
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

First Session of the Forty-ninth Parliament

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 27 April 1982

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT BY COMMISSION

The Forty-ninth Victorian Parliament was opened this day by Commission. The Commissioner appointed by His Excellency the Governor of the State of Victoria for this purpose was the Honourable Sir John McIntosh Young, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

At 11.31 a.m. the Clerk read the following:

PROCLAMATION

By His Excellency the Governor of the State of Victoria and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia, &c., &c., &c.

I, the Governor of the State of Victoria in the Commonwealth of Australia, do by this my Proclamation fix Tuesday, 27 April 1982 as the time for the commencement and holding of the First Session of the Forty-ninth Parliament of Victoria for the despatch of business at the hour of Eleven-thirty o'clock in the forenoon, in the Parliament Houses, situated in Spring Street in the City of Melbourne: And the Honourable the Members of the Legislative Council and the Members of the Legislative Assembly are hereby required to give their attendance at the said time and place accordingly.

Given under my Hand and Seal of the State of Victoria aforesaid, at Melbourne, this nineteenth day of April, in the year of our Lord One thousand nine hun-

dred and eighty-two, and in the thirty-first year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Australia.

(L.S.)

B. S. MURRAY

By His Excellency's Command

JOHN CAIN,
Premier

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN !

The Commissioner immediately afterwards entered the Chamber, and was conducted by the Usher of the Black Rod to the chair.

The Commissioner directed that the attendance of the members of the Legislative Assembly be requested.

The members of the Legislative Assembly appeared at the Bar.

The COMMISSIONER (Sir John Young)—Mr President and honourable members of the Legislative Council: Members of the Legislative Assembly: His Excellency the Governor, not thinking fit to be present in person, has been pleased to cause Letters Patent to issue under the Seal of the State constituting me his Commissioner to do in his name all that is necessary to be performed in this Parliament. This will more fully appear from the Letters Patent which will now be read by the Clerk.

The Letters Patent authorizing the Commissioner to open Parliament were read by the Clerk.

The COMMISSIONER (Sir John Young)—Mr President and honourable members of the Legislative Council: Members of the Legislative Assembly: I have it in command from His Excellency to let you know that later this day His Excellency will declare to you in person in this place the causes of his calling this Parliament together; and,

members of the Legislative Assembly, as it is necessary before you proceed to the despatch of business that a Speaker of the Legislative Assembly be chosen, His Excellency requests that you, in your Chamber, will proceed to the choice of a proper person to be Speaker.

The members of the Legislative Assembly retired from the Chamber and the Commissioner withdrew.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade) took the chair at 11.44 a.m., and read the prayer.

The sitting was suspended at 11.45 a.m. until 2.32 p.m.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The Usher of the Black Rod announced the approach of His Excellency the Governor.

His Excellency entered the Chamber attended by his suite.

The Legislative Assembly, with their Speaker, attended in response to His Excellency's summons.

His Excellency addressed the following Speech to both Houses of Parliament:

MR PRESIDENT AND HONOURABLE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL:

MR SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

The election on April 3rd resulted in a change of Government in Victoria for the first time in more than a quarter of a century, and it also produced the greatest popular mandate for more than sixty years.

The people of Victoria showed that they wanted a new Government to govern on behalf of all the people.

They also showed that they wanted a government in touch with the eighties and the challenges they bring in terms of the financial management of the State's resources.

My Government has already acted to bring firm financial control over Victoria's assets.

Modern management structures and updated financial management techniques will be introduced into the public sector.

My Government is determined to implement the programmes for which it received such a significant popular mandate.

These programmes will be implemented both fully and promptly on the basis of providing the greatest benefit in the areas of greatest need.

In this the First Session of the Forty-ninth Parliament of Victoria you will be asked to consider a range of legislative proposals for furthering the Government's policies.

My Government is concerned that this Parliament act as a catalyst to harness the energies and talents of all Victorians to restore this State to the pre-eminent position it once held.

My advisers believe that the community must be brought together with the common goal of getting this State moving again.

The Government is deeply concerned about the present high level of unemployment in Victoria and the low level of economic activity, particularly in the area of small business.

Too often there has been a tendency for government to blame overseas economic conditions and national trends.

It must be recognized and re-affirmed that there is a State economy and action can be taken by State Governments to improve the climate in which business operates.

The number of unemployed in Victoria at the end of March stood at 118 700, an intolerably high level both in economic and social terms.

But the most alarming statistic in terms of the future of this State was that one in four of these were people under the age of 21.

The policy initiatives you will be asked to set in train during the coming Session will be aimed at creating the climate to stimulate the private sector and in turn provide jobs.

The Government is also concerned that manufacturing industry, the base of this State's economy, is operating well below capacity.

The housing and construction industries are depressed, with house building commencements at the lowest level for many years.

Legislation to come before this Session will be aimed at giving added protection and encouragement for home buyers and stimulation for the building industry.

The Government is prepared to cooperate fully with all other Australian Governments to reduce inflation.

It does not, however, believe that economic policies which lead to increased unemployment and high interest rates are acceptable or responsible.

Judicious use of the State's economic powers will temper and ease the climate created by the Federal Government.

The Government is committed to manage the State to provide for the most effective use of its abundant resources for all Victorians, particularly those on middle and lower incomes.

State taxes and charges will be framed with the interests of these groups in mind.

The Government's priorities were clearly outlined during the election campaign.

They include vital improvements in the areas of education, health, housing and public transport services.

It is hoped that the actions to be taken in these areas and the vital area of economic management will produce a better Victoria for all Victorians.

The Government will work actively towards the restoration of growth and prosperity in the private sector of the Victorian economy.

A key initiative to achieve this will be the Victorian Development Fund.

This Fund will be established to re-invest Victorian money into projects in this State.

These projects will create new jobs for Victorians, particularly in areas of social and economic necessity.

My Government is committed to creating a new and better industrial relations climate in this State.

Too frequently in the past the focus of government endeavour in this vital field has been based on confrontation rather than consultation.

A new era of consultation and cooperation with all parties in industrial relations is vital to the future of Victoria.

The Government has already established a Cabinet Industrial Relations Task Force to act as the prime negotiator in industrial matters.

This will reduce the high level of disputes.

But it will also bring a greater degree of certainty and predictability into the industrial relations field.

My Government has already indicated to the Arbitration Commission that it supports a return to a centralized system of wage fixation, which equitably compensates wage and salary earners for rises in the cost of living.

The Government has also indicated to the Commission its willingness to assist in any conference it might call to achieve consensus on this question.

I turn now to legislation for the forthcoming Session.

In fulfilment of the Government's commitments, priority will be given to Bills providing for exemption from stamp duty for first home buyers up to a value of \$50 000; stamp duty exemption in cases affected by the recent Family Court decisions; re-imposition of probate duty on estates with a value of \$200 000 or more or the top four per cent of dutiable estates; exemption from probate for family farms; and control over Building Society interest rates.

The Government will ensure that estates of ordinary Victorians and family farms will not be subject to probate.

Estates worth less than \$200 000 will not be subject to probate and this figure will be adjusted in line with inflation.

Exemptions will apply to estates passing to *de jure* or *de facto* spouses or wholly dependent brother or sister, to a parent by a child, and to genuine family farms left in the immediate family.

There will be a package of local government Bills, including one for the election of a Melbourne City Council to replace the present administrators.

Representative government will be restored to the City of Melbourne.

And there will be legislation to empower the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works to strike a differential rate.

A Freedom of Information Bill will be introduced to protect the personal freedom of citizens often under threat from governments, the bureaucracy, the police and modern business technology.

There will be legislation to amend the Equal Opportunity Act to include discrimination on the grounds of disablement, race or religion.

The Government will enact a Bill of Rights in which the fundamental human rights of all citizens are spelt out clearly, simply and comprehensively.

And the current legislation providing for a minimum price for packaged beer will be repealed.

Health Bills will include provision for reducing the amount of lead in petrol; regulation of the ownership of private hospitals by medical practitioners and their registration; and legislation on human tissue transplants.

The Historic Buildings Act will be amended to strengthen the role of the Historic Buildings Preservation Council.

Legislation will be introduced to grant land rights at Framlingham to the Aboriginal people.

A Victorian Electoral Commission will be established under new legislation.

Boundaries will be re-drawn to ensure equality in value of the vote of city and country voters.

Provision will be made for the establishment of a Director of Public Prosecutions to be responsible for prosecutions in the superior courts. A Firearms Consultative Committee will be established and firearms registration will be introduced.

I now turn to individual departmental programmes over the next eighteen months.

A major priority for the Government will be the provision of housing, both public and private.

Additional funds will be injected to stimulate the building industry and to increase the provision of rental accommodation and homes for purchase through the Housing Commission.

Other measures will include new approaches to assist home buyers; new methods of improving and diversifying the stock of rental accommodation; and new approaches to co-operative housing.

The tenancy laws, which affect more than 750 000 Victorian households, will also be reformed.

The process of reform was begun six years ago but the present Act must be strengthened.

My Government intends to thoroughly remodel this legislation in every major area—security of tenure, bonds, leases, repairs, discrimination, and protected tenants.

The Government is deeply concerned at the failure of the Federal Government to assume its full responsibility for providing income security for the poor and disadvantaged.

The Minister for Community Welfare Services will establish a Task Force to investigate and report on this important matter as soon as possible.

Under my Government's community welfare policy the women's refuge programme will be strengthened.

The Government will give emphasis to upgrading correctional services in the State.

In consumer affairs, my Government will introduce a new and comprehensive concept of fair trading.

New legislation will provide clear-cut rights, effective protection and readily enforceable remedies for consumers.

Ethnic affairs will be given increased status and resources.

An Ethnic Affairs Commission will be established to promote the needs of all ethnic groups and monitor the development of Government services for ethnic communities.

Improved interpreter and translation services will be provided.

Migrants will be protected against discrimination in employment, training and the services of the law, and education services for migrants will be improved.

My Government recognizes the significance of primary industry which injects almost three billion dollars into the State's economy each year.

The Government will give high priority to research and extension services which will enable Victorian farmers to achieve maximum productivity.

The Government will review and where necessary restructure Primary Produce Marketing Boards to improve efficiency.

The Government recognizes the need to take a vigorous attitude to the problem of salinity, particularly in north-eastern Victoria.

As a first step the Government intends to establish an All-party Parliamentary Committee devoted exclusively to the issue of salinity. This will be in addition to an expanded capital works programme.

The Government will act immediately to improve the State's education system.

My Government will ensure that our children are adequately prepared for the employment opportunities and the wider challenges facing them in the future.

Sufficient teachers and class rooms will be provided to ensure a maximum class size of thirty pupils in primary schools.

Education allowances will be increased. And there will be no reduction in the funds allocated to non-government schools.

Greatly increased funds will be provided over the next three years through the Victorian Development Fund for school buildings.

A State Board of Education will be established to provide an independent source of advice to the Government.

New education industrial relations machinery will be created to minimize the incidence of industrial disputes in schools, which have been prevalent in the past.

The existing public transport administration will be re-organized to provide for greater efficiency and accountability.

The Government will establish a Metropolitan Transit Authority to bring together all Melbourne trains, trams and buses into a single co-ordinated system.

Additional rolling stock will be provided for both city and country services, and urgently needed system improvements will be accelerated.

Modern financial techniques will be used for this purpose.

The Government's public transport programme in its first three years will increase patronage by at least twenty per cent, leading to a reduction in fares.

Travel concessions will be increased for pensioners, students and supporting parents.

The State's energy resources are vital to our future economic growth and prosperity.

Our brown coal, oil and natural gas must be used effectively and efficiently in the interests of all Victorians.

Energy management will be improved and co-ordinated and energy conservation highlighted.

The State Electricity Commission and the Gas and Fuel Corporation will be brought under more effective Ministerial control.

At the next round of tariff increases, the service charge of \$6 per month for domestic consumers of electricity will be abolished.

The tariff structure of the State Electricity Commission will be reviewed and the terms of reference of the Zeidler Inquiry will be widened to include the complete range of energy issues.

The Government will reconstitute the Mining Advisory Committee, with the aim of maximising economic activity in this area and protecting rights of small miners.

The Government will take urgent action to remove problems in the taxation field.

This will be based on the principle of fairness and equity.

Immediate reforms will be undertaken in the areas of probate duty and stamp duty.

Before moving on to the matter of Supply, I must make reference to my distinguished predecessor, His Excellency the Honourable Sir Henry Winneke who completed his term of office early this year.

During his period of almost eight years as Governor of Victoria Sir Henry fulfilled his high position with great distinction, travelling to all parts of Victoria and meeting people in every walk of life. He endeared himself to all Victorians whilst upholding the dignity and honour of the Crown.

It is fitting that I pay tribute to him on behalf of the people of this State. I will do my utmost to maintain the high standard he has set.

It is with deep sorrow that I refer to the death of the former Lieutenant-Governor of Victoria, Lieutenant-General the Honourable Sir Edmund Herring.

Sir Edmund served with distinction as Lieutenant-Governor for a record term of twenty-seven years and gave outstanding service to the community both in this capacity and as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

I refer also with deep regret to the deaths, since you were last called together, of two former Ministers of the Crown, the Honourable P. J. Kennelly, the Honourable Sir Horace Petty and a former Member of the Legislative Council, the Honourable A. Smith.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

To enable the services of government to continue from July 1, next, further Supply will be necessary.

A Bill will be presented to you for this purpose, thus enabling Supply for five months of the year 1982/83.

MR. PRESIDENT AND HONOURABLE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL:

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

The Government has been given a very clear mandate from the people of Victoria to provide strong leadership over

the next three years, to improve the quality and effectiveness of public administration, and to ensure that the living standards and well-being of the whole community are improved and enhanced.

It intends to carry out that mandate.

The will of the people has been expressed clearly and unmistakably.

To that end the Government will introduce a wide range of legislation and commence the implementation of comprehensive programmes across the whole spectrum of government services.

I now formally open this Parliament and pray that the guidance of Almighty God may attend on your deliberations.

Copies of the Speech were handed by the Governor's Private Secretary to the President and the Speaker.

His Excellency and suite withdrew, and members of the Legislative Assembly retired from the Chamber.

The sitting was suspended at 3 p.m. until 4.47 p.m.

THE MINISTRY

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development) (By leave)—I desire to advise the House of the change of Government. Following the resignation of the Ministry on 8 April 1982, the Honourable John Cain, M.P., was commissioned by His Excellency the Governor to form a new Government. The names of the Ministers selected and the portfolios held by them are as follows:

The Honourable John Cain, M.P.—Premier, Attorney-General and Minister for Federal Affairs.

The Honourable Robert Clive Fordham, M.P.—Minister of Education and Minister of Educational Services.

The Honourable William Albert Landeryou, M.L.C.—Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism.

The Honourable Evan Walker, M.L.C.—Minister for Conservation and Minister for Planning.

The Honourable Ian Robert Cathie, M.P.—Minister of Housing.

The Honourable Steven Marshall Crabb, M.P.—Minister of Transport.

The Honourable John Joseph Ginifer, M.P.—Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.

The Honourable Robert Allen Jolly, M.P.—Treasurer and Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Honourable Daniel Eric Kent, M.L.C.—Minister of Agriculture.

The Honourable Roderick Alexander Mackenzie, M.L.C.—Minister of Forests, Minister of Lands and Minister of Soldier Settlement.

The Honourable Charles Race Thorson Mathews, M.P.—Minister for the Arts and Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

The Honourable Thomas William Roper, M.P.—Minister of Health.

The Honourable James Lionel Simmonds, M.P.—Minister for Employment and Training.

The Honourable John Hamilton Simpson, M.P.—Minister of Public Works and Minister for Property and Services.

The Honourable Pauline Therese Toner, M.P.—Minister for Community Welfare Services.

The Honourable Neil Benjamin Trezise, M.P.—Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation.

The Honourable David Ronald White, M.L.C.—Minister for Minerals and Energy, Minister of Mines and Minister of Water Supply.

The Honourable Frank Noel Wilkes, M.P.—Minister for Local Government.

The list of responsibilities of Ministers in this place representing Ministers in another place has been circulated to honourable members.

RESIGNATION OF THE HONOURABLE D. N. SALTMARSH

The **PRESIDENT** (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! I have received communications from His Excellency the Governor which I shall read:

Dear Mr. President,

I enclose a copy of a letter of resignation from his seat in the Legislative Council of Victoria for Waverley Province, addressed to and received by me today, from the Honourable Donald Neville Saltmarsh together with a copy of my acknowledgement to him.

By virtue of Section 30 of the Constitution Act 1975, Mr. Saltmarsh's seat in the Legislative Council became vacant on the 1st April 1982, being the day upon which his letter of resignation addressed to me was received by me.

Yours sincerely,
BRIAN MURRAY
Governor

The Honourable F. S. Grimwade, M.L.C.,
President,
Legislative Council of Victoria,
Parliament House
MELBOURNE, 3002

His Excellency,
Rear-Admiral Sir Brian Murray, K.C.M.G., A.O.,
Governor of Victoria,
Government House,
St. Kilda Road,
MELBOURNE, VIC. 3004.
Your Excellency,

I hereby tender my resignation as the Member for Waverley Province, in the Victorian Legislative Council.

My reason for this action is to enable me to stand for election in the Assembly District of Wantirna, at the forthcoming election to be held on Saturday, April 3, 1982.

It has been a privilege to serve the Victorian community as an elected Member for the Legislative Council, and I trust that I shall continue to serve the Victorian community in any way that will promote the well-being of the people of this State.

Yours sincerely,

D. N. SALTMARSH, M.L.C.,
Member for Waverley Province.

Dear Mr. Saltmarsh,

This is to acknowledge that I have this day received your letter of the 1st April 1982, addressed to me, resigning your seat in the Legislative Council of Victoria for the Waverley Province.

By virtue of Section 30 of the Constitution Act 1975 your seat became vacant upon the receipt by me of your letter of resignation.

May I offer you my thanks for your distinguished service to the people of Victoria in the Legislative Council. With kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,
BRIAN MURRAY
Governor

The Honourable Donald Neville Saltmarsh,
18 Blenheim Avenue,
GLEN WAVERLEY, 3150

DEATH OF THE HONOURABLE SIR HORACE ROSTILL PETTY

The **Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU** (Minister for Economic Development) —Since the House last met there has occurred the death of a former Minister of the Crown, the late Honourable Sir Horace Rostill Petty. Unfortunately, I

did not have the privilege of meeting Sir Horace Petty as it is some 30 years since he entered the Parliament and some eighteen years since he retired as a Minister of the Crown. Nevertheless, although I regret I am not in the position of being able to speak personally about the former Minister of the Crown in this State, it is desirable that I move the following motion:

That this House expresses its sincere sorrow at the death on 16 February 1982 of the Honourable Sir Horace Rostill Petty, and places on record its acknowledgement of the valuable services rendered by him to the Parliament and the people of Victoria as a Member of the Legislative Assembly for the Electoral District of Toorak from 1952 to 1964, Minister of the Crown from 1955 to 1964, and Agent-General for Victoria in London from 1964 to 1970.

The late Sir Horace Petty served the people of Victoria in a variety of positions and held an office of the Crown in this Parliament. He was a member of the Legislative Assembly from 1952 to 1964, Minister of Housing from 1955 to 1961, Minister of Immigration from 1956 to 1962 and Minister of Public Works from 1961 to 1964. He was temporary Chairman of Committees from 1952 to 1955 and then he was Agent-General for Victoria from 1964 to 1970.

As I indicated earlier, it is a matter of some regret that I had no personal association with the former Minister but I believe the late Sir Horace Petty faithfully served the people of this State. That goes without question as his record speaks for itself. No doubt there are a number of honourable members, certainly one or two on the Government side of the Chamber, who remember the late Sir Horace Petty and I am certain that I spoke on their behalf when I proposed the motion of condolence.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—I associate myself and the members of the Opposition with the motion moved by the Leader of the Government. Only three present members of the House, Mr Walton, Mr Campbell and myself, were serving in Parliament while the late Sir Horace Petty was a Minister. His prime characteristic was the forthright way in which he approached every problem. No one

was ever in doubt as to what Horace Petty believed and what he intended. He was never a fence-sitter. He made his views on all matters clearly known and he was a decisive Minister of the Crown and member of Parliament.

I was a member of the pre-selection convention in 1951 which chose him as the Liberal Party candidate for the Toorak seat to fill the shoes of Mr E. R. Reynolds, Q.C., who had served with great distinction as member for that seat. Horace Petty was then Mayor of Prahran. There has been no mention of his municipal service. He served quite a time as a councillor of the City of Prahran and as its mayor, and was mayor at the time of his pre-selection. I remember also that he was the thirteenth candidate in a field of thirteen but that did not prove unlucky for him. He was elected and took a strong stand on almost every issue. He was well known for the way in which he did so. He was not a politician's politician: He was a man who stated his view very clearly at all times.

Our sympathy goes to Lady Petty, his widow, together with our appreciation of the great service he rendered over the years to the Victorian community.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—Members of the National Party also would like to be associated with the motion. I am in a position similar to Mr Landeryou. I did not know Sir Horace Petty. I am pleased that Mr Hunt was able to indicate to the House, from the knowledge he had when serving with Sir Horace Petty, some of the details of his work, and the attitudes that he took. Certainly, his service to Victoria was excellent. He served twelve years as a member of the Legislative Assembly, and nine years as a Minister. His service has been outstanding. We convey our condolences to his widow and children.

The Hon. J. V. C. GUEST (Monash Province)—I am one of the few members of the House who had the good fortune to know Sir Horace Petty. I remember as a little boy going to the newsagency that he owned. I do not know anything of his Parliamentary and Ministerial career because those were

the years I did not know him. When he returned from England, he was a member of my branch of the party. All the good qualities Mr Hunt mentioned were abundantly clear in Sir Horace Petty's last years. He was a strong minded, vigorous and forthright man and he was a most helpful person to any new member of Parliament. His death is indeed sincerely to be regretted.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province)—I shall add to the remarks that have already been made about Sir Horace Petty. I knew him briefly, although it was a long time ago. I found him to be a very easy gentleman to speak to. I remember him particularly for his local government work. He was a councillor and at one time mayor of the City of Prahran, and Housing Commission flats in that area have been named after him. I recall that he worked hard for some charitable organizations, which is something that perhaps has been overlooked. He was a great charity worker. Organizations with which I have been associated have told me of the work Sir Horace Petty has done. Mr Landeryou has placed the achievements of Sir Horace Petty before the House. Sir Horace also served for some years as Agent-General for Victoria in London. I offer my condolences to Lady Petty.

The Hon. V. T. HAUSER (Nunawadling Province)—I add my remarks to those made by other honourable members for the motion of condolence for the late Sir Horace Petty. Before he became a member of Parliament, Sir Horace Petty assisted me on numerous occasions and during the time he was a member of Parliament I also had the benefit of his advice. In recent years I had the opportunity of meeting him on many different occasions. I express my condolences to his widow, Lady Petty. I agree with those honourable members who have pointed out that throughout his life Sir Horace Petty contributed an enormous amount for the benefit of the State of Victoria.

The motion was agreed to in silence, honourable members showing their unanimous agreement by standing in their places.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I move:

That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honourable Sir Horace Rostill Petty, the House do now adjourn until 8 o'clock this day.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.1 p.m.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade) took the chair at 8.3 p.m.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I have to advise the House that, due to a prior commitment that was made some time ago by the Minister of Agriculture, he will be absent from question time.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—In order to assert the independence of this House from that of the Crown and in order to preserve the privileges of this House, and in accordance with the Standing Orders, I move that I have leave to bring in a Bill to revise the statute law of Victoria.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ELECTION PROMISES

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—Is the Minister for Economic Development familiar with a document issued by the Australian Labor Party on 22 March purporting to contain the answers of the Australian Labor Party to the costings of the Liberal Party of the present Government's election promises? If so, did the honourable gentleman, the Premier and any other present Ministers in the Labor Government participate in the compilation of that document and, if so, can the honourable gentleman confirm the accuracy of the answers given in that document?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—“Yes”, “Yes” and “Yes”.

WATER AND SEWERAGE LOAN SUBSIDIES

The Hon. W. R. BAXTER (North Eastern Province)—Does the Minister of Water Supply recall that at a meeting he and I attended at the Sebastopol Bowling Club during the recent election campaign, he indicated that a Labor Government would retain interest subsidies on water and sewerage loans down to the now existing 4 per cent level? If the honorable gentleman does recall that commitment, is it the Government's intention to adhere to that undertaking and, if so, will the honorable gentleman make an announcement to that effect as soon as possible?

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Minister of Water Supply)—I remind the House that during the election campaign and during the debate on a Bill that was introduced into the House late in the last sessional period, the former Minister of Water Supply indicated that during the next three years the then Government proposed that the interest rate subsidy would be lifted to 7 per cent. The present Government has a variation of that policy and it will be the responsibility of the Treasurer and the Minister of Water Supply to make a further announcement about that matter during the autumn sessional period.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS PRESERVATION COUNCIL

The Hon. C. J. KENNEDY (Waverley Province)—Can the Minister for Planning indicate whether the annual reports of the Historic Buildings Preservation Council were prepared for the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 and, if so, whether those reports were printed? If the answer to that question is, “Yes”, can the Minister indicate why those reports were never tabled in the Parliament?

The Hon. E. H. WALKER (Minister for Planning)—On assuming the role of Minister for Planning, it was indicated to me by officers of my department that two annual reports had not only been compiled but they had also been printed

and made ready to table. The annual reports for the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 remain with the department and they have not been tabled in either Houses of the Parliament. I assure the House that I will be tabling those reports because they should be made available to the House. I can only assume that those reports were suppressed by my predecessors for reasons unknown to me. Reports have been printed for 1979-80 and 1980-81. The reports are available and they will be tabled in this House at the earliest opportunity.

ELECTION PROMISES

The Hon. P. D. BLOCK (Nunawading Province)—I direct my question to the Minister for Economic Development and it concerns the answers of the Australian Labor Party on 22 March to the Liberal Party's costing document issued on 21 March. In another place today the Premier answered a question on the matter and said that some of the figures contained in the Australian Labor Party document were wrong and some of the figures were right. In light of the assurances of the Australian Labor Party to the electorate during the election that these figures were 100 per cent accurate and in light of the fact that the Leader of the House has indicated that he was involved in preparing the answers contained in the document, is the honorable gentleman prepared to inform the people of Victoria and the Opposition which answers supplied in the document are wrong and which answers are right, or is the honorable gentleman prepared to still be as arrogant as he was when he last answered this question?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—In his usual way, Mr Block has attempted to mislead the House. When I responded to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, I indicated that, at the time, I believed the propositions that were put to the people on the costings were accurate. At the time, although we as the Opposition had the overwhelming support of the people, we were denied access, in terms of the Westminster tradition, to the Ministerial heads of various depart-

ments. That information would have been required by any Opposition to determine the costings involved.

The Hon. A. J. Hunt—You didn't ask for it. Tell the truth!

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—You are misleading the House again. You have not changed your approach, although you have changed your position. The reality is that the new Premier, in his former capacity as Leader of the Opposition, asked the then Premier, Mr Thompson, a question without notice in the Lower House. He asked whether the then Government would give shadow Ministers access to the relevant information that was required from departmental heads. That request was in his former capacity as Leader of the Opposition. Members of the present Opposition ought to check the facts before they get into the debate they have planned for later tonight.

The reality is that the history of the previous Government in economic management is a history of outrageous mismanagement. The previous Government planned deliberately to have a deficit. It planned the use of money that did not exist in the Consolidated Fund and it had no intention in the lead up to the recent election of coming clean with the people of Victoria. The present Treasurer made that quite clear when he was scoring points and kicking goals when answering questions similar to these in another place earlier tonight. The Treasurer made it quite clear that the Victorian Government, at long last, is now starting to get on top of the difficulties associated with Treasury, the difficulties associated with the economy of this State and the difficulties associated with Government financial management in this State.

VICTORIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Hon. I. B. TRAYLING (Melbourne Province)—Can the Leader of the Government confirm whether in October 1981 a decision was made by the previous Government to close the New York office of the Victorian Economic Development Corporation? If such a decision was made, was it carried out

and why was it necessary to make such a decision? Can the honourable gentleman indicate whether he, as the Minister now responsible for the corporation, has taken any action concerning the New York office of the corporation?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—In the current fiscal year the New York office of the Victorian Economic Development Corporation involved the expenditure by the Victorian Government of taxpayers' funds of almost \$300 000. The justification for that expenditure was that it was a post representing Victoria. As I understand from the minutes of the corporation, the governing body of the Victorian Economic Development Corporation decided that the office should be closed. That decision was made last year but no serious attempts were made to close the office. The chairman of the corporation visited New York recently, at corporation expense, and did not close the office in accordance with the determination of the board.

In those circumstances, as the new Minister, I have decided that the chairman and general manager of the corporation should be directed to take the necessary steps to close the New York office of the corporation. That will represent a substantial saving for Victoria. I do not believe that even people as lacking in talent as some of those who are now seated on the front bench on the Opposition side of the Chamber would need \$300 000 to promote the interests of Victoria in New York. It is even harder to understand why the previous Premier twice removed, Sir Rupert Hamer, found it necessary to open yet another office in Los Angeles. It is beyond my comprehension to understand why the previous Government needed to find so many jobs for the boys that it was forced to establish yet another office in Los Angeles at the very time when the corporation was deciding that the New York office should be closed.

I believe there will be a substantial saving to the Government, the department and the corporation by the closure of the office and I have requested

the Ministry to review all overseas posts of this nature to ascertain whether there can be more savings of this sort.

The present agent in New York is 75 years of age and his agency has been paid almost \$300 000 in this financial year.

My Government takes the view that that is an unnecessary waste of money. A comparison of the return, limited though it was, shows that in the three months reviewed by my department at my request there were in fact three inquiries from the State of New York expressing some interest in Victoria. I believe representation in the States can be achieved. I have, therefore, taken the steps I have outlined.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Perhaps the Leader of the Government might consider a Ministerial statement at some other time.

MINISTERS

The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN (Western Province)—I ask the Leader of the Government: Are the Ministers of the Government, in the performance of the duties of their office, bound by the decisions of the ALP State Conference and the ALP Administrative Committee and do they intend to abide by the decisions of each of those bodies?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—All members of the Government are members of the Labor Party.

WATER AND SEWERAGE TRUSTS

The Hon. D. M. EVANS (North Eastern Province)—I refer to the report of the Public Bodies Review Committee to the last Parliament making certain recommendations with regard to water and sewerage trusts throughout Victoria. The former Minister of Water Supply indicated certain implementation procedures which would be followed. Can the Minister of Water Supply advise whether the Government will follow the same implementation procedures? If not, will the honourable gentleman shortly spell out the implementation procedures which his Government will follow?

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Minister of Water Supply)—I thank Mr Evans for the question and indicate that it is the intention of the Government and myself in my capacity as Minister of Water Supply to make a Ministerial statement on this issue during the course of the autumn sessional period. The six reports of the Public Bodies Review Committee became available in December. It is clear that an overwhelming majority of water trusts and sewerage authorities in Victoria are happy to abide by the recommendations contained in that report.

The process of implementation has been assisted by the fact that the former Attorney-General made available the Parliamentary draftsmen to assist the Public Bodies Review Committee to prepare amendments to the Sewerage Districts Act and the Local Government Act. At some stage in future, that process of implementation by the Public Bodies Review Committee will be taken over by the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission with a view to preparing legislation for the spring sessional period.

As I indicated at the outset of my answer, a Ministerial statement on this matter will be made during the autumn sessional period which will put the definite position of the Government on this matter.

DRUNK AND DISORDERLY BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province)—I ask the Leader of the Government, what steps does he, and/or the Government, intend to take to stop incidents like that reported in the press where Mr Robert Dickson lost his life because of the behaviour of some drunken louts?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I thank Mr Walton for the question. The Government views seriously the death of that person and the unfortunate circumstances which caused his demise. Files reveal that the previous Minister received clear and unmistakable advice from the Liquor Control Commission

and the Victoria Police that in fact persons taking liquor into football grounds on match days were breaking the existing Victorian laws.

The Hon. R. J. Long—What is the purpose of the conference tomorrow?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—The purpose of the conference tomorrow is to confer with the relevant authorities—that is, the police and the Victorian Football League—to spell out what the existing law is and to seek their advice as to whether changes are necessary. I repeat my assertion that the previous Government knew that what was in fact happening at football grounds was a breach of the current law. As it did with so many other problems that confront our society, it chose to cover it up and ignore it.

ALLEGATIONS OF MR NOEL TURNBULL

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province)—Is the Leader of the Government aware of the claim by Mr Noel Turnbull, the former press secretary of the then Leader of the Opposition, that the tactic of accusing the previous Government of leaving the coffers bare was decided upon more than a year prior to the election and that Mr Landeryou took part in those discussions. If the honourable gentleman is aware of those allegations, will he inform the House whether he was involved in any conversation of any sort which could have given rise to such an allegation and if his answer is, "No", when is he going to take proceedings for defamation against Mr Turnbull?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—Yes, yes, I was not.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—On a point of order, Mr President, the answer was not hearable on this side of the Chamber and I ask the Leader of the Government to repeat it.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—Yes, yes, I was not.

USE OF HERBICIDES

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—My question is directed to the Minister of Lands and concerns the use of herbicides 2, 4, 5-T and 2, 4-D. Is the honourable gentleman aware of the importance of the use, particularly of the herbicide 2, 4-D, in Victoria's agricultural industry and that industry's contribution to the economics of Victoria and, if so, will he bear that aspect in mind when any future decision is being made or any future consideration is being undertaken on the future use of those herbicides?

The Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Lands)—Yes, I am aware of the problems that confront the rural community in the control of noxious weeds, the role that has been played by 2, 4, 5-T in the control of those weeds and that farm production necessitates the use of pesticides and herbicides. Upon attaining Ministerial office, one of the first duties I undertook was to ask my department to provide me with a complete statement and report on the use by the department of 2, 4, 5-T particularly, and also to indicate what had been used, where it had been used and who was using it.

I have also had discussions with Mr Bill Parsons, one of the leading research men in this field, and he is at present collecting information and preparing a report on the ramifications of the withdrawal from use of some of these dangerous herbicides. That report will also indicate options which are available to the Government and what other methods can be used. The report will also indicate where the Government should be looking concerning the use of herbicides and pesticides in this area.

I repeat that I am aware of the problem and it has been taken in hand and any decision will be made only when all the facts are placed before the Government.

I might remind honourable members that this matter not only covers my portfolio but is also the responsibility of the Minister of Health, the Minister for Conservation and the Minister of Agriculture. I can assure Mr Dunn

that all aspects of the use of these pesticides and herbicides will be taken into account before any decision is made.

FINANCIAL MISMANAGEMENT

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Thomastown Province)—I direct my question to the Minister representing the Treasurer. What steps does the Government intend to take to stop the waste and mismanagement of the previous Government?

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Minister for Minerals and Energy)—It is clear that during the past six years the most significant political issue in this State has been the performance of the Liberal Party and the previous Government in its administration and management which started, firstly, conspicuously and prominently with the land deals and was further reinforced by the activities of the Public Bodies Review Committee.

As one of the first steps on achieving Government, it is clear that the Treasurer has taken initiatives not only with the formation of an Office of Management and Budget but also the formation of a task force comprising some of the most able economists in the community. These economists were also available to the former Government. Their task will be to ensure that during this period of austerity the revenue and capital works funds available to the Government are put to the best possible use and that effective management and scrutiny of the activities of all departments and utilities takes place to ensure proper and adequate accountability to the Cabinet, the Parliament and the people of Victoria.

