

PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA

**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(HANSARD)**

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION**

Thursday, 17 November 2005

(extract from Book 8)

Internet: www.parliament.vic.gov.au/downloadhansard

By authority of the Victorian Government Printer

The Governor

JOHN LANDY, AC, MBE

The Lieutenant-Governor

Lady SOUTHEY, AM

The ministry

Premier and Minister for Multicultural Affairs	The Hon. S. P. Bracks, MP
Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment, Minister for Water and Minister for Victorian Communities.....	The Hon. J. W. Thwaites, MP
Minister for Finance, Minister for Major Projects and Minister for WorkCover and the TAC	The Hon. J. Lenders, MLC
Minister for Education Services and Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs	The Hon. J. M. Allan, MP
Minister for Transport	The Hon. P. Batchelor, MP
Minister for Local Government and Minister for Housing.....	The Hon. C. C. Broad, MLC
Treasurer, Minister for Innovation and Minister for State and Regional Development	The Hon. J. M. Brumby, MP
Minister for Agriculture.....	The Hon. R. G. Cameron, MP
Minister for the Arts and Minister for Women's Affairs.....	The Hon. M. E. Delahunty, MP
Minister for Community Services and Minister for Children.....	The Hon. S. M. Garbutt, MP
Minister for Manufacturing and Export, Minister for Financial Services and Minister for Small Business	The Hon. A. Haermeyer, MP
Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrections	The Hon. T. J. Holding, MP
Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Planning	The Hon. R. J. Hulls, MP
Minister for Aged Care and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs	The Hon. Gavin Jennings, MLC
Minister for Education and Training	The Hon. L. J. Kosky, MP
Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Commonwealth Games.....	The Hon. J. M. Madden, MLC
Minister for Gaming, Minister for Racing, Minister for Tourism and Minister assisting the Premier on Multicultural Affairs.....	The Hon. J. Pandazopoulos, MP
Minister for Health	The Hon. B. J. Pike, MP
Minister for Energy Industries and Minister for Resources	The Hon. T. C. Theophanous, MLC
Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Information and Communication Technology.....	The Hon. M. R. Thomson, MLC
Cabinet Secretary	Mr R. W. Wynne, MP

Legislative Assembly committees

Privileges Committee — Mr Cooper, Mr Herbert, Mr Honeywood, Ms Lindell, Mr Lupton, Mr Maughan, Mr Nardella, Mr Perton and Mr Stensholt.

Standing Orders Committee — The Speaker, Ms Campbell, Mr Dixon, Mr Helper, Mr Loney, Mr Plowman and Mrs Powell.

Joint committees

Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Cooper, Ms Marshall, Mr Maxfield, Dr Sykes and Mr Wells. (*Council*): The Honourable S. M. Nguyen and Mr Scheffer.

Economic Development Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Delahunty, Mr Jenkins, Ms Morand and Mr Robinson. (*Council*): The Honourables B. N. Atkinson and R. H. Bowden, and Mr Pullen.

Education and Training Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Eckstein, Mr Herbert, Mr Kotsiras, Ms Munt and Mr Perton. (*Council*): The Honourables H. E. Buckingham and P. R. Hall.

Environment and Natural Resources Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Duncan, Ms Lindell and Mr Seitz. (*Council*): The Honourables Andrea Coote, D. K. Drum, J. G. Hilton and W. A. Lovell.

Family and Community Development Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms McTaggart, Ms Neville, Mrs Powell Mrs Shardey and Mr Wilson. (*Council*): The Honourable D. McL. Davis and Mr Smith.

House Committee — (*Assembly*): The Speaker (*ex officio*), Mr Cooper, Mr Leighton, Mr Lockwood, Mr Maughan and Mr Smith. (*Council*): The President (*ex officio*), the Honourables B. N. Atkinson and Andrew Brideson, Ms Hadden and the Honourables J. M. McQuilten and S. M. Nguyen.

Law Reform Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Beard, Ms Beattie, Mr Hudson, Mr Lupton and Mr Maughan. (*Council*): The Honourable Richard Dalla-Riva, Ms Hadden and the Honourables J. G. Hilton and David Koch.

Library Committee — (*Assembly*): The Speaker, Mr Carli, Mrs Powell, Mr Seitz and Mr Thompson. (*Council*): The President, Ms Argondizzo and the Honourables Richard Dalla-Riva, Kaye Darveniza and C. A. Strong.

Outer Suburban/Interface Services and Development Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Baillieu, Ms Buchanan, Mr Dixon, Mr Nardella and Mr Smith. (*Council*): Ms Argondizzo and Mr Somyurek.

Public Accounts and Estimates Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Campbell, Mr Clark, Ms Green and Mr Merlino. (*Council*): The Honourables W. R. Baxter, Bill Forwood and G. K. Rich-Phillips, Ms Romanes and Mr Somyurek.

Road Safety Committee — (*Assembly*): Dr Harkness, Mr Langdon, Mr Mulder and Mr Trezise. (*Council*): The Honourables B. W. Bishop, J. H. Eren and E. G. Stoney.

Rural and Regional Services and Development Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Crutchfield, Mr Hardman, Mr Ingram, Dr Naphine and Mr Walsh. (*Council*): The Honourables J. M. McQuilten and R. G. Mitchell.

Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms D'Ambrosio, Mr Jasper, Mr Leighton, Mr Lockwood, Mr McIntosh, Mr Perera and Mr Thompson. (*Council*): Ms Argondizzo and the Honourable Andrew Brideson.

Heads of parliamentary departments

Assembly — Clerk of the Parliaments and Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Mr R. W. Purdey

Council — Clerk of the Legislative Council: Mr W. R. Tunnecliffe

Parliamentary Services — Secretary: Dr S. O'Kane

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT — FIRST SESSION

Speaker: The Hon. JUDY MADDIGAN

Deputy Speaker: Mr P. J. LONEY

Acting Speakers: Ms Barker, Ms Campbell, Mr Cooper, Mr Delahunty, Mr Ingram, Mr Jasper, Mr Kotsiras, Mr Languiller, Ms Lindell, Mr Nardella, Mr Plowman, Mr Savage, Mr Seitz, Mr Smith and Mr Thompson

Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and Premier:

The Hon. S. P. BRACKS

Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and Deputy Premier:

The Hon. J. W. THWAITES

Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and Leader of the Opposition:

Mr R. K. B. DOYLE

Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and Deputy Leader of the Opposition:

The Hon. P. N. HONEYWOOD

Leader of The Nationals:

Mr P. J. RYAN

Deputy Leader of The Nationals:

Mr P. L. WALSH

Member	District	Party	Member	District	Party
Allan, Ms Jacinta Marie	Bendigo East	ALP	Languiller, Mr Telmo Ramon	Derrimut	ALP
Andrews, Mr Daniel Michael	Mulgrave	ALP	Leighton, Mr Michael Andrew	Preston	ALP
Asher, Ms Louise	Brighton	LP	Lim, Mr Hong	Clayton	ALP
Baillieu, Mr Edward Norman	Hawthorn	LP	Lindell, Ms Jennifer Margaret	Carrum	ALP
Barker, Ms Ann Patricia	Oakleigh	ALP	Lobato, Ms Tamara Louise	Gembrook	ALP
Batchelor, Mr Peter	Thomastown	ALP	Lockwood, Mr Peter John	Bayswater	ALP
Beard, Ms Dympna Anne	Kilsyth	ALP	Loney, Mr Peter James	Lara	ALP
Beattie, Ms Elizabeth Jean	Yuroke	ALP	Lupton, Mr Anthony Gerard	Prahran	ALP
Bracks, Mr Stephen Phillip	Williamstown	ALP	McIntosh, Mr Andrew John	Kew	LP
Brumby, Mr John Mansfield	Broadmeadows	ALP	McTaggart, Ms Heather	Evelyn	ALP
Buchanan, Ms Rosalyn	Hastings	ALP	Maddigan, Mrs Judith Marilyn	Essendon	ALP
Cameron, Mr Robert Graham	Bendigo West	ALP	Marshall, Ms Kirstie	Forest Hill	ALP
Campbell, Ms Christine Mary	Pascoe Vale	ALP	Maughan, Mr Noel John	Rodney	Nats
Carli, Mr Carlo	Brunswick	ALP	Maxfield, Mr Ian John	Narracan	ALP
Clark, Mr Robert William	Box Hill	LP	Merlino, Mr James	Monbulk	ALP
Cooper, Mr Robert Fitzgerald	Mornington	LP	Mildenhall, Mr Bruce Allan	Footscray	ALP
Crutchfield, Mr Michael Paul	South Barwon	ALP	Morand, Ms Maxine Veronica	Mount Waverley	ALP
D'Ambrosio, Ms Liliana	Mill Park	ALP	Mulder, Mr Terence Wynn	Polwarth	LP
Delahunty, Mr Hugh Francis	Lowan	Nats	Munt, Ms Janice Ruth	Mordialloc	ALP
Delahunty, Ms Mary Elizabeth	Northcote	ALP	Napthine, Dr Denis Vincent	South-West Coast	LP
Dixon, Mr Martin Francis	Nepean	LP	Nardella, Mr Donato Antonio	Melton	ALP
Donnellan, Mr Luke Anthony	Narre Warren North	ALP	Neville, Ms Lisa Mary	Bellarine	ALP
Doyle, Mr Robert Keith Bennett	Malvern	LP	Overington, Ms Karen Marie	Ballarat West	ALP
Duncan, Ms Joanne Therese	Macedon	ALP	Pandazopoulos, Mr John	Dandenong	ALP
Eckstein, Ms Anne Lore	Ferntree Gully	ALP	Perera, Mr Jude	Cranbourne	ALP
Garbutt, Ms Sherryl Maree	Bundoora	ALP	Perton, Mr Victor John	Doncaster	LP
Gillett, Ms Mary Jane	Tarneit	ALP	Pike, Ms Bronwyn Jane	Melbourne	ALP
Green, Ms Danielle Louise	Yan Yean	ALP	Plowman, Mr Antony Fulton	Benambra	LP
Haermeyer, Mr André	Kororoit	ALP	Powell, Mrs Elizabeth Jeanette	Shepparton	Nats
Hardman, Mr Benedict Paul	Seymour	ALP	Robinson, Mr Anthony Gerard	Mitcham	ALP
Harkness, Dr Alistair Ross	Frankston	ALP	Ryan, Mr Peter Julian	Gippsland South	Nats
Helper, Mr Jochen	Ripon	ALP	Savage, Mr Russell Irwin	Mildura	Ind
Herbert, Mr Steven Ralph	Eltham	ALP	Seitz, Mr George	Keilor	ALP
Holding, Mr Timothy James	Lyndhurst	ALP	Shardey, Mrs Helen Jean	Caulfield	LP
Honeywood, Mr Phillip Neville	Warrandyte	LP	Smith, Mr Kenneth Maurice	Bass	LP
Howard, Mr Geoffrey Kemp	Ballarat East	ALP	Stensholt, Mr Robert Einar	Burwood	ALP
Hudson, Mr Robert John	Bentleigh	ALP	Sykes, Dr William Everett	Benalla	Nats
Hulls, Mr Rob Justin	Niddrie	ALP	Thompson, Mr Murray Hamilton Ross	Sandringham	LP
Ingram, Mr Craig	Gippsland East	Ind	Thwaites, Mr Johnstone William	Albert Park	ALP
Jasper, Mr Kenneth Stephen	Murray Valley	Nats	Trezise, Mr Ian Douglas	Geelong	ALP
Jenkins, Mr Brendan James	Morwell	ALP	Walsh, Mr Peter Lindsay	Swan Hill	Nats
Kosky, Ms Lynne Janice	Altona	ALP	Wells, Mr Kimberley Arthur	Scoresby	LP
Kotsiras, Mr Nicholas	Bulleen	LP	Wilson, Mr Dale Lester	Narre Warren South	ALP
Langdon, Mr Craig Anthony Cuffe	Ivanhoe	ALP	Wynne, Mr Richard William	Richmond	ALP

CONTENTS

THURSDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2005

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF TRADITIONAL OWNERS ..	2215	<i>Police: Geelong</i>	2244
PROCLAMATION	2215	<i>Tourism: Moving Forward.....</i>	2244
ADDRESS BY MAYOR OF GREATER GEELONG	2215	<i>Port of Geelong: rail link.....</i>	2245
PETITIONS		<i>Geelong: government initiatives.....</i>	2246
<i>Racial and religious tolerance: legislation</i>	2221	ABSENCE OF MINISTER	2241
<i>Schools: religious instruction</i>	2221, 2222	MINISTERIAL STATEMENT	
<i>Schools: literacy.....</i>	2222	<i>Parliament: 150th anniversary.....</i>	2247
<i>Police: schools program.....</i>	2222	ROAD SAFETY AND OTHER ACTS (VEHICLE	
<i>Greenvale secondary school: site.....</i>	2222	IMPOUNDMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS)	
<i>Industrial relations: federal changes.....</i>	2222	BILL	
AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS		<i>Second reading</i>	2267, 2295
<i>Response by Minister for Finance</i>	2222	<i>Remaining stages.....</i>	2295
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT		WORKPLACE RIGHTS ADVOCATE BILL	
COMMITTEE		<i>Second reading</i>	2284
<i>Regulation of funeral industry</i>	2223	<i>Remaining stages.....</i>	2293
COUNTY COURT JUDGES		HEALTH PROFESSIONS REGISTRATION BILL	
<i>Reports 2002–03 and 2003–04.....</i>	2223	<i>Consideration in detail</i>	2293
DOCUMENTS	2223	<i>Remaining stages.....</i>	2295
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE		SUPERANNUATION LEGISLATION (GOVERNANCE	
<i>Adjournment.....</i>	2223	REFORM) BILL	
<i>Program</i>	2284	<i>Second reading</i>	2295
MEMBERS STATEMENTS		<i>Circulated amendments.....</i>	2295
<i>Legislative Assembly: Geelong sitting.....</i>	2223	<i>Remaining stages.....</i>	2296
<i>Hazardous waste: Geelong.....</i>	2224	DUTIES AND LAND TAX ACTS (AMENDMENT)	
<i>Geelong: history.....</i>	2224	BILL	
<i>Domestic violence: legislation.....</i>	2224	<i>Second reading</i>	2296
<i>The Bellarine ... via Ramblers Road.....</i>	2225	<i>Circulated amendments.....</i>	2296
<i>Socceroos: World Cup.....</i>	2225, 2227	<i>Remaining stages.....</i>	2297
<i>Princes Highway, Geelong: upgrade</i>	2225	ADJOURNMENT	
<i>Emergency services: South Barwon electorate.....</i>	2225	<i>Greater Geelong: child-care centre application.....</i>	2297
<i>Government: performance.....</i>	2226	<i>Geelong Football Club: pre-season competition.....</i>	2297
<i>Tuong Van Nguyen.....</i>	2226	<i>Schools: apprenticeship project officers</i>	2298
<i>Geelong: family connections.....</i>	2226	<i>Child care: Churchill.....</i>	2299
<i>Conveyancing: review.....</i>	2227	<i>Police: Geelong and Surf Coast.....</i>	2299
<i>Midland Highway–Tatura–Undera Road,</i>		<i>Footscray West Primary School: upgrade.....</i>	2300
<i>Tatura: safety</i>	2227	<i>Timber industry: Otways</i>	2300
<i>Police: Boronia</i>	2228	<i>Lake Connewarre: environmental values project....</i>	2300
<i>Christmas reflection.....</i>	2228	<i>Hamilton Special Development School: traffic</i>	
<i>Knox Pride awards.....</i>	2228	<i>management.....</i>	2301
<i>Christopher McIlvain.....</i>	2229	<i>Disability services: legislation.....</i>	2301
<i>Glen Orden Primary School: Hungry</i>		<i>Responses</i>	2302
<i>Caterpillars program.....</i>	2229		
<i>Vermont Secondary College: art and technology</i>			
<i>wing</i>	2229		
URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY: AMENDMENTS	2230		
2255			
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE			
<i>Hazardous waste: Geelong.....</i>	2240		
<i>Transport Accident Commission: head office</i>			
<i>relocation</i>	2241		
<i>Rural and regional Victoria: business</i>			
<i>regulation.....</i>	2241		
<i>Geelong bypass: contract</i>	2242		
<i>Roads: funding</i>	2242		
<i>Arts: Geelong</i>	2243		

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Tuesday, 15 November 2005

575. *Employment and youth affairs:*
ministerial international travel.....2305
596(ao). *WorkCover: Shannon's Way Pty Ltd*2305

919. *Transport: VicRoads — speed zone*
complaints..... 2344
921. *Transport: V/Line — taxis*..... 2345
925. *Transport: rail — carriage defects*..... 2345
928. *Transport: Peninsula Bus Lines*..... 2346

Thursday, 17 November 2005

441. *Transport: unanswered questions on*
notice.....2307
713. *Transport: rail — Ararat/ Bairnsdale*
services.....2307
714. *Transport: V/Line — revenue*.....2311
716. *Transport: pensioner concession*
vouchers.....2315
725. *Transport: traffic growth*.....2316
771. *Transport: V/Line — compensation*
claims2329
799. *Transport: trams — route 75 passenger*
numbers.....2330
801. *Transport: trams — route 75 low-floor*
trams2330
802. *Transport: rail — Sandringham*
crossing.....2331
803. *Transport: rail — pedestrian fatalities*2331
807. *Transport: V/Line — link services*.....2331
810. *Transport: V/Line — link services*.....2332
812. *Transport: V/Line — link services*.....2332
834. *Transport: Midland Highway —*
roadworks2332
835. *Transport: Midland Highway —*
condition2334
838. *Transport: speed limit changes*2334
839. *Transport: speed limit changes*2334
841. *Transport: VicRoads — signs*.....2335
844. *Transport: V/Line — carriage cleaning*.....2336
853. *Transport: taxidriver complaints*2337
861. *Transport: V/Line — compensation*
claims2338
866. *Transport: Spencer Street station*
public address system.....2339
867. *Transport: Great Ocean Road —*
concrete kerbing2339
868. *Transport: Great Ocean Road —*
concrete kerbing2340
869. *Transport: Skenes Creek and Forrest-*
Apollo Bay roads2340
870. *Transport: Great Ocean Road —*
Kennett River2341
884. *Transport: rail — average dwell times*2341
888. *Transport: VicRoads — traffic*
controller jobs.....2342
899. *Transport: Monash Freeway noise*
walls2343
915. *Transport: Spencer Street Station —*
platforms2344

GEELONG**Thursday, 17 November 2005****The SPEAKER (Hon. Judy Maddigan) took the chair at 10.35 a.m. and read the prayer.****ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF TRADITIONAL OWNERS**

The SPEAKER — Order! The Parliament today acknowledges the land of the tribes and nations of the Aboriginal people of Victoria.

PROCLAMATION

The SPEAKER — Order! I wish to read the proclamation allowing us to sit today:

Whereas:

- A. By proclamation made on 4 February 2003 by me, John Landy, Governor of Victoria, pursuant to section 8 of the Constitution Act 1975, fixed 25 February 2003 at 11.00 a.m. as the time for the commencement and holding of the first session of the 55th Parliament of Victoria for the dispatch of business, at the Parliament houses, Melbourne.
- B. Pursuant to section 8(1) of the Constitution Act 1975 the Governor is empowered to vary and alter the places fixed within Victoria and the times fixed for holding every session of the Legislative Council and of the Legislative Assembly.

I, John Landy, Governor of Victoria, acting under section 8 of the Constitution Act 1975 and all other powers vested in me:

- 1. hereby vary and alter the place for holding the first session of the Legislative Council:
 - i. from 17 November 2005 to the Colac Otway Performing Arts and Cultural Centre at Rae Street, in the city of Colac; and
 - ii. thereafter, when the Legislative Council has completed its business on that day or on the following day if necessary, to the Houses of Parliament, Melbourne.
- 2. hereby vary and alter the place for holding the first session of the Legislative Assembly:
 - iii. from 17 November 2005 to the Deakin University Geelong waterfront campus at 1–11 Gheringhap Street in the city of Geelong; and
 - iv. thereafter, when the Legislative Assembly has completed its business on that day or on the following day if necessary, to the houses of Parliament, Melbourne.

Given under my hand and the seal of Victoria at Melbourne this 15th day of November 2005.

John Landy
Governor

By His Excellency's Command

The SPEAKER — Order! I ask the Serjeant-at-Arms to escort the mayor of the City of Greater Geelong into the chamber.

Mayor escorted into chamber by Serjeant-at-Arms.

The SPEAKER — Order! I invite the mayor of the City of Greater Geelong to address the chamber.

ADDRESS BY MAYOR OF GREATER GEELONG

Cr DOWLING — Honourable Speaker, the Premier, the Honourable Steve Bracks, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Robert Doyle, the Leader of The Nationals, Mr Peter Ryan, members of the Legislative Assembly, ladies and gentlemen, on this auspicious occasion I acknowledge the Wathaurong people as the traditional owners of the Geelong region and register my respect for the indigenous carers of this great land.

Today I am deeply honoured to address the 55th Legislative Assembly as the mayor of the City of Greater Geelong, Victoria's second city.

I stand before you buoyed by the great sense of optimism that pervades our city. We are going places, as is our august Geelong Football Club, as many members of this Assembly would agree. Australians were rightly in awe in witnessing the Geelong football team's inspiring ability to gain a place in the final eight this year. The parochial pride we display in our courageous Cats demonstrates a community spirit and passion that is the envy of many a city and town — and that is not all they envy. I am sure many Victorian localities feel we have some kind of advantage in the bipartisan support our team attracts — from both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, no less, not to mention the Honourable Rob Hulls and Ted Baillieu. I am sure it is just a coincidence that we now have a fantastic football stadium to showcase and nurture our sporting talents.

Our city was built from the honest sweat and toil of working men and women who created the city we are immensely proud of. When you drive from Melbourne across those somewhat soporific plains and arrive at the bayside where that gentle breeze greets you, you know you are in a very special place.

Our unique identity can be traced back to 1849, when the act of the Parliament of New South Wales to incorporate the Town of Geelong came into force. They hoped it would one day become the capital of Victoria. Obviously, as history records it, this did not happen, but that disappointment has been tempered somewhat after 150 years.

We are living during a time of profound demographic and market change. Never have communities like Geelong been so important. At a recent conference it was noted that the strength of our municipalities is fundamental to Australia's competitive position in the global economy. It is where the face of Australia is changing most and where the exciting dynamic diversity of a country expresses itself.

It is local governments that are improving the competitiveness of their regions, altering the physical landscapes, building community capacity and enhancing their ability to attract, grow and retain the population.

This is an era of a new kind of leadership, one where we are recognised as true place managers and where partnering with state and federal governments is paramount. We need to seize the moment to embed these partnerships and together work to make the City of Greater Geelong great. We need to acknowledge that Victoria's second city has a definite role to play in the health and vitality of the state and the nation.

Over the past few years we have pursued strategies to unleash this city's potential with a vision that focuses on sustainability. As a result we now live in a municipality that is changing and growing rapidly. The City of Greater Geelong's vision is:

Geelong: coast, country and suburbs, is the best place to live through prosperous and cohesive communities in an exceptional environment.

Our biggest growth areas are the gateway to the coast in Waurn Ponds and Grovedale, as well as in the coastal townships on the peninsula. Our tourism industry is flourishing in part due to the arrival of Jetstar at Avalon, the marketing efforts of Geelong Otway Tourism and a strong major events calendar.

Such growth throws up many challenges, such as ensuring community connectedness, achieving environmental sustainability, managing population growth, taking care of our aged infrastructure and maximising economic development in the region. We have recently decided to focus on strategic land-use planning as a mechanism for tackling some of these challenges. There is going to be no pussyfooting

around: we are going to be bold in what we imagine and the parameters we set.

The structure plan for Mount Duneed/Armstrong Creek and the strategic framework for the western wedge are two perfect places to start. Armstrong Creek is a greenfield site on the edge of our city where we have plans for a new suburb the size of Ballarat. It is a rare opportunity to create truly groundbreaking developments and bring our imaginings to reality.

Who was it who said, 'Build it and they will come.'? We can demonstrate how thinking up front about issues like environmental management, public transport infrastructure and joint community facilities can lift the bar and prevent rejigging or retrofitting down the track.

Of equal importance is planning with others such as Barwon Health, Barwon Water, Victoria Police and education providers on how we will deliver essential services. We are already talking about the possibility of providing whole-of-government facilities to reduce costs and improve relationships.

The western wedge is my second example. This is a brownfield site, a wedge-shaped area bordering central Geelong and the water. The precinct is a key transport hub. It has enormous potential to house commuters and add a cultural vibrancy to our city. It would combine residential and commercial properties, public open space, existing period buildings and innovative new architecture. Here we would like to see a major new conference centre and an expanded university. Both of these projects are really fantastic opportunities for us, and the time is right to lead rather than to follow.

There is already little or no opposition to the idea that infrastructure, especially public infrastructure, is a collective responsibility of all three spheres of government. Spending on infrastructure is an investment in communities, and if we invest in the appropriate infrastructure, our community's productive capacity will grow.

Armstrong Creek and the western wedge are two such opportunities for investment. There is also the issue of the city's infrastructure maintenance and renewal deficit — that is, the difference between the rate at which our infrastructure is declining and our ability to maintain it in a state of good repair. It is huge, it is significant, it is overwhelming and it is growing. The transport infrastructure remains a concern and a priority.

I imagine you are asking yourselves where the funding for such developments is going to come from. My

position is that the funding should come from revenues that grow with the economy. We know that Geelong ratepayers pay many billions of dollars in tax revenues to the state and federal governments. On top of that, every year the state and federal governments benefit from Geelong's growing economy through growth in stamp duty and land, sales and income taxes, not to mention gaming revenue. But not all of that comes back to the city. I believe a greater portion of that growth should be returned here, where it is generated, so that we can make the necessary investments in Geelong's public realm.

Securing a share of revenues that grow with the economy would ensure the managed and sustainable evolution of this city that we love to live in — a city where people feel they belong because they have helped to make it what it is. We ask the Parliament of Victoria to consider this and advocate for such an approach with the federal government.

The winds of change are upon us. We are willing to take up the mantle of being true place managers, but to do that we need to act as a whole and have a share of the whole. We look forward to working together to make it happen.

Thank you, Speaker, for this opportunity to address the Parliament.

Mr BRACKS (Premier) — I would like to acknowledge the Wathaurong people, the traditional owners and custodians of the land on which we stand. I pay my respects to their elders, past and present, and welcome all indigenous Victorians who may be with us here today.

I speak on behalf of the government members of this Assembly. I thank the mayor of the City of Greater Geelong, Cr Shane Dowling, for his welcome and timely remarks. I appreciate them very much. I would also like to thank the people of Geelong for their hospitality. I thank the members of Parliament — in this region the members for Lara, Geelong, Bellarine and South Barwon, and in another place, sitting today in Colac, the members for Geelong Province — for the work they have undertaken to make today a success. I also thank Deakin University for the use of its Waterfront campus, rejuvenated with Better Cities funding secured by the then Deputy Prime Minister, Brian Howe, on the strength of a chance meeting with the then vice-chancellor, John Hay. The member for Richmond wanted me to put in here — and I have not put it in — that he was an adviser to Brian Howe at that time. As I said, Speaker, I have chosen not to put that in my speech!

In January 1857 the then Geelong council moved a motion and requested that the colony's newly independent executive build Government House in Geelong on the site of the botanical gardens. The colonial government decided against making Geelong the capital of Victoria, but, as the Speaker noted today, 148 years after that event it could be argued that the voice of council has finally been heard at least for today in this Geelong sitting of Parliament. This is only —

An honourable member — It always takes that long for this government!

