staff, special schools have been ignored.

I draw the attention of the Minister for State Development and Decentralization and the Government to the need for remedial teachers for teaching English to migrant children. This has been a continuing complaint against the Education Department. It has been claimed that 20 per cent—in some cases, an even higher estimate has been given—of children going from primary school to secondary school cannot read. I know that to be true and I know that many of them cannot write or spell.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: But many of them are not retarded.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: I am not referring to retarded children but to normal children who have not had sufficient opportunity at primary school. Many of them have lacked opportunity because of a shortage of people to teach English to migrant children.

There are many migrants in the province I represent, particularly in the Goulburn Valley. Other honorable members representing inner-suburban areas know of acute problems arising when children of 25 to 30 different nationalities attend one school. All honorable members will appreciate the need. Promises were made to appoint additional staff and a Bill was enacted to provide for remedial teaching of both normal and handicapped children, but little progress has been made.

It has been suggested that people qualified to teach migrants English could be engaged although they may not necessarily be qualified to be registered as teachers. I know that the Victorian Teachers Union, the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association and the Technical Teachers Association of Victoria will be up in arms at the suggestion. They will say that people who have not gone through the full course of teacher training cannot teach at their schools.

There is a closed shop in Australia today. I am not anti-union. In many respects, unions are essential to our society. But there are limits to the control which the teaching unions should be able to impose on those who teach in our schools in areas which are not common to normal education. Remedial teaching of English is one of those areas.

Clause 8 provides that the Teacher Registration Board may—if it considers it appropriate—take into consideration the teaching or industrial experience of an applicant when determining whether he is suitably qualified to teach. This is a reference to technical teachers with industrial experience, who are in short supply in our technical schools, but who may not have all the teacher-training requirements wanted by the Teacher Registration Board.

I know that many technical schools would like part-time assistance from experts in particular fields, such as automotive or electrical engineering, who could impart their skills to children. They are particularly needed when a group of children at a technical school are interested in one subject but the school has nobody on the staff to teach it. The councils of technical colleges and schools should be allowed to bring in these specialist teachers without requiring them to undergo a four-year course in teaching. Their industrial experience would be invaluable.

More than anything else, Australia needs technical people. It is not the tradesman or the technically equipped person who is unemployed today. In fact, these people are in short supply; there are just not enough of them. One of our handicaps is the inability of our technical schools and colleges to produce enough tradesmen. As Mr. Trayling points out, I referred to a lack of professional people earlier today.

It has been shown again and again in the United States of America, where there is a pool of some 5 million unemployed, that the great bulk of these people are unskilled, relatively uneducated, left school at an early age, and usually engage in labouring work. It is essential, in order to raise productivity and standards in Australia, that standards of education are improved so that we have more professional and technically-trained people of whom there is an acute shortage.

The remainder of the Bill deals with the composition of the teacher registration boards. The amendments to the principal Act follow the establishment of the State College of Victoria, with which the teacher-training colleges were incorporated as part of their fight to achieve autonomy from the Education Department and the Minister. There is no objection to the changes in the teacher registration boards, the elections, or to the members who make up the boards.

I commend the Government for presenting this amending Bill although it does not go far enough. I direct the attention of the Minister to the attitude of the Education Department to ancillary staff. In the first place, ancillary staff are regarded as something less than teachers. This has proved to be most unfortunate, but the attitude has become apparent in many ways.

A member of the ancillary staff of the Rochester High School, who had a child attending that school, and whose front gate, 4 miles from Rochester, the school bus passes each day, was refused permission to travel on the bus. There was ample room for her and she could have helped to maintain discipline if that was needed.

When I took up this matter with the Minister, he informed me that the Education Act provided that only registered school teachers could travel on school buses. This is bureaucracy at its worst. Why should a reputable member of the ancillary staff of a school not be permitted to travel on a school bus? Apparently the fact that ancillary staff cannot travel on school buses is just too bad, and no action has been taken to have the Act changed.

However, if ancillary staff are to be attracted to schools, there must be amendments to the Act. The fact that none on this subject are incorporated in this Bill is regrettable. Surely these people should be allowed on school buses in the same way as teachers. I see that the Minister nods his head, and I hope I have got the message across to him.

The other point is that although the councils of the high schools and technical schools and so forth are empowered to employ ancillary staff of school age, the provision of finance for this purpose is not stated in the Bill and has not been indicated by the Government. There has been some suggestion that the Schools Commission, as a result of the Kar-

mel report, may be providing funds for this purpose. But how are the school councils from their own funds going to be able to employ this staff? The answer is they cannot do it and they will have to have assistance from the Government. The Government has not indicated how much it is going to provide, how it is going to provide it, and when it is going to provide it. The schools will go ahead, I hope, at the beginning of the next school year, or before then, and appoint ancillary staff and teacher aides, and then wonder how they are going to pay them.

I ask the Minister to give some indication of the Government's intentions about funding this new service. I naturally commend the ancillary staff and teacher aides. It is essential that assistance be given to teachers and education in this State, but there must be some clear indication how it is going to be paid for.

The Hon. W. G. FRY (Higinbotham Province): This Bill introduces a very forward step. In 1960 the teacher ratio to staff was 1 to 29, and in 1974, the current year, it is 1 to 14.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: That 1 to 14 gives a false impression.

The Hon. W. G. FRY: I am giving Mr. Tripovich the correct impresion. It is 1 to 14. People foment and want better conditions; they take a person out of one job to do subject co-ordination, and another one to do another thing, and a teacher cannot do yard supervision because that would be another period. That is the exact figure, and there are people who are subject co-ordinators.

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING: Despite this Mr. Fry says there are enough teachers.

The Hon. W. G. FRY: Mr. Trayling had his say. Why did he not raise this matter then. I wish to mention this point. The State has reached a very good teacher-student ratio. It logically follows that registration boards can be set up, for the good of the children of this State, to control the great masses of teachers it appoints, and it demands, in my opinion, better qualifications. One can say that the better qualified teachers will give the children of the State a better deal. The basis of the Bill is to set up boards to regularize qualifications of teachers, and that is exactly what the Government has done.

Mr. Clarke and Mr. Trayling mentioned Dr. Maddocks, and why he has been appointed to his present position. There is no point beating the drum about that any longer. There are other matters Mr. Clarke raised which I did not see in the Bill, but which were relevant, such as special teachers for migrants. To put Mr. Clarke out of his agony, I inform him that the Government is getting on with this matter. There are certain legal problems to be overcome as to who may be appointed as teachers, and whether the Government can employ people highly qualified linguistically and so on. This problem has not escaped the notice of the Government, and I hope that in the next session the Bill I have in my hand will see the light of day. It is about the subjects which Mr. Clarke mentioned. The Government will be having a look at this Bill during the recess.

For the first time the Government is giving school committees in high schools the chance to employ teacher aides. Mr. Clarke quite rightly raised the subject of paying their salaries. That is not a question for me to raise with the Government. When it was desired to give say, $8,000 to primary schools in lieu of subsidies, it was not difficult to provide the necessary power. It was done quickly and easily and I know of no reason why this cannot happen in this case. Mr. Clarke properly raised the subject that when people are employed they have to be paid. What fund is the money to come from? That is a legitimate query.

The next few clauses of the Bill deal with teachers organizing themselves. It provides that if teachers are in a secondary school, primary school, or technical school, they will be able to register with the appropriate board. It is as simple as that. Recommendations go to the Teacher Registration Council, and the council, if it agrees with them, then returns them to the board. If the council does not agree with the recommendations the views of the council are put to the secondary, technical or primary boards. and they adopt or disagree with the council's suggestions. The council cannot impose its will on any one of the boards. It allows the various services to run their own divisions. This is a reasonable approach to this subject.

Mr. Clarke said there was a great deficiency in the Bill because it had no provisions relating to the teaching of migrants. In the amendments to section 52L the words " categories of teachers " was put in specifically to deal with the problem which Mr. Clarke raised. It does give the board the right to register those people, and to appoint those who are qualified to teach music or languages.

For example one of the most important provisions in the Bill is in clause 8 (*b*) under which the board may take into consideration the teaching or industrial experience of a person when determining whether he is suitably qualified to teach. There were people who had been teaching long periods and who were not able to obtain registration because they had been trained at some institution that was not fully known, or acceptable to the board at that stage. The board considered that, under the Act, it had to take this tough stand towards people who had no teaching experience. It has now been spelt out. The board takes into consideration teaching experience. It is a good thing to allow people who have learnt the hard way to go into the schools. They are needed.

Mr. Clarke also talked about the lack of people in our technical schools with industrial experience. I know of several cases of people with industrial experience wanting to teach. I know of one man who was a plumber, and he came to me and wanted to know how he could teach plumbing in a school. He had no teaching experience. He was a respectable man and lived in the district with his family. It was not hard to get him into a school. That young father today has completed a university course. He became so interested in what he was doing that he completed this course and he has now changed over to another branch in the service, but he has the industrial and academic experience behind him. I can give other examples. Those people are being brought into the service, and the Government is doing something to fill this need. There is a need to get people who have had practical experience in a trade provided that they are suitable. If these people have the urge to become teachers, it is not hard for them to obtain the necessary teaching instruction so that they can teach in their trade.

It may be possible to incorporate provisions relating to buses in a clause of the Bill. Surely if teacher aides are considered good enough to be appointed to teach children part time or full time in the schools, they should be permitted to travel on a school bus. Members of the Liberal Party are happy that the Bill has been introduced because we have been bombarded with requests that people should be appointed as teacher aides. I hope this Bill will solve a difficult problem.

I am always pleased to see a similar provision to that which appears in clause 11 (*d*) of the Bill. It states—

> (*d*) After paragraph (*pb*) there shall be inserted the following paragraph :—
>
> " (pc) appeals to the Teacher Registration Council against the decision of a Divisional Registration Board to deregister a registered teacher."

Therefore, if a penalty is to be imposed on a teacher, he has the right of appeal against such a decision. This is a forward-thinking Bill, and I welcome it.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province) : I am grateful to Mr. Fry for his explanation of the Bill. I suggest to him that my interjection that one to fourteen was an average for the pupil-teacher ratio was not intended to be offensive.

The Hon. W. G. FRY : I did not take offence.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH : I want to assure the honorable member of that. A college has been established by the Catholic education authorities at Broadmeadows, based on the senior high school system which was recommended by Mr. Ron Reid, a former Director-General of Education. This recommendation has been killed. In many fifth and sixth forms at State high schools the courses are either restricted or have low numbers for certain courses. If those pupils could be collated at a senior high school, the teachers could be used to advantage. More teachers could be released and more courses could be taught than are at present available in some schools. I ask the Government to reconsider the introduction of senior high schools, and to do what the Geoghegam College did. It established the basis of a college and allowed it to grow from there instead of attempting to start with a $4·5 million senior high school with everything that opens and shuts. I regret that the proposition for the establishment of a senior high school at Broadmeadows was killed.

I am delighted that provision has been made for the appointment of teacher aides. For years the Opposition has been taunting the Government to introduce such a Bill. This has finally eventuated after a delay of some two years. The establishment of libraries at schools has been delayed because no one can even paste a book together in a library unless he has had teacher training. Today teachers are similar to doctors. They are too highly trained and expensive to be used on menial tasks. The teacher who is receiving the salaries in the higher grades today should not be doing manual work if it can be carried out by teacher aides. Members of the Labor Party commend the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 6240 s. 4).

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization) : I thank honorable members for their contributions, particularly Mr. Fry, who has ably answered the matters raised by honorable members. He has had a lifetime of experience as a teacher and has been a senior teacher. I thank him for his contribution and also for the help he has given me in the House over the years.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 3 (Employment of assisting staff, etc.).

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province) : There is one matter that Mr. Fry did not answer and to which the Minister has not replied. During the second-reading debate I referred to the employment of ancillary staff and teacher aides by special schools. The special school is excluded from clause 3 of the Bill. It does not have a committee or a council which qualifies it under proposed section 14AA (*b*). Proposed section 14AA (*a*) refers only to technical schools. Therefore, it appears that the special school has been excluded from the provisions of the Bill in the employment

of ancillary staff and teacher aides. I regret this omission. The Minister did not explain why it occurred but I point out to him and to Mr. Fry that the special school has been left out in the cold.

The Hon. W. G. FRY (Higinbotham Province) : Mr. Clarke is right. The special school has been left out. I thought I made it clear, but apparently I did not, that the copy of another Bill dealt with many subjects which are not in the Bill before the Committee. It is not ethical for me to refer to what will be in the future Bill, but I assure Mr. Clarke that special schools have not been forgotten and that they will be receiving special consideration.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 4 to 7.

Clause 8 (Amendment of No. 6240 s. 52L).

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

Clause 8, lines 22-23, omit "teaching or" and insert "teaching experience and in addition, where relevant, the".

If the amendment were accepted, it would place industrial and teaching experience and training into proper perspective to ensure that where consideration had been given to the registration of a teacher who had industrial experience, the priority of the registration board would be towards teaching experience. There are obvious reasons for this. Technical teachers are concerned about possible abuses of the system occurring if the Bill is left in its present form. That concern is understandable. Industrial experience can be important and helpful to a teacher, as Mr. Fry has indicated, but in moving the amendment, the Labor Party expresses that concern.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): The amendment is a little pedantic. There is sufficient connection between industrial experience and the remainder of the clause to make it clear. The clause goes on to state "whether he is suitably qualified to teach" so the connection with teaching is apparent.

The proposed amendment would considerably restrict the right of the board to choose or employ a person who has had predominantly industrial experience. In my view that would place too much emphasis on the academic aspect. I have strong views on this subject. Certainly the Government will not accept the amendment because it places this restriction on the board.

Personally, I would put work experience before academic experience, particularly in a technical school. For these and other reasons with which I shall not weary the Committee, the Government will not accept the amendment.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): The Country Party does not support the amendment. I agree with the comments which the Minister has just made, but I wonder whether the Technical Teachers Association of Victoria was behind the amendment. I have no reason to believe that is so; it could have been Mr. Trayling's own creation, but if so, it places undue emphasis on the fear raised by the unions in connection with this provision.

In my second-reading speech, before I knew the amendment would be moved, I agreed with the Minister that industrial experience can be of incredible value. Only this morning I received representations from people who pointed out that the predominantly academically trained teacher does not produce the results which a skilled tradesman with adequate teacher training can achieve with boys in country schools or any other schools.

The Committee divided on the question that the words proposed by Mr. Trayling to be omitted stand part of the clause (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	..	22
Noes	..	5
Majority against the motion	..	17

AYES.

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

NOES.

Mr. Galbally	*Tellers:*
Mr. Knight	Mr. Elliot
Mr. Trayling	Mr. Tripovich

PAIRS.

Mr. Dickie	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Granter	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hider	Mr. Walton

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.

EDUCATION (WORK EXPERIENCE) BILL.

The House went into Committee for the further consideration of this Bill.

Discussion was resumed of clause 2 (New Part IVA.).

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province): I have checked in *Hansard* the remarks made by Mr. Grimwade during the second-reading debate and I find that I misinterpreted what he said. I wish to place this fact on record and tender an apology.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): I thought the Minister would have spoken first to clause 2.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Mr. Clarke might have something to say and I shall answer it.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: If the Minister intends to reply to the criticisms made during the second-reading debate I shall yield to him.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister for State Development and Decentralization): All honorable members supported the principle of work experience and said it was a wonderful thing. However, Mr. Clarke expressed many fears that somehow or other the Bill would interfere with the principle which he so enthusiastically supports.

I have not had the experience of Mr. Clarke in this matter because he referred to a scheme at a school with which he has been associated. It appeared from the debate that everybody wants work experience right across the board for all schools, so surely it is sensible for the Minister of Education to prepare the Bill. Whether honorable members like unions or not, they at least have a knowledge of industry.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Unions have not yet been brought into the matter.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Representatives of trade unions sat for eighteen months on a committee to consider all aspects of a principle which Mr. Bradbury so enthusiastically supports. On the committee were also persons from industry who would have some knowledge of industry as well as officers representing the Education Department and the teachers. I understand that the Bill results from their unanimous agreement. Despite the fears expressed by Mr. Clarke—which he wants me to answer—I should have thought a Bill resulting from eighteen months' hard work by such a body of people in trying to achieve something that everybody wants—for the young people in secondary education to obtain work experience before they leave technical school—would be supported.

I could answer each matter which has been raised but I do not think I need do so. Whatever arrangements may have been made outside the proposals in this measure may well have been illegal. In some instances it is quite likely that either State or Federal industrial awards were being broken. Under these agreements there are also problems of workers compensation. Again I take the word of Mr. Clarke and Mr. Bradbury that it is possible to obtain some type of insurance cover to safeguard situations which may arise concerning workers compensation.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH: But to the full value of workers compensation?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: It is some years since I have had experience in this field and I could only bow to the practical knowledge of Mr. Bradbury and Mr. Clarke. I hope that the Bill does what it sets out to do, that it will certainly put the matter beyond any doubt and afford protection to people as well as employers who employ the students.

I should be interested to analyse some of the arrangements made outside in good faith because it would probably be found that the unfortunate head master did not telephone the Secretary of the Social Welfare Department or some other person. I rest my case on the combined advice of people who have had the most experience in the field and who have examined the matter for eighteen months.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE: Theorists!

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: I should have thought that persons engaged in industry or other persons representing the Trades Hall Council were not theorists. Admittedly, officers representing the Education Department could be theorists but at least teachers have some practical knowledge of the relevant field. Therefore, I rest my case on the combined and unanimous recommendations of the committee. I hope that all the fears expressed by Mr. Bradbury and Mr. Clarke are unfounded. If they have any substance and if all honorable members are sincere, they will have to rectify the matter, but I can see a host of problems outside the Bill. The Government believes this should apply right across the State.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): This Bill consists really of only one clause—clause 2—which is now being debated. It contains all the objectionable matters which I raised during the second-reading debate and I do not intend to traverse that ground again. However, I have discovered since I spoke then that this Bill was conceived and promoted by the Assistant Minister of Education, Mr. Dixon, and that many members of his party are ignorant of its provisions. I have been told that when the Bill came before this House a number of members of the Government party were astonished to find what was contained in it and that some of its provisions were contrary to those that they had previously approved. As for this anonymous committee that the Minister is hiding behind——

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: There is nothing anonymous about it.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: The Minister mentioned a committee consisting of employers and trade unions. Not one name has been mentioned.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: I understood that Mr. Stone was on the committee.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: What experience would Mr. Stone have of work experience? He would only try to stop work experience to protect the jobs of people in employment. The unions are not involved in it. How could we expect them to be? They would want everybody to be paid $25 a day at the age of thirteen years to participate in work

experience. That is the reason why a payment was introduced. A minimum payment of $5 a day was proposed in the other place.

The Hon. W. G. FRY: Did the union increase it?

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: How on earth do I know what the union did? Mr. Fry presumably negotiated with the union.

The Hon. W. G. FRY: I did not, but Mr. Clarke can read *Hansard,* as he has quoted from it.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: There is an anonymous committee which the Minister is hiding behind and which, I believe, has no experience of work experience.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): Mr. Clarke has already covered that ground. I warn him against the possibility of tedious repetition. I have not found him repetitious so far.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: There is ignorance behind this Bill and I wish to put to the Committee the actual experience of the school principals who have been associated with this work experience. At the Echuca Technical College the whole of form V.—approximately 50 students—was employed on work experience from 12th August to 16th August this year within a 35-miles radius of Echuca.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: Were they all covered by some sort of insurance policy?

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: The school principal has informed me that this was a most successful enterprise. Insurance cover was arranged.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE: On every one of them?

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: For every one of those 50 students. Mr. Bradbury is familiar with this form of insurance cover because the Wangaratta Technical College has had it for some years.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: I quoted it.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE: Some of these students were paid and some were not. Some were paid as much as $20. Some did it for nothing. The point I made in the second-reading speech was that this payment should be a matter of arrangement and not of compulsion.

At the Kerang High School, which has a technical wing and which is a comprehensive school, 150 students from form IV. have been out on work experience this term. The principal stated that it had been extremely successful. The community and the parents are happy. The period of the work experience has varied from three to five working days. Insurance cover was arranged. None of those 150 students was paid; that was a condition of the scheme.

At the Kyabram High School where 30 students from forms IV. and V. have been out on work experience mainly in connection with office work in Kyabram, this is the third year in which the school has organized the work experience. There is no pay involved and it is considered that the benefit to the children and the co-operation and goodwill between the school, the employer and the community have justified the work experience and enabled it to function. So I point out that in some cases there has been pay while in the cases of Kerang High School and Kyabram High School no pay has been involved. If honorable members have understood the meaning of the regulation-making clause, and if they listened to the second-reading speech, they will find that this Bill lays down a minimum payment of $3, although it is not stated. It could be $10. This House has no control over that.

Permission must be obtained from the Social Welfare Department and the Department of Labour and Industry. The Trades Hall Council is concerned, and the Apprentice-

ship Act must also be considered. The principal of Kerang High School, for example, is a hard-working, busy man. I know him personally. He will have to arrange for the documentation for 150 form IV. pupils and that may not be confined solely to form IV.; it may be possible to send out on work experience a great many more students from the Kerang High School and each one will have to be processed. The Government is creating a mountain of paper work with this Bill. It is a bureaucrat's dream. Another teacher will be seconded to the Kerang High School purely to administer the dream. The council presumably will have to employ a teaching aide or a member of ancillary staff—we do not know what that will cost, but it will not be cheap—to administer the scheme that the present school staff is handling adequately. This is purely legislation for the sake of legislation, regulations purely for the sake of regulations. This Bill is totally unecessary. I have asked the Government to withdraw it. It will not do so. I suppose I shall now have to ask it not to proclaim it. The Country Party opposes the whole of clause 2 on the grounds which I have stated during my second-reading speech and in Committee.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province): As Mr. Clarke spoke after me, I feel I must indicate the Labor Party's attitude towards the Country Party's view on this matter. It is not a question of everything being demanded by the unions. At present this scheme is operating at 86 schools. Shortly it could operate at 186 schools. If the Government does not put it on a proper basis now and if the scheme applies to 186 schools in twelve months' time, some day some boy will lose a hand or suffer some disability which will affect his welfare, and the Government will be in a heap of trouble.

The matter should be put on a proper basis and the Opposition supports the view of the Assistant Minister of Education in this respect. It is satisfied with the co-operation that it has received from the Assistant Minister of Education, the trade union movement and those interested in the scheme, and proposes to support the measure.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province): I support my colleague, Mr. Clarke. Members of the Country Party have had practical experience with work experience programmes. If the Government does not want the scheme to succeed, let it say so. It is all very well for members of the Labor Party to say "Ah" but members of the Country Party are talking from practical experience. As Mr. Clarke pointed out, the scheme has worked successfully in his area. He has named the schools there and I have named the technical college with which I am associated, where it has worked successfully, and 105 students last year had the benefit of work experience.

In my area a survey was conducted of every employer to whom the students went and, as I indicated in the second-reading debate, all employers except one said that they would not be interested in the new scheme.

I again ask the Minister for State Development and Decentralization and the Government not to continue with the present proposal of forcing the employers to pay an amount of $3 a day. The technical college with which I am associated has covered every student with a comprehensive insurance policy in the event of their being injured during the work experience scheme. The programme has been of tremendous benefit to the students in the country areas of Victoria, whereas the scheme proposed by the Bill would be impracticable. Earlier, I referred to the Postmaster-General's Department, the Young Men's Christian Association, the State Electricity Commission, architects and veterinary surgeons.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. J. Nicol): I hope Mr. Bradbury will excuse the interruption, but is he repeating what he said in his second-reading speech?

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: I understood that the rules of the Committee state that, provided that I speak to the clause, I am entitled to continue. I am speaking to the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I was merely going to suggest to the honorable member that if he is repeating his second-reading speech perhaps he could truncate it a little.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: With due deference to you, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in the interests of the children of this State and I will reiterate what I have been saying whether it is on the first reading, the second reading, or the third reading. I believe sincerely that this Bill will be the death knell of work experience schemes in country centres, because it is an impractical measure which will be unnecessarily forced on the students.

Surely the Government should take note of the unanimous recommendation of the committee which was referred to in another place, but which has not been mentioned in this place. The members of the committee have had practical experience with the scheme and therefore would not want to kill it. Members of the Country Party have knowledge of a work experience programme and therefore the Country Party pleads with the Government, even at this closing stage of the sessional period, not to take this action as the technical college with which I am associated has students participating in the work experience programme over the Christmas vacation.

The Country Party appeals to the Government to retract from this measure because it was never intended by the Liberal Party committee that payments were to be made under the scheme as long as the students participating in it were adequately and securely covered by the Workers Compensation Act.

The Committee divided on the clause (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	22
Noes	6
Majority for the clause	16

AYES.

Mr. Block	Mr. Houghton
Mr. Byrne	Mr. Hunt
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Jenkins
Mr. Crozier	Mr. Kent
Mr. Elliot	Mr. Long
Mr. Fry	Mr. Trayling
Mr. Galbally	Mr. Tripovich
Mr. Gleeson	Mr. Ward
Mr. Grimwade	
Mr. Gross	*Tellers:*
Mr. Hamilton	Mr. Knight
Mr. Hauser	Mr. Storey

NOES.

Mr. Clarke	*Tellers:*
Mr. Dunn	
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Bradbury
Mr. Swinburne	Mr. Wright

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and the report was adopted.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province): This Bill to prevent work experience for students shows the position the Government has reached with its majority in the Parliament. It has presented a Bill which was not studied by members of the Government and which the Minister did not master or understand. The Minister says, "Thank you" to me for those remarks, but that is his only comment.

In bringing the Bill before the House, the Government hid behind a committee, the members of which have not been named, but who were said to be union experts, teacher experts, and employer experts. The names have not been given to the House although I suggested to the Minister that they should be provided.

The Government has chosen to use its numbers to push through a Bill which will be a tragedy for the concept of work experience which has worked well in so many schools. Those honorable members who support the Government but who have remained silent are blameworthy; I know that many of them have grave misgivings about the Bill. The Country Party deeply regrets that the Government has made this attack on the work experience programme which was functioning so well in our high and technical schools. It condemns the Government for a most inadvisable measure.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province): Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! I should point out that *May* says that debate on the third reading is more restricted than that on earlier stages and that it is limited to the contents of the Bill. I need go no further.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: I am glad that you can read my thoughts, Mr. President, and foretell what I intend to say. I shall not keep the House long. I know that that statement, at least, will be well received by Mr. Galbally. All children at the Wangaratta Technical College will now be told that, because of the stupidity of the Government's actions, they will be denied the right of work experience which they have valued so much.

The Hon. W. G. FRY: If they are told that, it will not be true, and Mr. Bradbury knows it.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: Mr. Fry is saying that he knows the area which I represent better than I do. He cannot deny that I have the names of employers who have been approached and who have said that, because of the payment demanded by this stupid Government, they will not be interested in the scheme.

The PRESIDENT: I do not know about Mr. Fry, but "Mr. May" says that Mr. Bradbury must adhere to the terms of the Bill.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY: This is inherent in the Bill, Mr. President. It is the factor which will determine the success or failure of its operation. I want the Government to know that I will make no secret of the fact that it is the wish of this supposedly liberal Government—liberal in what, I do not know—to prevent students from gaining valuable work experience. When I tell the students these things publicly, the Government will not be able to say that I did not warn it.