BUILDERS LABOURERS FEDERATION

The Hon. D. K. HAYWARD (Monash Province)—My question to the Leader of the Government refers to the Builders Labourers Federation deregistration proceedings. Is the Minister in a position to advise when the decision was first taken that a future Labor Government would withdraw from the Builders

Labourers Federation deregistration proceedings and by whom the decision was taken?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—The Government decided only at the second meeting of its Cabinet to issue the necessary instructions to withdraw from the Builders Labourers Federation deregistration proceedings. The decision was made on the basis of advice received from the senior industrial adviser to the Government. The same advice had been given to the previous Government. The decision was made on the basis of legal advice which was also available to the former Government.

I might say that in a memorandum directed to me the senior industrial relations officer employed by the previous Government indicated that that Government made its decision purely for political purposes rather than on the ground of industrial relations.

HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—By leave, I move—

That the Honourables H. G. Baylor, B. P. Dunn, A. J. Hunt, W. A. Landeryou and I. B. Trayling be members of the House Committee.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—I seek an assurance from the Leader of the Government on the issue. The Opposition supports all those names. However, in negotiations later today behind the scenes between honourable members in another place there was a suggestion that the Labor Party's strength on the House Committee in another place be increased. If so, the Opposition might need to consider an adjustment to the representation in this place. I point out that the representation asked for by the Opposition is precisely the same as has been accorded to the Government when in Opposition throughout the past 27 years and my party sees no reason whatsoever for a change.

If the Leader of the Government is able to assure me that in a motion being moved in another place there is no change in the respective representation

between Opposition and Government, then the Liberal Party is happy to support this motion. If the Leader of the Government cannot give that assurance, I ask that the motion be postponed until the matter can be negotiated. There is no point in having argument over procedural issues of this kind. I hope the Leader of the Government will give an assurance at this stage that he will agree to an adjournment to check the matter out so that justice will be done in the same way as it has been in the past.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I am not in a position to give any such assurance, and I suggest the proper course is that the debate on the motion be adjourned until later this day.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—I would appreciate the matter being adjourned to later this day, because on previous occasions the National Party has had two members from the Legislative Council on the House Committee. As is seen by the motion, the representation of the National Party on that committee has been reduced to one, so I would appreciate the opportunity of discussing and considering this matter further with a short adjournment.

On the motion of the Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

LIBRARY AND PRINTING COMMITTEES

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—The Government takes the view that until the matter of appointment of members on the House Committee is resolved, the other committees should not be the subject of consideration by the House.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—By leave, I move:

That the Honourables the President, W. R. Baxter, G. A. S. Butler, B. A. Chamberlain, B. P. Dunn, D. E. Kent, W. A. Landeryou,

Haddon Storey and J. M. Walton be members of the Select Committee on the Standing Orders of the House; three to be the quorum.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—I was under the impression, Mr President, that the Chairman of Committees has been included *ex officio* in the past as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, as has the President.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—As I understand it, there is nothing in the Standing Orders which requires that.

The motion was agreed to.

TEMPORARY RELIEF IN CHAIR

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—By leave, I move:

That during any absence of the Deputy President, the President be authorized to call upon any of the Temporary Chairmen of Committees to temporarily relieve him in the Chair, and that during any absence of the President, the Deputy President be similarly authorized to call upon any of the Temporary Chairmen.

The motion was agreed to.

SESSIONAL ORDERS

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—By leave, I move:

That unless otherwise ordered by the House, in each week of the present session—

(a) the days and hours of meeting of the Council be Tuesday at three o'clock, Wednesday at eleven o'clock and Thursday at eleven o'clock;

(b) on Tuesday and Thursday the transaction of Government business shall take precedence of all other business, and on Wednesday private members' business shall take precedence of Government business; and

(c) no new business shall be taken after ten o'clock.

In so moving, I advise that it is proposed to ring the bells precisely at the abovementioned times.

The motion was agreed to.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION BILL

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province)—By leave, I move:

That I have leave to bring in a Bill to give members of the public rights of access to official documents of the Government of Victoria and of its agencies, to amend the Ombudsman Act 1973 and for other purposes.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—Leave is refused.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province)—I thought the Government was in favour of freedom of information. I will simply give notice that on the next day of meeting I will move along those lines.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade) laid on the table his warrant nominating the Honourables P. D. Block, G. A. S. Butler, B. A. Chamberlain, Joan Coxsedge, R. J. Eddy, D. M. Evans, V. T. Hauser, R. J. Long, I. B. Trayling and J. M. Walton to act as Temporary Chairmen of Committees whenever requested to do so by the Chairman of Committees or whenever the Chairman of Committees is absent.

STATUTE LAW REVISION COMMITTEE

The Role of Upper Houses of Parliament

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—By leave, I move:

That there be laid before this House a copy of the progress report of the Statute Law Revision Committee on the Constitution Act 1975 as to the Role of Upper Houses of Parliament. (Interim report.)

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development) presented the report in compliance with the foregoing order.

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

On the motion of the Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province), it was ordered that the report be taken into consideration on the next day of meeting.

PAPERS

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

Building Industry Long Service Leave Board—Report for the year 1980–81.
Dandenong Valley Authority—Report for the year 1980–81.

Friendly Societies—Report of the Registrar for the year 1980–81.

Geelong Regional Commission—Report for the year 1980–81.

Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board—Report for the year 1980–81.

Melbourne Wholesale Fruit and Vegetable Market Trust—Report for the year 1980–81.

Monash University—Report of the Council for the year 1980.

National Companies and Securities Commission—Report and financial statements for the year 1980–81.

Police Service Board—Determinations Nos. 356 to 359 (4 papers).

Port of Melbourne Authority—Balance sheet and statement of accounts for the year 1980–81.

Port of Portland Authority—Balance sheet and statement of accounts for the year 1980–81.

Railways Act 1958—Agreement dated 23 April 1981 between the Victorian Railways Board and Steam Age Australia Pty. Ltd. as to the purchase of two locomotives and the use of lines.

River Murray Commission—Report for the year 1980–81.

Statutory Rules under the following Acts of Parliament:

Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973—Nos. 75 and 78/1982.

Agricultural Chemicals Act 1958—Nos. 96 and 97/1982.

Appeal Costs Fund Act 1964—No. 113/1982.

Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1970—Nos. 98 and 106/1982.

Building Industry Long Service Leave Act 1975—No. 530/1981; and No. 107/1982.

Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act 1974 and Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act 1979—No. 68/1982.

Cemeteries Act 1958—No. 55/1982.

Coal Mines Act 1958—No. 91/1982.

Community Welfare Services Act 1970—No. 518/1981.

Companies Act 1961—No. 499/1981; and Nos. 41 and 114/1982.

Consumer Affairs Act 1972—No. 105/1982.

Coroners Act 1958—No. 26/1982.

Country Fire Authority Act 1958—Nos. 510 and 511/1981; and Nos. 21, 40, 51, 52, 53 and 88/1982.

County Court Act 1958—No. 502/1981.

Dentists Act 1972—No. 496/1981.

Discharged Servicemen's Preference Act 1943—No. 115/1982.

Education Act 1958—No. 70/1982.

Education Service Act 1981—No. 74/1982.

Environment Protection Act 1970—Nos. 517 and 524/1981; and No. 101/1982.

Evidence Act 1958—Nos. 1 and 3/1982.

Extractive Industries Act 1966—No. 92/1982.

- Firearms Act 1958—Nos. 521, 525 and 534/1981.
- Fisheries Act 1968—Nos. 62 and 72/1982.
- Forests Act 1958—No. 495/1981; and Nos. 31 and 100/1982.
- Friendly Societies Act 1958—No. 60/1982.
- Geelong Harbor Trust Act 1958—No. 509/1981.
- Groundwater Act 1969—No. 90/1982.
- Health Act 1958—Nos. 30 and 61/1982.
- Hospitals Remuneration Tribunal Act 1978—No. 66/1982.
- Hospitals Superannuation Act 1965—No. 95/1982.
- Industrial Relations Act 1979—Nos. 8 and 108/1982.
- Industrial Training Act 1975—No. 111/1982.
- Juries Act 1967—No. 23/1982.
- Labour and Industry Act 1958—No. 503/1981.
- Land Tax Act 1958—No. 16/1982.
- Law Reform Act 1973—No. 112/1982.
- Liquor Control Act 1968—No. 85/1982.
- Lotteries Gaming and Betting Act 1966—No. 102/1982.
- Magistrates' Courts Act 1971—No. 79/1982.
- Marine Act 1958—Nos. 24, 33, 34, 64 and 73/1982.
- Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works Act 1958—Nos. 476 and 527/1981.
- Metropolitan Fire Brigades Act 1958—No. 507/1981.
- Milk and Dairy Supervision Act 1958—No. 14/1982.
- Mines Act 1958—No. 93/1982.
- Motor Boating Act 1961—Nos. 19, 39, 50 and 77/1982.
- Motor Car Act 1958—No. 520/1981; and Nos. 37 and 89/1982.
- Motor Car Traders Act 1973—No. 104/1982.
- National Parks Act 1975—No. 103/1982.
- Nurses Act 1958—No. 65/1982.
- Pay-roll Tax Act 1971—No. 516/1981.
- Physiotherapists Act 1978—No. 531/1981.
- Pipelines Act 1967—No. 28/1982.
- Police Regulation Act 1958—Nos. 7, 46 and 54/1982.
- Port of Melbourne Authority Act 1958—Nos. 528 and 536/1981; and No. 32/1982.
- Post-Secondary Education Act 1978—Nos. 2 and 110/1982.
- Public Service Act 1974—Nos. 500 and 501/1981; Nos. 9 to 13 and 22/1982. P.S.D. Nos. 172, 187, and 194 to 214/1981; and Nos. 1 to 11, 13 to 23, 26 to 48, 51, 53, 54, and 57 to 63/1982.
- Racing Act 1958—No. 533/1981; and Nos. 38, 82 to 84, and 121 to 123/1982.
- Railways Act 1958—No. 526/1981; and Nos. 4 and 81/1982.
- Reference Areas Act 1978—No. 116/1982.
- Road Traffic Act 1958—Nos. 498, 522 and 523/1981; and Nos. 5, 48 and 56/1982.
- Scaffolding Act 1971—No. 109/1982.
- Second-hand Dealers Act 1958—Nos. 71 and 87/1982.
- Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1981—No. 17/1982.
- Stamps Act 1958—No. 505/1981; and Nos. 25 and 29/1982.
- State Bank Act 1958—Nos. 513 and 514/1981; and Nos. 42 and 118/1982.
- State Electricity Commission Act 1958—No. 512/1981.
- Stock (Artificial Breeding) Act 1962—Nos. 58 and 59/1982.
- Superannuation Act 1958—No. 20/1982.
- Supreme Court Act 1958—Nos. 506 and 535/1981.
- Survey Co-ordination Act 1958—No. 515/1981.
- Tattersall Consultations Act 1958—No. 18/1982.
- The Constitution Act Amendment Act 1958—No. 49/1982.
- Town and Country Planning Act 1961—Nos. 504 and 519/1981; and No. 67/1982.
- Transport Regulation Act 1958—No. 508/1981.
- Valuation of Land Act 1960—No. 529/1981; and No. 99/1982.
- Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act 1958—No. 27/1982.
- Vermin and Noxious Weeds Act 1958—No. 76/1982.
- Water Act 1958—Nos. 35, 36, 43 to 45, 47 and 57/1982.
- Wildlife Act 1975—No. 532/1981; and No. 63/1982.
- Workers Compensation Act 1958—Nos. 6 and 69/1982.
- Youth, Sport and Recreation Act 1972—No. 117/1982.
- Zoological Parks and Gardens Act 1967—No. 15/1982.
- Teaching Service Act 1958—
Teaching Service (Classification, Salaries, and Allowances) Regulation—Amendment Nos. 580, 581, 585 to 587, 589, 591, and 594 to 599.
Teaching Service (Teachers Tribunal) Regulations—Amendments Nos. 582 to 584 and 588, 590, Corrigendum to 590, 592 and 593.
- Town and Country Planning Act 1961—
Alexandra—Shire of Alexandra Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 16, 1982.
Ararat—City of Ararat Planning Scheme 1953—Amendments No. 22, 1977 (with 2 maps); and Nos. 27 (with 2 maps) and 29.
Bacchus Marsh—Shire of Bacchus Marsh Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 14, Part 2 (with map).
Bairnsdale—Town of Bairnsdale Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 25 (with map).

- Ballaarat—City of Ballaarat Planning Scheme—Amendments Nos. 58, 61, 64 and 65.
- Ballarat—Shire of Ballarat Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 12.
- Benalla—
City of Benalla Planning Scheme—Amendment Nos. 3 and 32.
Shire of Benalla Planning Scheme 1953—Amendments Nos. 16 and 18 (with 12 maps).
- Bungaree—Shire of Bungaree Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 11 (with map).
- Cobram—Shire of Cobram Planning Scheme 1979 (with 4 maps).
- Croydon—City of Croydon Planning Scheme 1961—Amendments Nos. 86 (with map), 109, 110 and 111.
- Eaglehawk—Borough of Eaglehawk Planning Scheme; and Amendments Nos. 1 and 2.
- Eppalock—
Eppalock Planning Scheme (Shire of Metcalfe)—Amendment No. 2.
Eppalock Planning Scheme (Shire of Strathfieldsaye) Amendment No. 4, 1981.
- Flinders—Shire of Flinders Planning Scheme 1962—Amendments Nos. 138 and 142, 1981 (with 6 maps); and No. 145.
- Frankston—City of Frankston Planning Scheme—Amendments Nos. 28, 29 and 32, 1980; and No. 33, 1981.
- French Island Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 5.
- Geelong Regional Planning Scheme—Amendments No. 17, 1980 (with map); and Nos. 20, Part 1 (with map); 21, Part 1 (with map); 24, Part 1 (with map); 25, Part 1 (with map); 35 (with map) and 36 (with map).
- Horsham—City of Horsham Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 58, 1980, Part 1.
- Kilmore—Shire of Kilmore Planning Scheme 1973—Amendments No. 47, 1980; No. 48, 1981; and Nos. 52 and 52A.
- Knox—City of Knox Planning Scheme 1965—Amendments No. 223, Part 2, and No. 226, 1980 (with map); Nos. 242 and 244, 1981; and Nos. 245 and 246.
- Lake Tyers to Cape Howe Coastal Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 7.
- Lillydale—Shire of Lillydale Planning Scheme 1958—Amendments Nos. 123 and 131, 1980; and Nos. 144, 146 and 150.
- Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme—Amendments Nos. 3, Part 1c (with 2 maps); 69, Part 3 (with map) and Part 4 (with 2 maps); 120, Part 2 (with map); 138, Part 2A (with 6 maps) and Part 3 (with map); No. 141, Part 2A (with 5 maps), Part 2B; 142, Part 3 (with map); 154, Part 1A (with 6 maps) and Part 1B (with map); 155, Part 2; 156, Part 1 (with 11 maps); 158, Part 1 (with 2 maps); 159, Part 1 (with 6 maps); 160, Part 1 (with 9 maps); 175 (with map); 179; 180; 195; 196; 197; 199 (with map); 200; 204 and 207.
- Mildura—City of Mildura Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 34, 1980.
- Moe—City of Moe Planning Scheme 1966—Amendment No. 61.
- Mornington—Shire of Mornington Planning Scheme 1959—Amendments No. 136, 1981; and No. 133.
- Morwell—Shire of Morwell Planning Scheme 1977—Amendments Nos. 8, 11 and 12, 1981.
- Numurkah—Shire of Numurkah Planning Scheme 1956—Amendment No. 5, 1979 (with map).
- Otway Ocean Road Planning Scheme (Shire of Otway)—Amendment No. 21.
- Pakenham—Shire of Pakenham Planning Scheme Part 1—Amendments Nos. 3 and 6.
- Portland—
Shire of Portland (Heywood Township) Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 5.
Shire of Portland Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 17, 1980.
Town of Portland Planning Scheme 1957—Amendments Nos. 28 and 33, 1981; and No. 35 (with map).
- Port Fairy Planning Scheme 1959—Amendment No. 12, 1981.
- Rosedale—Shire of Rosedale Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 17, 1980.
- Sale—City of Sale Planning Scheme 1975—Amendment No. 13, 1980; and No. 14, 1981.
- Sebastopol—Borough of Sebastopol Planning Scheme—Amendments Nos. 17 and 19.
- Seymour Planning Scheme—Amendments Nos. 46, 54, 57, 58, 59, 62 and 64.
- Shepparton—City of Shepparton Planning Scheme 1953—Amendment Nos. 58 and 59, 1981.
- Sherbrooke—Shire of Sherbrooke Planning Scheme 1965—Amendment No. 143, 1982.
- Stawell—Town of Stawell Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 23, 1981 (with map); and No. 22, 1982.
- Swan Hill—
Shire of Swan Hill (Castle Donnington) Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 7.
Shire of Swan Hill (Nyah-Nyah West) Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 3.
Shire of Swan Hill (Robinvale) Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 4.
- Wangaratta Sub-Regional Planning Scheme 1976 (City of Wangaratta) Amendments Nos. 8 and 10.
- Woorayl—Shire of Woorayl Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 53, 1982.
- Yea—Shire of Yea Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 3.
- Town and Country Planning Board—Report for the period 1 July 1980—2 February 1981.
- Urban Land Authority—Report for the year 1980–81.
- Victorian Post-Secondary Education Commission—Report for the year 1980–81.
- West Gate Bridge Authority—Report for the year 1980–81.
- West Moorabool Water Board—Report for the year 1980–81.

On the motion of the Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province), it was ordered that, with the exception of the Statutory Rules and regulations under the Teaching Service Act 1958, the papers tabled by the Clerk be taken into consideration on the next day of meeting.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Address-in-Reply

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—I have to report that His Excellency the Governor attended the House this day, and was pleased to make a Speech, of which, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy. As the Speech is printed, I take it that honourable members do not desire that I should read it to them.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province)—It gives me a great deal of pride and pleasure to be the first member of the Australian Labor Party to be invited to move for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply since 1954—a period of 28 years. Therefore, I move:

That the Council agree to the following Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

We, the Legislative Council 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.

In moving the motion I am mindful of the enormous responsibility that has been placed upon the newly elected Cain Labor Government and of the resolve of that Government to carry out its responsibilities in a manner that will be beneficial to the State of Victoria, and to all Victorians.

These are hard and difficult times, but I am confident that the Cain Ministry, while acutely aware of the expectations of the community, will not make decisions for the sake of political expediency, when those decisions could be harmful to the long-term interests of Victoria.

Australians take pride in the fact that they are part of a democratic system. The late John Cain—the father of the

present Premier—when he was speaking on the election of Speaker in another place on 15 June 1955, is reported as having said:

... Irrespective of political affiliations, members of this Parliament have always endeavoured—I hope they always will—to remember that this institution is the one that can best preserve our present way of life, and its dignity, prestige and standing must be maintained.

Too many people—they come from all political parties—are inclined to belittle Parliament, and attack it. If we desire to maintain the conditions that we at present enjoy and cherish, this institution must be preserved. One must admit that at times mistakes are made by Parliament, but no substitute has been evolved to take its place.

I agree with those remarks. With all the imperfections of the Westminster system we have yet to find a better one to take its place. However, that does not mean that one should not be continually trying to improve the system.

I know that in this regard it might be said that one should hasten slowly, but nevertheless there are some important changes that must receive consideration in the not-too-distant future, not the least of these being a redefinition of the role and structure of the Upper House. Even the previous Liberal Government recognized that changes have to be made to this House if it is to be relevant to the times.

With the ever-increasing growth in the bureaucracy and the accumulation of power by the Executive, ways must be found of reversing this situation and this House could play a major role in returning lost powers to the Parliament of the people.

The Australian Labor Party has long believed in the abolition of this House because its activities in the past have been a useless and costly duplication of what happens in another place, and with the occasional use of that ultimate power, the rejection of Supply to the popularly elected Government, forcing it to an election, without having to go to the people itself. It is in fact one of the most unassailable second Chambers in the world.

This House is a direct threat to the democratic system and when one considers that it is elected on a franchise

that deliberately gives one person's vote a greater value than another, it could hardly be said to be democratic. However, the reality of the situation is that, in order to abolish this House, it would have to vote itself out of office, and this is unlikely, at least for the time being. In the meantime I am sure that the newly-elected Labor Government will increase the efficiency of this House and make it more meaningful. Apart from the deliberate weighting of voting power—and this applies to the other House—there is a natural imbalance that occurs with the effluxion of time in the numbers of electors in both the electoral districts and electoral provinces. Currently that difference is most marked in some areas and there is an urgent need for a redistribution to take place before the next election. For example, the electorates of Wantirna and Keilor have enrolments in excess of 43 000, and the electorate of Melbourne has an enrolment of fewer than 24 000 and a number of other electorates have enrolments of about 25 000.

The Legislative Council province of Doutta Galla, represented by Mr Landeryou, the Leader of the House, has 145 000 electors, while North Western Province has only 83 000. You, Mr President, and Mr Granter would be well aware that in the past three years the number of electors in the Central Highlands Province has increased by about 10 000. I have the figures for all the other electorates and provinces but I shall not bore the House by reading them out so I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! I advise honourable members that I have seen the figures to which Mr Walton refers. They are pertinent to the motion he has moved and the way in which he has raised this matter in debate. I know of no reason why they should not be incorporated in *Hansard*. Copies will be circulated.

The Hon. J. V. C. Guest—What is the source?

The Hon. J. M. WALTON—Private research.

Leave was granted, and the table was as follows:

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Enrolments for Election to be held on
3 April, 1982

<i>Electorate</i>	1979	1982	<i>Plus</i>	<i>Minus</i>
Albert Park ..	27 902	27 705	..	197
Ascot Vale ..	28 098	27 759	..	339
Ballarat North ..	27 461	28 216	755	..
Ballarat South ..	27 545	28 615	1 070	..
Balwyn ..	28 505	28 135	..	370
Benalla ..	25 869	26 711	842	..
Benambra ..	28 168	30 162	1 994	..
Bendigo ..	27 203	28 094	894	..
Bennettswood ..	28 444	28 666	222	..
Bentleigh ..	27 913	27 347	..	566
Berwick ..	33 097	39 779	6 682	..
Box Hill ..	28 836	28 398	..	438
Brighton ..	27 271	25 960	..	1 311
Broadmeadows ..	34 979	39 105	4 126	..
Brunswick ..	28 666	29 039	373	..
Bundoora ..	31 052	33 557	2 505	..
Burwood ..	27 458	26 293	..	1 165
Carrum ..	30 171	31 367	1 196	..
Caulfield ..	27 954	26 979	..	975
Coburg ..	28 773	29 323	550	..
Dandenong ..	35 979	39 611	3 632	..
Doncaster ..	30 473	33 023	2 550	..
Dromana ..	31 823	35 516	3 693	..
Essendon ..	27 594	27 164	..	430
Evelyn ..	32 891	37 613	4 740	..
Footscray ..	28 052	28 169	117	..
Forest Hill ..	31 724	33 778	2 052	..
Frankston ..	32 904	35 899	2 995	..
Geelong East ..	26 575	27 859	1 284	..
Geelong North ..	28 355	30 338	1 983	..
Geelong West ..	25 968	25 794	..	174
Gippsland East ..	26 563	28 280	1 717	..
Gippsland South ..	26 619	27 920	1 301	..
Gisborne ..	32 026	36 125	4 099	..
Glenhuntly ..	26 622	26 807	185	..
Glenroy ..	27 615	28 040	425	..
Greensborough ..	34 703	39 109	4 406	..
Hawthorn ..	27 060	25 864	..	1 196
Heatherton ..	30 909	32 746	1 837	..
Ivanhoe ..	30 459	30 849	390	..
Keilor ..	35 783	43 346	7 563	..
Kew ..	29 065	27 839	..	1 226
Knox ..	31 114	33 774	2 660	..
Lowan ..	25 261	25 370	309	..
Malvern ..	28 751	27 155	..	1 596
Melbourne ..	25 415	23 657	..	1 758
Mentone ..	28 873	28 581	..	291
Midlands ..	26 532	28 423	1 891	..
Mildura ..	25 566	26 785	1 219	..
Mitcham ..	28 827	29 071	244	..
Monbulk ..	30 262	32 748	2 486	..
Morwell ..	26 878	28 658	1 780	..
Murray Valley ..	26 288	27 182	894	..
Narreacan ..	27 236	29 055	1 819	..
Niddrie ..	29 152	30 651	1 499	..
Noble Park ..	32 386	36 298	3 912	..
Northcote ..	29 338	29 412	74	..
Oakleigh ..	28 849	28 152	..	697
Polwarth ..	25 168	25 595	427	..
Portland ..	25 746	26 521	775	..
Prahran ..	26 766	25 550	..	1 216
Preston ..	27 627	26 739	..	888
Reservoir ..	30 020	29 990	..	30
Richmond ..	28 908	28 586	..	322
Ringwood ..	30 448	31 926	1 478	..
Ripon ..	26 703	27 322	619	..
Rodney ..	26 107	27 353	1 183	..
St. Kilda ..	27 012	26 612	..	400
Sandringham ..	28 051	27 472	..	579
Shepparton ..	26 800	29 093	2 213	..
South Barwon ..	29 031	31 805	2 774	..
Springvale ..	30 402	32 277	1 875	..
Sunshine ..	29 798	30 163	565	..
Swan Hill ..	25 922	26 561	639	..
Syndal ..	29 789	29 734	..	55
Wantirna ..	36 973	43 618	6 645	..
Wandryte ..	32 056	35 894	3 838	..
Warrandyte ..	25 749	26 503	754	..
Warrnambool ..	34 550	42 004	7 454	..
Werribee ..	31 323	34 426	3 103	..
Westernport ..	29 523	29 627	104	..
Williamstown

Total number of Electors enrolled for whole State = 2 453 642 (1982); 2 350 407 (1979); + 103 235 (on 1979 figures).

1982

2 453 642 ÷ 81 = 30 291 (average).

1979

2 350 407 ÷ 81 = 29 017 (average).

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Enrolments for Election to be held on
3 April, 1982

Electorate	1979	1982	Plus	Minus
Ballarat ..	90 442	94 948	4 506	..
Bendigo ..	87 468	92 109	4 641	..
Boronia ..	124 540	138 347	12 807	..
Central Highlands	96 898	107 313	10 415	..
Chelsea ..	127 390	137 494	10 104	..
Douita Galla ..	132 345	145 030	12 685	..
East Yarra ..	112 088	108 131	..	3 957
Geelong ..	90 659	94 727	4 068	..
Gippsland ..	84 931	90 260	5 329	..
Higinbotham ..	112 157	110 024	..	2 133
Melbourne ..	109 211	106 459	..	2 752
Melbourne North	115 148	114 771	..	377
Melbourne West	115 951	121 381	5 430	..
Monash ..	109 530	106 024	..	3 506
North Eastern ..	90 724	96 240	5 516	..
North Western ..	81 230	83 355	2 155	..
Nunawading ..	122 452	125 028	2 576	..
South Eastern ..	96 423	106 741	10 318	..
Templestowe ..	121 831	129 930	8 099	..
Thomastown ..	123 890	133 653	9 163	..
Waverley ..	122 086	127 347	5 261	..
Western ..	83 013	84 930	1 917	..

Total 1982 = 2 453 642; Total 1979 = 2 350 407.

Total number of electors enrolled for whole State = 2 453 642 ÷ 22 = 111 529 average.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON—These examples are not isolated, and point to the urgent need for correction in the near future.

I note with satisfaction the statement contained in His Excellency's address that the Government will establish an electoral commission. This proposed commission should be out of the reach of the influence of Governments and Parliament, and its task of maintaining some equality between electorates should be an ongoing one.

I note, too, that the Cain Labor Government intends to bring in legislation to enshrine in the Constitution a Bill of rights which will set out for the first time in this State, fundamental human rights that should be enjoyed by all citizens. Over a number of years there has been a gradual erosion of the rights of citizens, and the passing of legislation to place these basic human rights in the statutes is worthy of urgent consideration by Parliament.

The rights to which I refer are as follows, and are as set out in the Progress Report on the Constitution Act 1975 dealing with a Bill of rights:

- (a) political rights—
 - (i) right to vote.
 - (ii) freedom of speech.
 - (iii) freedom of the press.
 - (iv) freedom of assembly.
 - (v) freedom of religion.
 - (vi) freedom of movement.
- (b) legal rights—
 - (i) independence of the judiciary.
 - (ii) right to *habeas corpus*.
 - (iii) freedom from arrest.
 - (iv) freedom from search.
 - (v) right to bail.
 - (vi) right to trial by jury.
 - (vii) freedom from unusual punishments.
- (c) equality right and freedoms—
 - (i) equal opportunity.
 - (ii) aliens—exclusion from professions.
 - (iii) freedom from discrimination of aliens, aboriginals and homosexuals.
- (d) other rights—
 - (i) right to privacy.
 - (ii) right to speedy trial.
 - (iii) freedom from surveillance.

I commend the inclusion of a Bill of rights in the statutes of this State.

A major objective of the new Government will be to reduce the amount of industrial confrontation that is and has been taking place between employers, employees and the Government. This is to be done by the Cain Labor Government through the use of a Cabinet industrial relations task force. The task force intends to solve industrial problems, preferably by dealing with disputes before problems occur, by consultation rather than by confrontation. All that was needed was a lead from Government. That lead will now be given by the Cain Labor Government.

In the past the Liberal Government, which had a vested interest in maintaining industrial unrest, preferred confrontation. Already the task force, headed by Mr Landeryou, the Leader of the House, has made considerable progress towards achieving industrial peace in a number of areas. I know, too, from my associations outside Parliament that private enterprise will welcome the existence of this task force, and I understand that already inquiries have been made of Mr Landeryou on whether the jurisdiction of the task force could

be useful outside as well as inside Government projects.

I join with His Excellency in his remarks about his predecessor, Sir Henry Winneke. Both he and Lady Winneke were dear to the hearts of the people of Victoria and served the State well.

The Cain Labor Government has received a clear mandate from the people of Victoria to carry out its policies. It cannot be said that these policies were not given plenty of airing during the recent election and over the past year. They have not been secret; they have been available for all to see. Indeed, the Premier made sure during the election campaign that he was not sidetracked by the innuendoes and stupid remarks of the now Leader of the Opposition; he was determined to stick to the facts and policies, and because of that he won the support of the people of Victoria. A rejection of these policies would be a rejection of the will of the people.

I congratulate His Excellency on outlining the Government's outstanding programme to be carried out over the next three years, and wish the Government every success in its endeavours to provide these long-awaited reforms. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Thomastown Province)—I consider it an honour to second the motion that has been so ably moved by my colleague, Mr John Walton, for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech, and also to express my appreciation and congratulations to His Excellency Rear-Admiral Sir Brian Murray, our newly appointed Governor, on his Speech at the opening of the first session of the 49th Parliament. May Sir Brian and Lady Murray enjoy the best of health so as to enable them to carry out their numerous public duties. I am honoured to have the opportunity of seconding the motion as a member of the Government.

Earlier this month the people of Victoria elected a Labor Government after 27 years of Liberal Party Government. They voted in a Government with the greatest mandate for more than 60

years. On that day the people clearly indicated that they were dissatisfied with Liberal Governments which continually during election campaigns made promises that were not fulfilled.

The people of Victoria now have a progressive Government which is fully aware of the requirements to be met to achieve progress in Victoria over the next decade. The Government is also aware of the needs of all people in Victoria, particularly those in the areas of greatest need. We are extremely concerned about the high level of unemployment in this State. At present the total is approximately 119 000. Approximately 25 per cent or 30 000 of these people are under the age of 21 years. This is an alarming and frightening statistic. As Mr Walton has stated, the priorities of the Labor Party were outlined during the election campaign. One of the priorities of the Labor Government will be to create jobs for many people. This will be done by injecting funds to stimulate the building industry. All honourable members appreciate that when the building industry is stimulated, jobs are created for many people not only in the building industry but also in the areas of public works and community services.

In the Governor's Speech honourable members were informed of the priority to be given to a number of Bills which will be introduced. The proposed legislation will benefit many people in the community. A priority will be the provision of housing both in the public and private sectors. Thousands of people have applied to the Housing Commission for accommodation, both for rental and purchase. The names of some 16 000 to 17 000 people are on the waiting lists, and the commission is unable to house them. Some of the applicants are in a desperate plight. I refer to the young, the middle-aged and the elderly. One has only to read the daily press to learn of the numbers of people who sleep under bridges, in the parks and in the streets of Melbourne because they are not being housed properly. The Government will do all in its power to ensure that these people receive the proper housing to which they are rightly entitled.

At present some 750 000 Victorian households are affected by tenancy laws. It is pleasing to learn that the tenancy laws will be reformed by the Act being strengthened. My Government intends to remove this legislation in every major area by providing security of tenure, controlling bonds, controlling leases and preserving the rights of protected tenants. From day to day one learns of the astounding amounts of bond money and rental money being asked of tenants. Only the other day I learnt of a young mother with three children who was paying \$100 a week in rental for a home. It is outrageous that such people should be placed in that position. My Government will ensure that the tenancy laws are tightened to protect people and to control bond money and rentals.

Another matter of priority falls within the area of community welfare services. I refer to correctional services. The Government will give emphasis to upgrading correctional services in Victoria. Already it has learnt, and all honourable members present are aware, of the degrading circumstances in which prisoners are being housed in the remand section at Pentridge Prison and at Fairlea Female Prison. For eight years, since returning from an overseas trip through the generosity of the Government when I inspected a number of correctional institutions, I have advised the Government of the degradation in which people are housed in the remand section at Pentridge Prison and at Fairlea Female Prison. The former Government continued to make statements and each respective Minister continued to advise honourable members and the people of Victoria that plans were being devised for a new high-rise remand centre, firstly in Russell Street and, secondly, in Spencer Street, West Melbourne. I was pleased to learn that the Government will now allocate funds to ensure that the remand section at Pentridge and Fairlea female prisons will be reconstructed and that the degrading conditions that have existed for so long will be rectified.

Another concern of mine and of the Government is the provision of interpreters at all Government institutions. When travelling throughout the State

and visiting hospitals, mental institutions, prisons and other institutions, the insufficiency of interpreters is apparent. This subject has been raised time and again in Parliament. People of ethnic backgrounds in those institutions who are unable either to speak or understand the English language are seriously disadvantaged in being provided with information and in being able to advise the authorities of their requirements when they are not able to have the services of interpreters. The employment of a sufficient number of interpreters in those institutions is a long overdue requirement.

The Labor Party Government, in its election promises, is committed to providing additional teachers and classrooms for schools. In primary schools, the class size shall be a maximum of one teacher for 30 pupils. For far too long, primary school classes have consisted of more than 30 pupils and teachers have been unable to give sufficient time to slow learners—only brighter students have benefited. The Labor Party Government will provide sufficient teachers for primary schools to assist slow learners. These children need to be assisted and the Government will assist them through the policies it outlined in the election campaign.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN—What about the exceptionally bright children? What will you do for them?

The Hon. R. J. EDDY—They are well looked after already. When in opposition, the Labor Party asked many questions of previous Ministers about why certain teachers were not being provided for secondary education—mathematics, science and other teachers. I now hear interjections from the Opposition asking what the Labor Party will do about private school education. It is apparent that members of the Opposition are not concerned about slow learners. The Labor Party Government will look after private students and it is very concerned about children who are slow learners. The Government will ensure that those children will receive the proper tuition to which they are entitled.