Mr BRACKS — I heard that interjection. This is only the second regional sitting of the Legislative Assembly in its 149-year history, following its inaugural regional sitting in Bendigo on 16 August 2001, which was also a great success. I would like to congratulate also the Legislative Council for sitting in Colac today — its third regional sitting following on from Benalla in 2002 and Ballarat in 2001.

In 2001 I told the house that one of the key reasons for holding regional sittings was to ensure that our government governed for all Victorians, not just the central business district of Melbourne. Four years on, that is still the case. That is why our government has held 38 of our 59 community cabinets in regional and rural municipalities starting — and I can remember this very well — with the inaugural community cabinet meeting in Geelong on 15 November 1999. I congratulate the municipality for the welcome we also received then. That is why we held the regional mayors' summit in Bendigo two months ago. That is why we are spending billions rebuilding services and infrastructure, including upgrading the Geelong road and committing \$380 million to the construction of the Geelong bypass, which the transport minister will be announcing some more details on today.

We are investing \$28 million in local infrastructure projects such as the Skilled Stadium redevelopment — which the mayor mentioned — which Geelong deserves as the only headquarters of a national league competition club in a regional centre in Australia. There is the extension of natural gas to Bellarine and Barwon Heads through the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund; the implementation of the regional fast rail project, the biggest upgrade of our rail system that has occurred in 120 years; the rolling out of fibre-optic broadband — which, on average, will be something like 60 times faster — to every government school in the state, and of course this region will be enormously advantaged by that initiative.

That is why we have facilitated 303 new investments outside Melbourne since 1999, including 55 investments in the Barwon/south-west region with an estimated worth of \$1.28 billion and the creation of 1567 new jobs. That is why we are attracting more people back to live in provincial and rural areas, with Geelong's population now growing faster than Victoria's overall population. But there is more work to be done to ensure Victoria remains the best place to live and raise a family, which is why on Monday I travelled to Beaufort to release *Moving Forward*, our government's \$502 million action plan to position provincial Victoria to respond to the challenges we face in regional and provincial Victoria.

It is why I am also pleased to announce today that our government will hold a feasibility study into the relocation of the Transport Accident Commission to Geelong. A relocation of the Transport Accident Commission to Geelong would provide a massive boost to this region. With 650 people employed at its head offices it could be worth as much as \$50 million a year to the local economy — and that is a conservative estimate. It will also potentially facilitate new developments and new buildings, and the mayor referred to some of the proposals the council has for the western wedge development, for example. The feasibility study into the relocation of the Transport Accident Commission will include close consultation with all stakeholders, including the Community and Public Sector Union and of course the board of the Transport Accident Commission, which has endorsed this proposal.

Our government has already successfully relocated the State Revenue Office to Ballarat and the Rural Finance Corporation to Bendigo, and jobs and investment have been created in the process of those relocations. Those kinds of initiatives are possible because of the investments we have made and will continue to make in provincial Victoria. That is why regions such as the Barwon/south-west region have performed so strongly since 1999, with 25 800 new jobs created and building approvals more than doubling over the last six years.

Median house prices in Geelong have also jumped over the last six years, going from \$160 000 to \$375 000. Our government's Moving Forward plan will help keep Geelong thriving by building on its achievements in population, infrastructure, industry, investment and job growth — just as today's regional sittings will help keep our democracy thriving by taking Parliament to the people, because our democracy cannot be confined to Spring Street.

I congratulate you, Speaker, and the team at Parliament House for recognising that this is important for our state. Parliament needs to be actively engaged with the community at large, whether through community cabinets, regional sittings, the outreach efforts of local members or community activism, which is why our government is so pleased that Victoria's democracy has found a home today in Geelong for the Legislative Assembly and one in Colac for the Legislative Council.

Geelong has a proud history of democracy and dissent. After all, Victoria's first Premier, William Clark Haines, came from Barrabool Hills. The first female candidate for state Parliament, Alicia Katz, stood for the seat of Barwon for the ALP in 1924. Victoria's first political rebel, Peter Lalor helped build the Geelong–Williamstown railway. He hid in Geelong after the Eureka Stockade rebellion and married a Geelong schoolmistress, Alicia Dunne. No doubt Haines and Lalor would have approved of the regional sitting we are holding today in Geelong, as would Victoria's Surveyor-General, Robert Hoddle, the man who planned the layout of Geelong and Melbourne. Hoddle would have approved because he loathed state Parliament. I disagree with what he said, but he said the building was 'adequate for a state prison or lunatic asylum'.

He never forgave the authorities of the time for plonking the building at the top of the hill and blocking his beloved Bourke Street. If Hoddle had had his way, he would have demolished state Parliament and rolled Bourke Street over the top of its foundations. He probably would have found justice in the fact that Peter Kerr's grandiose design for Parliament House was never realised and that almost 150 years after the foundations began to be laid on Boxing Day 1855, the state Parliament House remains incomplete.

Speaker, I think that state of affairs is highly appropriate, because, much like our Parliament House, the work of good government, the work of open and accessible democracy, is never complete. There is always more work to be done, which is why today we look forward very much to delivering open and accessible government to the people of Geelong and the people of Victoria.

Mr DOYLE (Leader of the Opposition) — To the mayor of Greater Geelong, Shane Dowling — and if I may say to the people of Geelong who have come to this historic sitting and in particular the schoolchildren of Geelong who have come to see their Parliament in operation — this is an historic moment, and it is right that we recognise the traditional owners of the land upon which we stand.

Moving away from the formal, traditional and historical perspective, can I say from a personal perspective that I always feel very much at home here in Geelong. I went to school here; my first teaching job was here; I have many friends here — and I hope not too many enemies; and I always like coming back here.

Mr Crutchfield — They're over there.

Mr DOYLE — You can be so ungenerous sometimes! What happened to that spirit of cooperation?

It is a familiar and very friendly place for me and, of course, it would be appropriate to also mention that there is one of the great meccas of football here, down at Kardinia Park where the banners fly high from dawn to dark. Although there has not been a banner flying since 1963, we are hopeful that next year — as we are always hopeful at the Geelong Football Club — will be the year.

Could I say to people who do not know Geelong well, I hope they will get the chance today to discover that this is one of the best kept secrets of our state. Many of us would have come into Geelong today along The Esplanade as we went down to the carousel to be welcomed by the mayor and the chief executive officer of this great city. As you drive along that Esplanade you surely recognise that you are driving along one of the great boulevards of Victoria, one of the great boulevards of Australia. As you look out across the bay and as you look at the development of the waterfront and the beautiful houses that are there, you recognise that you are in a very special place indeed. But it is not just those physical attributes. People who know Geelong well understand the lifestyle of Geelong and know that, whether it is the beautiful suburbs of Geelong or its proximity to the coast and the Great Ocean Road, this is a very special place to live.

As you come in along that waterfront — and I will speak more about that a little later — and go along Eastern Beach and move further along to the Botanic Gardens you realise you are in one of the great precincts of one of the great cities not just of this state but also of Australia. This is a remarkable city for its cultural and sporting life as well. There is a richness in both of those areas that is truly remarkable — and may I say on a personal note that I applaud the council's moves to try to get the von Guerard view of Geelong back to this city. It would be a remarkable addition to the gallery and to the cultural life not just of Geelong but also of this state.

When you look at the potential of the people who live here, not just the institutions but the people who make up Geelong, and when you look at the schools that are here and the great university and the Gordon Institute of TAFE, you see that there is a rich life here. It is appropriate that we meet here in Deakin University, and again I feel quite a connection to Deakin. One of the Deakin campuses, Stonnington, is in my electorate. When I was at school my headmaster was Peter Thwaites, and we always thought him a rather distant figure and rather an absentee headmaster.

An honourable member — Good name!

Mr DOYLE — I won't take up that interjection! As I said, he was rather distant and perhaps a little bit pleased with himself, but it was not until we left school that we discovered that he had become the vice-chancellor of Deakin University. Then we realised that perhaps his mind was not entirely upon secondary education and the school where he was headmaster. But it is a remarkable connection to think that he was the first vice-chancellor of this remarkable institution, which has gone on to be one of the great universities not just of Victoria but also of Australia.

I pay great tribute in that wrap-up of Geelong not only to the council but also to the Committee for Geelong, which has shown great leadership in making sure that it not only safeguards what is best about Geelong but also promotes change where it is necessary to further improve Geelong.

I mentioned the waterfront before. If I may, I want to take a personal moment to say something about a friend of mine whom I particularly wish to remember. The waterfront is a remarkable development and a remarkable testament to our former colleague, Ann Henderson. As the member for Geelong in this place Ann was a champion of Geelong and a champion of the waterfront. Every time I walk along it or drive past it I think of Ann and her legacy, and it is great that we are here today.

There are also projects that have support from both sides of this house and federally. The upgrade of the Geelong road, the Geelong bypass and the Avalon development are all very important for Geelong. As I said, I hope development will continue on the waterfront, because there is more work to be done there. In particular I think of the Denny Lascelles building and what might be possible there, and I think of the development of Kardinia Park. Listening to the mayor I was also reminded of the necessity of the development of the western wedge.

In conclusion I want to say a little about that, because I think that is a particular challenge for Geelong. This is a remarkable city, in that I do not know of another economic centre that supports itself. There are about 10 000 businesses in and around Geelong, and by and large they actually support each other. They have a self-generating capacity whereby they are entirely prepared to do business in Geelong with Geelong people. That is a great boon for the economy of the region as a whole. I do not even know if Geelong knows how special that is, but I have not come across that sort of culture anywhere else. Here people are prepared to support their own and support local businesses.

This is a very resilient city. It would have to be, because the Pyramid Building Society disaster would have brought a city of a lesser capacity to its knees and perhaps wiped out its self-confidence forever — and for Geelong it nearly did. It was a terrible disaster that still affects a number of families. However, Geelong got on with its business. People got on with their lives, and their resilience and resourcefulness meant that they were able to recover from that terrible financial disaster.

There are still challenges ahead for this great city. There is the challenge of water, which our provincial cities — Geelong, Ballarat and Bendigo — all face. Perhaps that is so to a slightly lesser extent here; nevertheless, it is an important infrastructure issue for the future of Geelong. Traffic congestion is another challenge. There may not be the same level of congestion here as there is in the inner parts of Melbourne, but I noticed today, as I am sure many of us did as we drove down this morning, the near gridlock on the Geelong road approaching the West Gate Bridge. When you get into Geelong itself there is also a traffic congestion problem — and I am thinking of Latrobe Terrace — that makes life in the city sometimes very difficult. We hope the bypass will fix that problem, but there are other traffic congestion problems in Geelong as well.

Again on a personal note I would like to focus on the one thing that I think will be Geelong's great challenge over the next 5 to 10 years. It is the product of both its present and its future strengths, and it is the challenge of managing development. That is why I want to come back to talk about the western wedge, as mentioned by the major. I would personally like to see cranes on the skyline in the western wedge, getting that development done. I would like to see some of the great projects that are on the drawing board up and running, with real economic activity generating further prosperity that would be very good for Geelong. However, I also

detect in the people of Geelong, because of their love of the lifestyle here, a concern about overdevelopment.

On the one hand people want their economy to prosper and move ahead, but on the other hand they very jealously guard their special lifestyle. Yes, it is a major city, but as anyone who lives here can tell you, there is something about the lifestyle here which feels much more like a country lifestyle. It is relaxed, it is friendly and it is neighbourly. The people of Geelong quite rightly wish to guard that. So how do you manage the necessary growth and future development of this great city but at the same time balance it with all the wonderful things that accrue to people in Geelong through their very special lifestyle and their proximity to the coast?

I am not trying to lecture the council, the Committee for Geelong, or indeed the people: it is just what I see as perhaps the great challenge that still faces this city. But it is an exciting challenge, and it is one that I am sure the council, the Committee for Geelong, the people of Geelong and the business community of Geelong will embrace and take care of so that they retain the best of both worlds: a prosperous, vibrant, growing city with a truly remarkable lifestyle. With the resources that are here, the people that are here, and particularly the future of Geelong represented by the young people in our galleries today, I am confident that the city of Geelong can not only face those challenges and overcome them, but that in future decades we will see a great city grow even greater.

Mr RYAN (Leader of The Nationals) — It is my great pleasure on behalf of The Nationals to extend to Mayor Shane Dowling and to the community he so ably represents our thanks for the very warm welcome they have extended to us today.

I have to say I cannot let the commentary go in relation to football. My last visit to this fair city was in round 20 of the season just gone. That was the day when the mighty Demons came to town, and when they were down and out they came back from beyond and got up and won by a point. The Premier was there — I saw him; he did not celebrate it as I did — and the Deputy Premier would have liked to be there, of course, as a Melbourne supporter. The Leader of the Opposition could not come.

Last night across Australia we saw a magnificent result that I know we all celebrated, but for the Demons to come to Geelong after 17 years and beat the Cats on their home ground was almost no less an achievement. I do not want to go any further on that matter, but I am pleased that the mayor introduced the topic.

This is a magnificent city of about 180 000 people that quite properly lays claim to its role as the second major city within the state of Victoria. As I have already said, I thank you for the warm welcome its people have extended. The history of Geelong has been told today, and I am sure it will be retold during the course of the day. When you look at some of that history it is quite remarkable to see the growth over the years and the way this community has adapted to the changes that have occurred over the decades.

In 1839 Geelong comprised 82 houses and 545 residents. By 1850 it had grown to a population of about 8000 people, based around the wool industry, the soon-to-be-discovered gold and the seaport. By the latter part of the 1850s there were approximately 23 000 people living in Geelong.

Over the subsequent years we have seen changes occurring during that enormously important period of growth in this great city. We have seen at different stages the development of the woollen mills, the distillery, the fertiliser factory, the textiles industry, and of course the Ford Motor Company. There is also the food manufacturing sector, and there is Deakin University where we are now located. There is the Avalon airport and the development of not only Jetstar but also the air show. There is the tourism industry that has developed around the Great Ocean Road and the many aspects that are now reflective of Geelong.

But the message that goes with that commentary is that this city has had the ability to move on and to adapt. The reality is that, as the mayor well knows and has reflected on in some of his comments about the winds of change, like it or not we are all part of a global economy now. We do not live and trade village to village, we trade nation to nation; that is the reality. From Geelong's perspective, particularly of the community that lives and works here, the fact that the Ford Motor Company, particularly, is able to stand its ground in an environment where it is under such intense pressure from global competition is testimony to the great work done by the people of Geelong. This is just another instance of the way in which this wonderful city has been able to adapt to change over the years.

I listened with interest to the mayor's comments about Armstrong Creek and the western wedge issues and his observations about the necessity for the development of future infrastructure in and around this great city. I heard also the comments from the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition about the issues of development as it is occurring and as it is proposed to occur, and the aspirational matters that go to make up so much of the work of the council.

I congratulate you for that and wish you well in being able to see it achieved. It is an honour for Geelong that the Parliament of Victoria is here in your fair city today, but by the same token, Sir, it is an honour for us to be here. We are certain that the warm welcome already extended to us will continue to be reflected in the way we are received as this day proceeds.

The SPEAKER — I thank the mayor very much for his address to us this morning, and I also thank the City of Greater Geelong for its hospitality to us today. I will ask the Serjeant-at-Arms to lead the mayor from the chamber.

Mayor escorted from chamber by Serjeant-at-Arms.

PETITIONS

Following petitions presented to house:

Racial and religious tolerance: legislation

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of the undersigned residents of Victoria draws the attention of the house to the decision of the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal in the complaint against Catch the Fire ministries by the Islamic Council of Victoria, dated 17 December 2004. The decision has highlighted serious flaws in the Racial and Religious Tolerance Act 2001 which restrict the basic rights of freedom of religious discussion.

The petitioners therefore request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria remove the references to religious vilification in the Racial and Religious Tolerance Act 2001 to allow unencumbered discussion and freedom of speech regarding religion and theology.

By Dr SYKES (Benalla) (380 signatures)

Schools: religious instruction

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of citizens of Victoria concerned to ensure the continuation of religious instruction in Victorian government schools draws out to the house that under the Bracks Labor government review of education and training legislation the future of religious instruction in Victorian schools is in question and risks becoming subject to the discretion of local school councils.

The petitioners therefore request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria take steps to ensure that there is no change to legislation and the Victorian government schools reference guide that would diminish the status of religious instruction in Victorian government schools and, in addition, urge the government to provide additional funding for chaplaincy services in Victorian government schools.

The petition of citizens of Victoria [is] concerned to ensure the continuation of religious instruction in Victorian government schools, and to provide additional funding for school chaplains.

By Mrs SHARDEY (Caulfield) (12 signatures)
Mr PERTON (Doncaster) (54 signatures)
Mr DELAHUNTY (Lowan) (256 signatures)

Schools: literacy

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of Victorian parents, students and teachers, concerned about the decline in Victorian literacy standards.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the house the Bracks government proposal to lower the VCE English standard requiring students to read only one book in their final year of school.

We request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria require the Bracks government to reverse this proposal.

By Mr PERTON (Doncaster) (110 signatures)

Police: schools program

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of citizens of Victoria concerned about the abolition of the police schools involvement program (PSIP) draws to the attention of the house that the Bracks Labor government has blatantly ignored the safety of children in its move to abolish PSIP. The government has disregarded research and expert advice by Monash University which showed the program to be extremely effective.

The petitioners therefore request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria support the reinstatement of the police schools involvement program to build a secure environment for the children of Victoria.

By Mr PERTON (Doncaster) (100 signatures)

Schools: religious instruction

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of citizens of Victoria concerned to ensure the continuation of religious education in Victorian schools draws out to the house that under the Bracks Labor government review of education legislation the future of religious education in Victorian schools is in question, and the petitioners therefore request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria take steps to ensure that there is no change to legislation which would diminish the status of religious education in Victorian schools and, on the contrary, require the government to provide additional funding for chaplaincy services in Victorian state schools.

By Mr PERTON (Doncaster) (13 signatures)

Greenvale secondary school: site

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of the families of Greenvale and surrounding suburbs draws to the attention of the house the growing population in the Greenvale and Meadow Heights area, the lack of quality state secondary schools in the area and the

government's appalling proposed action to sell land on the corner of Barrymore Road and Glencairn Drive in Greenvale reserved for a secondary school.

The petitioners therefore request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria force the Bracks government to reverse its position and establish a Greenvale high school.

By Mr PERTON (Doncaster) (391 signatures)

Industrial relations: federal changes

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of residents of Victoria draws to the attention of the house the impact of the industrial relations changes proposed by the federal government.

These changes will remove unfair dismissal protections from one million Victorian workers, reduce the bargaining power of workers so they are forced to accept individual contracts, strip away automatic entitlement to many important conditions like weekend, shift and public holiday rates, overtime, redundancy pay, allowances, and casual loadings, effectively abolish the award safety net and replace it with just five minimum conditions, reduce the capacity for workers to bargain collectively with their employer, and take away the powers of the independent Industrial Relations Commission.

The petitioners therefore request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria take all action possible to protect Victorian employees and their families from these unfair changes.

By Ms GREEN (Yan Yean) (360 signatures)

Tabled.

Ordered that petition presented by honourable member for Caulfield be considered next day on motion of Mrs SHARDEY (Caulfield).

Ordered that petition presented by honourable member for Benalla be considered next day on motion of Dr SYKES (Benalla).

Ordered that petitions presented by honourable member for Doncaster be considered next day on motion of Mr PERTON (Doncaster).

Ordered that petition presented by honourable member for Yan Yean be considered next day on motion of Ms GREEN (Yan Yean).

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS

Response by Minister for Finance

Mr BATCHELOR (Minister for Transport), by leave, presented response by Minister for Finance to Auditor-General's reports issued during 2004–05.

Tabled.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Regulation of funeral industry

Ms NEVILLE (Bellarine) presented report, together with minority report, extracts of proceedings and minutes of evidence.

Tabled.

Ordered that report, minority report and extracts of proceedings be printed.

Public Prosecutions — Report of the Director, Committee and Office for the year 2004–05.

Special Investigations Monitor — Report for the year 2004–05.

Subordinate Legislation Act 1994 — Minister's exemption certificates in relation to Statutory Rule Nos 137, 138.

Victoria Law Foundation — Report for the year 2004–05.

Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal — Report for the year 2004–05.

Wimmera Health Care Group — Report for the year 2004–05 (two documents).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES

Reports 2002–03 and 2003–04

Mr HULLS (Attorney-General) presented, by command of Governor, reports for 2002–03 and 2003–04.

Tabled.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Adjournment

Mr BATCHELOR (Minister for Transport) — I move:

That the house, at its rising, adjourn until a day and hour to be fixed by the Speaker, which time of meeting shall be notified in writing to each member of the house.

Motion agreed to.

DOCUMENTS

Tabled by Clerk:

Financial Management Act 1994 — Report from the Treasurer that he had received the 2004–05 annual report of the South Eastern Medical Complex Limited.

Freedom of Information Act 1982 — Report of the Attorney-General on the operation of the Act for the year 2004–05.

Gippsland Southern Health Service — Report for the year 2004–05 (two documents).

Health Services Act 1988 — Report of the Community Visitors for the year 2004–05 — Ordered to be printed.

Housing Guarantee Fund Limited — Report for the year 2004–05 (including the Domestic Building (HIH) Indemnity Fund Financial Statement).

Intellectually Disabled Persons' Services Act 1986 — Report of the Community Visitors for the year 2004–05.

Parliamentary Committees Act 2003:

Response of the Premier on the action taken with respect to the recommendations made by the Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee's Report on Victorian Electronic Democracy.

Response of the Minister for Transport on the action taken with respect to the recommendations made by the Road Safety Committee's Inquiry into the Country Road Toll.

Police Appeals Board — Report for the year 2004–05.

MEMBERS STATEMENTS

Legislative Assembly: Geelong sitting

Mr TREZISE (Geelong) — I take this opportunity to welcome the Parliament to my electorate and home town of Geelong. At the same time I welcome the people of Geelong here to the Parliament, and in particular all those students who will visit us over the course of the day. As a lifetime resident of what I consider to be the best city in Australia, it is an honour personally to be representing Geelong in the Parliament and especially at this historical sitting.

It has been a great initiative of the Bracks government to take the Parliament into regional Victoria, an initiative which symbolises the important emphasis the Bracks government places on regional and rural communities. Only this week the government provided further evidence of this ongoing commitment to regional and rural Victorian communities through the launch of the \$500 million Moving Forward provincial package, an action plan to stimulate further growth and opportunity in cities like Geelong.

I welcome all members of the Legislative Assembly and hope you take the opportunity whilst in Geelong to have a good look around the city, which as locals we are very proud of. As locals we may have a few

disagreements about how as a community and a city we should progress and grow, but all of us who engage in this public debate do so with the intention of ensuring our city continues to thrive. As the member for Geelong I can assure members that my local parliamentary colleagues and I are committed to the ongoing partnership that exists between the Bracks government and the community of Geelong and its civic leaders in working towards making this great city an even better place in which to live and raise a family.

Hazardous waste: Geelong

Mr HONEYWOOD (Warrandyte) — This inept government has repeatedly demonstrated that it cannot be trusted by the people of Victoria and does not really care about what the community thinks. Instead the government constantly muscled in on people's right to be informed and to have input into genuine choices about their own local communities' future. Current plans to turn Geelong into a chemical dumping ground for Melbourne are no exception.

The Bracks government's most recent toxic dump proposal — namely, the Nowingi toxic waste dump in Mildura — has been handled with absolute arrogance. The government has dismissed the people who will be most affected by the waste facility as insignificant to the debate. Instead the government has opted to conduct the environment effects statement (EES) proposal in secrecy and in spite of strong public opposition.

Let the community of Geelong be warned that in the EES for the Mildura-Nowingi toxic waste dump the Bracks government's lack of community consultation was made clear. Page 124 of volume 4 of the report says:

To date the government has not engaged effectively with the community and certainly has not gained their trust, only outrage ... local people feel disfranchised by the process. They have had no say in the siting proposal, feel a strong sense of injustice in being asked to accept Melbourne's waste and see no real benefits accruing locally. The containment facility is a threat to their human and social environment ... its —

the government's —

approach can be typified as one of informing or placation rather than real community engagement.

After considering the Bracks government's track record it begs the question what guarantees the people of Geelong have when it comes to their collective voices being heard, given that they have categorically rejected — —

The SPEAKER — Order! The member's time has expired.

Geelong: history

Mr LONEY (Lara) — I welcome all members to the fabulous Geelong region. Geelong is a proud city and it has much to be proud of. It is a strong, vibrant and resilient community which is typical in many ways of the Victorian story. Geelong has had a number of golden eras, the first being in the 1850s as a gateway to Victoria's goldfields when we were a more thriving, prosperous and bustling community than Melbourne. We were the pivot of Victoria and had it not been for the unscrupulous behaviour of Melbourne merchants distributing false maps we would have been the capital. The second golden era was as a nation's wool capital. Western District superfine wool came to the Geelong sales, setting world record prices as it was sold globally. This building is the legacy of that era.

It also represents the difference in approach of Victoria's regions of Labor and Liberal-Nationals governments. It survives today because the Geelong Regional Commission bought it with money provided by the Cain Labor government when wool stores were being demolished. The Kirner government then pursued the vision of turning it into a waterfront university and the project was funded through the Keating Labor government's Better Cities program. Another wool store became the national wool museum. Again today another Labor government is investing in regional infrastructure and I believe Geelong is on the verge of another golden age.

Finally I wish to offer congratulations from Geelong to the Socceroos, in particular to Josip Skoko.

Domestic violence: legislation

Mr MAUGHAN (Rodney) — This Labor government stands condemned for its lack of action in combating domestic violence. Once again the government has shown that its talent for rhetoric and spin far outweighs its capacity to deliver. Having made all the right noises about the impact of domestic violence in our community and requesting the Law Reform Committee to prepare and deliver an interim report on family violence and police holding powers, the government has shown its lack of commitment to the cause by yesterday withdrawing the Crimes (Family Violence) (Holding Powers) Bill in favour of amendments to suburban planning schemes.

Domestic violence costs the Australian community an estimated \$8 billion per annum, is the leading

contributor to death, disability and illness in Victorian women aged between 15 and 44 years and, more importantly, predisposes one-quarter of Australian children to accepting violence as the norm and condemning their own children to a greatly increased risk of child abuse and neglect. It is an unacceptable cost to the individual and the community. One in five women are victims of family violence and one in four Australian children have witnessed violent behaviour towards their mother or stepmother. To withdraw a bill which would have given the police powers to remove a perpetrator from the house and above all enable an intervention order to be served to protect the victim and in most cases the victim's children in favour of a planning amendment — —

The SPEAKER — Order! The member's time has expired.

The Bellarine ... via Ramblers Road

Ms NEVILLE (Bellarine) — Since being elected as the member for Bellarine I have often spoken in this house about the great assets we have in Bellarine. I have reflected on the history of Bellarine, including its great maritime and agricultural history. I have celebrated its fantastic wine and food. I have spoken of the great range of schools and community organisations, and I have talked of the big and small achievements of local community members — people who have contributed and continue to contribute much to the quality of life in Bellarine.

In a couple of weeks I will have the pleasure of launching a new book about Bellarine, *The Bellarine ... via Ramblers Road*, written by Rick Wilkinson. Although I cannot give too much away about the book until it is formally launched, it is a reflection on the history of the area and the way in which the local communities have changed over time. It is not a history book but rather uses the characters of the area, those who have been there a long time and the new sea-changers, to remind people of a unique, interesting and beautiful part of the world. It will answer many key questions: which Bellarine town was initially established as a religious resort; when were the first wine grapes grown in the Bellarine region; where on the Bellarine Peninsula could the in-crowd of the late 1800s and early 1900s find a spa resort; and, importantly, in which town will you find more public toilet blocks than any other place in Victoria? All the answers to these questions will be revealed.