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

Ayes	.. ..	23
Noes	.. ..	6
Majority for the motion	..	17

AYES.

Mr. Block	Mr. Jenkins
Mr. Byrne	Mr. Kent
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Knight
Mr. Crozier	Mr. Long
Mr. Fry	Mr. Nicol
Mr. Galbally	Mr. Storey
Mr. Gleeson	Mr. Trayling
Mr. Grimwade	Mr. Tripovich
Mr. Gross	Mr. Ward
Mr. Hauser	*Tellers:*
Mr. Houghton	Mr. Elliot
Mr. Hunt	Mr. Hamilton

NOES.

Mr. Dunn	*Tellers:*
Mr. McDonald	
Mr. Swinburne	Mr. Bradbury
Mr. Wright	Mr. Clarke

The Bill was read a third time.

The sitting was suspended at 6.35 p.m. until 7.48 p.m.

MOTOR BOATING (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 5) was resumed on the motion of the Hon. A. J. Hunt (Minister for Local Government)—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

and on Mr. Knight's amendment—

That all the words after "That" be omitted with the view of inserting in place thereof—

"this House refuses to read this Bill a second time until an investigation has been made of safety measures necessary to adequately protect both users of boats and the public in general".

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province) : This is a most welcome Bill in more ways than one. It amends the Motor Boating Act 1961. Listening to the debates and the points that have been raised, I have had difficulty in ascertaining where members of the Labor Party stand on the issue. Members of the Country Party take the attitude that if a Bill to control motor boating is to be strict and concise enough to tie up all the loopholes, it will be so restrictive that people will be unable to go on the bay or the various waterways of the State in a boat.

The amendment moved by Mr. Knight seeks to have the Bill withdrawn, and yet in his speech Mr. Knight referred to the need to achieve greater safety in boating. Admittedly the Bill is not perfect and contains loopholes. I believe this is necessary. How far does Parliament want to control and tie up the operations of boats? If the people who act responsibly are restricted to a great degree, a wonderful sport, recreation, pastime and hobby will be spoilt. Boating is something that man has enjoyed for centuries.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE : Not motor boating.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN : Mr. Knight will agree that the Bill goes further than motor boating. I read the honorable member's remarks with great interest.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE : That was the reason for the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN : Mr. Swinburne was good enough to move the adjournment on my behalf so that I could study Mr. Knight's remarks. Man has enjoyed and used boating for hunting, transportation and sheer pleasure. There is no doubt that a motor boat in the wrong hands, particularly a power boat, can be a lethal weapon and equally as dangerous as a car on the road. It amazes me that more accidents do not occur considering the number of boats that are using the waterways. It has been stated that there are 60,000 registered boats in the State and the number is increasing at a tremendous rate.

Members of the Country Party agree with the necessity to control and improve safety. We are aware that the irresponsible element of the boating public is in the minority. The majority of people who use boats on the waterways or harbors of the State, whether they be water-skiers or power boat operators, carefully observe the rules. They are enthusiasts with a knowledge and interest in boating generally.

The majority of the boating public are responsible people with an interest in their hobby or pastime. Members of the Country Party do not wish the Bill to be so restrictive that it will confine these enthusiasts to such a degree that the pleasure, enjoyment and freedom of boating are lost. Freedom is perhaps the most enjoyable aspect of boating. One does not want to restrict the enjoyment of boating. The arguments which have been put forward in this House and in another place suggest that the Bill should be drawn so tightly that a couple of boys will not be able to launch a row-boat on a creek.

As I said before, motor boats in the hands of the wrong people can be dangerous. If this Bill or any other measure can restrict the irresponsible use of boats without unduly restricting the majority of the boating public, it has the support of the Country Party.

The Bill makes a number of important amendments in this direction. Not all of them will be effective because, like the Motor Car Act and various regulations concerning the operation of motor vehicles, it relies on enforcement. The enforcement of the Motor Boating Act is limited to the operations of a small section of the Police Force, the police Motor Boating Squad, which has sixteen

members and ten boats to cover the whole State of Victoria, so what hope has it of doing so? The majority of people are fairly responsible, and one of the greatest benefits they can receive is to have their responsibilities in a boat outlined to them and be aware that these provisions apply on the Victorian waterways. The question is how this can be brought about.

If motor boating legislation is to be effective this should be done at the time of the registration of the boat. There is no provision for the licensing of operators. A full and up-to-date copy of the regulations and provisions of the Bill should be given to people on registering and renewing registration of their motor boats, telling them specifically and concisely what their responsibilities are.

The Country Party has advocated that a similar provision could apply to motor car drivers' licences and registration. I hope the Minister and the Government will investigate this possibility, because the Bill could be ineffective if the majority of people do not know its provisions.

The Bill also allows a refund to be given when a boat ceases to be registered before the expiry of its registration, which could be up to three years. If a person registers a boat and wishes to sell it after a year, he may seek a refund of the registration fee for the two years during which the boat is out of his possession.

The measure will allow trade plates to be provided for the testing and exhibition of boats. An initial fee of $20 and a fee of $2 a year thereafter will be charged.

Clause 7 provides that a person shall not operate a motor boat on any Victorian waters while towing more than three persons at one time if the persons are riding on water skis, surfboards or other similar devices. A hypothetical argument has been propounded of what would happen in the case of a shipwreck or accident if five or six people needed to be towed by boat from the scene of an accident. Perhaps it is a valid example of something that could occur, although I do not think any prosecuting officer would exercise his authority in such a case.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Even if he did so, there is a legal defence of necessity.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: One of the members of the Country Party suggested that instead of limiting the provision as outlined in clause 7, it could be phrased to provide that a person shall not operate a motor boat on any Victorian waters at a speed of more than 16 kilometres an hour while towing more than three persons at any one time.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: At that speed, a skier could only just get up on the skis.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: That is the minimum speed. If it were applied to this clause, it would allow the driver of a motor boat, if he came upon an accident or had to tow more than three people, to do so legally at a speed of less than 16 kilometres an hour. Persons need not necessarily be on skis.

More than three persons could not be towed on water skis at one time, and if the speed were limited to 16 kilometres an hour this could not be done because, as the Minister said, that is the cut-off point below which skiing is impossible.

Clause 7 also refers to the need to have a responsible observer in the boat. It is aimed at eliminating the present provision which would allow young children to act as observers in a boat. The driver, however, could be sixteen years of age or younger. There may be a need to look at the licensing provisions.

If the loopholes which the Opposition has outlined were closed boating in Victoria would be so restricted that a couple of children would not be able to launch a raft on a creek. I do not want it to reach that stage.

Clause 10 refers to a person operating a boat recklessly or negligently or in a manner dangerous to the public. That is a wide coverage, and one may well ask what is reckless and what is negligent? However, there needs to be some breadth in the interpretation. It is difficult to define the matter strictly.

Under the Bill, penalties for breaches will be increased from $100 to $200 although there is an exemption for yachts which are racing under special competition conditions. Under clause 8, it is proposed to substitute a life belt for a life jacket. Clause 9 relates to the shut-off mechanism for motor boats. Clause 11 amends section 28 of the principal Act to extend the offences of operating a motor boat whilst under the influence of intoxicating liquor or of any drug to all classes of boats, and clause 12 relates to safety distances and speeds.

The Bill adopts a new concept in regard to fines and penalties. Schedule 3 lists fixed penalties for boating infringements. One could perhaps criticize certain aspects of the infringements and the penalties provided, but at least people will know what they are up for if they are in breach of the Act and it will mean less time spent in court by enforcement officers in proving a case.

Clause 17 provides that all registration fees shall be paid into the Tourist Fund and that after certain deductions the money remaining shall be applied for motor boating facilities.

The Country Party does not intend to oppose the Bill. I note that Mr. Galbally makes some derisive comment. If the right of honorable members in this House to speak is taken away, Parliament might as well be dispensed with.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: If that is the sort of contribution Mr. Dunn can make, it should be.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Honorable members have had to listen to rubbish spoken in this House day after day. Many motions in which members of the Country Party have had no interest have been debated, but we have been prepared to participate in those debates in the interests of Parliamentary democracy.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Order! That is not the subject of the debate; Mr. Dunn should speak to the Bill.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN: Mr. Galbally has cast some reflections on me and I should have the right to answer those comments. I hope the House does not support the remarks by Mr. Galbally.

The Country Party will vote for the Bill because it goes some of the way towards achieving a greater degree of safety. Nothing will be gained by postponing the Bill as suggested by Mr. Knight. The Country Party sees the need constantly to improve safety and control boating activities. We hope it does not reach the stage where boating is over-controlled and the freedom, pleasure and enjoyment derived from it are taken away from the people of this State.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON (Higinbotham Province): I shall make some comments in the light of the remarks made by Mr. Knight with his whistle. He seems to have laboured under the misapprehension that the Bill was plucked out of the air by people who knew nothing about boating. To set his mind at rest, perhaps I should briefly explain some of the circumstances under which the Bill was brought to the Liberal Party committee and later to Parliament.

The Bill has been in the course of preparation for a long time and people who know more about all aspects of boating than Mr. Knight have been consulted. The Liberal Party committee which was charged with the ultimate vetting of the measure included two experienced yachtsmen, one a deep water yachtsman, and also a motor boat expert who has owned and operated motor boats for many years.

Not being satisfied with this, the committee sought the advice of the ultimate authority in Victoria in yachting, the Victorian Yachting Council. The Bill was prepared in consultation with representatives of that council who attended many conferences, which were also attended by representatives of the major motor boating organizations in Victoria. In case Mr. Knight does not think that authoritative bodies were consulted, perhaps I should mention that a club which is close to his heart was represented by the Victorian Yachting Council. I refer to the Royal Victorian Yacht Club.

The committee also had the advice of the Port Phillip Power Boat Association, the Australian Volunteer Coast Guard Association, Geelong Yachting Club, Beaumaris Motor Yacht Squadron Co-operative Ltd., the Blue Water Cruising Club, the Victorian Speedboat Club, the Australian Offshore Power Boat Club, the Patterson River Motor Boat Club, the Victorian Water Ski Association, the Melbourne Speedboat Club and the Victorian Council of Australian Power Boating Associations. The fact that the Bill was prepared in consultation with representatives of those organizations rather gives the lie to the claim by Mr. Knight that it was prepared by incompetent members of the Liberal Party who did not know anything about the subject.

As the Minister remarks, there is a notable omission in that the Williamstown sea scouts were not consulted. Mr. Knight seems to know more about what is needed in a Bill of this nature than do those authoritative bodies.

Mr. Dunn expressed the matter well when he said the intention was to provide for a recreation which is becoming more and more popular, without constricting it so much that the enjoyment of it becomes impossible. The Government has had to strike a balance between control in the interests of safety and freedom in the interests of enjoyment and it was not an easy balance to strike. If one looks at it in a strict way, one finds that obvious criticisms can be made of the Bill. However, if one considers the Bill in the sense of a recreation which can be enjoyed by a large number of people and in which a large number of people are involved, the Bill has a great deal of merit. It provides some of the most needed measures or strengthens some of the measures already in existence to provide for the safety of people involved not only in boating but in other water sports and enjoying recreations around our bays and inland waters. It has been prepared in consultation not only with the people I have mentioned but also with the authorities charged with the control of Victoria's inland waters; it has their approbation. To suggest that it has been hastily prepared and does not represent the views of experts on the subject is to mislead the House.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT: The Government should talk to the Port Phillip Pilot Service.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON: The matter concerns yachting and does not concern the *Wyuna* and the heavy deep sea vessels that come into Australia. They are controlled under a different Act which is not relevant to this debate. I merely emphasize that the Bill has the approbation of the various authoritative bodies. Amendments were made to meet their suggestions and they understood and readily accepted the reasons why other amendments which they suggested could not be incorporated in the Bill. The Government achieved a great deal of co-operation with those bodies and has arranged for this to be continued in the interests of water sports, boating and motor boating in Victoria. The Bill serves a need and I commend it.

The House divided on the question that the words proposed by Mr. Knight to be omitted stand part of the motion (Sir Raymond Garrett in the chair)—

Ayes	..	23
Noes	..	6
Majority against the amendment	..	17

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Granter	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hider	Mr. Walton
Mr. Long	Mr. Eddy

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clauses 1 to 14 were agreed to.

Clause 15 (Boating infringements).

The Committee divided on the clause (the Hon. G. J. Nicol in the chair)—

Ayes	..	22
Noes	..	6
Majority for the clause	..	16

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIRS.

Mr. Granter	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hider	Mr. Walton
Mr. Long	Mr. Eddy

Clauses 16 and 17 were agreed to.

Clause 18 (Amendment of No. 6832 s. 2).

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province): Clause 18 amends section 2 of the principal Act, which is the section containing interpretations. Firstly, the interpretation of "horsepower" is repealed. Secondly, there is a change brought about by metric conversion, and the matter to which I refer is the proposed new interpretation of "power units'. The second portion of the interpretation refers to power units related to internal combustion engines. It follows a fairly standard formula which is commonly used in assessing the power of an internal combustion engine. The final provision in the clause relates to an engine other than an internal combustion engine. I ask the Minister what other form of engine is likely to be used in a power boat. The most likely would be a steam engine of some kind. In what will become section 2 (1) (iii) (*b*) of the Act, it is provided that the power of an engine other than in internal combusion engine shall be—

> the power units indicated by the manufacturer or, where they are not so indicated, the power units declared by a statutory declaration of the owner to be the power units of the engine.

That is an unusual way to approach a problem of this kind. I would have thought it would be as easy to define how the power of an alternative type of engine should be determined as to define how the power of an engine other than an internal combustion engine should be determined. It seems odd to rely on a statutory declaration of the owner of the engine.

I ask the Minister what are the likely alternative forms of power and whether it is not possible to define the power units of other than internal combustion engines in the precise way in which the power units of internal combustion engines are defined.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Western Province): I take issue with the words "power units". I can imagine a boat owner laboriously unscrewing the cylinder head of the engine and multiplying its area by various things and arriving at the number he first thought of. In any case, the result determined by the owner of the engine should not be accepted as its true power.

An alternative form of power would be the Flettner rotorship. In the 1930s, a remarkable German designed this ship. He used a theory —that of Bournville relating to a drop in pressure, that when the speed of the gas increases the pressure drops. What he designed could be called a sailing ship but it was propelled by the effect of the wind blowing past the rotors which are rotating. Admittedly, they are clumsy to use in yachts. In the event of their being used, I can see great problems arising because the Bill does not take account of them or give any indication of how the horsepower would be calculated.

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.

ADJOURNMENT.

CHRISTMAS FELICITATIONS.

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

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until a day and hour to be fixed by the President or, if the President is unable to act on account of illness or other cause, by the Chairman of Committees, which time of meeting shall be notified to each honorable member by telegram or letter.

Once again, on behalf of members of the Government party and, indeed, of all honorable members of this House, I thank you, Mr. President, for the impartial, courteous, dignified and, above all, tolerant way in which you have conducted the affairs of the House during this sessional period. We all are very proud of this House and of you as its presiding officer. This House has some outstanding features; some of them are unique. One of the outstanding features is the wonderful spirit of co-operation that exists between the leaders and all members in conducting the affairs of the House, and in enacting legislation on behalf of the people of Victoria. That does not mean that the Opposition consists of tame cats. It does not mean that members of Parliament are not prepared at every opportunity to put a strong point of view and to exercise their rights. Mr. President, tonight you have seen them try to speak to a fourth reading of a Bill!

Another thing of which honorable members are conscious is that this House has great privileges, and the members have great rights—greater rights, I suggest, than any other House in Australia. We have seen tonight that members of this House have an unlimited right to put a point of view; they have an unlimited period of time in which to do it, even though on occasions it may be frustrating when private members' Bills are being debated; to raise matters again is very much a feature of the House. All these things may have been born from the fact that for more than 100 years no Government has had absolute control in this House. Honorable members are proud to be members of this House despite the fact that in recent times the Government majority has been a little shaky, but every member of the House is jealous of the rights of the House and the rights of its members.

To the people who are more the custodians of the rights and privileges of the members, and who are probably responsible for this co-operation that exists in the House, I certainly pay a tribute. I refer to the leaders, the senior members of this House, my colleague and very good friend, Mr. Galbally, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ivan Swinburne, the two deputies, Mr. Jack Tripovich and Mr. Stuart McDonald. I thank them for their co-operation and for the way in which they have acted in the very highest traditions of the House. My Cabinet colleagues, with the exception of myself—we always say we have the best Ministers in the Parliament—are good, hard-working, dedicated Ministers, Ministers who get better as the years go on, and who are certainly conscious of their responsibility to the House and to the members. I thank them all for the courteous way in which they have handled the business of the House and for helping to give members the opportunity of putting their point of view and discussing legislation at any time.

The Chairman of Committees is one of the great personalities of the House. He is a very difficult person at times as far as I am concerned, but when he gets in the Chair he is wonderful and impartial, and he has a fine sense of humour. I thank him for his work on behalf of the House.

I hope other honorable members will talk about the Whips, but I must say that the Government party has a fantastic Whip ; he is 500 times better than I was in that position, and he now receives some slight remuneration. I am very grateful to the honorable member. I am sure other leaders in the House share my views.

There are many other members who make up the House. I shall not mention them by name. That is really your privilege, Mr. President, and you can do it in a way in which I certainly cannot. I thank them all on behalf of the Government. I am happy to wish all honorable members a very happy and safe Christmas. I hope they will have the opportunity of spending some time with their families. I try to make up for the fact that I do not spend much time with my family, and do all the things I should do during the Christmas period. I hope I shall see everybody back here in March, when there will be an even more active and fruitful session. Again, on behalf of the people of Victoria I thank all members of the House.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province) : Mr. President, on behalf of the Opposition, I acknowledge the fair way in which the Government has conducted the business of this House. It seems to me that an elementary task of the leaders in this House is to arrange the business ; if we cannot do that we ought no longer to be leaders. What happens once everything is sorted out is beyond our control.

In all the dealings I have had with the Leader of the House, he has shown that he maintains the highest traditions of integrity and helpfulness of the late Sir Gilbert Chandler who, I remind the House, departed from us almost a year ago and who is still missed very much by some of us.

To my sometimes friend and usual enemy, Mr. Swinburne, I want to say that his announcement to the House that he will be retiring before the next election was received with very great regret by all honorable members, and particularly the members of my party. We are used to seeing him here with his craggy features and his sometimes puritanical approach, but above all we respect his skills in Parliamentary debate and his complete integrity.

The Opposition has received from all the Ministers very warm co-operation and help. Honorable members delight to see Mr. Nicol as Chairman of Committees, with his sharp wit and great respect for the Parliamentary institution.

Now, Sir, with your unbounded energy in your early seventies.

The PRESIDENT: Not quite so early now!

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY: And not very late either, Sir. But you do not surprise us any more because we have come to realize your energies and your great respect for this House, the integrity of the House, and your desire to see the debates conducted fairly, properly, but with vigour.

I thank all my colleagues for having put up with me once again, and I also ask the House to pardon us all for the indiscretions and mistakes that we see in others but fail to see in ourselves. The hardest job of a member of Parliament after being here for a number of years is to listen to the other fellow talking.

Mr. President, you have never failed with meticulous detail to thank all the officers of this House. Both the Leader of the House and I feel that this task, a duty and pleasure, should reside in your hands. Whenever I visit the Library, the staff run, but I catch up with them. The Parliament of Victoria is privileged in having such an energetic, learned and understanding staff in the Library. The Clerk of the House is a most learned man and is all things to all men. Information goes in one ear and stays there, until someone comes along and it goes into the other ear and stays there. The integrity of the clerks is a matter of wonderment which only those honorable members who have been in Parliament for a number of years can understand and appreciate. To you, Sir, and all honorable members and their families, I wish a happy Christmas and a happy recollection of this year spent in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province): I join with the Leader of the House and Mr. Galbally in expressing to you, Mr. President, our sincere thanks for your patience and tolerance in conducting the affairs of the House. Members of the Country Party have contributed to the rowdiness of the House, but, you, Sir, have handled us with a great deal of tact and tolerance, which we appreciate. Occasionally we have tested your strength and that of your worthy Chairman of Committees. My good friends on the opposite side have also been involved in some trials of strength, but we have come to respect both you, Sir, and the Chairman. You have sometimes frowned as if you were about to name someone and throw them out of the place, but you have always kept us in the Chamber and have had a happy fellowship with us. To you, Sir, and your Chairman of Committees, we express our thanks for the courtesy that has been extended to us.

Members of the Country Party have had a happy association with the Leader of the House and his Ministers. Mr. Galbally says that someone must run the House. Mr. Galbally and I and whoever is the Minister in charge of a Bill, have always co-operated with each other. It is difficult to keep Ministers running straight down the Notice Paper, but we always seem to get somewhere near that objective. We appreciate the frank way in which the Leader of the House and his Ministers have dealt with Bills and the way in which debates have been conducted in this Chamber. One of the things I have enjoyed over the long years I have been a member of Parliament has been this House; it has been my life. I enjoy the parry and thrust of debate with everyone, but I always hope we remain friends. Whatever we might disagree about, our relationships have always remained on an even keel.

I join with the Leader of the House in paying tribute to the overworked and under-paid Government party Whip, who is the busiest man in the House. Often when he becomes frustrated he will sit beside

me and say, "Do you know what is to be dealt with next, because I would not have a clue?". It happens sometimes that things run off the rails. Probably Mr. Galbally has sneaked in the back door and decided that he wants a change. The poor Whip must bear the brunt of it because he has probably already informed me that a certain course would be followed. We appreciate Mr. Jenkins's tolerance and understanding in running the House smoothly. Mr. Walton and Mr. McDonald have both enjoyed fellowship with the Whips of the House.

My old friend, Mr. Galbally, and I sometimes say terrible things to one another. Members of his party may make some hostile remarks, and so might I, but it is all taken in good fellowship. Some members who sit on the back bench, more so than those on the front bench, with the exception of my friend who is busy concocting some skulduggery at the moment, have always enjoyed the debates. My good friend Mr. Kent has been a little subdued over the past few weeks because of his bad luck, which we greatly regret. I expect when he returns in the autumn sessional period he will be back to his old form.

I thank my fellow members of the Country Party for their loyalty and I express appreciation to my deputy who is always present when I am not. When I want something he always seems to be able to produce it. People sometimes say we talk too much. However, we are elected to do a job. I suppose, as Mr. Galbally says, the longer one stays here, the more impatient one becomes when the other fellow is talking. I like to see the young enthusiastic members. When Mr. Galbally first came into this Chamber, he was similar to Country Party back-bench members now; he could not be stopped. He has not changed as it still takes a lot to stop him. To each and every member of the House, I express my thanks for the fellowship that has been extended to members of the Country Party and myself. I wish all members of this House the best for Christmas and the coming year. I trust that we will meet again here when the bells ring some time in the New Year.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL (Monash Province) : I thank the Leaders of the various parties for what may have been their excessively kind remarks about me. I also express my great appreciation to all members of the Chamber for the kindly tolerance they show to my little foibles. I can only say that those foibles are directed at maintaining what I believe to be the best traditions and integrity of this Chamber.

I also thank the clerks for their great assistance when I have occupied the chair. I should perhaps make special reference to the Clerk, Mr. McDonnell. Members may not generally know that Mr. McDonnell has a clot in his leg and he assures me that the volumes of *Hansard* under the table have been extremely useful for resting his leg. He also assures me that it is the first time that he has found any use for *Hansard*. To yourself, Sir, and to members of the Council, my sincere wishes for the merriest of Christmases and the happiest of New Years.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province) : I crave your indulgence, Sir, and that of honorable members. As you well know, Mr. President, I am not averse to verse. I fully realize that the final felicitations should come from your good self. That is why I stand up at this moment.

Mr. President, we go our ways—
may we meet next year,

And be pleased to say, "Hullo friends, we're glad to be here".

As time passes, we once again hanker

To debate, to argue, without any rancour.

Good luck, good health, to you and yours.

Enjoy to the full this Parliamentary pause,

Mr. President, thank you, Sir, for your toleration ;

You're a credit, Sir, to this State, to this nation.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Raymond Garrett): Before intimating to the House on behalf of all present our thanks to various people, I should like to thank the Leader of the House, Mr. Galbally, and Mr. Swinburne, for the kindly remarks they passed about me. It is a pleasure and a privilege to have been permitted to serve for such a long time in this post which I hold.

I thank everyone in the Chamber for their co-operation and tolerance. Mr. Galbally mentioned that the most difficult thing, after one has been a member of this place for some years, was to listen to other people speak. I have to sit here by the hour and listen to them speak, but the severest cross I have to bear is to have beautiful interjections running around my head and not be able to pop any of them out! One can think of them when one is sitting here, but it is dreadful not to be able to use them.

I was very pleased that Mr. Galbally mentioned the late Sir Gilbert Chandler because I am about to mention him. Reference has been made to how smoothly this Chamber works. That is due to the co-operation between the leaders of the parties. You, Mr. Leader, I know, have followed in the path that the late Sir Gilbert Chandler trod. He worked out those arrangements over many years and found that they worked. You and the other leaders have, as I said, followed in his path. We miss him very much and realize that he was a great Parliamentarian and a great Australian. This Chamber is certainly the poorer for his passing.

I congratulate the Leader of the House on the manner in which he has handled the business of the Chamber over the past year. I think he is possibly the youngest Leader this House has ever had. Members who have been in the House longer than I have would probably know whether that is so. Mr. Byrne has an old head on young shoulders, and we all appreciate the courtesy, sincerity, humour and charm with which he has handled the business of the Chamber and frequently poured oil over troubled waters.

The Leader has been well backed up in his absence by his deputy Mr. Dickie and three other Ministers who have performed excellently. It has been said that the Ministers in this Chamber are excellent, and that is the truth. They are well trained in the Legislative Council. We have even trained a couple of good Ministers who have gone over to another place, to the advantage of that other place. Since I have been in this House, for almost seventeen years, there has been a high standard on the Ministerial bench.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the co-operation I have received from him. Occasionally we cross swords, but not often.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY : I have lost my sword!

The PRESIDENT : Mine has been bent. Both Leaders and I understand one another and get along well together. That applies also to the deputies. Both Leaders have good deputies in Mr. Tripovich and Mr. McDonald. Everyone in the Chamber appreciates what they do.

Quite a lot has been said about Mr. Nicol, the Chairman of Committees, and I confirm those remarks. I thank Mr. Nicol for the assistance which he gives me by standing in when I have been sitting here for three or four hours and need to stretch my legs. He is always able to take over capably. I also congratulate him on the way he handles the Chamber during the Committee stage. That applies also to the temporary Chairmen. Their numbers have crept up, like inflation. Mr. Bradbury—who wears two hats ; one

as the party Whip—Mr. Campbell, Mr. Elliot, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hauser, Mr. Knight and Mr. Ward have all served capably in the centre chair, and I thank them. Mr. Jenkins, the Whip, has been mentioned. He has whipped this place as it has never been whipped before. It is not an easy task to get everyone into this place when they are needed. The task can be arduous and sometimes unpleasant and thankless. Mr. Jenkins has carried this out excellently and we all appreciate his efforts.

I thank the table officers, Mr. McDonnell, Mr. Grose and Mr. Evans. They always provide assistance both inside and outside the Chamber. Their work is continuous and arduous, and no matter what I ask them to do for me, it is always done quickly, cheerfully and efficiently. We appreciate the standard of our table officers. The Clerk of the Papers, Mr. Mithen, runs a department which is extremely useful to us. I congratulate Miss McGovern, the Librarian, and the Assistant Librarian Mr. McVilly, not only on their qualifications but on their enthusiasm for the Library of this Parliament, which is a most useful section of the organization.