The Government will do all it can to assist pensioners in Victoria and to improve their conditions. Travel concessions will be increased for pensioners, supporting parents and students. These persons have been sadly neglected by the Federal Government and they have had to rely heavily on the State Government. The Labor Party Government will endeavour to assist those persons. It will attempt at least to raise their standard of living to the poverty line because far too many people today live well below that poverty line. The Government will endeavour to improve the circumstances of those persons over the next three years. It will attend to all problems of all people in Victoria.

The Government is determined to implement the programmes for which it received an overwhelming mandate. State Governments must at all times defend State interests and the Government now has the ability and determination to promote the well-being of all Victorians. I commend the motion.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—On behalf of the members of the Liberal Party and on my own behalf, I associate myself and the people of the province I represent with the motion and express our loyalty to the Crown and our commendation to the Governor. On behalf of those of whom I have spoken, I go further and congratulate the Labor Party on its win in the recent election. I congratulate also those members of that party who have been appointed as Ministers on their appointments. We express the trust that all of them will endeavour to exercise their discretion in the interests of the people of Victoria. They will find the job arduous, as did Ministers of the previous Government. It is not always as easy when constructive decisions have to be made as it is when constructive criticism has to be undertaken. They will find that the pressure is greater and the possibility of error is significantly increased.

I turn now to His Excellency's Speech. I acknowledge that it rightly claims a mandate of the people of Victoria for

the policies that were enunciated and formed the real issues in the election that has just passed.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Well said!

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—I would have thought there was no doubt about the issue. That is what democracy is all about. If one believes in democracy one believes in the system of clearly highlighting the issues at an election. The party whose views on those major issues are accepted by the public, will then form the Government. The doctrines of mandate are clear as set out in all the major books on Parliamentary government and Cabinet government. It is clear that a party that wins an election has a mandate from the public on the major issues highlighted during that election and, moreover, has a general mandate to get on with the business of governing on major policy matters.

I respect that doctrine and members of the Liberal Party respect it also. From the posturing that has gone on in this House, one would imagine that some immediate threat has been made to that doctrine and that this House will suddenly, for some strange reason that nobody has explained, take the business of government out of the hands of the Government. Nothing could be further from the truth and nothing that anyone has said gives rise to any fear or threat of that kind. In fact, the Minister for Conservation and Mr Walton have been engaged in putting up an Aunt Sally so that they can knock it down. They have been engaged in creating an atmosphere of threat to make it appear to the public of Victoria that the newly elected Government will have the rug pulled out from underneath it. That is not true and, as I said on the night of the election, the Liberal Party respects the Government's mandate. Members of the Liberal Party would not be party to the use of this House to defeat that mandate. I want that point clearly understood. There is no threat and the Government need not pretend that there is one. The situation is no different from what it was in the first twelve years of the Bolte Government when the Government did not have a majority in this

House except for one day in 1964. However, during that period Victoria had an excellent Government to which the Legislative Council committed itself.

The Legislative Council was never a rubber stamp and members of the Opposition at that time, who were members of the party that is presently in Government, including Mr Walton, certainly did not automatically endorse every piece of legislation, whatever it contained. They questioned proposed legislation, as was their right. At times, amendments were proposed and when they appeared to be in the interests of the people of Victoria, they were accepted by the Government of the time. Frequently, the actions of the then Opposition and the corner party contributed to changes for the better that would not have taken place but for the existence of this House and the non-Government majority.

The Hon. I. B. Trayling—Did you say frequently or occasionally?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—There were frequent improvements for the better.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—Sir Henry Bolte's industrial legislation was rejected by this House.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—Few measures were rejected. In fact, only two Bills were rejected in that twelve-year period. Many amendments were made by agreement and the Opposition and National Party ensured that the Government took great care. They were a protection against the Government becoming arrogant and considering that a mandate meant more than a doctrine implied and that it was a *carte blanche* to do anything at all.

The doctrine of a mandate does not invite the right to do anything at all with or without the approval of the people and without question by the other parties in a bicameral system. During the period of twelve years to which I have referred, the numbers in this House were used responsibly, as was the House itself. They were a safeguard for the public and served the community well.

I have had discussions with my colleague, Mr Dunn, the Leader of the National Party in this House, and I can

assure honourable members that both he and I are determined to ensure that the prerogatives of this House will be used with great responsibility and in the same way that they were used during that period of twelve years. I might say that on a number of occasions the Labor Party when in opposition voted against Supply.

I do not foresee circumstances when the present Opposition will vote against Supply in this House and such circumstances will certainly never arise if the Government acts responsibly and in accordance with its mandate. I am not prepared to postulate or anticipate that it will disregard its own mandate, seek power that was never given to it or govern irresponsibly. I hope it will not do so. On that basis, there should be no likelihood or good cause for fear of any kind that this House would use its powers in any other way than they have been used during the past 27 years.

During those 27 years this House, which is elected on the basis of universal franchise, has demonstrated itself a valuable watchdog for the people and has proved its worth for the State of Victoria. It will continue to do so during the Parliamentary term that is now ahead of honourable members. I say without hesitation that we, on this side of the House, will offer our co-operation to the Government in getting its essential legislation passed and in ordering the business of the House so that undue delays will not be encountered. In return, we would expect that decencies would be shown to us and that there would be proper consultation on procedural and other matters.

I want it to be said that we did not appreciate the fact that tonight the Labor Government used a motion in relation to the death of a member to take a political advantage and avoid question time proceeding at that stage without any warning to the Opposition. Good relations and the smooth running of the House and of its business depend on mutual consultation, good faith and trust. We offer it on this side of the House; we expect it in return and we

believe it is an essential prerequisite to the proper running of the business of this House.

I turn now to other issues. I must say that, despite the clear mandate of the people to the Government, there are aspects which concern members on this side of the House and which cause me to move an amendment to the motion for an Address-in-Reply. I therefore move, as an amendment:

That the following words be added to the proposed Address:

"but express our concern at the failure of the Government to inform the people of Victoria fully, truthfully and in advance, of its real intentions, particularly with respect to financial and industrial matters."

I shall deal first with industrial questions. I express my conviction that the people of Victoria are appalled at the fact that the Government withdrew from deregistration proceedings against a union which has clearly been guilty of industrial blackmail, intimidation on a wide scale and occasional violence in addition. If that was the intention of the Government, that intention should have been made clearly known to the electorate. It was the intention of the present members of the Government before the election, a fact which can be clearly established beyond doubt. The Minister for Economic Development, Mr Landeryou, has purportedly relied on advice given to him by the Director of Industrial Relations after the election. I will have something to say about that in a moment or two, but that is no more than a smokescreen, because the decision was taken in advance.

The Minister evaded the issue when asked whether Labor Ministers of this Government were bound by decisions of the State conference of his party and by decisions of its administrative committee. He merely said that they were members of the Labor Party, which honourable members all know. Honourable members also know that, as such members, they are in fact bound.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Why did you ask the question? You knew the answer.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—You frequently ask questions to which you know the answers. It is a matter of getting it on the record and I am happy to place on

the record that Ministers of the Labor Government are bound by decisions of the State conference and the administrative committee of their party, as provided by their constitution. There is no doubt about that. The effect of decisions of the administrative committee of the Labor Party on 20 February 1981 and of the State conference of that party on 28 and 29 March 1981 was that a Labor Government would not participate in deregistration proceedings against the Builders Labourers Federation. In other words, that was a party determination made a year ago.

Why was there a conspiracy of silence on that issue during the election campaign? Why was the public of Victoria not informed that that was the intention? Why was that intention hidden from the public? Why is it that, after the election, Mr Landeryou throws up a smokescreen to justify the decision which had already been taken a year in advance?

In throwing up this smokescreen, the Minister for Economic Development has used a public servant in an unconscionable way. It is a matter for Ministers to take responsibility for their own decisions and not to hide behind the views of public servants. To put public servants up as one's reason brings them into the political firing line when the Minister ought to accept that responsibility. The Minister comes into Parliament and should take responsibility for his own actions instead of hiding behind a public servant and using that public servant as his reason for taking certain action. No Minister is bound to accept the advice of the Public Service all the time. He must stand or fall on his explanations to Parliament or his reasons—not his public servants' reasons—for taking one action or another, irrespective of whether the action was recommended by the Public Service. To do otherwise is to make the Public Service political and is to assume that every Minister ought automatically to rubber stamp the views of the Public Service. The Opposition does not for one moment concur with that proposition. The Minister takes into account the advice of the Public Service, then makes up

his or her own mind; the Government makes up its mind. The view that is formed and taken and becomes policy may be based in part on what the Public Service had advised; the Public Service advice may be modified or rejected for reasons which the Government thinks fit, but the Minister takes responsibility and does not make the public servant a political figure or pass the buck to him.

I turn to the question of finance and the answers given tonight by the Minister for Economic Development to Mr Storey. The second question asked by Mr Storey was whether the Minister was a party to any discussions with a view to blaming the previous Government for the financial situation as an excuse for not honouring promises. The answer of the Minister was a simple, "Yes".

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—That is a lie.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—With respect, that is what the Minister said.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—You should listen.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—The Minister has alleged a lie. What I have said is clearly the truth. If the Minister has any doubt, I will have played back for him the question and his answer, which was a smart-aleck answer, "Yes, yes, no." The answer to the second part was that he was a party to these discussions.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—That is not true at all.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—The Minister is now changing the answer he gave.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—I will give you a reply in a minute.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—I would invite the Minister to listen to the tape of what was said. The Minister may now be seeking to say he has made a mistake, but in answer to the question asked by Mr Storey he said he was a party, and the tape of the proceedings would disclose that.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province)—I raise a point of order. Mr Landeryou has called into question what was said in answer to

a question I asked of him. I would ask if the tape could be provided so that the question and the answer, which was repeated on two occasions, could be heard by yourself and the House, Sir.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—Mr President, in time I propose to meet all of the scurrilous points that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition in this debate. There is no point in further delaying the proceedings of the House simply for the political purposes of the Government that was removed so decisively at the recent election. On the point of order, I suggest that it would be an unnecessary delay of the proceedings of the House because I will meet, point by point, all of the matters that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition and he will then understand the substance of the answers I gave earlier today.

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Minister for Minerals and Energy)—I do not believe there is a point of order. Mr Storey has invited you, Mr President, and the House to listen to the tape but he has not made a point of order in relation to the matter before the House in a way that would call on the Chair to take some course of action under the Standing Orders. The honourable member has merely invited the House and you, Sir, to consider listening to the tape at some stage. That does not constitute a point of order, and for that reason I submit that there is no point of order.

The Hon. P. D. BLOCK (Nunawading Province)—On the point of order, members of the Opposition took very careful note of the Minister's answer to Mr Storey's question. His answer of, "Yes; yes; no," was very telling, not only in relation to his absolute arrogance but also in its complete revelation of the activities that the Minister undertook on behalf of his party.

I do not believe the debate can proceed on the basis of the input of the Leader of the Opposition when the Leader of the Government denies categorically that he answered the question in the way that he did. I claim that it is imperative that the matter be cleared

up now so that the debate can proceed with everybody knowing what is being talked about. As matters now stand, nobody knows what is right. Members of the Opposition know, but it has to be dealt with unequivocally.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—If there is any doubt, Sir, I invite you to adjourn the House while you listen to the tape of the question and the answer. I am certainly prepared to have it played over for the benefit of the Minister and the press if necessary, but I would suggest that you should thoroughly satisfy yourself, bearing in mind that the Minister has called me a liar on this issue.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! Unfortunately, I missed the start of the proceedings that have developed into a question of order. I propose to call for a transcript from *Hansard* of the answer to that question. If there is any doubt at all I will have the tape played back. I will invite the Leaders of the parties to enter my suite to see the transcript. I now suspend the sitting and I propose to resume the chair at 10 p.m.

The sitting was suspended at 9.45 p.m. until 10.7 p.m.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—During the suspension of the sitting I checked the transcript. I am satisfied that what has now been circulated is a correct transcript of the question asked and the answer given. If Mr Hunt wishes to speak, by leave, to this matter I am prepared to hear him. If not, the House will resume the debate.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—It is clear from the transcript that three questions were asked. It is also clear from the transcript that the answer to the first two questions was, "Yes." The first of those questions was:

Is the Leader of the Government aware of the claim by Mr Noel Turnbull, the former press secretary of the then Leader of the Opposition, that the tactic of accusing the previous Government of leaving the coffers bare was decided upon more than a year prior to the election and that Mr Landeryou took part in those discussions?

I repeat, the answer was, "Yes". The second question was:

If the honourable gentleman is aware of those allegations, will he inform the House whether he was involved in any conversation of any sort which could have given rise to such an allegation?

The answer again was, "Yes".

Mr President, I understand from the Minister for Economic Development that he regarded the first question as having two parts and his two "Yes" answers were intended to relate to the two parts. But on that basis he should not use such smart-aleck answers and then accuse another speaker of being a liar when he reports them accurately to this House, as I did.

I now turn to other questions asked of the Minister for Economic Development this evening. I draw attention to the fact that the honourable gentleman gave entirely different answers to Mr Block and to me with respect to the document by the Labor Party replying to the costings of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. D. R. White—Was that before 3 April or after? Do you want to contest the election again?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—I specifically asked the Minister for Economic Development tonight whether he confirmed the truth of the answers contained in that document and he said, "Yes". When Mr Block asked a follow-up question the honourable gentleman walked away from that and said that at the time he believed they were true—a different answer again. He alleged that access to departments had been denied for the purpose of compiling these costings. That is not true either. Certainly in my own case the facilities of my department were made available to the Labor spokesman on education if he desired to use them and they were not used in the costing of the promises. There was, between the publication of the Liberal Party costings and the Labor Party response to it, no approach to any Ministry, so far as I am informed, for assistance in costing those promises. What we had was a document that is not costed at all but which evades the cost of the promises.

What it does is walk away from many of the promises made and refuses to provide any funds for the promises or refuses to provide any funds for the provision of base staffing, for instance, which led teachers in schools to believe that huge numbers of additional teachers were to be supplied.

When the picture of the Turnbull article and the answers given by Mr Landeryou to the questions relating to the costing of Labor promises are taken as a whole, it is clear that the Labor Party knew very well that funds were not available in the resources of Victoria to enable it to carry out those promises.

It is clear, too, that the Labor Party had decided upon a deliberate tactic to blame the previous Government as quickly as it possibly could by using the financial statement, that was quickly prepared, as an excuse for postponing the implementation of its promises, perhaps indefinitely.

If the Labor Party did not know the financial situation of Victoria, it has nobody but itself to blame for the previous Treasurer was shouting it from the rooftops for many months. The previous Treasurer went to Premiers Conferences and Australian Loan Council meetings and told them of the desperate situation confronting Victoria and that Victoria was not getting a proper reimbursement of Federal loan funds. Even the Grants Commission confirmed what he had to say.

During the election campaign, the then Premier made it abundantly clear that funds were simply not available to carry out promises of this nature or of this magnitude. Yet the Labor Party, on its first day in office after it was sworn in, claimed suddenly that it was faced with a state of affairs different from that which it had imagined.

Of course, the assumption that huge funds were available was in its own imagination for we had made it abundantly clear that those funds were not there.

The Opposition regards action, such as the withdrawal from the proceedings to deregister the Builders Labourers

Federation, as particularly serious. The intention to do this ought to have been made known by an honest Government prior to the election rather than immediately afterwards.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU
(Minister for Economic Development)

—As I understand the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, it is that the following words be added to the proposed address:

but expressing its concern at the failure of the Government to inform the people of Victoria fully, truthfully and in advance, of its real intentions, particularly with respect to financial and industrial matters.

I am one of those in this House and in general who has the highest regard for the competence and the degree of administrative skill—I often question his judgment—of Mr Alan Hunt, but tonight the House has been entertained, if that word can be properly used, by the Leader of a party which is really in great disarray, which has had to suffer the greatest defeat of any Government in the history of this State, but still the honourable member comes before the House tonight using high school-type debate and tactics, to try to divert attention from the most appalling record of the previous Administration when it was in Government.

His amendment to the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply, so ably moved by the father of the House, Mr Walton, did not display the ability for which he has a reputation. I must apologize for wasting the time of the House with respect to financial matters, but I assumed that the Leader of the Opposition was serious in moving his amendment and in doing so that he was going to speak about financial matters. However, he did not do so, other than to allude to this matter. Of course, he was present, as I was, during question time in another place and so heard the present Treasurer reply to the tired, timid and apparently weak men opposite who were responsible for the financial mismanagement of this State. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition did not want to introduce the same subject-matter again and receive the same drubbing in this House, but I shall

give it to him anyway because it is important to the Government that the people of this State, who are represented in this House in such a gerrymandered way, understand the financial mess that the so-called Treasurer in the previous Government led Victoria into.

As the Minister for Minerals and Energy alluded to in replying to a question asked earlier this evening, the previous Government knew that it was employing the techniques of a bankrupt to try to avoid electoral responsibility and to hang on at all costs. It was not a question of starving the education system of funds. It was not just a question of running down the transport system. It was not just a question of protecting new federalism that was once supported by the Victorian Branch of the Liberal Party, although only at Federal election time and never at State election time. It was not just adopting policies that had disastrous effects upon the economy or allowing small businesses to go broke at a record level. It was not just allowing hospitals to run down their services or having the former Minister of Health signing letters committing funds which he knew he did not have. The facts are that the previous Government is guilty of all that and its members must share that responsibility.

As I stated earlier, I respected the Leader of the Opposition as an administrator in the previous Government but when he came into the House tonight I assumed that at his first opportunity he would not have engaged in political point scoring by asking some stupid school boy question that had been asked earlier. One must remember that he is in his position because the rural rump is responsible for his election to his position but in fact instead of asking a serious question about Government administration by an inexperienced Government, he attempted political point scoring about the policies of the Australian Labor Party.

I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition had his heart in his task tonight and his absurd performance in asking for the tape to be checked and asking you, Mr President, to hold his

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou

hand and have checked the transcript of a question asked by one of the members of the front bench was purely to divert attention. That is what the honourable member did and the sitting was suspended and the tape and the transcript checked, but I suggest that I should ignore that and deal with the facts of the matter.

In fact, the Government faces enormous fiscal problems in this financial year because of the deliberate electoral cheating of the former Government. It knew that it was spending funds that were not available.

I turn to a number of matters, in particular a note from Mr I. G. Baker, the Director of Finance in the Treasury. I propose to read it to illustrate the masquerade that occurred in this State and in this country by the financial managers that governed this State. "We will lower interest rates. We will return wage indexation. We will maintain Medibank"—remember all those political promises made by the Liberal Party's beloved Federal Leader under the banner of new federalism! The Liberal Party had no intention of carrying out those things and it knows it. The Liberal Party committed 120 000 people in this State to unemployment and it did not do anything about it. When I, in a previous sessional period of Parliament, accused Mr Block of supporting previous Federal Government policies in respect of that matter, I was thrown out. That is the hypocrisy followed, Mr President, under your Government, and the Liberal Party has to live with the shame and degradation of the unemployed. It is responsible for that.

Mr Baker's note to the Treasurer reads as follows:

I refer to your request for advice about the developing deterioration in the Current Account of the Budget for 1981-82.

Late in 1981 it became clear that there would be a net deterioration of some significance, principally because of the size and timing of wage and salary awards which had not been foreseen when the Budget was introduced in September.

Mr Chamberlain interjects and says, "Who caused that?". In fact, the high inflation rate in this country has been

caused by the Liberal Party at a national and State level. I shall continue to read the memorandum.

A confidential Treasury Minute of 2 December 1981 to the Treasurer, in the context of a consideration of hospital finances, gave an expected over-all current account shortfall of the order of \$62.5 million.

The magnitude of the Current Account deficit which was developing became clearer in the regular review of the Budget which was completed early in January 1982.

In a formal sense this was brought to the notice of the Treasurer in a confidential Treasury Minute dated 3 February 1982 which also outlined possible options for action to offset the shortfall. At that time the estimated Current Account deficit was \$56.6 million.

The memorandum is signed by the Director of Finance.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Is there a date on it?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—It is dated 27 April 1982. In my view, and from the point of view of the Government, that meets conclusively the nonsense that has been argued by the Leader of the Opposition that in some way we, as a Government, are not prepared to honour our obligations to the people of this State in respect of our policies. Mr Block did all the sums for the Liberal Party and mucked them all up. Even the present Leader of the Opposition in another place concedes that fact.

The present Government is committed to using far more efficiently the resources available to Government, and my Government is going to do that under the management of the Victorian Development Fund. The present Leader of the Opposition in this place did not seem to understand the difference between recurrent expenditure and capital expenditure. Hopefully, during this debate on the Address-in-Reply, members of the Government will be able to educate the honourable member in time to know whether he is serious on the question of Supply, on which he accused us of trying to create a smoke-screen.

The Liberal Party had opportunities in previous sessions of Parliament to amend the Constitution. There are people on the back bench of the Opposition who, when in Government, made private commitments to seek reform of

the Constitution that governed the operation and power of this House, and the Opposition will very shortly be put to the test by this Government and reminded of that.

So far as I am concerned there is no difference between the present Leader of the Opposition and those who have gone before him in positions of power in this House. They are all demagogues, talking about acknowledging the importance of democracy. The present, disastrous Prime Minister abused the powers of the Senate and completely wrecked the conventions that existed in the national Government, and there was no intention leading up to that. The contribution by the Opposition so far has been pathetic, but if honourable members read past *Hansard* debates in this House, particularly on the question of the so-called blocking of Supply over the banking Bill, they will see the hypocrisy that existed then—three months before the use of the powers of this House to block Supply—and the same assurances that Mr Hunt has publicly given, and repeated again tonight, were then given in the Parliament and to the people of Victoria. It seems very clear that members in Opposition, as in Government, will use any technique that is available to them to try to obtain power by whatever means are available.

I now turn to the matter that caused the brief interlude earlier this evening, and my understanding of the question that was put to me. I put it to you very sincerely, Mr President, in the House, as I did to you privately, there was no doubt in my mind, and I did not need the notes. Mr Storey asked a question, which I saw in four parts. I answered the first three parts of that question, and I deliberately refrained from commenting in respect to my rights as a citizen *versus* those of Mr Turnbull. The House will subsequently understand the importance of that comment.

I was asked the question whether I was aware of the claim by Mr Noel Turnbull, the former press secretary of the then Leader of the Opposition, that the tactic of accusing the previous Government of leaving the coffers bare was decided upon more than a year prior

to the election. My answer to that was, "Yes". The next part of the question was whether I had taken part in those discussions, and if I was aware of those allegations would I inform the House whether I was involved in conversation of any sort which could have given rise to such an allegation. My answer was, "I was not". The fourth aspect of the question, as I saw it, did not justify a response for reasons which I think will become apparent to all concerned.

I turn now to the question of industrial matters. There was only one industrial matter. The Leader of the Opposition alluded in his reference to some of the long-standing disputes that confronted this State, and which have been settled by the industrial task force of this Government in the past fortnight. I know that it comes as a great sense of bitterness to the present Opposition, as throughout the recent months that led up to the recent election campaign it was absolutely afraid of the prospect of industrial peace breaking out in this State. Fortunately for the outgoing Government, it is now confronted with some people who do know what they are about in the area of industrial relations, and I stress again, Mr President, and I always have, that anyone who claims to have all the answers to this complex and difficult problem that confronts our community is obviously misleading us, but at least there are men and women in the Government who are committed to ensuring that they do not pursue a confrontationist course, but rather engage the parties in consultation.

I turn to the question of the Builders Labourers Federation deregistration and to the position of the Government in respect of that matter. By inference, Mr Hunt claimed that I was hiding behind a public servant. However, I have frequently claimed in this House that deregistration of a union is not a weapon that can be used to the advantage of a Government. This Government has become aware of the advice that was given to the previous Government on this matter. Mr Stelmach, who is the Director of the Office of Industrial Relations Co-ordination, has made it

clear that, from the first time he became aware of the previous Government's intentions towards the Builders Labourers Federation, he has expressed the opinion that there would be no value in the Victorian Government becoming part of the deregistration proceedings against the Builders Labourers Federation. I have here a memorandum dated 20 April from Mr Stelmach on the deregistration proceedings against the Builders Labourers Federation. That memorandum states:

When the Commonwealth Government first announced that it intended to initiate deregistration proceedings against the Builders Labourers Federation, the advice to the Victorian Government from this Office was that it should not join with the Commonwealth in such proceedings.

This advice was based on industrial relations reasons rather than political expediency. The Office continued to offer the Government this advice throughout the sustained overtures from the Commonwealth Government eliciting the Victorian Government's support.

However, for overt political reasons, the Government declined to adopt the Office's recommendations and agreed to become a co-applicant with the Commonwealth Government in the deregistration.

I have here a document written by Mr Douglas and Mr Uren—neither of whom could be described as radicals—giving a legal opinion to the previous Government on the deregistration proceedings. This document is dated 30 March 1982. It is clear from that legal opinion that the previous Government has committed Victorians to a massive political exercise engineered by the present Federal Government and supported by the lackeys in the previous Victorian Cabinet. The advice of the lawyers to the Government was that if it achieved the objective of deregistration, there would have to be substantial changes made to a number of statutes and that if those changes were made "it may not be within the power of any Australian State to deny to a corporation the legal personality given to it by the law of another State or territory". In other words, even if the Government achieved deregistration of the Builders Labourers Federation, it would have to amend a substantial number of statutes and even then there would be serious doubt whether the Victorian Government would be acting within the Constitution.

In terms of industrial relations and the law the previous Government was involved in a nonsense exercise at a blatant political level.

When I discussed the issue with what must have been the weakest Ministers in the history of the weakest Government and I told them that they could have a peace deal with the Builders Labourers Federation on Loy Yang, it took three weeks to obtain a response. That response was yet another legal solution in the form of a Bill that was raced through Parliament. That Bill was used as an example in political advertisements that claimed: "Liberals act".

The Hon. J. V. C. GUEST (Monash Province)—On a point of order, Mr President, should not the Minister table the document to which he is referring?

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. A. J. Hunt—Is the Minister prepared to table the document?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I am certainly prepared to make the document available. The previous Government adopted an outright confrontation approach to industrial relations. The Government's decision to withdraw from the deregistration proceedings was firmly based on the advice it has received. The Government's decision to extend the life of the Royal Commission has been made because the Government is conscious of its obligations to the people of Victoria. It should be noted that, if as a result of the report of the Royal Commission, it is found that any member of the community is in breach of the law, that person will be prosecuted.

Prior to the State election, the previous Government was desperate to create industrial confrontation for political purposes. However, my Leader in another place was smart enough to see through the previous Government's ploy and he appointed experienced people to an industrial relations task force. Those people ensured that the

workers involved in areas like Loy Yang were made aware of the previous Government's attempt to provoke industrial confrontation.

I have here a document, which I shall table, which demonstrates that the approach of the Liberal Party to the deregistration proceedings was to offer an enticement in terms of advice to those contractors who wished to give evidence in the deregistration proceedings. The document indicates that the previous Government would consider various contracts for different Government buildings for different contractors who gave evidence at the deregistration proceedings. I refer to claims for damages arising from information that they may give to such an inquiry. It is an open-ended commitment; it goes further than the Commonwealth inquiry, but in one aspect it is narrower.

I have sought the opinions of legal officers advising the present Government on this matter, because it seems extraordinary that members of the former Government would participate in proceedings aimed at destroying legally the existence of a particular organization and that to obtain what they believed was the assistance of people who would give evidence, they would offer financial inducement. That shows the deplorable level that industrial relations have reached in Victoria and to which the political desperation of honourable members opposite has caused them to sink.

As usual, just as the events of 11 November 1975 proved, they were prepared to do anything to get into power, and they were prepared in Government to use techniques of bankruptcy to finance the State and cover up, despite Treasury advice, leading to a breach of the previous Government's commitments, without considering election commitments, and to a deficit next year approaching \$450 million.

Despite that cover-up, the previous Government was prepared for political purposes, against the advice of its industrial relations experts and its legal advisers, to back the Prime Minister in

his political ploy. The Builders Labourers Federation deregistration proceedings were costing in excess of \$20 000 a week. All the previous Government had to do was to accept the advice of its own advisers, and stop playing politics and using industrial relations as a political football.

Because I intend to stay in Government for a long time there will be many matters on which the trade union movement and the Government will disagree. As my Leader made clear, if the responsible answer to Norm Gallagher or to the Chamber of Manufactures is "No", that is the answer they will get. It will not take six years to get it through our party rooms as it did with some questions put to the previous Government.

The Labor Government is committed to ensure that in the area of financial management it will use every modern tool that is available and will ensure that its election programme will be implemented. It is extraordinary to hear accusations from honourable members who ruled on this side for so long. I confess that the last election was the only election campaign I can recall when the Liberal Party did not promise to roof the railway yards. That promise has been made in every other election campaign for many years, so a new depth of immorality is being reached when a Government that has been in office for only a couple of weeks is already being accused of not honouring election promises. Obviously Mr Storey cannot read legal opinions correctly, when by interjection Opposition members imply that the deficit for this year is our responsibility, whereas it is the responsibility of the previous Government. The total cost of implementing the Liberal Party's electoral promises would mean that the State would face a deficit of \$450 million next year. The Liberal Party is stuck with that.

The Victorian people, not only in the view of the Labor Party but in the view of every responsible observer, made the right decision. They have put into power a Government that is committed to the interests of the State on the basis of all the people of Victoria. The Governor's address today embraced the points that

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou

this Government stands for. It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition did not bother to apply his mind to some of the highly desirable and urgently needed reforms and initiatives that were set out in his Excellency's address. It is a pity that after suffering the greatest defeat that any Government has suffered in Victoria, the Liberal Party has entertained the House with the charade that preceded my contribution to the debate.

Despite all the public assertions the Opposition has made about co-operation and Supply, no assurances have so far been given to remove the prospect that when it is opportune and pragmatic—when November 1975 occurs again—the Liberal Party will revert to type. It will abuse its power, as it has always done, in a House that is notoriously gerrymandered in the interests of the Liberal Party.

On the motion of the Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Day of meeting—Chairman of the State Electricity Commission — Public works depot at Picnic Point—Smorgon Consolidated Industries—Land compensation—Protection for residents of Housing Commission flats—Extension of F19 freeway—Picketing at Noel Searle Pty Ltd —Mt Helen 120A section sewerage schemes—Disposal of toxic chemical wastes—Appointment of Mr Natham, Q.C.—Mining advisory committee—Security cameras—Link between Mulgrave and South Eastern freeways—Casinos—Geelong Hospital

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU
(Minister for Economic Development)
—I move:

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until a date and hour to be fixed by the President, which time and place shall be notified to each honourable member by telegram or letter.

You, Mr President, have indicated to me privately that you are required to notify all honourable members at least seven

days before the calling together of the House and the Government agrees with that proposition.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province)—The motion clearly ought to be moved by leave. Sessional Orders have been adopted to provide for the House to meet on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, and the Opposition would not give leave for the motion to be passed in that form.

This is the start of the session; it has already been indicated that the Legislative Assembly will meet again on 25 May. It is our view, as I previously indicated to Mr Landeryou, that this House should at least meet on that day. If the Government does not then have business ready for us, we could proceed some distance with the Address-in-Reply debate, and then I should be happy to facilitate, with the consent of Mr Dunn, any proposal by Mr Landeryou for a reasonable further adjournment until the business was ready, so it is just a matter of seeing that we are here on deck when the Assembly next meets.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—It is the intention of the Government for this House to meet on the same day as the Assembly, that is 25 May. I was endeavouring to make the point that Opposition members are the ones who continue to argue that this House should exercise its independence, and I believe the President should be given the prerogative of calling the House together and exercising the Council's independence as a House. However, if that is not what members of the Opposition are on about, perhaps I have misunderstood what they have been waffling about for a few years.

I put it to the Leader of the Opposition that it is the intention of the Government that both Houses should meet on that day, and that would be the request I would convey to the President. Whether the House would continue to meet during that week or the next week would be a matter for negotiation between the party Leaders, as has been the custom.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (South Eastern Province) (*By leave*)—If the Leader of the Government amends his motion to refer to 25 May, no problem is involved in meeting on that day and I am sure that a mutually convenient adjournment thereafter would be agreed on.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I imagine we are really having a conversation about nothing in some ways but I just assumed that the words that have fallen from my predecessor's lips on previous occasions had some meaning. I strongly hold to the view that so long as there is a Legislative Council, it should assert its own independence, and just because the other House or the Leader of the Government in another place sends around a memorandum saying what the other House is doing, it should not necessarily follow that the Council should fall into line. The Leader of the Opposition knows what is the intention of the Government. I have said publicly that this House will meet on 25 May.

The Hon. A. J. Hunt—Why do you not put it in a motion?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—I have assumed that Mr Hunt was agreeing with what I have said before. The Council should assert its independence, in view of the way the Government is composed and, in view of the comments made in earlier debates, I am astonished by the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition tonight. I persist with the motion that the Council, at its rising, adjourn to a date to be fixed by the President.

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province)—I appeal to the better nature of the Leader of the House because he is a person of common sense. In this case there is no difference between the parties. The point about the independence of the House is met by the fact that you, Mr President, determine when the session starts, in consultation with the Leader of the Government, and this has happened. The Parliament commenced its first session today.

We are now talking about the adjournment to the next day of meeting. That matter has often been debated in this House. On many occasions the previous Leader of the Government has moved a motion as to the time of the next sitting, and Mr Landeryou in his turn has debated the question. Eventually the two honourable members and their parties have agreed in this House as to the date of the adjournment. We seem to have reached agreement here except that the Minister for Economic Development persists in a motion which does not actually specify the date. I ask the Leader of the House, in light of the reasons I have produced, to amend his motion and to move that the adjournment be until 25 May.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—In view of the Government's policy of consultation and not confrontation, I agree.

By leave, the motion was withdrawn.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I move:

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday, May 25.

The Hon. J. V. C. GUEST (Monash Province)—I express my regret that the Leader of the House, who is now responsible for determining the principal business of this House, should be subject to a criticism which was made of the previous Government by Barry Jones when I first came into this Chamber. He said:

Parliament has been put to sleep.

Some centuries ago an illustrious commentator on political affairs, King James I of England—

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—The honourable member is talking to a motion that the Council, at its rising, adjourn until 25 May. I hope the honourable member can direct his remarks to just that motion.

The Hon. J. V. C. GUEST—I believe the Council ought to sit throughout May. Mr Landeryou's attitude is

evidently that of King James I, as expressed to the Spanish Ambassador, on the Parliamentary institution when he said:

I am surprised that my ancestors should ever have permitted such an institution to come into existence. I am a stranger and found it here when I arrived so that I am obliged to put up with what I cannot get rid of.

Mr Landeryou would know that there are matters which many people in this House would wish to discuss. If the Government seriously wants its business to be expedited when it has Bills to be introduced in this place, surely some further definition and development of the role of the Upper House, into which a lot of thought has been put by members from all parties in this House, should be considered, as well as what sort of system of standing committees might be set up to expedite dealing with the Government's business, and what kind of budgetary preparations should be undertaken for this Council. This was a matter highlighted in the last session when I pointed to the unsatisfactory nature of the preparation of the Budget for this House.