The book is a fantastic read, and I encourage members to have a look at it. I also encourage members to visit the area as they are here with the Parliament.

Socceroos: World Cup

Dr NAPHTHINE (South-West Coast) — Firstly, let me congratulate the Australian Socceroos on their magnificent win last night, and particularly no. 8, Josip Skoko, a Geelong boy who is a former student of Chanel College, my alma mater. Congratulations Socceroos and Josip Skoko!

Princes Highway, Geelong: upgrade

I urge the government to immediately implement a real plan to upgrade the Princes Highway west of Geelong. This highway is a key transport route linking western Victoria through to Geelong and Melbourne. Already the highway is carrying significant heavy traffic, with many trucks, B-doubles and tourist traffic as well as local traffic. Building the Geelong ring-road will bring increased traffic along this highway.

The planned upgrade should include the following features: duplication of the highway between Geelong and Colac; more overtaking lanes between Colac and Warrnambool; duplication of the highway between Warrnambool and Port Fairy; beginning a plan for a ring-road around Port Fairy; and improvement of the pavement along the entire route of the highway, because the pavement is in very poor condition.

I would also suggest that the government should remove the costly and dangerous wire rope barriers which have recently been placed inappropriately along the highway, far too close to the roads where they are a danger to motorcyclists and motorists alike. This road has been ignored by the city-centric Bracks Labor government. It is time to get on with the job of fixing the Princes Highway west of Geelong.

Emergency services: South Barwon electorate

Mr CRUTCHFIELD (South Barwon) — In Victoria, and in Geelong and the Surf Coast in particular, we have a great story to tell about our emergency services: we have new ambulance and fire brigade stations in Torquay; work is soon to start on the new Torquay police station; a new ambulance station is to be built in Ocean Grove to service Barwon Heads; and a new police station in Ocean Grove is open and servicing Barwon Heads. There has been an unprecedented injection of resources, but as a government we acknowledge that there is more to be done. One example of this is the long-awaited upgrade to the Belmont ambulance station.

I previously met with area manager, Mick Cameron, and urged him to make the new station one of the

region's highest priorities. I congratulate him and station officer Bernie Malone on their efforts with Rural Ambulance Victoria. I have also recently raised with the minister the substandard condition of the Belmont ambulance station, and I urged her to inspect the current station for herself. I have previously inspected the station with Bernie Malone. I will be pleased to accompany the minister on an inspection of the facility today. What I know she will see is a very efficient group of paramedics who easily exceed the required response times and provide a wonderful service despite the conditions they have to work in. The current Belmont station is much too small for current and future service provision, and I believe the current site precludes further expansion.

With the establishment of the Torquay and Ocean Grove stations, further north would be the best location for current and future service provision by a new Belmont station. I am confident that after her inspection today, the minister will agree.

Government: performance

Mr MULDER (Polwarth) — As we get down to business in Geelong I feel it is important to give the city's residents a run-down on what has happened in the Victorian Parliament over the past few weeks — a typical few weeks for the Bracks government.

Firstly, we had the cancerous new tax on long-term car parks, which was followed closely by the transport legislation that allows for V/Line to charge Geelong commuters for parking at stations such as Geelong, Marshall and South Geelong. But there is more, Speaker: the government has been busy.

These two cash grabs were followed up by the Treasurer's new tax on property trusts, ensuring he puts his hands into the pockets of families who had legitimately placed property in trusts for asset protection and other legitimate reasons as recommended by their accountants. But we should not stop there. To top the week off, the Premier has announced a new tax on first home buyers who purchase a new block of land on which to build their dream home.

As all of this legislation was being rammed through the Parliament, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services was hard at work installing the new and no doubt highly reliable speed cameras on the Princes Highway, while the West Gate Bridge cameras clicked happily away as the variable speed limits jumped from one to another.

On behalf of the Bracks government I wish the residents of Geelong a very happy Christmas. I say to them, 'Do not spend too much on the kids' Christmas presents: the government needs your money more than you do'. There are still more trees to be painted blue in Melbourne, and the \$500 000 taxidriver weight loss program has been a real winner! Hoarding a \$2 billion surplus while attempting to charge sick kids for their tube-fed food shows how disconnected this government has become.

Tuong Van Nguyen

Mr HULLS (Attorney-General) — On behalf of the Victorian government I take this opportunity to call on the government of Singapore to intervene and save the life of an Australian citizen, Tuong Van Nguyen. The Victorian government believes that the death penalty has no place in the practices of any legal system and that the right to life is quite simply the most fundamental human right of all. We believe, then, that the capacity of a state to sanction, let alone impose its termination, is the antithesis of every value we otherwise share with those nations who, like Singapore, subscribe to international human rights instruments.

Having admitted to attempting to traffic a substantial quantity of heroin, Mr Nguyen has demonstrated significant remorse, pleaded guilty and cooperated at every stage with police. He has even agreed to testify against those on whose behalf he was transporting the contraband. He has done what, in the tradition of most legal systems, would earn him a reduction in sentence. Yet the relevant law not only authorises but demands the imposition of death, demonstrating no flexibility or consideration of the specific circumstances of each case.

With all humility today I plead with the Singapore government to reject this penalty. I am sure members join with me in voicing support for an Australian citizen, Mr Nguyen, and our reverence for the value of his life and our condemnation of a penalty that is utterly disproportionate to his offence.

Geelong: family connections

Ms BEARD (Kilsyth) — My connection with Geelong can be traced back through 140 years of family history. In the early 1860s Bridget Leader and her sister, Maggie, left their home in County Clare in Ireland, never to return. They had lived through the Great Famine, seeing hunger and poverty before leaving their beloved Ireland to begin a new life in a strange country. After a harrowing journey of over two months they finally disembarked at the Moorabool

Street pier in Geelong. We believe they stayed in a small cottage in Little Malop Street with a friend, Mrs Roach.

Another recently arrived Irishman, John Malone from County Wexford, was also staying there. He and Bridget Leader were married in St Peter and St Paul's Church — coincidentally in Malone Street — in West Geelong in July 1863. They could hardly have foreseen that 142 years later their great-granddaughter would exult in their glory as a member of Parliament at an historic sitting in Geelong. Although they moved to the goldfields and later to Malmsbury, where they had their family of eight children, many of their descendents today live in Geelong.

Another fond memory I have is of school excursions to Geelong. Growing up just outside Colac, excursions to Eastern Beach remain a treasured memory. Geelong seemed like a wonderland to us country students on the buses travelling from Cororooke. Arriving at Geelong last night I again experienced the excitement of visiting this extremely beautiful city, so full of memories and family history for me. The walk on the promenade and to the Beach House this morning was another nostalgic journey. I feel privileged to be a part of this parliamentary sitting, and thank the Geelong community for its welcome.

Socceroos: World Cup

Mr CARLI (Brunswick) — Next year the Socceroos will be back in Germany for the World Cup finals after 32 years. This November also marks the first anniversary of the death of Socceroos great Johnny Warren. I just want to say, 'He told us so'. Johnny Warren said Australia would take its rightful place in the finals of the largest sporting competition in the world.

I congratulate the whole team, but especially the impenetrable goalkeeper, Mark Schwarzer, who made two terrific saves. I also congratulate the team's coach, Guus Hiddink — Aussie Gus — who is taking Australia to the World Cup. I want to acknowledge the work done by Frank Farina, who put an enormous amount of effort into building up the Socceroos squad. I congratulate the Football Federation of Australia for totally revamping and bringing about a renaissance in the game in Australia. I also want to congratulate Qantas as the major sponsor of the team and also as the organisation that fitted out the 767 that no doubt gave an advantage to the Australians, who were the fresher, stronger team in yesterday's competition.

So to the entire Socceroo team, to all the players who make up the squad and to all the supporters who have supported the team over the years through many unfortunate campaigns, this is for you. Thank you!

Conveyancing: review

Mr McINTOSH (Kew) — Over 400 families and citizens of Geelong and surrounding regions were completely let down by the Bracks Labor government following the collapse of Grove Conveyancing Services over 12 months ago. These innocent consumers of conveyancing services still do not have a regulatory regime in place that would provide the protection that thousands of other people who use conveyancing services around this state every day, every month and every year require so much from this government.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Law Institute of Victoria has called for a strict regulatory regime, notwithstanding the fact that the Australian Institute of Conveyancers has called for such a scheme or that most other states have a regulatory regime, this government does nothing. It sits on its hands. It promised a review by early this year with a regime in place by the middle of the year. It has not done so and these consumers of conveyancing services still lose out. Indeed, the only regime that is in place is in the Legal Practice Act which does nothing. In fact a conveyancer can practise in this state without being able to read or write. It is a disgrace and a demonstration that this government is not fair dinkum about consumer protection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Midland Highway–Tatura-Undera Road, Tatura: safety

Mrs POWELL (Shepparton) — On 11 November there was a serious accident at the intersection of the Midland Highway and Tatura-Undera Road involving two cars and five people. Both cars were extensively damaged and an elderly female was airlifted to the Royal Melbourne Hospital with life-threatening injuries. The other occupants of the cars all received injuries. This is an extremely dangerous intersection. On 2 December last year in the adjournment debate I raised with the Minister for Transport the need for safety measures and lighting and followed that with a letter.

I have received a letter from Senior Constable Simon Hutchings of the Tatura police outlining the danger of this intersection, and another close by on Dhurringile Road. In March last year five vehicles were involved in

one accident. A cow was on the road at night time, and because the cow was black and it was a foggy night, no-one saw it. After more accidents I wrote again on 3 August this year seeking a response from the minister. There has still been no response and no action.

After this recent bad accident I received another letter from Senior Constable Hutchings advising that the intersection had received no attention at all from VicRoads and with the fruit-picking season almost here and the heavy concentration of fruit and milk trucks using that intersection regularly, Senior Constable Hutchings is expecting more accidents to occur.

The Tatura-Undera Road intersection is poorly designed due to the angle of the bend and there is poor visibility and no street lighting. After the latest accident Senior Constable Frank Hogan of the Tatura police stated in the media that it has been sheer luck that no-one has been killed. The community, the police, the media and I all hope that no-one has to die before some action is taken to fix these busy intersections.

Police: Boronia

Mr LOCKWOOD (Bayswater) — I would like to acknowledge the Socceros and the great work they did — and for keeping us in suspense for a very long time!

However, my main purpose today is to acknowledge the great work of members of the Victoria Police at the Boronia police station. There was an unfortunate incident at my office on 4 November, when I found out that the distress alarm really works. We got a prompt response from the security company and Victoria Police. Sergeant Dave Yeoman and officers from Boronia attended. They showed patience, diligence and thoroughness and got a good result on the night. I was very, very satisfied and impressed with their work.

Police officers put themselves in harm's way, and we do not always appreciate that. We often do not appreciate the risks and dangers they face. We often take them for granted. That night they showed their great skills in dealing with a traumatised person. I have got to say the distress alarm really works. I was pleased at that. And it is all in a day's work for them, part of the policing job, and it is run from Boronia.

As a contrast, as part of their more day-to-day work they recently did a safety audit in the area near my office in the suburb of Bayswater that involved a routine check of possible trouble spots. The local community is looking at lighting, car parks and things like that. Obviously they should also have thought

about my office as a possible trouble spot, but I have to say that no-one appreciates the local members of the police force more than I do, and I thank them.

Christmas reflection

Mr THOMPSON (Sandringham) — I offer the following words by way of a Christmas reflection. Maureen Jenkins recently retired as a nurse after 47 years service, the last 17 of which were spent working in a cancer hospice. She recently led an Anglican congregation in the following prayer, which has been edited:

Gracious God, we praise you and bless your name. The heavens declare your wondrous creation. We rejoice in the animals, birds, fish and flowers around us. Thank you for rain, sunshine and seasons, our homes, families and one another. Thank you, Jesus, for coming to reconcile man to yourself, to rescue and guide us, and it cost you your life.

For our world, we ask for continued relief for the earthquake victims; for the tsunami rebuilding; for those suffering from AIDS and illnesses — across Africa, Asia and in the poorest countries; for the hurricane-devastated areas. Comfort them with your presence and help. We pray for people who are isolated and powerless: for the poor, refugees, the hungry, homeless and desperate, prisoners and depressed and those bent over with burdens. We pray for our government and our leaders. Be with farmers, teachers, writers, medical researchers, bankers and all workers. Help us to care for our neighbours and one another.

We pray for our children — that you love and care for them. Look to Jesus and see the new things he wants to do. So help us all in our resolve to follow you more each day into all the fullness of the Lord. In Jesus' name we pray.

Knox Pride awards

Ms ECKSTEIN (Ferntree Gully) — Last Monday I attended the presentation of the Knox Pride awards, which recognise community achievement in environmental, conservation, heritage and beautification projects in the city of Knox. I would like to congratulate all the nominees and winners of this year's awards. There were over 60 nominees this year, the highest number ever.

I would particularly like to congratulate the following nominees and winners from my electorate: Kaye Cox; Mr and Mrs Depta; Karen Gibbs; Mr and Mrs Wingrove and the Windemere Reserve Preschool, nominees for the garden competition; St Joseph's Primary School in Boronia, winner of the primary school pride award; Fairhills Primary School, a nominee; and Lysterfield Primary School, which received the encouragement certificate. Rowville Secondary College was winner of the secondary school

pride award, and Ferntree College was the winner of the encouragement certificate.

I would also like to congratulate Karen Edwards from Ferntree Gully Primary School, winner of the primary teacher award; Jill Evans from Ferntree Gully North Primary School, who received a special commendation; Heany Park Scout Group, winner of the proud sustainability award; Wilbow Corporation, a special commendation; Friends of Blind Creek, Skill Plus Inc. and the Burmese Cat Association, which were nominees; *Rowville-Lysterfield Community News*, the joint winner of the proud heritage award; and the Knox Historical Society, a nominee. All have made a worthy contribution to our local community. Well might we say that the electorate of Ferntree Gully cleaned up with these awards!

Christopher McIlvain

Ms BEATTIE (Yuroke) — Recently I had the great pleasure of attending the presentation of a Queen's Scout award to a young man from Craigieburn, Christopher McIlvain. The pledge is:

A Queen's Scout is one who, having thoroughly trained, places that training at the disposal of the community for public service.

Christopher is truly the embodiment of fine community spirit, and I offer him my congratulations, as many other locals did when they joined us at the Craigieburn Scout Hall. A young man of exceptional talents, Christopher has given generously of his time, having committed 300 hours to community service. It is efforts of this calibre that make such a difference to our local communities.

Having started his scouting career in 1993 at the age of six, Christopher has progressed through many stages of development. In November last year he completed his four diamonds, the leadership development badge, the community involvement badge, the personal growth badge and the adventurer activity badge, ultimately earning his Queen's Scout award.

Christopher has developed an array of skills, and I was privileged to present him with the leadership development badge, which recognised his work such as preparing reports on management and leadership processes within the Craigieburn State Emergency Service unit. Christopher McIlvain is a fine example of the potential of our local young people. As the local member, it was a privilege to spend my Sunday afternoon celebrating his success.

Glen Orden Primary School: Hungry Caterpillars program

Ms GILLETT (Tarneit) — On Friday, 28 October, it was my pleasure to launch a new and wonderful program in my seat of Tarneit, and I would like to place on public record my congratulations to ISIS Primary Care, Glen Orden Primary School, the sensational people at Heathdale neighbourhood renewal and everyone else involved.

This is a wonderful new program, called Hungry Caterpillars, for parents and their children aged between six months and five years. Every Friday morning for a couple of hours parents and their children play games, sing songs, laugh and giggle and read stories. It is a sad fact that some in our community miss out on the songs and stories that are a vital part of a healthy childhood, and this program will help to address that lack.

I want to say a public thankyou to the very special people who put together and run this program. It is important that all of our children are able to celebrate and enjoy their childhood and that parenting skills can be improved in this way. My thanks to the wonderful people who have created this program, and may it flourish.

Vermont Secondary College: art and technology wing

Ms MARSHALL (Forest Hill) — It was with great pleasure that I represented the Minister for Education and Training and the Minister for Education Services on Monday, 14 November, at the opening of stage 1 of the Vermont Secondary College's master plan: its art and technology wing.

The Bracks government has made a commitment to investing in lifelong education through the provision of first-class educational facilities that create a state-of-the-art learning environment. It has provided an additional \$5.23 billion of investment in education and training since 1999. This investment has seen over 6000 new teachers and support staff employed in schools throughout the state. Class sizes at the prep-grade 2 level are now the lowest on record. Student numbers for English classes in secondary schools that all secondary students attend are the lowest in 10 years.

This \$3.42 million project at Vermont Secondary College will greatly improve the students' working environment, enabling them to learn in a clean, modern, spacious facility. Vermont Secondary College has a real culture of continuous improvement and development at all levels, resulting in outstanding student

achievements. Its school council, school principal and staff are dedicated to meeting the community's expectation in an environment where individual students can learn and develop to their full potential.

This project has been a long time in planning and I would like to acknowledge particularly the assistant principal, Kim Fallon, who has been a driving force in the planning and development of the project. Congratulations to everyone involved in an outstanding design, and I commend the college community on its enthusiasm and commitment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The time for members statements has expired.

URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY: AMENDMENTS

Mr HULLS (Minister for Planning) — I move:

That under section 46AH of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, the following six amendments to modify the urban growth boundary be ratified:

- Cardinia planning scheme — no. C81
- Casey planning scheme — no. C85
- Hume planning scheme — no. C66
- Melton planning scheme — no. C51
- Whittlesea planning scheme — no. C83
- Wyndham planning scheme — no. C80.

These planning scheme amendments amend the urban growth boundary (UGB). As members would know, the urban growth boundary is one of the tools which are available to help manage the outward growth of Melbourne. It was established around the Melbourne metropolitan area in 2002 as a key part of the Bracks government's strategy to ensure the sustainable growth of Melbourne.

The urban growth boundary sets the limits of urban development around the Melbourne metropolitan area. Together with the landmark green wedge legislation, the UGB is a central element of our metropolitan strategy, Melbourne 2030.

The UGB strikes a balance between the protection of non-urban areas and agricultural land and providing for future outward growth, which will be directed to the five designated growth areas of Casey-Cardinia, Hume, Melton-Caroline Springs, Wyndham and Whittlesea.

We are working through Melbourne 2030 to see a greater proportion of future housing accommodated

within the established urban area and an accompanying increase in the overall housing yield from development in growth areas.

A significant amount of outward urban growth will continue, as we know, over the next 25 years, and even as a declining proportion of future growth, housing on Melbourne's fringe will continue to provide housing options for many people. This growth will require careful and also coordinated management. The Melbourne 2030 implementation plan outlined that the interim boundary around five growth areas would be subject to review in light of the growth area development needs in the longer term.

When the government first introduced the urban growth boundary it committed to ensuring an ongoing adequate supply of land in the growth areas for future housing and employment growth. Our commitment was to maintain a minimum of 15 years residential land supply within the urban growth boundary to ensure that housing remains affordable — a key part of Melbourne's competitive advantage with other comparable Australian cities. Melbourne 2030 also establishes a commitment to provide an adequate stock of employment land in growth areas, putting jobs close to where people will live.

There has been a comprehensive process to determine where today's urban growth boundary for Melbourne should be.

Submissions were invited following the introduction of the interim urban growth boundary in 2002. Submissions were received in February 2003. More than 500 submissions in relation to the urban growth boundary were considered, and the boundary was subsequently settled in late 2003 through changes ratified by Parliament, except for five designated growth areas.

Decisions regarding the settling of the boundary on growth areas were deferred at that time pending advice from smart growth committees. Consideration of those submissions that related to land in proximity to the growth areas was also deferred.

Smart growth committees were then established and charged with providing advice regarding long-term growth in the five designated growth areas.

The Casey-Cardinia, Hume, Melton-Caroline Springs and Wyndham committees included broad representation from local government, the development industry, state agencies and the community. A comprehensive analysis was

undertaken of environmental issues, land requirements and infrastructure needs associated with growth in each area.

In Whittlesea, growth area plans were already well advanced. As a consequence the committee's position and process were different and Whittlesea's existing plans were reviewed for consistency with the objectives of Melbourne 2030.

The smart growth committees consulted widely with the community, providing all interested parties with an opportunity to be heard via community workshops and also submissions. Each committee has produced recommendations relating to the future land use, population growth and related challenges in each of the five growth areas.

Each committee was chaired by an independent chairperson. I thank the three chairs, Tim Offor, Robyn Stewart and Rodger Eade, for their very hard work. Indeed I thank all members of the smart growth committees and all who took part in the consultation process.

Final reports have been submitted by each of the smart growth committees. An assessment of the metropolitan implications of the reports and growth issues in each area was undertaken by all state government departments and key infrastructure agencies.

The results of the 2005 urban development program have also informed this process. The government established the urban development program in 2002 to expand the base of information used to inform analysis of the supply and demand for residential and industrial land across metropolitan Melbourne.

The information contained in the urban development program represents a shared understanding of existing and future land supply. This understanding has been achieved through a comprehensive consultation process, resulting in significant information exchange between the development industry, local government, infrastructure providers and of course the department's own research activities.

There has been extensive research and analysis undertaken to inform the urban growth boundary changes that are being tabled. Similarly the consultation process undertaken by the government and the smart growth committees has certainly been extensive.

Amendments to the urban growth boundary are now proposed in all six growth area municipalities that were reviewed — Cardinia, Casey, Hume, Melton, Whittlesea and Wyndham.

The changes that I have approved and present to this house for ratification provide for around 25 years of residential land in each growth area, based on current population projections. This will provide certainty for the housing construction industry and protects housing affordability.

The government also outlined yesterday new proposals that will ensure that future rezoning and development in growth areas are carefully planned and result in healthy places for families to live and that they have more timely access to the infrastructure and services that they need.

With the achievement of Melbourne 2030 policy objectives, the land supply within the UGB will last significantly longer. These amendments will avoid the need for ad hoc changes in the short term and provide the necessary lead times to plan new communities and for the planning, design and delivery of very important infrastructure and services.

Good planning, together with timely rezoning and also timely provision of infrastructure, will assist to ensure the supply of quality serviced land and thereby maintain downward pressure on land prices.

The changes will help to ensure that there is a competitive housing market in each growth area, an important part of maintaining affordable housing choices for new purchasers in growth areas.

In addition to residential land the planning scheme amendments also provide adequate industrial and employment land to meet anticipated future needs. Land has been provided for local employment growth in each growth area, in both activity centres and dedicated employment precincts.

Additional land has been provided in the nationally significant Hume corridor that takes advantage of excellent access to the national freight network, comprising major road and rail infrastructure. These changes will increase the supply of industrial land from around 22 years to around 40 years.

Additional land to be brought within the urban growth boundary in Melbourne's south-east will see total employment land supply increased from 15 years to approximately 30 years. A major new industrial area is provided for in the longer term on strategically significant land to the south of the Pakenham bypass. This will take greatest advantage of the significant transport infrastructure investments occurring in this region.

An extra two years supply of employment land is provided in Cranbourne West, adding to the strategically important industrial area in Dandenong South and the area already designated in Cranbourne West.

Wyndham will maintain a 20-year land supply in the Laverton North industrial area.

In approving the amendments to the urban growth boundary I have also approved related changes to zoning, on advice from the Department of Sustainability and Environment.

As foreshadowed in *Melbourne 2030* I have applied rural zones to land previously zoned green wedge. The new farming zone has been selected to ensure that current rural uses on the land can continue. This zone will act as a holding zone until land is rezoned for urban development.

The Department of Sustainability and Environment will continue to work with local councils to confirm appropriate zoning arrangements for growth areas.

In conclusion, in accordance with section 46AH of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 these amendments are required to be laid before each house within seven sitting days after they have received my approval. In laying these amendments before the house today I am meeting this requirement. In accordance with section 46AH and section 46AK of the act, the respective amendment lapses if it has not been ratified by resolution passed by each house within 10 days after it is laid before that house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! Before calling the member for Hawthorn I advise the house, as the Speaker did earlier, that the clocks available to the Chair are sometimes different to the one on the wall, so I will advise people when they have a minute to go on the clock in front of the Chair.

Mr BAILLIEU (Hawthorn) — I wish to move an amendment to the minister's motion. I move:

That all the words after 'That' be omitted with the view of inserting in their place the words 'this house refuses to consider the ratification of the planning scheme amendments to modify the urban growth boundary tabled in the house on 16 November 2005 until all such amendments have been placed on public exhibition for a minimum period of four weeks and all affected communities have been notified of the proposed changes and provided with an opportunity to comment'.

I listened with interest to the Treasurer on the radio on the way here this morning. He was doing his best to justify some unjustifiable actions of the government. A

caller rang in and said he had despaired of this government because it had been his opinion that it was a government of smoke and mirrors, but today he had decided that this government was not a government of smoke and mirrors, it was now a government entirely of smoke. There could be no greater demonstration of that than this motion here today and no greater demonstration of the con this government engages in on a regular basis. The government's standards on issues such as this could not be lower. The reality is that this process is an absolute and utter sham. You have to ask yourself what can the Parliament possibly offer this process when less than 24 hours has been provided for members of Parliament to become acquainted with the proposed changes — less than 24 hours!

The government claims to have introduced the urban growth boundary (UGB). Interestingly one of the architects of Melbourne 2030, Michael Buxton, told a function for the Planning Institute of Australia, Save Our Suburbs, the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology and the Victorian Local Governance Association on Saturday that the urban growth boundary existed before and there was nothing particularly new about it. That was an interesting comment from Professor Michael Buxton.

The government claims to have introduced the urban growth boundary into the planning system and to have provided the ultimate safeguard by requiring any changes to the urban growth boundary to be ratified by the Parliament. This was said at the time to provide ultimate protection and scrutiny. Here we are now for the second time making changes to the urban growth boundary and for the second time the government has sought to absolutely minimise scrutiny of the changes. Less than 24 hours ago —

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The member for Hawthorn, without interruption.

Mr BAILLIEU — Less than 24 hours ago the government introduced these changes, significant changes, and I understand the government backbenchers were briefed yesterday morning; the media were briefed around midday out in Craigieburn in a government stunt which we saw on the television last night; and I was briefed, with the member for Box Hill, at about 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon. Now, less than 24 hours later, we are here and obliged to determine a parliamentary position on these changes.

Mr Wynne interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! We are not going to conduct a debate by interjection and response. The member for Hawthorn, without interruption.

Mr BAILLIEU — I am delighted that the member for Richmond has sought to intervene by interjecting with the words, ‘You want to allow land speculation’. This has been the cry of the government. This was the cry the last time we dealt with these urban growth boundary changes in November 2003. Again, in November 2003 it was last minute — no public process, no public consultation. If the government is of a mind that a change to the urban growth boundary must proceed immediately to avoid land speculation, what is the purpose of the Parliament ratifying such motions? If the government is making the decisions and seeking to have them ratified with no public process or public exposure, this process is a sham.

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The government benches!

Mr BAILLIEU — This process is a sham. It is not possible for members of Parliament to consult with their communities about the proposed changes in less than 24 hours. It is not possible for councils, most of which are on a minimum four-week cycle, to comment. It is not possible for stakeholders or those who have an active interest in the process to comment. There is less than 24 hours to scrutinise the proposal.

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The constant interjecting from the government benches is not acceptable!

Mr BAILLIEU — The government has sought to introduce these changes on the last sitting day of the parliamentary year in a delightful location, but a location not subject to the same levels of scrutiny as might otherwise be the case. The reality is that the government had an opportunity to advise that this process would proceed this week. It has taken every opportunity to say otherwise. The question was asked by the manager of opposition business earlier in the week. There was no notice of these provisions. Indeed the government business program had to be altered yesterday to accommodate this process. Efforts have been made to minimise scrutiny of this process.