Mr. Oliver and his staff perform an excellent task. Mr. Oliver officially is the Housekeeper and no House could be kept better than this House is kept. It is a pleasure to walk around this side of the building and see the standard of maintenance here. He does many other things as well. When there are calls from ambassadors, which happens almost every week, they are always ushered in by Mr. Oliver and I am sure a favourable impression is made because there is an atmosphere about him. We appreciate not only what he does personally, but the way he organizes his staff to carry out his duties so efficiently.

I thank Mr. Stuart and the staff of *Hansard* for their work. An old story is told that they make speeches out of what we say in Parliament, but they do more than that. They work very long hours on what is probably a thankless job. They carry it out efficiently and well. We appreciate everything that is done by the *Hansard* reporters, typists and staff members.

It is unusual to mention Mr. Campbell because he is not actually an officer of the Parliament. I thank him for the work he does as secretary to the party. He carries out his duties efficiently and well, as I am sure the secretaries do on the other side of the Chamber.

As I mentioned before, Mr. Bradbury wears two hats, as does Mr. Tripovich. They both carry out their duties well and to the satisfaction of the various parties.

The staff of the refreshment rooms were mentioned at a function which honorable members attended a couple of nights ago. We appreciate everything that Mr. Barry and Mr. Kerr and their staff do for us. No matter until what hour Parliament sits, there is always something ready for us when we have finished. Meals are prepared excellently and served pleasantly and happily by an efficient and charming staff of young ladies, and we appreciate what they do for us.

I thank my secretary, Miss Green, who makes my life easier. She is a most efficient young lady and carries her efficiency into the typing pool, with which she is closely associated.

I thank also my driver, Mr. Fred Gotts. Those who have cars provided for them—and we are very fortunate to have this service, which is a great satisfaction—receive wonderful service from their drivers. I thank my driver, who has helped me so much over the years. I also thank my orderly, Mr. Collins, who is always there when he is wanted and looks after everything on this side of the building very well.

We do not see much of Mr. Tynan, the engineer, who looks after the building, but the task he performs

is arduous and he has carried it out efficiently and well over more years than I would care to remember. He has been here for many years and has an able and efficient staff.

I suppose the bowlers would like me to thank the head gardener and the greenkeeper. I understand that bowls are rolled from time to time on the back lawn. Although I am not a bowler, I am led to believe that the green is kept in good order.

One person whom we do not always thank is the Government Printer. We sit in this House until the early hours of the morning and the clerks work after the House rises. It does not matter how late we are, the Notice Paper always appears on our desks next morning. The Government Printer should be thanked for all he does. I think I have covered all those who should be thanked.

I pass on to all honorable members my best wishes for a Happy Christmas and a peaceful and prosperous New Year. I also extend the wish that was extended by the Leader of the House; that we see one another early in the New Year. I wish everybody a safe trip to their homes, particularly those from far-distant places. Perhaps I could suggest that honorable members will guarantee their reappearance by driving carefully and wearing their safety belts.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.17 *p.m.*

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

WELFARE HOUSING.

(Question No. 244)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

What liaison exists between the Housing Commission and the Social Welfare Department to re-house families on the recommendation of the department in order that —(i) children can be returned to their families from institutions; and (ii) children can be kept at home with their families and avoid placement in institutional care?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

No formal agreement exists between the Social Welfare Department and the Housing Commission of Victoria regarding preferential treatment in the matter of housing social welfare clients.

However, officers of the Social Welfare Department are often in contact with Housing Commission staff regarding the housing needs of individual clients.

AVAILABILITY OF STATE WARDS FOR ADOPTION.

(Question No. 247)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

How many State wards—(i) are currently available for adoption; and (ii) could be made available for adoption under the powers of the Adoption of Children Act 1964.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(i) There are 41 state wards available for adoption who have not been placed with adoptive applicants. A number of these children suffer serious medical difficulties and it is unlikely that applicants will be found for them.

(ii) There is no way of ascertaining the number of children that can be made available for adoption under the Adoption of Children Act 1964. The Act requires the consent of parents to the child's adoption but provides that the Court may dispense with the consent on various grounds.

Very few parents of State wards are prepared to consent to the child's adoption and adoption is inappropriate for most State wards in view of involvement of parents and siblings.

CHILD WELFARE.

(Question No. 249)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

What assistance is available from the Social Welfare Department to—(i) voluntary welfare agencies; and (ii) policewomen —to assist them in arranging an alternative preferable to the placement of children in institutions?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer supplied is lengthy, and I

seek leave of the House to have it incorporated in *Hansard*, without it being read.

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows—

Assistance from the Social Welfare Department is as follows:—

1. Voluntary welfare agencies providing a family counselling service for parents are eligible to apply for a financial grant from the Welfare Services Fund.

2. The department is now able to provide family supportive grants for families where there is danger of the children being placed in institutions or to enable children in institutions to return to their families more quickly. As this is the first year funds have been available for this purpose, two pilot schemes are being conducted to test the effectiveness of the grants. The department's Central Highlands Regional Centre (Ballarat) will make grants to selected families to prevent admission of children to institutions. The second scheme will be conducted by the Children's Homes Section and involves grants to enable children in institutions to be returned to their families more quickly.

3. In January, 1974, the department commenced the approved fostering scheme to encourage the greater use of foster care as an alternative to institutional care for children who are unable to remain in the care of their own families. The Geelong foster-care programme and the Methodist Department of Child Care have already come into the scheme and other agencies are considering applying for approval. Under the scheme, the department subsidizes the voluntary agencies for all wards placed in foster care and for non-wards at the ratio of one non-ward for every two wards placed.

4. The Family Assistance Section provides financial assistance for non-parents who are unable to obtain maintenance payments from the parents.

5. Voluntary agencies have access to a consulting service on child placements through the department's Family Counselling Section.

STATE WARDS IN CHILDREN'S HOMES.

(Question No. 254)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

In respect of State wards in children's homes—

(*a*) What is the current practice of the Social Welfare Department in regard to the review and planning for all wards?

(*b*) How frequently are wards in voluntary children's homes visited by a representative of the department?

(*c*) How frequently are parents of wards visited to review their circumstances and assess whether their children could return home?

(*d*) How many wards in children's homes have been reviewed on a regular basis in each of the past three financial years?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer supplied is lengthy, and I seek leave of the House to have it incorporated in *Hansard*, without it being read.

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows—

(*a*) The initial planning for a ward is made by Allambie, Baltara or Head Office (Social Welfare Department) placement meetings soon after the child's admission to care.

Once a child leaves a reception centre and is placed in a children's home, it is the responsibility of the Children's Home Section for the review and planning of the child's future.

This responsibility is discharged in various ways depending on the type of case.

It includes formal review meetings between staff members of homes and Children's Homes Section staff; more informal reviews between head office area workers and their supervisors; reviews done by a senior social worker on the basis of a report from the home and a report on the family where applicable; and the "ongoing", informal reviews done by review secretaries.

There are about 900 children not under regular review, usually due to the fact that they were wards before the review systems were implemented. These children may only come to attention when the home concerned advises the Social Welfare Department that home release, private board, or hostel placement should be considered.

(*b*) Due to lack of staffing, there are no regular visits to children's homes to visit and assess children. Rather, visits are arranged when the superintendent matron or parent indicates that home release is a viable alternative.

Other instances where visits would occur would be if a child has been exhibiting behavioural problems and some form of counselling is felt necessary and, to a lesser degree, when holiday arrangements are being made.

(*c*) Again, because of lack of staff, there is no visiting on a regular basis.

Similar standards as above, in question (*a*), would apply.

Other instances where parents would be contacted would emanate from pressure being brought to bear and home release requests being made by the parents. In most cases of this nature, a visit would eventuate and an assessment of the situation made.

(*d*) A record has been kept of all formal review decisions—

1971–72 1,033 children reviewed
1972–73 512 children reviewed
1973–74 318 children reviewed

However, many children are reviewed informally and at the end of 1973–74 financial year there were 2,192 children under both formal and informal review.

CLASSIFICATION OF PRISONERS.

(Question No. 261)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

Is there a classification problem in Victoria's prisons in that incompatible prisoners are forced together to their mutual rehabilitative and emotional disadvantage?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

The Classification Committee of the Prisons Division gives regard to the record and character of men who become prisoners and makes decisions about the placement of men in particular prisons or locations with special attention to the need for ensuring compatibility and maximum rehabilitative opportunity.

PRISON OFFICERS.

(Question No. 262)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) Do prison officers have an opportunity to specialize in the handling of particular offender groups, or are they continually being transferred between divisions without achieving expertise?

(*b*) Do officers at Pentridge prison handling young offenders or mentally disturbed offenders receive special training; if so, what courses are available, who are the lecturers, and what is the duration of the lectures?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) Currently, the division of Pentridge prison into particular wards is being undertaken with a special intention of enabling officers to remain on duty in the same location.

(*b*) In Part II. of the course of training for prison officers, the subject penology II. includes study in the areas referred to by the honorable member.

Courses (Part II.) to date have been conducted by correspondence. It is planned to commence a full-time, six weeks' training course for promotion to senior prison officer in March, 1975. This course will include study in the above areas. The duration of the lectures is not known as yet.

Lecturers in this part of the course will be Mr. Graham Walsh, training officer, Institute of Social Welfare and Mr. Philip Badger, psychologist, H.M. Prison, Pentridge.

PRISON OFFICERS.

(Question No. 268)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

(*a*) How many prison officers possess—(i) the higher school certificate; and (ii) qualifications from recognized tertiary institutions?

(*b*) Does the Social Welfare Department make use of available and relevant tertiary courses as part of its training programme for prison officers?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Social Welfare): The answer is—

(*a*) (i) Two and a number of prison officers are currently studying for the higher school certificate.

(ii) One.

(*b*) The Social Welfare Department provides its own training programme for prison officers at the Institute of Social Welfare.

Prison officers who possess the necessary pre-requisite qualifications may apply for Public Service Board (Victoria) free places at university or study leave to undertake tertiary courses.

ADVERTISING HOARDING REGULATIONS.

(Question No. 270)

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

Is it intended that Advertising Hoarding Regulations be amended; if so—(i) when; and (ii) will advertisements in areas of natural beauty be more stringently controlled?

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

Yes.

(i) Supporting legislation is required, has been prepared, is currently being circulated for comment by interested parties, and will, I hope, be introduced in the autumn session.

(ii) Yes.

TEACHER HOUSING.

(Question No. 271)

The Hon. K. I. WRIGHT (North-Western Province) asked the Minister of Housing—

Has he had discussions with the Treasurer on the need for more funds for teacher housing as indicated in this House on 3rd December; if so, what was the result?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister of Housing): The answer is—

Representations have been made to the Minister of Education seeking the allocation of an additional $2·329 million for teacher housing. This matter is still under consideration.

MUNICIPAL WELFARE SUBSIDIES.

(Question No. 273)

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

In view of the escalation in costs to municipalities in operating infant welfare centres, elderly citizens' clubs and home help services, will the Government consider subsidy payments on the basis of four-fifths of total net cost of the services to councils?

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

Increases in the cost of the various health services conducted by municipal councils, with the assistance of the Department of Health, have been recognized but provision has not yet been made in the Budget for payment of subsidy for all services to be on the basis of four-fifths of net cost.

Provision has been made for payment of the following increased subsidies from 1st October this year:

Infant Welfare Services: $4,000 towards the cost of the salary of each full-time infant welfare sister employed.

Elderly Citizens' Clubs: Four-fifths of the net cost to councils of operating the clubs with a maximum of $3,000 a year.

Home Help Services: Four-fifths of the net cost to councils of the services with $82 a week fixed as the ceiling for the wages of housekeepers.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, December 11, 1974.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. K. H. Wheeler)** took the chair at 11.4 a.m., and read the prayer.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! I have to advise the House that the Chief Secretary is away.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES AT WILSON'S PROMONTORY.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister for Conservation inform the House whether he required any and, if so, what environmental impact study to be carried out before the Mines Department granted leases for an extractive industry operating within the Wilson's Promontory National Park, and what is the nature of the industry which is proposed to operate there? Will the honorable gentleman inform the House of his view on the damage that can be done to the flora and fauna of Wilson's Promontory as a result of those operations?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation): The two leases to which the Leader of the Opposition referred are existing leases. When the northern section which, I believe, is known as Yanakie, was added to the park, both those extractive works were in operation. It was agreed by the National Parks Service at the time of the incorporation of the land that the two facilities would continue to exist and operate. The document relating to the leases which has been tabled before the House is not new. This is a continuation of existing works, and consequently no environmental impact study was made.

YOUNG FARMER MOVEMENT.

Mr. MITCHELL (Benambra): Will the Minister of Agriculture institute an immediate inquiry to ascertain to what extent Mr. Clappison is wrecking the young farmer movement in Victoria?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): This is a matter of opinion from somebody else, but as I said last night during the debate on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting, the Government is happy to provide the Royal Agricultural Society with a sum of money to help it with the operations of the Victorian young farmer movement. It has no intention of fiddling with the internal affairs of the Royal Agricultural Society or of the young farmer movement, and the matter of employment within the movement is the responsibility of the Royal Agricultural Society. Therefore, I do not intend to cause an inquiry to be made.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. FOGARTY (Sunshine): I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of recent amendments made to the Public Service Act reducing the qualifying period for long service leave from fifteen years to ten years, is it the honorable gentleman's intention to amend section 187 of the Railways Act to grant that privilege to certain railway workers?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): Whatever amendments are made to any Acts of Parliament will be applied as intended by the legislation. In so far as these changed arrangements apply to the railways, they will be observed.

WHEAT ADVANCES.

Mr. McCABE (Lowan): I direct a question to the Premier and Treasurer. During the recent debate that took place in the House on what was then a proposed rise in freight charges, the honorable gentleman said that he would try to have the 10 per cent increase deducted from the second advance payment to wheat growers instead of the whole of it being taken from the first advance. In view of the small payment that has been made by the Commonwealth Government as a first advance, has the Premier been successful in his application to have this done?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I wrote to the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board proposing that the increase in rail freights, instead of being deducted from the first payment, should be deducted from a subsequent payment—either the second or the third. I said that the Victorian Government would be prepared to receive the rail freight in two parts to assist the wheat grower to retain as much as possible out of the first payment to enable him to continue in the next season and maintain his liquidity.

I received a reply from the chairman of the board stating that the board was not able to do what I proposed and that the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act required it to deduct the whole of the rail freight from the first advance on the ground that the grower was obliged to deliver his wheat f.o.r. at the port. The cost of getting the grain through by rail to the port is part of the f.o.r. cost.

I propose to ask the Minister of Agriculture to examine the Act to ascertain whether it can be amended to make the Government's proposal work if not for this season then for future seasons, and to obtain whatever consents to this course would be necessary from the other States and from the Commonwealth Government.

CHAIRMAN OF HOUSING COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): I ask the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing, whether Mr. David Hamer was an applicant for the position of Chairman of the Housing

Commission of Victoria. In view of his wide experience and ability, on what basis was he rejected in favour of Mr. Allwinton? Was his relationship with the Premier a factor which unfairly discriminated against him?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): I regard the question as nonsensical. There were many applicants for the position of Chairman of the Housing Commission. A Cabinet sub-committee interviewed a number of applicants and selected the man who they thought was best equipped for the job.

YOUNG FARMER MOVEMENT.

Mr. HANN (Rodney): As the Government provides a grant through the Department of Agriculture for the Victorian young farmer movement and as Mr. Clappison has given the Minister a report concerning the sacking of organizers, will the Minister of Agriculture lay on the table of the Library that report and any other documents relating to the sacking?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): As I indicated earlier, the Government is happy to provide the Royal Agricultural Society with finance to assist in the running of the young farmer movement, and the employment of staff is solely the responsibility of the society. If, as a matter of courtesy, from time to time the society advises the Minister of the activities of the young farmer movement, that is a privilege which the society extends to the Minister. I do not think the society plans that the privilege should be spread any further than direct contact with the Minister himself.

I shall be happy to discuss the matter with the Premier and if it is felt that the report which the Royal Agricultural Society has made to the Minister—it is not called for but is something which the society simply does as a matter of courtesy to the Minister—can be tabled, I will consider the matter and advise the honorable member.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): In view of references in documents in the Library to a proposal by the State Electricity Commission to operate a power station at Tyabb, can the Minister for Fuel and Power inform the House of details of the proposal and what fuel the commission expects to use at the station?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): An area at Tyabb has been obtained for a future power station. There are currently no plans for building the station. The area was available to the commission as a possible suitable location, but the station is in the far distant future.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): Is the Attorney-General aware that only persons aged 35 years or older can qualify for appointment as a justice of the peace? If the Minister is aware of this fact, will he consider recommending that the age of appointment be reduced to a more contemporary level in society, perhaps either eighteen or 21 years of age?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): I am glad the honorable member asked this question because it is quite clear that he does not understand the background of the practice in Victoria of appointing justices of the peace only when they have attained the age of 35 years. The reason is that stipendiary magistrates are not appointed until they are 35 years of age, and, as justices of the peace sit on the bench with stipendiary magistrates, the practice of appointing justices of the peace when they have attained the same age seems to be sensible to me, and I do not see any need to change it.

The other aspect that I think is important is that over a number of years the Government's attitude to the appointment of justices of the

peace has been upgraded. For example, in Victoria there is nowhere near the same number of justices of the peace as there is in New South Wales. That should be borne in mind also.

EDUCATION EXPENSES.

Mr. REESE (Moorabbin): I direct a question to the Minister of Education. I refer to the amended statutory deduction under the income tax scale for education purposes—a reduction from $400 to $150—introduced this year by the Socialist Government in Canberra. What representations has the Minister made to have the decision varied or changed, and what are the prospects of change?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): This is another crazy, off-the-cuff, financial decision which is causing general dissatisfaction.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray): I take a point of order. At question time matters should relate to Government departmental administration. The question asked by the honorable member for Moorabbin relates to the Australian Government's administration of taxes and has nothing to do with the administration of the Victorian Education Department.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The final portion of the question of the honorable member for Moorabbin asked what representations the Minister had made, and that is quite in order.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): In view of the fact that this hasty and ill-judged decision could place increased pressure on accommodation in State schools and cause a degree of financial hardship to the parents of children at independent schools, the matter was raised by Victoria, together with other States, at the Ministers' conference in Adelaide in October. Although the conference was attended by State Ministers of all political complexions, there was no support for the move in its present form. The explanation given by the Commonwealth Minister was that the present system made it possible for a larger deduction for people who were earning higher incomes. That was generally conceded; it does have that effect, but instead of changing the method of deduction the Commonwealth allowed the method of deduction to remain exactly the same and reduced the maximum deduction that may be made for education expenses from $400 to $150.

The recommendation of the Ministers who attended the conference—I stress that they came from both Liberal and Labor States—was that the original level for deduction be restored but that the method of assessing the deduction be changed so that there would be no advantage to people on higher incomes. In all fairness, the suggestion or recommendation was well received by the Federal Minister for Education, Mr. Beazley, but I am afraid that after he returned to Canberra the more influential moguls in Cabinet were not receptive to the idea. However, I shall raise the matter once again with Mr. Beazley with the view of ensuring that justice is done to all sections of the community.

REPORT OF EDUCATION TASK FORCES.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): In view of the repeated assurances that the Minister of Education has given in the public press and in this House that one day the report of the various education upgrade task forces will be released, and in fact promises he made at the beginning of this year that the report will be tabled or will be made public, when will it be made public, and will schools such as Coburg West, which were not visited and were totally neglected by the task forces, be included in a subsequent report?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): Yes, the report will be made available at an early date. If certain schools, such as the one mentioned

by the honorable member for Brunswick West, have been inadvertently overlooked, rectifying action will be taken.

RENT INCREASES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Dundas): Is the Attorney-General aware of a recent decision by the Full Court of the Supreme Court of Queensland in which it was held that landlords under periodic tenancies were not allowed to vary or increase rentals unilaterally? Will the honorable gentleman examine that to see what effect it will have in Victoria?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): It is a good question because it refers to Queensland. I am delighted to have questions about Queensland at present. It is a most interesting State and the people have shown absolute sense as good Australians. It gives me great hope for this country. I do not know whether the Queensland Supreme Court really is good and whether it is as good as the rest of the Queensland people. On the basis that it is as good as the average sensible person there, I would be happy to look at the report to which the honorable member refers. I did see a heading about the matter in a newspaper this morning but I did not have an opportunity of looking at it. One would need to go beyond the newspaper report. From a quick reading of it I doubt whether it would make any difference to the law in Victoria, but I will most certainly examine it.

PENTRIDGE GAOL.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North): In the absence of the Chief Secretary I should like to ask the Premier: In view of the weekly walk-outs at Pentridge Gaol at present, will the Premier agree that the security at Pentridge is a joke, or worse than that, a disgrace?

THE SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! That is asking for an opinion. I ask the honorable member to rephrase the question.

Mr. TREZISE: Is the Premier satisfied with the security at Pentridge at present and, if not, what action does he intend to take as Leader of this State?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): Nobody can feel totally satisfied with the security of a gaol from which there are any escapes. As to how they can be prevented, I shall refer the matter to the responsible Minister, who is the Minister for Social Welfare.

YOUTH, SPORT AND RECREATION GRANTS.

Mr. TEMPLETON (Mentone): Is the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation able to inform the House when his department will be able to announce the additional grants available to the community for youth, sport and recreation purposes?

Mr. DIXON (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation): The unfortunate fact is that the Federal Government is still unwilling to inform my department which projects it is prepared to finance. All honorable members will be interested to know the sorts of projects which are being held up and the areas in which they are being held up. These were listed in *Hansard*. They are projects in the cities of Altona, Box Hill, Preston, Brunswick, Chelsea, Sunshine, Coburg, and Northcote. It seems to me absolutely extraordinary that in a time of inflation, with costs mounting every day, as honorable members are aware unemployment——

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation is in contravention of the Standing Orders inasmuch as he is debating the question. The Standing Orders require that if the honorable gentleman is to answer the question, he should do so and not debate it. The Minister is quoting from *Hansard* and although what he is saying might be interesting, it is not appropriate to bring forward those matters during question time.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! Standing Order No. 81 provides—

> In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

I ask the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation to be precise in answering the question.

Mr. DIXON (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation): The Federal Government should get off its bottom and make certain it is either going to label——

The SPEAKER: Order! I have quoted Standing Order No. 81, and I ask the Minister to answer the question precisely and positively.

Mr. DIXON: It should label these projects and inform me whether or not it is going to finance them so that I can decide which projects I am able to support in their entirety.

GAS PIPELINE TO WODONGA.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla): With reference to the natural gas pipeline to be constructed between Melbourne and Wodonga, can the Minister for Fuel and Power advise the House whether any contracts have been let for the construction of this pipeline and, if so, to whom? Further, when is it expected that a start will be made on its construction, and what is the expected date of completion?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power): The Gas and Fuel Corporation is still investigating the route which the pipeline should follow. It has applied for a permit and on advertising a number of objections were received—frankly, not as many as one would have expected. Those objections are now being processed, and I hope very shortly the Government will be in a position to issue the permit for the easements. The next step will be to apply to the Mines Department for a licence to construct and operate. At this stage I do not know whether any contracts have been let. The expected completion date is prior to the winter of 1976.

DAYLESFORD JUBILEE LAKE RESERVE.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park): I refer to the proposed sale of the Daylesford Jubilee Lake Reserve, a matter raised in this House some time ago. I understand the Premier has referred the proposal to the Minister for Local Government. Is the Premier in a position to report whether this sale of public land has been approved and, if not, will he give a guarantee that no decision will be made prior to the next sitting of Parliament?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I have referred the matter to the Minister for Local Government. The land is owned by the Shire of Daylesford and Glenlyon. I am quite sure that the Minister for Local Government will consider all the facets in making any decision which falls to him to make. I am not able to give the kind of assurance that the honorable member asks me to give, but I can assure him that the whole matter will be very thoroughly investigated.

AID FOR MEAT PRODUCERS.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): In view of the report that the Federal Government will allocate $20 million to aid Queensland meat producers, hypocritical as it was prior to the recent election held in that State, will the Minister of Agriculture continue to press the Federal Government for a similar allocation to Victorian meat producers to enable carry-on funds to be provided prior to the imminent crisis which will occur in the next few months due to the complete failure of the trading banks or the Reserve Bank to extend carry-on finance for farmers involved in this industry?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The $20 million from the Commonwealth Government is available through private banks. It is not exclusively for meat producers in Queensland but for meat producers around Australia. Unfortunately, it

represents only 70 cents a head for the cattle in Australia and will not go very far.

The main difficulty is that the people who require the money have no equity left on which to borrow. Nor do they have an ability to service any interest rates, let alone the commercial interest rates which will be charged for this money. Those who have equity and can service commercial interest rates are already able to borrow.

The $20 million will do no good in solving the problems of equity being suffered by the meat producers of the nation. The Government has supported a request to the Federal Government for carry-on finance of $50 million made by the Australian Cattlemen's Association. I am not sure that, in itself, that sum will be sufficient to cope with the difficult situation which 1975 will bring.

In these days, as the honorable member knows, Victoria has some 7·5 million cattle, or about 2 million more than its normal stocking. Most of these will be forced on to the market because of a shortage of credit or by normal summer conditions. The market prospects are not good and therefore in the coming months the problems of the beef industry will be increased. These problems will not be met by high interest rates or by money being made available to people who have equity on which to borrow. It is to people who do not have equity that money should be made available.

BROADMEADOWS DAY TRAINING CENTRE.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows): Has the Treasurer approved of a grant to the Whittlesea branch of the Helping Hand Association for the establishment of a day training centre? If so, how much is the grant and from what source did the money come?

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I am unable to give the exact figures, but certainly the Government is assisting from loan funds, in the normal way, the construction of a retarded children's centre—I think it is—at Whittlesea on the normal $4 to $1 basis. I will obtain details and give them to the honorable member later today. A number of centres are involved in the whole scheme.

SCHOOL BUILDING FUNDS.

Mr. MACLELLAN (Gippsland West): I ask the Minister of Education whether the Commonwealth Government has offered any special aid to the education authorities of Victoria to assist schools with accommodation problems arising from pupils returning to school because they cannot obtain jobs?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education): No. A request has been made on three occasions this year for an additional $27 million to assist with the general school building programme because of inflationary trends in the building industry. Three factors make it extremely difficult to predict exactly the enrolments in secondary schools next year.

The first is the possible transfer of pupils from independent schools for reasons which I mentioned earlier today. The second is the general employment situation. The third is the fact that the department is currently receiving some hundreds of inquiries from school leavers about participation in the Commonwealth training and retraining programme. I will again ask the Commonwealth for additional aid to assist in the accommodation of these special groups.

USED-CAR DEALERS.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir): Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs inquire into the extent to which cars damaged in the recent floods in Queensland are being sold under false pretences by used-car dealers in Victoria?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Consumer Affairs) : If the honorable member will give me the information in writing, I shall have the matter examined.

PETITIONS.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. RAMSAY (Balwyn) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 211 signatures.

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

Mr. RAMSAY (Balwyn) 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 195 signatures.