I remind the House and you, Mr President, that when a year ago the then Government attempted to adjourn the House without allowing business which could well have been debated, Mr Landeryou said:

It may well be that the Government's programme does not cover next week. There are, nevertheless, a substantial number of items on the Notice Paper that ought to be discussed.

And in the same debate on which the House divided Mr Mackenzie referred to his own private members' Bills on the Notice Paper. There is now much potential business, apart from what I have already referred to, and questions could be asked. The House has a new facility which has never been used in the Standing Orders for urgency motions. There are questions on notice which can be put on notice only when the House is sitting. I seriously suggest that this House should, as has been so often argued in the past by the party which is now the Government, be put to work.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER (Western Province)—I raise a matter of topical interest which falls within the jurisdiction of the Minister for Minerals and Energy. I refer specifically to a much publicized statement by the honourable gentleman during the election campaign, to the effect that a Labor Government, if elected, would sack the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission, Mr Trethowan. I ask the Minister whether, in the light of some reflection and no doubt some consultation with his peers and the Premier, a more rational view now prevails and can he now advise the House, the Parliament and the public whether the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission is under threat of imminent and arbitrary dismissal?

The Hon. ROBERT LAWSON (Higinbotham Province)—I address my remarks to the Minister of Forests, who is the representative in this place of the Minister of Public Works. I draw the attention of the honourable gentleman to the public works depot at Picnic Point, Sandringham. The depot is rather shabby and has been placed at that scenic point for many years. It occupies a superb piece of real estate, which it is disfiguring. The council has made numerous requests for its removal. I have made several representations to the previous Minister of Public Works and I had nearly succeeded on the issue when there was a change of Ministers. This matter is important to the people of Sandringham. The land should be released for public use. It could be made into a fine park or used as a viewing area of the sea, the pier, and the harbour at Sandringham.

The Hon. JOAN COXSEGE (Melbourne West Province)—I raise a serious matter with the Minister for Conservation. It is a matter I have raised many times and deals with the granting of approval to Smorgon Consolidated Industries to build a steel mill at Laverton North. Considering that construction of the steel mill is already well

under way and the abysmal track record of this highly political firm, I request the Minister to give an assurance to the people in the province I represent, who are understandably very concerned at the building of the works, that he will take strong action to protect the environment of the western suburbs from being degraded even further.

The Hon. R. J. LONG (Gippsland Province)—I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Conservation which affects many people in the Gippsland Province. Many landowners are threatened with acquisition of their properties by the State Electricity Commission and other Victorian instrumentalities. In the election campaign, the honourable gentleman was recorded in the *Latrobe Valley Express* as stating that the Labor Party hoped to have guidelines drawn up which it proposed to publish a week before the election. In fact, the honourable gentleman went further and stated that the Labor Party had employed a prominent barrister to deal with those guidelines.

In view of the urgency of the matter and the large number of people affected, I request the honourable gentleman to state whether those guidelines have been produced. If they have been produced, I request him to inform me where I may obtain a copy. If the guidelines have not been produced, I request the honourable gentleman to inform me whether the matter has been put into the "too hard" basket and whether he is prepared to name the barrister dealing with those guidelines.

The Hon. G. A. SGRO (Melbourne North Province)—I raise a matter of urgency for the Minister representing the Minister of Housing in this place. I refer to violence occurring at Housing Commission high-rise flats in Richmond and elsewhere and especially to the murder of three persons in those flats. I request the honourable gentleman to inform the House what the Minister intends doing. I understand that the former Minister of Housing made promises of protection some months ago to persons in high-rise flats and, in fact, promised them the world. However, it costs

money to guard those flats and to give police protection to the people living in them.

I request that the Minister take action to protect the tenants of high-rise flats and I remind the honourable gentleman that residents from more than 44 nationalities are using the flats and that extra care should be taken to ensure that those persons coming to Australia from other parts of the world are given protection and respect in this country.

The Hon. H. G. BAYLOR (Boronia Province)—I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister of Forests, who is the representative in this place of the Minister of Transport. Prior to, and during the election campaign and subsequently, the Government has stated that its first priority in transport will be the upgrading of public transport. I seek an assurance that some consideration will be given to the needs of road transport. I refer particularly to the opening of the extension of the F19 Eastern Freeway which is due at the end of May and which will create a large traffic volume in the vicinity of Doncaster Road.

Some consideration must be given to the people living in that area, to residential streets, to access to property and to the needs of motorists and pedestrians. The Government should not follow a narrow policy of excluding and not considering the needs of motorists in its updating of public transport. I seek an assurance that some priority will be given to these urgent needs.

The Hon. D. K. HAYWARD (Monash Province)—I raise a matter with the Leader of the Government in his capacity as Chairman of the Industrial Relations Task Force and as the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry in this place. I refer to the indefinite picketing by members of the Federated Furnishing Trade Society of Australasia, who are actually glaziers, of various firms around Melbourne, particularly Noel Searle Pty Ltd. The picketing is in support of a log of claims concerning both wages and hours. I have received complaints from companies and from individuals. It is a

form of intimidation of that company and, just as importantly, it is a form of intimidation of the public because the pickets prevent delivery of supplies to the firm and goods to retail outlets of the firm. This intimidation is likely to create a breach of the peace.

I request the honourable gentleman to take action to stop the picketing of these firms and to consult with his colleague, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, with a view to preventing any possible breach of the peace arising from the picketing.

The Hon. CLIVE BUBB (Ballarat Province)—I refer the Minister of Water Supply to the sewerage scheme at Mt Helen under section 120A of the Sewerage Districts Act and to the meeting at which the scheme was discussed when expectations were raised from statements made by the honourable gentleman when shadow spokesman for the Labor Party. Many people believe that their capital contribution requirement will be met by the Government or that, if they have already paid, the sum will be refunded. I request the Minister to confirm now whether that course of action will be adopted and, if so, when it will be adopted.

The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN (Western Province)—I refer the Minister for Conservation to an issue that has attracted attention from him dealing with disposal of toxic chemical wastes. On a number of occasions in the House, the honourable gentleman has drawn this problem to the attention of the House. I note that the matter is dealt with at page 13 of *Conservation and Planning: What the ALP Will Do*. The publication is a bit thin on the subject but states:

Meanwhile, millions of gallons of extremely dangerous liquids are stored in unmarked, corroding drums around Melbourne. A serious accident is bound to occur soon, and countless drums of this lethal material have been illegally poured into old mineshafts and disused quarries in Victoria. Urgent action is needed.

In view of the perceived need to provide urgent action, I request him to state what procedures he is proposing to adopt to meet the problem, what will be the proposed strategy and what action will be taken prior to Christmas

to meet the problem. I wish to know whether a disposal system can be expected prior to then. Does the Minister rule out the possibility of using the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works farm at Werribee or the Dargile State Forest for that purpose?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (East Yarra Province)—I raise a matter with the Leader of the Government representing the Attorney-General. It concerns the appointment of Mr Nathan QC as counsel assisting the Attorney-General. I have heard of a number of other different titles but so far as I am aware, no press statement has been released by the Attorney-General concerning this matter which on the face of it appears to be a very important appointment. On the face of it again it appears that the appointment of Mr Nathan is really that of a surrogate Attorney-General, to perform a job which one would expect the Attorney-General to perform.

If the Minister for Economic Development is unable to answer this question tonight, I invite him to obtain the information as soon as possible and let me know.

First of all, I should like to be informed of the terms of appointment of Mr Nathan, whether he is being paid a salary or is he on a retainer and, if so, what is the amount? I should also like to know whether it is a full-time appointment, which I understand it is from the small amount of information which appeared in the media about this appointment.

Secondly, could I be informed as to the duties of Mr Nathan and particularly does he represent the Attorney-General in giving instructions to the Law Department and the various agencies of the Law Department.

Again referring to the meagre press report on this matter, there was one which suggested that Mr Nathan was appointed as liaison between the Law Department and the Department of the Premier which rather suggests that the Premier will have very little to do with the duties of Attorney-General.

I make it quite clear that I have a high regard for Mr Nathan and I am in no way denigrating Mr Nathan, but it is important for a Government which believes in open Government and freedom of information, to ensure that in an important appointment like this, the full details are announced. The term of office ought to be made quite clear just as should the duties of the appointment. Honourable members ought to be informed as precisely as possible concerning this appointment.

I ask that if the Leader of the Government cannot provide an answer tonight to the questions that I have raised, he will provide me with the information in the next few days.

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD (Bendigo Province)—I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister for Minerals and Energy. It refers to an article that appeared on page 3 of the *Age* on 26 April. The article was headed "Committee to study Mines Bill". It referred to a new mining advisory committee that is to be set up by the Minister for Minerals and Energy and the article then listed a number of agencies invited to be represented on the committee. The article refers to the Conservation Council of Victoria, the Prospectors and Miners Association and the Aboriginal community. The article then refers to the Government being represented by the departments of Minerals and Energy, Conservation and Planning and the Environment Protection Authority. The Law Institute of Victoria has been asked to provide an expert in mining law.

Will the Minister indicate the reasons why he has not asked an organization such as the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association, which represents many hundreds of landholders—large and small—who have been adversely affected by the present mining laws, to have a representative on the proposed advisory committee?

Further, will the Minister change his mind and invite the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association to have a representative on that committee so that a more balanced consensus can be obtained?

The Hon. N. B. REID (Bendigo Province)—I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. It relates to the future use of the 25 cameras which were installed for the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. A proposal has come from senior officers of the Victoria Police Force concerning the future use of these cameras. It has been suggested that these cameras be used for surveillance of the housing estate in Elizabeth Street, Richmond. The cameras have been described by senior officers of the Victoria Police Force as being an effective crime fighting tool.

The cameras could be set up on the Richmond housing estate and monitored by police officers at the Richmond police station and thereby used as an effective tool for fighting crime at the Richmond housing estate.

I remind the Minister that in recent months there have been three deaths at that housing estate, one only last Friday. The suggestion has come from members of the Victoria Police Force and I ask the Minister to consider seriously the proposal that cameras be installed at the Richmond housing estate and be used as a surveillance weapon against crime which is prevalent in that area.

The Hon. N. F. STACEY (Chelsea Province)—I raise a matter with the Minister representing the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Transport was recently quoted as indicating that he was reviewing the construction of the freeway link between the Mulgrave Freeway and the South-Eastern Freeway. I do not know whether the Government is aware of the position, but I believe it is a fact that the Princes Highway, east of Melbourne, now carries more traffic than the Hume Highway.

During the past five years a number of new industries have been established in the Dandenong-Springvale area, very much in the distributive and service industry field. Those industries have been established because of the freeway and arterial road system that exists in the Dandenong area.

Therefore, the people in that area believe an early connection between the Mulgrave Freeway and the South-Eastern Freeway is of prime importance, not only for the continuation of their business but also for the development of further small businesses.

I understand that it is thought by the Country Roads Board that work on the widening of the freeway could be completed in 1984 and that some \$37 million has already been expended on that work. Has the Minister of Transport considered exchanging funds or the resources to provide the link between the two freeways?

I seek an assurance from the Minister of Transport that he will give serious consideration to the development of new industry in the Dandenong area in view of the unemployment in that area. I believe that freeway link is essential to the continued development of the area I represent.

The Hon. P. D. BLOCK (Nunawading Province)—My matter of public importance is directed to the Minister for Tourism. In light of the fact that the current Government, prior to becoming the Government, gave many assurances to the electorate that prior to considering the establishment of a casino in Victoria it would conduct a public inquiry, can the Minister for Tourism confirm or deny the fact that the Government has made a decision to introduce a casino in Victoria?

Can the Minister also comment on the extraordinary performance of a prominent member of the Labor Party who went to Queensland to defend an applicant for a casino licence in that State and whether that person subsequently withdrew his licence application and is now a forerunner for a casino licence in Victoria, if a decision has been made by the Government to go ahead with a casino? It is a pretty convoluted question, but I think the Minister for Tourism will get the message!

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Geelong Province)—I raise a matter with the Minister for Minerals and Energy representing the Minister of Health. If the Minister does not know, his colleague,

the Minister of Forests, would know of the growing concern in the Geelong region concerning the future development of the north wing of the Geelong Hospital. This is a \$16.6 million project for which \$200 000 was allocated this year and which has enabled the site to be cleared.

The former Premier, Mr Thompson, gave an assurance that \$2 million would be provided next year to commence the work and a programme was outlined which would bring the north wing into operation by 1985. There will be a desperate need for the facilities and accommodation to be made available in the north wing. I ask the Minister for an assurance about future funding for the north wing of the Geelong Hospital particularly in view of the commitment by the Cain Government of a sum of \$65 million for the transfer of the Queen Victoria Memorial Hospital to Clayton.

I understand that some form of inquiry may be conducted on the basis of examining the needs of Victorian hospitals. Why has an examination not been made of the Queen Victoria project which, as indicated will cost \$65 million when up to date no commitment has been made for the \$16.6 million project at Geelong? Is the Minister in a position to make a commitment? If not, will he take it up with his colleague and give me an answer in writing?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Minister for Economic Development)—Mr Hayward raised a matter concerning a dispute involving Noel Searle Pty Ltd. I became aware of the existence of a dispute and it gives me opportunity to make the position of the Industrial Relations Task Force of Cabinet clear. This is despite the efforts of the Melbourne Herald and Weekly Times Ltd. office. It is not the intention of the Government to interfere in any way with the due process of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

The matter was listed for hearing with the commission early this morning. I would be interested to hear the outcome of that and perhaps, more importantly, that a satisfactory result has been reached. I have not been to my office today, but if there has been no

resolution of the dispute I shall certainly confer with both parties to see if there is anything the Government can do to assist in the resolution of the matter. Concerning the conflict on the picket line, I do not have a view on the matter and I will raise it with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

Mr Storey raised the matter of the appointment of Mr Howard Nathan. I have been told of the appointment but I do not know the circumstances. The Government is departing from the practice of employing press secretaries and calling them personal assistants. I am not aware whether the Premier has made a similar announcement. The intention of the Government is to ensure that Ministerial staff have qualifications other than membership of a political party. Ministerial staff should have skills in the area in which they are to assist the Minister.

The Hon. Haddon Storey—Like the people I employed?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—Presumably that is so. Since the question has been posed by Mr Storey, my response is not directly aimed at him or at his previous appointments. The previous Government—this is not unique because other Governments do it—appointed personal assistants who were press secretaries. That is not the practice of this Government. Mr Nathan is not in that category. He was appointed by the Attorney-General to assist in his function as Attorney-General in the same way as I have appointed people to assist me in my area. Since the matter has been raised, the honourable member is entitled to a direct response and requires a reply from the Attorney-General.

Mr Block raised the issue of a casino and referred to a certain citizen who went to Queensland. I ask Mr Block to raise the matter with me privately and I shall be happy to give a satisfactory response if I can. The Government has not made a decision on the casino matter.

The Hon. E. H. WALKER (Minister for Conservation)—Mrs Coxsedge raised a matter concerning the steel mill of Smorgon Consolidated Industries. She

is quite correct in saying that construction is under way. This is quite legal. Mrs Coxsedge emphasized in her comments the need for an assurance for local people about the effects on the environment in the western suburbs. I have certainly put a great deal of effort into catching up with the facts about Smorgon Consolidated Industries.

I have taken certain action since becoming the Minister responsible for the environmental part of the question. I have asked for a review of zoning in the west which is long overdue. Much of what the people in the western suburbs are suffering from relates to the fact that previous Liberal Governments have allowed new subdivisions and houses to be built close to what is a "noxious industry zone" in the west. This has been so since the 1954 Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme was developed. One cannot turn the clock back, but it is necessary to review zonings in order to improve the environment of these people.

At a meeting prior to the election in the area affected by the Smorgon mill I indicated that it would be my intention to have an environmental effects statement prepared. The guidelines of the 1978 legislation provide that an environmental effects statement cannot take place after construction has begun. That is out of phase.

I have persevered with the notion and am having an environmental report prepared so that we can be fully informed of the effects of the mill on the environment in the west and so that in negotiating the matter of licences with the company proper attention will be given to all issues regarding emissions to air, water, and land and regarding matters of noise. The recently-elected Government cares very much about the environment in the west and will do all it can to stop any further degradation of that environment.

Mr Sgro expressed concern about the violence in Housing Commission flats in Richmond in recent times. The Government is gravely concerned about certain violent tragedies that have occurred recently in Housing Commission estates.

Mr Sgro quite correctly pointed out that a high proportion of nationalities are represented in Housing Commission developments; he mentioned the existence of 45. The Government is particularly concerned about the violence occurring amongst communities of recent immigrants. I shall refer the matter to the Minister of Housing in another place to ascertain the action being taken to solve the problem and provide the honourable member with an early report.

Mr Long raised the matter of land compensation in Gippsland and comments I made prior to the election. He mentioned a series of guidelines that my predecessor, the former Minister for Planning in the previous Government, had issued not long before the election. They had no status as guidelines. The document my predecessor produced was distributed for comment and indicated his direction in regard to compensation, particularly for large projects such as Driffield. I certainly visited the Latrobe Valley a couple of times. I did not simply make comments to the local press; I made some comments on television. I correct Mr Long on this issue. I did not intend to bring forward full guidelines prior to the election but I certainly intended to give a comprehensive comment on the guidelines Mr Lieberman had produced and I did so on television about a week before the election.

I commented on what, in my view, were deficiencies in those guidelines. Mr Long asked me other questions. It is true that I obtained the advice of a barrister prior to the election to help me form a view. I have now briefed the same barrister to report to me as Minister, not with a whole new set of guidelines, but to indicate where he considers the guidelines are weak and how they may be improved. I then intend to have legal advice obtained within the Ministry for Planning so that it can prepare a new set of guidelines, which I believe should be better.

I consider the guidelines that the previous Minister prepared were just a rehash of the existing practices within the Valuation of Land Act and other Acts.

The Hon. Glyn Jenkins—That is not true.

The Hon. E. H. WALKER—They were a set of guidelines that included some initiatives. Difficulties arose in the consultation process and I believe that the previous Minister was remiss in not having enough talks with people in the Latrobe Valley. I have made a commitment, particularly to groups such as the Land Over Coal group, who are most concerned about the matter and prior to making a final announcement, I shall talk to other groups about the guidelines.

Mr Long also asked whether guidelines have been produced. The answer is, "No". As I have indicated, they are in the course of production. He also asked what barrister is assisting me in this regard. In addition to the legal advice within the department, I have asked Mr Stewart Morris, who is a barrister of good standing, to assist me and he is currently working on the matter.

Having answered the bulk of Mr Long's question, I shall deal with the matter raised by Mr Chamberlain in regard to toxic waste. He raised an unnecessary number of questions as I noticed that he had a document in his hand which outlines the fact that the Labor Party will undertake a comprehensive strategy in regard to disposable, intractable trade waste. It is true that millions of litres of waste are stored around Victoria in unmarked drums, much of which has been there for a long time. They are of grave concern, which is not a partisan matter; both parties would agree that this is a problem.

Mr Chamberlain also asked what basic strategy is in operation and what action can other honourable members expect prior to Christmas and whether the Government will rule out the Board of Works site at Werribee and the site at Dargile. A comprehensive strategy is required. I make it clear that I criticized the previous Government strongly for taking three stabs at this issue in a far too arbitrary fashion.

The choice and method involved in the choice of the Dargile site prior to the 1979 election caused a tremendous furore in the area. I am referring to the Bendigo area. The Government was forced to back away from the programme on the basis that it could not sustain its strategy technically. The experts that the local people engaged were much more knowledgeable than the Government had been prepared for. Electoral pressure was applied and the Government of the day withdrew. In addition, on the basis of an Environment Protection Authority strategy that was not well enough prepared, the site at Avalon was chosen. The then Government and the Minister responsible called for a strategy far too quickly and the Environment Protection Authority admitted that it had not had time to prepare a proper strategy. The form of announcement was also wrong. It was a surprise and the reaction was similar to the reaction to the Dargile site. The people at Lara were fearful of what could happen and a great deal of material was produced and public meetings were held. I was critical of the Government and the Minister of the day as they were not willing to attend the meetings that were held about Avalon. They left it to Mr Fraser, the head of the Environment Protection Authority, to take the political punches. Again, the previous Government did not have proper consultation and had not prepared a comprehensive strategy. Of course the strategy that was prepared had to be withdrawn.

Finally, a few weeks before the election, as if to bring some magic out of a bag, an announcement was made that a toxic waste dump would be established at the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works farm at Werribee. The response was entirely predictable. The local people who had been involved with the farm at Lara were fearful that another arbitrary off-the-cuff decision had been made. In that instance, the Minister of Water Supply who was a reasonably new Minister, came into the event because he had some responsibility for the Board of Works farm at Werribee. He was conscious of what had happened in Geelong on a previous

occasion and the attitudes involved. The Government had again not done its homework three times.

In answer to Mr Chamberlain, it is quite clear that because the homework had not been done and because the present Government did the best it could in reviewing the three sites, it was necessary to reassure people in relation to Dargile, Lara, Avalon or Werribee that the Labor Government would not proceed with any of those plans. Because the previous Government did not do its homework properly, an absolute refusal must be offered and that must mean there is no way that the present Government can review those decisions at all. Those sites are out of the question.

Mr Chamberlain asked what is under way. A comprehensive strategy is required and it is clear that a strategy to dispose of this most dangerous material will include a number of methods of disposal. I certainly intend to do my homework properly because I have made enough comments about this matter with the previous Government. Mr Chamberlain also asked whether an answer will be provided before Christmas. I cannot say whether that is possible. If he reads the document he has, he will realize that it will take some time. I suspect that it will take longer than between now and Christmas to prepare a proper and comprehensive strategy.

The problem is urgent and if one makes incorrect decisions about what to do one will fail. There are some short-term solutions the Government will endeavour to take with poly-chlorinated biphenyls, which are some of the most dangerous chemicals. I will endeavour to arrange for the ship *Vulcanis*, which is now owned by American interests, to come to this State. I have conducted inquiries to determine whether that is possible.

Nevertheless, the proposals that will be made will be discussed with the people who may be affected. The public will be informed of the strategy and, wherever a community might be affected, it will be brought into the job and discussions will be held prior to an announcement being made. The history

of mismanagement of the previous Government has left the present Government in a far more difficult position than it ever should have been in. Honourable members such as the defeated member for Geelong Province lost credibility over issues to the extent that he will never be able to go before the electors in his province—

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! This is not a matter to be debated at length in the House. It can be dealt with at another time.

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Minister for Minerals and Energy)—Mr Crozier raised a matter concerning the future position of the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission. The priority of the Government is firstly to fill vacant positions. The position of permanent head was recently advertised to give any person in the community the opportunity of applying for that job. It is then the Government's intention to examine reports of the Public Service Board in respect of the future role and structure of the Department of Minerals and Energy. The Government intends to bring the existing public utilities, in particular the Gas and Fuel Corporation and the State Electricity Commission, both in respect of their capital works programme and their marketing role, under more effective Ministerial control.

As the honourable member will be aware, three of the commissioners, excluding Mr Trethowan, are due for retirement prior to 30 June 1983, and it is the intention of the Government to resolve the issue that the honourable member raised, and all other issues in respect of the future replacement or continuation of the commissioners of the State Electricity Commission and the permanent head of the Department of Minerals and Energy. They are matters that will be resolved by the Cabinet.

Mr Bubb raised the question of the implementation of the Labor Party policy in respect of section 120A schemes at Delacombe. It is clear that this matter does include more than Delacombe. It includes Lilydale, the Bellarine Peninsula, particularly Portarlington, and Mount Martha and Lara. The Govern-

ment chose to consider the question in respect of the people at Chirnside Park and Lilydale in the first instance because they were facing a bill of \$1600 by 16 April. As a result of consultation with the Lilydale Sewerage Authority, and as a result of co-operation on their part, it is hoped to resolve that matter by Friday, 30 April. There was a deferral granted in respect of the commitment to Chirnside Park, and it is hoped to resolve that matter in favour of implementing the Government's policy on Friday. It is also true that on Friday I will meet representatives of Ballarat, particularly the most conspicuous activist in the Delacombe Estate in that area, and representatives of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission in conjunction with representatives of Mount Martha.

In respect of Portarlington, discussions have already commenced in respect of implementing the Government's policy in that area.

Mr Radford raised a question of the establishment of the Mining Advisory Committee and whether the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association would be represented on the Mining Advisory Committee. It is the Government's policy to resurrect the Mining Advisory Committee, which was operative from at least August to November last year and which was in fact a Government advisory committee. It should first be noted that the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association was not represented on the Government's Mining Advisory Committee. The Government is proposing to extend the Mining Advisory Committee to include conservation, planning and Aboriginal affairs, to ensure that their representations and interests on this matter are dealt with before a Bill is introduced in the House. I indicate to Mr Radford that I will be seeing representatives of the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association on another matter on May 11 at 2.30 p.m., and if the association believes it has a bona fide case to be represented on that mining committee then in the interests of producing a piece of legislation which is bi-partisan and reflects the interests

of all those affected by that measure, I shall have no desire to exclude them from representation if it is their wish. Until Mr Radford raised the matter in the House I had not sought any representations from them to be included.

I will take up the matter raised by Mr Jenkins in regard to the north wing of the Geelong Hospital with my colleague, the Minister of Health.

The Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Forests)—Mr Lawson raised a matter in regard to the Public Works Department depot at Sandringham. I am aware of the problem and the eyesore it is. I visited that particular spot and spoke with the then candidate, Mr Graham Ihlein, and members of the local council, and agreed with them that it is an eyesore and that something should be done. I took up the matter with the Public Works Department at that stage, as did the local member. Had I become the Minister of Public Works I had intended that that would be one of the first actions I would take. I will remind the Minister of Public Works of the shopping list I gave him and of the commitments I made. I agree with the honourable member that this eyesore should be removed from the area.

Mrs Baylor raised a matter of transport priorities. I remind Mrs Baylor that the Labor Party transport policy was not arrived at without a great deal of consideration over a long period by many people from all walks of life, including users of various means of transport and motorists. From years of work by a very competent honourable member who is now Minister of Transport, the Government has arrived at a series of priorities which it believes will be in the best interests of the people of Victoria in regard to transport. I will pass on Mrs Baylor's comments to my colleague, the Minister of Transport, and her concern regarding what she sees as priorities in the best interests of the people of Victoria.

Mr Reid raised a matter concerning the future use of CHOGM cameras. The Government believes they should be put to better use than previously, mainly in

regard to traffic control by the Country Roads Board. Mr Reid suggested they should be used for fire protection in the high-rise estates. I would have thought rather than the police using the cameras that they would be better used by the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. A decision is being made on these cameras by the Government, and I will pass on Mr Reid's comments to the Minister concerned.

Mr Stacey raised a matter in regard to the extension of the freeway link in his electorate. He put forward a number of reasons why he believed there was a need for that freeway to be extended. I will pass his comments on to the Minister concerned for consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.48 p.m. until Tuesday, May 25.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 27 April 1982

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT BY COMMISSION

Proceedings commenced at 11.27 a.m. by the Clerk reading His Excellency the Governor's Proclamation convoking Parliament.

The Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar, and intimated that the Commissioner appointed by the Governor to open Parliament (the Honourable Sir John McIntosh Young, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria) requested the attendance of members of the Legislative Assembly in the Chamber of the Legislative Council to hear the Commission read for the commencement and holding of this present session of Parliament.

Honourable members, accompanied by the chief officers of the House, proceeded at once to the Chamber of the Legislative Council.

On the return of members to the Chamber of the Legislative Assembly, the Honourable Sir John McIntosh Young entered the Chamber and was conducted by the Serjeant-at-Arms to the chair.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The Commission (dated 19 April 1982) appointing the Honourable Sir John McIntosh Young to administer the oath of allegiance to members of the Legislative Assembly was read by the Clerk.

The Clerk announced that he had received 81 writs issued by His Excellency the Governor for the election of members to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the several districts of the State, with the names of the members duly endorsed thereon as follows:

District	Member
Albert Park	Ronald William Walsh
Ascot Vale	Cyril Thomas Edmunds
Ballarat North	Alexander Thomas Evans
Ballarat South	Francis Patrick Sheehan

District	Member
Balwyn	James Halford Ramsay
Benalla	Patrick John McNamara
Benambra	Louis Stuart Lieberman
Bendigo	Andrew David Kennedy
Bennettswood	Douglas Richard Newton
Bentleigh	Gordon Stanley Hockley
Berwick	Robert Roy Cameron Maclellan
Box Hill	Margaret Elizabeth Ray
Brighton	Jeannette Tweeddale Patrick
Broadmeadows	John Thomas Wilton
Brunswick	Thomas William Roper
Bundoora	John Cain
Burwood	Jeffrey Gibb Kennett
Carrum	Ian Robert Cathie
Caulfield	Edgar Miles Ponsonby Tanner
Coburg	Peter Murray Gavin
Dandenong	Robert Allen Jolly
Doncaster	Morris Thomas Williams
Dromana	David Lindsay Hasset
Essendon	Barry John Rowe
Evelyn	Maxwell John McDonald
Footscray	Robert Clive Fordham
Forest Hill	John Ingles Richardson
Frankston	Jane Margaret Hill
Geelong East	Graham Keith Ernst
Geelong North	Neil Benjamin Trezise
Geelong West	Hayden Kevin Shell
Gippsland East	Bruce James Evans
Gippsland South	Thomas William Wallace
Gisborne	Thomas Carter Reynolds
Glenhuntly	Gerard Marshall Vaughan
Glenroy	John Albert Culpin
Greensborough	Pauline Therese Toner
Hawthorn	Walter Jona
Heatherton	Peter Cornelius Spyker
Ivanhoe	Anthony John Sheehan
Keilor	John Joseph Ginifer
Kew	Prudence Anne Sibree
Knox	Steven Marshall Crabb
Lowan	William Desmond McGrath
Malvern	Lindsay Hamilton Simpson Thompson
Melbourne	Keith Henry Remington
Mentone	Thomas William Templeton
Midlands	William Thomas Ebery
Mildura	Milton Stanley Whiting
Mitcham	John Dyson Harrowfield
Monbulk	Neil Albert Pope
Morwell	Valerie Joy Callister
Murray Valley	Kenneth Stephen Jasper

Narracan—John Edward Delzoppo
 Niddrie—John Hamilton Simpson
 Noble Park—Terence Richard Norris
 Northcote—Frank Noel Wilkes
 Oakleigh—Charles Race Thorson
 Mathews
 Polwarth—Cecil William John Burgin
 Portland—Donald Kelso McKellar
 Prahran—Robert Henry Miller
 Preston—Carl William Dunn Kirkwood
 Reservoir—James Lionel Simmonds
 Richmond—Theodore Sidiropoulos
 Ringwood—Kay Patricia Setches
 Ripon—Thomas Leslie Austin
 Rodney—Edward James Hann
 St. Kilda—Andrew McCutcheon
 Sandringham—Graham Richard Ihlein
 Shepparton—Peter Ross-Edwards
 South Barwon—Harley Rivers Dickinson
 Springvale—Kevin Francis King
 Sunshine—William Francis Fogarty
 Swan Hill—Alan Raymond Wood
 Syndal—David James Frederick Gray
 Wantirna—Donald Neville Saltmarsh
 Warrandyte—Louis Joseph Hill
 Warrnambool—Ian Winton Smith
 Werribee—Kenneth Alastair Coghil
 Westernport—Alan John Brown
 Williamstown—Gordon Francis Stirling

The recently elected members took and subscribed either the affirmation or the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK—The House will now proceed to the election of a Speaker.

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I propose to the House that Cyril Thomas Edmunds, Esquire, be appointed Speaker.

Mr Edmunds brings to the House fourteen years of experience, having been first elected a member of Parliament in 1967 and having served widely on committees of the House. That service has given Mr Edmunds a wide knowledge of the Parliament's workings both in this Chamber and outside. Accordingly, I am pleased to move—

That Cyril Thomas Edmunds, Esquire, do take the chair of this House as Speaker.

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—It is my pleasure to second the motion that Mr Edmunds be elected Speaker of this House. Mr Edmunds

has the experience, the vigour, the initiative and, above all, the wit to handle the arduous task that lies before him.

Mr EDMUNDS (Ascot Vale)—I accept the nomination and express my deep sense of gratitude for the high honour bestowed upon me by the proposal that I occupy the chair as Speaker of this House.

The CLERK—As there is no other nomination, I declare the honourable member for Ascot Vale duly elected as Speaker.

Mr Edmunds was conducted to the chair by his proposer and seconder.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—I express to the House my sincere thanks for the great honour it has conferred on me by electing me to be Speaker.

Mr CAIN (Premier)—Mr Speaker, I am particularly honoured that my first duty as Premier in this House should be to congratulate you on your election to the extremely important office of Speaker of this House.

You will bring to the office of Speaker a quality and capacity that the House will only learn about in more detail as you demonstrate your capacities in the role of chairing the debates of this House and exercising your authority as Speaker.

Mr Speaker, you bring to the office a background of experience of having been involved in the debates of the House over a long period of time as a member of the Opposition front bench. For many years you have been involved in the various committees of the Parliament and you have a history of involvement in the Australian Labor Party. Indeed, any man who can be a branch secretary of the Australian Labor Party for fifteen years, as you have been, has a real capacity and quality and, most importantly, an understanding of people. An important aspect of the Australian Labor Party is that it has a capacity to ensure that people who serve the party understand people. You, Sir, bring that great capacity to this House. You bring an impartiality, a dignity, and I believe a tolerance, that is important in the fulfilment of those functions. You also

provide a wit, a humour, that is unmatched in this place. You, Mr Speaker, have a very sharp and sometimes biting capacity to respond by quip and by interjection. You are, without question, the best interjector in the place. It may be a title of which you are proud, I am not sure, but you certainly have that capacity and your timing in interjecting is superb. No doubt you will put that talent to good use in the chair and make it clear to people when they are straying beyond your tolerance. I am sure you will use it with devastating effect when the occasion arises.

I believe you will not find it easy to make rulings in this place as you, and those who deputize for you, are required to do on the spot, but your experience and understanding of people, of the members of this House, will equip you to do it.

My party applauds your decision to dispense with some of the formal trappings which have been the custom of your predecessors, and I refer to the robes and wigs. We welcome your initiative in this regard. You seek to bring the Parliament to the people, and more closely to the people than might be the case if you were to insist on some of those trappings of the past. It is not just for the reason you have enunciated regarding the top part of your anatomy. I welcome your decision for more meaningful reasons than that.

Mr Speaker, the Government wishes you well in the task you are undertaking for the next three years, and we pledge to you co-operation and goodwill in helping you to carry out your function as Speaker in the way this House has expected and come to know Speakers to carry out their role.

You follow a long line of notable Speakers who have fulfilled the best traditions in this place and we have no doubt you will do the same in the next three years in which you will occupy this office.

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—On behalf of the Opposition I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to this important position. I cannot speak as a member of that ALP branch to indicate whether

your secretaryship justifies your appointment to this high office. However, Mr Speaker, I believe the appointment of the Government is very sound. You have been a member of the Legislative Assembly for fourteen years. You have been a popular member, and respected on both sides of the House. You have a powerful voice and I know at times it will ring like a clarion call through the precincts of the building.

You have been described as one of the wittiest interjectors in the House, and I trust that as Speaker your interjections will always be orderly. I have no doubt that your unfailing good humour, your ready wit and your impeccable impartiality will enable you and this House to dodge any outbreaks of mass violence. If at some time in the future, Mr Speaker, you care to resort to some form of woollen aid for the "upper house", to wit the head, then we will support you in that also.