I said the last time this occurred that the way the government had sought to handle this was to diminish the role of Parliament in this process and to make the role of Parliament really just a sham. I said then — and

I say it again — that this process is simply wrong. You have to ask yourself what purpose is served by members of Parliament who will not, by definition, be familiar with the proposed changes — —

Mr Nardella — Rubbish!

Mr BAILLIEU — ‘Rubbish!’, says the member for Melton. Well may the member say ‘Rubbish!’, because he has had a personal involvement in these changes.

An honourable member — You withdraw that!

Mr BAILLIEU — The reality is that members of government were briefed yesterday morning, and some have had prior knowledge of what the proposed changes were. The interesting thing — —

An honourable member — Rubbish! That is nonsense. That is an absolute lie and a slur.

Mr BAILLIEU — The interesting thing is the government managed, having only made the decision on Monday, we are told, to produce a slab of glossy brochures for the media yesterday, but did not have the courtesy to even advise the Parliament on Tuesday that this process would be proceeding.

The reality is that these changes will be rammed through regardless on the last sitting day of Parliament, as they were on the previous occasion. This process of ratification of the urban growth boundary is a sham. This is insulting, not consulting the community. We had a 3.00 a.m. adjournment of the sitting yesterday morning and less than 24 hours for the community to be consulted. Interestingly the announcements the government made about the UGB have been consumed by the public debate about the tax that was introduced at the same time. I do not think that is any accident because these changes to the UGB represent a significant shift on behalf of the government. In reflecting that let me quote from the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) winter 2005 newsletter, *Urban Affairs*.

Mr Nardella interjected.

Mr BAILLIEU — The member for Melton mocks the UDIA. I am sure that is his attitude. They are professionals. Rob Taber, an engineer and property specialist, is also the chief executive of Villawood Properties. He was formerly with VicUrban, and is not unknown to the processes of government. He says in the article:

But the pertinent point is that the high cost base for raw land is locked in — thanks to the UGB eliminating the scope for

the developers to do something new and unique as there is no reward for this risky venture.

From this examination of the effects of the UGB it is reasonable to predict that the days of highly innovative projects are gone.

Developers do not need to have smart ideas to meet all stakeholder needs and they do not have the incentive of a 'high-risk reward' approach to introduce new products and new ways of developing.

In essence the UGB has 'dumbed down' the land development industry and severely diminished housing affordability along the way.

The article also says:

The UGB has taken away the need to look at innovative development approaches.

There are many other examples of stakeholder groups indicating that the UGB has had a significant upward effect on prices. The UGB has pushed up prices. The cries from the government that somehow or other a public consultation period on proposed changes would lead to land speculation suggests there has not been land speculation already — and that has to be the furphy of the year. There has been enormous speculation since the UGB has been introduced. Supply has been constrained and these changes say it all.

In introducing these changes the government is effectively walking away from one of the pillars of Melbourne 2030, its own proposition. Interestingly it is doing that at the same time that the New South Wales government is walking away from its equivalent proposition. These changes maximise the alienation of green wedge land, and the 2002 anti-urban sprawl article of faith on the part of the government has been abandoned. Sprawl is back.

It was fascinating to hear the minister talking just now about how the government's commitment was to guarantee 15 years of land supply. That commitment is now out to 25 years, not 15. That gives the lie to the government's proposals before the house now. In 2005 we have an urban growth boundary which is to accommodate us until 2030 — in other words, we have gone to the max. The ultimate goal has been reached now, according to the minister, including the industrial land supply, and that simply reflects the fact that the government failed to provide an employment strategy with Melbourne 2030 or an industrial land strategy when it introduced the proposition. But, interestingly, the documents the government has released provide that the 25 years of land supply is rated at 11 households per hectare.

We had a briefing yesterday and the department heads said to us, 'The targets have not changed; the number of households to be accommodated has not changed', but somehow or other we have gone to a 25-year supply at 11 households per hectare and not 15. The government is under pressure on Melbourne 2030 in almost all respects. The land supply has been expanded, and many will applaud that. But the government is claiming, quietly in the back of a press release, in the back of some documents, that this will be at 11 households per hectare.

The reality is that the push is on in government for that number to dramatically increase. In the event that it dramatically increases, as has been advocated by many of the government's own consultants — —

Mr Nardella interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! I notice that a number of the members who consistently interject are listed for the call on this debate. I would ask them to keep their comments for their contributions.

Mr BAILLIEU — We will see that the pressure on activity centres, which the government has been suffering because of its failure to introduce this policy in any credible way, will be relieved by increased growth on the boundaries. We will see the 11 households per hectare dramatically increase.

This motion today represents an acknowledgment by the government that Melbourne 2030 has failed; it was flawed in the first place. In effect we are by this motion resuming substantially the growth area plans that were in place for 20 years. Curiously the department heads, just yesterday, sought to pretend that those growth area plans did not even exist. It was staggering that at the briefing we had to hear the department secretary say, 'No, those plans never existed'. The government should tell that to the Wyndham community, tell that to the Epping community and tell that to the south-east community.

Melbourne 2030 has failed and the government is rapidly withdrawing from it, if not in the rhetoric but in the reality — no money for public infrastructure, no support for activity centre developers — and Melbourne 2030 remains flawed, unfunded, unpopular and increasingly unworkable.

The architect of the government's green wedge policy was at pains in 1999 to point out that from 1996, under the previous government, 2000 hectares of green wedge land had been alienated. Since 1999, 3700 additional hectares — almost twice that which was undertaken

under the Kennett government — have been alienated. I asked yesterday at the briefing for the number of hectares which would be alienated from the green wedge introduced inside the urban growth boundary to be provided, and the promise was given that we would be provided with that figure. It did not come. I did my own rough calculations last night, and found that somewhere between 8000 and 10 000 hectares, which means that we are now up to somewhere between 12 000 and 14 000 hectares, of green wedge land has been alienated under this government's stewardship.

This compares with the outrage that the members of the then opposition had for the Kennett government which had alienated 2000 hectares. Let's simply understand that this has been a rhetorical policy from the start — a political document. The origins of green wedge policy rest with the Bolte and Hamer governments, and we will stand by green wedge policy. But let's not kid ourselves that this government is doing anything other than playing politics and exercising its rhetorical aptitude. Under the long-held green wedge policy there were some 80 000 hectares of green wedge, and this government expanded that to what is often referred to as a very large doughnut of green wedge — some 800 000 hectares — but the government has not sought to invest in that green wedge in the way that the Hamer government did. Since then we have seen extensive changes to the urban growth boundary.

Now we have seen the government walk away from its own policy. It is interesting to ask: where were the endorsements for this step yesterday? Every planning exercise we have seen from the government has involved glossy brochures and stunts, and an array of endorsements. There were no endorsements last night on the television. Either the part-time planning minister has failed the government, or the reality is that those who might have supported the government in the past have walked away. We certainly got an indication from the master builders and from the Urban Development Institute of Australia yesterday of their views on what was announced yesterday by the government.

I was interested to see the views of Professor Buxton in an article in this morning's *Age*. It states:

Professor Buxton said the release of so much land without minimum housing densities was a 'breach of a key commitment' in Melbourne 2030. 'Melbourne is squandering land as if there's no tomorrow. This announcement perpetuates Melbourne's sprawl at the world's lowest densities', he said.

The Australian Planning Institute's Victorian president, Trevor Budge, welcomed the levy —

the tax that was introduced yesterday —

... and the new authority but said the package would do little to rein in urban sprawl. He said while the tax was intended to help provide services such as transport on new estates, continued sprawl would make it difficult and expensive [to] do so.

Other similar commentary was aired on the television last night. The urban growth boundary changes were introduced yesterday. We are now debating them and concluding any consideration of them without public exposure of those changes to councils. I am firmly of the view that this process will add almost nothing to a consideration of the urban growth boundary and green wedge provisions.

Six planning scheme amendments are being introduced; 1 in Cardinia where 4 planning scheme maps are being changed; 1 in Casey where 7 maps are being changed; 8 maps are being changed in Melton, 6 maps in Hume, 1 in Whittlesea and 7 in Wyndham, giving a total of 33 planning scheme map changes in 21 different locations. Interestingly, the government has chosen to take the land which will now be added to the urban area and rezone it for farming. At the briefing yesterday I asked the department secretary why the farming zone was chosen. I would have thought there would have been an indication of some knowledge, and I was staggered to learn that neither of the department heads knew why the farming zone had been selected. Indeed, the farming zone is positively rejected by Cardinia and Casey in the consideration of rural zones.

We have to ask ourselves how we got there. The minister referred to smart growth committees, and there is a classic exercise in rhetorical smoke and mirrors from the Bracks government. I invite members to look at the record of proceedings and at those who attended those smart growth committees. The curious thing is that the smart growth committees themselves are substantially — almost 95 per cent — made up by government employees. Some workshops were conducted in the smart growth areas. No proposals were put to those who attended; it was a self-selecting audience.

Those in the audience were asked questions such as: where would you like to see future development; where would you like to see future protection? The reality is that maps were prepared — not in all the smart growth committees, but some — and you could have concluded almost anything from the maps that were reproduced, albeit in a superficial way, in the record of proceedings. That is because the minutes of proceedings are confidential, we are told, and all the participants have signed the confidentiality agreement. The reality is that we have been through a farce.

In the Cardinia corridor — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr BAILLIEU — Let me go through some of the corridors. The changes to the Melton corridor are not consistent with the proposals under the Melton strategy plan. The proposals in the Hume corridor are not consistent with the workshops that were undertaken, to the extent that you can discern them. Curiously the Whittlesea corridor was the only source for the development contributions levy, or tax, that has been introduced. We heard the Treasurer last week trying to justify the proposal for a tax by saying that the councils and the smart growth committees had asked for this tax. I am sure they had begged for it! But the only source I can find for that is the government employees who addressed one of the smart growth committees which was attended by government employees! This was a direct proposition from the government, and now the government in its classic way is saying, ‘No, the idea came from someone else’. It is a complete furphy.

The Wyndham corridor proposals are inconsistent with the original growth area plan that has been in place for more than 20 years — and still the government persists. Similar things can be said about the Cardinia and Casey corridors, because the workshop results are totally inconsistent. Curiously those smart growth committees finished their work, to the extent that they had done any work, several months ago, some almost 12 months ago. But we have reached the stage where, at the very last minute and with no public scrutiny, the government is introducing these changes. It is curious indeed that the government would suggest — —

An honourable member interjected.

Mr BAILLIEU — You asked about the member for Melton. The member for Melton had an — —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The member for Hawthorn, through the Chair.

Mr BAILLIEU — The member for Melton had an active involvement in the smart growth committee. He attended those smart growth committees and contributed to those propositions.

Mr Nardella — On a point of order, Deputy Speaker, I seek a withdrawal by the honourable member for Hawthorn. What he said is absolutely incorrect — and false. I seek an immediate withdrawal by the honourable member for Hawthorn.

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The member for Melton has taken offence at words used by the member for Hawthorn and he has sought a withdrawal.

Mr BAILLIEU — Acting Speaker, the point — —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! No, we will deal first with the member for Melton. The member for Melton has taken offence at words used by the member for Hawthorn and he has sought a withdrawal.

Mr BAILLIEU — The last thing I would want to do — —

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The behaviour at the moment is starting to deteriorate rapidly. I think we should compose ourselves. We may be on the stage this morning, but we do not need to be theatrical.

Mr BAILLIEU — The last thing I would want to do, Deputy Speaker, would be to offend my friend the member for Melton. But the member for Melton was active, and I actually congratulate him for actively attending the workshops. But if the member for Melton takes offence at my suggesting that he was active in the workshops of the smart growth committee, I withdraw, because the last thing I would want to do would be to — —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The member for Hawthorn should now move on.

Mr BAILLIEU — The reality is that this process has been a sham. It adds nothing to the consideration of the urban growth boundaries other than to make the Parliament a fall guy for the decisions of the government. What the government is doing here is walking away from the fundamental planks of Melbourne 2030. The very architect of the green wedge policy in Melbourne 2030, Professor Michael Buxton, said as much in the *Age* this morning.

We have moved an amendment which seeks to allow the community to consider these proposals. It may be that those proposals are warmly embraced by the community, but why is it that the community should not be allowed to observe them before the decision is made in the place where the government has said ultimate scrutiny should prevail? Because the backbenchers of this Parliament are not in a position to know in detail, in less than 24 hours, the consequences and impacts of the changes being proposed.

I invite members to consider the detail. I might be in a position to know something of the detail — I have studied it at some length — but most members here would be unable to determine where the boundaries are now, let alone where they are proposed to be and the impacts. That scrutiny should be available to not just the Parliament but also the public. Let's presume that in 24 hours members of Parliament could have done all the consultation. Where was the opportunity for the public to contribute? Where was the opportunity for council to consider the boundaries proposed and compare them with any propositions they might have had themselves? Where was the opportunity for any stakeholders to do likewise? There have been no opportunities. This has again been an exercise — just as it was under the previous planning minister and now under the new part-time planning minister — in smoke and mirrors and it adds nothing to the consideration of green wedge policy or urban growth boundary policy.

Mrs POWELL (Shepparton) — I am pleased to speak on this motion on behalf of The Nationals. I put on record that The Nationals will be supporting the member for Hawthorn's amendment, which, in effect, asks the house to refuse to consider ratifying this motion until all amendments have been placed on public exhibition for a minimum of four weeks and that all affected communities are notified and can have the opportunity to comment.

We have been told by the minister that the communities have had an opportunity to comment. We have been told that there has been a number of committees where members have been able to talk to communities and councils to see whether they support the amendments. As The Nationals spokesperson for planning I have not been given any information, and I certainly have not seen any evidence of the consultation process or whether the councils themselves have acted. I have not seen any evidence or information about any consultation of committee members or any consultation about the changes to maps. I am taking the minister at his word in saying that he has consulted. It is almost one of those trust-me bills where a minister says he has done all these things.

A number of backbenchers are aware that a number of committees were put in place and they know what the community thinks. They also know that the council has approved of map changes, but The Nationals have certainly not been given that information, and we certainly have not seen any evidence. As The Nationals spokesperson for planning, I have to say that I was very disappointed that I was not advised of this motion before it actually appeared on the notice paper. We did

not have an opportunity for a briefing. I know that the government — —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! There are far too many conversations taking place in the chamber. The member the Shepparton, without interruption.

Mrs POWELL — I know that the government has given the appropriate notice under the ratification amendments, but I think it would have been a courtesy to give more notice than one day. As a country member of Parliament, I do not necessarily know some of those areas, and it would have been good if I had been able to have access to some of the maps and boundaries. As The Nationals spokesperson, that would have been more appropriate. We were given one day's notice — it is on the notice paper today. Being in Geelong today, we have not been able to have access to our offices to see whether we have any information. This is one of those times when the minister has treated this Parliament with arrogance and without courtesy. It would have been more courteous had the minister let the spokespeople for planning know first hand whether the councils approved of the changes and whether the people who hold the land approved of the changes.

There is nothing new in planning ministers bringing changes to this house at short notice. I know the former Minister for Planning did it on a number of occasions, but on one occasion the minister actually did give me the courtesy of sending me notification and a letter to my office with background information and the council's comments. That was much more helpful to me as a member making a decision on this motion. When you know the information, you actually can speak to the council and say, 'Do you approve of this? Is it in your best interest?'. You can actually speak to some of the land-holders to see whether this information and the consultation they had was appropriate.

The current Minister for Planning has said publicly on a number of occasions that under his leadership planning would be more consultative. He said he would go out and talk to organisations and municipalities and would consult more. He said that under his leadership planning would be more accountable and much more inclusive. The minister said that on *Stateline*, and he was also reported in the newspapers as having said that while being interviewed. I thought that was very refreshing, but obviously it is not the case. To bring a motion of this type into the house in the last week of the sittings with no consultation with either me or the member for Hawthorn is arrogant in the extreme.

The minister is the third planning minister since this government was elected in 1999. While we call this minister a part-time planning minister, it is not a reflection on his work ethic, it is just a statement of fact. The minister is also the Attorney-General and the Minister for Industrial Relations. By any measure those two portfolios are very important; but equally, so is planning. The planning of this state, whether metropolitan or rural, is very important, and we all need to have a share in making sure that planning is done responsibly, with balance and with a lot of accountability.

Melbourne 2030, the blueprint for planning, has had many changes made to it over the years. This proves again, as many architects, planners and other experienced people in the community have been saying, that the government did not get it right. This blueprint for the next 20 years or so has not been adopted by the people, and we just keep saying, 'You got it wrong'. The government should now have a really good look at Melbourne 2030, go back to the community, have more consultation and see what effect the changes that have been made over the last few years have had on its strategy.

With that in mind, one of the issues I would like to speak on is the rural zones. The former Minister for Planning undertook some consultation on rural zones and then had to make a number of changes and do a number of backflips. That happened because the former minister just did not understand country areas. The minister talked about how to protect prime agricultural land. As a rural member of Parliament I know, first hand, that we need to protect farm land and prime agricultural land. But changing the names of zones does not protect land. The automatic transfer from rural zone to farm zone does not mean protection is being provided. The government could have protected that land by strengthening its right-to-farm legislation, which it did not do. We still have the same right-to-farm legislation that virtually says that if you buy a parcel of land you need to be aware that it is in a farming zone and that there are certain things you cannot do. The legislation not strong enough; it needs to be strengthened.

The government also needs to look at what it can do to encourage growth in rural and regional Victoria. We all applaud growth happening in the metropolitan area, and we all want to see Melbourne prosper and grow. But again, the government and the Minister for Planning should seriously look at where we are going with planning for country Victoria.

The urban growth boundary, which we are amending today, is a blueprint for managing growth in the Melbourne area. The government says that it has committed to supplying land for residential areas, and this is what has been driving the Melbourne 2030 discussion. But when we were having consultations on Melbourne 2030 the government was told there was not enough land available for housing and that housing would have to go into Melbourne itself and into some of the shopping and retail areas. It was also advised that this would mean the price of housing would absolutely go through the roof.

The government was advised of that. And this motion is obviously an acknowledgement of the fact that there is not enough land available for residential areas and that if this were not put through the price of residential land would go through the roof. Obviously the government has listened to some of the experts and has now made a number of changes.

The minister also said today — and it was the first time I had heard it — that extensive research and analysis of these changes was undertaken. I really hope so, but again I am not aware of that research and analysis. I would certainly hope that the members who went to those meetings understand that if this is wrong, they will bear the brunt of that. We are told there has been enough research. We are told the consultation has been extensive. Again, we rely heavily on the members of Parliament who went to those meetings, and we rely on the minister saying that there was adequate consultation. We hope they have got it right because they are asking the Parliament to endorse those changes with virtually not enough evidence to say that the changes are appropriate.

We are being told it was five years ago that the municipalities were set in concrete under the blueprint for the urban growth boundary. Now we are being asked to make more changes, so it was not right five years ago. If the government got it wrong, it should have said so then and consulted back then. A number of people who live near Melbourne whose land is locked in the green wedge zone have also been saying that maybe their land should be looked at because they believe it is not appropriate farming land; they believe the land has not appropriately been —

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The member for Shepparton, without the assistance of government benches.

Mrs POWELL — The members on the other side are yelling me down and saying that people should not speak to The Nationals, but a number of people have been telling us that their land is not appropriately zoned in green wedges. That could be the case because we have seen a number of cases come through this house where we have made changes to the urban growth boundaries, we have made changes to the transit cities, we have made changes to the green wedge areas. We need to make sure we get it right, so obviously a blueprint is a moving document. We do not expect things to be set in concrete. People change, needs change, but on balance there needs to be more consultation, so if way back five years ago the community said, ‘This is the way it is’, and the government is changing something now, we need to make sure that it has had enough consultation on the changes.

The Nationals do not oppose making land available for housing, but the motion that is before us at the moment is saying that under section 46AH of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, six amendments to modify the urban growth boundary should be ratified. They are fairly substantial growth areas. We have the Cardinia planning scheme to be changed; we have the Casey planning scheme to be changed; we have the Hume planning scheme to be changed; we have the Melton planning scheme to be changed; we have the Whittlesea planning scheme to be changed; and we have the Wyndham planning scheme to be changed. Again, we in The Nationals would hope that councils have been consulted, but just as importantly we hope the people who own the land in those areas have been consulted. We are being told that they have. We take this on face value because we have had 24 hours to have a look at this, so we have not been able to be convinced that the consultation has taken place. We are making — —

Mr Nardella — You wouldn’t know.

Mrs POWELL — We hope that you do know, because it will be on your heads.

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! There is far too much of this continual interjection. The member for Shepparton should be allowed to make her contribution in the same manner as others.

Mrs POWELL — Again, during the process of what we do here on planning, members are entitled to know what the motion is about. We are entitled to know whom it affects and to be able to say whether we believe it is good planning or not — otherwise why

even have it come in here to be ratified? Why does the government not say, ‘This is what we are going to do’ with the stroke of a pen? It just makes changes to those planning laws.

This process is to come before this Parliament, and we as members of Parliament who have to make decisions about ratifying it should be extended the courtesy of being able to say we agree that the process is right, the reasons are right and the consultation has been put in place. We are not made aware of that. We are not 100 per cent sure that has happened. It will be on the government’s head if it has not been done. The member for Melton is shaking his head. I hope he understands that for the residents in Melton, this is going to be changed and the maps are going to be changed. We hope his community approves of the changes we are making here today.

Both houses need to ratify this motion. That is part of the planning process that is before us at the moment. We are going to make a decision about ratifying this motion, but again we are totally disappointed with the lack of consultation with The Nationals and with the Liberal Party. When something comes before this house it should be treated with dignity and respect, and we should make sure that we have the relevant information to make appropriate decisions. The Nationals take that seriously. We want to make sure that we give due consideration to the decisions that we make and that they will not affect people adversely. The government business program has been changed to include this motion on the notice paper only 24 hours after we learnt about it. We have come to this beautiful city of Geelong, and while it is wonderful to be here, we are away from our offices and do not have some of the processes we normally have available to us to see whether the information before us is correct.

The Minister for Planning has said that he has done his consultation. Perhaps the oversight in not ensuring that The Nationals and Liberals were well briefed on this happened because the minister has been busy with his other portfolios. As I said, the minister has other busy portfolios, and maybe he has been busy with them. We ask the minister to direct his attention to planning for Victoria rather than leaving it to other people and then quickly bringing something before the Parliament in the last week of sittings — this is in fact the last sitting day — and asking us to ratify the changes being made to the blueprint of Melbourne 2030. We ask the minister to treat the Parliament with respect, to advise the spokespeople for planning in both houses of the need for any changes and to not have the arrogance to bring on this motion in the last week, having given us only one day’s notice.

I do not know how the government expects councils in Victoria to achieve the best value to which they have to aspire. They are told, 'You must consult with your communities, and you must put in place best value principles'. Members know that most councils do that, and the Greater Geelong City Council certainly would do that. It is a real shame when the Victorian government does not apply its best value principles. I urge the government to take note of the practices of this house and make sure it gets it right next time.

Mr DONNELLAN (Narre Warren North) — This is a great motion. It puts together the urban growth boundaries and provides better planning and a better future for families in Victoria. I want to talk about the history of neglect and bad planning in my council. The Fountain Gate shopping centre is miles away from the train station, so people have to walk to get there. In the 1980s the council decided it did not need industrial or employment land in the area. Now we have limited local employment opportunities because the council did not have the vision to realise that local opportunities were needed.

Cranbourne was subdivided in such a way that there is now isolation, with people living miles away from the train station, which is just ridiculous. We have roads which are too narrow for buses to travel along and people to park their cars in. We have footpaths which end in the middle of nowhere. Every year we have only five bus stops built in the whole of Casey, which has 200 000 people, so we have kids going to school while being rained on. We have streets with no lighting. The infrastructure is simply not being provided quickly enough to keep up with the pace of subdivision. We have lots of subdivision in Casey, but no infrastructure.

That is what the motion addresses. It introduces the Growth Areas Authority to enable us to manage planning, including putting in infrastructure when people move into an area. It is no use putting in infrastructure after the people have moved in; it is needed when they move in. That is really what my area has had for many, many years. The last time social infrastructure of any substance was built in Endeavour Hills was in 1982 by the state government. The council has not done much there ever since. At the end of the day that area needs it, and it is the responsibility of the council, with the government and the Growth Areas Authority, to actually start addressing it.

The Growth Areas Authority will continually monitor the need for land. It will ensure that we have 25 years worth of residential and commercial land. It will monitor pricing and ensure that if more land needs to be released to dampen price levels, that will be done, so

affordability will not be an issue. Open space will be delivered, and sports fields will be delivered when they are needed, not 25 years after the event, which is what I grew up with. When I was a young man people in Templestowe and the surrounding areas had no infrastructure. The areas were subdivided, but there were no facilities to help people.

This motion will allow for greatly improved employment zoning in my local area, including the City of Cardinia, which is needed. As I said, many years ago in the 1980s the council decided it did not need local employment and it did not want dirty industry. That was the idea of a bird brain, because at the end of the day people like local employment, and it is why they move into an area. Currently the biggest employers in my area are the shopping centres. The council is the second-biggest employer, and my good friends at Ralphs and Wagstaff meatworks are the other big employer. That is all we have. I congratulate the smart growth committee on addressing the substantial need for zoning for employment — not necessarily more housing — so that people can work locally.

In summary this motion will result in the release of more land, which is great. It will introduce a new levy so that infrastructure will be built when people move in. Pricing will be monitored by the Growth Areas Authority. People will end up with a better life, instead of years of neglect. We will have 25 years of residential and commercial land.

The amendment moved by the member for Hawthorn is ridiculous. Four weeks delay would take us into February. We would end up with chaos and with land speculators dreams, which would take us back to the days of the Thomas Bent government. It is ridiculous. It would bring development to a halt, and it would be a recipe for corruption. At the end of the day, it is a joke. I commend the motion to the house.

Sitting suspended 1.01 p.m. until 2.03 p.m.

Business interrupted pursuant to standing orders.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Hazardous waste: Geelong

Mr HONEYWOOD (Warrandyte) — My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to plans by the Bracks government to increase both the quantity and the type of toxic chemicals stored at the port of Geelong, and I ask: why is the Premier prepared to dump toxic waste on Geelong while reducing the level

of toxic waste at Coode Island, adjoining his electorate of Williamstown?

Mr BRACKS (Premier) — I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his question. Can I indicate that port planning in Geelong has never been about increasing chemical storage in the area. Could I indicate to the honourable member that the opposition's attempts to link the two are misconceived and misleading.

Mr Honeywood interjected.

Mr BRACKS — I am answering the question. Port planning is about addressing key issues around port development, consistent planning, transport links to the port, community amenity and buffers around the port. It is the proper and appropriate planning you have for any port facility in this state.

Transport Accident Commission: head office relocation

Mr TREZISE (Geelong) — My question is to the Premier, and I ask: can the Premier detail to the house the purpose of the feasibility study into relocating the Transport Accident Commission head office to Geelong? It is a great announcement!

Mr BRACKS (Premier) — I thank the member for Geelong for his question and also for his continual efforts to make sure that Geelong is a vibrant place with a growing economy and a high-quality lifestyle. I congratulate him on his work, as I do the member for South Barwon, the member for Bellarine and the member for Lara, who do a great job in this area.

Part of that effort is to ensure that we have a continual wave of economic growth activity in this region, and that is why today, with the Treasurer and the local members present, I was very pleased to announce that we will be conducting a feasibility study over the next month into the relocation of the whole of the Transport Accident Commission to Geelong. This would be the biggest relocation of a head office facility that any region in Victoria has seen; it is bigger than the State Revenue Office (SRO) and bigger than the Rural Finance Corporation in Bendigo. This will effectively mean a minimum of 650 extra jobs in Geelong, increased spending in the economy and making sure that that activity is located here in Geelong. It will also mean at least \$50 million of extra economic activity for this region.