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

Mr. LIND (Dandenong) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973, is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 108 signatures.

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

Mr. LACY (Ringwood) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to ensure that fluoridation of communal water supplies, as provided by the Health (Fluoridation) Act 1973 is undertaken without further delay. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 102 signatures.

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

SUBDIVISIONS IN DANDENONG RANGES.

Mr. LACY (Ringwood) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that the House take action to impose a temporary freeze on all subdivisions and development in the Dandenong Ranges and to establish a planning and environmental management authority for the Dandenong Ranges. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 395 signatures.

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

VICTORIAN ENERGY RESOURCES.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) : I move—

That there be laid before this House a Summary of Victorian Energy Resources and Estimated Requirements 1974–2000.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer) presented a return in compliance with the foregoing order.

It was ordered that the report be laid on the table and be printed, and be taken into consideration next day.

SIR COLIN MacKENZIE SANCTUARY, HEALESVILLE.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation): I move—

That there be laid before this House a copy of the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Animal Losses and Conditions at the Sir Colin MacKenzie Sanctuary, Healesville.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister for Conservation) presented a return in compliance with the foregoing order.

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

ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE.

THIRTEENTH PROGRESS REPORT.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton) presented the thirteenth progress report from the Joint Select Committee on Road Safety on aspects of roadworthiness, speedometers, alcohol and road accidents and intersectional management, together with minutes of evidence and appendices.

It was ordered that they be laid on the table, and that the report and appendices be printed.

PAPERS.

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

Hospitals and Charities Commission—Report for the year 1973-74.—Ordered to be printed.

Ombudsman—First Quarterly Report of the Ombudsman for the quarter ended 30th September, 1974.

Teaching Service Act 1958—Teaching Service (Teachers Tribunal) Regulations—Regulations amended Nos. 294 and 295 (two papers).

Town and Country Planning Board—Report for the year 1973-74.—Ordered to be printed.

SCAFFOLDING (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a simple measure to add the City of Hawthorn to the list of cities in the schedule to the Act. At present there are seven cities in the schedule comprising the City of Melbourne and six inner municipalities. They are Collingwood, Fitzroy, Port Melbourne, Richmond, St. Kilda and South Melbourne.

The cities in the schedule are those where the responsibility for inspection of scaffolding rests with inspectors appointed under section 5 of the principal Act. These are officers of the Department of Labour and Industry. In all other municipalities the responsibility rests with municipal scaffolding inspectors.

The council of the City of Hawthorn has requested the Government to take over responsibility for scaffolding inspection in its municipality because it considers that the enforcement of the regulation would be better undertaken by the Department of Labour and Industry. The Bill meets that request.

The fees payable for scaffolding permits in the cities in the schedule are payable to the department. These are paid to the Consolidated Fund from which is met the costs of departmental administration of the principal Act. It can be expected that the fees received for scaffolding permits for buildings in the City of Hawthorn will offset the cost of inspections made by inspectors of the department. 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 later this day.

BUILDING INDUSTRY LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for long service leave for casual employees in the building and construction industry. The concept of a scheme for long service leave based on service in an industry as opposed to service with one employer is new. The present long service leave provisions of the Labour and Industry Act 1958 are concerned only with service with the one and the same employer. Long service leave has been properly regarded as a reward for long and loyal service with the one employer. The present entitlement to leave is thirteen weeks after fifteen continuous years service with the one employer.

Because of the casual nature of employment in the building industry, most employees are unable to establish and maintain a history of employment with the one employer of sufficient duration to qualify for long service leave. Employment is, in most cases, on the basis of hourly hire. Employment with an employer often ceases when a building contract is completed or when a particular phase of the building contract is finished.

These employment practices in the industry preclude a large number of employees from having that continuity of employment with the one employer which would enable them to accumulate sufficient length of service to qualify. Employment in the building industry is, however, usually continuous in that the employee who is dismissed by one employer on one day usually finds employment with another employer in the industry on the next day.

The Honorable A. M. Fraser, the then Minister of Labour, said in introducing the Factories and Shops (Long Service Leave) Bill in 1953—

> The Bill does not cover any employee who, by virtue of his calling, may have served under a number of employers over a period of twenty years. That is one problem which Parliament will have to tackle at some future time.
>
> A worker in the building industry might work for seven years with one master builder and then, on account of particular circumstances, transfer to another master builder for another seven years, and then pass on to a third employer for a period of six years. At present, such a worker is not covered under the terms of the Bill, but I trust that, as we advance, that problem will be overcome and that by some system of pooling, under which the employers concerned will contribute, it will be possible to extend the long service benefit to workers of that type.

The honorable gentleman had a good deal of foresight; he was, of course, a Minister in a Labor Party Government. Employers, through their representative organizations, in conjunction with employees represented by the Victorian Trades Hall Council, have now requested the Government to introduce such a scheme based on employment in the building and construction industry. The employers have agreed to meet the cost of administration of the scheme and the cost of maintaining a fund to meet the expected costs of providing long service leave for employees. The Government has agreed to introduce legislation to provide for such a scheme and this Bill represents the fulfilment of that promise.

Before preparing draft legislation, the Government appointed an interdepartmental committee of specialists to examine the economic feasibility and administrative practicability of the scheme. The committee comprised the Government Statist and Actuary, the chief budget officer of the Treasury, the principal systems analyst of the Public Service Board's E.D.P. Centre and as chairman, the deputy secretary of my department. The committee reported that there were no apparent reasons why such a scheme would not be economically feasible or administratively practicable. The committee reported in detail on the proposal. Its recommendations were taken into consideration when decisions were being made on the Bill. Representatives of employer and employee interests were consulted at appropriate stages leading up to the preparation of the Bill.

It is expected that 40,000 persons will be covered by the scheme and the cost to the employers in the industry will be of the order of 2 to 2·5 per cent of wages for 40 hours' work. I now propose to deal with the provisions in the Bill.

Clause 1 is introductory and needs no explanation. Clause 2 contains the interpretations. The definitions of "building and construction industry", "building and construction work" and "worker" are of particular interest in that they define the limits of the scheme. It is intended to cover workers including apprentices performing work usually performed by persons in the occupations listed in

the definition of building and construction work. It will also cover persons acting as foreman, sub-foreman or leading hand in the supervision of this work. It should also be noted that this scheme is meant to cover only persons employed by private employers as defined. Employees of the Crown and of statutory bodies will not be covered.

Clause 3 provides that the Bill is to be read as one with the Labour and Industry Act 1958. Clauses 4 to 9 concern the establishment and operation of a fund to be known as the Building Industry Long Service Leave Fund.

Clause 4 establishes the fund which is to be administered by a board set up under the provisions of Part VI. of the Bill. It proposes that the income of the fund shall comprise long service leave charges paid by employers, proceeds of investments and other moneys received in the course of administration. From it are to be paid the long service leave benefits to workers and other sums authorized to be paid under this Act and the expenses incurred in the administration of the Act. It is to be noted that the Government proposes to make no contribution to the running of the long service leave scheme for casual workers. All costs of administration are to be borne by the fund.

Clause 5 allows the board to invest the money in the manner provided under the Superannuation Act 1958. The provisions in that Act are more extensive than those provided in the Trustees Act 1958 but are sufficiently circumscribed to ensure that only prudent investments will be made. It will be noted that under Part VI. of the Bill membership on the board will include a person who has knowledge of or experience in the investment of moneys.

Clause 6 deems that moneys held by the board lodged at any bank are to be held to be moneys of the Crown. This will give priority in the event of the winding up of the banking company, however unlikely an event that may seem.

Clause 7 provides that the accounts relating to the fund are to be audited by the Auditor-General. Clause 8 provides for an actuarial investigation to be made each three years by not fewer than two actuaries appointed by the board. Clause 9 allows the board to temporarily borrow money up to $1 million.

Clauses 10 and 11 provide for the registration of employers and workers. It will be noted that workers with less than three months service in the industry are not to be registered. This provision has been included so as to exclude the need to register and keep records of the many short-term workers who stay a very short time working in the industry. The number of these persons is considerable and their exclusion from the scheme will lessen the administrative burden on employers and the administrators of the fund.

Clause 12 provides that employers shall pay to the board a long service leave charge once a month. The amount is to be the number of working hours not exceeding 40 in any one week multiplied by a prescribed amount. The charge is expected to be in the vicinity of 2·5 per cent of the wages for 40 hours earned by a worker; the amount however will be prescribed to meet the needs of the fund as assessed by actuarial reviews.

Clause 13 provides for the calculation of long service leave pay to be paid to the worker. The provisions in relation to ordinary pay are similar to those contained in the Labour and Industry Act. Clause 14 contains a proviso that the board may determine ordinary pay where it appears that the rate due to be paid under the definition is excessive. The clause provides for appeals to the Metropolitan Industrial Court, the decisions of which shall be final.

Clause 15 contains the proposed limits of what is to constitute continuous service. These provisions are similar to those in the Labour and Industry Act 1958.

Clause 16 provides for the determination of workers' entitlements. Sub-clauses (1) to (4) relate to credits for service in the industry prior to 1st January, 1974. Only unbroken service with the one employer accrued at 1st January, 1974, will be taken into account. Sub-clause (5) provides that the first three months of the period of continuous service shall be disregarded. This relates to the non-registration of workers until after three months' service, as has been provided for in clause 11. As I said earlier, the keeping of records of the first three months service in a large number of instances is unwarranted. There is therefore a minor penalty on workers in that they must serve three months before service commences to be counted for the purposes of long service leave. This penalty is very minor when compared with the benefits of having a scheme based on employment in the building industry.

Clause 17 gives the entitlement to long service leave. The *quantum* of leave provided—thirteen weeks after fifteen years continuous service—is the same as that provided in the Labour and Industry Act. The detailed entitlements included in clause 17 (2) of the Bill are similar to the entitlements under the Labour and Industry Act. The difference, of course, is that service in the industry is counted rather than service with the one employer.

Clause 18 provides for payment in lieu of long service leave on the death of a worker. These provisions are similar to those in the Labour and Industry Act. Clause 19 provides that service before the commencement of the Labour and Industry (Long Service Leave) Act 1964 shall be reduced by one-quarter. This is a similar provision to that in the Labour and Industry Act 1958.

Mr. Rafferty.

Clause 20 provides for the taking of long service leave. The provisions in this clause are also taken from the Labour and Industry Act. Clause 21 provides that the fund shall not be liable for the payment to a worker for leave taken as a result of the accrual of an entitlement to leave which occurred before the 1st January, 1974. The employer would continue to be liable to fulfil his responsibilities under the provisions of the Labour and Industry Act 1958 in relation to that service.

Payments in respect of long service leave, the entitlement to which accrues after the 1st January, 1974, are to be made from the fund. Clause 21 (3) provides that the fund shall reimburse employers any amounts paid for leave deemed to have accrued after the 1st January, 1974. Sub-clause (4) provides that where an employee is given long service leave or payment in lieu under the provisions of the Labour and Industry Act 1958, and the employer has during the period of service of that worker paid long service leave charges under the provisions of the Bill in respect of that worker, the employer is entitled to be reimbursed from the fund a proportional amount of the sum paid to the worker on account of long service leave except where the board determines that a lesser sum be paid.

An example illustrating the case that is in mind is where, say, a carpenter is employed by a building contractor first as a tradesman, then perhaps as a foreman. During this period the employer would be required to pay long service leave charges into the fund. The carpenter might then be promoted to a higher position within the original employer's service, say to draftsman, site manager, or clerk of works, which would take him outside the definition of "worker" under the Bill. Having completed his fifteen years' service with the one employer he would be entitled to leave under the Labour and Industry Act. It would be unjust for him to lose his entitlement to

leave because of the operation of the Bill so it provides for the recognition of continuity of service with the one employer and also recognition of an employer's reasonable right to be reimbursed on account of payments made to the fund.

Clause 22 provides for a board to be appointed by the Governor in Council to be known as the Building Industry Long Service Leave Board. Provision is made for a board of seven members, two to be appointed from a panel of names nominated by the Trades Hall Council, and one each from panels of names nominated by the Master Builders Association and the Victorian Employers Federation. There will be an independent chairman and two other members, one of whom shall have knowledge of or experience in the investment of moneys and one of whom shall be an actuary.

Clause 23 provides for the appointment of deputy members in the cases of members appointed under the provisions of sub-clause (5) and clause 22. Clause 24 sets out the requirements for meetings.

Clause 25 provides that the secretary and such other staff as are required to assist the board in the administration of the Act shall be appointed under and subject to the Public Service Act 1958. Clause 26 provides that the board shall submit annually to the Minister a report dealing with the general administration and working of the Act. Clause 27 provides for the keeping of books and records by employers.

Clause 28 gives the board power to make determinations as to whether work of a particular kind is or is not building and construction work within the meaning of this Bill; whether work so determined by the board to be building and construction work was performed by a particular worker during any specific period; and what are to be regarded as ordinary hours in relation to a particular kind of building and construction work. Subclause (3) provides for notice to be given of the board's intention to consider any application. Sub-clauses (4) to (7) relate to dates when the determination is to take effect and the procedure to be followed in any hearing.

Clause 29 provides for the settlement of disputes in relation to entitlements by the Metropolitan Industrial Court, appeals to lie to the Industrial Appeals Court. Clause 30 provides that the decision of the Industrial Appeals Court shall be final and without appeal and adopts provisions in the Labour and Industry Act relating to appeals to the Industrial Appeals Court. It also provides for the Governor in Council to make general rules relating to the procedure of the Industrial Appeals Court for the purposes of this Bill.

Clause 31 prohibits contracting out. Clause 32 restricts a worker's entitlement to be paid in lieu of leave and to engage in any employment during the period when he is on long service leave. Clause 33 describes the method to be adopted for acceptable service of notices. Clause 34 provides for refunds in cases of over payment.

Clauses 35 to 43 inclusive have been included in the Bill to ensure that the board has adequate powers to recover long service leave charges from employers who seek to avoid their responsibilities. The provisions are similar to those contained in the Pay Roll Tax Act 1971.

Clause 44 contains the powers of inspectors appointed under this Act and requires each inspector be furnished with a certificate of his appointment. The clause also adopts the provisions of Division 1 of Part X. of the Labour and Industry Act 1958 in relation to inspectors exercising certain powers.

Clause 45 relates to offences and prescribes a maximum penalty of $1,000. Clause 46 relates to particular offences under the Act. Again the penalty is not more than $1,000. Clause 47 makes the proof of certain

matters in legal proceedings unnecessary. Clause 48 relates to the regulation-making powers of the Governor in Council. Clause 49 is a machinery clause. 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 next day.

MARINE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The prime purpose of this short Bill is to raise the amounts prescribed under the Fourth Schedule to the Marine Act 1958, as the maximum rates payable for pilotage in respect of Port Phillip, Westernport and Portland.

Pilotage rates actually require the approval of the Governor in Council. The main rates are already at the maximum level now permitted under the Fourth Schedule, which, except for inclusion of the Port of Westernport, has not been altered since 1951 when some ceiling rates were increased.

A recent review of pilotage service finances shows an increase in such rates from 1st January, 1975, to be essential for receipts and expenditure to be maintained in a break-even situation.

Further, the present Fourth Schedule divides ships into various classes, sailing, steam and so forth, and this is no longer considered necessary. Thus, in addition to providing new maximum pilotage rates and obviating the need for further amendments for some time, the proposed new Fourth Schedule is expressed in a simpler and more appropriate manner for present and foreseeable needs.

Clause 1 cites the short title, provides for commencement on the day on which Royal Assent is given, and defines the principal Act.

Clause 2 replaces the existing Fourth Schedule to the Act with a new, simplified Fourth Schedule. The proposed new schedule raises the maximum charges which may be fixed by the Marine Board of Victoria, with the approval of the Governor in Council, under section 79 of the principal Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. STIRLING (Williamstown): I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : I suggest that the debate be adjourned until later this day, if the Opposition and the Country Party are ready to proceed. It is essential that these rates be increased from 1st January. If the Opposition and the Country Party are not ready to proceed later this day, I shall understand.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until next day.

DRAINAGE OF LAND BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It relates to the drainage of land in Victoria. It is an important and far-reaching measure of considerable complexity and it is the Government's intention that the Bill should lie in the House during the summer recess and be debated in the autumn sessional period so that municipalities and other interested organizations and individuals, who have made extensive representations on this matter over the years, may have ample opportunity of studying the provisions of the Bill in depth and comment upon them.

Members will be aware that in 1967 Parliament passed the Joint Select Committee (Drainage) Act 1967 and appointed a Joint Select Committee on Drainage to report and recommend to it on the question of whether the

then existing statutory provisions relating to drainage were satisfactory and what changes, if any, should be made. The committee's terms of reference included a number of specific questions and also allowed the committee to consider any other matters which appeared relevant to the inquiry. The committee in fact broadened its inquiry into an over-all review of drainage law and administration in Victoria. The committee was reappointed in 1967 and issued its final report in 1970.

In the course of an extensive and thorough investigation during which 128 witnesses were heard, representing many diverse interests and a considerable body of expertise in practical drainage administration, the committee presented seven progress reports to Parliament.

In addition to hearing witnesses the committee travelled throughout the State to see at first hand the practical difficulties encountered in the drainage of land. Thus the committee was able to study the land drainage problems which exist in both rural and urban areas and which result from the wide range of climatic and topographical conditions present within Victoria. In addition visits were made to see problem areas and to confer with bodies responsible for the operation and maintenance of land drainage in Queensland, New South Wales and New Zealand.

A large body of evidence was given to the committee, indicating many weaknesses within the existing statutory framework and giving strong support for the codification of drainage laws within Victoria. The committee came to the conclusion that the criticism of the existing statutory framework was well founded and agreed that a codification should be undertaken. This gave rise to its major recommendations which were stated in its final report presented to Parliament in March, 1970, and which proposed that—

A new principal drainage Act should be enacted setting out basic rights and obligations in the drainage of land, such Act to provide a focal point of reference for those concerned with tackling drainage problems arising from the development of land.

The Act should contain machinery measures to deal with disputes, to assist the co-ordination of works by authorities which affect land drainage and to enable the establishment of authorities to deal with drainage problems on a catchment basis.

Existing acts relating to drainage, suitably amended to conform with the principles of the new Act, should be retained on the grounds that the statutory powers of the existing authorities have evolved over a considerable period of time and were designed to deal with differing problems and varying circumstances.

It would be remiss of me, I feel, not to commend to this House at this stage the valuable work of the committee and the clarity and stature of its reports in this vexed and complex field of land drainage. The committee was remarkable in that its membership remained unchanged over the five-year period of its deliberation, although two of the original members resigned in 1970 at the end of the session in which the report was submitted.

The membership of the committee comprised the Honorables I. R. Cathie, F. J. Granter and I. A. Swinburne, and Messrs. B. J. Evans, L. M. Fennessy and R. H. Suggett, and its report demonstrates the ability of a Parliamentary committee to analyse and propose solutions to complex problems having wide ranging implications.

This Bill reflects the spirit and tenor of the Joint Select Committee's recommendations and is a sincere effort to implement its findings for the benefit of the people of Victoria generally. The only substantial recommendation which has been deferred is that relating to the setting

up of a drainage co-ordination committee the responsibilities of which, the Government feels, could best be exercised at this stage by existing authorities, namely, the Board of Works within the metropolis and the Water Commission elsewhere.

The Bill is divided into seven Parts: Part I.—Regional drainage authorities; Part II.—Drainage tribunal; Part III.—Rights and duties of occupiers of land; Part IV.—Acquisition of drainage rights; Part V.—Flood-prone areas; Part VI.—Drainage courses; and Part VII.—Amendments of various Acts.

The Bill has four innovative features. Firstly, it provides for the constitution of regional drainage authorities with drainage responsibilities over whole catchments. Secondly, it establishes a specialist drainage tribunal on the lines envisaged by the Joint Select Committee. Thirdly, it codifies certain aspects of the common law on drainage. Fourthly, it provides for the declaration of drainage courses.

These features are embodied in Parts I., II., III. and VI. of the Bill respectively. Of the remaining parts of the Bill, Part IV. is a re-enactment of existing legislation concerning the acquisition of private drainage rights, and Part V. extends to other authorities powers similar to those of the Dandenong Valley Authority to declare flood-prone areas.

I turn now to Part I. Division 1 contains a number of machinery clauses including definitions, provisions relating to the application of the Act and amendments necessary to enable the Governor in Council to extend the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works "drainage and rivers" responsibilities within the areas drained by the Yarra and Maribyrnong rivers.

Division 2 provides for the definition of "drainage region", the assignment of names to regions and the constitution of regional drainage authorities to carry out the functions of drainage, river improvement and flood protection as envisaged by the committee. The term "drainage region" did not figure in the committee's report but has been adopted as an appropriate term for the administrative area of an authority dealing with drainage on a catchment basis. It will be noted that the Bill excludes the areas drained by the Yarra and Maribyrnong rivers and the Dandenong Creek on the principle that successful existing authorities, in this case the Board of Works and the Dandenong Valley Authority, should be disturbed as little as possible.

The Division also includes fairly standard machinery provisions relating to the election of members to the authority and to its proceedings. The general functions of regional drainage authorities are contained in clause 10 of the Bill, and it will be noted that they correspond generally with the functions envisaged by the committee in paragraph 15.41 of its report.

Honorable members may be aware that proposals for the constitution of these authorities were made in this House long before the joint committee was set up. As far back as 1957 a Bill was introduced to provide generally for the constitution of such authorities throughout the State. That Bill was based on the report of the then chairman of the Water Commission—Mr., now Sir, Ronald East—following his overseas mission in 1952, but because of opposition from some quarters that Bill lapsed.

Nevertheless the concept of dealing with drainage, flood protection and river improvement on a catchment basis was accepted by this House in 1963 when it passed the legislation setting up the Dandenong Valley Authority. The success of that authority has led to many aspects of its legislation being used as a model for the regional drainage authorities provided for in this part of the Bill. It will be seen that the provisions of this Bill relating to the

functions, powers and duties proposed for regional drainage authorities follow closely the provisions in the Dandenong Valley Authority Act. Honorable members will also note that this part of the Bill, in addition to implementing the committee's recommendation that catchment authorities be only set up with the consent of the majority of municipalities, provides further that an authority may be set up on the recommendation of the Water Commission. This is considered desirable as otherwise in some cases there may be undue delays in the constitution of an authority despite the existence of urgent flooding or drainage problems which could only be solved by a united approach.

Part II. establishes a specialist Drainage Tribunal. Witnesses advised the Joint Select Committee that many problems now apparent in the drainage of land arise because persons involved were often confused and uncertain as to their obligations under the numerous existing drainage provisions and under court interpretations of the common law. The Law Institute of Victoria gave evidence that a tribunal should be established to determine drainage disputes and attend to other allied matters.

The committee came to the opinion that the establishment of such a specialized tribunal was desirable in order to develop the necessary expertise to deal with the technical problems inherent in land drainage and to deal expeditiously with drainage matters requiring determination.

The committee therefore recommended in paragraphs 11.11 to 11.14 of its report that—

> A specialized drainage court should be established to determine disputes and settle compensation claims under the proposed Drainage Act or under any relevant existing Act.
>
> The court should be empowered to grant drainage rights and determine compensation for both urban and rural lands.
>
> The decisions of the court should be final and appeals allowed only on questions of law.
>
> The court should consist of; (*a*) a chairman who is a Judge of the County Court or an experienced barrister or solicitor; and (*b*) not more than three lay members nominated by the court chairman from panels of names submitted by appropriate professional institutions and approved by the Governor in Council.

The intent of these recommendations of the Joint Select Committee has been carried into the Bill which contains provisions for the constitution of a Drainage Tribunal consisting of judical members and lay members shall be persons qualified for appointment as judges of the County Court and the lay members persons of "suitable qualifications and experienced in civil engineering or the development and management of land or water resources". Honorable members will note that this latter provision is slightly wider than that recommended by the committee, but it has been so framed to enable the Governor in Council to have as broad a choice of expertise as possible in appointing lay members to the tribunal. It will be noted, also, that the provision is not adverse to the committee's intention in that it does not preclude the consideration of panels of names submitted by appropriate institutions.

The tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear the matters set out in clause 75 of the Bill but, broadly speaking, it will be concerned with matters such as civil actions between private landowners regarding drainage rights and other allied matters which are normally determined by a court of law. In addition it will take over the role at present assigned to arbitrators and judges under certain provisions of the Drainage Areas

Act, the Health Act and the Local Government Act relating to disputes between landowners and municipalities on drainage matters.

Part III. relates to the rights and duties of occupiers of land and codifies certain aspects of the common law of private drainage rights with emphasis on the "free flow" doctrine. Broadly speaking, it provides that water may be discharged "in a reasonable manner" from the land of the upper landholder to that of his lower neighbour but reserves the right of the lower neighbour to resist the discharge of water on to his land if the discharge is not "reasonable".

The Joint Select Committee heard considerable evidence proposing that the principle whereby a landowner may "resist" the inflow of drainage waters should be superseded by new provisions aimed at securing the free flow of such water. In the course of its investigations into this evidence the committee inspected many areas to see for itself the situations cited in evidence. It concluded that in the majority of cases lower landowners had adopted measures precluding the free flow of water and in so doing had acted unreasonably in the circumstances. The committee therefore recommended in paragraph 9.19 of its report that the drainage rights of landowners as fixed by common law should be superceded by statutory provisions providing for the unobstructed flow of drainage.

As I have already said, the Bill codifies certain aspects of the common law with an emphasis on the free flow principle and places in the hands of the Drainage Tribunal the responsibility to determine disputes having regard to the tests of reasonableness envisaged by the committee and the development of consistent doctrines on that basis.

The criterion which goes towards the consideration of reasonableness is contained in clause 89 and includes such factors as land use, past ownership and occupation, the source of the drainage water, the contours of the land concerned and the availability of lawful points of discharge. Such factors include those proposed by the Joint Select Committee and while the Bill requires the drainage tribunal to have regard to such criteria it leaves it to the tribunal to decide on relevance in each particular case.

Part IV. relates to the acquisition of drainage rights. The committee was advised by witnesses that the Drainage of Land Act 1958 enabled a landowner to seek the right to drain his lands over neighbouring lands by serving an appropriate notice on the owner and occupier of those latter lands. The Act also provided for the assessment and payment of compensation. As a result of its investigations the committee concluded that the principles of the Drainage of Land Act 1958 would be suitable for inclusion in the proposed new Drainage Act. It therefore recommended to that effect with two modifications—firstly, that the provisions extend and apply to both rural and urban lands and to both natural and artificial drainage; and secondly, that the proposed Drainage Court should have the necessary powers to enable the relevant sections of the new Act to operate successfully.

That recommendation has been carried into the Bill, Part IV. of which is a re-enactment of the existing Drainage of Land Act, which I am advised applies to both urban and rural lands, with the difference that the Drainage Tribunal exercises the powers formerly exercised by a Magistrates Court in the determination of disputes and that the Registrar of the tribunal retains any documentation in respect of the rights granted to any person to drain land.

Part V. relates to flood-prone areas. One of the matters of early concern to the Joint Select Committee

was the difficulties faced by authorities where development encroached on to the flood plains of rivers and watercourses or where uncontrolled development would create future flooding problems. In this regard the committee paid considerable attention to the views of those witnesses who commended to it the provisions of section 27 of the Dandenong Valley Authority Act 1963 which enables that authority to seek proclamation, as a flood-prone area, of lands within the flood plain of any river, creek or watercourse.