Mr Speaker, you have the support of the Opposition. You follow a long line of distinguished Speakers in the Victorian Parliament and we believe you have the personal qualities to carry on the very fine tradition set by those Speakers of the past.

Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—Mr Speaker, on behalf of National Party members, I join with the Premier and with the Leader of the Opposition in congratulating you on your appointment as Speaker. Since you were elected to this place some fifteen years ago you have earned the respect and friendship of those who have known you during that period, and I commend the Government for its choice of Speaker; it could not have done better.

I know that you will treat every honourable member with the same impartiality and the same tolerance and that you will live up to the very high standard of Speakers who have gone before you. Members of the National Party wish you well.

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—Mr Speaker, I join with previous speakers in commending the appointment of yourself to this very important office. As has been mentioned, you have had some fifteen years as a member of

this Legislative Assembly, and you have demonstrated throughout that period a genuine, and a very real concern for the Parliament and for its operation, both as a member representing an electorate, and as a hard-working member of many Parliamentary committees over many years. You have had a most proper preparation for the arduous task that is now before you. In addition, as a very active member of the community, not only in your own electorate but also in a much wider sense, you appreciate the expectations of the Victorian people concerning this Parliament, this Assembly, and the office which you have now taken. You have demonstrated the sort of judgment and integrity that is needed for a Speaker, given the difficulties that face that particular office.

You are part of a long line of great Parliamentary tradition. I am sure you will be very conscious of that tradition, and during your period as Speaker that tradition will be in safe hands and will be passed on unblemished in any way in the future. In addition, you have a very real role to play as the head of many Parliamentary committees that are important to the good operation of Parliament. I refer in particular to the House Committee and to the Standing Orders Committee. The House Committee will have some very important issues facing it over the next few years concerning not only this building but also the provision of services to honourable members and their effect on the community. Similarly, with the Standing Orders Committee, your predecessor went a long way in ensuring that that committee operated successfully to provide up-to-date orders governing the Legislative Assembly. I am sure you will inherit that tradition and that it will be in safe hands indeed as we face important issues concerning our internal governance over this period.

I have great pleasure as the member for Footscray and as Deputy Premier in commending you on this election.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—I thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the National Party, and the Deputy Premier. I thank them for their compli-

ments and their congratulations. I thank all honourable members, particularly of this House, for giving me the opportunity of upholding the great traditions of this Legislative Assembly.

The undoubted rights of all honourable members are important if they are to be responsible to their constituents, but it is equally important that the Speaker should uphold the principles of fairness, firmness and strict impartiality. I assure honourable members that it is my intention, with equal candour, to maintain those principles.

I thank all honourable members for placing their trust in me to follow a long line of Speakers who have been men of the highest calibre, and to ensure that members, whether in the minority or the majority, have their rights and privileges safeguarded in this House. While I hold this position, I intend to maintain those traditions.

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I have to inform the House that I have already ascertained that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive the Speaker in the Library of Parliament House this day at 10 minutes past 2 o'clock. I should like as many members as possible to accompany the Speaker.

The sitting was suspended at 12.40 p.m. until 2.30 p.m.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds) took the chair, and read the prayer.

PRESENTATION OF THE SPEAKER TO THE GOVERNOR

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—I desire to inform the House that I this day presented myself to His Excellency the Governor as the choice of this Assembly, and that His Excellency was pleased to address me in the following terms:

MR SPEAKER,

I have much pleasure in congratulating you on your election to the high and important office of Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

The wise and able manner in which you have always discharged the various duties you have undertaken during your Parliamentary career proves the wisdom of members of the Legislative Assembly in selecting you as their Speaker.

I have every confidence that you will fulfil the duties of that most distinguished office by holding fast to its age-old traditions and customs.

STATE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Usher of the Black Rod brought a message from His Excellency the Governor desiring the attendance of honourable members in the Chamber of the Legislative Council.

The House, headed by the Speaker, proceeded to the Council Chamber.

The sitting was suspended at 2.35 p.m. until 4.5 p.m.

DEATH OF THE HONOURABLE SIR HORACE ROSTILL PETTY

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I move:

That this House expresses its sincere sorrow at the death of the Honourable Sir Horace Rostill Petty, and places on record its acknowledgement of the valuable services rendered by him to the Parliament and the people of Victoria as a Member of the Legislative Assembly for the Electoral District of Toorak from 1952 to 1964, and Minister of Housing from 1955 to 1961, Minister of Immigration from 1956 to 1962, Minister of Public Works from 1961 to 1964 and Agent-General for Victoria in London from 1964 to 1970.

Sir Horace had a distinguished record in the Victorian Parliament for twelve years and brought to it the skills, tenacity and capacity of a person engaged in small business. He conducted his own business for some considerable time before entering Parliament and, I understand, returned to it upon his retirement. The business was carried on by his son.

Sir Horace brought to this place those capacities that people who are concerned in that area have to bring to this place, and made a significant contribution. His service in four Ministeries at a time when certain directions were being taken in two of those Ministeries left a mark on Victoria for some time.

Later Sir Horace served for six years as Agent-General for Victoria in London at a time when considerable activity was taking place in the industrial area and heavy investment being made in Victoria from the United Kingdom, and he played no small part in providing an information service to people from Great Britain who were seeking to establish businesses in this State during

those years. Sir Horace's six-year stint in this position was longer than that which most people have remained in that office. The Government accords its sympathy to Sir Horace's family, and desires that this expression of sorrow be placed on record in the House.

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—I should like to associate the Opposition with the remarks of the Premier in relation to the passing of a former colleague, Sir Horace Petty. I had the privilege of serving with Horace for nine years while he was a member of Parliament and later in the years while he was a member of the Bolte Cabinet.

Sir Horace first came to the House in 1952 as the honourable member for Toorak and remained as the member for that electorate until 1964. When the Bolte Government was formed in 1955, Sir Horace was made Minister of Housing, and retained that portfolio for six years. In 1961 he took over the Public Works portfolio and remained in it for a further three years. For portion of those times—from 1956 to 1962—he also served as Minister of Immigration.

Sir Horace was a decisive administrator. He was a Minister, a member and a person who saw things in shades of black and white rather than grey. He occasionally made enemies, but he also made many friends.

Sir Horace took over the Housing Commission at a difficult time when the post-war shortage of houses was most marked and when the emphasis was upon slum reclamation, a term which is not used these days, but in those days it was very much a challenge. The reports on Melbourne's slums, drafted and formulated by the late Oswald Bartlett, had given a challenge to the people of Victoria to clear the State of sub-standard housing. Sir Horace took up that work with the help of the building industry and the Housing Commission and performed his duties with gusto and enthusiasm. One of his first tasks in those days was to remove a sub-standard settlement—a blot on the landscape called Camp Pell. He did that quickly—before his first year in the housing portfolio ended.

Sir Horace was also a keen supporter of the free enterprise system, and particularly of small business, as the Premier has already indicated. He operated his own small business, and when he retired from active public service he went back to that small business.

In 1964 Sir Horace went to London as Agent-General for the State of Victoria and remained there for six years. He was an enthusiast for Victoria and its people, and made his mark in that important post. Many people who travelled overseas during that period would be grateful to him for the way in which he looked after them during their stay in London.

Sir Horace hated to remain idle, and when he retired from the post of Agent-General, he was determined to do something active, so he went back into his own small business.

Often one of the unusual sights in the Toorak-South Yarra area in the early morning was to see Sir Horace Petty delivering newspapers. If ever a young lad failed to turn up to deliver newspapers, instead of apologizing to his customers, Sir Horace would grab the roll of papers and deliver them himself.

That was typical of the man. He was a man of action, and one who made sure things were done, and done properly. He certainly made his mark in public life in Victoria and is remembered most affectionately by all his former colleagues and by members of the Opposition who had the privilege of knowing him during his period as a Minister of the Crown.

On behalf of the Opposition, I extend to Lady Petty and Sir Horace's two sons and two daughters our deepest sympathy. He will be missed in the public life of Victoria.

Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—I join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in paying tribute to the late Sir Horace Petty, a very distinguished Australian; a member of the Victorian Parliament from 1952 to 1964; a Minister of the

Crown from 1955 to 1964; knighted by Her Majesty in 1964, and Agent-General for Victoria in London, for six years from 1964 to 1970.

Sir Horace had an interesting background: He was a Bachelor of Commerce, University of Melbourne, a news-agent by occupation, a past president of the Authorized Newsagents Association in the early 1950s, a former councillor and mayor of the City of Prahran and during the second world war served as a major in the armoured division. He was an outstanding citizen and interested himself in a host of public activities.

What I admired about him was that when he came back from London he could easily have sat back and enjoyed a comfortable retirement but, instead, he involved himself in a host of activities and served Victoria well.

I remember only too well that at 78 years of age he chaired with great distinction the Australia Day luncheon at the Melbourne Town Hall in January of this year, just three weeks before his death. It was a memorable luncheon. That is my last memory of this great Victorian. I saw him socially, as we were both members of the Naval and Military Club. He and Lady Petty often dined there and he would pass the time of day. Inevitably he would mention politics but mostly matters of public interest and public concern.

On behalf of the National Party, I extend our deepest sympathy to Lady Petty and his children.

Mr MILLER (Prahran)—As a member whose electorate takes in part of Sir Horace Petty's former electorate of Toorak, I join with the leaders of the parties in paying tribute to Sir Horace Petty. He was a distinguished Victorian and Australian. He gave admirable service to this State, both at local government level as a councillor and mayor of the City of Prahran and at the State level, as a Minister of the Crown for a number of years.

Probably his most enduring physical monument is the Horace Petty housing estate in the electorate of Prahran. It is

a tribute to his tenacity and his perceptiveness that that estate was built to house a great many people in Prahran.

Everyone has spoken very highly of Sir Horace because he was a very well regarded man. He was a well-known identity in the Prahran and Toorak areas not only for his political activities but because he ran an exceptionally good newspaper agency.

I express my personal condolences to his widow and family and, on behalf of the residents, ratepayers and others in the City of Prahran.

Mrs PATRICK (Brighton)—I am pleased to be given the privilege of joining in this tribute to Sir Horace Petty, a fine man, a man who will be a great loss to the Victorian community.

He was a man of much energy who had an interest in everything that went on around him. Honourable members have already heard that he had a news-agency. He helped a number of people, and I saw him only a few weeks ago, when he asked me how things were in Brighton. Sir Horace always had a moment to speak to people. He was a humane man who, in all the time he held office, was never too big to speak to people who came to see him, irrespective of how junior they were. At social functions he would even go out of his way to speak to people.

I first met him when he was Minister of Housing. He was held up to me as an example of energy and of what a politician ought to be. I extend my sincere sympathy to his sons and daughters and to his widow, Lady Anne Petty, who helped him greatly in so many ways.

Mr WILKES (Minister for Local Government)—I join with the Leaders of the House and the honourable members for Prahran and Brighton in passing on my condolences to Lady Petty and the family of the late Sir Horace Rostill Petty.

When I first came to this Parliament Sir Horace was Minister of Housing. On one occasion, at which time Sir Horace was a member of the Prahran City Council, I asked him how he could be an independent member of the Prahran

Council and the Liberal Party Minister of Housing. He reassured me by saying that it was easy, that he took off the cloak of Liberalism and left it on the steps of the Prahran Town Hall and proceeded to do his duty. That is the type of man he was.

He was fond of racing and sport and was an excellent Minister. Indeed, I thought the Housing Commission was well run at that time. Honourable members will remember that there was the combination of Sir Horace Petty as Minister of Housing and the late Vic Bradley, appointed by the father of the present Premier of Victoria; later the late Jack Gaskin took over the administration of the Housing Commission in Sir Horace Petty's time and in the time of the present Leader of the Opposition. However, Sir Horace Petty held the reins of the Housing Commission.

He was an excellent and a fair debater in this Parliament. I am bound to say that it was easier to obtain a house from him than from subsequent Ministers of Housing. I take this opportunity of expressing my sympathy to his widow, Lady Petty, and to his family.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—I add my condolences to the family of the late Sir Horace Rostill Petty. I knew him. I met him when I became a member of this Chamber because he frequented this place. He was a forthright person in politics and anyone who knew him as positively as I did was aware of that. We mourn his passing. He was a distinguished person and a distinguished Australian.

The motion was agreed to in silence, honourable members signifying their unanimous agreement by standing in their places.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I move:

That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honourable Sir Horace Rostill Petty, the House do now adjourn until five o'clock this day.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.19 p.m.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds) took the chair at 5.3 p.m.

COMMISSION TO SWEAR MEMBERS

The **SPEAKER** (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds) informed the House that he had received from His Excellency the Governor a commission authorizing him to administer the oath of allegiance or affirmation to such members as had not already taken and subscribed the same since their election.

TABLE OFFICERS

THE SPEAKER—Order! Following arrangements successfully made during the last session of Parliament, I have authorized the Clerk to make arrangements for certain officers of the Legislative Assembly to assist the Clerks at the table of the House as may be necessary from time to time. This will not only improve the flexibility of the House staffing arrangements, but will also advance the training and development of senior staff of the House.

THE MINISTRY

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I desire to inform the House of the composition of the new Ministry and officers of my party in this House.

Legislative Assembly

The Hon. John Cain—Premier, Attorney-General and Minister for Federal Affairs, who will also answer for matters concerned with economic development on behalf of the Minister for Economic Development in the other place.

The Hon. R. C. Fordham—Minister of Education and Minister of Educational Services.

The Hon. I. R. Cathie—Minister of Housing, who will answer on behalf of the Minister for Conservation in another place.

The Hon. S. M. Crabb—Minister of Transport.

The Hon. J. J. Ginifer—Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, who will answer on behalf of the Minister of Forests, Minister of Lands and Minister of Agriculture in another place.

The Hon. R. A. Jolly—Treasurer and Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. C. R. T. Mathews—Minister for the Arts and Minister for Police and Emergency Services, who will answer on behalf of the Minister for Minerals and Energy in another place.

The Hon. T. W. Roper—Minister of Health.

The Hon. J. L. Simmonds—Minister for Employment and Training.

The Hon. J. H. Simpson—Minister of Public Works and Minister for Property and Services, who will answer on behalf of the Minister of Water Supply in another place.

The Hon. P. T. Toner—Minister for Community Welfare Services.

The Hon. N. B. Trezise—Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation, who will answer on behalf of the Minister for Tourism in another place.

The Hon. F. N. Wilkes—Minister for Local Government, who will answer on behalf of the Minister for Planning in another place.

Legislative Council

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Minister for Conservation and Minister for Planning.

The Hon. D. E. Kent—Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. R. A. Mackenzie—Minister of Forests, Minister of Lands and Minister of Soldier Settlement.

The Hon. D. R. White—Minister for Minerals and Energy, Minister of Mines and Minister of Water Supply.

The Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet is Dr K. A. Coghill, M.P., the party secretary is P. C. Spyker, M.P., and the party Whip is R. W. Walsh, M.P.

LEADERSHIP OF PARTIES

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—Mr Speaker, I desire to indicate to the House the names of the official office-bearers of the Opposition. Apart from myself as Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of

the Liberal Party is the Honourable Robert Maclellan, M.P. The Whip of the Opposition is Mr T. W. Templeton, J.P., M.P., and the Secretary of the Parliamentary Liberal Party is the Honourable Robert Knowles, M.L.C.

Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—Mr Speaker, I wish to indicate the office-bearers of the National Party. I have been elected Leader of the National Party. Mr E. J. Hann, the honourable member for Rodney, has been appointed Deputy Leader of the Party. Mr B. J. Evans, the honourable member for Gippsland East, has been appointed Whip of the party, and the Honourable Ken Wright, M.L.C., has been appointed secretary of the party.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

STATE FINANCES

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—Is the Premier aware of the claims by Mr Noel Turnbull, the former highly respected secretary of the previous Leader of the Opposition, Mr F. N. Wilkes, that the tactic being used by the Government at the moment that it will have trouble carrying out its promises because the previous Government left the coffers of the Treasury bare, is in fact, a tactic decided by senior members of the Government when they were in Opposition more than twelve months ago?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—It does not need anybody inside or outside this House to tell the Government the problems that have been encountered with the finances of this State. The Government is aware that the information Treasury gave it was known to the Leader of the Opposition at least seven months ago. He chose not to tell this House or the people of this State of the financial situation into which this State—

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! If questions without notice are to proceed in a seemly way, I ask members of the Opposition and

the Government to remain silent while questions are being asked and while they are being answered.

Mr CAIN—The record speaks for itself so far as the financial situation of this State is concerned. The Leader of the Opposition is well aware of the situation. Treasury has told the Government—it is on the record—what the situation is. In the past two weeks the Government has told the people of Victoria what the position is. I am advised that the assertions by Mr Turnbull are not true, and I accept that.

Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—I refer the Treasurer to recent statements by him that certain Government policies are in jeopardy because of the poor position of Treasury. Will the Treasurer give strong consideration to making a Ministerial statement so that the House can be informed of the true position and honourable members can also be given an opportunity to debate the financial affairs of this State.

Mr JOLLY (Treasurer)—I will give serious consideration to making a Ministerial statement about the state of Victoria's finances because the situation is extremely serious and was revealed to me only after consultation with Treasury officials.

BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr MILLER (Pahran)—Will the Treasurer inform the House when the serious Budget deficit problem facing this State this financial year was first identified and when he became aware of it? What action has been taken since the problem was so identified?

Mr JOLLY (Treasurer)—Treasury officials first identified the magnitude of the deficit problem facing Victoria at the end of 1981, and advice was given to the Treasurer at the time that, if the Government did not take action, the Budget deficit in the Consolidated Fund would be of the order of \$50 million for the current financial year. Following that advice, a review was undertaken and, at the beginning of February 1982,

the Treasurer was advised by Treasury officials that certain action should be taken to rectify the Budget deficit.

As all honourable members would know, by law the Consolidated Fund must be in balance at the end of the financial year. However, following that advice, no action was taken. I assume the only reason for the lack of action was the fact that the election date was set for 3 April. The Government has inherited a serious financial problem. The state of Victoria's finances is the worst it has been for at least twelve financial years, and that statement is based on direct advice provided to me by Treasury officials.

ELECTION PROMISES

Mr MACLELLAN (Berwick)—I refer the Premier to the earlier answer he gave to the Leader of the Opposition. Will the honourable gentleman inform the House whether he was in any way a party to the decision to excuse the dishonouring of his election promises in the way alleged by Mr Turnbull; if not, when did the Premier decide to adopt that tactic?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I have never had any discussions with Mr Turnbull about the matter to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition refers. I repeat that the matters about which the Government has alerted the people of Victoria stand for themselves. The record is there. The state of this State's finances, as alluded to by the Treasurer a short while ago, is a matter of Treasury record. The situation is not of the Government's making; it is of the making of the previous Administration.

The Government will do its best to ensure that Victoria's finances are put back onto a sound footing. That may take some time but the Government will do the best it can. However, little can be done in the current financial year, apart from the matters to which the Treasurer has alluded. Next year, the Government will be concerned about wiping out the projected \$450 million deficit. Again, the Leader of the Opposition, as the then Premier, knew of this

projected deficit late last year at the latest and, for the reasons enunciated by the Treasurer, he did nothing.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE RESOURCE CENTRE PROGRAMME

Mr HANN (Rodney)—Will the Minister of Education advise honourable members whether the Government intends to retain in its existing form the special assistance resource centre programme set out by the former Government approximately eighteen months ago, or whether it intends to modify that programme? Is the Minister aware of the concern expressed by the personnel in these centres regarding permanent appointments which have been advertised, for which applications close this week?

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—I am aware of the concern being expressed by the people involved in these centres and I can understand their concern, given the long delays and indecision in this important area.

Honourable members on both sides of the House would be aware that the previous Minister of Educational Services announced certain changes which were deemed to be an improvement of special assistance resources and services to the schools. Honourable members would also be aware, if they had bothered to read those reports and the comments from schools at the time, that it was essentially a cost-cutting exercise introduced by the Minister as part of the activities of the "cold chisel gang" and that there was no increase whatsoever of services to schools.

The Government has undertaken to review both aspects of the special assistance resource programme—firstly, in terms of the structures themselves and as to whether they are the best way of restructuring special assistance; and secondly, in regard to the notion of the allocation of special assistance resource teachers in schools. I have sought advice from the department on this issue and I should expect a response within the next fortnight at the latest.

The Government supports the notion of providing additional special assistance to schools, but that in fact is not

what was initiated under the previous Minister, as is becoming increasingly evident to the education community.

STAMP DUTY FOR HOME BUYERS

Mr WILTON (Broadmeadows)—The Premier would be aware of the difficulties that have been faced by first home buyers. Can the Premier indicate what steps the Government proposes to take in regard to stamp duty payable by home buyers?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—Stamp duty is one of the matters on which the Government received a resounding mandate at the recent State election. Indeed, stamp duty is one of the matters about which the electorate spoke strongly and directly. The Government proposes, as an early initiative, to introduce legislation to ensure that those first home buyers who purchase homes up to a value of \$50 000 will not be required to pay stamp duty.

The Government has taken steps, through the Minister of Housing, to effect an agreement with the building societies to implement a ceiling on interest rate rates. All home buyers will benefit from what the Minister of Housing has been able to achieve in the short period in which he has been the Minister responsible for housing. That action is in sharp contrast to what was not achieved by the previous Administration when interest rates charged by building societies were going up willy nilly in an area where there is a capacity for a Government to exercise some control.

The Government will introduce legislation to ensure that there is a capacity to fix interest rates charged by building societies. From time to time the Minister of Housing will be announcing other initiatives that will voice the concern of the Government about all home owners—not only those who are first home buyers but also all home buyers—so that those people get a better deal from this Government than they got from the previous Government.

STATE FINANCES

Mr KENNETT (Burwood)—When did the Premier first become aware that there were insufficient funds to honour his Government's election promises?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I have never suggested that there are insufficient funds to honour the Government's election promises. I became aware on the second day or thereabouts of the life of this Government that there were insufficient funds to meet the on-going and already commenced programmes of the previous Government. However, it was obvious from the projected figures that have been conveyed to me through the Treasury that the previous Government had not been prudent and it had not taken steps to ensure that the costs of the projects to which it had committed this State could be met from the existing Treasury resources either this financial year or next financial year.

ELECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

Mr B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East)—The figures supplied by the State Electoral Office show that the Australian Labor Party secured 50·02 per cent of the valid primary votes cast at the recent State election. Through that 50·02 per cent of the votes, the Australian Labor Party secured 60·05 per cent of the seats in this House and 54·5 per cent of the seats contested in the other House. How then can the Premier justify his frequent claims that the weighting of rural electorates constitutes a gerrymander in this Parliament?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I am somewhat fascinated that this matter should concern the honourable member for Gippsland East so soon, especially when the next election is three years away. The Government is determined to ensure that the Parliament passes legislation to determine that the value of votes cast in Victoria are as near as practicable to being equal.

It is true that in a single-member constituency, election results will never—or it is unlikely that they will ever—ensure that the number of seats won by each party corresponds to the proportion of votes each party receives. The Parliament should provide a system of voting that ensures that each person's vote is, as near as practicable, equal to his neighbour's vote. A vote cast in the country should be of no different value to a vote cast in the city.

The only way in which to achieve the perfect mathematical response that the honourable member for Gippsland East seems to contemplate is through a system of proportional representation. If the party to which the honourable member belongs is in favour of that, let him say so. The view of the Government is that the Westminster system is best served by single-member constituencies and it will ensure that, so long as Victoria has that system, the capacity of voters to influence the Government and to record their will will be equal, so far as that is possible.

PENSIONERS

Miss CALLISTER (Morwell)—In view of the difficulties faced by Victoria's 430 000 pensioners, can the Premier advise whether it is the intention of his Government to appoint a Minister to be a contact point for pensioners?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—Yes, it is. The Government recognizes that pensioners in this State have had a rotten deal from the Federal Government for too long and that the State must do what it can to combat the difficulties pensioners are encountering in their day-to-day existence. I have asked the Minister of Health to be a contact point for pensioners, a person to whom pensioners can go and a person whom they can make aware of their needs and requirements.

I have asked the honourable gentleman to be, as it were, an advocate for pensioners with the Federal Government, because that is what is needed. It is time this State stood up to the Federal Government—not only in that regard, but also in other regards. I have asked the Minister of Health to be the agent for those pensioners who have received such a bad deal from the Federal party colleagues of the Opposition. I have asked him to be a pensioners' advocate and to ensure that they have some direct link with a person who can put their case direct to the Federal Government.

STATE TAXES

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—Did the Premier, at a debate between himself and myself at the

Age newspaper office on Friday, 19 March, give an unqualified assurance that State taxes would not be raised?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—In the presence of the Leader of the Opposition, I told the journalists talking with us that, so far as I could see, there was no reason why State taxes should be raised to meet Labor Party programmes. I stand by that. I was not aware at that time that the Leader of the Opposition had left this State's finances in a situation in which it was not possible to ensure that we, as a Government, could continue to meet the programmes that had been commenced by his Government.

The Labor Party did not know that. I stand by what I said. There is no reason for me to say at this stage that there is not a capacity to meet the programmes of this Government, because we will be prudent in managing the affairs and finances of this State and we will endeavour to overcome the problems that have been left behind by the previous Administration. At this time next year, the people will see a much more tightly run and soundly financially based State than they see at present.

ELECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

Mr JASPER (Murray Valley)—I refer to the Premier's recent comment that National Party members of Parliament represent horses, sheep and cattle. While the National Party recognizes that there is a need for redistribution, I ask the Premier whether he is aware that the electorate of Murray Valley has 27 016 voters, compared with the electorate of Melbourne, which is held by a member of the Government party, which has 23 454 electors. Will the Premier confirm that the honourable member for Melbourne represents starlings and pigeons, as well as people?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I recognize the apprehension of the honourable member for Murray Valley, because, leaving aside residents who are not electors because they are migrants who are not naturalized, the electorate which he represents would enable the honourable member to represent far fewer voters who voted for honourable members both on this side of the House and on the other side of the House. If the hon-

ourable member for Murray Valley and his colleague, the honourable member for Gippsland East, want to be mathematical purists concerning the allocation of seats to voters, I remind the House that the National Party holds approximately 10 per cent of the seats in the Legislative Assembly with about 5 per cent of the votes.

All I have ever said is that I do not believe the value of a person's vote ought to depend on where he or she lives. Whether a person lives in Murray Valley, Bundoora, Shepparton, Carrum or Greensborough, his or her vote ought to have the same value, and that is what we intend to bring about.

If it is suggested that there is some difficulty in doing this because of the geographic size of certain electorates, that is another question. If honourable members tell me they need help to enable them to represent their electorates properly, they should say that, because I have respect and some sympathy for that view. It may be necessary to provide additional electoral assistance for those honourable members who represent dispersed electorates and who have large distances to cover, but that is not the present question.

This question is about saying that members of Parliament ought to be elected by the people of this State on the basis of each elector's vote being of equal value. That is the principal issue about which we are prepared to stand up. The National Party—I am not sure about the Opposition yet; perhaps we will hear later—wants to cling on to its unrepresentative charter in country areas because the electorates it represents are large.

It is people that matter; it is people that governments are about—not land, not farms, not pigs, not sheep, but people.

TRANSPORT REGULATION BOARD

Mr WALSH (Albert Park)—I ask the Minister of Transport whether the salaries of the Transport Regulation Board staff have had to be paid from special overdraft funds, and, if that is so, can

the Minister inform the House how this situation arose and advise what steps are being taken to correct the matter.

Mr CRABB (Minister of Transport)—The situation we inherited was that the salaries of the staff of the Transport Regulation Board—almost 1500 of them—were being paid on overdraft, and one of my first duties was to obtain an extension of that overdraft in order that they could be paid.

The reason why the board had no money was that the Treasury was refusing to pay some \$9 million which was owed to the Transport Regulation Board because the previous Minister of Transport, the new Deputy Leader of the Opposition, had made a determination in December last year that those sums were due. A notarized document made under the Act was signed by him and provides "after consulting with the Honourable Treasurer, the Minister does take into account. . ." these certain sums of money. The best information we can gather is that that consultation involved a conversation in the lift.

Not surprisingly, the Treasury refused to endorse that document, and refuses to pay the money, and my department informs me that despite many attempts, the former Minister of Transport, who is now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, was unable to meet with the former Treasurer, who is now the Leader of the Opposition.

The situation was left until the change of Government took place, and the present Treasurer and I have agreed and determined that the payment from the Consolidated Fund and the State Insurance Office will be made on the basis of obtaining costs of collecting the various amounts of money, and that \$5.5 million will be paid into the account. A further \$2 million will be paid shortly. Those matters will be adjusted when the proper apportionment of costs is established in the next few months, and we expect no further problems.

STATE TAXES AND CHARGES

Mr RICHARDSON (Forest Hill)—How does the Premier reconcile his several statements relating to State taxes

and charges with the statement of the Treasurer on Wednesday, 14 April, that the Treasurer could give no guarantee against increases being made in State taxes and charges?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—Both the Treasurer and I have always said that, so far as we can tell, on what we now know, despite the over-commitment of expenditure by the previous Administration, there will be no requirement to raise State taxes and charges to meet the Government's programme. What we will learn when we get the details of some departments remains to be seen. However, on the material so far available, that appears to be the case. That is what we have both said, and we stand by that statement. That remains the position.

DRUNK AND DISORDERLY CONDUCT

Mr McGrath (Lowan)—As a result of what seems to be an increase in the incidence of drunk and disorderly conduct, I ask the Premier, in his capacity as Attorney-General, especially relating to the unfortunate tragedy of Mr Robert Dickson of Bacchus Marsh, what initiatives is the honourable gentleman prepared to take to increase the penalties relating to people convicted of drunk and disorderly conduct at sporting arenas anywhere in the State and/or on public transport?

Mr CAIN (Attorney-General)—The Government has considered the whole question of behaviour at football matches, to which the honourable member is properly alluding. Discussions are to take place between the Ministers for Youth, Sport and Recreation and Police and Emergency Services with police and Victorian Football League officials, I think tomorrow.

It is recognized by the Government and others that the problem to which the honourable member alludes is serious. I am not sure whether additional penalties for those apprehended and convicted will necessarily lead to a lessening of the likelihood of those offences occurring in future.

It appears that we should be looking at ways of preventing these incidents

occurring in the first place. Tomorrow's discussion will examine the whole question of the introduction of drink into places of spectator sport. It is a matter on which we ought to receive the advice of the police and the Victorian Football League.

WORLD TRADE CENTRE

Mr Rowe (Essendon)—Is the Minister of Public Works aware of the existence of two reports into the economic viability of the World Trade Centre and, secondly, has he had the opportunity to read those reports? If so, can he inform the House of the thrust of the recommendations contained in those reports, and, finally, will he make the reports available to honourable members and the public?

Mr Simpson (Minister of Public Works)—Yes, I am very conversant with those two reports. The Baker-Suttie report and what was known as the Public Works Department Treasury report were two reports commissioned in 1978 by the honourable member for Ripon in his capacity as the Minister of Public Works in the previous Administration.

At that time I had the privilege to be the spokesman for the Labor Party during the debate on the enabling legislation for the World Trade Centre to be built. I recall receiving permission from the Minister at that time to go with Mr McInnes who was at that time a member of the National Party and the spokesman in this area. We were shown many documents and reports but failed to be shown those two reports and were told that they were secret and confidential documents.

After being sworn in as Minister of Public Works, I asked my department to have those two reports made available to me. I have since read the reports and, for the benefit of the House, I quote a very brief few lines from the conclusion of the Baker-Suttie report where it states:

We have reached the conclusion that in terms of normal commercial property assessment the project is definitely not economically viable nor would it attract development interest, ownership or finance from the private sector without Government underwriting by way of guarantee of higher than fair market rent or interest charges.

If that material had been available to the Parliament, the Parliament may have taken a different view at that time. Following discussions with the Premier, it is my intention to make both of those reports available to persons who apply to me.

COSTING OF LABOR PARTY ELECTION PROMISES

Mr SMITH (Warrnambool)—Can the Premier advise whether the Government endorses and accepts the document entitled "Labor response to Liberal costing" issued by the Labor Party on 22 March in response to the Liberal Party's costing of Labor election promises?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I do not propose to answer that question with a "Yes" or "No". The document contains a number of assertions that are correct and a number that are not correct. I do not propose to take that question any further.

LABOR PARTY SUPPORT BY TEACHER UNIONS

Mr WHITING (Mildura)—In view of the fact that the Government party reputedly received a donation of some \$170 000 from teacher unions in this State and as those unions have asked their members to wait and see what rewards may be forthcoming from the Government, can the Minister of Education indicate to what extent teachers in this State will receive a return for their investment?

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—The teachers of Victoria, as part of the entire Victorian community, will receive an enormous return on their investment in bringing about a change of Government in Victoria. Throughout the State there was overwhelming evidence of the neglect by the previous administration of our schools and school services, and the Labor Party made it clear during the election campaign that the priority would be to revitalize the education system. That promise will be honoured. Not only will teachers be rewarded for their investment but schools and children will also be rewarded by a Government which has a real commitment to education.

FINANCIAL POSITION OF VICTORIAN HOSPITALS

Mr SPYKER (Heatherton)—Can the Minister of Health inform the House of the financial position of Victorian hospitals as at 3 April, and what steps have been taken by the Government to overcome this serious problem?

Mr ROPER (Minister of Health)—The former and unlamented Minister asks by interjection whether it came as a surprise. It did not, in the sense that there were major problems. During the election campaign I suggested that the Government was being financially irresponsible in relation to hospital funding. I suggested that there would be major deficits but I did not expect to be provided with a document from the Health Commission on the first day of my formally taking up the position of Minister, indicating a shortfall of \$54 million in relation to this State's public hospitals.

As I have said on many occasions, I do not intend to be the Minister for closing hospitals and ending health services in this State but, nonetheless, I was staggered at the financial situation into which the old Thompson Government had got this State's hospital funding.

The first decision by the Labor Government was to ensure funds were provided by Treasury to cover wage rises that have occurred since December last year. At that time the former Government had told hospitals that they could meet the wage rises by bank overdraft, by "funny money" if honourable members like, without any undertakings whatsoever that the overdraft interest payments would be met by the State. Many hospitals were getting to the position where their bankers were no longer prepared to provide them with funds.

The first step of the Government was to ensure that the \$25 million required to cover wage rises was in fact made available so that staff could be paid to the end of this financial year—there were real threats to staff wages in June.

The second step was to communicate with the Commonwealth Government about the major shortfall in its revenue predictions and our revenue predictions

which suggest that Victoria is \$30 million short in that area. The Government has contacted the Commonwealth Government and intends, with the New South Wales Government and other State Governments—both National Party and Liberal Party Governments—to fight the Commonwealth Government for a fairer share so that the Victorian Government can run the hospitals of this State adequately.

The last step the Government has already taken has been to ensure that \$9 million of additional funds is made available to benevolent organizations, such as the Spastic Society and similar charitable organizations, so that they can also meet their wage commitments without having to resort to the use of overdrafts arranged since last December.

The Government will have a policy of paying for health services rather than leaving it to kindly bankers to make overdraft provisions.

APPOINTMENT OF EXTRA POLICE

Mr RAMSAY (Balwyn)—Can the Premier inform the House whether it is the intention of the Government to honour its promise to appoint an extra 1000 police in the State of Victoria and to meet the cost of those policemen from a reduction in vandalism? If so, when and how?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—The Government intends to strengthen the Victoria Police Force over the term of this Parliament—over the next three years. It hopes to increase the effective police personnel in this State by up to 1000.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! I ask the honourable member for Hawthorn to control himself and other honourable members to listen to the answer in silence.