Alongside the Transport Accident Commission and its direct responsibilities go the ancillary services. The

suppliers, the contractors, the actuarial industry, the other key industries will also seek over time — —

Dr Napthine interjected.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for South-West Coast will cease interjecting in that manner!

Mr BRACKS — They will also seek over time to look at their location and their opportunities in Geelong. This is probably the biggest single relocation of any activity by any government in Victoria's history. I am very pleased that we will have the option of having the Transport Accident Commission here, and I believe, just as we were successful with the SRO and the Rural Finance Corporation, we will be successful here as well. I congratulate all the local members for their support of this region and their continual commitment to grow the economy in Geelong and the surrounding districts.

Questions interrupted.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

The SPEAKER — Order! Before calling the next question, I apologise to the house. I should have advised the house that the Minister for Education and Training is absent today. The Minister for Education Services will take questions addressed to her portfolio.

Questions resumed.

Rural and regional Victoria: business regulation

Mr RYAN (Leader of The Nationals) — My question is to the Minister for State and Regional Development. I refer to the June 2005 report of the Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission on regulation in regional Victoria and to the comments by the chair, Graham Evans, that:

The commission found the extent and the complexity of the regulatory arrangements faced by those doing business in Victoria to be daunting.

Is the government actually going to do anything to relieve the burden upon country businesses of 260 000 pages of Victorian legislation and regulation?

Mr BRUMBY (Minister for State and Regional Development) — We established the Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission last year precisely for the reason that it could examine issues like this — that is, issues of competitiveness and issues of

regulation. For that we have been applauded by the federal government and we have been applauded by the National Competition Council. I would reiterate to the Leader of The Nationals that the state which according to the National Competition Council performs the best of all the Australian states in terms of competition policy and tackling regulation is — —

Honourable members — Victoria!

Mr BRUMBY — That report was from a reference we gave to that commission, because as the Premier has said today, we want to continue to put in place the framework to drive jobs and drive investment in regional Victoria in the future. No state is tackling this issue more aggressively than Victoria. That is why we continually get confirmed by the National Competition Council as the best-performing state in these regards.

That report was provided to me in June. The act requires that I release a full government response within six months. That response will be released within the six-month period, and it is a response which will set the framework for further jobs, further investment and further opportunities in provincial Victoria.

Geelong bypass: contract

Mr LONEY (Lara) — My question is for the Minister for Transport. I ask the minister to outline for the house the latest developments in relation to the construction of the Geelong bypass.

Mr BATCHELOR (Minister for Transport) — Today we are announcing a \$135 million contract for the people of Geelong as the first stage of the Geelong bypass. This government believes the provision of appropriate infrastructure is vital to regional economies. That is true for Geelong, as it is true for other parts of Victoria and as it is true for Melbourne. Not only is it true for improving economic capacity and activity, it is also important for livability — and there is no better example of that than the announcement here today of this first-stage contract.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr BATCHELOR — The poor old member for Doncaster! The Geelong bypass is a \$380 million project. It will provide a huge boost not only to Geelong but to the whole of the south-west of Victoria. This bypass is some 23 kilometres in length, and it is designed to deliver improved travel times for freight and other traffic, for tourists and for local users. It will result in a reduction in noise, in pollution and in traffic finding its way into local residential areas.

The project will comprise two lanes in each direction, and it will avoid 29 sets of traffic lights along Latrobe Terrace, which will result in really significant travel time savings, improved road safety and a dramatic reduction in the congestion that is experienced along the existing route. The project has reached a major milestone today with the announcement of the awarding of the contract for stage 1, which is between the Princes Freeway at Corio and the Midland Highway at Bell Post Hill. This is a \$135 million contract for the design and construction of 10.5 kilometres. It represents the first stage, and it has been awarded to Abigroup. The bypass is 23 kilometres in length, and stage 1 is almost half of that. It will go through to that very strategic location, the Midland Highway.

This is great news. We are proud of what we have achieved here. This government successfully lobbied the federal government to have this project included in AusLink, and that has enabled us today to make this joint announcement — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr BATCHELOR — I think they are saying ‘Stewart McArthur’. Who has ever heard of him? No-one has ever heard of him. Stewart McArthur has done nothing for this project — and let the record show that. He is useless!

The SPEAKER — Order! The minister, to return to answering the question.

Mr BATCHELOR — I am responding to interjections.

The SPEAKER — Order! The minister will answer the question.

Mr BATCHELOR — Nevertheless, it will be this Bracks government, in conjunction with the federal government, notwithstanding the attempts of Stewart McArthur to try to undermine it. We are happy to work with the federal government in delivering this, even though the Liberal Party, as demonstrated by its comments today, is actively opposed to this project.

Roads: funding

Mr MULDER (Polwarth) — My question is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the doubling of the road toll in the Geelong region, and I ask: given that the Auditor-General has revealed that the government has a \$2.1 billion surplus, why has the government cut funding to VicRoads by \$250 million, ensuring that deathtraps like the Princes Highway and the Midland Highway are neglected?

Mr BRACKS (Premier) — I thank the member for Polwarth for his question. The issue of road safety is a very serious one for the whole community of Victoria. It should be noted that over the last three years we have seen the lowest road toll that Victoria has had on record. Nevertheless, we do not think it is suitable or acceptable that we are still seeing a large amount of people who are dying on our roads, who are injured on our roads or who are facing long-term issues of trauma as a result of road accidents. I believe it is the responsibility of the whole community to get behind a campaign to ensure that we have the safest roads in the country.

Part of that is ensuring not only that we get the message across that drink-driving is a problem, which there has been great success with over a long period of time from successive governments, from the Transport Accident Commission, from VicRoads and from Victoria Police, but also that we get the message across about speeding on our roads.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr BRACKS — It would be irresponsible in the extreme if any of our community leaders were encouraging people to speed or break the road law — that is, to say it is okay to speed, to say you could be more tolerant, to say it is more acceptable to go faster than you can now — and that is the policy of the Liberal Party here in Victoria.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr BRACKS — We are as committed today as we have been — —

Mr Mulder — On a point of order, Speaker, on a matter of relevance, the Premier is using question time to attack the opposition. The question is quite clear: why will the government not spend the money on the Princes Highway and the Midland Highway to stop people killing themselves?

The SPEAKER — Order! There is no point of order.

Mr BRACKS — We will also, as part of our road safety campaign, continue to spend more money on roads in Victoria, as we have in the past six years — for example, we have continually allocated, through the Transport Accident Commission, money for black spot road funding in Victoria. I can remember six years ago when the policy that we proposed, of black spot road funding by the Transport Accident Commission, was opposed and criticised by that side of the house. The then Treasurer, Alan Stockdale, said in the 1999

campaign that we should not be applying Transport Accident Commission money to black spots. We reject that. We will continue to increase money for roads, as we have in the past.

Arts: Geelong

Mr CRUTCHFIELD (South Barwon) — My question is to the Minister for the Arts, and I ask: can the minister advise the house on action the Bracks government has taken to support the arts in the Geelong area and the benefits to the Geelong community from this investment in the arts?

Ms DELAHUNTY (Minister for the Arts) — I thank the member for South Barwon for his question and, of course, for his well-known cultural credentials.

It is terrific to be here in Costa Hall, because it is a great place for performances for the Geelong region. Of course, today we have *Parliament — the Musical*; next week we have Joe Cocker, the rock legend. At the other end of the arts spectrum we have the Melbourne Symphony Orchestra concerts that are performed here each year.

The arts are booming in Geelong because the people of Geelong and this region love the opportunities available in this area. Just look at what is on offer. In this precinct alone there is the Geelong Gallery, and on an earlier visit I watched a lot of schoolchildren who were absolutely enthralled by an exhibition of letters and photographs from the First World War. Geelong also has the Back to Back Theatre, which was a stunning success at the Melbourne International Festival. It stopped the commuters at Flinders Street station and was one of the highlights of our international festival. The Courthouse youth theatre is doing a fantastic job — —

Ms Allan interjected.

Ms DELAHUNTY — The Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs acknowledges how much of a job it is doing to support the youth of Geelong.

But right here in the precinct — one of the great art spaces — is the very popular Geelong Performing Arts Centre (GPAC). It has been serving the residents of Geelong and the wider region for about 25 years, whether it has been through Julie Anthony and the Three Chinese Tenors or the Alcoa children's program. In fact in the last year more than 150 000 people, including 12 000 school pupils, have attended the activities and events at GPAC. As the member for Geelong said earlier, it is rather on a par with the

number of people attending the footy at Skilled Stadium.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms DELAHUNTY — You always have a win at the Geelong Performing Arts Centre, although not necessarily at Skilled Stadium if you are black and white!

As we know, the Geelong region is one of the state's fastest growing regions. This centre was built 25 years ago for a much smaller population. It is now time to look to its future, a future able to respond to the growing needs of an expanding region. I am pleased to announce that the Bracks government will fund a \$250 000 scoping study to explore the future expansion of the Geelong performing arts.

Honourable members interjecting.

Ms DELAHUNTY — I am delighted to hear the support from the other side of the house. This is part of the government's bonanza for the arts in the *Moving Forward* statement, with \$28 million for cultural opportunities in the arts right across this great state of ours.

There is more great news for the arts in Geelong. Next March Geelong will be buzzing with its very own Commonwealth Games cultural festival, thanks to \$250 000 from the Bracks government to make it happen. It will be planned and managed right here in Geelong and will bring together local artists and performers as well as artists and performers from across Australia and indeed from commonwealth countries. It will take place at Steampacket Place, with live sites with jumbo screens broadcasting the games events and ceremonies as part of the festival. What is really fantastic about this Commonwealth Games cultural festival is that it will be free. Like our festivals right across the state and in Melbourne, it will be free and open to everybody. I want to thank the City of Greater Geelong for its contribution to the festival.

Mr Smith interjected.

Ms DELAHUNTY — Philistine! We have a view on this side of the house that we want to grow the whole state. We understand that arts and cultural opportunities are an important part of the livability of our regions. They are a great attractant for people to live and work in provincial Victoria, and it is a pleasure to support the arts in such a vibrant region as Geelong.

Police: Geelong

Mr WELLS (Scoresby) — My question without notice is for the Premier. I refer the Premier to the government's commitment to provide 600 extra police in this term of government, and I ask: can the Premier confirm that in the Geelong region there is a shortage of 76 police, leading to the fact that on many occasions only one police van is available for the entire city of Geelong?

Mr BRACKS (Premier) — I thank the member for Scoresby for his question. All members of this place, here in Geelong, would be pleased to know that in the last three years the crime rate in Geelong has dropped by 15 per cent. Since 1999 in this region of Geelong and the Surf Coast we have also increased police numbers by 25. An extra eight are due by the end of June 2006. The member is quite right in addressing that question about the 600 extra police.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr BRACKS — Yes, it is — I am glad you highlighted it. That is because we will have, backed up by the Police Association and backed up by police more broadly, 600 extra on the front line by the end of our term of office. That will accumulate to 1400 extra police since we came to office in 1999. Could I just remind the member that that is in contrast to the situation under the previous government, which promised 1000 extra police and set about cutting 800. We have seen the crime rate come down, we have seen police numbers go up, and we have more to come.

Tourism: *Moving Forward*

Ms NEVILLE (Bellarine) — My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister advise the house on how the government's *Moving Forward* statement will benefit tourism in the Geelong and Bellarine Peninsula area?

Mr PANDAZOPOULOS (Minister for Tourism) — I thank the member for Bellarine and all the Geelong members who are part of the government's Friends of Tourism group which is about trying to ensure that we continue the great work of tourism. One of the great legacies of this government is definitely that we have the biggest tourism industry we have ever seen, and a lot of that has been led by this fantastic region that is known not just around Victoria or interstate but internationally.

It has been recognised that the Geelong and Bellarine area is what we call in Tourism Victoria a level 1

destination because of the international, interstate and major event profile that this city has. Of course it is fully deserved. It has taken a lot of hard work to get that happening, not only from the state government but really from the great investment that the City of Greater Geelong puts in. It is a significant investor in tourism, and I want to commend the mayor and the council for that as well as the very strong, powerful and closely working tourism industry agencies, from Geelong Otway Tourism down to the local tourism associations in the Bellarine Tourism Association and the Geelong Tourism Association.

You grow tourism through cooperative arrangements. That is the reason why we have 7 million visitors, both Australian and international, to this region. If you want to grow tourism, this is one of the great regions in which to have the opportunity. The growth in this area has been absolutely phenomenal. Since the Labor Party has been in government there has been a 38 per cent growth in the number of interstate visitors and an 18.5 per cent growth in the number of international visitors to the region.

We know as a government working closely with local government and industry that we need to take strategic steps to keep the regions growing to their next stage. One of the great things that has been happening in this region is that there has been a lot of activity in the Bellarine and Geelong area. It has been driven by leisure and holiday travel and a lot of events travel. Let's look quickly at some of the events we have been able to hold and support since we have been in government.

In 2000, just a few weeks after we were elected, the first event to which we gave financial support was what is now known as Skandia Geelong Week. We have been able to give it financial support every year. That is an event that did not attract financial support from the previous government. Skandia Geelong Week is now an international event that promotes Corio Bay to the sailing community around the world.

Of course there have been other events in the region that we have been able to attract: there is the world women's cycling classic; Geelong had a role in the World Masters Games a few years ago; the international ITU triathlon, and now we have secured the national triathlon championships for three years; the airshow at Avalon has continued to grow over a number of years; the Queenscliff music festival is now one of our hallmark events; a few weeks ago there was the launch of the program for Rescue 2006, the world lifesaving championships; and next March will highlight the important role the region plays as part of

the Commonwealth Games, from both an event and a tourism point of view.

The other great thing that has happened is that this government has worked closely with the City of Greater Geelong, tourism and the private sector to ensure we have domestic airline travel to Avalon Airport. That has brought 300 000 people from around Australia into the Geelong region, and that is why this region is doing so well. But there is more work to be done. Despite the growth and cooperation, this region has much more potential. That is why under the *Moving Forward* statement \$27 million has been made available to support tourism, marketing and infrastructure, of which \$11 million is in marketing.

I was very shocked, but not surprised, to see a member from the opposition, the member for Doncaster — they do not even have a shadow Minister for Tourism — in the *Herald Sun* criticising —

Mr Plowman — On a point of order, Speaker, the minister is clearly debating the question. I ask you to bring him back to government business.

The SPEAKER — Order! I uphold the point of order. I ask the Minister for Tourism to return to answering the question.

Mr PANDAZOPOULOS — I remind the house that the member for Doncaster criticised —

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The Minister for Tourism will heed my direction or I will sit him down.

Mr PANDAZOPOULOS — I am very pleased to be able to announce to the house in this very special sitting that, as part of this \$11 million marketing campaign over four years, this government is making available to the Bellarine and Geelong region a destination marketing campaign worth a quarter of a million dollars to help the tourism product continue to grow as part of this great regional attraction along the Great Ocean Road. We will grow tourism. Tourism is about jobs. It is great to see that not only have we had a nearly 10 per cent increase in tourism jobs in this state but we have had a 19 per cent increase in tourism jobs in the Greater Geelong region since we have been in government.

Port of Geelong: rail link

Dr NAPHTHINE (South-West Coast) — My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the government's promise in May 2002 to connect

Lascelles Wharf to the national and state rail network — and I can see that the paper is being passed along to give him the answer.

The SPEAKER — Order! I ask the member for South-West Coast to put his question.

Dr NAPHTHINE — I refer to the government's promise in May 2002 to connect Lascelles Wharf to the national and state road network. Given that no work has actually commenced on this vital project, can the Premier explain why only \$17 000 has been provided for the project this financial year, or is this another Bracks broken promise to the people of Geelong?

Mr BRACKS (Premier) — I thank the member for South-West Coast for his question. I can indicate to the member that we have entered into a heads of agreement with Pacific National, enabling works on the next phase of Geelong's port-rail program to commence. I indicate that that has been done and undertaken.

We have also recently released a significant provincial statement, *Moving Forward*, which commits the government to \$502 million of new spending for regional Victoria over the next four years. That is a very important legacy to leave — —

Dr Napthine — On a point of order, Speaker, the question was quite specific with regard to the government's promise some three and a half years ago to connect Lascelles Wharf to the rail network. The question is: why have they not started the work?

The SPEAKER — Order! A point of order is not an opportunity to repeat the question. The Premier is entitled to make comments around the question, as well as answering it.

Mr BRACKS — I reiterate that that work is starting. That was the question asked of me by the member. The heads of agreement have been signed. Can I also indicate, in looking at investment in port facilities, that one of the things our government will do will be to invest in these new port facilities. What did the previous government do with the port of Geelong? It privatised it. That is what it did!

Mr Lim interjected.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Clayton will cease interjecting in that manner.

Dr Napthine — On a point of order, Speaker, on the issue of relevance, the question was very specific about Lascelles Wharf — —

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for South-West Coast has already raised a point of order. If he is raising another one, it must be on a different topic.

Dr Napthine — No, it is on relevance.

The SPEAKER — Order! Exactly, so I am asking the member to explain his relevance point of order.

Dr Napthine — Because the question was specifically about Lascelles Wharf. The Premier is not addressing that issue; he is talking all around it. If he wants a debate about privatisation and its benefits to the people of Geelong, he should know that the port has boomed since it has been privatised.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for South-West Coast has been a member of this house for a very long time. He knows he is abusing the point of order system. I rule his point of order out of order.

Mr BRACKS — As I have already answered the member's question, and as the point of order raised the very point that I was raising, I am satisfied with the member for South-West Coast's response!

Geelong: government initiatives

Mr HOWARD (Ballarat East) — My question is to the Minister for State and Regional Development. As someone who grew up in Geelong I feel compelled to ask the minister today to advise the house of any recent announcement that demonstrates the government's commitment to the Geelong region.

Mr BRUMBY (Minister for State and Regional Development) — I thank the member for Ballarat East, a former Geelong resident, for his question. Today has been a day of great news for Geelong — good news on all fronts — and I have some more good news. Today the Australian Bureau of Statistics regional labour force figures were released. These figures look at the last quarter and also at the last year, and I am pleased to advise the house that over the last year employment growth in the Barwon/south-western region has seen 8000 new jobs. To put that in perspective, in the last six years of the former Kennett government in the Barwon/south-western region there were 6771 new jobs. There have been more new jobs in one year under the Bracks government than there were in six years under the former Kennett government.

It is no wonder we are seeing that strong jobs growth. As the Premier has indicated today, there has been a substantial package of government commitments that

have driven growth and new investment in the Geelong area. They include the completion of Geelong Road, the Geelong bypass, Grovedale station and the regional fast rail project. There has been \$162 million worth of new investment and commitments in the health system. These include the Geelong hospital accident and emergency centre, the Andrew Love Cancer Centre, a huge investment in the Grace McKellar Centre and the 24-hour hotline for Barwon Health. There has been a huge investment in this region's health system. In education there has been the investment of \$97.6 million in capital works for schools and TAFE in Geelong since 1999.

With respect to the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund, the Premier mentioned the Skilled Stadium this morning, and some of the RIDF funding went towards that. The Geelong city centre upgrades — —

An honourable member — Not nearly enough!

Mr BRUMBY — Who said, 'Not enough.'?

Mr Hulls — Me and him and him and him!

The SPEAKER — Order! It does not matter who said it, the minister will address his answer to the Chair.

Mr BRUMBY — As you would appreciate, Speaker, as the minister responsible for the RIDF fund, and of course as a Collingwood supporter, I thought it was an extraordinary contribution and very generous indeed. Avalon airport facilitated investment of \$1.3 billion overall in the Barwon region, and as the Minister for Tourism has mentioned today, the fantastic support for Avalon airport is now seeing something like 300 000 visitors coming to this region.

On top of all that, of course, there is the G21 commitment of \$600 000, and, as the Minister for the Arts has announced today, there is \$250 000 for the Geelong Performing Arts Centre study.

All of that, great news as it is, is eclipsed by the announcement made today by the Premier of the relocation of the Transport Accident Commission to Geelong. As the Premier said today, subject to the feasibility study report, which is to be released before Christmas, the relocation of the Transport Accident Commission to Geelong will occur.

Members will remember back to the relocation of the State Revenue Office to Ballarat. It was just on three years ago that we announced there would be a feasibility study. That feasibility study confirmed the government's judgment that there would be a relocation to Ballarat, and I have to say today that that relocation

has been extraordinarily successful. There has been a vast improvement in the productivity of the State Revenue Office, and it has been an enormous economic benefit to Ballarat. We moved the Rural Finance Corporation to Bendigo, and we moved the call centre of the department of housing to Moe, which has also been a sensational success.

During the week people have referred to the *Moving Forward* provincial statement as being a bonanza for provincial Victoria. I think the announcement today about the Transport Accident Commission is bigger than that. It is a huge announcement in terms of Geelong. It will mean around 600 new jobs, it will mean new highly skilled, highly paid white-collar jobs, and it will drive growth in the Geelong area for many years to come.

On the last day of Parliament for this year — when, I might say, we might have expected a question from the Leader of the Opposition — here we are in Geelong, a great place to be and a city with a great football team, with a great series of announcements from the government today that will drive confidence, drive jobs and drive new opportunities in this city for many years to come.

The SPEAKER — Order! The time for questions has now expired. The time set by the Premier for making a ministerial statement has now arrived. In accordance with standing orders, I have received advice that two members will speak in response.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Parliament: 150th anniversary

Mr BRACKS (Premier) — I rise today to mark the upcoming 150th anniversary of the proclamation of the Victorian constitution on 23 November 1855. Before doing so I again acknowledge the Wathaurong people, the traditional owners and custodians of the land on which we stand. I pay my respects to their elders, past and present, and any indigenous Victorians who are with us here today.

One hundred and fifty-five years ago this month a bonfire was lit on Flagstaff Hill, the ship lookout for the colonial outpost of the Port Phillip District of New South Wales. It was an historic bonfire — the separation bonfire — a flame lit in the dusk of 11 November 1850 to mark a dawning, the news that Britain had agreed to grant Port Phillip independence from New South Wales. That bonfire was lit by William Nicholson, a grocer who would go on to be

elected to the first Victorian Parliament, champion the cause of the secret ballot and become the fourth Premier of Victoria.

At the time Port Phillip had no constitution and no Parliament, yet people celebrated all the same. Beacons were lit up and down the coast — and, no doubt, in Geelong.

Yet it would take another five years and the tragedy of the Eureka Stockade before a Victorian constitution was proclaimed law on 23 November 1855 and self-government could begin.

Ever since then our democracy has been a work in progress, with each generation of Victorians building on the foundations of 23 November 1855.

Within 12 months we had the first sitting of a democratically elected Parliament, but it took another 53 years for women to get the vote and 127 years for the democratic principle of one vote, one value, to be introduced.

As I said, ours is a democracy in progress. And it is incumbent upon each generation of Victorians to keep our democracy moving forward — to keep that bonfire burning — because democracy can only burn brightly when it fully engages the people it represents.

That is why our government welcomes the parliamentary Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee's inquiry into electronic democracy — because we want to use new technologies to engage more Victorians in the democratic process.

That is why we established an independent committee, comprising Professor George Williams, Rhonda Galbally, Andrew Gaze and Haddon Storey, QC, to carry out community consultation on human rights.

That is why we have reformed state Parliament, introducing fixed four-year terms in both houses and proportional representation in the Legislative Council.

And that is why we amended the Constitution Act to give recognition to Victoria's Aboriginal people and their contribution to the state of Victoria.

That is because democracy is not just a word, it is not history; it evolves as we change, reflecting our goals and aspirations.

And it calls on us to protect the civil rights of all members of our community — no matter what their

race or creed, no matter what language they speak. And it is, as the Ballarat Reform League Charter states:

... the inalienable right of every citizen to have a voice in making the laws he is called upon to obey ...

If it is to retain its vibrancy and relevance, democracy must reflect the changing ideals of the people it represents.

On 23 November 1855 'democracy' meant giving the right to vote to men of the right background aged over 21. On 17 November 2005 'democracy' means every citizen — everyone, men and women, indigenous and non-indigenous, migrant and Australian born.

We are all equal. We are all free to practise our faiths, speak our minds, celebrate our cultural diversities and live our lives without discrimination or vilification. That is our right.

But with that right comes a heavy responsibility — the responsibility to respect the rights of our fellow Victorians and respect the democratic and legal principles of Victoria.

The social harmony we have achieved is built upon those principles — principles that are currently being tested by the threat of terrorism.

Now more than ever we need to stay true to the democratic principles that generations of Victorians have kept burning since William Nicholson first lit the separation bonfire. We must not give in to fear and extremism. We must remember who we are — a multicultural and multifaith community of 5 million people. And we must remember the principles that bind us together — tolerance, diversity, and freedom — because those are the principles that the extremists are trying to attack.

Victoria has a long history of tolerance and diversity, and I see examples of that tolerance and diversity as I travel around our great state. Earlier this month I was in Shepparton and visited the Batdja preschool to announce a \$500 000 funding commitment for the construction of a new children's centre.

Batdja is run by and for the local Koori community. But when I visited I noticed some newcomers had been welcomed into that preschool. Koori children were playing side by side with Iraqi-Australian children. The youngest members of Shepparton's oldest community were playing with the youngest members of Shepparton's newest community.

Our democracy needs to stay true to that kind of inclusiveness and tolerance — which brings me back to Victoria's constitution and Victoria's first Premier.

It is impossible to understand Victoria's constitution and the unique style of democracy it spawned without knowing the seismic events leading up to its proclamation, because ultimately our constitution and democracy are products of the gold rush.

Victoria was proclaimed a colony on 1 July 1851. The Legislative Council first sat on 11 November 1851. And between those two dates — on 7 July — gold was first discovered at Clunes.

Over the next four years, as Governor Charles Hotham and his fledgling Legislative Council struggled towards self-government, the colony of Victoria underwent a revolution of sorts. The population tripled, going from 77 345 to 236 798. To put that in perspective, imagine what would happen if Victoria's population grew by 10 million between now and 2008. That is the size of the population increase at the time.

For colonial Victoria it was overwhelming. Inside five years the colony went from a British monoculture and squattocracy to a multicultural community and democracy with a golden economy.

The citizens of this new Victoria — the Victoria forged by the gold rush — demanded political representation. That led to the ratification of the nearest thing Australia has to Magna Carta — the Ballarat Reform League Charter — three years to the day after William Nicholson lit the separation bonfire and which on 3 December 1854 led to Eureka.

The democratic advances our state is founded upon are the birth of self-government in 1855; the holding of democratic elections in 1856; and the introduction of universal male suffrage in 1857. And all that has followed since can be attributed to the catalytic effect of the gold rush in general and Eureka in particular.

Victoria, as I have indicated, would have become a democracy without Eureka. But I doubt it would have come as quickly. And I doubt it would have been as egalitarian as we find it today, because the social forces that became Eureka did not just instigate change, they shaped change.

The aspirations of the Ballarat Reform League Charter — aspirations of justice, democracy and the right to dissent — were taken into account when our constitution was drafted. And the parliaments that were elected following the proclamation of that constitution were packed with gold rush Victorians, particularly in

the case of the Legislative Assembly. For example, consider one of the men whose public life was launched by Eureka, Henry Chapman.

Chapman successfully defended John Joseph, the African-American who was the first miner to stand trial for high treason. Following that success Chapman was elected to serve in Victoria's new Parliament in 1856. And it was as a parliamentarian that he invented the secret ballot here in Victoria — a democratic safeguard that was soon adopted around the world.

Would Chapman, let alone the stockade's leader, Peter Lalor, have even been elected to Parliament without Eureka? I doubt it.