In evidence to the committee it was stated that the purpose of section 27—

> is to enable the authority to control any building or construction works within such proclaimed areas which might adversely affect drainage or the movement of flood waters . . .The establishment of flood-prone zones will have little effect on the developments already on the flood plain except perhaps to make the present occupants more flood conscious. It can, however, restrict new development and construction so that, over the years, the desired modifications of uses is affected.

The committee recommended that a power similar to that in section 27 of the Dandenong Valley Authority Act should be provided to enable a new drainage authority to seek proclamation of lands as flood prone areas. This part of the Bill has therefore been modelled on the provisions of the Dandenong Valley Authority Act.

Part VI. of the Bill relates to drainage courses and is designed to enable existing drainage lines, many of which are ill defined, to be kept open where this is in the interest of private persons, of a drainage authority or of an authority responsible for the maintenance of streets and roads. Such courses will be declared by the Governor in Council and will be assigned to appropriate authorities, which will have power to prevent interference or obstruction of the course on the land which it traverses.

The declaration of drainage courses is seen as a means of mitigating existing local drainage problems, or of preventing potential problems, where the situation does not warrant the declaration of an arterial drain under section 36 of the Bill, which would usually imply some intent to carry out works or to prescribe building lines. The Bill provides that any landholder likely to be affected by the proposed declaration may object and any costs he may incur in carrying out the directions of the responsible authority may on the direction of the Minister be reimbursed by that authority.

The appeal provisions relating to flood-prone areas are also applied to drainage courses. These provisions are modelled on the Dandenong Valley Authority Act, which is operating satisfactorily. This Part further provides that the drainage authority in its assigned drainage courses is empowered to carry out work, require the removal of obstructions to flow and regulate the discharge of flows into such courses. Where the owner or occupier is required to remove obstructions to natural flow the Minister may direct that his costs be reimbursed. This part of the Bill is in keeping with the tenor of paragraphs 12.14 to 12.18 of the Joint Select Committee's report.

Part VII. comprises consequential amendments to various Acts, in some cases complementary to provisions of the preceding parts of this Bill, in other cases implementing specific detailed recommendations made by the committee. The Acts in question are the Municipal Association Act 1907, the Country Roads Act 1958, the Drainage Areas Act 1958, the Health Act 1958, the Local Authorities Superannuation Act 1958, the Local Government Act 1958, the Water Act 1958, the Dandenong Valley Authority Act 1963 and the River Improvement Act.

In conclusion I should like to repeat that because of the intense public interest in this measure and because of its complexity and importance, the Government intends that the Bill should lie on the table of the

House and be considered in the autumn sessional period. This procedure will enable all interested parties to peruse and comment on its content. The Government will certainly consider any representations and constructive criticism and any recommendations made by the Public Works Committee in connection with its inquiry into flooding in northern Victoria so that, when debated, the measure may be amended as seems necessary to make it as effective and practical as possible.

I realize that in studying this Bill members will have a complex task, and to assist them in that study, should they so desire, the Minister of Water Supply has freely offered to make the services of officers of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission available for discussions. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park): I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

I appreciate the action of the Minister of Water Supply in making officers available to honorable members for discussions. However, there are inconsistencies between provisions of the Bill and recommendations made by the Drainage Committee. I ask the Minister of Public Works whether the filed memoranda of the department could be supplied to honorable members so that they can peruse the recommendations of the Drainage Committee and compare them with the Bill as drafted and see why there is a variance.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, January 8.

I am sure the Minister of Water Supply will make available all the documents and reports for which the honorable member for Deer Park has asked, as they will certainly help with the debate in four weeks' time.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until Wednesday, January 8.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SHIRE OF BACCHUS MARSH) BILL.

The Order of the Day for the resumption of the debate on the motion for the second reading of this Bill was read.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I have examined this Bill, and I am of the opinion that it is a private Bill.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : By leave, I move—

That all the Private Bill Standing Orders be dispensed with, and that this Bill be treated as a public Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The debate (adjourned from the previous day) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park): One might call this an enabling piece of legislation to rectify a mistake which has been made by the secretary of the Shire of Bacchus Marsh. It is not the type of legslation that the Opposition willingly assents to but, from information that we have been able to glean, no one is being disadvantaged because of the action that has been taken by the shire secretary. If a little more thought had been given to the proposals, perhaps a subdivision of the land in question could have taken place, the council could have acquired the section that it required, and the other party would have been able to purchase what it sought.

The Opposition places on record that it is opposed to the principle whereby a municipal authority can compulsorily acquire land and then resell it. In this type of arrangement there can be great dangers, and the Opposition does not wish this to be a precedent for other action taken along similar lines by a municipal council. As no one has been harmed by this Bill, the Opposition does not oppose it.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): I endorse the remarks of the honorable member for Deer Park. I am sure

that no member of this House wants to see this type of Bill brought in often. From inquiry it would appear that a genuine mistake was made in this instance. No one is being disadvantaged and the Country Party does not oppose the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

SEWERAGE DISTRICTS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from December 5) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) was resumed.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park): This Bill contains a number of unrelated matters. It is of great interest to the community generally. The membership of many a sewerage authority consists of members of the local municipal council, and provision is made in this Bill for an increase in the membership of the authority when the area to be serviced extends into an adjoining municipal district. Opposition members do not oppose the other unrelated clauses, and would prefer to discuss them in Committee.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): This Bill makes seven unrelated amendments to the Sewerage Districts Act 1958, and I believe they will make for more efficient operation of sewerage authorities. The honorable member for Deer Park has indicated that the principal amendment is to enable sewerage authorities to undertake works outside the municipal boundaries. An authority ought to have this power. The guiding light should be efficient operation of any authority with the minimum capital and maintenance expenditure. Municipal boundaries should not have much to do with it. The installation of sewerage systems, particularly in country towns, has proceeded at a rapid rate since the second world war, and has added much to the quality of life in country towns. I am a member of the sewerage authority which has undertaken the sewerage of Nathalia.

Originally the project was criticized by people in the town, who felt that the expenditure of $500,000—37 per cent of which was provided by Government subsidy and the remainder by loan money to be repaid by the ratepayers—was too large to be borne by a small town. Now that the residents have seen the tremendous benefit which the installation of sewerage has provided, they do not think it was too much money to spend. I commend the Bill to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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

RIVER IMPROVEMENT (MINIMUM RATE) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 10) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park): One might regard this measure as a Budget Bill or an inflationary Bill. In any case it is inevitable, and the Opposition does not oppose it.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East): The Bill is one of the most insignificant measures which have ever been introduced into this House. It simply changes the minimum rate which may be charged by river improvement trusts to $4. The Bill does not enable one to comment on the difficulties confronting river improvement trusts, mainly through lack of finance, and certainly the measure will not resolve that problem. The Country Party does not oppose the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

GROUNDWATER (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 17) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park): The amendments to the Groundwater Act proposed by this Bill basically concern the qualifications of people who may be involved in groundwater engineering, or in seeking water, and in water husbandry. The Bill contains a number of unrelated clauses which could be better discussed in Committee. The Opposition does not oppose the measure.

The motion was agreed to.

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

POUNDS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from November 17) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara): The proposed amendments to the Pounds Act were recommended by the Municipal Association of Victoria, and the Opposition is generally in agreement with them. The first amendment deals with the charge for transporting cattle to a pound. The previous charges were 50 cents a head for sheep, $4 a head for cattle and $8 a head for horses. They were found to be impractical when large numbers of stock were impounded at one time. An accident occurred when a large number of cattle were impounded in a shire and the transport charge worked out at approximately $120, whereas the actual cost of transport should have been only $25. The amendment proposes that the charges shall be only the actual freight up to a maximum which appears reasonable.

The Bill also removes the requirement to advertise in the *Government Gazette* the fact that animals have been impounded. Few people ever read the *Government Gazette,* and I do not know why the provision was included in the first place.

The final amendment will permit a poundkeeper to impound cattle or other stock. In the old days it was thought that the poundkeeper might take advantage of the situation by rounding up stock from the highways, impounding them and making a few "quid". However, nowadays most poundkeepers are shire secretaries or similar responsible persons. As there is no longer any conflict in this regard because of the responsibility of the people involved, the Opposition does not oppose the measure.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): The legislation which this measure amends is ancient compared with the principal Acts to which most of the Bills dealt with in this House relate. It is probably used infrequently by municipalities now, but it is an important statute to have available to municipalities. No cattle have been impounded in my shire for the past seven years. However, that does not mean that the legislation is out of date or no longer necessary.

The honorable member for Kara Kara covered fairly well the three principal amendments in the Bill, including transport charges, the advertisements no longer being required to be inserted in the *Government Gazette*—I cannot imagine that anyone whose cattle have strayed would read the *Government Gazette,* anyway—and the principal amendment to clause 5 concerning the poundkeeper, where under the existing Act he is prevented from impounding cattle in his own town. That arrangement was impractical and imposed an additional cost for municipalities to bear. The amendment to allow poundkeepers to do the actual impounding of cattle is practical, and the Country Party supports the Bill.

Mr. PLOWMAN (Evelyn) : I support the intention of the Bill, which is to cover certain anomalies which have existed for some time. I direct the attention of the Minister to an anomaly in section 15 of the principal Act, which states—

> The occupier of any land and a Crown lands bailiff upon Crown lands may destroy or cause to be destroyed any goats or pigs or geese trespassing on such land . . .

This provision was originally introduced when large numbers of wild goats, pigs and geese caused damage to private property and agricultural land. There are now very few wild goats in Victoria, but considerable numbers of valuable animals are being raised as domestic goats, pigs and geese. The value of an Angora goat could be compared with that of a stud sheep, because the produce of the Angora goat is much sought after.

I suggest that in future the Minister might consider amending the provision to refer to domestic animals as distinct from wild animals in order to afford protection to owners of valuable domestic pigs, goats or geese which have inadvertently trespassed on another person's property.

I propose to introduce a small amendment of a mechanical nature during the Committee stage.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and committed.

The clauses were agreed to.

Mr. PLOWMAN (Evelyn): I move—

> Insert the following new clause to follow clause 5—
>
> 'A. In section 16 of the Principal Act after the word "nearest" there shall be inserted the words "or most conveniently".'

This is a minor amendment to section 16 of the Pounds Act which, in part, states—

> No cattle shall be impounded under the provisions of this Act except in the nearest accessible pound to the place where such cattle were found trespassing . . .

My amendment will insert after the word "nearest" the words "or most conveniently" so that, if the amendment is accepted, the section will read—

> No cattle shall be impounded under the provisions of this Act except in the nearest or most conveniently accessible pound to the place where such cattle were found trespassing . . .

In the Shire of Yea, if cattle were impounded at the southern end of the shire, the nearest accessible pound would be the Shire of Healesville pound—over a mountain range. The most conveniently accessible pound in terms of transport and administration, but not necessarily mileage, would be the Shire of Yea pound. A similar position probably exists in various shires throughout Victoria. My amendment will make for easier administration of the section.

The new clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House with an amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

The sitting was suspended at 1.5 *p.m. until* 2.10 *p.m.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MUNICIPAL EMPLOYÉS LONG SERVICE LEAVE) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 17) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston): The Opposition believes the concept embodied in the Bill is good but it is disturbed about several clauses. The measure provides for portability of service and long service leave entitlement. Of course, municipal councils can enter into agreements with other public authorities. The Bill reduces from fifteen years to ten years the entitlement period for long service leave.

The Government is ten years behind progressive municipal councils. For instance, the City of Preston has operated a long service leave scheme since 1964, so that council is ten years ahead of this Government.

Mr. WHITING: What is it doing now?

Mr. KIRKWOOD: It is continuing to progress. It is not like the backward, awkward country municipalities which seem never to observe the progress made by city municipalities. I do not know one country municipality which operates on a 35-hour week, yet that practice is common in city municipalities. Clause 6 of the City of Preston long service leave scheme provides—

> On the completion of an employee's ten years' continuous employment with the council—three months' long service leave and thereafter an additional one and a half months' long service leave on the completion of each additional five years continuous employment with the council.

Even today the scheme agreed to ten years ago by the City of Preston is far in advance of the measure before the House.

The Opposition agrees with the intention of the Bill but, as I said, it is not happy with some of its contents. Under the measure employees are subject to many restrictions. For example, a person must be employed for not less than three years before the municipality becomes liable to contribute towards long service leave; otherwise he does not receive the benefit of portability.

If an employee changes his position and takes longer than two months to move from one section to another—and there may be many reasons why an employee takes longer than two months—the first period of service with the municipality is lost, and he has to start all over again to qualify. The Opposition believes portability should be complete. The qualifying period should be extended by the Government to the ten years spent in the municipality, and whatever work the employees do on various jobs should be accepted. This should be the only requirement for portability of long service leave.

A number of people have contacted Ministers of the Crown on this matter. I refer to a letter I have received from the Victoria Division of the Federated Municipal and Shire Council Employees Union of Australia. The letter, which is addressed to me, was signed by Mr. T. H. Williams, a country organizer of the union. It states, *inter alia*—

> Further to our telephone conversation regarding proposed amendments to sections 167A and 167B of the Local Government Municipal Employees Long Service Leave Act 1974, which has just passed through all the stages of your Council, I would be pleased if you could see that the following submissions are presented to one of your colleagues, who will debate further, when the Bill is presented in the Legislative Assembly.
>
> (1) Clause 3A only provides for equity under the Act on account of age or ill health a municipal employee retires, or his services are terminated on account of age or ill health, after five years continuous service. It makes no provision for any person dismissed, other than for serious or wilful misconduct for minor breaches of the award. The history surrounding the silence of the Act on dismissal etc., stems from the Public Service Act, of which the Act under discussion was modelled and because public servants cannot be dismissed without a hearing. They can only be suspended pending a hearing which, when deciding guilt or innocence, makes a decision on the equity of the person under the Act. The Municipal Officers Association have similar arrangements, but the municipal employee is under weekly hire or fire and is not subject to a hearing after suspension. An amendment giving equity for dismissal for ordinary breaches of the award after five years continuous service should be incorporated in the Act.

The suggestion by the union should be seriously considered. I shall be happy to pass a copy of the letter to the Minister in charge of the Bill, who is usually concerned when there is an obvious anomaly which he can correct. The letter continues—

> (2) No provision for equity is included in the Act for a member who is stood down, when no work is available for him.

Mr. Williams then referred to clause 2 (*f*) of the present regulations. The point is well taken by the union and the letter refers to many other items which could be of interest to the Minister. The statements by the union are of such a character that, in the next sessional period, further amendments could be proposed. I trust that serious consideration will be given to these suggestions.

During the Committee stage the Opposition will move an amendment for the purpose of including the City of Melbourne within the provisions of the Bill. The City of Geelong which, like the City of Melbourne, operates under a separate provision, will be included. The Opposition cannot understand why the portability of entitlement to long service leave should not be applied to the City of Melbourne.

It could be argued that the City of Melbourne already has an agreement with its employees, but other municipalities, such as the City of Preston, also have agreements which include far better provisions than those of this Bill. If the City of Melbourne were included, the same provisions would operate throughout metropolitan Melbourne as well as in the country. The Minister may find that he can agree to the amendment which will be put forward during the Committee stage. The Bill was considered in detail in another place and the facts applicable to it are available in *Hansard*. Therefore, I shall not repeat them.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): The concept of portability of long service leave entitlements immediately conjures up a contradiction. Surely, long service leave was introduced to encourage officers and employees to remain with one employer for a longer period than they otherwise would have. However, it is obvious that if a local government authority is to attract the type of officer it needs for its competent administration it must be able to offer benefits similar to those applying in other fields. Portability of long service leave is a common practice.

Some municipal officers suffer under the present restrictions because, if they have been with a municipality for many years and are about to become entitled to long service leave, they are reluctant to move to other appointments. Municipalities, too, suffer because of this. I am not critical of any particular officer but there have been cases in which both the municipality and the officer would have been better off if there had been a change. However, the rapid progression of officers between shires would not help municipal government. Small shires are used as a stepping stone to greater things. I hope the amendment to the Act does not aggravate the situation.

I am opposed to the reduction of the period of entitlement to long service leave from fifteen years to ten years. The period of ten years is too short for long service leave. However, I shall do no more than register my objection. The period of three years for portability of entitlements also seems to be too short. I would have preferred a period of five years. The honorable member for Rodney and I have both received correspondence on this subject from municipalities in the electorates we represent. In some respects, a period of five years would overcome the problems involved in a rapid succession of municipal officers.

Some of the proposals for the scheme have attracted criticism, but it deserves a trial. The Country Party endorses the scheme subject to the reservations I have outlined. The bulk of the 211 municipalities throughout the country support the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 6299).

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston): I move—

Clause 2, page 8, line 13, after "Geelong" insert "and the city of Melbourne".

The Opposition believes the City of Melbourne should be included. The City of Geelong also operates under separate provisions. That being so, the Opposition believes employees who have an agreement with the City of Melbourne should

not lose any entitlement emanating from the Bill which could react in their favour. As I said during the second-reading debate, the City of Melbourne has an agreement with the Municipal Officers Association, but that should not separate it from other municipalities in the State. The Opposition hopes the Government will accept the amendment.

The Committee divided on Mr. Kirkwood's amendment (Mr. McLaren in the chair)—

Ayes	..	18
Noes	..	41
Majority against the amendment	..	23

AYES.

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

NOES.

Mr. Austin	Mr. Maclellan
Mr. Balfour	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Billing	Mr. Plowman
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Chamberlain	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Ebery	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hann	Mr. Vale
Mr. Jona	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Lacy	Mr. Williams
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Wiltshire
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Wood
Mr. MacDonald	*Tellers:*
Mr. McInnes	Mr. Baxter
Mr. McKellar	Mr. McClure

PAIR.

Mr. Holding	Mr. Burgin

The clause was agreed to.

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

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The message from the Council relating to the amendments in this Bill was taken into consideration.

Council's amendments—

1. Clause 6, omit this clause.

2. Insert the following new clause to follow clause 5 :—

'AA. In section 39 of the Principal Act for the expression "$10,000" there shall be substituted the expression "$20,000".'

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works) : Clause 6 (*a*) provides—

At the end of the section there shall be inserted the following sub-section :—

"(2) Where the Board, having entered into a contract with any person for the execution of any works, proposes to enter into a further contract with that person for the execution at or in the vicinity of the site of the works of any further works ancillary thereto or of a similar nature, the Minister may, if in all the circumstances he believes it desirable to do so, dispense the Board from compliance with sub-section (1) in relation to the further contract"; and

That gives the board the power to extend a contract at the Minister's discretion. I understand that in another place doubt was expressed about the justification of this provision, as the former arrangement for extending contracts has stood the test of time. The Minister of Water Supply, to whom the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is responsible, agreed that there was probably no justification for the amendment contained in the clause. However, if it should be proved from further investigation and experience to be necessary, the legislation can be amended and the omitted clause reinserted at some future time. I hope the reasons given in another place are sufficient to explain the proposal to omit the clause.

The second amendment inserts a new clause to increase the sum of $10,000 to $20,000 in line with monetary inflation. I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

OMBUDSMAN (EXEMPTION) BILL.

The message from the Council relating to the amendment in this Bill was taken into consideration.

Council's amendment—

Clause 2, lines 15-17, omit all words and expressions on these lines and insert—

'"(*aa*) by a board tribunal commission or other body presided over by a Judge magistrate barrister or solicitor presiding as such by virtue of a statutory requirement and appointment;"; and'

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): This matter was raised by the honorable member for Melbourne during his second-reading speech, and he must be commended for doing so.

Mr. JONES: It puts the matter beyond all doubt.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The Minister said that the honorable member for Melbourne must be commended for raising the matter, but I do not think he is commending him for the assistance that he is now giving.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The amendment made by the Legislative Council clarifies the point raised by the honorable member for Melbourne, to whom the Government conveys its gratitude. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): I thank the Minister for his graceful and spontaneous tribute. I am prepared to accept the accolade. Members of the Opposition do not accept Imperial honours, so that is about the best we can expect.

The motion was agreed to.

LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The message from the Council relating to the amendment in this Bill was taken into consideration.

Council's amendment—

Clause 2, line 15, omit "considers" and insert "is satisfied on reasonable grounds".

On the motion of Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works), the amendment was agreed to.

LATROBE VALLEY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 16) on the motion of Mr. Balfour (Minister for Fuel and Power) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): This Bill originated in the Legislative Council and was thoroughly canvassed in that place. The spokesman for the Opposition there put the case for the Opposition. The Bill is not opposed and therefore I shall not take up the time of the House in speaking any further on the measure.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): The Country Party supports the Bill. The proposal to increase from $4,000 to $10,000 the amount of any contract which the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board may invite proposals from tenderers without Ministerial approval is reasonable. Clause 3 will rectify an anomaly under the Latrobe Valley Act by empowering the board to grant easements over land to which it holds title. This has not been possible under the principal Act.

Perhaps the most important amendment relates to subsidies from the Government to meet the cost of interest payments in excess of 3 per cent per annum on borrowings. In answer to a question on notice, the Minister for Fuel and Power advised that since 1958, when the Latrobe Valley outfall sewer was constructed, Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd., which is the prime user, has paid approximately $2·9 million and other users have paid $2·2 million for the discharge of waste effluent. The Government subsidy goes nowhere near meeting the cost of interest payments on moneys borrowed to provide the effluent disposal facilities required in the community.

The Government will have to examine the situation with large industries. For instance Esso-B.H.P. is constructing a pipeline for discharge of saline effluent from its operations. The cost of providing such facilities ought to be a charge of the prime users. In this instance the prime user

is a large industry, and it is only fair that that industry should bear the major proportion of the cost. The Country Party supports the concept that some discretion should be applied by the Treasurer on whether the Government is prepared to pick up the interest payments in excess of 3 per cent on loan moneys. I know of no reason why municipalities or similar undertakings ought to bear such high interest charges when they are acting in the public interest. However, where industry demands the provision of such services, the returns from the industry should be related to bearing the full cost of the project including unsubsidized interest payments. With the increases in interest rates it is reasonable that utilities should expect industries to meet the cost. The Country Party fully supports the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 10) on the motion of Mr. Balfour (Minister of Mines) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell): This Bill originated in another place and has been thoroughly canvassed by members of all parties. It is a small Bill to extend the regulation-making powers under the Extractive Industries Act. As the Minister of Mines explained, the Subordinate Legislation Committee drew the attention of the Government to the fact that it considered that the regulation-making powers of the principal Act did not allow for fees to be paid to members of the board of examiners for quarry managers, which is established under the Act. It speaks well for the diligence of the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

The Bill highlights what members of the Opposition and indeed of the Government party have said concerning government by regulation rather than government by legislation and perhaps honorable members ought to pay more attention to Bills in this Chamber which give far too much power to the Executive Government to make regulations. The Opposition does not oppose the measure.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura): The Country Party supports the Bill, which merely permits attendance fees and travelling and other allowances to be paid to members of the board of examiners for quarry managers; this issue was in doubt under the principal Act. The Subordinate Legislation Committee, in performing its proper function as a standing committee of this Parliament, has pointed out the matter to the Government and the Government has seen fit to introduce this amending Bill to remedy the situation.

The motion was agreed to.

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

HOUSING (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 10) on the motion of Mr. Balfour (Minister for Fuel and Power) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): The Bill has been amply debated in another place and comes to this House for ratification. It proposes an amendment to the Housing Act to enable the Housing Commission to provide what are commonly known as granny flats but are more correctly called dependent-relative units.

The Opposition does not oppose the principle of the Bill. However, it foreshadows an amendment similar to that which was moved in another place because clause 2, as drafted, restricts the provision of such units whereas the publicity given to the measure by the Government indicated that grandmothers would be eligible to apply to have a flat built on a relative's property. In fact, the Bill does not do that. Only married couples will be eligible for a unit; the whole range of relatives, such as mothers and fathers,

uncles and grandmothers are not covered by the measure. The purpose of the Opposition's amendment is to broaden the measure to provide accommodation for the dependent relatives of the property owners, and it is in accordance with the public relations exercise of the Government in this matter.

The Bill amends a further section of the principal Act to enable advances to be made to persons whose homes are suitable for restoration in areas which have been proclaimed, such as Carlton, Fitzroy and South Melbourne. This has been suggested by the Opposition during many campaigns as the method whereby areas should be restored, and it is pleasing to see that the Government has finally accepted the principle. The Opposition does not oppose the measure but intends to move an amendment in Committee.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura): The Country Party likewise is critical of the fact that the Government has introduced a Bill which is far too restrictive. The occupants of the type of flat provided for in the Bill should be a married couple at least until one spouse passes on, and then the remaining spouse should be able to continue living in the unit. The majority of families which could make use of this accommodation would have one single living parent.

The other issue is that many bachelors and spinsters find in their declining years that they have need to be nearer to their relatives in order to obtain help should this be necessary from time to time. One would have thought that this section of the community would be covered by the Bill. There are enough restrictions operating already. The provisions of this Bill will be difficult to comply with and will not be undertaken by a large number of people anyway. One would think that because of this the Government could also have included single persons. This would be of greater use to the community.

I believe the Government has undertaken that at some future time it will consider this proposal but surely, in view of the small numbers of people who will take advantage of this type of accommodation, it could be done at this stage. I again suggest to the Minister that the Government should consider the proposal, particularly in view of the fact that the honorable member for Moonee Ponds intends to move an amendment along these lines. The Country Party will have a good look at that amendment during the Committee stage.

The other problem regarding this proposed legislation relates to the elderly couple, one of whom or perhaps both of whom, are not in the best of health and require a person, possibly a granddaughter, a niece or some other younger person, to live in the unit also. No provision is made in the Bill for this and it appears that it would be illegal for such a young person to reside in the unit. This is an anomaly which will have to be corrected in the future.

The principle of the Bill is good, but it will not be of sufficient use to as large a number of people as it should be, and the Government will have to propose amendments in the reasonably near future, even if it does not accept the amendment foreshadowed by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Principal Act No. 6275).

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): I move—

Clause 2, lines 8-9, omit "the father or mother or father-in-law or mother-in-law of the hirer of the unit" and insert "related by blood or marriage to the hirer or the spouse of the hirer of the unit".

Clause 2, lines 31-33, omit all words and expressions on these lines and insert—

"(*b*) requires accommodation on the land for one or two persons who are pensioners and related by blood or marriage to himself or his spouse—".

The first amendment is designed to eliminate the definition of eligible persons proposed in the Bill and to broaden it to include any person related by blood or marriage to the hirer or the spouse of the hirer of the unit. The second amendment provides that an eligible person will be either a married person or a single person. When this Bill was debated in another place, as the Minister and those honorable members involved in housing matters in this State are aware, there was considerable controversy about who would be eligible for granny flats. People believe that an aged single dependent relative will be eligible, and much argument will take place on how the hired unit will be put on land because many freehold allotments will be too small to have units placed on them.

These sentiments are shared not only by the Opposition. In the *Age* of 17th October, 1974, the Nunawading City Council criticized the Bill for the same reason—that it is far too restrictive. I suggest to the Government that there is no real hurry to pass this measure because it has been announced that the flats will not be available to eligible persons until April of next year. It is not outside the bounds of reason to suggest to the Minister handling the Bill on behalf of his colleague in another place that the matter be deferred because it is too restrictive. I suggest to the Government that progress should be reported on the matter rather than that the House should divide on the Opposition's amendment, and that the Bill should be returned to the House after the Christmas recess. Then it may be presented in a better form, although I have grave doubts about its success. I do not think more than 50 or 60 people would be eligible for this type of accommodation. Nevertheless I strongly suggest to the Government that it should accept the proposition I have put forward.