Mr CAIN—This was one of the matters about which comments were made in the document referred to by the honourable member for Warrnambool a short while ago. Some very wild assertions were made by former Government spokesmen in regard to the matters

being put—some are correct and some are totally incorrect. It is a document that mixes fact and assertions.

The Government places the safety of the people of this State on a high level and it intends to ensure that their safety is guaranteed by a Police Force that can meet the needs of the people of this State. That will be done during the term of this Government.

COUNTRY HOUSING

Mr JASPER (Murray Valley)—Is the Minister of Housing aware that over the past eighteen months there have been many areas of country Victoria, and particularly the electorate of Murray Valley where no houses have been built by the Housing Commission or purchased under the spot purchase programme? Will the Minister give an assurance to the House that the new Government will immediately institute a programme of house construction and house purchase under the spot purchase programme in country areas and, more importantly, that funds will be provided to co-operative housing societies throughout the State, and in particular, in the electorate of Murray Valley?

Mr CATHIE (Minister of Housing)—The Government has been very concerned about the state of the building industry in Victoria and for that reason it has been a priority of the Government that additional funds will be provided for a public housing construction programme to provide sufficient housing for public rental purposes. I assure the honourable member for Murray Valley that the Government is immediately examining ways and means of extending the house and land package programme to regional and country Victoria, and it would welcome any proposals which the honourable member might like to make.

There is a Government commitment, in an endeavour to help terminating building societies, and that commitment will be honoured, and additional funds will be provided for terminating building societies and co-operative housing societies in this State.

INTEREST REBATE SCHEME

Mr REMINGTON (Melbourne)—Will the Minister of Housing inform the House as to what status and what working papers existed for the provision of the old Thompson Liberal Government promise of a 1 per cent interest rebate scheme for Victorian home borrowers living in their own homes which was to cost \$60 million?

Mr CATHIE (Minister of Housing)—I thank the honourable member for Melbourne for that question because the Liberal Party campaigned very heavily on that election promise. I have to point out to the House that, to my knowledge, no costing of the scheme ever was completed by the Ministry of Housing.

Mr Kennett—Have you been looking under the carpets of the Ministry?

Mr CATHIE—I would have great difficulty in looking under the carpets because no shred of paper was left in the office of the Minister of Housing. Furthermore, it was never determined which department would manage the scheme, whether Treasury or the Ministry of Housing. No eligibility criterion or working procedures were ever discussed either with divisional executives or anyone else at the Ministry of Housing. No officer at the Ministry of Housing contributed to the development of that policy and election promise of the Liberal Party.

I know of no working papers on it, no files and no memoranda. I feel sure that officers of Treasury must have been consulted at some stage. The Ministry argued that the policy was wrong and that it would be better to increase the interest relief scheme if increasing interest rates were a problem. So far as I can determine from the Ministry point of view, the whole scheme was a hoax.

POLICE SPECIAL BRANCH

Mr JONA (Hawthorn)—I ask the Premier whether it is the intention of the Government to either abolish or change the Special Branch of the Police Force. If it is to be abolished, when and for what reason, and in whom will the important, essential responsibilities of the branch be vested?

Mr CAIN (Premier)—As announced during the election campaign, the Government intends to examine the role of the Police Special Branch and to act in response following that examination in the best interests of the people of Victoria, and not to maintain a Special Branch that has as its role a political function only.

SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS

Mr B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East)—In view of the decision of the Government to dismantle the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting surveillance cameras in Melbourne, will the Minister for Police and Emergency Services arrange for honourable members a demonstration of how the cameras might have been used to carry out surveillance on ordinary members of the community going about their lawful business?

Mr MATHEWS (Minister for Police and Emergency Services)—The subject of the relocation of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting cameras was covered in a strong recommendation from the Road Safety and Traffic Authority that this valuable equipment handed over to the Government by the Commonwealth Government following the conference could make an enormously useful contribution to traffic control in the State.

The Government has reached its decision on this matter in the light of the recommendation from the authority and on the principle that ordinary men and women should be able to go about their business free of the feeling that they are under unwarranted scrutiny. The Police Force understands and respects this principle and I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition and honourable members behind him would likewise do well to understand and respect that principle.

PRISON CONDITIONS

Mr HOCKLEY (Bentleigh)—What action does the Minister for Community Welfare Services intend to take to overcome the appalling conditions in some Victorian prisons?

Mrs TONER (Minister for Community Welfare Services)—I do not want to run away from the fact that I inherited from the former Government a most appalling prison system which is an absolute disgrace to a relatively affluent society. I say this despite the observation of the former Minister that I inherited one of the finest prison systems in the world. The previous Government failed to provide funds on a regular basis. I do not want to run away from the fact that funds are limited. However, the Government will develop rolling three-year strategy plans in areas which have the highest priority. Initially, we will rebuild Fairlea women's prison and review alternatives with respect to a remand centre. My department is already undertaking such a review but will not commit itself to the \$35 million extravaganza which was proposed by the former Minister prior to the election. We are examining responsible options which fit within our Budget and which therefore are able to be proceeded with.

The Government is committed to the improvement of prison industry. The former Minister will be aware of the report from the steering committee into prison industries which indicated that in the correctional services system, the whole of the prison industry system would be closed down because it is so inefficient, had it been operating in the private sector. The Government will examine options in this area which is not a vote winner but which reflects the actions of a responsible Government. We will proceed on a regular programmed basis so that Victoria has an efficient and effective prison system.

STATUTE LAW REVISION COMMITTEE

Role of Upper Houses of Parliament

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—By leave, I move:

That there be presented to this House the Statute Law Revision Committee's interim report relating to The Role of Upper Houses of Parliament.

In brief explanation, the report was adopted by the Statute Law Revision Committee after the last sitting of Parliament but before its prorogation. It is

now in the custody of the Clerk of the House and, in the circumstances, it seems desirable that the report be made available. I thank the Opposition for making it possible for me to raise this matter by leave.

Mr MACLELLAN (Berwick) — It seems regrettable that the House has not moved to re-establish the Statute Law Revision Committee so that the members of the committee could present the interim report on their own account, not necessarily having to do so by leave. It appears that the Government has decided to adopt the procedure of seeking leave to have the document presented, rather than taking the normal course.

The House deserves more explanation than has so far been given by the Deputy Premier of why it is necessary for him to move, by leave, that the report be presented. The normal course of events involves the appointment of members to the Statute Law Revision Committee, which is a joint committee of long standing in Parliament that has carried out significant work and has completed a report on a matter of interest to Parliament. The Minister of Education should explain why it is necessary for him to seek leave to have the report presented to this House, rather than seeking the re-establishment and appointment of the committee, perhaps at a later stage today, so that the chairman or members of the committee, depending on whether the chairman is in this House, can present the report.

There has been a paucity of information from the Government, and the Government has suggested that it is interested in having open Government. If the Government has decided not to maintain the Statute Law Revision Committee, the committee will not be able to present the report to Parliament itself. I consider Parliament deserves an explanation of the position from the Deputy Premier. It is not good enough for the Deputy Premier to stand up, move a procedural motion by leave, and seek to present the report to the Parliament when he has had nothing to do with it. He has never been a member of the committee; he has never done any of the work and so he heads off someone

having the right to present the report in the normal course of events, and does not disclose the Government's intentions in regard to the committee. I suggest that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition be given any leave he needs to make such explanation as he may wish on the matter.

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—I suggest that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should check his Standing Orders and the method of operation of the House. The question of whether the Statute Law Revision Committee is to be reconstituted is irrelevant to the matter before honourable members. The tabling of the report in this way is the normal procedure that is followed in circumstances of this sort, and I should have thought that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would have checked that matter with the Clerks or with the Parliamentary records before making such wild assertions as he was prepared to make.

Because of the concern of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the Statute Law Revision Committee, I can inform him that the Government received a letter from the chairman of that committee asking for the report to be tabled in the way that it has been tabled today. There will be an item dealing with the appointment of committees later tonight, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is well aware, and at that point I will be making a statement to the House, again a matter of which the honourable member is well aware.

The motion was agreed to.

The CLERK presented the report in compliance with the foregoing order.

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER** (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds) presented the further supplementary report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 1981.

It was ordered that the report be laid on the table, and be printed.

Session 1982—3

PAPERS

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

- Building Industry Long Service Leave Board—Report for the year 1980-81.
- Dandenong Valley Authority—Report and statement of accounts for the year ended 30 September 1981.
- Friendly Societies—Report of the Registrar for the year 1980-81.
- Geelong Regional Commission—Report and statement of accounts for the year 1980-81.
- Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board—Report and statement of accounts for the year 1980-81.
- Melbourne Wholesale Fruit and Vegetable Market Trust—Report for the year 1980-81.
- National Companies and Securities Commission—Report and statement of accounts for year 1980-81.
- Police Regulation Act 1958—Determinations Nos. 356 to 359 of the Police Service Board.
- Port of Melbourne Authority—Statement of accounts for the year 1980-81.
- Port of Portland Authority—Statement of accounts for the year 1980-81.
- Post-Secondary Education Commission—Report for the year 1980-81—Ordered to be printed.
- Railways Act 1958—Agreement made between the Victorian Railways Board and Steam Age Australia Pty. Ltd.
- River Murray Commission—Report for the year 1980-81.
- Statutory Rules under the following Acts:
 - Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973—Nos. 75, 78/1982.
 - Agricultural Chemicals Act 1958—Nos. 96, 97/1982.
 - Appeal Costs Fund Act 1964—No. 113/1982.
 - Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1970—Nos. 98, 106/1982.
 - Building Industry Long Service Leave Act 1975—Nos. 530/1981; 107/1982.
 - Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act 1974—Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act 1979—No. 68/1982.
 - Cemeteries Act 1958—No. 55/1982.
 - Coal Mines Act 1958—No. 91/1982.
 - Community Welfare Services Act 1970—No. 518/1981.
 - Companies Act 1961—Nos. 499/1981; 114/1982.
 - Consumer Affairs Act 1972—No. 105/1982.
 - Coroners Act 1958—No. 26/1982.
 - Country Fire Authority Act 1958—Nos. 510, 511/1981; 21, 40, 51 to 53, 88/1982.
 - County Court Act 1958—No. 502/1981.
 - Dentists Act 1972—No. 496/1981.
 - Discharged Servicemen's Preference Act 1943—No. 115/1982.
 - Education Act 1958—No. 70/1982.
 - Education Service Act 1981—No. 74/1982.
 - Environment Protection Act 1970—Nos. 517, 524/1981; 101/1982.

- Evidence Act 1958—Nos. 1, 3/1982.
 Extractive Industries Act 1966—No. 92/1982.
 Firearms Act 1958—Nos. 521, 525, 534/1981.
 Fisheries Act 1968—Nos. 62, 72/1982.
 Forests Act 1958—Nos. 495/1981; 31, 100/1982.
 Friendly Societies Act 1958—No. 60/1982.
 Geelong Harbor Trust Act 1958—No. 509/1981.
 Groundwater Act 1969—No. 90/1982.
 Health Act 1958—Nos. 30, 61/1982.
 Hospitals Remuneration Tribunal Act 1978—No. 66/1982.
 Hospitals Superannuation Act 1965—No. 95/1982.
 Industrial Relations Act 1979—Nos. 8, 108/1982.
 Industrial Training Act 1975—No. 111/1982.
 Juries Act 1967—No. 23/1982.
 Labour and Industry Act 1958—No. 503/1981.
 Land Tax Act 1958—No. 16/1982.
 Law Reform Act 1973—No. 112/1982.
 Liquor Control Act 1968—No. 85/1982.
 Lotteries Gaming and Betting Act 1966—No. 102/1982.
 Magistrates' Courts Act 1971—No. 79/1982.
 Marine Act 1958—Nos. 24, 33, 34, 64, 73/1982.
 Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works Act 1958—Nos. 476, 527/1981.
 Metropolitan Fire Brigades Act 1958—No. 507/1981.
 Milk and Dairy Supervision Act 1958—No. 14/1982.
 Mines Act 1958—No. 93/1982.
 Motor Boating Act 1961—Nos. 19, 39, 50, 77/1982.
 Motor Car Act 1958—Nos. 520/1981; 37, 89/1982.
 Motor Car Traders Act 1973—No. 104/1982.
 National Parks Act 1975—No. 103/1982.
 Nurses Act 1958—No. 65/1982.
 Pay-roll Tax Act 1971—No. 516/1981.
 Physiotherapists Act 1978—No. 531/1981.
 Pipelines Act 1967—No. 28/1982.
 Police Regulation Act 1958—Nos. 7, 46, 54/1982.
 Port of Melbourne Authority Act 1958—Nos. 528, 536/1981; 32/1982.
 Post-Secondary Education Act 1978—Nos. 2, 110/1982.
 Public Service Act 1974—Nos. 500, 501/1981; 9 to 13, 22/1982; PSD Nos. 172, 187, 194 to 213, 215/1981; 1 to 11, 13 to 23, 26 to 48, 51, 53, 54, 57 to 63/1982.
 Racing Act 1958—Nos. 533/1981; 38, 82 to 84, 121 to 123/1982.
 Railways Act 1958—Nos. 526/1981; 4, 81/1982.
 Reference Areas Act 1978—No. 116/1982.
 Road Traffic Act 1958—Nos. 498, 522, 523/1981; 5, 48, 56/1982.
 Scaffolding Act 1971—No. 109/1982.
 Second-hand Dealers Act 1958—Nos. 71, 87/1982.
 Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1981—No. 17/1982.
 Stamps Act 1958—Nos. 505/1981; 25, 29/1982.
 State Bank Act 1958—Nos. 513, 514/1981; 42, 118/1982.
 State Electricity Commission Act 1958—No. 512/1981.
 Stock (Artificial Breeding) Act 1962—No. 58, 59/1982.
 Superannuation Act 1958—No. 20/1982.
 Supreme Court Act 1958—Nos. 506, 535/1981.
 Survey Co-ordination Act 1958—No. 515/1981.
 Tattersall Consultations Act 1958—No. 18/1982.
 The Constitution Act Amendment Act 1958—No. 49/1982.
 Town and Country Planning Act 1961—Nos. 504, 519/1981; 67/1982.
 Transport Regulation Act 1958—No. 508/1981.
 Trustee Companies Act 1958—No. 41/1982.
 Valuation of Land Act 1960—Nos. 529/1981; 99/1982.
 Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act 1958—No. 27/1982.
 Vermin and Noxious Weeds Act 1958—No. 76/1982.
 Water Act 1958—Nos. 35, 36, 43 to 45, 47, 57/1982.
 Wildlife Act 1975—Nos. 532/1981; 63/1982.
 Workers Compensation Act 1958—Nos. 6, 69/1982.
 Youth, Sport and Recreation Act 1972—No. 117/1982.
 Zoological Parks and Gardens Act 1967—No. 15/1982.
 Teaching Service Act 1958:
 Teaching Service—Primary Schools Division (Classification, Salaries and Allowances) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 585, 596) (two papers).
 Teaching Service—Professional (Classification, Salaries and Allowances) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 581, 591, 595) (three papers).
 Teaching Service—Secondary Schools Division (Classification, Salaries and Allowances) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 587, 597) (two papers).
 Teaching Service (Teachers Tribunal) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 582, 583, 584, 588, 590, 592, 593) (seven papers).
 Teaching Service—Technical Schools Division (Classification, Salaries and Allowances) Regulations—Regulations amended (Nos. 580, 586, 589, 594, 598, 599) (six papers).
 Town and Country Planning Act 1961:
 Alexandra—Shire of Alexandra Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 16.
 Ararat—City of Ararat Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 22, 27, 29 (three papers).
 Bacchus Marsh—Shire of Bacchus Marsh Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 14 (Part 2).
 Bairnsdale—Town of Bairnsdale Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 25.
 City of Ballarat Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 58, 61, 64, 65 (four papers).
 Shire of Ballarat Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 12.

- Benalla—Shire of Benalla Planning Scheme 1953, Amendment Nos. 16, 18, 32, 33 (four papers).
- Bungaree—Shire of Bungaree Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 11.
- Cobram—Shire of Cobram Planning Scheme 1979.
- Croydon—City of Croydon Planning Scheme 1961, Amendment Nos. 86, 109, 110, 111 (four papers).
- Eaglehawk:
Borough of Eaglehawk Planning Scheme.
Borough of Eaglehawk Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 1, 2 (two papers).
- Eppalock Planning Scheme:
Amendment No. 2 (Shire of Metcalfe).
Amendment No. 4 (Shire of Strathfield-saye).
- Flinders—Shire of Flinders Planning Scheme 1962, Amendment Nos. 138, 142 (1981), 145 (three papers).
- Frankston—City of Frankston Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 28, 29, 32 (1980), 33 (1981) (four papers).
- French Island Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 5.
- Geelong Regional Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 17 (1980), 20 (Part 1), 21 (Part 1), 24 (Part 1), 25 (Part 1) (1981), 35, 36 (seven papers).
- Horsham—City of Horsham Planning Scheme 1973, Amendment No. 58 (Part 1) (1980).
- Kilmore—Shire of Kilmore Planning Scheme 1973, Amendment Nos. 47 (1980), 48 (1981), 52, 52A (four papers).
- Knox—City of Knox Planning Scheme 1965, Amendment Nos. 223 (Part 2), 226 (1980), 242, 244, 245, 246 (1981) (six papers).
- Lake Tyers to Cape Howe Coastal Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 7.
- Lillydale—Shire of Lillydale Planning Scheme 1958, Amendment Nos. 123, 131 (1980), 144, 146, 150 (five papers).
- Melbourne and Metropolitan Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 3 (Part 1g), 69 (Part 3), (Part 4), 120 (Part 2), 138 (Part 2A), (Part 3), 141 (Part 2A), (Part 2B), 142 (Part 3), 154 (Part 1A), (Part 1B), 155 (Part 2), 156 (Part 1), 158 (Part 1), 159 (Part 1), 160 (Part 1), 175, 179, 180, 195, 196, 197, 199, 200, 204, 207 (26 papers).
- Mildura—City of Mildura Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 34 (1980).
- Moe—City of Moe Planning Scheme 1966, Amendment No. 61 (Part 1).
- Mornington—Shire of Mornington Planning Scheme 1954, Amendment Nos. 133, 136 (1981) (two papers).
- Morwell—Shire of Morwell Planning Scheme 1977, Amendment Nos. 8, 11, 12 (1981) (three papers).
- Numurkah—Shire of Numurkah Planning Scheme 1956, Amendment No. 5.
- Ocean Road Planning Scheme (Shire of Otway), Amendment No. 21.
- Pakenham—Shire of Pakenham Planning Scheme, Part 1, Amendment Nos. 3, 6 (two papers).
- Port Fairy Planning Scheme 1959, Amendment No. 12 (1981).
- Portland:
Shire of Portland Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 17 (1980).
Shire of Portland (Heywood Township) Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 5.
Town of Portland Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 28, 33 (1981), 35 (three papers).
- Rosedale—Shire of Rosedale Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 17 (1980).
- Sale—City of Sale Planning Scheme 1975, Amendment No. 13 (1980), 14 (1981), (two papers).
- Sebastopol—Borough of Sebastopol Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 17, 19 (two papers).
- Seymour Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 46, 54, 57, 58, 59, 62, 64 (seven papers).
- Shepparton—City of Shepparton Planning Scheme 1953, Amendment Nos. 58, 59 (1981) (two papers).
- Sherbrooke—Shire of Sherbrooke Planning Scheme 1965, Amendment No. 143.
- Stawell—Town of Stawell Planning Scheme, Amendment Nos. 22, 23 (1981) (two papers).
- Swan Hill:
Shire of Swan Hill (Castle Donnington) Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 7.
Shire of Swan Hill (Nyah-Nyah West) Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 3.
Shire of Swan Hill (Robinvale) Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 4.
- Wangaratta Sub-Regional Planning Scheme 1976 (City of Wangaratta), Amendment Nos. 8, 10 (two papers).
- Woorayl—Shire of Woorayl Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 53.
- Yea—Shire of Yea Planning Scheme 1979, Amendment No. 3 (1981).
- Town and Country Planning Board—Report for the period ended 2 February 1981—Ordered to be printed.
- Urban Land Authority—Report for the year 1980-81.
- West Gate Bridge Authority—Report and statement of accounts for the period ended 30 June 1981.
- West Moorabool Water Board—Report and statement of accounts for the year 1980-81.

STATUTE LAW REVISION (REPEALS) BILL

Mr CAIN (Premier)—In accordance with the usual practice and in order to preserve the privileges of the House, I move that I have leave to bring in a Bill to revise the statute law of Victoria by repealing spent Acts and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH**Address-in-Reply**

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—I have the honour to report that the House this day attended His Excellency the Governor in the Legislative Council Chamber when His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament of which, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy. As the Speech is printed, and copies are in the hands of honourable members, it will not be necessary for me to read it.

The sitting was suspended at 6.11 p.m. until 8.3 p.m.

Mr McCUTCHEON (St Kilda)—I move:

That the following Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor to both Houses of the Parliament be agreed to by this House—

YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, assembled in Parliament, wish to express our loyalty to our Sovereign, and to thank your Excellency for the Speech which you have made to the Parliament.

It is an honour for me to be asked to move the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. I understand that this motion is traditionally moved and seconded by new members. On this occasion, because of the special significance that it has had for my party and my colleagues, I am deeply honoured.

The election of 3 April saw the highest vote recorded by any political party since 1917. The Government has a resounding seventeen-seat majority in this House. Rarely has a Government in this State been returned with a majority of this size, so the present Government can proceed to its business with the assurance, support and goodwill of the people of this State.

I acknowledge the Speech by His Excellency. It represents the views of the Government and indicates the programme that this House will implement during the autumn sessional period. It was His Excellency's first opening of Parliament and I express good wishes to His Excellency and Lady Murray and express the hope that they will have a successful term in the service of the people of Victoria.

To you, Mr Speaker, I extend my personal congratulations. I wish you well and know that you will discharge your responsibilities with distinction and with the impartiality that befits the office of Speaker.

One of the first impressions gained in this Parliament on a day of this type is that of the traditions of this institution. There is a place for tradition, but one must also recognize that tradition can overwhelm, bind and constrict. I also believe in change and in the need for change. The new Government is committed to policies and programmes that will bring about important changes. In the course of governing it will have to make choices that will involve retaining those traditions that have served the community well. At the same time, it will have to modify and on occasions abandon some traditions, if they no longer serve the community's goals. If Parliament is to be the place where the common life of the people is ordered, this process of adaptation and modification will certainly continue.

I was pleased that the Premier acted so promptly in relation to one long-standing tradition in this community. In this day and age, it is no longer acceptable to define areas for men and women at racing clubs and other public places by means of a white line painted on the ground. Some public organizations have a long tradition of segregation but, in today's terms, segregation of this sort has been evaluated and found wanting. Nevertheless, it has been allowed to remain because no Government has made the simple move required to achieve a very necessary change until this time. So far as the responsibility of Government is concerned, distinctions of that sort in those places where it has jurisdiction should not be tolerated.

This Government will adopt a different approach to the people. The new Government will not acknowledge elites. It will serve the interests of all Victorians and, where interests are in conflict, those interests will be resolved for the benefit of the many and especially in the interests of those in greatest need.

This Labor Government will raise the community's sights and will increase its awareness of the needs of individuals. The Labor Government's philosophy is not a free enterprise philosophy which allows the few to make headway at the expense of the many. It is a much more difficult and demanding task to be committed to equality of opportunity for all; to be committed to open government; to be committed to freedom of information, to the devolution of power and decision-making, and this should be seen in sharp contrast to the elitism and patronage systems of the previous Government.

A Labor Government will respond to people and their needs. The test of a Government's compassion is perhaps the acid test—the test that will give a pointer to the likely survival of this system of government in future generations. Today we face the pressing issues of unemployment and poverty. As a community we are becoming immune to the desperate plight of others.

The report of the Victorian Emergency Relief Committee published in March carries a stark message. It points to the fact that nearly half a million Australians are unemployed, and, when added to what has been termed as the hidden unemployed, the figure is estimated to be closer to 1 million—certainly in excess of 900 000. Some 240 000 of those unemployed and hidden unemployed are Victorians.

Secondly, as the report says:

Even by the most austere measures, somewhere between 1 million and 2 million Australians are poor. They do not have enough to live on. All this in a rich country where income per head of population is amongst the highest in the world.

The Salvation Army was reported in the last week as saying that the level of demand for welfare assistance in Victoria is the heaviest for 50 years—that is to say, the worst since the days of the great depression.

The fact is that poverty and unemployment are in the first place Federal Government issues, and present Federal Government policies are a major cause of the levels of poverty and unemployment. Further, the report claims that the Federal Government has failed

in its constitutional role of providing an adequate income for all Australians and has failed to create a healthy, stable and equitable society. It is clearly also a major concern of the new Government in this State to take what action it can to alleviate the obvious distress of so many Victorians.

The Government's programme of community welfare services will be taxed to the limit. At the same time it will have the responsibility of drawing public attention to the failure of the Federal Government to discharge its responsibilities. The Victorian Government will also press the Federal Government for change as a matter of urgency. Priority must also be placed on the work of the task force to be set up by the Minister for Community Welfare Services announced by His Excellency this afternoon.

One further area that impinges directly on the poor and the unemployed is that of public sector housing. There are ever-increasing numbers of people who cannot afford home ownership. They have to rent accommodation, and currently private sector rents are higher than they can afford. Furthermore, insufficient rental housing is available in the public sector.

The Green Paper on housing stated that some 100 000 households in Victoria were in need of housing assistance. That was the figure in 1980. It could well be higher now in 1982. The Green Paper suggested that a target for Government of 3600 houses and flats per year should be set if any significant impact should be made on this housing situation.

The previous Government had an appalling record in which it had sold more than 50 per cent of its public housing stock over the years. It only recently moved to halt those sales. It also had the lowest *per capita* expenditure of any State on public housing. Coupled with the savage cuts by the Federal Government to the public housing sector through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, this has meant that the prospect for achieving any improvement in Victoria has been forlorn.

The new Government has allocated more than \$70 million from the Victorian Development Fund to the housing budget. It has set a target of 2500 houses and flats, which is based on the funds it can allocate from the State and on those it can predict will come from Canberra. If the growing criticism of the Federal Government's low housing allocations leads to more funds being provided, these will be added to the funds already earmarked for this purpose.

Other aspects of Labor housing policy are to encourage innovative housing programmes, including more co-operative housing associations, more tenant participation in management and more housing for special groups in need. The housing issue particularly illustrates an area in which something effective can be done by a Government with compassion.

Accountability is an issue that is growing in importance as the business of government has expanded in size and complexity. Accountability applies not only to politicians; it applies also to the public sector, the Ministries and departments of Government and to the many thousands of public bodies and authorities in this State.

The work of the Public Bodies Review Committee since March 1980 has been of much importance in this regard. The former chairman of that committee said recently:

Few people, least of all members of the Liberal Government, realized that the formation of the innocuously titled innocuously introduced Public Bodies Review Committee would change for ever the nature of political debate in Victoria.

That was a strong comment when one considers that the work of this committee has been largely to examine the accountability of the State's public bodies.

The committee has been responsible for the first efforts to report critically on the main features of Victoria's public bodies and public sector management. During the course of its work it has drawn the attention of honourable members to gross deficiencies in the management of this State's scarce public resources. It has also emphasized the importance of sound economic

management as a requirement of good Government. Many of the measures that the new Government will seek to implement are the result of experience gained in the work of this committee.

I have spent seven years as a member of one of the State's largest public bodies, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. Along with many others I have been critical of the accountability of this body which is a rating authority that spends nearly \$300 million each year. Prior to the changes made to the board in 1978, the 54-member board was structured in a way that made it very difficult for board members even to know about the many decisions for which they were, in law, responsible. After 1978, in an amended board, the seven members were in a position to gain a much more comprehensive view of their responsibilities, but in many ways this new smaller board was less accountable to the rate-payers than the previous board.

In improving the processes of Government accountability, that is reporting and demonstrating that responsible management on behalf of the people has been carried out, many new methods and measures will need to be introduced. The public basically wants to know that its dollar is being wisely spent, that there are proper means of reviewing expenditure, that Government programmes are being assessed and measured in dollar value, that the means of undertaking Government and public sector programmes are up to date, efficiently planned and effectively monitored.

Until very recent times this has not been the case. It is only now that attention is being focused on Government efficiency, on Government departmental and authority budgetary processes, efficiency audits and other means to ensure an effective Public Service and Government process.

His Excellency outlined that legislation would be introduced to cover freedom of information, and Labor in Government is committed to making that Government more open. Many of its programmes will encourage the shift of

decision-making power to regions and areas closer to those who will have to live with the decisions.

For many people Government and the bureaucracy are remote and aloof. A concern of the Government will be to bridge the gulf between people and the bureaucracy. A critical area will be that in which the Government consults with the community. It is obvious that the Labor Government places a high priority on consultation and on participation in decision-making. Important lessons are to be learned from the experience of previous Governments. A classic example of an attempt at Government community consultation was tenancy law reform. Under pressure at the 1976 election, the former Government agreed to reform tenancy law. After the election, a community committee was set up with the then Minister's approval and that committee worked for three years to produce a report and recommendations. The Government then prepared a Bill which included many but not all of the chief recommendations of the community committee. During the introduction of the Bill into Parliament, the Government was lobbied by interests outside the community committee which led to the Bill being dropped and a new Bill being drafted with significant changes and concessions to the lobby groups.

The Government failed to consult with the community committee about these changes. It departed from the consultative process that it had commenced. It moved in response to pressure from those who had its ear. The second Bill led to a protest boycott of Government consultations by many community groups.

Finally, when yet another Bill was introduced into Parliament, which differed again from the second Bill, the Government made little allowance for debate and amendment to the Bill in its course through the Parliament. What could have been an important pilot project for consultation on an important community issue—tenancy law reform—degenerated into a process where the expectations of the participants were finally dashed.

Much work has been done in assessing that pilot project to try to identify what steps should be followed for any future Government community consultation. It is clear that each step in the process should be stated clearly and agreement reached before it is commenced so that false expectations are not raised and the process of consultation does not end in disillusionment.

The new Government is committed to making the process of government more acceptable, more understandable and more open to the people. I am critical of the consultative performance of the former Government. It listened to its friends; clearly some sections of the community had access to that Government and enjoyed a privileged position of influence. In contrast, although given an opportunity of putting their views, other groups and sections of the community seldom received satisfaction from that Government.

For twenty years, I have been a member of many community groups that have sought to put their cases to the Government. Time and again, I have experienced the frustration of being rejected because only rarely did the groups to which I belonged obtain any positive response.

I have been a member of many deputations—as a city councillor and as a member of school councils and various community groups interested in housing issues, traffic and transport, freeway impacts, the environment and many other matters. It is not possible to conclude, and I cannot accept, that all the issues that were brought before the former Government were wrong, unacceptable or unwise. On the majority of occasions, these issues were people issues but the Government of the day had placed its priorities elsewhere. I am proud to be part of a Government party whose concerns and priorities are for and with the people.

I have the honour of representing the electorate of St. Kilda. Many issues to which the new Government is giving its attention are issues of my constituents. Unemployment, tenancy reform, public transport, poverty, housing, education and health—all are important to the

people in the electorate that I represent. St Kilda comprises a wide cross-section of Victorian society and I am proud to be able to represent them in Parliament. I thank them for placing their confidence in me so clearly at the recent poll. I hope to serve the electorate energetically and represent my constituents effectively in Parliament.

Mrs RAY (Box Hill)—I am honoured to second the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. It is an honour, not only for me, but also for the people of Box Hill whom I am pleased to represent in this House. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on attaining the important office you hold in this place and, on behalf of the people of Box Hill, I wish His Excellency Rear-Admiral Sir Brian Murray and Lady Murray a long and happy association with Parliament and the people of Victoria.

The Labor Party comes to Government in Victoria with few people in the electorate having any clear memory of life under a State Labor Government. Historically, in Australia, the Labor Party has been called to govern in times of hardship and disenchantment. It has traditionally stood alongside those who are the victims of injustice. In 1949 the Labor Party was described by Ben Chifley as protecting those who are helpless and without hope. He referred to this objective as "the light on the hill to which our eyes are always turned and to which our efforts are always directed". That social justice remains a strong tenet of Labor Party philosophy was indicated in the legislation outlined in the Governor's Speech—concern for those 118 700 people unemployed in Victoria as at the end of March, of whom about 29 500 are under the age of 21 years. Of those people a disproportionately high number are young women. The Labor Party is concerned at the failure of the Federal Government to assume responsibility for the provision of income security for those on low incomes and concerned for the 750 000 households in rental accommodation that are affected by laws that do not give tenants adequate protection.

The Government has concrete programmes to match these concerns and with sound financial management will carry them out for the benefit of all Victorians. The Labor Party in Victoria, as elsewhere in Australia, grew out of the realization that the only way of securing justice for the working class was through representation and legislation in Parliament. Thus, as early as 1859 the Political Labor League was formed, although it was not until 1891 that a Labor candidate won a seat. That was at a Collingwood by-election.

For today's purposes, a significant date in Victorian ALP history is 1917. That was the occasion of the election of the first John Cain to the Victorian Parliament. He was Premier for two years between 1945 and 1947 and for three years between 1952 and 1955. In that period the Labor Government, although troubled by divisions that led to the Australian Labor Party/Democratic Labor Party split, had an impressive record of achievement, which this Government inherits across a generation gap.

In two areas, namely, electoral reform and workers' protection, the present Cain Government will be building on the work of the last Cain Government. The 1952 election was fought on the issue of electoral reform. The ensuing Cain Government acted to ameliorate the gross electoral distortion that operated in favour of people with rural acres at the expense of metropolitan people. The present Government is committed to the long overdue completion of this process of reform. The Government will be legislating for a one vote, one value system.

A second major achievement of the Government of John Cain senior was the development of Victoria's workers compensation system, which the Labor movement has had to defend in recent times. The present Government intends to build upon that system by initiating a complementary system for the prevention of industrial accidents and the promotion of industrial health. Now, in 1982, the Labor Party has gained Government with an impressive majority. It is the greatest popular mandate in Victoria for more than 60 years.

Some of the pleasing gains have been in the eastern metropolitan area along the Maroondah Highway and radiating out from that area. I refer to them, as the seat I represent is among them. They are the electorates of Warrandyte, Ringwood, Mitcham, Bennettswood, Syndal, Ivanhoe, Noble Park and Box Hill, and the Legislative Council provinces of Nunawading and Templestowe.

Many people in these areas have never been represented by a Labor member, and their expectations are high. To those people—as, indeed, to all Victorians—the Cain Government brings the possibility not of miracles but a new method of decision making. This is perhaps one of the most exciting, if least understood, implications of the change of Government.

This Government, a social democratic Government, believes in consultation and negotiation with people as a means to finding solutions. It recognizes that participation in those areas that most affect one's life is crucial to being a satisfied human being and that real freedom means as full control over one's life as possible. Society has been conditioned over the years to distrust participation. People have become accustomed to decisions made at the top and imposed from the top.

People have been conditioned to believe that there are experts who know, or who ought to know, what is best, and if their decision does not suit us it leaves us free to complain about what is done.