But there is no doubt the lives of innumerable people — people such as Chapman and Lalor — were changed forever by Eureka. And those countless Chapmans and Lalors did not just change our history. They also shaped our democratic institutions and they shaped our present. That is why last year our government funded celebrations to mark the 150th anniversary of Eureka. And that is why over the next 12 months we will embark on a broad range of events to mark the 150th anniversaries of self-government and democratic government in Victoria.

The celebratory events include:

- an interactive multimedia display of Victoria's parliamentary history, which will open in Castlemaine this Saturday and then travel to Portland, Ararat, Mildura, Warracknabeal, Shepparton, Wodonga, Bairnsdale and Morwell;

- exhibitions of political cartoons and petitions at Parliament House;

- separate exhibitions of historic documents at the State Library of Victoria and the Public Record Office of Victoria;

- a conference on the legacy of self-government;

- open days of Parliament House and its historic gardens;

- commemorations of the secret ballot, the 8-hour-day movement and the official opening of Parliament House; and

- the issuing of a commemorative coin by the Royal Australian Mint — and we are grateful to the mint for that initiative.

The celebrations officially begin today with the regional sitting of the Legislative Assembly here in Geelong and the sitting of the Legislative Council in Colac. These sittings are all about opening up Parliament to the people, because our state's democracy, which is now one of the oldest and most stable democracies in the world, is at its strongest when it listens to and acts in the best interests of the broader community; just as it is at its wisest when it is informed by our history.

With that in mind I will today unveil a plaque commemorating Victoria's first Premier, William Clark Haines. Haines, a retired surgeon and dairy farmer in the Barrabool Hills, was an MP for the Geelong area between 1853 and 1858. He had become well known in Geelong as the local magistrate and a local trustee for the Port Phillip Savings Bank, and he had been a member of the Grant District Council in 1843. Haines may not have been a product of the Eureka phenomenon, but he played a key part in our golden rush to self-government and democracy. He was a member of the Legislative Council's constitution committee which drew up the bill titled 'An Act to Establish a Constitution in and for the Colony for Victoria'. That bill was passed by the Imperial Parliament in 1855, becoming British law, and remained the legal foundation of our state until it was replaced by our Parliament's Constitution Act in 1975.

Haines, who was known as 'Honest Farmer' Haines, also successfully guided Victoria through the transitional period between the establishment of self-government and the first sitting of the democratically elected state Parliament on 25 November 1856. Haines remained Premier until 11 March 1857. He served a second term as Premier between 29 April 1858 and 10 March 1859, and he was Treasurer in a coalition government between 14 November 1861 and 27 June 1863.

William Haines can also lay claim to being a lead player in our state's first constitutional conflagration as well as our Parliament's first political crisis. On 26 November 1855 Haines and his ministry resigned their commissions only to be reappointed two days later by Governor Hotham, causing confusion and uproar in the Legislative Council. Then just four weeks later, on 20 December 1855, Haines resigned again in protest at the passing of the secret ballot legislation championed by none other than William Nicholson, of gold rush fame.

Eleven days later Governor Hotham died, and the newly self-governed colony of Victoria entered 1856 without a governor or a government. Needless to say

the colony and the Haines government survived those crises, but they serve to remind us that democracy is not always neat and tidy. And it is not always agreeable, because ultimately our democracy — our Parliament — is where we debate our ideas and values. It is through the contest of those ideas and values that we decide who we are and what we stand for as a community, and as such it is to be expected that we will agree to disagree. This is how it always has been in Victoria. After all, we have had a running debate over public policy and principles since 1855 — for 150 years and counting. That running debate is the lifeblood of our democracy, which is why it is incumbent upon us all to ensure that the quality of that debate remains high.

In conclusion I would like to compare two sets of statistics. In 1856, 60 021 Victorians were enrolled to vote. In 2002, there were 3 228 466 voters here in Victoria — a fiftyfold increase. That is how much our democracy has grown since self-government began. That is how many more Victorians are now directly concerned with the conduct of this Parliament. We should remember that number, just as we should remember the quotation from Proverbs that is emblazoned on the floor of state Parliament's vestibule:

Where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counsellors there is safety.

Mr DOYLE (Leader of the Opposition) — I also wish to pay my respects to the traditional owners of the land upon which we stand. Today I want to cover two things: first of all, a bit of the history of the democracy over the last 150 years, as the Premier has done, but then to focus more directly on issues of democracy today. It is interesting to note that as we stand here in Costa Hall as the Parliament of Victoria it may have been much more common for us to meet in Geelong because, as we have heard earlier today, there was a lively debate about whether Geelong would be the capital of Victoria and therefore also the seat of the Victorian Parliament. That was not to be, but, as I say, it shows you that history takes some interesting turns, and one wonders what would have been the relative fates of the two cities had that decision been made.

As the Premier said, the Constitution Act of 1842 gave Victoria the power to elect members. Five were elected to the Port Phillip District, and the Parliament of New South Wales, the Legislative Council, had one member returned from Melbourne. The Constitution Act of 1850 created the Colony of Victoria with its own legislature. It granted the colonies the power to make their own constitutions. On 1 July 1851, Separation Day, writs were issued for the election of members to the Legislative Council, and this was the formal legal

trigger for the separation of Victoria from New South Wales.

It is interesting that gold was discovered just a couple of days after that Separation Day, and the goldfields were given special representation. In July 1851 Charles Joseph La Trobe was installed as Lieutenant-Governor of the state. The first meeting of the Legislative Council was held in St Patrick's Hall in Bourke Street. The Premier in his speech earlier mentioned the contribution of Hoddle to the layout of both Geelong and Melbourne, but I will also mention the contribution of La Trobe to the vision of Melbourne in particular as a city ringed by gardens, an identity which we keep to this day.

In December 1853 a bill to establish the constitution for the colony of Victoria was placed before the Council and passed in March 1854. In December 1854 the Eureka Stockade took place, and the Premier has noted the importance of that seminal event to Victorian democracy. I must say we do not always agree on the significance or the meaning of that event across both sides of the house, but we recognise its important place in our history.

The Victorian constitution was given royal assent after passing through the House of Lords and the House of Commons in July 1855. The constitution enshrined the two-chamber system that we have now, but it had to be made up of men over the age of 30 with property of a certain value and a professional career or training. The Premier has noted at some length, and I will not repeat the details, that the first Premier, Geelong citizen William Clark Haines, was appointed on 28 November 1855. He was supported by a ministry of six. As the Premier outlined, a somewhat chequered history of political consistency followed.

Manhood suffrage for the Legislative Assembly was granted two years later in 1857. In 1908 adult suffrage was conferred on women in respect of Assembly elections, and in 1923 women were allowed to stand as candidates for the lower house. In 1926 voting was made compulsory. It is interesting how these democratic debates take full turn. At the moment there is a healthy debate about whether voting should be compulsory in Australia.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr DOYLE — If you do not wish to take part in it, that is fine, but there is such a debate. It may have eluded your attention, but there is such a debate.

Throughout each of those steps Victorians have played a crucial role not just in shaping Victorian democracy

and the democracy of this Parliament but also by being at the forefront of the development of the federal system. I want to mention briefly two of the giants of the Victorian Parliament who have also made a contribution to the federal scene.

We are at Deakin University, and therefore it is proper that we recognise Sir Alfred Deakin, who was born and raised in Collingwood, educated at Melbourne Grammar School — not everyone is perfect, but he did go on to make a contribution — and Melbourne University. Deakin entered the Victorian Parliament in 1879 and was made Solicitor-General and Minister for Public Works in 1884. In 1890 he was Victoria's delegate to the Australasian Federation Conference, becoming perhaps the leading proponent and father of Federation. He helped the Constitution Bill pass through the Victorian Parliament. As the member of the Ballarat in the first federal Parliament he served as Attorney-General and was instrumental in the creation of the High Court of Australia. He became Australia's second Prime Minister.

There are very few Australians who could be said to have made such a contribution to parliamentary democracy, not just in Victoria but also in Australia. On this side of the house we could perhaps name a second figure who served in both houses, and that is Sir Robert Menzies. He was Australia's longest serving Prime Minister, holding office for 17 years in his second stint.

Menzies entered politics through the Victorian state Parliament in 1928. He was educated at Ballarat and came from the Wimmera. He won the federal seat of Kooyong in 1934 and was immediately named Attorney-General and Minister of Industry. He was made Prime Minister in 1939 and led the unanimous decision to take Australia into war. Still, perhaps, the most difficult decision for any Prime Minister is the decision to take young Australians to war. So Victoria's contribution to democracy has not just been confined to this state. It has been a catalyst for some of the greatest contributors to our federal scene as well. We should be proud of their contributions, not just to Victoria but to the greater democratic debate.

But proud history alone is not enough. The Premier spoke of keeping democracy burning brightly and ensuring that our democratic rights are constantly upheld. It is the work of every elected Parliament to ensure that it upholds, maintains and builds a solid democratic base. They are fine words, but they need to be matched by honest actions. I want to talk a little about democracy today. Despite all the rhetoric we have heard today we now have a government that

consistently blocks the access of the public to information.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr DOYLE — We have a government that ignores the public's right to have government scrutinised and its right to be informed about the state of Victoria. Let's consider freedom of information.

Freedom of information (FOI), according to former Labor Premier, John Cain, is the most significant issue in politics. Yet here today we have a government which feels no compunction in delaying FOI requests. It makes ridiculous calls for clarification of words like 'contract', 'invoice' or 'briefing papers'. The latest figures show that 21 per cent of the 2404 requests for information from government departments resulted in full disclosures between July 2002 and June 2003 — that was down from 25 per cent in 2001–02 and down again from 28 per cent in 2000–01.

Today the report for 2004–05 was tabled. That, of itself, is of concern. In the last two days alone we have had 226 annual reports dumped into the Parliament. How could they possibly have been read, much less scrutinised? Does the house think that was deliberate in the last week of Parliament? Of course it was. But the government is unfazed about spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers money denying the public its right to know.

FOI requests have been mired in delays, with many requests taking months to be clarified, let alone to have information on them released. The request on the fast rail project is now 416 days late, and it is being investigated by the Ombudsman as a direct result. Do not take me as a commentator. Just yesterday the *Age* stated that the government's shameless resort to semantics showed contempt for the public.

Let's think about questions on notice. As at 31 October there were over 1700 unanswered questions on notice on the notice paper. One minister — Minister Delahunty — has refused to answer 184 questions for this year alone. Again it does seem unusual that we are concluding our sittings on this day in the middle of November.

Since this government came to power the Parliament has had 15 fewer sitting days and 155 fewer sitting hours than it had in the previous period and in the comparable period under the previous government. In 1993 the Assembly sat for 62 days; this year we have sat for 48 days — five sitting weeks less.

Under this government, in this Parliament, we have something we have never seen before, and we had a demonstration of it today in question time. The opposition's ability to scrutinise the government is reduced by the number of questions it can ask in the crucial time for questions without notice. It has never happened before in this Parliament. Government members give themselves five questions a day —

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr DOYLE — Yes, it is true. The government has reduced the number of questions. The government has five questions a day so that people like the Treasurer — —

Mr Brumby — Try two. Rubbish! You are a hypocrite.

Mr DOYLE — The government has five questions a day, and the Treasurer may like to grandstand on the last question of each day — that is fine — but note that the government has reduced this side of the house to 10 questions per week. While it may claim that it is open, honest and transparent, have a look at the way it has reduced scrutiny through question time. In Victoria ministers responsible for major portfolios spend about 3 hours in front of the Public Accounts and Estimates Committee. In Tasmania ministers are questioned for 9 hours.

Let's take one more measure. In any previous government the matter of public importance (MPI) debate was always part of opposition business. The MPI debate was on Wednesday morning, and it was always opposition business. But what does this mob do? It says, 'We don't just want all the dorothy dix questions; we want some dorothy dix MPIs as well'. Government members rotate themselves in a way that members of no other Parliament have done — no other Parliament! Let's compare it with the federal situation. In the federal Parliament it is opposition business.

Let's look at some of the measures the government has taken — and I am delighted the Treasurer is still here — just to blur comparability between budgets. Compare the 2004–05 budget to the 2005–06 budget. The government discontinued 437 performance measures. It put in some new ones, but overall it had 167 measures fewer.

Yet we were told at the start of this government's term of office that any time that happened there would be an explanation to the public so that budgets could be compared, but the reality is that they simply are not. At the moment we have a racing and gambling bill that, for

the first time, the executive government has directed the Governor not to give royal assent to. That has never happened before in Victoria's history, and we do not have an explanation as to why it has happened.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr Perton — Are you controlling this house or not?

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Doncaster has made a reflection on the Chair. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr Perton — I withdraw.

The SPEAKER — Order! Thank you.

Mr Holding interjected.

Mr DOYLE — I know interjections are disorderly, but if I were going to ask a question, I would ask the organ grinder and not his monkey — but thank you for the suggestion. Finally — —

Mr Holding interjected.

Mr DOYLE — I tell you what, we are both sensitive and precious. I love the reaction. We're both precious and sensitive!

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The level of interjection is too high. I ask members to be quiet to allow the Leader of the Opposition, to continue.

Mr DOYLE — Do we hear the rumblings of guilt? Precious and sensitive!

The Premier has touted as his best achievement what he calls the reform of Parliament, and we are sitting today historically in Geelong. He has said that the changes made to the upper house are one of the proudest achievements of this government. So how does he explain to the people of Geelong that at the moment they have two Legislative Council members who represent Geelong and the Bellarine Peninsula, with that community of interest, yet under the changes made by this government there will be members — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr DOYLE — If you think you are going to get five, I wish you good luck. We will now have a region with Geelong and Ballarat and all of Victoria out to the South Australian border. Try to explain to the people of Geelong how that gives them better representation in the Legislative Council. It simply does not. I appreciate

the sensitivity from the other side. They are a bit precious about the Labor Party's supposed guardianship of democracy, because the reality is quite different. Labor Party members do not have a mortgage on democratic rights or process, and their behaviour demonstrates that what they say and what they do are completely different things.

Democracy requires more than rhetoric: it requires honest action. Parliament requires more than lip service: it requires real respect for the institution. Unfortunately we have a government of pretence that shows neither respect for the institution nor any real understanding of democracy.

Mr RYAN (Leader of The Nationals) — On behalf of The Nationals I support the motion moved by the Premier and supported by the Leader of the Opposition.

On 23 November we will mark 150 years of government in Victoria. It is an extraordinary story, and the Premier told much of it in the speech he delivered today, as did the Leader of the Opposition in recounting much of the history as well as some of the contemporary activity of government in the state of Victoria. But for us 88 members of the Legislative Assembly I think the true story is about what is occurring and what has occurred within our own electorates. It is an issue I want to highlight in the context of setting the foundation for these 150th anniversary celebrations, because each of our electorates has something special about it which makes up the totality of the Victoria we all know.

In the case of my own electorate I want to tell the house about the development of a great initiative back in the late 1800s. It was the construction of what is known as the swing bridge, which crosses the Thomson River just to the south of Sale. The great thing about this story is that it was a portent of things to come, because it tells how inventive and amazingly committed the people of the day were and what great ingenuity they had. It also tells you plenty about the egalitarian nature of the people of that day and even of the fledgling colony which we then were. It was, as I said, a portent of things to come.

The swing bridge built across the Thomson River opened in 1883 and established the trade route from Port Albert, which was one of the earliest establishments in the state of Victoria, running through to the borough of Sale. Its significance was enormous at that time, because it represented a means whereby traffic could cross over the Thomson. River punts had been used until the swing bridge was constructed. I am sure that anybody who has been there and seen it would

agree that it is a remarkable structure. The centre span is about 80 metres in length and capable of pivoting on a central core. I repeat that this was built in 1883 — an absolutely extraordinary engineering achievement. It allowed traffic to cross the bridge, but when it was opened it allowed traffic to come up the river and therefore serve the interests of the population in a way which drew great acclaim at the time.

Many interesting characters were associated with the swing bridge, the leading one probably being Eliza Emma Ball. This was a lady formidable in form. She was the licensee and owner of the Swan Hotel on the banks of the river at Longford, adjacent to the bridge. She was appointed by the Sale borough council to be the bridge-keeper or curator. It was her responsibility to swing the bridge, as it was termed, and she had the task of ensuring that the bridge was opened at the appropriate times. Opening that bridge was no mean feat. It required the cranking of a handle similar in fashion to cranking a car engine to get it going, yet this lady was capable of doing it herself. She did not need any help from any guy. She was able and formidable.

The former government committed to the refurbishment of the bridge as part of the project for the development of alternative crossings over the Thomson, and the current government, to its credit, continued with the project. The result has been the re-establishment of this remarkable structure which is now back in a functioning form. For 30 years that bridge had been locked closed, but now it functions again. Peter Synan, who is a great local historian, has written a piece about the bridge and its history which will soon be published, and in it he recounts the matters I am referring to now as well as the complete details of the construction and operation of the bridge.

I raise this issue on this day because I think it opens the prospect of an important project for the government to undertake. I believe within each of the electorates that we represent in this place there is something of this extraordinary nature which is pertinent to our particular district. I would nominate the swing bridge, but I am sure each of us could nominate a particular project or icon. There is a challenge here for the government in this 150th year in Victoria to bring together a collage of these respective icons and enable them to be published in a form which is available for all Victorians.

For some it will be a bigger task than for others — for example, the electorate of Lowan, I am reliably informed by the member for Lowan, occupies an area equivalent to 76 of the other 87 electorates of the Parliament. He is going to have a lot of difficulty picking one out. I recognise the problem. Similarly the

member for Swan Hill is going to have a problem because he has the second biggest district in Victoria. Nevertheless it is an initiative worth pursuing by the government.

Apart from that, as both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have remarked, at the core of this celebration is the issue of democracy in the state of Victoria. I venture to suggest that the community has tended to take for granted its 150 years of democracy. It is something we tend to enjoy without giving it appropriate thought. We need to be reminded occasionally of the fragility of democracy. It is instructive when we have people from Timor come here, whose friends and relatives were shot and who died in their own streets simply because they wanted to put a piece of paper in a ballot box and elect their own government. It is something we overlook and need to be reminded of regularly.

We have obvious challenges to democracy in this nation and this state. One of them is the question of terrorism, but there are challenges that are more subtle. I had occasion recently to be in Paris, where 30 000 cars have been torched since January this year. It is remarkable to see what is eventuating in that magnificent city. There is a lesson for us to learn here in Australia, and particularly in Victoria. I am not for one moment being judgmental about France or its people, but there is a lesson to be learnt about the capacity of that nation to integrate young Muslim people into their population in a way which gives them a place in the scheme of things and the dignity that they deserve. It is a lesson that Australia needs to look at and take into account.

As I say, I support this motion. The Premier has mentioned the words from Proverbs:

Where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counsellors there is safety.

I am pleased he has incorporated that in his speech, because I referred to it when we spoke on the occasion of the celebrations surrounding Eureka. Those words are set in stone in the foyer of our Parliament, and it is something upon which we should all reflect.

The Premier also mentioned Shepparton. A couple of years ago we staged our annual conference there. The member for Shepparton was able to organise, in concert with the community, a choir of children of about 20 different nationalities who came together to sing *I Am Australian* at the start of our conference. It was something that was truly inspiring. They are the sorts of events which are happening in places such as Shepparton. I should also say that when the Iraqi

elections were held they included the Iraqi citizens in Shepparton — the only country location that hosted them. Indeed, the member for Shepparton was one of the official observers. So these issues are being played out in our country locations and across our state generally. They are reflective of the matters which have gone to make up our proud 150 years.

The general principles of democracy are strong here, but there is always going to be enormous debate about the manner in which those principles are maintained. Freedom of speech is one of the basic things we enjoy. The people gathered here today have had what they might later recall as the dubious pleasure of seeing and hearing question time. True it is that passions get inflamed, and true it is that people get fired up, but there are no bombs going off, no-one is getting shot and no-one is getting whacked. The fact is that we can come here and put a point of view passionately, and in the interests of freedom of speech and democracy that is an important aspect of who we are and what we do. Freedom of association, the freedom to move about our state as we choose and the capacity to get a fair go are all things of which we are proud as Australians and Victorians. Those things are very important to reflect upon as we approach a wonderful moment in history of the state — its 150th anniversary. Again, I support the ministerial statement.

URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY: AMENDMENTS

Debate resumed from earlier this day; motion of Mr HULLS (Minister for Planning); and Mr BAILLIEU's amendment:

That all the words after 'That' be omitted with the view of inserting in their place the words 'this house refuses to consider the ratification of the following planning scheme amendments to modify the urban growth boundary tabled in the house on 16 November 2005 until all such amendments have been placed on public exhibition for a minimum period of four weeks and all affected communities have been notified of the proposed changes and provided with an opportunity to comment'.

Mr HONEYWOOD (Warrandyte) — It is interesting to reflect on the 150th anniversary of the Parliament as well as on the key issue of today's debate — that is, Melbourne's urban growth boundaries. You would have thought that if this government really cared about key cities in the state like Geelong, we would be having a debate today about Geelong's urban planning and the future of the city. But what has been the biggest item on the agenda today for this first historic meeting of the Parliament in Geelong? What is the key issue? A debate about the urban growth

boundaries of the city of Melbourne. That is what we spent 2 hours on this morning, and that is what we are going to spend another 2 hours debating — not Geelong's, not Ballarat's and not Bendigo's but Melbourne's urban growth boundaries.

It is not surprising that only a short period of time after this government legislated to supposedly try to enshrine green wedges we are now back at the urban planning drawing board, interfering with the community amenity and doing a nip-and-tuck job here and there for and on behalf of certain developer mates who feature prominently at Labor Party fundraisers. Even after the green wedge legislation went through both houses of Parliament, this deceitful government made a significant change to the Warrandyte green wedge.

The former minister, who is now at the table, did that in my electorate in order to allow a favoured development to proceed, even though it was no longer for a permitted land use within the green wedge. The minister knows she did this. After she supposedly enshrined green wedge legislation, she put a development right in the middle of my green wedge. So much for enshrining urban planning by legislation.

The people of Melbourne are crying out for predictability in lifestyle choice. According to Professor Buxton, who has in the past been a supporter of this government's planning policies and was closely associated with the Melbourne 2030 policy, they thought that at least they had some predictability with the Melbourne 2030 policy's emphasis on infilling high-density housing options into well-serviced inner suburbs. Unfortunately for the government, Professor Buxton has now turned on it and is saying that it is an absolute nonsense to have these additional large areas, thousands of hectares, put onto the outer ring of Melbourne's suburban growth so that it will be many years to come before the public transport and other services these communities want can be provided.

The opposition has moved a significant amendment to this Melbourne-centric government motion. The amendment the opposition has moved is intended to ensure that there is an appropriate period of community consultation. After all, community consultation was what the Premier promised Labor would do back in 1999. What has it achieved? It has rammed this motion to increase the urban growth boundary through the Parliament in 24 hours. Has it made any maps available in the parliamentary library for us to check? Of course not. Why has the government done this while sitting in Geelong? It is because it does not want the people of Melbourne to know what it is doing so it has had to

move down to Geelong in order to impose this on the people of Melbourne.

Then we had these smart growth committees that were just basically public servants talking to public servants — a bit like the upper house reform committee to which nobody turned up. That was because advertising for the meetings was buried in the *Government Gazette* so nobody knew what was happening.

In the area of my electorate covered by Yarra Valley Water, 17 000 households are totally reliant on septic tanks. These households have been told that they are on a 20-year plan. I can see the member for Monbulk sitting up there. He would be well aware of this situation — and he is nodding his head in affirmation. A 20-year plan has become a 40-year plan. What that means is that instead of focusing its priorities on ensuring that areas of Melbourne and other cities around Victoria that have Third World sewerage systems and rely on backyard septic tanks — and in the case of areas in my electorate their effluent leads to E.coli run-off into the creeks that flow into the Yarra River — what do we find? This government takes \$60 million in dividend payments from the Yarra River Water Authority and provides only \$5 million for the sewerage backlog program. No wonder we have increasing numbers of households with septic tanks. This government is fiddling around with the urban edges of Melbourne instead of focusing on the key priorities where its much-vaunted Melbourne 2030 policy was meant to focus.

How many government backbenchers have been bothered or will be bothered to examine the maps on the extension of this officially sanctioned urban growth? They would not have a clue. Apart from the member for Melton, who may have a pecuniary interest, we are not aware of any government member who has bothered to look at the maps for this urban growth boundary. How many government MPs have been or will be bothered to discuss the potential impact of this proposed officially sanctioned urban growth with their local councils, affected neighbourhoods, and/or community organisations? Of course they will not be bothered. They have rushed this through in 24 hours. That is their community consultation. They have done it because they do not want the financial contributions of their developer mates to the Labor Party exposed, that is why.

In reality, what would be the downside of holding this urban growth boundary extension over until the next sittings of Parliament? The minister at the table, who was well known for having developers going through

the revolving door of her office when she was Minister for Planning, would have us believe there would be a land scandal because of that. That would presuppose that the deal was not already done. That would presuppose that the fix was not already in. But the minister would be well aware that far from holding this over for proper community consultation until the next session of Parliament, leading to a massive price increase in the additional land that will now be carved up as a result of today's rushed measure, on this side of the house we know that the nod and the wink was already done prior to that announcement. The white shoe brigade has been in and out of the minister's office as it was in the former minister's office all the time, and the fix has been put in for some time.

What role will the new authority — the so-called new authority — that will now be monitoring the urban growth boundaries have compared to VicUrban? What role will VicUrban have compared with what this new authority is going to be doing — an authority supposedly charged with the responsibility of monitoring and ensuring that urban growth boundaries are put in place properly and appropriately? What role, if any, will the so-called partner in government — namely, local government — have in terms of the powers of this new urban land growth authority? The speech made by the Minister for Planning makes it quite clear that this is meant to be an independent authority.

We are also told, however, in the minister's speech that the independent authority will have to take all of its advice from the minister of the day. So we have yet another so-called arms-length-from-government new authority being created. I believe the government has created over 100 different independent commissioners and independent authorities at arms-length from government, but this one will take directions from the minister who takes directions from the white shoe brigade. What a wonderful transparent system we have here! We can see the transparency on this side of the house, but on their side this is all about ensuring that their mates get a foot in the door. The deal has been done.

Mr Nardella — Name one.

Mr HONEYWOOD — I take up the interjection, 'Name one'. Just go to any progressive business Labor Party fundraiser and watch the table numbers. Go there and see how many people sitting around those tables have paid extra to have the Minister for Planning at the table, as well as those who have paid extra to have the former Minister for Planning at the table — not that she knows anything — or those who have paid extra to be

there so that favours will be provided in return. We know how they work; we know what this is all about.

The member for Hawthorn has, quite correctly, moved an amendment for and on behalf of true transparency, for and on behalf of true democracy, which is surely about ensuring that we can examine with the wider community of Victoria where the nips and tucks have been done to these maps, why they have been done and what implications they will have for the future of Victoria and indeed the future of Melbourne. And blow Geelong, because the government could not care less about Geelong. That is why it is doing it down here.

Mr SEITZ (Keilor) — I rise to support the motion by the Minister for Planning and the amendments to the urban growth boundary notification. I want to constrain myself to areas in my electorate which are affected by these boundary changes, but before I do that, I make the observation that we have heard a lot of criticism from the opposition on this issue. I was around when we put the levy on developers to put in the water, the sewerage and the gas provisions, because before that a subdivider only had to mark out the maps, put a bit of gravel down on the roads and had no other expenses. The rest was left for the community — the people, the council and the state — to pick up the bill, and they walked away with the profits. So I think the announcement of the developers levy is a further step in something that was long overdue, ensuring that the developers do contribute to the development of an area.