Mr. McINNES (Gippsland South): The Country Party is sympathetic to the amendment. Since the Bill has been introduced it has created wide interest among people with pensioner relatives. The fact has to be faced in any community that people grow old and rely upon others who can take care of them. Unfortunately the axe falls in different directions, if I may put it that way. It is not possible to legislate in a straight line situation as is intended here, although honorable members would like to do so. Pensioner couples are stipulated in the Bill, but frequently the problem arises of an elderly person being the sole remaining parent. Although there is provision in this Bill for the subsequent passing of one or the other parent, what is the situation when there is only one parent surviving as of now?

The second part of the equation is that people in these circumstances invariably need aid in one form or another, and if that aid can be given to them in the home, in the surroundings of their family, its therapeutic value probably far outweighs any benefits that might be obtained from ultra-modern nursing homes. People in their declining years want to stay as close to their families as possible and at the same time to try to avoid being with them. The Bill is an honest attempt to rectify this situation, and the Country Party applauds it. However, one anomaly is being overlooked, and it is a situation that is perhaps more common than the Bill envisages—the question of a sole remaining parent.

The Opposition's second amendment concerns connection by blood. How often, as some of the family pass on, has one pensioner uncle or aunt remained? Very often the only people to whom he or she can turn are nieces or nephews, and the stipulation of parents only precludes practical support being extended to that person.

No doubt in the Minister's mind is the thought that the provisions of this Bill will be abused, and I am sure they will be, but I do not think they will be abused on a widespread

scale. In this social Bill—I believe it is a social Bill rather than a housing Bill—perhaps we should err on the side of sympathy and should trust to the policing methods that are available to try to avoid abuse of the scheme. There is power to remove the unit if abuse takes place. Sufficient safeguards are contained in the Bill, and we should err on the side of sympathy and heed the cause of the single relative, the single parent or the surviving parent pensioner and adopt as humanitarian an approach as possible to a real issue, not merely to the people concerned but perhaps one of these days to every one of us.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport) : I sympathize with the sentiments expressed by the honorable members for Moonee Ponds and Gippsland South. I point out to the committee that this is pilot legislation. It represents a new experiment and approach to the problem. It has been designed to cater only for married couples because the Housing Commission already has a substantial programme of single-unit low-rental flats.

If, as suggested, a blood relative or a single person were to be provided with one of these flats, it would be necessary for the commission to develop two prototypes because obviously it would be uneconomical to provide a double unit for a single person. As this scheme is experimental, and as the commission is moving into an entirely new field, it is wise to concentrate on the production of double units to ascertain whether there are any flaws in the scheme. I have no doubt that if very few people need double units, and the Government finds it does not work because of inadequacies suggested by honorable members, it will be a very simple matter for the legislation to be suitably amended in the autumn.

The suggestion of the honorable member for Moonee Ponds that progress be reported would have the effect of delaying the over-all programme. I should not like to do that. The commission should be in a position to start producing these units and commence hiring them out as soon as possible. For those reasons the Government does not accept the amendments. The Government is acutely aware of the sense of what the honorable member said, and will keep the matter under review. I hope that in the not-too-distant future the Government will produce an amendment that will meet the wishes of all parties.

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

Ayes	..	46
Noes	..	18
Majority against the amendments	..	28

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

PAIR.

Mr. Burgin	Mr. Kirkwood

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): I point out that these units can be erected on properties within municipal boundaries only because of amendments to the Uniform Building Regulations. I am still not happy with some of the provisions. As I understand it, the municipality will be the final arbiter of whether a person has one of these units on his property for dependent relatives.

Questions from the local government committee were sent to all municipalities and where no reply was received it was considered that there was no need to seek any further opinion from those councils because obviously they agreed with the amendment of the regulations. However, 27 councils replied, and all but one favoured the amendments. It is interesting to note that only the Brighton City Council opposed the proposal for the erection in backyards of granny flats for dependent relatives. I know of no reason why the city should be allowed to dodge its responsibility in this matter. I understand that under the amendments to the Uniform Building Regulations that council can disapprove an application.

The Chief Secretary, who temporarily represents Brighton, has not a great deal to say in defence of the council. He will be in the embarrassing position of having people ask him to support their applications for permits to build units on their properties. Because of the way in which the Uniform Building Regulations have been amended, it seems the Brighton City Council will be able to reject their applications. I point this out to the Committee because I believe the Government ought to inquire into it. I do not believe municipalities should discriminate. The firm belief is held by the Labor Party that the building regulations, which have been built up over a long period, are not sacrosanct. I do not believe the amendments being dealt with in the Bill do anything to enhance the living standards of our community.

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.

WODONGA AREA LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was returned from the Council with a message relating to an amendment.

Council's amendment—

Clause 5, line 1, omit "effect" and insert "affect".

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The Legislative Council found that the word proposed to be altered could have an injurious effect on the "affection" of this Bill. The Government agrees with the amendment. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): The Opposition offers no objection to the preciseness of the Legislative Council.

The motion was agreed to.

VALUATION OF LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 19) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): The Bill has been thoroughly debated in another place and comes to this House for ratification. The measure is designed to improve further the standards of valuations in Victoria. The Opposition believes it improves the principal Act and effects a number of important changes in cities such as Brighton.

The measure empowers the Valuer-General to make valuations for taxation purposes to assist with the new Commonwealth capital gains tax. It is surprising that the State Government has readily co-operated with the Commonwealth Government in this respect.

The Bill extends the confidentiality provisions to include all employees of the Valuer-General's Office. In addition, it makes approximately 24 amendments, many of which are improvements in the drafting and general corrections to the principal Act. Thirteen of the amendments are substantive and seven involve matters of principle to which the Opposition is not opposed.

The Bill further proposes that the limit on monetary claims for compensation heard by the Land Valuation Board of Review will be increased from $10,000 to $50,000. A variation is also made to the rule which stated that compensation must be claimed within two years after the service of a notice to treat by an authority. Arguments have occurred in many instances on whether a further period should be provided. The Bill amends this provision to enable parties to agree on a longer period before a claim is finally lodged.

Where an objector to a valuation has had difficulty under the principal Act in dealing directly with the valuer, to enable an objection to be made the Bill now provides that if the valuer and the objector agree on whether the objection is warranted, the objection can be lodged without first ensuring that the valuer will accept the objector's eligibility to make an objection.

The Bill is detailed, but as I said at the outset, it has been thoroughly examined by the Opposition in another place and the Opposition in this House does not oppose it.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): This Bill has been well canvassed by two of my colleagues in another place, the Honorable K. I. Wright, who is a qualified valuer and has had consultations with many people concerning the Bill, and the Honorable S. R. McDonald. I do not intend to cover all that ground again, but wish to comment on one aspect of the Bill with which the Country Party disagrees.

Clause 3 extends the power of the Valuer-General to make valuations for taxation purposes. The Valuer-General already has extensive powers to make valuations, and the Country Party can see no justification at this stage for further extending the competition with private valuers simply for taxation purposes, which one would assume would relate to a proposal of the Federal Government to introduce a capital gains tax. That is a hypothetical matter, and I know of no reason why this Parliament should act on it. As a result of proceedings in another State last Saturday, the introduction of such a provision may be considered even less likely to eventuate.

Members of the Country Party are concerned that this clause remains in the Bill, particularly in view of an assurance given by the Premier some years ago when he was Minister for Local Government that the authority of the Valuer-General to compete with private valuers would not be further extended. The Bill seems to go back on that undertaking.

Furthermore, it could have some effect on the establishment of valuers in country areas. Victoria is not overendowed with qualified valuers, and the fact that the Valuer-General is entitled to make yet another inroad into their business will mean that there will be even fewer valuers to service the country people of Victoria.

The Minister for Local Government gave an assurance that this competition would not occur. It is all very well for the honorable gentleman to give such an assurance, but no one can foresee whether, in due course, subsequent Ministers will honour it. In another place a good deal of time was spent debating the date of the return of valuation and which of the three dates mentioned was the relevant one. Certain assurances were given by the Minister, and I do not intend to canvass that matter any further.

I register my party's disapproval of the provisions contained in clause 3 extending the power of the Valuer-General to make valuations for taxation purposes, and will move an appropriate amendment during the Committee stage.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

Clause 3 (Amendment of No. 6653 s. 3).

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): I move—

Clause 3, line 9, omit " and ".

Clause 3, paragraph (c), omit this paragraph.

For the reasons I outlined during the second-reading debate, the Country Party can see no justification for extending the Valuer-General's powers in this regard simply for " taxation purposes ", whatever that may mean. In the future there may well be justification for so doing. The Country Party is not convinced by the argument which has been put forward so far, and that is the reason for the amendments.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): For the same reasons which were stated in another place, the Opposition will not support the Country Party's amendments.

The amendments were negatived, and 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.

CATTLE AND SWINE COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The message from the Council relating to the amendments in this Bill was taken into consideration.

Council's amendments—

1. Clause 2, page 2, lines 4-5, omit paragraph (*b*) and insert the following paragraph :—

'( ) in sub-section (1) of section 6 for the words " meat inspector or medical officer of health " there shall be substituted the words " or meat inspector ". '

2. Clause 2, page 2, lines 10-11, omit paragraph (*d*) and insert the following paragraph :—

'( ) in paragraph (*b*) of sub-section (1) of section 21 for the words " meat inspector or medical officer of health " there shall be substituted the words " or meat inspector ".

3. Clause 3, lines 19-20, omit paragraph (*b*) and insert the following paragraph :—

'( ) in sub-section (1) of section 6 for the words " meat inspector or medical officer of health " there shall be substituted the words " or meat inspector ". '

4. Clause 3, lines 23-24, omit paragraph (*d*) and insert the following paragraph :—

'( ) in paragraph (*b*) of sub-section (1) of section 21 for the words " meat inspector or medical officer of health " there shall be substituted the words " or meat inspector ". '

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture) : I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

They are all consequential and simply remove health inspectors from the provisions of the Bill. With the transfer of the administration of the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act to the Department of Agriculture, health inspectors are no longer involved in the chain of killing, and it is therefore unnecessary to include the words " meat inspector or medical officer of health " and the words " meat inspector " have been substituted. I commend the amendments to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MILK AND DAIRY SUPERVISION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The message from the Council relating to the amendments in this Bill was taken into consideration.

Council's amendments—

1. Clause 7, line 2, before " chief " insert " a ".

2. Clause 8, lines 9-11, omit "greater than any tolerance that may be prescribed" and insert "in an amount greater than the tolerance that may be prescribed for that substance".

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture) : The amendments made by the Council are simply grammatical and clarify the intention of the Bill. I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MUNICIPAL ABATTOIRS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 27) on the motion of Mr. Scanlan (Minister of Health) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara): The Bill contains further amendments caused by the implementation of the Abbattoir and Meat Inspection Act. However, one amendment in the Bill repeals Part XXXIII. of the Local Government Act, which authorizes those shire councils having electricity supply undertakings to make and supply ice in the municipal district. Ice works as we used to know them no longer exist because people use refrigerators and persons who require ice can obtain crushed ice which is not produced by shire councils that operate electricity supply undertakings. Therefore, that Part of the Local Government Act is no longer required.

The other amendments in the Bill result from the further progress of the Victorian Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority. Councils operating abattoirs will be able to collect fees from the abattoirs and pay them to the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority instead of the authority collecting the fees directly.

I do not see anything in the Bill that causes concern to the Opposition. However, I point out that six municipal abattoirs are leased to private operators and ten are operated by municipal councils, so the Bill affects sixteen abattoirs throughout the State. The Opposition does not oppose the Bill.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla) : This small Bill amends the provisions of the Local Government Act which relate to municipal abattoirs. As has been mentioned, not many such abattoirs exist today. This is an indication that local government is gradually shedding itself of this involvement. Municipalities which operate abattoirs have to comply with the provisions of the Act. I am sure that if country people examined some of the municipal abattoirs around the city, especially those at Oakleigh and at Richmond, they would favour their disposal so that livestock may be killed under more hygienic conditions. Perhaps in the next decade this will come about.

As they exist, provision must be made in the Local Government Act and for the new Victorian Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority to ensure that abattoirs are suitably equipped to slaughter stock and dispose of offal. Too often around the city, regardless of the weather, meat carts distribute meat as they did 30 or 40 years ago. Under the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority efforts must be made to improve slaughtering and the distribution of meat firstly through wholesale outlets and then through retail outlets. Retailers such as butchers and many chain grocery shops are doing their fair share and are providing facilities for customers to purchase meat prepared and packaged in cryovac wrapping under hygienic conditions.

Since the report of the Meat Industry Committee and the transfer of meat inspection from the Department of Health to the Department of Agriculture, inspection fees have been increased, and I understand that this increase will be reflected in the price of meat. It was previously a fairly simple matter for municipalities to employ a health officer to act as a meat inspector, and in some instances the municipality made a few dollars

in this fashion. Now it is necessary to employ qualified meat inspectors in the employment of the Department of Agriculture and under the guidance of the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority. The result is that fees are being increased considerably. It is necessary to ensure that livestock that is slaughtered is healthy and suitable for human consumption and also that greater supervision is exercised over the disposal of meat to the consumer. Members of the Country Party support the Bill although much remains to be done in the meat industry to ensure that the public obtains meat under the best possible conditions.

At an abattoir where inspections are made it is necessary to indicate the fees that are charged for meat inspection, and so on. Eventually some amendment may be necessary to the Auction Sales Act so that it will not be compulsory for portion of the Act to be read prior to the commencement of a livestock auction sale. At present prior to every auction a person reads a screed in an inaudible voice. This procedure could be shortened considerably. I mention that in passing because the auction sale is part of the meat selling process. Some amendment should be made in this procedure.

The report of the Meat Industry Committee has resulted in many excellent changes being made. The fees charged for inspections should not be increased to such an extent that the price of meat to the consumer is increased. There is too much margin between the price of meat to the consumer and the return received by the producer. If fees are increased to any considerable extent the increase will either be taken from the producer's return or be added to the price charged to the consumer. The Country Party supports the Bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Box Hill): I am most concerned that municipalities are engaged in municipal abattoirs. The auditor's report reveals that the City of Richmond spent more than $1 million on developments at its abattoirs and that it is losing $80,000 a year on this activity. The auditor is so upset about the way in which the City of Richmond is conducting its abattoirs that he refused to approve the accounts.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): Order! The House is not debating the auditor's report on the Richmond City Council. It is debating this Bill, which relates to abattoirs.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I was endeavouring to substantiate the contention that it is highly undesirable for municipal councils to be conducting abattoirs. I was trying to indicate that a city such as Richmond, in which there are many poor and underprivileged ratepayers, should not have to spend so much money on developing and operating a valuable asset. Am I in order in elaborating along those lines, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: So long as the honorable member confines himself to the Bill he is in order. However, it is difficult to connect the honorable member's statements with the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

CLUSTER TITLES BILL.

The debate (adjourned from November 27) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): This Bill is one of the most detailed to come before the House in this sessional period—in fact, for a long time. It contains 41 clauses and six schedules, and it is divided into six Parts. The Bill amends the Health Act, the Local Government Act, the Town and Country Planning Act, the Sale of Land Act, and the Strata Titles Act and it has to be read in conjunction with the Transfer of Land Act

and the Uniform Building Regulations. It affects nine Acts and in many instances must be read in conjunction with each of those Acts if one is to understand what the Bill actually intends.

The Opposition favours the principle of cluster development. The Housing Commission has been working in this field and moving away from the grid pattern syndrone upon which Melbourne has been developed for so long. I particularly refer to the Raeburn development programme, which enhances a locality.

The proposition before the House really turns the clock back with respect to the way in which communities have developed in the past. In old communities in Europe, such as villages in Great Britain, this type of development has been occurring for centuries. The Bill proposes to introduce it into Victoria.

One of the big difficulties with the conventional pattern of living is the impact that the motor car has made on our lives, our life style and independence. For a variety of reasons there is no security with motor cars which may be driven within 10 or 15 feet of people's homes. They not only cause a disturbance but also provide a danger to children. The cruising vehicle passing through built-up areas is becoming more prevalent.

The cluster titles proposition is designed to make more efficient use of land. The Bill provides for cluster redevelopment and even cluster subdivisions. In another place the Bill was debated for between four and six hours. I have no intention of pursuing each clause, as occurred in another place because many of the questions raised are hypothetical. Nobody knows how the Bill will operate until developers submit proposals and snags arise.

The municipal council is the safeguard, the watchdog in these matters. Persons must notify municipal councils of the proposals, and the councils decide whether a project will go ahead. The real power rests with the municipal councils.

The Bill makes provision for persons who are not aware whether a development provides for public open space or is common property. It also provides for staged development. It does have some dangers for municipalities. I believe many municipalities will be unable to cope with the big developer who will be able to impose on it regarding the provision of plans and so on. Again this is an opinion which is not based on fact because there has been no proper development along these lines.

The advantages, as I see them, lie in the fact that common property is held by the community involved in a cluster title subdivision. The advantages should lead to a more interesting design of properties, more interesting styles of designs and greater use of natural features in the particular area rather than bulldozing them flat or filling them in. In many areas native trees and other prominent features will be left and development will proceed around them.

I can recall years ago when the Beaumaris area was being developed. It was considered to be a show place for individual expression because of its trees and low shrubs. There were conservation groups even in those days, twenty years ago, earnestly trying to retain the area in its natural state. However, those organizations discovered that development or progress—as it was called—had to take first priority, and that roads with kerbing and channels had to be constructed, drains laid and sewers provided. Beaumaris is now a suburb similar to the rest of Melbourne suburbs. Associations of people in Beaumaris strongly resisted progress and tried to prevent roads from being constructed; they wanted the native trees to remain on the property.

The Bill will not go as far as to prevent the construction of roads, drains and sewers, and

the services people require, but a similar Bill was produced by the Minister for Local Government in another place in April, 1974. That Bill was freely circulated and municipal Association of Victoria, have had a fair "chop" at it. There has been criticism, and the Government has conceded certain amendments, but many doubtful areas remain.

The Bill is most difficult for a landholder to interpret, and I believe Queen's Counsel will have many a feast from fees obtained in trying to work out how the legislation operates.

Many people will be involved in a cluster proposal, and the cost will be fairly high. The advantages will be entirely different from what you and I, Mr. Speaker, have in the suburb in which we live. Most honorable members in the metropolitan area would know of the costs of providing residences. Solicitors, surveyors, town planners and designers must be paid and it has been suggested that a single title in a cluster subdivision could cost approximately $1,000 extra, together with the other associated costs such as the cost of the land and services, and this will make it an expensive proposition. This is pioneering legislation. The Bill does not stand on its own, as it must have the support of nine other principal Acts. It is a most difficult Bill to comprehend.

The Opposition believes it is worthy of a trial. I do not propose to eulogize about it because the Opposition has not been taken into the confidence of the Government. Many municipalities were provided with copies of the first proposal and the second proposal before the Opposition had even seen them. For all that, particularly with the festive season approaching, it is not the intention of the Opposition to deal with the Bill with the same thoroughness as occurred in another place.

However, I shall make passing reference to what I consider are gaps in the measure. Many questions can be posed but I understand that many of them are hypothetical. There are areas in the Bill which I believe will stand up only with the aid of regulation. This concerns the Opposition. The measure contains much detail but it will require many regulations also. I believe the Government is in doubt on how it really will operate.

I have listened to the Minister for Local Government speak on the subject and the honorable gentleman has a fair grasp of what is contained in the Bill but in my view he is not certain how the Bill will operate in practice. A municipality should have been nominated by the Government to put a cluster title proposal in its office to see how it would operate and to discover how the municipal council would be able to manage the proposition.

The Opposition will not vote against the measure. However, there are three clauses upon which I require some clarification from the Minister of Public Works, and I will deal with those in Committee.

Mr. BAXTER (Murray Valley): This is a very complex Bill, and I do not claim to understand its implications. As the honorable member for Moonee Ponds has pointed out it amends nine fairly substantial pieces of legislation and no doubt the "legal eagles" will get a fair amount of mileage out of it. It has been a long time in its preparation. The Bill was circulated, and was examined by many people. An expert committee was set up to examine its proposals. I find it difficult to understand why a surveyor was not included; everyone else seems to be. Surveyors are important on matters relating to the subdivision of land.

The Bill has been expertly canvassed in another place and I do not propose to cover the ground again. All honorable members would be distressed by seeing around Melbourne rows and rows of similar houses and what the honorable member for

Moonee Ponds referred to as the grid pattern. Even some of the newer suburbs leave much to be desired in their quality of life. They are attractive when they are new but, too soon, they take on that drab sameness.

It is possible that early developments of cluster type housing will occur in the Albury-Wodonga area. That district has beautiful land and will probably lend itself to cluster housing. Some difficulties could arise with common land. I do not think the Bill spells out all the possible implications of land owned in common by all the residents of a development.

The Strata Titles Act was a post-war development which came with the building of separately owned multi-story flats. That has been used as far as possible, as a guide to introduce the concept of cluster housing. Under that Act it was necessary for all building to be completed before the issue of the titles. Also, it was a requirement that all buildings be artificially connected. Such a procedure is obviously unsatisfactory and does not lend itself to the type of cluster housing we want. I shall be interested to hear the comments of the honorable member for Moonee Ponds during the Committee stage.

The Country Party supports the Bill. There will be teething troubles but they are to be expected with a concept which has never been used before. I wish the Bill well.

Mr. LACY (Ringwood) : Of all the Bills which have come before this House during the time I have been a member of it, this Bill, more than any other, is related more to my interests, especially in regard to the development of communities. I shall speak on the theoretical concepts behind the Bill and its implications, and point to some of the problems which could arise.

I agree with some of the general criticisms of the Bill offered by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds. Similar criticisms were made in another place but they were well answered by the Minister there. The Minister recognized that this is a pioneering and experimental measure. For those reasons it must be presented in this form.

The Bill essentially deals with the Government's encouragement of the creation of locality communities. The definitions of subdivisions, body corporate, and common property, all point to this. However, this encouragement of the development of locality communities is not apparent from the Bill except in those definitions. It is not evident in the Bill itself, from the Minister's second-reading speech, or in the speeches made by honorable members in another place.

However, I believe this is the reason for the introduction of the Bill. What it makes possible is exciting and is essentially sociological in nature. The Bill also raises the questions of what a community is, whether it is desirable for the Government to encourage community development and, if it is desirable, how the Government should go about encouraging it.

The British urban sociologist, Ruth Glass, has said that the word "community" has reached a high level of use and a low level of meaning. I agree. Everyone uses the word but no one wants to explain what he means by it. Social workers, teachers, the clergy, and politicians, are perhaps the most guilty on this point. With one voice they assert that a community is a good thing, especially when it is attached to the word "spirit". They say that it must be preserved and encouraged but they rarely say what they mean by it. Le Bon has said that it is one of those terms—

> which are uttered with solemnity and as soon as it is pronounced an expression of respect is visible on every countenance, and all heads are bowed.

I raise the question of how this word is used because it is important to the Bill. It is important to realize that the word "community" has an extremely wide use. We speak of the European Economic

Community, the medical community, the Australian community, the Warrandyte community, and so on, but we surely cannot mean the same thing with these various usages.

The Bill deals with a community in a locality and that is why the definition of the community must be thought through. Otherwise, it will have no success. Ruth Glass has given what has become the classic definition of a community. She said that a community is—

> A territorial group of people with a common mode of living, striving for common objectives.

According to that definition there are three objetive elements of a community; its territorality, its propinquity and its homogeneity. These three elements go to make up the classic definition of community. They are three of the elements in the concept of a community which the Bill seems to encourage.

To some extent our existing communities are based on these objective criteria today in our existing municipalities, towns and cities of Victoria. But it is widely recognized that these social-geographical structures can be meaningless for many, and even most, people living in them. The trend has been for this to become increasingly true of the urban societies which modern industrialization has created. This trend has prompted the editors of the *Ecologist* to produce a book *A Blueprint for Survival,* which makes a profound point on the effect of modern industrialization on our existing community. At page 23 the editors say—

> In the rush to industrialize we break up communities so that the controls which formerly regulated behaviour are destroyed before alternatives can be provided. Urban drift is one result of this process, with a consequent rise in anti-social practices, crime, delinquency, and so on, which are so costly for society in terms both of money and well being.

The editors of the book which, incidentally, is endorsed by 37 of the most eminent scientists of the world, including Sir Julian Huxley and Sir Macfarlane Burnet, propose a blueprint or a strategy for the survival of modern society. Essentially, they propose what the Bill makes possible, the establishment of small, self-regulated communities.

That is why the Bill is so exciting, relevant and contemporary. It deals with the problems which are evident in our mass urban society and our industrial way of life. It seeks to deal with the dehumanization of society, the loneliness, the isolation, and the de-personalization of suburban life. This is rightly seen by social scientists to be the cause of various forms of pathological behaviour, such as delinquency, drug adiction, alcoholism, mental illness, suicide, and breakdowns of marriages and families.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): The honorable member is getting wide of the subject of the Bill, which deals with cluster titles.

Mr. JONES (Melbourne): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I suggest that the breakdown of society is relevant to the terms of the Bill, which could do something to offset it.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry to disagree with the honorable member for Melbourne, but I have given a ruling and it will stand.

Mr. LACY (Ringwood): I was referring to drug addiction, only in passing. The development of communities has been seen by some practising social workers and other professionals, as they have tried to come to terms with the problems to which I referred, as the answer. They have done what they could to encourage the formation of groups and associations in existing suburban structures. However, in doing so, they failed to recognize what has now been revealed by, in one case, a community study of Doveton, in the electorate of the honorable member for Dandenong.

It was discovered there that only 30 per cent of the residents of Doveton, a Housing Commission development, belong to any organization at

all, and only in one case for example Lois Bryson's and Faith Thompson's study, entitled *An Australian New-town,* which is in fact a study of Doveton, and only 15 per cent belong to an organization within Doveton itself. This evidences the false premise on which social workers and other professionals have based the means by which they are sought to encourage communities.

The Bill recognizes the need to do something different, to provide an alternative life style in such a way that it will encourage specific locality and neighbourhood based communities which have not been recognized until now. Fundamentally, these people have been engaged in their professional activity in a misguided way because the premises on which they acted have been shown to be false.

The Bill provides for an alternative life style and an opportunity for people to develop, deep, stable, interpersonal relationships on a locality and neighbourhood basis. As I said before, the Bill is exciting for that reason. In the understanding of communities in the past, objective criteria have been acted on.

When communities are analysed they must also be recognized as having some subjective criteria for a sound definition.

I refer to an article by a Monash University sociologist, Peter Cock entitled "A Model for Community Living", contained in volume 1 no. 2, in the journal *Contradiction* published by the Monash University Anthropology and Sociology Society. On page 77 this gentleman defined "community" as follows—

> 'Community' to me means the experience of continuous meaningful interpersonal relationships with a group of chosen and committed people, of each caring for and sharing with all. This involves the pooling and sharing of resources, each member contributing according to his capacity and receiving according to his needs.