Where there is genuine consultation and community input to the decision-making process, there is also a sense of responsibility for the final decision. It is the aim of the new Government to operate in this way particularly in the areas of industrial relations, community welfare, health and education. It is a very different way of operating from the previous conservative Governments which believed that the way to preserve freedom was by the hierarchical style with limited access and limited participation.

His Excellency the Governor has indicated the Government's intention to act immediately to improve the State's education system and to ensure that

children are adequately prepared for the employment opportunities of the future. However, in the future, whether we like it or not, work will be less dominant; there will be less of it available in the traditional areas and the community will need to adjust its attitude to the compulsory work ethic. In this process of adjustment to social and technological change education will be critical.

In recent times in this State there has been a tendency to define education in narrowly vocational terms. This no doubt has been exacerbated by the economic climate which has markedly increased competition for jobs. There is an urgent need to broaden our perception of education. It needs to be seen not just as bestowing the capacity to earn money but as a means of achieving personal development, creativity and the effectual use of one's time.

The Government will need to expand educational options for both children and adults. Many young people who leave school at the age of fifteen find they want to return later to a less authoritarian environment when they have discovered what they want to learn. Adults, too, need similar opportunities. The Government wants to encourage the idea of recurrent education so that people can "drop out" or "drop in" to education at any stage in life.

The technical and further education colleges, of which there are two in the electorate I represent, are a great community resource in this regard. Although technical in their emphasis at the moment, they can readily develop into highly accessible educational places for specializing, for retraining or for enabling people to gain new skills or pursue new interests in full-time, part-time or off-campus courses.

This Government recognizes the special value of neighbourhood learning centres which have been established through community initiatives. They represent a more informal learning alternative for adults, especially women, who have had difficulty in gaining access to education institutions. They

also provide an environment in which mutual support and encouragement can take place.

Finally, I want to refer to the fact that the 49th Parliament of Victoria has twelve women members. In this election 6 new women members have been added to the Government benches and from July there will be a total of 5 in the Legislative Council and 7 in the Legislative Assembly. They hold the seats of Boronia, Melbourne West and Melbourne North in the Council, and Ringwood, Frankston and Box Hill in the Assembly. Although this is a significant increase it should not make us complacent. In a Government which claims to be truly representative, and in a mature society, there should be equal representation of men and women. If women do not share equally in the decision making and the exercise of power, Parliament suffers because the whole range of human values is not expressed.

For women in the electorate, the increased number of women in the Parliament is very heartening. It is an indication to them that things which women hold to be important are being given some public value. It is also seen as an expression of belief by the electorate as a whole that women are competent to participate in the development of society in this way. In so far as it does this, it increases women's confidence in their own capacity to participate.

That three-quarters of the women members belong to the Labor Party is perhaps a hopeful sign that the traditional conservatism of women is weakening. This will accelerate as both men and women begin to experience increased flexibility and choice in their lives. With freedom to enter new fields, women are likely to become a powerful force for change.

The Government is aware of the women in our society who carry special burdens both economic and emotional. In the individual departmental programmes for the next 18 months outlined by the Governor, the Government is committed to strengthening the

Mrs Ray

women's refuge programme. Migrant women will also benefit from our policy to protect migrants against discrimination in employment and the increased status we will give to ethnic affairs.

I thank the people of Box Hill for the confidence they have shown in the Labor Party and in me. I look forward to representing them in this new Cain Government which is pledged to enhance the wellbeing of all Victorians.

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—In formally speaking to the address delivered by his Excellency the Governor this afternoon, I should like to congratulate the honourable members for St Kilda and Box Hill for their interesting and informative speeches. I also congratulate all new members of the Legislative Assembly, regardless of the party they represent. Every member, when first coming to this House, comes with a feeling of apprehension, to a degree, as if he or she were walking into the lion's den. I wish all members a successful period in this House, without being precise about the term for which they should stay here!

Once again, Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation to the high office of Speaker of the Victorian Legislative Assembly. The "Edmundites" of Ascot Vale will welcome this decision by the Parliament, and, in a short space of time, no doubt you will also be given the freedom of the City of Essendon! It is interesting to note that the last Speaker but one also came from that municipality, and it appears that Essendon is a very good training ground for Speakers of the Legislative Assembly.

I think all honourable members of the Parliament are delighted at the manner in which His Excellency Rear-Admiral Sir Brian Murray, and Lady Murray are carrying out their important duties. Undoubtedly, they will become worthy successors to Sir Henry and Lady Winneke. In the Speech, reference was made to the work of Sir Henry and Lady Winneke. This is the first time that Parliament has assembled since the retirement of Sir Henry Winneke. Unfortunately, in the days of his retirement so far, he has not enjoyed the

same measure of good health that he enjoyed during his eight years as Governor. I have previously paid tribute to the splendid work of Sir Henry as Solicitor-General, as Chief Justice, as Lieutenant-Governor and then, in the past eight years, as Governor of the State of Victoria. There are few towns or hamlets in the whole of Victoria that he or Lady Winneke did not visit during their period of office. Sir Henry went out of his way to mix with Victorians of all types in all geographical areas. He was very much a Governor of the people. Victorians will remember his first class intellect, his scholarship, his wit, his genuine interest in all things Victorian and the keen interest he showed in the sporting pursuits of Victorians.

He was equally at home whether talking with visiting Royalty or with the gardeners at Government House. He mixed readily with people without in any way losing the dignity of his high office. On behalf of the Opposition—and I am sure on behalf of the Parliament—we thank him for his magnificent years of service and extend to him and to Lady Winneke our best wishes for renewed good health during his years of retirement.

I should like to concentrate my opening remarks around that section of His Excellency's Speech that states:

The Government is committed to manage the State to provide for the most effective use of its abundant resources for all Victorians particularly those on middle and lower incomes.

State taxes and charges will be framed with the interests of these groups in mind.

The Government's priorities were clearly outlined during the election campaign.

That is in no way an accurate statement. It is exactly the opposite of what has happened. Let us retrace the steps of what actually occurred. As I indicated during question time today, during a debate at the *Age* office on Friday, 19 March, the Premier was asked by the Editor of the *Age* for an unqualified assurance about whether he would or would not increase State taxes. The Premier gave an unqualified assurance that he would not increase State taxes, yet, within a week of the Government

assuming office, there was a statement by the Treasurer saying that he could give no such guarantee.

Mr Crabb—That is not true, and you know it!

Mr THOMPSON—Page 1 of the *Age* of Wednesday, 14 April 1982, clearly quotes Mr Jolly as saying that:

He would not rule out the possibility of increases in State taxes and charges to overcome the shortfall.

That was in complete contradiction to the assurance his Leader had given the people of Victoria, an assurance that must undoubtedly have impressed the people of Victoria because nobody likes an increase in taxes.

During the debate I was asked the same question. I said I could not give such an unqualified assurance. Why did I say that? It did so because of spiralling wages and salary increases. I mentioned that at the time. In other words, a clear-cut assurance was given at that time by the then Leader of the Opposition to the people of Victoria that there would be no increase in State taxes. I was asked at that time, as Premier, whether I would give such an assurance and I said I was not prepared to give such an assurance. Obviously, honesty does not pay!

What was the reason for the extraordinary behaviour of the Government? The explanation can be discovered from the previous press secretary of the former Leader of the Opposition, Mr Noel Turnbull, who is highly regarded around the precincts of Parliament. In an article that appeared in the *National Times*, Mr Turnbull clearly stated that there was a plan. The three people who conspired in this particular plot were none other than Mr Jolly, the Treasurer, Mr Crabb, the Minister of Transport, and Mr Roper, the Minister of Health. Three senior Cabinet Ministers all agreed in early 1981 that the best way in which to diffuse expectations about rapid Government action on campaign pledges was to announce that the Liberals had left the State in worse condition than imagined. So, this tactic, this plot, was decided on fourteen

months ago by the then Opposition in anticipation that it might become the Government of Victoria.

Within a week of becoming the Government of Victoria, the Treasurer carried through the plot and said to the people of Victoria, "Sorry, people, we find that things are worse than we thought they were and we can give no undertaking to you that we will not increase State taxes and charges". That is a disgraceful situation! What I said in the *Age* debate was that because of spiralling wage increases I could give no such undertaking, but the then Leader of the Opposition gave that undertaking, which has now been switched.

We then saw the extraordinary situation of the Labor Party promising the people of Victoria all kinds of most attractive schemes, but what would they cost? We costed them at \$3000 million; two professors from Monash University, Professor Parrish and Professor Officer, costed those promises at more than \$2000 million; but what was the official statement of the Labor Party on the total cost of the promises? It was \$135 million. The official document of the Labor Party and this amazing Premier and this amazing Treasurer were 1400 per cent out in the costing of the Labor Party's promises, according to two independent professors from Monash University who were requested by the *Age* newspaper—which in any case advocated voting for the Australian Labor Party—to prepare an independent assessment. I reiterate that that assessment was more than \$2000 million, while the reckless and irresponsible statement emanating from the Australian Labor Party showed the costing as \$135 million.

Today, when the Premier was asked whether he subscribed to that costing document and whether he accepted responsibility for it, he made the amazing statement that some of the document was right and some of the document was wrong. What an extraordinary statement! Why did he make that statement now and not make it prior to the election?

Mr Thompson

Mr Crabb—He was talking about yours, not ours.

Mr THOMPSON—It was not ours, it was yours. The former Minister of Agriculture asked whether the Premier subscribed to that particular document.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! I ask members of the Government party to hear the Leader of the Opposition in silence.

Mr THOMPSON—The question was asked quite clearly this afternoon. The Premier was asked whether he subscribed to the Australian Labor Party costing document and he said that he would not give a "Yes" or "No" answer, but that some of the document was right and some of it was wrong.

Mr Crabb—That is a lie.

Mr THOMPSON—I resent that remark. I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked the Minister of Transport to withdraw the words that were used. I ask the Minister of Transport to withdraw them.

Mr CRABB (Minister of Transport)—I withdraw my statement that it was a lie. It may have been mistaken, but, in any case, it is not true.

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—Once again, I point out that that statement was made by the Premier this afternoon following a carefully worded question by the former Minister of Agriculture as to whether he subscribed to that document and took responsibility for it. His answer was not "Yes" or "No", but that some of the document was right and some of it was wrong. What an extraordinary admission from a Premier who was challenged about this throughout the election campaign and refused at that stage to admit that it was wrong, although two independent professors had proved that it was out by 1400 per cent.

Let us look at that document. First of all, the Premier said that he would provide 1000 additional police. How was he going to do it—from the elimination of waste and the reduction in vandalism.

What a ridiculous thing to say! Secondly, he was going to give teachers one term's study leave after seven years' service. The honourable gentleman said that when the Australian Labor Party came into Government 100 teachers would be granted leave in that way in the first year. It would take 500 years before all teachers in the Education Department would receive such leave. The last group would have to wait 500 years. What an insult to the teaching profession.

The Australian Labor Party promised to double spending on community health. When that statement was challenged the answer was, "This would be our aim, providing money is obtained from the Commonwealth Government." In other words, it would be highly likely there would be no increase in expenditure on community health.

Another promise was that the Australian Labor Party would provide sixteen new double decker trains which would be running on the rails within three years. When the Australian Labor Party was challenged about \$125 million worth of expenditure and where the money would come from, the reply was that a feasibility study would be carried out to see if double decker trains could be introduced.

That is another example of the people of Victoria being misled in a most irresponsible fashion about the costing of Labor's programme. It became obvious there was no chance of that promise being carried out without a substantial increase in taxes. We were then told that the \$475 million would come from the State Development Fund and that would cost nothing because inflation increases would be saved by building public projects now rather than a few years hence. What absolute nonsense! Of course, interest must be paid. That is tantamount to a potential home builder going to his bank and saying, "If I build a house now I will dodge inflation over the next five years and no interest should be charged on my loan". He would be laughed out of the bank or building society.

In addition, the Treasurer had the impudence to tell the Liberal Party it did not understand modern methods of financial management. That is the understatement of the year. Even the *Age* newspaper which commended the Labor candidacy for Government, stated only two days before the election that the Labor Party's economics were of kindergarten standard and that the costing document was pathetic. I repeat—that the economics of the Australian Labor Party were pathetic and the party's costing document was of kindergarten standard. That was the considered opinion of the *Age* leading writer in relation to the campaign promises of the Australian Labor Party.

Members of the Government party do not like to hear it but the facts they put forward to the people of Victoria were clearly incorrect and could never have been correct according to the opinion of competent economists. The Premier has admitted in the House today that the document was only partly right and partly wrong. I move:

That the following words be added to the proposed Address:

"but expresses its concern at the failure of the Government to inform the people of Victoria fully, truthfully and in advance, of its real intentions, particularly with respect to financial and industrial matters."

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! Who seconds the motion?

Mr MACLELLAN (Berwick)—I second the motion.

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—On industrial matters, the Liberal Party made it quite clear throughout the election campaign that, when the radicals on the left—the extremists—called the tune the Labor Party would dance. The reply of the then Leader of the Opposition was, "We will be very firm with the unions". Within a week or a fortnight of assuming office, what happened? The Government pulled out of the deregistration proceedings against the Builders Labourers Federation. Why? I will tell honourable members why. In February and April last year—1981—the conference and then the Administrative Committee of the Labor Party called for

members of the Labor Party to rally behind the Builders Labourers Federation. Fourteen months later, they rallied behind the federation and pulled out of the proceedings. If the Labor Party was going to do that why did it not say so before the election? The answer is, because it was not game to do so. It was not game to give any indication before the election that it would pull out of the deregistration proceedings; it lulled people into believing that a Labor Government would be firm with the unions. The party waited for the election and apparently told its friends to stay quiet until after the election and that it would then pull out of the deregistration proceedings. What a disgraceful performance!

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! I ask members of the Government benches to control themselves. I know it is an exciting time for all of us but, if the House is to manage its affairs in good order, the Leader of the Opposition should be heard in silence.

Mr THOMPSON—I refer now to the interest rates charged by building societies, a financial matter as distinct from an industrial matter. The people of Victoria were clearly led to believe that if the Australian Labor Party was elected to Government, it would stop further increases in the interest rates charged by building societies.

Mr Cathie—And that is what has happened.

Mr THOMPSON—The public was led to believe that by the announcement relating to the controlling of interest rates, but you are rubber stamping the increases. That is the point.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! I direct the House to listen to the Leader of the Opposition in silence.

Mr THOMPSON—If one uses a phrase such as "controlling building society interest rates", the average elector automatically assumes that that will be the end of increases. Within a fortnight or three weeks of assuming

office we find that there has been approval for an increase of 0.6 to 0.9 per cent to be paid by the borrowers from the major building societies. If the Australian Labor Party had stated before the election that interest rates would only rise by 0.6 to 0.9 per cent, remembering that there had been approval by the Federal Government to allow an increase of 1 per cent in the bank area, the people of Victoria would have known what the Australian Labor Party was speaking about. However, the Government clearly misled the public of Victoria about the controlling interest rates charged by building societies, a matter very sensitive to the hearts of young homeowners. When those young homeowners found out last week that there was to be a further increase in interest rates many of them felt completely let down. They were tricked and led down the garden path.

In relation to industrial matters, in an indirect sense, I come to the Victoria Police Force. Honourable members have been informed that there will be an inquiry into the inquiry which was conducted by Colonel Eric St Johnston in the early 1970s. What a ridiculous approach. Honourable members have also been informed that waste was going to be eliminated. Why do we want an inquiry into an inquiry if the aim of the Government is to eliminate waste?

Victoria has the best Police Force in Australia, as was generally agreed by honourable members—that was the consensus of honourable members during a debate on the Victoria Police Force a year or so ago. Victoria has the best Chief Commissioner of Police in Australia and yet the proposal of the Government is to bring some senior policeman from some other part of the world and have him inform our own highly competent Chief Commissioner of Police how he should run the Police Force. How ridiculous!

The Victoria Police Force does not want an inquiry. The Victoria Police Association does not want an inquiry. I am sure the Chief Commissioner of Police does not want an inquiry. The

Opposition does not want an inquiry and the public of Victoria does not want an inquiry. Who does want an inquiry?

Honourable members have also been informed that the Special Branch of the Victoria Police Force will be abolished. Why should it be? In what way has it let down the people of Victoria? We live in an age of increasing political terrorism and if ever there was a time—the Minister of Transport laughs but I assure the honourable gentlemen that the world over political terrorism is increasing and that has been one of the major worries of any nation conducting an international conference. We had trouble in Sydney but we did not have trouble in Melbourne and one of the main reasons why there were no problems during the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in September–October last year was the careful preparations carried out by the Special Branch of the Victoria Police Force.

The one thing that could have spoilt that conference and ruined the reputation of Victoria and Australia overseas was for some untoward incident to have taken place. However, the thorough preparation of the Special Branch, which lasted over a period of one year, resulted in an incident-free conference and if ever there was a time when Victoria needed an effective Special Branch of the Police Force, it is now.

Why is it being abolished? I suggest it is because the extreme elements of the Australian Labor Party do not like it. They have made that clear over the years and the Government and the Premier are dancing to the tune of those people, without any shadow of a doubt!

I was pleased to note that in his answer tonight the Premier was hedging a bit in that he was not quite sure whether the Special Branch was to be abolished. I strongly recommend that the Premier seek further views about the proposal. Once again, the Victoria Police Association strongly believes in the retention of the Special Branch of the Victoria Police Force. I also believe the Victorian people want it retained, not only in the interests of the safety of delegates representing overseas

countries coming to conferences in Victoria but also in the interests of preserving the safety and the security of Victorian citizens.

The public was informed only yesterday that the operation of the cameras that were erected at the time of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting were to be taken away from the control of the Police Force. The cameras were not to be used without special permission being obtained from the Premier. Was the Chief Commissioner of Police consulted about this? Were the heads of the Victoria Police Force consulted about this? Obviously not! What an extraordinary decision to make relating to the security of Victorian citizens. The cameras were installed for the security of Victorian citizens and the Secretary of the Victoria Police Association, Inspector Rippon, stated that the cameras were a very useful medium for crime detection and prevention.

Mr Crabb—How could the camera on the top of Parliament House detect or prevent crime?

Mr THOMPSON—Inspector Rippon would know better than the Minister of Transport. He is the Secretary of the Victoria Police Association and he intimated that the cameras were a valuable weapon in the detection and prevention of crime. Here is a perfect example of an incoming Government knowing better than the experts who in the past have been vitally involved in all aspects of security. I suggest to the Government that it should be speaking to Inspector Rippon and also Chief Inspector Knight and his senior officers on the best way of providing security for the citizens of Victoria and stop listening to their Socialist left colleagues for a change.

The public has been informed that an additional 1000 police will be appointed. It is not clear whether there will be another inquiry into the additional number of police to be appointed, but I should have thought the needs of the police are abundantly apparent.

Mr Mathews—Then why are we 2000 short?

Mr THOMPSON—Because when Colonel Sir Eric St Johnston made his report in the early 1970s, he recommended a build-up in the size of the Victoria Police Force and no branch of the Public Service has been built up to the same degree, with the possible exception of the Department of Community Welfare Services.

The teacher to student ratio has improved dramatically through the years, but so has the ratio of police to population.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! The Minister for Police and Emergency Services is interjecting from out of his place and I will give him the call if he requires it during the debate. I direct the House to come to order and to listen to the Leader of the Opposition in silence.

Mr THOMPSON—Thank you, Mr Speaker. Some of the new Ministers seem to be getting unduly excited in carrying out their policies, but when the report of Colonel Sir Eric St Johnston was made in the early 1970s, the ratio of police to population was of the order of 1 to 732. That represented one policeman to 732 people. At present the figure is approximately one policeman to 490 people. In other words, a spectacular reduction has taken place.

It has become abundantly clear from traversing the promises made at election time and the means of financing them which was given to the Victorian people that the two are completely irreconcilable. There is no way in the world that promises amounting to between \$2000 billion and \$3000 billion can be carried out and State taxes kept at their present levels. The Victorian people were fooled by these promises. They were led to believe they could be carried out because of undertakings given in cold blood. It has now become abundantly apparent that these undertakings are not going to be kept. There is no hope of keeping State taxes down and no hope indeed—without very substantial increases in State taxes and charges—of introducing and implementing even half of the election programme of the Australian Labor Party.

The Governor, Rear-Admiral Sir Brian Murray, and Lady Murray have made a magnificent start in their new office. Mr Speaker, you have made a splendid start in your important office as Speaker of the House. Unfortunately, the Government of Victoria has made a catastrophic start in its first four months of office.

Mr Crabb—Four months!

Mr THOMPSON—I meant four weeks; sometimes it seems like four months! The period in which the Government has been in office has been characterized by a spectacular series of somersaults on the major issues which formed the keystones of its election campaign. The people of Victoria are not fools; there is no question about that. The people of Victoria will remember this. Their approach is typified by the remarks of a man who approached me recently in Collins Street and said, "Mr Thompson, I believe that if another election were held in three weeks' time many people would vote in exactly the opposite way because the promises made by the Australian Labor Party are clearly not going to be kept!"

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! Honourable members will now be speaking both on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply and the amendment.

Mr CRABB (Minister of Transport)—It is with mixed emotions that I speak this evening. Firstly, I congratulate His Excellency the Governor for the excellent task he performed in opening the Parliament. May he continue to do so equally as well in the future. I congratulate my colleagues, the honourable members for St Kilda and Box Hill, for their sterling contributions to the debate. I contrast that point of view with my response to the pathetic contribution from the Leader of the Opposition. The word "pathetic" was used fairly often and quite appropriately by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe it is a good word for the Leader of the Opposition to use; it suits him and he should use it more often.

The Leader of the Opposition began his speech by discussing the finer points of costing and ended up by saying that

the Government had been in office for four months! His sense of timing is as good as his sense of costing! The Leader of the Opposition has no more sense of time than he has sense of sums! The Leader of the Opposition is the worst Treasurer Victoria has had in living memory. This has been demonstrated day by day in the Government's experience at Treasury. The Government is discovering the incompetence of the man whom Liberal Party members have decided to have as their Leader.

Mr Jona—What about Turnbull?

Mr CRABB—The honourable members for Benambra and Hawthorn are fascinated to know something about a chap who was once the press secretary of the former Leader of the Opposition upon whom they heaped abuse on many an occasion. It seems that honourable members opposite suddenly have some respect for his opinion!

Mr Kennett—Just as you destroyed the honourable member for Northcote!

Mr CRABB—We are pleased to see the honourable member for Burwood because he left the House and was absent during the entire speech of the Leader of the Opposition. The same can be said of the honourable member for Warrnambool except that he has not come back! I am not surprised at this because if I were listening to a speech like that from my Leader I would have left too. I quite understand why those honourable members left and I understand why the honourable member for Hawthorn was quiet.

Mr Maclellan—Where is your Leader?

Mr CRABB—He does not need to be here. It would not be proper for the Premier of Victoria to be involved in this pathetic debate. That task is left to humbler mortals like me.

The Government inherited the greatest financial mess that anyone could imagine. It is not enough that the Leader of the Opposition should grin in his self-effacing way. The honourable gentleman was once the Treasurer and refused to make decisions. I refer to

a memorandum from the Director of Finance dated 27 April 1982 which states:

Late in 1981 it became clear that there would be a net deterioration of some significance, principally because of the size and timing of wage and salary awards which had not been foreseen when the Budget was introduced in September.

A confidential Treasury Minute of 2 December 1981 to the Treasurer, in the context of a consideration of hospital finances, gave an expected over-all current account shortfall of the order of \$62.5 million.

Mr Jona—That is public knowledge.

Mr CRABB—It was not public knowledge; it was private information between the Treasury and the Treasurer. Suddenly members of the Opposition say that this was public knowledge. What did the Opposition do about it? What did the Leader of the Opposition do about it? The former Government did not pay its bills to hospitals, local government or in the transport area. From December until the election the former Government did not pay its bills. For a party which supposedly represents the conservative end of politics to neglect to pay its bills during the election campaign is as low as anyone can sink. That is the essence of the problem; the Opposition did not pay its bills and left them for the incoming Government.

The Treasury did not pay its bills to the Transport Regulation Board because the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition do not talk to one another. Not only do they not talk to one another, but also they do not share adjoining offices. It would be nice if they would get together and talk about these issues because it would help me and the Treasurer—we, incidentally, do talk to one another—to sort out the mess the former Ministers left behind.

The Leader of the Opposition made much about a costing document that was produced by the Liberal Party during the election campaign.

Mr Maclellan—The one produced by the Labor Party?

Mr CRABB—No, let us be careful about that. The Liberal Party produced something different which purported to be a costing of the Labor Party's policies

for the election. The Labor Party produced a response, and so it went on. One of the things to which the Opposition wants to address itself is, when did the Liberal Party produce a costing of its programme—the day after the blackout! It was at 7 o'clock on a wet night after the blackout; that is how ashamed the Liberal Party was of it. The Opposition produced sophistry and lies. The people of the State are not stupid. They saw through the sophistry and lies that the Liberal Party tried to peddle, and voted overwhelmingly for the Labor Party. The costing of the Liberal Party's promises was deliberately produced after the blackout because the Liberal Party did not have the capacity to do the costing itself. Its costing of the Labor Party's policies was a tissue of lies and deserved to be treated with the contempt to which it was treated by the Labor Party. Six weeks have now passed and that is where the Opposition still has its head.

The Leader of the Opposition will not be in that chair for three years. Look at him sitting next to the Deputy Leader with his sharp eyes. After the speech the Leader of the Opposition made tonight, it would be a sad thing if he were still Leader of the Opposition in three years, because this State needs a viable Opposition; it needs a party of conservatism that ought to be a party which represents reaction to change. It ought to be a party that wants to maintain the *status quo* or even roll back the wheels of change. There ought to be someone who represents that mood for the electorate. Currently there is not. After the performance of the Opposition at question time today, and in this debate tonight, clearly no vital opposition is coming from the Liberal Party. It may be that the National Party could rejuvenate itself, but that does not look likely. It may be there will be an articulate voice for conservatism, but it is not there now. If members of the Liberal Party have any responsibility on the Opposition benches, they ought to put their minds to how they can articulate their point of view, because they have not done it so far.

Mr Crabb

The Leader of the Opposition at one point during his speech referred to political terrorism—a nice phrase. He ought to know, not only from what he did to Dick Hamer, but to the Liberal Party. He would have done more damage to the Liberal Party than any other Victorian. Look at the empty seats! The Leader of the Opposition would be an expert on political terrorism. He ought to tell us how he kept Peter McArthur, the honourable member for Ringwood as he then was, overseas when the vote was taken, and he ought to tell us how he managed to carry out a vote in his own party with the old members voting. He never even tried that in some of the councils I can mention. The Leader of the Opposition is an expert in political terrorism. He knows all about it. That is how he got to where he is, and that is how he stays in his diminished position, and my bet would be that he will not be there for very long.

The Leader of the Opposition also made the point in his speech about State taxes and about what he claimed to be commitments of the Labor Party. Let me make it clear: The Labor Party encapsulated a programme for change in this State, for stimulus of the economy in this State, and for a programme that can be accommodated without increasing real rates of revenue. The money is there, but it is not being used properly. The honourable member for Doncaster is getting quite excited tonight. I thought he had a fair chance of being the Leader of the Opposition. He would probably have made a better speech than the one made by the Leader of the Opposition tonight. The money is there, but it is not being properly used.

Mr Maclellan—You are not short of money?

Mr CRABB—The honourable member for Berwick really ought to know, since he has been handling a \$1200 million Budget for years. He does not understand because, in his time as Minister of Transport, he was content to have a Transport Fund that he could play with himself, a fund that did not have a budget. The Leader of the Opposition did not talk to him when he was in

Government and he had this slush fund that he could play with himself. I found that in the Ministry of Transport there was no budgetary control of any kind except in relation to the former Minister's own little slush fund. He contributed a little bit here and a little bit there. That is the way the previous Government ran this State and that is why the State is today in this powerless situation; the previous Government did not have the competence, the intellect and the will to run this State in a modern, efficient manner.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! Interjections are disorderly and I ask the Minister to direct his remarks to his speech.

Mr CRABB—Thank you, Mr Speaker. The interjections do help the speech a little. The honourable member for Polwarth is constantly lobbying me to restore the line to Crowes. No one can find where Crowes is. I wonder what the honourable member has been doing for the past 27 years about public transport in his electorate, because there is hardly any public transport there.

The Leader of the Opposition also addressed himself to industrial issues, and he threw a tantrum about the Builders Labourers Federation deregistration. The reality is that everyone involved in the field of industrial relations considers that deregistration of a union is stupid, and that includes the previous Government's own advisers. The advice given to the previous Government by its advisers in the field of industrial relations was, "Do not be involved in deregistration", and yet the Leader of the Opposition was tonight beating the drum. He was saying that he had to find the least popular person in this State next to him, and it is fascinating to see him single out Norm Gallagher as the whipping boy.

The Government has said that the Royal Commission will be completed and that its report will be considered and, if necessary, acted upon. If the report concludes that anyone has committed a crime, that person will be charged.

Mr Maclellan—What happens if they have merely done something wrong?

Mr CRABB—If the report of the Royal Commission concludes that someone has committed a crime, that person will be charged. That applies not only to the Royal Commission but also to the files compiled by the previous Government, which the present Government is now examining. Honourable members opposite might well laugh, but the House will hear more of the matter in the ensuing sessional period. The Government is determined that anyone who is guilty of a crime will be charged.

Mr Williams—What about the Richmond inquiry?

Mr CRABB—There can be no doubt that the honourable member for Doncaster will raise that issue, amongst other issues. However, the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister of Australia are the only people who believe the deregistration of the Builders Labourers Federation is the correct way in which to conduct industrial relations. That attitude is one of the reasons why industrial relations in Victoria have been so abysmal over recent years. The situation has not been helped by the failure of the former Premier to tackle the human problems that are involved in industrial relations.

It should be noted that more builders have gone out of business owing to the inadequate industrial relations policies of the previous Government than were ever put out of business by any other factor. Why are so few buildings being constructed in Melbourne? The reason is that the previous Government was weak and vacillating in its decision-making process. Indeed, that weakness is evident in the fact that the Opposition benches today are depleted and only a handful of shellbacks from the rural region are present.

The question has been asked: How will the Government eliminate waste? The Government has made a good start towards eliminating waste by getting rid of seventeen former Government members and replacing them with seventeen capable Labor Government members.

The Leader of the Opposition addressed himself to the issue of State taxes and claimed that the Labor Government could not achieve its election promises

without increasing State taxes. However, that statement is indicative of the way in which Victoria was run under the previous Government, which believed that to achieve policies it had to either increase or reduce taxes. The previous Government never addressed itself to the efficient management of Victoria or to modernity of its administration. That is a big word for the honourable member for Burwood, who is interjecting. It may be that another honourable member could explain the meaning of the word to him.

However, the previous Government at no time introduced modern financial management to any of the statutory authorities except when it was forced to at the point of a gun. One example was the Housing Commission. The administration of the Housing Commission was rejuvenated only after a series of bloody conflicts in the courts. Those conflicts demonstrated how bad the administration was.

Mr Thompson—Tell us about Bourke's Store.

Mr CRABB—That interjection indicates the level of economic understanding that the former Treasurer of this State has. The former Premier could not bring himself to talk with the Minister of Transport on economic administration, so the Transport Regulation Board now does not have enough money to pay the wages of the staff. Indeed, the economic mismanagement extends further. The hospital system is completely in overdraft.

Mr Lieberman—What about New South Wales?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! I ask the honourable member for Benambra to cease interjecting.

Mr CRABB—The House has heard much from the Opposition about the Socialist left in New South Wales. The only matter that has not been raised is the Falkland Islands, but honourable members opposite will no doubt raise that matter in due course.

The SPEAKER—Order! I ask the honourable member for Benambra to behave himself. If the honourable member can-

not do so perhaps he could remove himself from the Chamber. If the honourable member does not behave himself, I will take other action.

Mr CRABB—The Leader of the Opposition raised the matter of the surveillance cameras as a *cause célèbre*. The honourable member became most upset about something, but I am not sure about what. The Government has received a proposition from the Road Safety and Traffic Authority that the surveillance cameras could be used to benefit the community by traffic monitoring. Therefore, the Government has resolved to remove the cameras to places where those cameras can effectively monitor the traffic situation. If there is another international conference held in Melbourne, the Government will consider any proposition put forward by the Victoria Police Force to use those cameras. Does that not seem a reasonable and rational approach for any sensible person to adopt? For some particular reason honourable members opposite want the surveillance cameras left where they are. The honourable member for Westernport interjects and says that the Labor Party is paranoid about the cameras.

Mr Brown—It was on the radio last night.

Mr CRABB—It is pleasing to note that the honourable member for Westernport listens to the radio so that he can form opinions on matters. It is a pity the honourable member does not form his own opinions. If those surveillance cameras can be used to improve the flow of traffic and diminish the number of road accidents, surely the honourable member for Westernport would agree that would be a good idea. There is no terrorist activity at present, except within the ranks of the Liberal Party. However, if an international conference is held in Melbourne, the Government will consider an alternative use for the surveillance cameras. If Opposition members object to the use of those cameras for road safety purposes, they should say so. However, honourable members opposite have attempted to make some cheap political point on the matter. That approach by a former Premier is unworthy of him. The

honourable member should raise his objectives. I know the Leader of the Opposition is in the twilight of his political career, but he should end his political career on a high note rather than seek to score cheap political points.

The choice of the level of debate has been that of the Opposition, not the Government. The Government is intent upon proceeding with the minimum of fuss to govern this State in the way in which it should have been governed for the past ten years, and to take it into a future of which all Victorians will be proud.

On the motion of Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party), the debate was adjourned.

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

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Mr FOGARTY (Sunshine)—I propose to the House that John Thomas Wilton, Esquire, be appointed Chairman of Committees. I make this nomination with great pleasure because John Wilton has been a member of the Victorian Parliament for some twenty years. He is a man of ability, integrity and experience with a deep knowledge of Parliamentary law and the laws of *May*. While you have received many bouquets this afternoon, Mr Speaker, one of the best bouquets you could receive on this occasion is to have a deputy such as the honourable member for Broadmeadows. He has served the electorate of Broadmeadows for twenty years and the figures show that the majority in the electorate of Broadmeadows is greater than in any other Victorian electorate.

This afternoon honourable members have been speaking of gerrymandering, but I know that the personal popularity of John Wilton has been one of the major contributing factors to the majority obtained in that electorate over the years.

Therefore it is with sincere pleasure that I nominate Mr Wilton as Chairman of Committees. He is a friend of mine and a person who has no enemies in this Parliament. Therefore I move:

That John Thomas Wilton, Esquire, be appointed Chairman of Committees of this House.

Mr KIRKWOOD (Preston)—I second the motion moved by the honourable member for Sunshine. Most honourable members who know the background of John Thomas Wilton realize that he came into Parliament many years ago with experience in local government. That has been obvious over the years from the way in which he has conducted himself in the House. It has also been clear that the understanding of debate which he gained in his early days in both council and community organizations has stood him in good stead because, like you, Mr Speaker, he became one of the leaders who, while the Labor Party was in Opposition, determined many of the positions to be taken by the party in Parliament. Because of the honourable member's ability to understand matters and to push and prompt, the Labor Party was able many times to gain advantages which it otherwise may not have gained.

I recommend John Wilton, the honourable member for Broadmeadows, as a very competent person to hold the position of Chairman of Committees.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Does the honourable member for Broadmeadows accept the nomination?