In my electorate in particular, which is a growth and interface area, people move in from where they have lived with their parents in Brunswick, Footscray or Carlton, where they had a train, tram and bus within 200 metres walking distance. In my area those things are not available. They do not have the multiple choice of schools, kindergartens or child-care centres that they have in the inner urban area. Therefore the developer levy is an important part of the program the government has adopted in the new growth areas. It is appropriate that it was announced at the same time as the boundaries for the growth areas were announced.

This is very important in my electorate in the areas of Taylors Hill and Caroline Springs and in the Plumpton township, which has the potential of being landlocked. The growth and extension of the boundary will mean that we will have the critical mass necessary to provide services that will eventually meet the education needs of the students in the catchment area. They will get a secondary college, a kindergarten and a child-care centre in the Taylors Hill area. We will be able to demonstrate that we have the critical mass and plan and lobby to have those facilities and services in the area.

Only last week the Minister for Transport announced a bus service connecting the Caroline Springs town centre with the Watergardens town centre. The government will have to find money to pay that large taxpayers bill. Contributions from developers are important because the developers need to provide some of the services, as happens in other states. We are too far behind on this. I well recall that when a campaign was run requiring that developers have fully constructed roads, sewerage and drainage in an area the scream was, 'Oh, it's all going to be extra cost on the community'. Nobody has gone broke, land developers are still making huge profits and the development of affordable housing is still there for our community. That is the important part of this whole program — to have affordable housing for the young families in the region.

Having listened to the opposition, I make the point that the plan is a good example of the need for forward planning and preventing the very things the opposition is talking about: developers profiteering by coming in and making huge amounts of money. Once the minister and the government have made a decision the proposal has to go through Parliament quickly so that some smart operators cannot cash in on the proposal. I well remember the inquiries into and scandals surrounding the land deals — they were highlighted by a former member for Niddrie, Jack Simpson, who exposed the whole deal — that actually brought down the Hamer and Thompson governments. That happened because there was not proper planning. In my area the Bond Corporation was involved at Taylors Lakes. Part of Keilor Downs, which was under the control of the then Urban Land Corporation, was also affected. Entrepreneurs were able to cash in during the time available because of lack of action by the government on the rezoning of the farmland.

This motion should be commended. The minister should not be criticised for moving this motion after he made the decision so that the rules can be followed and nobody can be cheated of their rightful income. There are a number of small land-holders in that area, which as I said is bounded by the Melton Highway, Taylors Road and the powerline, which is now known as the Taylors Hill area. A lot of small holdings are available in the area. People become confused, and if they do not know what is taking place they can be taken advantage of. With the proposal going on public display, I will ensure that my constituents are not taken advantage of. Plenty of public meetings have been held out there. The member for Melton and I attended them and were part of the consultation and meeting with our community. I therefore support the minister's motion and oppose the amendment moved by the opposition.

Mr CLARK (Box Hill) — I rise to raise my concerns about the motion before the house and to support the amendment moved by the member for Hawthorn. The member for Hawthorn and other speakers from this side of the house have very effectively put forward the concerns about the rush in which this motion is being forced through the house: the fact that it was kept secret until about 48 hours ago that this was being brought on; that the government business program had been altered; and that there is no effective opportunity for members on this side of the house to research the issues underlying what is proposed and to make an informed contribution or allow for input from members of the public.

We have had the reaction from members opposite, including the member for Keilor, raising the argument that the motion has to be rushed through the house as soon as it is made public or else it is going to open up the opportunity for speculation and improper land purchases of some description. I might be missing something here, but it seems to me that once the proposal from the government is out in the public arena, as it was when the Premier and the Minister for Planning announced their package yesterday, the opportunity for speculation is virtually at an end because there is an informed market. If you draw an analogy with the stock market, the time when the company makes an announcement or disclosure to the stock market and everybody is informed is not the time when there is risk of speculation. The time of risk of speculation and insider trading is when something is being developed internally and it leaks. A few informed people get in and make their investment ahead of a fully informed market.

I would have thought the time when insider trading or speculation was a risk was when the government was developing its proposals, getting its glossy booklets printed and undertaking whatever other deliberations it goes through but before the public was fully informed. Once the announcement is made I cannot see any reason not to allow the plans to be on exhibition to allow four weeks or some other reasonable period for public input. What is the risk and uncertainty? You would have to say in practical terms there is next to none at the moment where the government has control of both houses of Parliament, assuming it has done this work properly. Presumably if the opposition or other members highlighted serious flaws in what the government was proposing to the extent that the government was embarrassed and had to modify its proposals, then there might be a change. But if the government has done its work properly, then it is going

to go through. There is close to zero potential for speculation there.

Let's consider another scenario where the government does not have control of both houses, which as we know has been the case in the past and may be the case after the next election regardless of which side of the house forms government. How then does this supposedly democratic process work if the government is at the same time absolutely fearful that any potential for amendment of its proposal would lead to rampant speculation? Is it saying it is going to put it through the Parliament but the Parliament cannot be allowed to make any changes because that would open up room for improper speculation? If that is the government's argument, then it makes a sham of the whole process.

Let's turn to the substance of what the government is proposing. Melbourne 2030 was being geared up at the time when I was the shadow Minister for Planning. I certainly had serious concerns about it then, and those concerns have not abated. When it was announced, as I understand it, the concept behind Melbourne 2030 was that we were going to set an urban growth boundary within which future growth of the metropolis was going to be constrained and growth would be channelled into high-rise, high-density development around regional centres and other local shopping centres. I thought that was the concept and that changes to the urban growth boundary were intended to be minimal.

Now we have the government coming along and saying it is going to make significant changes and bring an extra 10 years worth of land into the pipeline, so instead of having 15 years worth it is going to have 25 years. What has happened to the concept? What has happened to everything the former Minister for Planning was telling us was so marvellous about Melbourne 2030, with all the other members of the government lining up behind her? She was telling us that it was absolutely imperative that the growth of Melbourne be contained within these defined, specified limits and that was to be the government's future strategic direction.

Now they are saying, 'No, forget all about that. What is important is land affordability, so we are going to bring another 10 years worth of land into the urban growth boundary, and we are going to toss out everything we said a few years ago'. Where on Earth is the certainty which is essential to intelligent and informed decision making and investment and planning by the private sector? The necessity is that the government should lay down the strategic plan and vision for the community with certainty and with established process, and then others can fit in around it. If it is chopping and changing all over the place and if there are persistent

opportunities for lobbying and change of direction, then that certainty and strategic long-term vision is lost. I certainly have not heard any coherent rationale from any speaker on the government side as to why they are tossing out what was so marvellous a few years ago and moving in an entirely different direction today.

Let me just comment briefly on the still embryonic Growth Areas Authority that has been announced — and I will certainly be keen to find out more about that. On the face of it, it looks like yet another layer of bureaucracy. How is it going to interface with councils? How is it going to interface with the department? How is it going to interface with other specialist government planning authorities?

Mr Helper interjected.

Mr CLARK — The member for Ripon interjects ‘By telephone’. If that is the depth of the government’s thinking on it, then we are in really big trouble. Are other planning authorities and decision making by local communities through their councils going to be overridden by this Growth Areas Authority? What on Earth are the bureaucrats in the Department of Sustainability and Environment supposed to be doing with this extra layer interposed into the system?

Finally let me say a few words about the new infrastructure tax that was announced as part of this package. If we ever wanted an example of duplicity and deceit, it is the way this infrastructure tax has been secretly plotted while being denied and evaded by the government and then simply imposed on the community. You just have to look at the way the government has framed the level of the charge, where it says the highest charge is going to be the equivalent of \$5400 per housing lot, but then it is saying, ‘Oh, that is after tax’. When you do the calculation you see it is not \$5400 after all; it is something upwards of \$7700 per lot when you add back in the 30 per cent company tax government members have taken off. Of course that is the way you have to calculate it.

If the developers are going to get in enough revenue to meet the development charge, they have got to get in upwards of \$7700 worth of revenue, because they have got to pay 30 per cent tax on that and then have the amount available to pay the development charge. You can see the shiftiness, evasiveness and lack of good faith and full disclosure even in the way the charge has been specified.

The government did not tell the community how much it expects to raise each year from this charge, but, based on the number of new homes it is expecting over the

next 25 years, it looks like something between \$35 million and \$70 million a year. This new charge is on top of all the other new charges we have had lately, like the inner city parking tax, the so-called environmental levy on water bills, the gaming machine levy, the land tax surcharge on trusts, the automatic indexation of fees and fines, the doubling of brown coal royalties and of course the reliance on bracket creep to raise the land tax and stamp duty burden.

The *Age* on 20 August reported the proposal for this new services tax. The Premier on 23 August told radio 3AW:

I am not aware that any such fee would be recommended.

We have had a number of backbench MPs describing the proposal in their local papers as a complete fabrication or saying that the government is not even considering such an idea and dismissing the rumour. We had the Deputy Premier going to an Urban Development Institute of Australia conference in October and saying the proposal had been abandoned — at least as he was reported by the *Age*. Then just a week ago we had the Treasurer saying that it is under consideration because it has been proposed by some of the councils and smart growth committees, but it is a matter which has not been decided at this stage. Yet just a week later it is a fully fledged, fully decided policy; all the glossy brochures and explanatory leaflets have been printed. Members of the government can snow the public like this from time to time, but they completely destroy their credibility as ministers. It is the antithesis of good policy development.

Ms GREEN (Yan Yean) — I am pleased to speak in support of the motion proposed by the Minister for Planning to modify the urban growth boundary (UGB) in six municipalities. Let me say at the outset that I am pleased that in the City of Whittlesea, the area I represent, there is only a very minor change to the urban growth boundary. I am sure that my community will welcome that. There is a great supply of residential land contained within the proposed urban growth boundary. There will be about 25 years worth there, and I am sure it is going to be well planned. The community will definitely welcome it.

The minor change proposes that a small area of land at South Morang in the beautiful Plenty Valley will be included in the urban growth boundary. This will provide an appropriate physical edge to the urban form and will complement the planned regional open space link to the iconic Quarry Hills regional parkland. This

change will also deliver a small amount of additional housing in the Waterstone Hill estate.

I was pleased only last month to represent the Minister for State and Regional Development at the opening of the iconic Quarry Hills park. I thank the minister for the \$250 000 of funding that made this wonderful natural resource available to the families moving into Epping, Mill Park Lakes, Waterstone Hill and Hillcroft estates. It is my understanding that the City of Whittlesea has advised that, as part of the development, the land to be included in the UGB will include a significant further addition to this wonderful park.

I am pleased that within the urban growth boundary in the City of Whittlesea a significant amount of land has been set aside for employment around the Cooper Street industrial precinct. At the very centre of this employment area will be the relocation of the Melbourne wholesale fruit and vegetable market adjacent to the Craigieburn bypass, which was announced early this year. The market alone will provide more than 10 000 jobs. I think it is a wonderful thing that families moving into Epping North, Mernda, Doreen and South Morang will have the lifestyle choice to work close to where they live.

Overall I am pleased to see that the green wedges in the Plenty Valley corridor and in Nillumbik will be protected. The beautiful majestic red gums are a great part of the reason why people are choosing to live there. With the Sherwin Ranges in the distance, it is a beautiful place to live.

The plan proposed by the planning minister ensures that home ownership remains affordable for families in our growth corridors, which is really important. The establishment of a Growth Areas Authority will see a better sequencing of the release of land. Having too many development fronts opening up all at once has been a cause for concern in my area. Having the authority overseeing that and working in partnership with councils and communities will be a good thing.

Infrastructure provision will also be better with the new developer contribution arrangements. We have not heard any policies from the opposition. All we have heard are scurrilous allegations, and I cannot believe the opposition would say that, given that it brought us the land deals of the 1980s.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms GREEN — In the 1980s. Yes, that is right — and it would do it again if it were in power, because there would be no brake on urban development. There

would be no urban growth boundary, our green wedges would be destroyed, and there would not be a good provision of infrastructure. We legislated for the green wedges — —

Mr Plowman interjected.

Ms GREEN — I acknowledge that they were introduced by the Hamer government, but we legislated for them. We protected them, and the opposition would not if it were in power. In closing I support the motion before the house, as it will ensure that the city of Whittlesea will continue to be a great place to live, work and raise a family.

Mr Nardella interjected.

Mr SMITH (Bass) — Yes, there is a queue of us to speak on this, so the member for Melton should not worry about it. He should just relax a little bit!

The truth of the matter is that this is nothing but a sham. There is no reason why this should have been brought with less than 24 hours notice for it to be discussed by this house of Parliament today. There is no reason why the minister has to rush this through. As the member for Box Hill has said, once it becomes public information, once it is tabled in the Parliament, the opportunities for speculation are taken out of the equation immediately.

It is on the front page of today's *Herald Sun* and *Age* — have a look at it, it is there — the public knows about it. If it had been notified to us a month ago and had been able to be looked at and discussed to allow us to have an opportunity to talk to our councils about it, that would have been fine. But no, the government wants to rush it in, wants to rush it through on this very last sitting day of the Parliament in 2005, and there was no reason for it to actually happen.

The truth of the matter is that this shiny document was handed out and given to the press yesterday. The government cannot say that that was going to be printed in a matter of moments. It has taken some time for the document to be set out, to get the maps into place and all those sorts of things; yet the government gives less than 24 hours notice that we have to discuss this issue. I have a great interest in this, because there is an area of land set out in the Officer-Pakenham area that is fine. I am not complaining about that being set out. But I most certainly would have liked the opportunity to talk to my local council about it, to see if it was happy with it, to see if it was satisfied with it.

And what have we got? We have an area that is set aside, all industrial lands, all jobs, all fantastic, and I give it my total support. I do not have a hassle with that.

But we have had the Minister for Planning stand up here and talk about how this is going to cut the price of land, this is going to balance out the price of land. It ain't gonna lower the price of land out in my Pakenham area! Why? Because there is no further residential land that is being set out in this plan, no residential land at all. What sort of favour is that going to be doing to the people out in the Pakenham area and the Cardinia council? None at all. But it would have been nice to have had a chance to talk to the council about it and get its views and opinions on it. But no, the government rushes it in, in very indecent and undue haste. As I said before, it is an absolute sham what this government has done in regard to this. Government members should hang their heads in shame instead of standing up here and trying to say 'This is fine. This is the sort of thing we want to do. We want to take the speculation out of this'. There is no speculation in it, particularly once it has been put out.

This is the second time the government has done this; it is not the first time it has happened. When will it wake up that we want to be there, we want to see proper growth carried out in our little patches of ground? I have an important little patch of ground in probably the fastest growing part of the growth corridor out into the Casey and Cardinia areas. Government members can poke themselves or do whatever they like, I do not care, but what I have is an area that is growing very quickly, and we have to be looking at decent, proper planning out there.

I did not have an opportunity, like the member for Melton or the member for Hastings or the member for Gembrook, to go along to the smart growth meetings and have some input. The member for Melton got very upset before and said, 'No, I want an apology, because you are reflecting on me'. The truth of the matter is that the three of you had input into what is on these plans, and we did not get an opportunity to be able to do anything about having input into it.

Ms Buchanan — On a point of order, Acting Speaker, the member for Bass is impugning my reputation by inferring that I had influence with the smart growth committees, and I did not. I would ask him to withdraw that reference please.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Savage) — Order! The member for Hastings has asked for a certain reference that the member for Bass has made to be withdrawn.

Mr SMITH — If I said she was a crook I would probably apologise, but I did not.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Savage) — Order! The member for Bass is required — —

Mr SMITH — I stated factual information that she and the member for Gembrook were at a meeting. That is what I stated — nothing more, nothing less.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Savage) — Order! The member for Bass is required under the sessional orders — —

Mr SMITH — If I am required to withdraw, I withdraw. Settle down, relax, go back to your seats — all right? Just relax a little bit. What really worries me about — —

Ms Beattie — On a point of order, Acting Speaker, I believe the member for Bass impugned my reputation, and I ask him to apologise and withdraw.

Mr SMITH — I have never mentioned you, so I am not apologising or withdrawing.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Savage) — Order! The member for Bass is required to — —

Mr SMITH — I did not even mention her.

Ms Beattie interjected.

Mr SMITH — Go back into *Hansard* and have a look. I never mentioned her.

Ms Beattie interjected.

Mr SMITH — You are one, too. I withdraw for you, too, so sit down and get out of my time!

Ms Lobato — On a point of order, Acting Speaker, the member for Bass implied that I had something to do with a smart growth committee — —

Mr SMITH — You went to a committee meeting; that is what I said!

Ms Lobato — It was an open, public — —

Mr SMITH — You went to a committee meeting!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Savage) — Order! The member for Bass! This is not a point for debate.

Ms Lobato — I ask that he withdraw that insinuation.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Savage) — Order! The member for Bass has been asked to withdraw an impugning of character.

Mr SMITH — They're a touchy lot, aren't they! I withdraw.

An honourable member — You're touched!

Mr SMITH — I cannot believe you lot! Here you are, indecently rushing this sort of legislation in, and I state factual information that you were attending smart growth meetings — —

Ms Lobato interjected.

Mr SMITH — It is factual information, because we have the proof that you were there. That is what I said. You had an opportunity to have some input into a meeting that I did not have and other members of my party did not have. This whole thing is a sham. We would have liked to have an opportunity to have some input. We would have liked an opportunity to speak to our councils regarding this matter, but you people have robbed us of the opportunity — —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! The member for Bass is required to make his remarks through the Chair, so it is not appropriate to refer to 'you' or 'your', because it is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr SMITH — They are the problem we have in this place. The government has become so arrogant in the way it introduces notices of motion like this and in the way that it dumps important issues from the government business program.

It has put its developer mates ahead of people who bash their partners and kids. It has pulled a really good piece of legislation that we may have been able to take some action on, and there is no opportunity for that to be heard before this Parliament goes into recess for the year. Government members sit back and look smug because they think they are getting away with it. The truth of the matter is that they are all crooks!

Ms BEATTIE (Yuroke) — A few things have become obvious during this debate. The opposition does not understand good planning, it does not have any policies and it is lazy. Opposition members do not care about the outer suburbs of Melbourne. I want to refute a couple of things that have been said. The smart growth committees, which people opposite say they could not have input into, have been meeting for two years now. Early on in the process there was talk about bringing amendments into Parliament in spring 2005, both under this planning minister and the previous minister, and that is exactly what is happening. I support the amendments put forward by the Minister for Planning for the six municipalities.

I want to talk particularly about Hume, the area which I represent, and I want to talk about the tax. The fact is that this plan will ensure that home ownership remains affordable for people in the fastest growing areas of Melbourne. It will ensure that the urban growth boundaries that are being moved will include somewhere between 15 and 25 years worth of both industrial and residential land, and it will enable developers to provide the services and infrastructure that families need. They need them to be delivered when they arrive in an area, not years after they arrive. It will also provide access to parks and open spaces, with shops and services nearby. The plan also establishes a Growth Areas Authority, which will act as a watchdog on housing affordability and monitor housing price movements.

The Liberals said they would not do this. I do not know what they would do, because they have not put forward any policy at all. The reason is that they have no policy. They do not want an urban growth boundary; they want open slather on development. The Liberal Party wants to take the place of Macquarie Bank as the millionaires factory, and that is what would happen if we allowed speculation by tabling these for weeks and then allowing people to make comments. They could have made submissions to their municipalities. I do not understand why they have not done so. Certainly in Hume this has been well received.

The member for Hawthorn asked where the third-party endorsements are. Obviously he does not watch TV, because on the television we saw Cameron Alderson from Stockland saying it was good, and Bryce Moore from Delfin Lend Lease was saying it was good. Those endorsements were there, but the Liberal Party just did not listen, because it does not have a policy on this. It has never had a policy, and it does not know how to do the work on one. In short, Hume will be provided with more residential availability and more areas for industrial use, which it is really important.

As people know, Hume has a strong employment base and significant state industrial and commercial assets. Hume is home to Melbourne Airport, the Hume Highway and the Craigieburn bypass. The highway, which traverses the city of Hume, is one of the most important transport corridors in Australia. It provides a gateway to strategic economic locations, including Melbourne Airport and the port of Melbourne. The Melbourne–Sydney rail line, which carries interstate passengers and freight, runs parallel to the highway in Craigieburn. Of course the city of Hume, as you know, Acting Speaker, is of one of the fastest growing municipalities in Victoria. The movement of the growth

corridors will allow for strong residential and employment growth to continue.

Therefore I support the amendments. I took the time to ring my municipality this morning, and it is very supportive of these amendments. I recommend to the people opposite that they pick up the phone book or ring Sensis and get the numbers of their municipalities if they want to talk to them, because that is how it is done. In closing I congratulate the planning minister for the work he has done and acknowledge the work of the City of Hume's smart growth committee, chaired by Robyn Stewart. I would also like to congratulate all those involved for moving forward with a great plan for Victoria and especially for the City of Hume.

Mr WELLS (Scoresby) — The word that springs to mind for the people in Knox when it comes to Melbourne 2030 and the urban growth motion is 'confusion', and let me explain why. The Waverley Golf Club, which is situated on Stud Road, is on the 2030 boundary. The Waverley Golf Club was halfway through negotiations with Australand when the government brought in, in October 2002, that magical boundary that goes through part of Knox. The deal was that the Waverley Golf Club was going to move from its present site up to Lysterfield, and there was going to be an exchange of land between the two.

The Waverley Golf Club was going to receive a brand new golf course and brand new club rooms and facilities, plus a million dollars paid into its bank account. This was going to set up the golf club for a very long time, and it was going to have world-class facilities. But because of the 2030 boundary and the confusion that the Bracks government, the bureaucracy and the minister have created, in the end Australand has actually pulled out of the deal. So the development of valuable land that could have been used for housing has now fallen through — and this is still an ongoing issue. The local newspaper, the *Knox Leader*, said that the plan has now been scrapped and that:

... the move has cast doubt over the club's plans to create a \$6 million golf course at Lysterfield.

The council wanted to build 350 homes on the Bergins Road site, which is in the member for Ferntree Gully's electorate. That would have included facilities for child care, medical centres and sporting complexes, and there was also a push for a school to be built. The proposal required the council to rezone 54 hectares from 'special use', which included recreational and community uses, to 'residential use' in order to finance the club's move to Lysterfield, but that was stalled because of the green wedge boundaries. This has been absolutely devastating to the Waverley Golf Club; it does not make sense to

the club, and it certainly does not make sense to the people of Knox. They do not understand why consideration has not been given to extending that boundary a number of hundred metres down the road to incorporate the golf club inside the boundary rather than outside it.

The second concern we have involves the site of the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army is located off Stud Road in an area where no-one can see them. Once again, unfortunately it is located just on the wrong side of the urban growth Melbourne 2030 boundary. That means that when the Salvation Army wants to move from that site into the heart of Rowville, where it can be of more significant value to the people of the area, it will be unable to get a decent price for that land to enable it to build a new conference centre and health centre in the city.

In summary, the 2030 boundary has been very confusing to the people of Rowville. It has been very concerning to those people who were halfway through negotiating, in good faith, with the Waverley Golf Club. For the rug to be pulled out from underneath them while they were halfway through negotiations seems grossly unfair. It made a lot of sense to its members for the golf club to be offered the chance to move from its current site to Lysterfield and to have brand new facilities, a new golf course and a decent revenue stream. They were all looking forward to it, but government bureaucracy stifled it. We will be supporting the shadow Minister for Planning's amendment, and we would certainly hope the government accepts it.

Mr NARDELLA (Melton) — The Liberal Party really is a party of corruption. That is what this amendment is all about: the white-shoe brigade of the Liberal Party is back! When it was in government, that is how the party operated. These were the rules that the Liberal Party used to work under, when the brown paper bags came out from underneath the desks, the files were handed over, the developers were made millionaires overnight and there was no open and transparent process for the making of these decisions. This process that we are undertaking at the moment has been laid down in legislation for many years. We gave notice to the community that at this point in time, November 2005, a decision would be made on the final urban growth boundary.

The only people who do not understand this — the only people who did not listen to what was being said and the only people who never consulted anybody — are the members of the Liberal Party and The Nationals in this house. It is a shame that we have such lazy

opposition members who cannot do their job and who have no understanding of their responsibility to put together policy and make a valued contribution. Instead we have this amendment before the house.

What does it mean? It means that on 16 December, just before Christmas, after a four-week consultative period and without any understanding of what the consultative process would be — would it just be the minister who consults, would a committee be set up to consult or would it be a community group that consults: nobody knows, because members opposite certainly do not know? — the opposition wants Parliament recalled on to debate this motion once again.

Will opposition members change their minds? Will they be any clearer on what this particular motion intends, what the urban growth boundary is or what Melbourne 2030 is? Of course they will not, because they have no clue about these matters whatsoever! I reject the amendment before the house. It is a shame that opposition members are putting this point when they have been able to consult out there in the community, but they have never taken that opportunity. They have never gone to the public meetings, and they have never talked to the relevant people they should have been talking to. In the time left to me to speak I want to say that this process has been open and accountable. This amendment would open up speculation — —

An honourable member — Of course it will.

Mr NARDELLA — That is not what the development industry and the community require at this stage. I do not support the amendment, and I support the motion before the house.

Ms BUCHANAN (Hastings) — In the brief time available to me I rise to proudly support the motion. I would like to also say that hell would freeze over before I ever supported the amendment moved by the member for Hawthorn.

I want to thank the current and former planning ministers for the fantastic job that has been done on community consultation on this issue. In the last two years over 30 000 householders in the Casey-Cardinia area were letterboxed and asked to come along and attend public open meetings about this process. Over 400 people went to those meetings.

Mr Smith interjected.

Ms BUCHANAN — The member for Bass says, 'Rubbish'. He did not go to any of those three meetings. I went to all of them. It is interesting to note

that I did not see one Liberal Party person at those meetings. Not one of the local, lazy Liberal MPs went along to those community meetings.

At those meetings every member of the community who attended had the opportunity to outline what they felt their community needed in the future. They had the opportunity to work collectively on those issues, and that information was passed back to the smart growth committee, which in the case of the Casey-Cardinia area was ably chaired by Tim Offor. The outcomes of the submissions on those days were put in a document and circulated to all the participants at the meetings. So in terms of being open and accountable, everything that was said at those meetings and community consultations was recorded. There were over 300 local people at each meeting. That was fantastic, given the area the committee had to cover. You certainly would not get that sort of response at a Liberal Party branch meeting, that is for sure!

In conclusion, this sets the foundation and framework for sustainable development across the interface regions. It certainly been looked at it from an environmental, social and economic point of view. Cranbourne East and Cranbourne West have a very sensible number of residential allotments. They will also have a very sensible number of industrial allotments so that local people will have local jobs. I fully support this motion.

Ms LOBATO (Gembrook) — I also wish to support this motion and condemn the amendment put forward by the member for Hawthorn. This motion is about providing security for the communities in the growth areas, particularly in my area of Casey-Cardinia, which is experiencing unprecedented growth. It will cater for that growth and also provide security for the local councils.

The opposition has claimed on numerous occasions that there has been a lack of consultation. There has been consultation for years, with hundreds and hundreds of submissions being presented. Contrary to the remarks made by the member for Bass, there were many open, public community meetings — which he was invited to, by the way — but only local members who wished to support their communities attended.

In one of our recent consultations both the City of Casey and the Shire of Cardinia acknowledged the in-depth consultation that had occurred and believed it to have been a good process. Both council chief executive officers and planners agreed that the sooner this decision was made, the better. They both agreed that a final determination of the urban growth boundary

was vital for their community's security, for the future vision that the municipalities were planning for and for the realisation of that vision. Neil Lucas, the mayor of the City of Casey, said in referring to this decision, 'Bring it on!'. The changes made to the Cardinia area allowing for growth in the south are practical and will be welcomed by the community.