This definition is basic to the whole movement towards communal living in Australia and the Western World. Essentially the movement is a desire for alternative life styles to those which have dominated urban society. This has been demonstrated by youth communes, student housing, group marriages, Kibbutz-style and communal arrangements, and religious communes. Even the development of play groups and bulk-buying groups amongst suburban housewives are expressions of the deep feelings people will necessarily have for an alternative life style. Essentially, the movement embraces a recognition of and a desire for an alternative life style to that which has dominated mass urban societies up to the present, namely, privatisation.

Therefore, the Bill brings us to the point where the Government has answered the three questions which I asked at the beginning. By implication it answered, firstly, that a community is not merely an objective phenomena. It is not a community unless it is subjectively satisfying and meaningful in terms of interpersonal relationships. Secondly, the answer is that it is desirable and ought to be encouraged. Thirdly, the means of doing this is by providing for an alternative life style such as is envisaged in the Bill. The honorable member for Moonee Ponds alleged that there was no pilot scheme, but there have been a couple of pilot schemes in Australia. One has operated successfully in Doncaster. I am not certain how these people got around the existing Acts for this purpose.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS: By strata titles, of course.

Mr. LACY: I am indebted to the Leader of the Country Party for his assistance. From reports, the Doncaster scheme appears to have been successful. This Bill is a significant and welcome development, and one which has my support. I regret that members of the Opposition have not seen fit to treat it with the seriousness it deserves. I will not delay the House any longer. The Bill interested me as it deals with a subject on which I have done a considerable amount of research myself.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Application of Transfer of Land Act 1958).

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds): I am pleased that the honorable member for Ringwood has decided to support the measure. I was most interested in his views on how the Bill will influence people who will be fortunate enough to own property within a cluster title subdivision. However, I believe the honorable member got away from the point to some extent. The author of the Bill and the person who has led the Government to this stage is a Mr. Yencken, who has been a developer in the Melbourne and metropolitan area for a long time. I understand that this gentleman has made a classic blunder in the Banyule estate in the Heidelberg area.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLaren): Order! I suggest to the honorable member for Moonee Ponds that clause 2 does not refer to the matter he is discussing. I do not know whether he can relate it to any other clause, but I do not want a general discussion on the application of the Bill or second-reading comments at this stage. I suggest that the honorable member might apply his remarks to another clause.

Mr. EDMUNDS: With respect to the guidance which you have offered me, Mr. Chairman, as the person handling the Bill on behalf of the Opposition I draw attention to the fact that clause 2 is the application of the Transfer of Land Act 1958, and it deals particularly with those sections which are amended. This is important, because it alters the whole style of the way land is transferred under a cluster title compared with the old type of transfer.

I could refer to the fact that the person who has brought the Government to the stage of introducing amendments to all of the principal Acts is a developer who was not aware of all the social implications of cluster title development. I make a passing reference to that matter.

Interesting as the comments of the honorable member for Ringwood were, I do not believe cluster titles will do any of the things that he has suggested they will. Although the Bill is unique in concept, it is fraught with dangers in the type of development that will occur in Victoria in future. As the Municipal Association also believed the Bill would be available for further examination, I suggest that the Government should not proclaim the legislation until the association, with its usual skill has examined the second-reading debate and decided whether to approve of the legislation.

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

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

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I have ascertained that it is convenient for His Excellency the Governor to receive the Address-in-Reply at 10 a.m. on Thursday, 19th December, at Government House. Members will be advised of further details, but at this stage I request that as many honorable members as possible should accompany me.

ADJOURNMENT.

CHRISTMAS FELICITATIONS—OAK INSURANCE LTD—BEACH UMBRELLAS—FLOOD-DAMAGED CARS.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until a day and hour to be fixed by Mr. Speaker or, if Mr. Speaker is unable to act on account of illness or other cause, by the Chairman of Committees, which time of meeting shall be notified to each member of the House by telegram or letter.

I wish all honorable members a pleasant and well-earned holiday. It may surprise honorable members to know how hard they have been working. A total of 166 Bills have

been introduced in the House, which is a large number by any standards. Fifty-seven of those Bills were introduced in the autumn sessional period, and no fewer than 109 were introduced during the spring sessional period. It is not often that more than 100 Bills are introduced in a session of a State Parliament. It means that all persons connected with Parliament, with the preparation of the Bills on the Government side and with their consideration by the Opposition and the Country Party, have had a great deal to do. There have been approximately 410 sitting hours, which is probably more than in most years. As honorable members are aware, that represents only a small portion of the work of a member of Parliament. It is worth emphasizing that it is only the tip of the iceberg in what is involved in being a member of Parliament, who apart from sitting in the House has a great deal of work to do as a member of a party and as a representative of a constituency, some more than others.

A great deal of time and effort goes into the working of this Parliament in the standing committees, and Select Committees, probably more than in other Parliaments. Every member who is not a Minister is involved in at least one of these committees, perhaps meeting several days a week throughout the year. These matters should be taken into account when considering whether one is justified in having a holiday in the near future. I wish those honorable members who are lucky enough to be going on a brief holiday a happy and pleasant recreational period.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party for their co-operation during the session, and also their deputies, because by and large the work of the Parliament has proceeded far more smoothly, and I commend them for it.

Mr. Speaker, you have had a fairly arduous session and I wish you a pleasant Christmas break. I thank you for your great diligence and impartiality in matters that have arisen for your decision. I express the appreciation of honorable members to Mr. Campbell and his colleagues at the table, Mr. McCarron and Mr. Boyes, who have been absolutely unfailing in their assistance and have never seemed to be stumped on any problem, however novel.

A great deal of gratitude is owed to Mr. Little, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the other officers and attendants, particularly for the way in which they look after the many visitors to this Parliament and show them around with such skill.

The House Committee and its Secretary, Mr. Duguid, have done us proud again. The manager of the refreshment rooms, Mr. Gerald Barry, is really a paragon and I am always proud to bring guests to the House for dinner or lunch to show them how well the meals are served and presented.

The *Hansard* staff, including the typists, under the Chief Reporter, Mr. Stuart, also deserve our thanks as they have once again made sense of much nonsense that has been said in this House. They have managed to improve on what honorable members have said and we thank them for that. We also thank them for the long hours that they have put in during the sittings of the House.

I turn now to what could be called the behind-the-scenes staff, such as Miss McGovern, the Parliamentary Librarian, and her staff, the engineer, Mr. Tynan, the ladies in the typing pool, who have served each member so well, the gardening staff, and the staff of the Government Printing Office. I wish them all a pleasant holiday and a happy Christmas and express the hope that they will return with vigour in the New Year. I do not think that the autumn session will be any less strenuous.

My purpose in speaking to the felicitations is to thank you, Mr. Speaker, as well as all the officers who serve the members of this

Parliament and help honorable members so unfailingly and so willingly, and to wish them all a happy holiday.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) : I join the Premier in his felicitations to all honorable members. I use the occasion to compliment you, Mr. Speaker, on the often difficult tasks which you have been called upon to perform from the chair, in providing difficult rulings at fairly short notice, and always endeavouring to uphold the traditions of the Parliamentary institution.

It is not possible for Parliament to function without the activities which go on behind the scenes by the clerks at the table, the *Hansard* staff, those who man the dining room, the staff of the Parliamentary Library, the gardeners, and not forgetting the members of the Victoria Police Force who are always in attendance but fortunately have not been called upon for their services. The fact that they are present is important.

It has been a hard-working session and I compliment those honorable members who have helped to make it so. The future of this Parliament is best assured when it is shown that it has a working capacity and also a capacity to initiate legislation to meet the needs of the community as a whole. Some stirring debates have been held in this House, and that is as it ought to be because, as I have said on other occasions, the Parliamentary institution is unique inasmuch as if one has to say something uncomplimentary about another member in this House, at least it is done face to face and across the table. That is a self-denying ordinance in its own right. According to the traditions, this Parliament can certainly hold its head up in the general community of Parliaments.

I wish all honorable members well and the very best for the Christmas season. I trust that they will return refreshed and ready to carry out their work when Parliament resumes.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) : I join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in extending Christmas greetings, to all honorable members and their families and in thanking you, Mr. Speaker, for your consideration, patience and tolerance during your term of office. One matter that does worry me from time to time is that you have not named anybody and I am wondering who the first victim may be.

I endorse the Premier's remarks when he thanked the staff of the House who serve this Parliament so well. One group that I should like to add is the members of the press. We have our moments with them, but they work the same hours as do honorable members and they have a difficult task to carry out. Public knowledge of what happens in this place depends on the diligence with which they undertake their duties.

I also thank the Premier in particular for the consideration and practical interest he has taken in the welfare of honorable members during his term of office. He understands members' needs and their requirements, and has been ever-ready to listen and, wherever possible, to accede to the requests of honorable members.

Finally, with some regret, I must mention the inevitable road toll which will continue to bring sadness and tragedy to many homes over the Christmas and New Year period. I hope that members, the staff of Parliament and the public of Victoria will do their best to keep the road toll to an irreducible minimum. This is a great problem which faces the State particularly at holiday times and instead of bringing

happiness it brings sadness to many people. I wish everyone a merry Christmas and a happy holiday.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I express appreciation for the remarks of the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party. I concur wholeheartedly in their sentiments concerning the officers at the table, the *Hansard* reporters, the readers or shall I say the back-room boys behind the scenes, the doormen, the engineers, the maintenance men, and the gardeners. I never really appreciated the dedication of those officers until I was entrusted with the position that I now occupy.

The staff of the House Committee deserve a special mention. This committee is now operating very successfully and meets monthly. A lot has been achieved by the staff of the House Committee.

The clerks at the table have the responsibility of detailing and documenting all the business before the House. Their continuous attention should be mentioned. At times they must be weary—one need only mention the hours that this House sat yesterday—and yet the clerks are still able to give well-considered opinions when called upon.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the debates in this place. This is one arena where members can be bitterly opposed to each other on a particular point of view or a particular policy. Above all that, there is a respect for the member's point of view and an underlying respect for each other when they leave this Chamber.

I sincerely hope that all honorable members will take advantage of the Christmas recess to relax in the interests of their own position as legislators because their electors will benefit from the fact that the members have taken time off to relax and to restore their energies. Honorable members should also relax in the interests of their families because undoubtedly their wives become political widows during the Parliamentary session. Another reason why the members should relax is for their own health. As the Premier has said, this House has worked hard and, irrespective of what some critics may say, all honorable members, whatever their political affiliations, have done the best they possibly could to represent their electors in the best possible tradition.

I wish to especially thank the Chairman of Committees. There have been occasions when it has been necessary for me to leave the chair for a time and I appreciate the readiness with which the Chairman of Committees has immediately taken over. The Temporary Chairmen of Committees have carried out the tasks that have been expected of them.

In conclusion, I return the good wishes that have been expressed and sincerely hope that every member in this place and in another place will have a happy, care-free and accident-free Christmas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West): Even at this late stage, I wish to raise a matter of urgent public importance for the attention of the Chief Secretary. As that honorable gentleman is not present, I ask the Premier to refer my remarks to him. Since 31st October, I have been waiting for the answer to a question on notice concerning Oak Insurance Ltd., which has been inserting full-page and double-page advertise-

ments in newspapers at a cost of many thousands of dollars to attract people to the company's sickness benefit scheme.

I placed a question on the Notice Paper on 31st October in an attempt to discover whether the Government Statist had examined the scheme, and on 27th November I discovered that the sickness fund was registered under the Benefits Association Act 1958 which was passed by this Parliament many years ago to prevent interstate sickness and funeral benefit funds from coming into Victoria and robbing the people. If the fund were registered, the answer would have been quite simple.

It has been put to me that such daylight robbery is precisely what Oak Insurance Ltd. is doing at present. It is spending a great deal of money on advertising, and according to its chief officers is doing it extremely well. It has been drawn to my attention that Oak Insurance Ltd. rates are double those of equivalent funds, and that if it were left to the Registrar of Friendly Societies under the Chief Secretary's Department to register this fund, no doubt he would wish to impose a large number of conditions on the registration before he would allow exemption. For a family with both adults under 39 and with children, the amount that has to be paid to obtain the advertised cover of $500 sickness benefit is $135 and if that family wishes a cover of $1,000 it has to pay $261. The equivalent sickness benefit from the Druids friendly society, which is fairly typical of the rates of friendly societies, $600 worth of cover for a family costs $57, and for $1,200 worth of cover it is $117.

I direct the attention of the Chief Secretary, through the Premier, to the fact that this company from New South Wales, which is an American-owned company, firstly, does not appear to have complied with the controls set down in the Act of this Parliament. Secondly, it is taking advantage of the gullibility of members of the public who do not understand actuarial calculations, and it is charging at least double the amount that respectable hospital benefits societies throughout the State are charging. This is something on which the Chief Secretary should have taken action many months ago and on which he should definitely take action now.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East): I raise a matter which I believe is within the jurisdiction of the Chief Secretary, but in his absence I direct it to the Premier. It relates to the forthcoming holiday season. It is a matter of some urgency, and if action is taken by the Government it may result in averting a tragedy. I refer to the fact that with summer upon us many thousands of people, when the weather improves, will be going to the beaches and employing the common beach umbrella, something that has been used for many years and which in windy conditions can be a lethal weapon. The beach umbrella has caused many minor accidents when it has been lifted out of dry sand on a windy day, and on one occasion this has resulted in the death of a young boy at one of the southern beaches.

There is a relatively simple and cheap method by which the beach umbrella can be made safe for all people, but unfortunately there is no commercial manufacturer engaged in the field of devising and manufacturing a stabilizer for the beach umbrella. The consumers' magazine *Choice*, in its latest issue, volume 15, number 12, of December of this year, in a coverage of various beach umbrellas investigated, referred to the safety factor. I quote from the magazine—

> An inexpensive and simple means of stabilizing a beach umbrella is available to both manufacturer and handyman. A disc of

waterproof plywood about 300 millimeters in diameter, with a hole just large enough to take the shaft in the centre, can be firmly attached to the shaft just above the tip. When the umbrella is erected and the disc embedded under 300 millimeters depth of sand, there is enough stability to stop tipping and sufficient anchorage to stop the umbrella blowing away.

The Premier would agree that it would be difficult to force any manufacturer to produce such a device, and it would be even more difficult to force users of beach umbrellas to use one. However, I should like the Premier to investigate the matter with a view to promoting the manufacture of stabilizers by institutions within the State, if no commercial manufacturer is prepared to undertake the production, and to promote an educational campaign in the State —not to exert compulsion, because I do not think that should be done— to encourage the use of stabilizers to beach umbrellas which would prevent the likelihood of tragedy.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir): I draw to the attention of the Minister of Consumer Affairs an article which appeared in the Melbourne *Truth* newspaper of 23rd November, 1974, in which it was stated that a 1974 Galant car was advertised and sold by Col Paige Motors of Sunshine as having been won in a raffle. In fact, this car had been released without warranty by Chrysler Australia Ltd. because, along with other vehicles, it had been damaged in the monsoon floods in Queensland. The car was brought from Queensland and sold at auction in Shepparton. On 11th July the car was advertised in the *Herald* as a "Galant 1600 GT 1974, brand new, only 134 miles, won in a raffle". The purchaser became suspicious and learnt through Chrysler that the car was a flood-damaged vehicle.

In view of the extensive car sales, particularly second-hand cars and the cars which will be sold in the Christmas period, members of the Opposition ask the Minister how many such cars are being advertised falsely and sold in Victoria and what is being done regarding the circumstances described in the *Truth* newspaper.

Mr. HAMER (Premier and Treasurer): I will bring to the attention of the Chief Secretary the matters raised by the honorable member for Brunswick West on Oak Insurance Ltd. and by the honorable member for Brunswick East on beach umbrellas.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Consumer Affairs): If the honorable member for Reservoir will let me have the facts I shall examine the matter.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.8 *p.m.*

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated—

COMMITTALS FOR TRIAL.

(Question No. 158)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Attorney-General—

In respect of each year from 1960 until 1970, inclusive, and in this year to date—

1. How many committals for trial and persons given notices for trial, respectively, there were in—(*a*) the Melbourne County Court; and (*b*) the Melbourne Supreme Court?

2. How many cases were dealt with by the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively—(*a*) as trials; (*b*) where the accused pleaded guilty; and (*c*) as cases which were granted a *nolle prosequi*?

3. How many cases remained not dealt with by the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively, and for what reasons?

4. How many public servants in the criminal branch of the Crown Solicitor's Office were directly responsible for the cases being dealt with by the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively, indicating the number of qualified barristers or solicitors in each case?

5. What was the numerical staff establishment of the criminal branch of the Crown Solicitor's Office and how many of such officers were fully qualified barristers and solicitors?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The answer is—

It is assumed that information is sought in relation to each year from 1960 to 1973 (inclusive) and not from 1960 to 1970 inclusive as appears in the question.

As in the case of the answer to Question No. 149 asked by the honorable member, the information given is in relation to persons and the counting of persons is done in the same way.

1. The numbers of persons committed for trial and persons given notice of trial in each year from 1960 to 1974 are as follows:—

Year	County Court	Supreme Court	County Court	Supreme Court
1960 ..	2382	137	3	1
1961 ..	2319	91	9	1
1962 ..	2498	105	10	10
1963 ..	1684	83	10	..
1964 ..	1876	91	9	4
1965 ..	1780	83	6	4
1966 ..	1812	74	8	3
1967 ..	1783	82	10	1
1968 ..	1733	129	16	2
1969 ..	1724	66	8	1
1970 ..	1612	130	15	4
1971 ..	1721	144	22	3
1972 ..	1958	140	18	5
1973 ..	1961	103	16	2
1974* ..	1298	108	12	1

* As at 30th September, 1974.

2. The numbers of persons dealt with in each year from 1960 to 1973, inclusive, and in 1974 prior to 1st October, 1974, by the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court, respectively, are as follows—

Year	(a) As trials		(b) As pleas of "guilty"		(c) Entry of *nolle prosequi*	
	County Court	Supreme Court	County Court	Supreme Court	County Court	Supreme Court
1960	796	80	1451	58	59	8
1961	685	53	1467	25	65	9
1962	611	72	1523	35	70	4
1963	684	52	1234	27	61	3
1964	505	50	1236	46	46	5
1965	480	45	986	26	47	7
1966	573	46	1095	21	62	7
1967	482	34	1152	22	62	6
1968	547	52	1245	43	60	4
1969	492	42	1063	24	39	4
1970	364	58	1049	70	46	2
1971	343	39	1189	73	79	3
1972	420	52	1213	77	63	2
1973	414	64	1261	67	70	1
1974*	299	35	884	32	56	4

* As at 30th September, 1974.

The decrease during the period 1960–1974 in the number of trials in the County Court is due to the enlarged jurisdiction of Magistrates' Courts having removed a great number of short trials from the County Court. In consequence, the remaining trials tend to be more complex and occupy a greater average time than was formerly the case, and this has had an adverse effect on the rate of disposal of trials in the County Court.

3. The numbers of persons not dealt with at the end of each of the years 1960 to 1973 inclusive and at 30th September 1974, by the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court are as follows—

Year	Melbourne County Court	Melbourne Supreme Court
1960 ..	295	11
1961 ..	348	14
1962 ..	595	17
1963 ..	246	16
1964 ..	272	7
1965 ..	492	15
1966 ..	515	8
1967 ..	542	22
1968 ..	369	50
1969 ..	443	22
1970 ..	591	17
1971 ..	643	42
1972 ..	823	48
1973 ..	926	15
1974* ..	886 (639 cases)	50 (34 cases)

* As at 30th September, 1974.

4. (*a*) In relation to the years prior to 1969, when the staffing of the Criminal Law Branch of the Crown Solicitor's Office was substantially reorganized, the only information readily available is in respect of officers solely engaged in the preparation of cases for trial. The details are:

Year	Melbourne County Court	Melbourne Supreme Court
1960 ..	3	1
1961 ..	4	1
1962 ..	5	2
1963 ..	6	2
1964 ..	6	2
1963 ..	6	2
1966 ..	7	2
1967 ..	8	2
1968 ..	8	2

(*b*) In relation to the years 1969 to 1973 inclusive and as at 31st October, 1974, the numbers of public servants in or attached to the Criminal Law Branch and responsible for performing duties in respect of trials in the Melbourne County Court and the Melbourne Supreme Court were—

Year	County Court Melbourne	Supreme Court Melbourne	Both courts	Total
1969	21	3	7	31
1970	21	3	7	31
1971	21	3	8	32
1972	22	3	8	33
1973	26*	3	8	37
1974 (to 31st October)	31*	3	11	45

* Includes four officers seconded from Magistrates Courts.

(*c*) The above figures under the heading "both courts" for the years 1971 to 1974 include an Assistant Crown Solicitor, who is responsible to the Crown Solicitor for the criminal law work of his office. He is now assisted by two barristers and solicitors, who are included under the heading "both courts" for the year 1974.

5. The staff establishment of the Criminal Law Branch of the Crown Solicitor's Office in each of the years 1960 to 1973 inclusive and as at 31st October, 1974 was as follows—

Year	Establishment
1960	23
1961	27
1962	30
1963	36
1964	37
1965	37
1966	37
1967	37
1968	37
1969	45
1970	45
1971	45
1972	47
1973	47
1974 (at 31st October)	53

These statistics do not include typing and messenger staff, nor do they include the barristers and solicitors or Magistrates' Courts officers referred to in paragraph 4 of this answer.

I would also point out that the staff establishment includes officers concerned solely with appeals, breaches of bond and probation and matters affecting courts outside Melbourne—none of these are included in the statistics in paragraph 4.

LATROBE RIVER POLLUTION.

(Question No. 491)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Premier—

Whether he has received a submission from Mr. P. C. Brown on the proposed Thomson River Dam and on Latrobe River pollution; if so—(*a*) whether the question raised by this submission will be considered by the Government with a view to answering the allegations made; (*b*) whether the Government was fully aware of the technical and ecological aspects of the Latrobe River which were available in 432 pages of evidence presented to the Public Works Committee as at 26th October, 1973; (*c*) whether the State Cabinet approved of the $100 million expansion by Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. at Maryvale only four days after the committee had received this information; and (*d*) whether he will make available to interested members a copy of his reply to Mr. Brown?

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

(*a*) Yes, in respect of the proposed Thomson River dam. Officers of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works have discussed with Mr. Brown the points raised in his submission, and a report will be made to the Minister of Water Supply.

(*b*) No. The Parliamentary Public Works Committee has not yet completed its inquiry on the Latrobe River, which will include the evaluation of all evidence submitted to it. The committee will then submit its report to the Government for consideration.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) Yes, in due course.

FREEWAY F2.

(Question No. 504)

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

Whether the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has heard the appeals concerning the Freeway F2 amending plan for the section between Mahoneys Road and Bell Street; if so, what was the outcome of the appeals?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

There are no appeals as such in relation to zoning questions. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works duly heard and considered all objections to this segment of Freeway F2, and forwarded its recommendations thereon to the Minister for Planning in accordance with section 30 of the Town and Country Planning Act. The Minister thereupon referred the planning scheme amendment to provide for this freeway segment to the Town and Country Planning Board for examination and report as required by the Town and Country Planning Act.

The latter board is in the course of taking up with the Country Roads Board various issues arising in connection with the scheme. At this stage there has therefore been no final determination.

BURBANK ESTATE, RESERVOIR.

(Question No. 552)

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

1. How many undeveloped building blocks there are in the Burbank estate, Reservoir?

2. Whether sewerage, water, electricity and gas, respectively, are available to service these blocks?

3. When this subdivision was approved?

4. Since the granting of subdivision to Mr. Thornton what number of residential and other buildings have been erected in each year?

5. What action is proposed to ensure that these serviced home allotments are made available to potential home-seekers?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister for Local Government is—

The information sought is not available from the records of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. The information could be obtained by the honorable member from the municipality. Alternatively, if the honorable member so requests, the Minister will seek it from that source.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS FOR EDUCATION.

(Question No. 554)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of funds advanced to Victoria by the Commonwealth Government under the Commonwealth States Grants (Schools) Act 1973, what is the proposed expenditure for each quarter from 1st October, 1974, to 31st December, 1975, in

respect of—(*a*) recurrent expenditure—(i) general primary; (ii) general secondary; (iii) librarian training course; (iv) librarian replacement; (v) disadvantaged schools; (vi) special schools; (vii) general recurrent; (viii) non-Government schools; (ix) training courses; (x) teacher replacement; (xi) teacher development; and (xii) teacher training courses; and (*b*) capital expenditure—(i) general buildings; (ii) primary libraries; (iii) secondary libraries; (iv) disadvantaged schools; and (v) special schools?

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

	Quarter ending 31st December, 1974	Quarter ending 31st March, 1975	Quarter ending 31st June 1975	Quarter ending 31st September, 1975	Quarter ending 31st December 1975
	$'000	$'000	$'000	$'000	$'000
(*a*) Recurrent expenditure					
(i) General primary	2,080	4,465	4,465	4,465	4,465
(ii) General secondary	1,880	4,103	4,102	4,103	4,102
(iii) Librarian training course	78	39	39	39	39
(iv) Librarian replacement	209	106	106	105	105
(v) Disadvantaged schools	875	875	875	870	870
(vi) Special schools					
(vii) General recurrent	272	428	427	428	427
(viii) Non-government schools	235	165	165	165	165
(ix) Training courses	94	44	44	44	43
(x) Teacher replacement	619	326	326	315	315
(xi) Teacher development					
(xii) In-service teacher training courses	630	489	488	219	290

The above does not take into account supplementary funds announced recently by the Commonwealth.

With regard to capital expenditure it is our aim to commit to firm contract all available funds emanating from the Commonwealth States Grants Act by the middle of 1975.

The rate of payments to builders will depend upon the rate of building progress on the various projects.

DEVELOPMENT IN WHITTLESEA SHIRE.

(Question No. 559)

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

In respect of areas of land released for development in the Whittlesea shire known as Mill Park, Eden Park and Blossom Park—

1. What consideration has been given to the effects of development of these areas on the residents of Reservoir and adjoining suburbs, indicating how such residents will be affected?

2. What is the expected population in the named areas and other areas released in the Whittlesea shire when development has been completed and what are the projected increases in the next five and ten-year periods?

3. What fixed rail or other public transport has been planned for the increased population?

4. Whether the matter of co-ordinating this development has been taken up with the education and social welfare departments?

5. What effects the proposed development will have on the Yarra River and its tributaries?

6. What estimated additional air and water pollution will take place with this development?

7. What number of vehicles is expected to use the road system—(*a*) when fully-developed; (*b*) in five years; and (*c*) in ten years?

8. Whether any roads or freeways are under consideration to cope with the population increase; if so, what roads or freeways?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister for Local Government is—

The question appears to be based upon the erroneous assumption that Eden Park, Mill Park and Blossom Park have all recently been "released for development", which is not the case. Because of both the incorrect underlying assumption and the breadth of the question it is not possible to answer it in the form in which it is asked.

The lands in question form part of the "Whittlesea Corridor Investigation Area", proclaimed under the Development Areas Act 1973, in respect of which a report is due to be presented by the Town and Country Planning Board to the Government in March next. Insofar as the report recommends that land in the corridor be

"released for development" either the report or the supporting working papers will doubtless canvass the broad ground inquired after by the honorable member. Upon release a copy of that report will be supplied to the honorable member for his information on those questions.