Mr WILTON (Broadmeadows)—I accept the nomination, and express my appreciation of the honour that has been accorded to me this evening of being nominated for the position of Chairman of Committees. I also express my sincere thanks to the mover and seconder of the motion for their kind remarks.

I have always considered it a privilege to have been able to sit in this Parliament for the time that I have done so—a privilege afforded to me by the electorate of Broadmeadows.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Are there any further nominations?

I have to announce that the time for proposals has expired and it gives me pleasure to declare that the honourable member for Broadmeadows, being the only member proposed, has been duly elected as Chairman of Committees of this House.

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—I congratulate the honourable member for Broadmeadows on his appointment to the important position of Chairman of Committees. In my twelve years in Parliament one of the many things that has been evident to me is the capacity of the honourable member for Broadmeadows to comprehend the Standing Orders and to assist the House in working in accordance with those long-standing orders, and with Sessional Orders.

As Leader of the House for the Opposition for many years I have sincerely appreciated the willing advice that has been given by the honourable member for Broadmeadows and have had the benefit of his years of experience and his understanding, which comes partly from a natural affinity and ability to understand, and also from the enormous amount of study of *May* that he has undertaken, as was indicated by the honourable member for Sunshine, as well as of the Standing Orders and the rulings of former Speakers and chairmen of committees.

I am sure the House will greatly benefit from the years of experience and the general interest that has been displayed by the honourable member for Broadmeadows in filling this important position. The House will be richer and better for this appointment tonight, and I sincerely congratulate the honourable member on his success.

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—On behalf of the Opposition, I also congratulate the honourable member for Broadmeadows on his unanimous appointment as Chairman of Committees. I first met the honourable member for Broadmeadows when he was elected to Parliament in a by-election about twenty years ago in succession to the late Harold Kane, who held that seat for the Liberal Party. One of the honourable member's main interests has been the study of the Standing Orders. He reads *May* with the same ease and delight with which the average person reads the latest novels.

He has taken a keen and intelligent interest in the Standing Orders and Sessional Orders of the House, and this

equips him well to make a very good and impartial Chairman of Committees who thoroughly understands the complicated procedures of the House. I wish the honourable member well.

Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—I congratulate the honourable member for Broadmeadows on his election as Chairman of Committees. He is a senior member of this House and a knowledgeable member and nobody would question his credentials for having been appointed to this position. I know he will be fair and carry out his duties well. He has the best wishes of the National Party.

Mr CAIN (Premier)—I add my congratulations and good wishes to the honourable member for Broadmeadows on his election to the office of Chairman of Committees in this House. Everything has been said about his capacity and his knowledge of the Standing Orders and the rules of this place. I add one thing. You, Mr Speaker, will be pleased to have someone of his capacity as your deputy to fill in for you when required, and I am sure the honourable member for Broadmeadows will be somebody from whom you will seek counsel and guidance from time to time on matters that might concern you, having regard to his extensive knowledge and experience of this place. I congratulate the honourable member on his election.

Mr WILKES (Minister for Local Government)—I add my congratulations to the honourable member for Broadmeadows on his election as Chairman of Committees of this Parliament. I have known the honourable member for the 21 years that he has been in this place and I believe his knowledge of Standing Orders has been of much benefit not only to me and to members of the Labor Party but also to all members of this establishment. As your deputy, Mr Speaker, he will add to the running of this Parliament in no small way. I wish him well in his appointment and hope that he enjoys the nomination, appointment and election to the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of this House.

The **SPEAKER** (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—I should like to congratulate the honourable member for Broadmeadows on his elevation to the position of Chairman of Committees of this House. Like other honourable members, I have had a long association with the honourable member, having assisted him to be elected to this House at a by-election a long time ago. As I recall, it was a difficult election and the Labor Party was more than pleasantly surprised when the honourable member for Broadmeadows was successful. He has had a distinguished career in this Parliament and I believe he will grace the position of Chairman of Committees very adequately.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

The **SPEAKER** (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds) laid on the table his warrant nominating Miss Callister, Mr Ebery, Mr A. T. Evans, Mr B. J. Evans, Mr Fogarty, Mr Hockley, Mr Jasper, Mr Kirkwood, Mr Miller, Mrs Patrick, Mr Remington, Mr Spyker, Mr Stirling, Dr Vaughan and Mr Whiting to act as Temporary Chairmen of Committees whenever requested to do so by the Chairman of Committees.

THE SPEAKER AND DEPUTY SPEAKER

Temporary Relief in Chair

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—By leave, I move:

That, during any absence of Mr Deputy Speaker, Mr Speaker be authorized to call upon any of the Temporary Chairmen of Committees to temporarily relieve him in the chair, and that during any absence of Mr Speaker, Mr Deputy Speaker be similarly authorized to call upon any of the Temporary Chairmen.

I add that the title of Chairman should perhaps be given further consideration by the House at some stage. In view of the changing sexual composition of this House, it might be considered whether that title is the most appropriate for the office. However, that is a matter for further consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

STAMPS (MATRIMONIAL SETTLEMENTS) BILL

The **SPEAKER** (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds) announced the presentation of a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the Stamps (Matrimonial Settlements) Bill.

Mr JOLLY (Treasurer), pursuant to Standing Order No. 169, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to provide exemptions from stamp duty in relation to certain dealings with property and for that purpose to amend the Stamps Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

STAMPS (FIRST PURCHASES OF LAND) BILL

The **SPEAKER** (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds) announced the presentation of a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the Stamps (First Purchases of Land) Bill.

Mr JOLLY (Treasurer), pursuant to Standing Order No. 169, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to provide exemptions from stamp duty in relation to certain purchases of land and for that purpose to amend the Stamps Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—By leave, I move the following motions in relation to the appointment of committees:

Library Committee

That Mr Speaker, Mr Evans (Ballarat North), Mr Harrowfield, Mr King, and Mr Wallace be members of the Library Committee; and that the committee have leave to sit on days on which the House does not meet.

Printing Committee

That—(a) Mr Speaker, Mr Gray, Mr Ihlein, Mr McGrath, Mc McNamara, Mr Ramsay, Mr Stirling and Mr Williams be members of the

Printing Committee; (b) the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to sit on days on which the House does not meet; (c) three to be the quorum; and (d) the committee have power to confer with the Printing Committee of the Legislative Council and to jointly report thereon to the House.

Privileges Committee

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon complaints of breach of privilege referred to it by the House; such committee to consist of Miss Callister, Mr Evans (Gippsland East), Mr Miller, Mr Jona, Mr Lieberman, Mr Walsh and Mr Wilton; and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records; to sit on days on which the House does not meet and to move from place to place; four to be the quorum.

Standing Orders Committee

That a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report upon the Standing Orders of the House, such committee to consist of Mr Speaker, Mr Gavin, Mr Jasper, Mr Maclellan, Mrs Ray, Mr Templeton, Mr Whiting and Mr Wilton; and that the committee have leave to sit on days on which the House does not meet; five to be the quorum.

I wish to comment on the Parliamentary committee structure.

Mr MACLELLAN (Berwick)—Leave is granted.

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for granting leave. A statement has been circulated outlining the proposed membership of these four committees. They are all significant to Parliament and it is desirable that those appointments should proceed.

I believe it is incumbent on me now, particularly in view of the earlier comments of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, to make further comment regarding other Parliamentary committees. I regret that it has not been possible to reach accord with another place on the composition between the parties of the House Committee and, in those circumstances, and in view of the decision made in another place not to proceed with the appointment of that committee, tonight there is little point in the Assembly proceeding. It is proposed that this matter be held over until the next day of sitting of the Legislative Assem-

bly and one would hope and be confident that the House Committee can be appointed at that time. As the honourable member for Gippsland East interjects, at least honourable members know that the prices in the dining-room cannot be increased until the House Committee does get together.

It is important that comment be made on the other Parliamentary committees. As honourable members may know, from time to time Parliament has appointed committees to inquire into various aspects of Government activity and public need and some of those committees have been long standing, whereas others have been of more recent establishment.

The new Government considers it desirable that a reassessment should be made of which of these committees ought to be appointed, the size of those committees and which additional committees should be appointed. The Government has made an initial examination of practices in other States of Australia and of the Commonwealth Government. As a result of that initial examination, it is desirable that the House not proceed with the appointment of those committees today but, rather, that there be inter-party discussions between members of the Government, members of the Opposition and of the third party on proposals the Government will be prepared to put forward at these discussions and then, of course, to the resumed House on the day to be fixed.

The Government recognizes the important role of Parliamentary committees and it is because of this recognition that the Government indicates that the reassessment has to be taken at the instigation of the Government. I know there will be ready co-operation from members of the Opposition and the third party in the reassessment being done expeditiously to bring back a recommendation to the House as soon as it is resumed. I give an assurance to the House that the report will be made on the next day of sitting.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Sessional period—Scallop fishing industry—Broadmeadows community health service—Public Bodies Review Committee—Yarrawonga police station—Australian Constitutional Convention—Violence at sporting venues—Country racing clubs—Electoral enrolment of naturalized persons—Richmond Housing Commission flats

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—I move:

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday, May 25, at half-past one o'clock.

Mr THOMPSON (Leader of the Opposition)—Would it be possible for the Deputy Premier to give honourable members some indication of what would be the date of the sessional period following the one to which he has referred in order for honourable members to plan their itineraries some months ahead?

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education) (*By leave*)—I regret that is not possible at this stage—in fact, to my knowledge, that request has never been sought by an Opposition following an election.

Mr Maclellan—How many weeks on and how many weeks off?

Mr FORDHAM—Honourable members have received communication to that effect from the Cabinet and myself and, as I indicated to representatives of the other parties, the House will resume on 25 May for a period of approximately five weeks. Those honourable members elected previously will know that a similar situation followed the 1979 election. Following that sessional period, there will be a break. As to when the House is likely to be called together after that, the Government is not yet able to indicate.

The Government is fairly new at the game and has not finalized the details of the legislative programme other than for this initial period. I do undertake that in the next sessional period, after a couple of weeks, an indication will be available to honourable members of the programme for the remainder of the year. It is a reasonable request and shall be undertaken.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East)—I draw to the attention of the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation in this place a matter relating to the scallop fishing industry and particularly to fishermen at Lakes Entrance. I shall remind honourable members briefly of the circumstances of the issuing of licences in the scallop industry. Roughly 110 boats are engaged in the industry; some 31 boats operate out of Lakes Entrance only, some 21 operate in Port Phillip Bay only and some 57 have the right to operate in either of those places. Honourable members will know that Port Phillip Bay has been closed to scallop fishermen for a certain period of the year and the season opened once again at the beginning of this month.

Within a day of the season opening, scallop fishermen at Lakes Entrance were advised by processors that they would take no further scallops from that area. The problem arises apparently because of unusual seasonal conditions in Bass Strait which have resulted in abnormally warm waters adversely affecting the growth of scallops in that area. This has placed the fishermen permitted to operate out of Lakes Entrance only in a position where they are unable to earn a living.

New scallop beds were discovered at Babel Island off Flinders Island and a number of scallop boats have been crossing to this island in order to get scallops, to stay in business and to avoid bankruptcy. Many of the boats are doing so at tremendous risk because they are undertaking what can be a hazardous journey across Bass Strait. For the initial three weeks of these operations, Bass Strait has been calm due to the unusually hot weather and the boats have been able to operate without trouble. However, about 100 fishermen operating from Lakes Entrance are putting their lives at risk should a sudden storm occur when they are returning home from Babel Island.

These circumstances occur because the Fisheries and Wildlife Division, which issues the licences, refuses to acknowledge that all scallop fishermen in Victoria should be entitled to the same rights and privileges and should hold scallop licences for the whole of the State. The scallop fishermen at Lakes Entrance are happy for the 21 boats operating only in Port Phillip Bay to come to Lakes Entrance when it suits them and Lakes Entrance fishermen want the right to go to Port Phillip Bay when that suits them.

At the moment the fishermen are in an invidious position. If they stay at Lakes Entrance and use only the scallops in that area they will be forced into bankruptcy because processors will refuse to take the scallops. If they continue to operate across Bass Strait a tragedy will occur if the ships are caught up in bad weather on the return trip to Lakes Entrance.

Mr WILTON (Broadmeadows)—I realize that the Minister of Health is familiar with the rather long drawn out history of the Broadmeadows community health service and in particular the frustration that occurred with the previous Government about the erection of a permanent building for this service. Will the Minister indicate the current situation with the building programme? I know he is aware that many people—both professional and lay—who are directly connected with the service are anxious to obtain an indication of immediate future prospects.

Mrs SIBREE (Kew)—I refer the Premier to the statutory committees of the Parliament which were alluded to earlier in the debate tonight. I express concern on behalf of both honourable members and interested people outside the Parliament with respect to the incoming Government's promises during the election campaign to continue the activities of the Public Bodies Review Committee and to expand its membership and possibly its role.

I raise the matter because I consider that the Government should have acted today to continue the activities of that committee. This could have taken place

even though the membership of the committee may be increased in future. The committee has an important number of decision areas still to be completed in order that other reports already tabled in the Parliament may be carried out and completed within a proper time framework. It will now be at least a month before the work of the committee can continue. I wish to express my concern at this situation and express amazement that three Ministers on the other side of the House who took part in the committee have not thought about how the committee should continue in view of the important work before it.

A waste of resources is occurring at the offices of the committee at No. 1 Little Collins Street. The staff of the committee is looking for direction and research staff appointed on a temporary basis will not be there in a month's time. Audit and accounting reports need to be completed as well as the legislative framework. I am concerned that this miserable Government will allow a month to go by and waste the valuable resources which are available to get on with the task. I call upon the Government to give reasons for failing to consider the matter. If it is merely a matter of increasing the membership of the committee surely the appointments could have taken place today.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! The honourable member has only five minutes. I ask members of the Government to hear the honourable member in silence.

Mrs SIBREE—I am sure I have put across my message. The Government should put its decisions where its mouth is! Three Ministers are well aware of the importance of the committee and should not be procrastinating and wasting important research staff. I hope the Premier can supply the reasons for the delay although I do not believe any valid reasons exist. Additional members could be appointed at a later date but the people of Victoria should be aware of the reasons for the delay. Is the Government afraid of the sort of legislative framework the committee might produce? The Government should let the Parliament get on with the job. An

answer from the Premier about the procrastination of resources is urgently required.

Mr JASPER (Murray Valley)—I refer the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to the deplorable condition of the Yarrowonga police station and residence. The station and residence are totally inadequate to house the police operating at Yarrowonga and the sergeant and his family. The establishment is riddled with white ants and part of the police station was used as a stable many years ago. I made representations to the former Minister who indicated that a new police station and residence would be provided. As you are aware, Mr Speaker, the Yarrowonga area receives many tourists during holiday times and up to 20 000 people visit the township of Yarrowonga.

The former Minister indicated that the police station and residence would be replaced and that design works would be undertaken in 1981–82. Construction was to commence in 1982–83. Subsequently, I received a letter from the Minister in which he indicated that the residence and police station would not be replaced until 1983–84. I am sure, Mr Speaker, that you remember—in your previous capacity as the shadow Minister for Police and Emergency Services—visiting the Murray Valley electorate and inspecting the police station concerned. The *Yarrowonga Chronicle* of 31 March 1982 contains an article outlining the inspection and includes an excellent photograph of you, Mr Speaker. The article states:

'I have visited a lot of police stations, but the Yarrowonga station is the worst I have seen. The home is a disgrace. If it was in Melbourne the Housing Commission would place a demolition order on it. If elected to govern, Labor would immediately allocate an additional \$10 million for such facilities. We would put a priority stamp on a new police station and residence at Yarrowonga,' Mr Edmunds said.

All honourable members have spoken highly of your integrity and past abilities, Mr Speaker. Everyone would agree that the comments you made are accurate. I have invited the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to visit the area, but I know that he would agree that it requires a "priority stamp" as

indicated. I ask the Minister to investigate the matter immediately so that an efficient police service can be maintained at Yarrowonga.

Mr MILLER (Pahran)—Will the Attorney-General make representations as a matter of urgency to the Prime Minister urging him to reconvene the Australian Constitutional Convention? Obviously the past Government was not interested in constitutional reform since the Constitutional Convention has not met since the last meeting in Perth in 1978. The convention requires both State and Federal co-operation and an input from each of the States in order to bring about a re-convening. Some honourable members, who were here in 1973, will recall that the first of these conventions began in Sydney in 1973. The convention subsequently met in Melbourne, Hobart and finally in Perth. The last meeting was in 1978 and the process of constitutional reform has slowed down enormously. One of the few means available under our Constitution for constitutional reform is through the convention mechanism.

It is necessary that our nineteenth century Constitution that governs so many aspects of our lives be updated and reformed. One principal means whereby that reformation process can be put into effect is through State Parliaments having a real effect through the Constitutional Convention.

I urge the Attorney-General to get in touch with the Prime Minister so that constitutional processes may be updated and so that the Constitutional Convention can deal with important issues such as a uniform system of laws relating to criminal law, defamation, shipping and family law. Only recently, the High Court pointed out the absurd anomalies that exist in the family law situation. These few illustrations highlight the need for a uniform consensus-style approach to constitutional reform. If the State Governments can push the Federal Government, particularly the Prime Minister, to reconvene the convention, all Australians will be better off under an updated Constitution.

Mr BROWN (Westernport)—I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation. Before doing so, I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to the high office of Speaker of this House. I am sure you will carry out your duties firmly, fairly and impartially. Likewise, I congratulate the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation on his appointment. As I am the shadow Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation, I will be following his activities closely and with interest to ensure that his decisions are good for the citizens and sporting organizations of this State.

The serious situation I raise relates to continuing violence at sporting fixtures. The recent tragic death highlighted the need for action to be carried out immediately. An innocent bystander sustained injury to the extent that he died after protecting his six-year-old son in the midst of a brawl which was carried on by drunken louts at a Victorian Football League football match. Honourable members in this House and members of the public deplore situations of that kind.

Regrettably, the standard of behaviour of people at sporting fixtures throughout Victoria generally in recent years has declined. The main attenders of sporting games wish to follow their team, whether it is football or another game, without having to tolerate drunken louts. I acknowledge that the Minister has taken up the cudgels with this problem and is meeting with various parties tomorrow.

I consider that action is needed immediately. The Victorian Football League has proposed that a committee will investigate the situation. I suggest that sporting clubs adopt a procedure that takes place at racing clubs in which people can be warned off for life if they are convicted of an offence. The suggestion should be followed by legislation to provide that a person who has been convicted of an offence at a sporting fixture can be warned off and if that person returns to the area with knowledge that he should not be there, it will be an offence punishable by law. The

person should then face court charges and if it is considered serious enough, be given a gaol sentence.

The Government should act on this matter swiftly to ensure that legislation is introduced. Overseas, particularly in the United Kingdom, drunken brawls are commonplace at sporting events. I understand that people go to some events, not just to watch the sport, but also to be disruptive and cause as much havoc as possible. It is unquestionable that alcohol plays a major part in these activities. The Opposition would like alcohol to be banned from being allowed through the gates at sporting fixtures in Victoria. Alcohol should be available inside the grounds only in controlled quantities. It should be dispensed in plastic cups which cannot be used as missiles as cans and stubbies can be.

The problem is not only occurring at football grounds; it is also becoming prevalent at racing venues, tennis games and cricket clubs. Action needs to be taken now by the Government. It is obvious that louts are causing trouble after consuming significant amounts of alcohol and the problem should be stopped immediately. I understand that the Minister of Health made statements prior to the recent election to the effect that it would no longer be an offence under the Labor Government to be drunk in a public place.

I would like the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation to inform the House of what is proposed to overcome the situation at sporting venues. I know honourable members share my concern on this matter and I hope that action by the Government will be taken immediately.

Mr McGRATH (Lowan)—I also raise a matter for the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation relating to the possibility of the rationalization of country racing clubs. Suggestions have been made in recent times—I think the Minister has been involved in the negotiations—about the possibility of rationalization whereby the Colac Racing Club will possibly be conducting races at the Geelong racecourse.

Before any rationalization of country racing clubs takes place, I ask the Minister to have full consultation with the club concerned. In the electorate that I represent rationalization has already taken place whereby the Apsley Racing Club conducts races at Edenhope and the Sheep Hills Racing Club was invited by the Minister, who was then the Opposition spokesman on Youth, Sport and Recreation, to present the trophies at Warracknabeal where the Sheep Hills club was operating. Racing was conducted at Warracknabeal and trophies were presented two or three months ago.

In the Wimmera area there are racing clubs at Warracknabeal, Nhill, Kaniva, Horsham and Murtoa. They all have fine facilities.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! I am having a great deal of difficulty hearing what the honourable member for Lowan is saying. I ask honourable members on the Government side of the House to cease talking amongst themselves.

Mr McGRATH—Thank you, Mr Speaker. Those racing clubs have fine courses, facilities and amenities. Their officers work very hard, as do their committees. The race meetings they conduct are well carried out and well performed and significant prize money is available for events.

One must also consider that those clubs conduct foundation events for horses to qualify for bigger events leading to regional meetings such as Ballarat, Bendigo and Geelong races and then eventually to the metropolitan area in Melbourne. To do away with many of those facilities would cause a lessening of the standard of racehorses in Victoria. I urge the Minister, along with the Victoria Racing Club and the Racecourses Licences Board, to ensure that full consultation is carried out with racing clubs in country areas before bringing about any rationalization of country race tracks in Victoria.

Mr REMINGTON (Melbourne)—I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs arising out of a comment made today by the honourable member for Murray Valley about the numbers of

people on the electoral roll in the Melbourne electorate. I checked the facts so that I could advise the House correctly. I consulted the last public census available, which was in 1976. At that time 28 215 people were on the electoral rolls in the Melbourne electorate. Australian citizens in the electorate at that time numbered 37 844 and 42 972 people were eighteen years of age and over. This indicates a rather staggering situation has arisen in which 37 844 people were Australian citizens but only 28 000 people were on the electoral rolls.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—Order! Can the honourable member advise me as to the area of Government administration to which he is directing his remarks? He may not raise a matter in respect to anticipating legislation. If he can inform me of the area of Government administration concerned, perhaps he may then proceed.

Mr REMINGTON—Yes, Sir. The matter is directed to the Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs because of the failure of the previous Government to encourage migrants to enrol. It is difficult for many migrant people to complete the enrolment form and to get onto the electoral roll once they have undertaken their citizenship ceremony. That is the nub of the matter.

Mrs PATRICK (Brighton)—On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the matter raised by the honourable member for Melbourne is a Commonwealth matter and has nothing to do with the Parliament of Victoria. What individual members decide to do is their own business, but this is a Federal matter.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—There is no point of order, but I ask the honourable member for Melbourne to come to the point as to how the Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs can assist in relation to the matter he is raising.

Mr REMINGTON (Melbourne)—I am asking the Minister to ensure that proper enrolment drives are undertaken.

Mr Williams—That is not his responsibility.

Mr REMINGTON—This course of action has been neglected for political purposes by the Opposition. Will the Minister also ensure that a simplified system of enrolment is made available so that people can easily be enrolled once they have been naturalized?

The electorate I represent is unique because it is the migrant centre of Victoria. In other electorates, such as Murray Valley, the difference between the number of resident eighteen-year-olds and the number of eighteen-year-olds on the electoral roll would be only about 115. I ask the Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs not to follow the actions of the previous Government but to encourage migrants to become naturalized and then to ensure that they are enrolled.

Mr KENNETT (Burwood)—I raise a matter with the Minister of Housing. I do so hoping that he and other honourable members will accept it in the way it is intended. I raise it in an apolitical sense, as a member of this Chamber. It refers to the recent unfortunate death of a person in Housing Commission flats which are the responsibility of the Minister. I think it would be fair to say that I probably have as much appreciation at this stage of the problems facing the Minister as he has in terms of violence in those complexes.

I also appreciate that the Minister last night met with tenants and the Richmond Tenants Council, together with the honourable member for St Kilda to try to work out, in their interest, given that the former Government had introduced a self-management programme, better security and safety measures to protect the residents from the type of activity that has occurred in the past few days.

I wonder whether the Minister feels disposed to inform the House, as a result of his deliberations with the tenants, of the conclusions, if any, that were reached and, more importantly, of the actions he and/or the Government may take in the future to protect residents in those units from vandalism and violence?

Those units accommodate a large number of people. When one relates their population to the density of country areas, it is probably greater than the density of population in many country areas.

Regrettably, unfavourable media attention is given to violence involving the Ministry of Housing. I believe a more responsible attitude to the reporting of incidents within this community should be adopted by the media. It has always disturbed me that, where violence occurs within ethnic communities or within the province of the Minister of Housing, the media play it up to the detriment of those communities. At the same time, crime occurs throughout the community on a daily basis and is not given the same media exposure. The recent incident is a tragedy, as all honourable members would agree, regardless of their politics, and the publicity is regrettable.

I ask the Minister of Housing to give this House and the public some indication of the results of last night's meeting. I congratulate him on his promptness in meeting with the tenants. I also ask that he inform the House of any action he and his Government might have considered at this stage to try to prevent this sort of crime in the future—and I realize that is difficult—and also what sort of action he might have taken with the media to ensure that crime, wherever it occurs in this State, is handled on an equitable basis so that certain sectors of the community are not disadvantaged.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—The time for raising matters has expired.

Mr CAIN (Premier)—The honourable member for Kew raised the question of the future of statutory committees in this House and, in particular, the Public Bodies Review Committee. I assure her that the Government intends that the work of the Public Bodies Review Committee should continue. It believes, however, that committee should be one of a structure of committees that will ensure that this Parliament can cover the whole field of legislative activity and initiative. The

Government felt it was better not to deal with public bodies on a "one off" basis. A proposal will be put to the House regarding the structure of a rather complex, although not novel, series of committees to cover the whole field of activities.

The honourable member for Prahran raised with me in my capacity of Attorney-General, the question of the future of constitutional conventions in this country, asking what initiative would be taken by Victoria to revive that flagging desire that seems to ebb and flow in this country.

The Government will do all it can to stir the other components of the Federation to revive those meetings that were, I think, enthusiastically attended in the months or years immediately following that dreadful Constitutional episode in November 1975. The Government believes important and lasting changes can and must be effected to this nation's Constitution if the Federation is to function as it should. Clearly, realignments of respective powers of the Federal and State Governments ought to take place and the Victorian Government will do all it can to remove from this area the political and point-scoring stances that have been adopted all too frequently by the components of the Federation over many years. None of us can be proud of the parochial and non-national stances taken by all components of the Federation at various times.

I will do all I can to reactivate those conventions. I believe the House should elect those members—I think it is required to do that—of this Parliament who should represent Victoria at those conventions.

Mr CATHIE (Minister of Housing)—The honourable member for Gippsland East raised the matter of the plight of the scallop fishing industry which is caused by a differential licensing system and particularly the current seasonal conditions in Bass Strait and in Port Phillip Bay. These conditions apparently result in many fishermen having to journey much further out into Bass Strait and endanger their lives. The Government is concerned about that situation.

I will pass on the comments of the honourable member to the Minister for Conservation for proper examination and for a further reply.

The honourable member for Burwood refers to the unfortunate murder that occurred in the Housing Commission high-rise estate at Richmond. He is correct in indicating that the honourable member for St Kilda and I met last night with the Richmond Tenants Council and the tenants to discuss ways of improving security on that estate.

On a previous occasion, the former Minister of Housing went to that estate and said, "Yes, I will pay for a guard at the entrance foyer to each of these high-rise blocks," and then found that he could not make that commitment because he did not have the money. He found that it would cost approximately \$5 million to do that on all of the high-rise estates within the Ministry of Housing.

We did not make those sorts of commitments. We accept that the present security system is totally inadequate and we examined ways of improving it. We discussed a wide range of options with the tenants and with the Tenants Council. It is the desire of the Government to improve both the amenity and the security of all Housing Commission estates in Victoria and we believe the best way of achieving that is to improve the community networks within those estates. That would operate as a preventive measure and would increase morale among the tenants as well as improving security.

The Government will be achieving both of those objectives. As soon as I have examined the range of options discussed yesterday, I shall have a further meeting with the tenants and the Tenants Council and I will then announce the decisions that have been arrived at.

Mr ROPER (Minister of Health)—I appreciate the long connection of the honourable members for Broadmeadows, Glenroy and Keilor with working for an adequate community health service in Broadmeadows. I am well aware of the difficulties that have been faced by the Broadmeadows Community Health Centre and everyone connected

with it in attempting to deliver an adequate health service in the area, particularly the difficulties in connection with capital works.

The only way in which to describe the building programme in the health portfolio is "chaotic", because far more projects have been promised than it would be possible to complete with the money that is available. There is no prospect of a reasonable delivery of the programme. Over the past three weeks the Government has put into effect a total review of the capital works priorities in the health portfolio, and it will be possible to make savings to ensure that the Broadmeadows Community Health Centre is commenced in an adequate and appropriate building during the next financial year. The Government is developing a ten-year health construction programme so that hospitals and health centres will know where they stand and how they relate to other priorities. That has not occurred in the past.

The Broadmeadows Community Health Centre was promised action in the mid-1970s. It has had promise after promise after promise. There has been a ludicrous situation in which capital funds voted by Parliament for community health centre construction have been returned unspent to Treasury—capital funds that could have gone to assist Broadmeadows, East Bentleigh, Craigieburn or many other centres.

What I am saying tonight is that the Government will be in a position to move ahead with the construction of a major facility for Broadmeadows that will incorporate services such as early childhood development services and any proposals for the Royal Children's Hospital. The Government is not aiming at creating a great edifice; it is aiming at creating a place that can provide the health services Broadmeadows needs. If there had been adequate attention to the social, health and other needs of Broadmeadows ten, or even twenty, years ago, we would not have some of the situations that now confront us.

My colleagues and I will overcome those problems and we will ensure that there is a Broadmeadows Community

Health Centre which people will be encouraged to attend and which will provide adequate services for the people of the area.

Mr MATHEWS (Minister for Police and Emergency Services)—The honourable member for Murray Valley raised with me the condition of the Yarrowonga police station. He will not be surprised to learn that he is not the first honourable member to raise that type of matter with me. The fact is that the outstanding record of service given by the Victoria Police to this State—to which the Leader of the Opposition rightly made reference earlier this evening—was poorly rewarded by the last Government in the standard of accommodation in which members of the force have been required to work and, in many cases, the standard of the accommodation in which they and their families were required to live, particularly in country areas. The honourable member's colleague, the honourable member for Mildura, has already spoken to me this evening about the condition of a police station in that electorate. I have discussed the whole matter of accommodation with the Chief Commissioner of Police and have asked him to show me both the best and the worst this State has to offer in police accommodation. In that context, I shall be visiting the Mildura police station in the near future and I should be happy to add the police station at Yarrowonga to my list.

I have also conferred with the Victoria Police Association and asked it to nominate its priorities in the replacement and maintenance of police stations and police residences across the State.

It would be possible to take the view that the honourable member for Ascot Vale has taken with him to the Chair not only his great ability but also the obligations he assumed during the course of the recent election campaign. However, that is not my view. The Government has undertaken that an additional \$10 million will be made available for the replacement and upgrading of police accommodation over the 3-year life of this Parliament, and I am here to see that effect is given to that undertaking.

Mr TREZISE (Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation)—The honourable member for Westernport raised his concern about the nuisance of the alcohol problem at football matches. I assume the honourable member was referring to sport in general. I am sure this is a matter for concern to all honourable members, on all sides of the House. The honourable member for Westernport suggested that the Victorian Football League might warn off for life drunken nuisances, in the same way that racing clubs are able to warn off offenders. Unfortunately, the honourable member was not quite on the ball. Racing clubs are able to warn off only those persons who are licensed under the Racing Act, such as jockeys, trainers, owners and so on; they cannot warn off members of the public. Similarly, the Victorian Football League can warn off for life licensed footballers, but not members of the public.

A great deal of concern has been expressed by people all over the State because the problem has been going on for too long. As I am sure the honourable member for Westernport will be aware, tomorrow there will be a round-table conference between the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, the Minister for Tourism, who is responsible for the control of liquor throughout the State, the Minister for Community Welfare Services and myself, together with representatives of the Victorian Football League and the Victoria Police, in an effort to discover what can be done to curb the activities of these louts.

The question of whether it is possible to ban alcohol altogether is extremely difficult. Hundreds of sporting events take place throughout Victoria each Saturday. People are charged admission in many cases and it would be almost impossible to police the consumption of alcohol, particularly if, for example, someone were to have a beer in a car. I am sure the honourable member would agree. In the case of VFL grounds, it is necessary to keep in mind the fact that there are licensed social clubs at most of the grounds and, therefore, to ban alcohol at those grounds would be to take away the licences of the social clubs and the amenity of the members of those

clubs. All of these matters will be studied at tomorrow's meeting between members of the Government, representatives of the Police Force and the Victorian Football League, which claims it has been studying the matter for some months.

Various options will be put to the meeting and I can assure the honourable member, Parliament and the public that every effort will be made to curb those louts who have for far too long been offending innocent people at football matches and other public gatherings.

The honourable member also said that the Labor Party was prepared to allow people who are drunk and disorderly to wander through the community without being guilty of an offence. That is not true. The Government has said that public drunkenness will not be an offence. At present the penalty is \$1 for a first offence, \$2 for a second offence, \$3 for a third offence and then a sentence of imprisonment. That does no good. Even the police do not support that system. The Government will support, through the courts, the existence of the charge of drunk and disorderly but it will not support the charge of public drunkenness.

The honourable member for Lowan raised the matter of the rationalization of race-courses and made particular reference to the country clubs with their own courses.

The rationalization of racing is supported by every section of the racing industry, including the Victoria Racing Club, the metropolitan and country clubs, owners and trainers. The jockeys club claims rationalization is necessary to make Victorian racing progress because it is at present going through a lull.

The real problem is which clubs to close. In the past the authorities closed racing clubs at places such as Bacchus Marsh, Ballan and Woodend. That has been a most progressive move despite the fact that the committees do not always agree with the decision.

I can assure the honourable member for Lowan that the Government intends to rationalize racing in Victoria at the

request of the industry, including country clubs. The clubs that will be closed will be decided according to the circumstances, bearing in mind the fact mentioned by the honourable member for Lowan, that the country clubs do a good job. So far as £sd is concerned—if that is the term used today—many country clubs throughout Victoria have not increased the prize money payable for four or five years despite an increase in inflation, nor have they increased the float rebate despite the fact that the price of petrol has increased four times in the past five years. Therefore, owners and trainers—the people at the grass roots—who put money into the industry are getting less return for their investment and are leaving the industry. Rationalization is needed to make it more financially viable, not only for the owners and trainers but also for the people who bet with the Totalizator Agency Board.

I assure the honourable member for Lowan that the Government is looking to rationalization in consultation with the Victoria Racing Club—the governing body—the Racecourses Licences Board, country racecourses and everyone connected with racing in the State.

Mr GINIFER (Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs)—The honourable member for Melbourne raised a question in relation to his and similar electorates. I draw to his attention the anomalies that exist even in the City of Keilor where my opponent received 10 000 votes and I received 26 000 votes. Remedies are available.

The matter raised by the honourable member relates to public awareness and the need to encourage people to ensure that when they reach 18 years of age or become Australian citizens they enrol as voters. The matters raised will be looked at by my department. Other matters raised by other honourable members, by interjection or otherwise, may eventually be looked at by the Department of Property and Services. All of the matters raised will certainly be considered. The community generally should be encouraged to enrol as voters. The many other anomalies involved may be considered by other departments.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.53 p.m. until Tuesday, May 25.