For the information of the honorable member, Eden Park was subdivided last century. It is not believed that the studies inquired after by the honorable member were then undertaken. Far from "releasing land for development" in this estate the Government on the contrary in 1969 imposed severe restrictions, which still continue, on the development rights which then existed.

In the case of Mill Park, a permit has existed for some time for the first stage of proposed development only.

Blossom Park is within the corridor zone, and has not been "released for development".

SHARE TRADING.

(Question No. 606)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Attorney-General—

1. What action the Corporate Affairs Commissioner has taken in respect of the allegations of fraudulent and improper behaviour referred to in the Rae report?

2. What action the Melbourne Stock Exchange Committee has taken to prevent a recurrence of the practices that occurred during the stock market boom?

3. What action he has taken to prevent—(*a*) a recurrence of the practices that occurred during the stock market boom; and (*b*) insider trading by share brokers who act as underwriters and company directors?

4. What action has been taken by the Corporate Affairs Commissioner against two companies floated by John T. Martin, namely, Australian Continental Resources Ltd. and Glomex Mines, under section 47 of the Companies Act 1961 which deals with the issuing of false prospectuses, specifying—(*a*) the nature of the investigations that have been carried out at the Attorney-General's request; (*b*) the result of such investigations; and (*c*) what charges, if any, have been laid, indicating the names of the individuals and/or companies so charged?

Mr. WILCOX (Attorney-General): The answer is—

The record in Victoria in relation to corporate affairs is good; I am glad to say that the standard of conduct has generally been higher than in some other places. Investigations have been carried out as necessary and prosecutions have been launched where the facts justified this course.

The answers to the respective paragraphs of the question are—

1. Insofar as Victorian firms and companies are concerned, action has been taken as follows—

(*a*) John T. Martin & Co.

An investigation into the affairs of John T. Martin & Co. was commenced shortly after its suspension by the Stock Exchange of Melbourne in April, 1971. The investigation was suspended when bankruptcy proceedings were commenced against the principal of the firm, but has since been resumed. Two former employees have been committed for trial on charges under section 187 of the Crimes Act.

(*b*) Michael Ricketson & Co.

Following investigation, Mr. M. S. Ricketson was committed for trial on 11th June, 1973 for an offence under section 156 of the Crimes Act in connection with his activities as a stockbroker.

(*c*) Garretty Companies.

An investigation was commenced in 1971 by the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. As a result of prosecutions in relation to three companies in the Garretty group Dr. Garretty was sentenced on 3rd September, 1973 to imprisonment for six months for an offence under section 47 (1) of the Companies Act, and Mr. P. D. Garretty was sentenced to imprisonment for three months.

Matters relating to Selected Mining Holding Ltd. and Trendex Mineral Corporation Ltd. have been investigated and further action is under consideration.

(*d*) North Deborah Mining and Industrial Ltd., formerly Deborah Mining No Liability.

Mr. P. D. Cummins, barrister, was appointed in October, 1973, to carry out an investigation into certain share issues and into the dissipation of funds raised by these issues. This investigation is proceeding. Advice has been received from counsel that the placement of shares referred to in Chapter 10 of the report does not constitute a breach of section 43 of the Companies Act 1961.

(*e*) Vam Ltd. and Leighton Contractors Ltd.

The circumstances relating to the issue of shares referred to in chapter 10 of the report are similar to those in the case of North Deborah Mining

and, in view of counsel's advice on that company, it is not proposed to investigate these matters.

(*f*) Australian Investment Counsellors Pty. Ltd. (Chapter 7).

This company ceased to hold a licence as an investment adviser under the Securities Industry Act 1970 in July, 1973. Many of the activities referred to in the report do not appear to have involved breaches of the law. However, the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs proposes to undertake an investigation to make sure of the position.

(*g*) Flinders Petroleum No Liability and Rimibo Resources Ltd.

The report does not clearly indicate that any breaches of Victorian law have occurred, but the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs will undertake an investigation to make sure of the position.

(*h*) The Swan Brewery Co. Ltd.

The Commissioner for Corporate Affairs has commenced an investigation.

The above answers relate to 14 companies and firms referred to in the Rae report with particular relation to Victoria. It should be noted that investigations had been undertaken, and in some cases completed, in respect of eight of them before the Rae report was published. In two of the other six cases it appears that no breach of legislation has occurred and in three others the Rae report has not clearly indicated any breaches of law in Victoria.

2. The Stock Exchange of Melbourne has since 1970 amended its Official List requirements, its articles and its regulations and has recently taken disciplinary action against members. I know that—

(*a*) During the period March, 1970 to September, 1974, the stock exchange issued nine sets of amendments to the official list requirements covering 260 individual changes.

(*b*) Over 126 amendments have been made to the articles and regulations of the exchange since July, 1970.

(*c*) Following the publication of the Senate committee's report, the Stock Exchange Committee investigated those matters which affected member firms of the exchange. As a result of the investigations, as has already been disclosed to the House, the Stock Exchange Committee has taken disciplinary action against two members of the exchange—viz., Mr. R. P. Parsons, who traded as Richard Parsons & Co. and Mr. N. L. Harman, a partner in the firm of Messrs. Guest and Bell.

3. (*a*) Action has been taken to control the securities industry generally. For example, since 1969, the following legislation has come into force in Victoria—

(i) Securities Industry Act 1970;

(ii) Securities Industry (Amendment) Act 1970;

(iii) Companies Act 1971.

In addition, in February, 1974 an agreement was entered into between New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria to establish the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission for the purposes of achieving uniformity in the administration of the law relating to companies, the regulation of the securities industry and trading in securities in the three participating States.

The commission is presently undertaking a review of the legislation and administrative procedures including licensing procedures under the Securities Industry Acts in each of the three States in order to achieve these objectives.

(*b*) The provisions of sections 124 and 124A of the Companies Act 1961 are applicable to officers of corporations who deal in securities including any person, whether or not a sharebroker, who acts as a director of a company. Section 124A, inserted in 1971, refers to dealings in securities by an officer of a corporation who uses to his advantage any confidential information acquired by virtue of his position.

The companies referred to in paragraph 4 of the question were not incorporated in Victoria. Australian Continental Resources Ltd. was incorporated in the Australian Capital Territory on the 5th March, 1970, and lodged a prospectus dated the 10th April, 1970 in that Territory and all other States, except Tasmania. Glomex Mines No Liability was incorporated in Queensland on 5th June, 1970, and lodged a prospectus dated the 21st October, 1970, in that State, the Australian Capital Territory and all other States, except Tasmania.

In accordance with arrangements between States and operating over some years, where a prospectus is issued in another State or Territory the Commissioner in that State or Territory determines whether the prospectus is in order and, if so, makes a notation on the document that the prospectus is acceptable for registration. The lodgment of the prospectus, with the appropriate notation, is sufficient evidence for the Victorian Commissioner to accept it in accordance with the provisions of section 42 of the Companies Act.

It is the practice for the State or Territory in which a company is incorporated to initiate any investigation, but the Commissioner in Victoria would if requested provide assistance if an investigation is undertaken and, of course, the powers of investigators are readily extended to any State pursuant to the uniform company law in existence for many years.

SUMMERLAND ESTATE, PHILLIP ISLAND.

(Question No. 608)

Mr. STIRLING (Williamstown) asked the Minister of Transport—

Whether the Country Roads Board has acquired land in the Summerhill estate on Phillip Island; if so, when it is expected that compensation will be paid to the former landholders?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

It is understood that the honorable member's question refers to land in the Summerland estate on Ventnor Road, (a main road declared under the provisions of the Country Roads Act), approximately 3 kilometres from Point Green.

The Country Roads Board after obtaining the necessary Order in Council served notices of aquisition on the registered landowners concerned for the widening of Ventnor Road at this location on 8th May, 1961. The Registrar of Titles was also notified and the titles were endorsed that part of the land was subject to an acquisition by the board.

All claims received for compensation have been settled by the board. However, one notice of acquisition for land valued at $162 was returned as the registered owner was deceased. The Titles Office records and the municipal records were regularly checked until late 1964 at which time no change of ownership was registered and compensation proceedings were deferred. The board is endeavouring to contact the present registered owner of the land to ascertain whether he is the person entitled to compensation.

HOUSING COMMISSION LAND.

(Question No. 619)

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Housing—

1. How many acres of land are owned by the Housing Commission in the metropolitan area of Melbourne, including Werribee, and what acreage is zoned residential?

2. How many acres of vacant land were owned by the commission in country areas as at 30th June, 1974, and where that land was located?

3. What were the locations of the commission's major broadacre vacant sites as at 30th June, 1974?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer supplied by the Minister of Housing is—

1. 3,127 acres are owned of which 138 acres is zoned Residential C and 2209 is zoned Reserved Living.

2. 7,860 acres and it is located in the following areas—

Town	Acres
Alexandra	·2
Anglesea	9·5
Ararat	11·7
Avoca	1·5
Bacchus Marsh	3
Ballan	2·5
Ballarat—Sebastopol	5
Ballarat East	8
Ballarat West	51
Beaufort	11·2
Beechworth	1·7
Benalla	17
Bendigo	
Eaglehawk	8·5
Sparrowhawk	55·5
Bright	2
Camperdown	14
Casterton	2·2
Castlemaine	15
Charlton	1·2
Churchill	1814
Cobram	20
Cohuna	4
Colac	18
Coleraine	2·7
Corryong	9
Dartmoor	4
Dimboola	5
Donald	3
Drouin	6
Dunkeld	·7
Echuca	28·5
Edenhope	·2
Foster	·5
Geelong	
Corio	149
Whittington	131
Girgarre	8
Glenthompson	·5
Hamilton	45
Hastings	240
Heathcote	2
Horsham	35
Irymple	·7
Kangaroo Flat	4·5
Kerang	1·7
Kilmore	4·7
Koroit	7·2
Kyabram	15
Lakes Entrance	10
Leitchville	1
Leongatha	3
Longwarry	·5
Mansfield	1
Maryborough	10·7
Meeniyan	1·5
Melton	1250
Merbein	3
Merrigum	5
Moe	139·2
Mooroopna	6·5

Town	Acres
Mortlake	3·2
Morwell	87
Myrtleford	8
Nathalia	4
Natimuk	1·7
Nhill	·5
Numurkah	16·2
Orbost	6·7
Pakenham	973
Point Lonsdale	·7
Port Fairy	8·5
Portland	13
Red Cliffs	9·2
Robinvale	6
Rochester	6·5
Rosedale	5
St. Arnaud	1·2
Sale	45
Seymour	140
Shepparton	428
Simpson	1
Stawell	4
Sunbury	1005
Swan Hill	17·7
Tatura	3
Terang	2
Toora	10
Traralgon	208
Wangaratta	25
Warracknabeal	10
Warragul	51
Warrnambool	165
Wodonga	361
Woorenin	·5
Wycheproof	1·5
Yarram	2·5
Yarrawonga	11

3. The location of major undeveloped broadacre sites.

Metropolitan—

Broadmeadows
Cranbourne
Macleod
Narre Warren
Paisley
Werribee

Country—

Ballarat West
Benalla
Bendigo Sparrowhawk
Churchill
Cobram
Echuca
Geelong Corio
Whittington
Hastings
Melton
Moe
Numurkah
Pakenham
Sale
Seymour
Shepparton
Sunbury
Swan Hill
Traralgon
Wangaratta
Warrnambool
Yarrawonga

LEARNER-DRIVER PERMITS.

(Question No. 691)

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

1. How many learner-driver permits were issued in 1973–74?

2. In respect of planning for the introduction of the new learner-driver permit scheme, introduced on 20th September, 1974, how many permits were expected to be—(*a*) applied for; and (*b*) issued, during the period 20th September to 30th June, 1975, and in a full year respectively?

3. In the six weeks following the introduction of the scheme how many permits were—(*a*) applied for; and (*b*) issued?

4. Whether applicants from the metropolitan area will be able to undertake their learner permit examinations at all suburban licence testing stations; if so, when this will be possible?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): The answer is—

1. No permits were issued in respect of applicants for motor car drivers' licences in the period 1st July, 1973, to 30th June, 1974.

2. (*a*) Detailed estimates of expected applications were not prepared having regard to the fact that the system of testing to be used under the Learner Drivers' Permit Scheme differed from that previously employed. It was not practicable to predict failure rates under the new scheme and to assess the number of repeat applications which would be submitted in a given year.

(*b*) Subject to the above-stated difficulty, it was estimated that 80,000 permits would be issued in the period 20th September, 1974, to 30th June, 1975, and 120,000 in a full year.

3. (*a*) 41,120. (*b*) 34,200. These figures indicate a heavy initial influx of applications for permits. More recently, the rate of receipt of applications has decreased.

4. The existing facilities for bulk testing at Cambridge Street, Collingwood, enable applicants to undertake permit tests immediately after payment of the prescribed appointment fee. It is intended in due course to extend the testing of applicants in knowledge of the road law to selected suburban centres but little would be gained by such action at present. The extension of the testing to all suburban licence testing stations could result in delays between the time of seeking to make an appointment and the time of taking the test. The position will be reviewed in the first half of 1975.

PROBATE DUTIES.

(Question No. 730)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Treasurer—

In respect of probate on small estates—

1. When the limit for eligibility for assistance from the Probate Duties Office was last determined?

2. Whether the present limit of $5,000 is based on present day values; if not, what action is proposed to lift the limit and when it is proposed?

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

1. The present levels of $2,500 and $5,000 respectively in section 71 of the Administration and Probate Act have applied since 1st June, 1965.

2. The revision of the amounts specified in section 71 is currently under consideration.

REZONING OF PHILLIP ISLAND LAND.

(Question No. 741)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister for Planning—

Whether the Town and Country Planning Board intends seeking a change of zoning of land at Phillip Island from residential to rural "A"; if so—(*a*) whether compensation will be made as a result of such change; (*b*) whether owners of such land will still have to pay rates; (c) what reasons for the proposed rezoning the board has given the people of Phillip Island; and (*d*) whether submissions have been received on this proposal from the Woolamai Waters Ratepayers Association and, in that event, what submissions?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister for Planning is—

The Town and Country Planning Board was given the responsibility of administering planning control and preparing a planning scheme for Phillip Island following intensive speculative subdivision of land in the early 1960s.

A planning scheme was evolved, the primary purpose of which was to promote orderly development by means of zoning controls. Land already subdivided was to be zoned for residential development and, apart from allowing for some extension of urban growth at established resorts such as Cowes and reserving land for the protection of wildlife habitats, the major part of the island was zoned as rural to prevent further premature subdivision.

Phillip Island possesses striking and unique wildlife resources. Indeed there are few places and certainly none in Australia where one can observe so much unique wildlife in its natural surroundings and in such a compact and accessible area. With the growth of the tourist industry the value of these resources has greatly increased because of their attraction to overseas as well as local tourists. Consequently the need for planning has achieved a wider significance embracing not only orderly development but factors such as management, particularly as regards the wildlife sections of the island and protection of the rural landscape which provides a setting for the main wildlife habitats and foreshore scenery.

During 1966, the then Minister for Local Government made a tour of the island accompanied by the chairman of the board and the shire president and council officials. Arising out of his visit he requested the council to take action to remove or improve a number of unsightly residential buildings, the Country Roads Board to plant trees on sections of roadways to screen certain unsightly development and the Town and Country Planning Board to examine prematurely subdivided areas zoned residential with a view to reversion to rural zoning.

The Town and Country Planning Board's examination led to the view that the previous study of the island for the purpose of zoning should be extended to permit the formulation of comprehensive proposals regarding management of the island's tourist resources, amendments to the planning scheme to introduce more stringent measures to protect tourist resources and landscape, and treatment of prematurely subdivided and poorly developed areas.

Amendment No. 1 to the Phillip Island planning scheme, which was proposed following detailed studies of the island's ecological resources and tourist potential, proposed the rezoning of two areas, including part of the Woolamai Waters west estate from residential to rural zone. The part of the estate considered for rezoning comprised 221 allotments out of a total of 730 and embraced the more exposed part of the estate adjoining the southern coast of the island where development had been extremely slow and which was poorly serviced.

The aim of these proposed rezonings was to discourage development in areas considered critical from an environmental and ecological viewpoint and to concentrate development on the balance of the coastal subdivisions which had better potential for improved roads and services.

After public exhibition of amendment No. 1 and subsequent consideration of objections to the amendment, the board determined not to pursue the rezoning of the Woolamai Waters area to rural "A" zone but instead to retain all but 56 lots in the

residential zone and those lots to be further considered in another amending scheme for reservation for public purposes; these latter allotments, which are immediately adjacent to the erosion prone foreshore and primary dune system, being considered critical for protection from building development.

There is therefore no further intention to rezone any of the Woolamai Waters west estate to rural zone and all of the owners of the 221 allotments originally considered for such rezoning have been so advised by the board.

RAIL CONCESSIONS FOR CHILDREN.

(Question No. 766)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Treasurer—

Whether he will consider subsidizing free rail passes for children of eligible pensioners for use in respect of annual holidays?

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

The Government has no plans at present to extend the existing transport concession scheme for pensioners to include passes for their children. However the matter has been listed for consideration in connection with the preparation of the next budget.

BENDIGO AND EPPALOCK LIFE SAVING CLUB.

(Question No. 774)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Treasurer—

Whether, to enable necessary protection services to be provided, he will consider making a special grant to the Bendigo and Eppalock Life Saving Club to enable completion of a club house at Lake Eppalock?

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

The responsibility of funding building grants to life saving clubs has been transferred to the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation and I understand that the Minister for that department will be providing you with an answer to your question.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE.

(Question No. 811)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister for Local Government—

Further to the answer to question No. 435 asked on 16th October, 1974, and the subsequent oral agreement of the Minister with the member for Brunswick East to supply detailed information, whether the Minister is now able to supply full details of action or decisions taken on each recommendation of the Board of Inquiry into Local Government Finance; if so, what are such details?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister for Local Government is—

Detailed information of the nature sought has in fact been prepared by the Local Government Department and checked and supplemented by the Minister. Because of the importance of the question and the wide-ranging implications of the answers for local government and ratepayers throughout Victoria, the Minister desires however to circulate the information to other Ministers and departments affected for further checking, and supplementation where necessary.

As the information will fully set out the Government's policies and actions in relation to all the recommendations of a major public inquiry, it could also prove desirable to refer the final text to Cabinet for approval.

Upon completion of this process, the information will be supplied under cover of letter to the honorable member. The Minister reserves the right to circulate and publish the material, but will withhold doing so for fourteen days after forwarding to the honorable member, unless the latter earlier maker public comment thereon.

It is suggested that the honorable member place a fresh question on the notice paper in the autumn session to enable the information to be incorporated in *Hansard*.

The course proposed above has been discussed and agreed with the honorable member.

FORMER EMPLOYEES OF VICTORIAN INLAND MEAT AUTHORITY.

(Question No. 819)

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

In respect of former employees of the Victorian Inland Meat Authority employed at the Bendigo works during the twelve months prior to sale—

1. How many persons were dismissed?

2. What long service leave and other entitlements each person had accrued?

3. Whether the persons so dismissed have subsequently been re-employed by Farmers and Graziers' Co-operative Co. Ltd.; if so, what action he has taken or proposes to take to ensure continuity of long service leave and any other award entitlements to former employees of the authority dismissed prior to the sale?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer is—

1. The sale agreement with Co-operative Farmers and Graziers' Direct Meat Supply Ltd. for both Bendigo and Ballarat works, provided for employees of the Victorian Inland Meat Authority immediately prior to the date of take-over to be offered suitable employment by the purchaser, due regard having been made in the financial arrangements with the purchaser for the long service leave and other award entitlements of those concerned. There were 115 employees who were not employed by the Victorian Inland Meat Authority at Bendigo at the time of hand-over but who had been employed by the authority for different periods and who had ceased employment in the previous twelve months, and in respect of which periods of employment may in due course accrue long service leave entitlements in the event of re-engagement by the purchaser.

2. The long service leave entitlements, if any, of each individual in these 115 former employees are covered by the relevant legislation and awards and in each individual case may be subject to change in the event of a particular person being re-engaged by the purchaser.

3. The Victorian Inland Meat Authority does not have the employment records of the purchaser but it is understood that 59 of the 115 referred to in question 1 have been re-engaged, of whom three have subsequently ceased employment. Financial provision was made in the sale agreement with Co-operative Farmers and Graziers' Direct Meat Supply Ltd. which provided for the contingent liability of the co-operative in the event that it re-engaged dismissed employees and thereby became liable for long service leave payments, part of which may have been accrued during employment with the Victorian Inland Meat Authority.

WELFARE ASSISTANCE FOR MOTHERS.

(Question No. 845)

Mr. ROPER (Brunswick West) asked the Minister of Agriculture, for the Minister for Social Welfare—

In respect of negotiations between the Commonwealth and State Governments on the subject of the Commonwealth Government assuming full responsibility for assistance to mothers of families without a breadwinner—

1. Whether such negotiations are proceeding?

2. What attitude the State Government is taking in the negotiations?

3. Whether the State Government is prepared to hand over responsibility; if so, on what conditions?

4. What is the estimated—(*a*) additional benefits to such women; and (*b*) saving to the State, resulting from such transfer of responsibility?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister of Agriculture): The answer supplied by the Minister for Social Welfare—

1. Yes.

2. Correspondence has been received from the Minister for Social Security suggesting that discussion take place between officers of the Department of Social Security and the Victorian Social Welfare Department in the near future. I have replied to the Minister that I am fully in accord with such a proposal and I now await word from the Director-General of Social Security who will institute the necessary arrangements.

3. Any conditions for such a handover will be largely dependent upon the outcome of the talks between Commonwealth and State officers referred to in paragraph 2 above.

4. (*a*) The benefit to mothers receiving such assistance in the event of a transfer of responsibility would mainly be their eligibility to earn income additional to their pension. The recent increase in the rates of family assistance payments in Victoria has brought them on a par with those of the Commonwealth.

(*b*) Approximately $1,765,000 less expenditure would be involved, representing the cost of family assistance over a full year at the recently increased rates, less 50 per cent reimbursement received from the Commonwealth under the existing system.

However, it is highly probable that no effective saving to the State would result if the Commonwealth acted as it has in similar instances and correspondingly reduced its provision of funds to the State for general purposes.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER STATION FOR EAST GIPPSLAND.

(Question No. 862)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power—

Whether the Minister has received representations from the Snowy River Improvement Trust in respect of a proposed hydro-electric power station to be built in East Gippsland on the Snowy River; if so, when, and what was the outcome of the representations?

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

No.

EDUCATION EXPENDITURE.

(Question No. 865)

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party) asked the Minister of Education—

1. How many pupils attended State primary and secondary schools, respectively, in 1973 and in 1974 and what was the respective cost per pupil in 1973–74?

2. What items of expenditure were included in the cost per pupil?

3. What was the State expenditure on registered schools in respect of—(*a*) per pupil grants; (*b*) scholarships, etc.; (*c*) subsidy on interest on secondary school buildings; (*d*) transportation; (*e*) grants to teachers' colleges; and (*f*) other expenditure?

4. How many pupils attended registered primary and secondary schools, respectively, in 1973 and 1974 and what would have been the cost of educating these pupils at the same cost per pupil for respective State schools in 1973–74?

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

1.

Year	Primary	Secondary
1973 ..	373,823	231,821
1974 ..	375,970	232,639 (preliminary)
	$473.38	$864.69

2. The items of expenditure included in the cost per pupil figure are detailed in tables 7·1 to 7·5 less table 7·6 of my report to Parliament 1973–74 already published in the House.

	$
(*a*)	13,974,554
(*b*)	1,062,586
(*c*)	425,787
(*d*)	3,694,263
(*e*)	516,599
(*f*)	667,281

4.

Year	Primary	Secondary
1973 ..	109,537	83,900
1974 ..	109,831	86,557
	$51,922,212	$73,708,770
Total ..	$125,630,982	

CATTLE CLEARING YARD AT BAMAWM.

(Question No. 869)

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park) asked the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister for Local Government—

Whether the Co-operative Farmers and Graziers Direct Meat Supply Co. has a clearing yard for cattle at Bamawm; if so, whether the Shire of Rochester charges the company yard dues for this enterprise and, in that event, under what conditions, why, and what are the respective fees?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Public Works): The answer supplied by the Minister for Local Government is—

1. Such sale-yards do exist.

2. Council charges the company yard dues.

3. The yard dues are in accordance with the scale of fees as laid down by the Local Government (Market Fees) Regulations 1974, as authorized by the provisions of section 762 (*d*) Local Government Act 1958.

4. The respective fees are—

Every head of horned cattle	17 cents
Every bobby calf	5 cents.

RAIL LINK TO WEBB DOCK.

(Question No. 876)

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

Whether a final decision has been made as to the route of the rail spur line which is to service the Webb Dock area; if so—(*a*) what is the proposed route; and (*b*) when it is expected that the construction of the line will be commenced and completed?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Transport): The answer is—

Various matters relating to the construction of a rail line to serve Webb Dock are currently being examined.

BRENTWOOD HIGH SCHOOL.

(Question No. 880)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

1. What is the present enrolment of Brentwood High School and what is the expected enrolment in 1975 and 1976, respectively?

2. When a further secondary school will be provided in the district?

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

1. Enrolments February, 1974—808
Enrolments February, 1975—919
Enrolments February, 1976—920

2. The need of the State for new post-primary schools is constantly under review. Full consideration will be given to the needs of this district when the establishment of new post primary schools is announced.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, March 4, 1975.

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

RESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE MEMBER FOR BRUNSWICK EAST.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I wish to announce that on 10th February last I received a letter of resignation from the honorable member for Brunswick East. I ask the Clerk to read the letter.

The Clerk read the letter, which was as follows—

The Honorable Kenneth Wheeler, M.P.,
Speaker,
Legislative Assembly,
Parliament House,
Melbourne, Vic. 3002.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

It is with some regret that I advise you of my resignation as member for Brunswick East in the Legislative Assembly.

I have decided on this course of action only after a great deal of consideration and reflection.

It has been a privilege to represent the district of Brunswick East, whose electors have returned me on two occasions to serve in the Victorian Parliament.

I desire to convey to you, Sir, to the members of the Legislative Assembly, to the Clerks of the House and to all the other officers and employees of the House my deepest appreciation of the courtesies extended from the time I was first elected to this Chamber in 1970.

Yours faithfully,
DAVID BORNSTEIN.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): As directed by this honorable House, on 19th December last I waited upon His Excellency the Governor and presented to him the Address of the Legislative Assembly, agreed to on 11th December last, in reply to his Excellency's Speech on the opening of Parliament. His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply—

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

In the name and on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign contained in the address you have just presented to me.

I fully rely on your wisdom in deliberating upon the important measures to be brought under your consideration, and I earnestly hope that the results of your labours will be conducive to the advancement and prosperity of this State.

ABSENCE OF MINISTERS.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. K. H. Wheeler): I have to announce that the Minister for Conservation will be absent for the remainder of this week. I also have notice that the Minister of Health will be absent for today only.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

INQUIRY INTO VICTORIA POLICE.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote): Can the Chief Secretary inform the House of the terms of reference of the private inquiry into certain allegations against members of the Victoria Police Force, of how many men are involved in the inquiry, and, in the interests of the Victoria Police Force, when the honorable gentleman expects finality in this matter?

Mr. ROSSITER (Chief Secretary): I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would regard any comments I make as having regard to your position, and I do give a damn about what you have to say.