Due to time constraints, I will end my contribution with one further comment. The coalition opposition should be condemned for politicising domestic violence in this debate. It has falsely exploited an issue that is a major contributor to disease and death amongst our women by claiming that we introduced the urban growth boundary over the Crimes (Family Violence) (Holding Powers) Bill. The fact is that the urban growth boundary needed to be given security now, and the police holding powers would not have come into effect until July 2006. The Attorney-General has introduced some of the most socially progressive legislation ever. I support the motion.

Mr PERTON (Doncaster) — This debate has been a disgrace, and the last contributions by the members for Gembrook and Hastings were an utter disgrace. That the member for Gembrook completed her contribution by claiming that this rushed debate has higher priority than the safety of the victims of domestic violence is the ultimate act of hypocrisy.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr PERTON — This motion has been rushed in, introduced yesterday by way of notice and put through the Parliament today. You, Acting Speaker, and every one of the members of this house had three days marked up in their diaries for next week during which the Parliament could have sat and during which people could have had time to examine these changes to the boundary and to examine the types of contributions that have been made by the developers to Progressive Business to grease and facilitate the construction of this.

The member for Melton again delivered an ultimately hypocritical speech. Labor mates are being delivered favours under these changes, which were rushed in yesterday and brought on for debate today. But the greatest disgrace of all is the \$10 000 levy, yet another tax on new home buyers, on young couples trying to make a start in the suburbs. This \$10 000 takes away the benefit of the federal government's new home buyers grant. It is a greedy government that does this. It needs to be repeated that when the Kennett government left power in 1999 the total government spend was \$19 billion. Today it exceeds \$31 billion, and there is a \$2 billion surplus. This is not a miracle; this is money

extracted from the pockets of Victoria's citizens. We can ask whether any of them who go to a general hospital find that the waiting list — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr PERTON — The language, Acting Speaker!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! Honourable members should cease interjecting, and the member for Doncaster should direct his comments through the Chair.

Mr PERTON — The people of Geelong can see what the standards of the house have declined to, as the member for Evelyn in her contribution to the debate just used the word 'wanker' in the house. You, Acting Speaker, can uphold the standards of the house by taking that into account.

Ms Lobato — On a point of order, Acting Speaker, the member is, of course, confused. He referred to the member for Evelyn, but he was referring to me, the member for Gembrook. He said I used the word 'wanker'. I said, 'Grandstander', and I ask him to withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! The member for Gembrook has taken offence at comments made by the member for Doncaster and requested that the member withdraw them.

Mr PERTON — On the point of order, Acting Speaker, you will recall that yesterday — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr PERTON — I did not refer to the member for Gembrook. I have nothing to withdraw about the member for Gembrook. I withdraw the comment about the member for Evelyn, but the member for Gembrook has a very guilty conscience, and the people sitting in the front rows of the public gallery will know exactly what term she used.

As I said, \$10 000 a year is being extracted from young couples by this greedy government. As I was saying prior to her interjection, in 1999 the state budget was \$19 billion and today it is \$31 billion, with a \$2 billion surplus. Why does the government need to extract yet more money from young couples trying to build a home? Why is it trying to extract money from those whom they refer to as the working families of Victoria? This motion ought not to have been brought on today.

The amendment moved by the member for Hawthorn is spot on. The people of Victoria need to analyse who

will be the beneficiaries of the decisions which underlie the motion moved by the government. The young couples who will suffer detrimentally as a result of those decisions deserve to be heard in condemnation of this wicked government.

Ms GILLET (Tarneit) — I have limited time available to me this afternoon to speak on this motion, but as it has been my privilege to represent the state seat of Werribee and now the state seat of Tarneit, both of which are in the middle of a very busy growth corridor, I have to say to the house that this motion and this debate are as good as it gets when you are representing a growth corridor. This is an outstanding motion that is the culmination of two years of intensive hard work and very broad consultation. It is a remarkable result.

My council has been advocating for standard and fixed developer levies for the past nine years. At last we will have them and have an authority, independent from government, that will be able to manage growth in a way that could never happen under any government except a Bracks Labor government. I congratulate the minister and wish him well. It is a sensational motion and a wonderful program.

Mr HULLS (Minister for Planning) — I thank all members for their contributions to the debate on this motion. I have listened to the debate, and I have to say that tragically members of the opposition have nothing to offer the people who are living in Melbourne's five growth areas. I was waiting to hear what plans they have, but they have no plans and no ideas. By moving this amendment to the motion what they really want to do is defer a decision, not for four or eight weeks but until February. They know that the amendments have to be ratified by the Parliament and that Parliament will not be back until February, because this is the last day. Members of the opposition obviously do not understand what the consequences of deferring a decision like this would be.

The urban growth boundary changes that are before the house today are the product of an extensive consultation process, including the consideration of submissions from the public over the past two years. The smart growth committee process provided a means by which local councils, landowners and the broader community could express their views about the future of Melbourne's growth areas. Not only were submissions considered but comprehensive workshops were held as well.

The proposed urban growth boundary changes have now been tabled in Parliament, and indeed the government's plan for Melbourne's growth areas was

released yesterday. The package as a whole gives industry, councils and others the certainty that they have been asking for in relation to these changes.

A failure to put these changes in place now would create uncertainty and land speculation. But of even greater concern is the fact that it would grind development to a halt, costing investment and costing jobs. We have to remember that what we are delivering is not just an extra land supply but a whole package as well. I am pleased to say that the package has been welcomed by such groups as the Property Council of Australia. The property council yesterday put out a media release in which it:

... welcomed announcements by the Victorian government of changes in the area of urban growth boundary management.

The changes will amend the urban growth boundary and increase the available land supply from the current 15 years supply to 25 years or more. The policy also establishes a new Growth Areas Authority to coordinate development in the outer growth areas of Melbourne.

...

Increasing land supply will ensure affordability. It is important that we adopt this measure to maintain Melbourne's competitive edge in this area. More importantly, it is imperative that Melbourne's development is well thought out and coordinated, and the establishment of the Growth Areas Authority is something we welcome and is long overdue.

So it certainly welcomes the changes that are being made. The Municipal Association of Victoria also put out a media release saying that it:

... supported the introduction of developer contributions towards essential infrastructure for burgeoning urban fringe communities.

...

The state government is showing necessary leadership to ensure new suburbs get the roads, schools, health facilities and police stations that make up well-serviced and properly supported communities.

....

The establishment of a Growth Areas Authority will provide a one-stop shop for councils and developers who currently have to contend with multiple government agencies when planning for new communities.

Graham Wolfe from the Housing Industry Association came out yesterday and made a number of comments on radio. He was asked about the package as a whole and the developer contribution plans, and he said:

Well, I don't think you can look at the levy in isolation. The government has released a package today, and that package includes a guaranteed supply of land for the next 25 years. So

that's actually very good news for Melburnians and the future population of Melbourne.

The fact is that the people who understand the package understand that it will be of real benefit to housing affordability in this state. It basically means that we will put an end to the urban splatter that has occurred in the past, where developers have come, carved up tracts of land, built housing estates and not had an eye for the infrastructure and facilities that are appropriate. This whole package will ensure that infrastructure goes with the development. The Growth Areas Authority will see that the sequencing of land will only take place in an appropriate way. There will be a holistic view of the release of land that will ensure that housing remains affordable.

Housing affordability is not just about the price of house and land packages but also about ensuring that the infrastructure is there as well. As I said yesterday, the last thing we want is for people living on the outer fringes to have to use a litre of petrol to go and buy a litre of milk. That is what housing affordability is all about. The releasing of 25 years supply of land will ensure there is a downward pressure on land prices, because there will be competition as a result of the release of extra land.

I am very pleased to have moved this motion. It is not in the public interest to extend this process any further. That is why I have chosen to use my ministerial powers under the Planning and Environment Act to approve these changes to the urban growth boundary. These amendments have been tabled in Parliament in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Environment Act. No further process is required or necessary. I certainly wish this motion a very speedy passage.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! The Minister for Planning has moved a motion to ratify amendments to the urban growth boundary. To this motion the member for Hawthorn has moved an amendment that proposes to omit all the words after 'That' with the view of inserting in their place the words copies of which have been circulated and are in the hands of honourable members. Those who support the honourable member's amendment should vote no.

House divided on omission (members in favour vote no):

Ayes, 57

Allan, Ms
Andrews, Mr
Barker, Ms
Beard, Ms

Langdon, Mr
Languiller, Mr
Leighton, Mr
Lim, Mr

Beattie, Ms
Bracks, Mr
Brumby, Mr
Buchanan, Ms
Cameron, Mr
Campbell, Ms
Crutchfield, Mr
D'Ambrosio, Ms
Delahunty, Ms
Donnellan, Mr
Duncan, Ms
Eckstein, Ms
Garbutt, Ms
Gillett, Ms
Green, Ms
Haermeyer, Mr
Hardman, Mr
Harkness, Dr
Helper, Mr
Herbert, Mr
Holding, Mr
Howard, Mr
Hudson, Mr
Hulls, Mr
Jenkins, Mr

Lindell, Ms
Lobato, Ms
Lockwood, Mr
Loney, Mr
Lupton, Mr
McTaggart, Ms
Maxfield, Mr
Merlino, Mr
Mildenhall, Mr
Morand, Ms
Munt, Ms
Nardella, Mr
Neville, Ms
Overington, Ms
Pandazopoulos, Mr
Perera, Mr
Robinson, Mr
Savage, Mr
Seitz, Mr
Stensholt, Mr
Thwaites, Mr
Trezise, Mr
Wilson, Mr
Wynne, Mr

Noes, 25

Asher, Ms
Baillieu, Mr
Clark, Mr
Cooper, Mr
Delahunty, Mr
Dixon, Mr
Doyle, Mr
Honeywood, Mr
Ingram, Mr
Jasper, Mr
Kotsiras, Mr
McIntosh, Mr
Maughan, Mr

Mulder, Mr
Naphine, Dr
Perton, Mr
Plowman, Mr
Powell, Mrs
Ryan, Mr
Shardey, Mrs
Smith, Mr
Sykes, Dr
Thompson, Mr
Walsh, Mr
Wells, Mr

Amendment defeated.

Motion agreed to.

ROAD SAFETY AND OTHER ACTS (VEHICLE IMPOUNDMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS) BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed from 27 October; motion of Mr BATCHELOR (Minister for Transport).

Mr MULDER (Polwarth) — I rise to support the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill. I will detail the reason for our strong support as I work my way through the bill, as well as outlining the main provisions within the bill and giving a brief description of the concerns that the Liberal Party has.

The main provisions create a new offence of the improper use of a motor vehicle under the Road Safety Act 1986. The bill targets recidivists driving while disqualified and hooners doing burnouts, doughnuts and excess skidding or spinning or speeding 45 kilometres or more above the posted limit. It allows the seizure, impounding and immobilisation of motor vehicles and their forfeiture and sale when third or subsequent offences are committed. Police will retain the discretion to charge or not to charge if the offence involves a mental element. Towing and storage charges for police and private compounds are to be established by regulation. There will be a recourse to court for those with interests in vehicles other than the offenders so they can be compensated from the proceeds of any sales.

In brief, the concerns the Liberal Party has in relation to the bill before the house include the lack of police — particularly in the Geelong area — to enforce the laws in relation to hoon driving. Parental guarantors may be adversely affected financially, particularly if they are unaware of their children's actions with motor vehicles because the children do not live at home. There is no requirement for the police or the courts to notify guarantors or others with interests in such vehicles; instead, the obligation is on the operators. The government expects that between 1000 and 2000 vehicles a year will be impounded, mostly for 48 hours at a time.

There will be an impact on police resources, given the need to protect towing operators as they load cars for towing and manage large groups of unpredictable, hostile youths on busy roads, particularly at night. Police procedures may vary between police regions, and in time some areas may obtain a reputation for being more tolerant of this hooning behaviour than others, creating social problems for the former. The cost of a typical impoundment is estimated to be between \$150 and \$300, and the many offenders may have few assets in relation to that provision.

This is a proud day for the Liberal Party, in that the government has surfed the Internet, logged on to the Liberal Party web site and picked up our policy on hoon drivers. The Labor government has adopted our policy to protect the public from hooners who engage in dangerous behaviour that puts at risk the lives of Geelong and district residents as well as the lives of those across the state. Here we have it, on Thursday, 17 November. I will quote from the Liberal Party web site of 6 July 2005 to give the house an idea of the origin of the policy that is formulated in the bill we have before us:

The Liberal Party will ... support ... measures such as confiscation of vehicles.

...

So-called hoon drivers are a scourge on our roads, endangering lives and compromising the safety of all Victorians. A hotline operated by Victoria Police would help identify and apprehend offending and dangerous drivers who persistently disregard road rules.

A Liberal government will legislate for a range of penalties including fines, confiscation of vehicles and the cancellation of drivers licences.

...

A driver who has been prosecuted would have their car confiscated for 48 hours following a first offence, for three months for the second offence and permanently for the third offence.

I think all members will agree, as I go through the various provisions of the bill, that the bill has its origin in the Liberal Party's web site and in the work that has been carried out by the Liberal Party to rid Geelong and indeed the rest of the state of hoon drivers.

If the government were interested in dealing with the issue of hoon drivers, it could have gone a step further in surfing the Internet and looking at the Liberal Party's web site. I note that on Saturday, 30 July, the parents of an Essendon young person who was tragically killed called for defensive driving courses for learner drivers and for police powers to seize cars from dangerous drivers. Of course, if the government had taken that step it would have picked up the young drivers policy off the Liberal Party web site as well, which talks about subsidising the cost of undertaking best practice driving courses for P-plate licence-holders.

If the member for Geelong is in the chamber he will recognise that the Road Safety Committee, which he chairs, also made a recommendation to the government that it should support driver training. Unfortunately at this point nothing has happened with those two policies, which entail putting some money into driver education and teaching younger drivers about the dangers of hoon driving, the reason being there is a cost factor involved. In actual fact what we are talking about here would most likely be a full cost-recovery scheme, because hoon drivers would end up paying the fines that are imposed on them, and they would also end up paying out the costs associated with the confiscation of vehicles being impounded, such as tow-truck costs.

We have had a lot of support from some very eminent people, particularly in the Geelong area, for the Liberal Party's policy on hoon driving. At page 33 of the *Herald Sun* of 10 July Magistrate Max Beck from Geelong supported stiffer action being taken in relation

to hoon drivers. The article also refers to the mayor of Greater Geelong, Cr Shane Dowling, supporting tougher action. Another prominent person also joined in; he had obviously been surfing the Internet and looking very closely at what the Liberal Party was saying. Not long after our policy appeared on the web site this other prominent local person, the member for Geelong, welcomed the Liberal Party's policy.

I would have to say that the government has not done too bad a job in putting together a bill that reflects Liberal Party policy. Hopefully it will do something to deal with the very serious issue that we have here in Geelong. One of the articles I referred to deals with Geelong being a hot spot for hoons. That certainly is not a reputation that we believe Geelong deserves, and it is not a reputation for Geelong to be proud of. We have the trifecta. We know that the Labor government has grabbed this policy from our web site — well done! The government has done a good job with it, and that is why we are prepared to throw some support behind it.

This bill should give police in Geelong, along with police in the rest of the state, the laws they need to rid the region and the state of hoon behaviour and make the streets and public areas safer for individuals and safer for families. The bill sends a very clear message to hoon drivers in the region: we want hoons off the road, and we want them out of our public spaces. The public will no longer tolerate their dangerous behaviour. Their time is up; they have to go.

According to the media release I quoted from earlier, Geelong has been identified as a hot spot. We want to do all we possibly can to assist the Geelong community by getting these people off the road and stopping them being a danger to themselves and, indeed, a danger to other people who are on the road, including pedestrians and people who are out for a quiet walk at night. We want hoon drivers kept away from those areas.

Geelong has one of the most pristine waterfronts in Australia. It is enjoyed by families, individuals walking their dogs at night, elderly people out for a stroll and, of course, tourists who visit this great city. Unfortunately the waterfront is also a favourite location for hoons and their unacceptable behaviour. Revving engines and screaming tyres ruin the amenity of the area. Families seeking a quiet weekend deserve better, and the Liberal Party and this bill should deliver that for them. Hoon behaviour should now come under close scrutiny and hopefully will be stamped out. But you cannot stop this sort of behaviour unless there are adequate numbers of police on the ground to deal with the problem. Police cannot seize, impound and immobilise hoons' vehicles

if they are not there to catch them in the first place. That is the weakness in the bill before the house.

I have been on the waterfront with my family while hoons have been doing wheelies at will with no fear whatsoever of being caught. Unfortunately, in Geelong the resources are not there to support the bill. There are just not enough police. That is not new; it has been going on since this government came to power. We have had a shortage of police since then. I quote from the Hansard transcript of evidence given to the Road Safety Committee in Geelong on 8 December 2003 on this matter which spells out the problem that exists in our largest regional city.

As I have pointed out, the member for Geelong is the chair of that committee, and the Honourable John Eren, a member for Geelong Province in the other place, is also a member of the committee. This evidence was given to the country road toll inquiry by Mr David Briggs, and it tells the story of how a city develops a culture of hoon behaviour, where it originated and why Geelong has the problem it has today. We have heard the claims from the Labor Party about who is at fault for the shortage of police in Geelong, but this is what Mr Briggs said:

Just in relation to that last recommendation, in 1999 Geelong as a region had some 24 police officers specifically tasked with traffic duties, and shortly after that the numbers were reduced to about 9.

That happened in 1999. He continued:

There appears to be a direct correlation between the numbers of traffic management unit police and the number of fatalities that have occurred. For example, in 1999 we had 10 fatalities in the region. By 2000 it had gone up to 11. By 2001 it was 18. By 2002 it was 24, and to date this year we have 18, but we have not got through the Christmas season yet. To us that would indicate that the reduction in the numbers of police dedicated to traffic duties and visibility on our roads has a correlation with those figures.

The number of police directly associated with traffic duties in this region has been slashed by the government. That was the evidence provided to the Road Safety Committee. For further evidence you only have to look to an article in the *Geelong Independent* of 28 December 2004 under the heading 'We'll walk out', which states:

Geelong police are considering a walk out unless [the] state government improves staffing in the region.

The threat comes at the busiest time of the year for local police, with holiday leave cancelled and additional officers called in from Melbourne as the Geelong force begins its New Year's Eve campaign.

Local police, who did not want to be identified, told the *Independent* staff shortages were hampering operations in the region, particularly in night shift traffic management and crime investigation units.

The policeman claimed only one vehicle was patrolling the Geelong and Corio areas on any given night.

'The whole region is understaffed and officers are fed up', an officer said.

'We are considering walking out, just like the Werribee officers did, to get some action'.

This really points to the problems with the bill before the house. How on earth can you implement it and put the law into effect when the evidence to the Road Safety Committee had the lower house member for Geelong and John Eren, a member for Geelong Province in the other place, sweating so much they were sliding on their seats and saying, 'Get this fellow out of here. We do not want to hear this news'. They knew very well that there is a chronic shortage of police in this area.

You still have not fixed it. You are as bad as the former minister — —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! Through the Chair!

Mr MULDER — The *Geelong Advertiser* of Tuesday, 5 July 2005, says:

The Police Association has called on Geelong MPs to support its push for more crime fighting resources across the region.

The association has written to the six Labor politicians as part of its latest campaign to boost the city's police numbers.

And what did they do when the meeting about police numbers was called? They walked out. They spat the dummy and they all walked out. It is all here in front of you. I know it must be terribly embarrassing, but it is a simple fact: we do not have the police numbers here to enforce the legislation.

Mr Holding interjected.

Mr MULDER — Can you shut that prick up? This government has created a police-free zone. The hoons have responded accordingly.

Mr Lupton — On a point of order, Acting Speaker, I distinctly heard the member for Polwarth utter a disgraceful term directed towards the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. It is an absolute abuse of the processes of this house, and I seek your protection for the house in relation to this matter.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! It is up to individual members who take offence at comments to raise those issues.

Mr Holding interjected.

Mr MULDER — Get up and do it!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! I remind members — —

Mr Holding interjected.

Mr MULDER — Get up and do it! Show some backbone.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ingram) — Order! The Minister for Police and Emergency Services! I remind members that it makes it much easier for the Chair and the house if members are not interjecting across the chamber. There is no point of order, but I also remind the member for Polwarth that inappropriate comments are unparliamentary behaviour. The member for Polwarth, on the bill.

Mr MULDER — Acting Speaker, I would also point out that as Acting Speaker you should provide some assistance to members who are on their feet.

You will hear the rhetoric from the local members as they quote from their parrot sheets — 'The Liberals sacked police' — but history and all the information I have put before the Parliament today will tell you exactly what the situation is. The bill will frustrate Geelong residents in that they will still see the behaviour of hoons but there will be no police numbers to catch them. It is sad, but it is true.

If you want any further evidence in relation to the problem with the bill before the house, I have a letter dated 10 November 2005 from Paul Mullett, the secretary of the Police Association about the legislation:

The Police Association ... acknowledges receipt of your letter dated 1 November 2005, where you sought comments on the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and other Amendments) Bill ...

We confirm that we have not been consulted during the process of the development of the bill. However, we have conducted a review of the bill and the accompanying references.

The bill places increasing administrative demands upon our members and we are of the strong view that these increased administrative responsibilities have the potential to place additional strain on front-line policing numbers.

Once again!

This highlights our concerns that our members are, yet again, being exposed to increasing administrative tasks that would be better handled by public servants or reduced with an increase in the numbers of sworn police.

Should you wish to discuss these matters further prior to the debate, please telephone me at the association ...

We have a bill before the house that puts a huge amount of pressure on a limited number of police, which will affect resourcing, yet the Minister for Police and Emergency Services has not even had the decency to go and speak with the Police Association on the matter, because he understands very well that it would have raised with him the matter of the additional resources that would be required.

The bill gives hooners every chance to improve their behaviour. It creates a new offence of 'improper use of a motor vehicle' in that loss of traction becomes an offence. The bill deals with hoon behaviour such as burnouts, doughnuts or screeching tyres as they accelerate from traffic lights. If hooners get caught, the consequences are that for a first offence they will be 48 hours without their vehicle. They will pay a fine of up to \$500, and they will pay all the costs, including the cost of immobilising, transporting and storing the vehicle. A second offence within three years of the first offence will incur a fine, three months without their car and, again, all costs associated with the seizure and storage of the vehicle. If a hoon has not woken up to the fact that his behaviour is unacceptable to the community, a third offence committed within three years of the first offence will entail the forfeiture and sale of the vehicle, along with a fine and all costs.

There are provisions in the bill whereby any party affected by such a seizure can appeal to the magistrate on hardship grounds to have the vehicle released. A lot of work has been done in relation to notification and to ensure that people are not going to be impacted upon because of the behaviour of a hoon. They can take their concerns to the magistrate, and if the magistrate deems it necessary, the vehicle can be returned. There are provisions to ensure that the decision to seize is correct. The seizure of a vehicle is a very serious issue. I know that the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria has raised some real concerns with us in this regard. It is not something that a junior officer can do. As an example I refer to clause 84M at page 17 of the bill, which provides:

- (1) A member of the police force who impounds or immobilises a motor vehicle, or who authorises another person to do so, must, as soon as is practicable and in any event within 48 hours after the motor vehicle is impounded or immobilised, notify a senior police officer of the grounds on which he or she relied in forming the

belief that the motor vehicle was used in the commission of a relevant offence.

- (2) A senior police officer who is notified in accordance with sub-section (1) must make inquiries into the circumstances of the impoundment or immobilisation and if, after making those inquiries, he or she is not satisfied that there were reasonable grounds to impound or immobilise the motor vehicle, must ensure that the motor vehicle is returned to the registered operator as soon as is practicable.

It is not as if a junior police officer heads out, notices someone driving a car in an unsafe manner or losing traction while driving the vehicle and has the power to seize the car without justifying it to a senior officer. There must be justification to someone above the rank of inspector as to the grounds on which the officer acted in determining to seize a vehicle.

Clause 84T of the bill deals with forfeiture orders. This applies in the case of someone who has been involved in a third offence, and it states:

- (1) On the application of the Chief Commissioner of Police —

once again we are not talking about just a senior police officer, we are talking about the Chief Commissioner of Police —

under section 84U(1), if a driver is found guilty of a relevant offence the relevant court may order that the motor vehicle used in the commission of the relevant offence or a substituted motor vehicle be forfeited to the Crown.

So there is a very extensive process of consideration and consultation before the police head down the path of taking a motor car off the owner and operator and actually selling it, with the proceeds going back to the Crown.

The only real issue I have with the bill — other than the lack of police to enforce the law, which I have spoken about extensively in my contribution to the debate — is that provisions in the bill rely on the registered owner of the vehicle notifying any other party who may have an interest in the vehicle. For example, if a finance company were to have an interest in the vehicle, it is up to the operator to notify the finance company that the vehicle has been impounded. If it is a third offence, the vehicle is going to be forfeited to the Crown.

As it stands, the vehicle is sold and the proceeds of the sale, after costs, would find their way back to anybody else who had an interest in the motor vehicle — and I am talking here about a finance company — to cover the remainder of whatever the loan may have been on the vehicle. Anything left over from the sale stays with the Crown, if indeed there is a surplus.

The concern I have, and I raised it in the briefing, is that quite often young people ask their parents to go guarantor for a motor vehicle. There is nothing in this bill to ensure that, if a vehicle is forfeited to the Crown and is sold, there will be any prior notification going to that parent of the sale. We have been given all types of assurances in relation to the notification processes; the government believes it has done all it possibly can, and I know that only a small number of vehicles are going to be affected by a forfeiture and sale. But I have an uncomfortable feeling, given that not all parents know what their children are up to — there are a lot of dysfunctional families and there are a lot of children who live away from home — that there may be teenagers who could be in a situation where parents have gone guarantor for a vehicle and the teenager has not been prepared to admit to them what has happened. That vehicle is then sold, and when the proceeds of the sale are dealt with the finance company would of course express an interest. The parent would then get a knock on the door from the finance company and be expected to make up any shortfall.

As I said, an awful lot of work has been done on this legislation to ensure that if, for instance, the operator of the vehicle is not the owner, there is a provision in the bill that allows another vehicle to be substituted. There are also provisions to ensure that senior police officers, and even the commissioner, are involved with the seizure and sale of a vehicle, if that is going to be the case. But there is a certain weakness in the bill where I can just imagine that at some stage the minister might find someone on his doorstep saying, 'I have had a finance company knock on my door. I am up for \$10 000. I understand that my son's car was seized. I was a guarantor for it, but it I did not know what had happened and I am the innocent victim of this particular law'.

I do not know whether anything further can be done on working through this matter with finance companies to ensure that, if they are notified of the seizure of a motor vehicle, there is some obligation on them to go immediately to the guarantor, if there is one associated with the vehicle, and warn them that the vehicle is going to be sold because the driver of that vehicle has been found guilty of the offence of using a motor vehicle for an improper purpose.

I believe there has been a reasonable attempt by the government to pick up a Liberal Party policy and to transfer that policy into a bill, and as I said the bill is reasonably sound. The weakness is not so much in the provisions of the bill, it is in the lack of resources to support the bill. No amount of correspondence, even when it is from the Police Association, local news

articles, the police threatening to walk out or evidence given to the Road Safety Committee, even when the member for Geelong was sitting there as the committee chair and people from his own region were telling him about the way police numbers have been cut in Geelong from 1999 through to now and how the lack of numbers is responsible for deaths on the road, seems to make any difference.

You create a culture of hoon behaviour in communities when there is a police-free zone. That is the difficulty we have in Geelong: we have a police-free zone. There are not enough police patrolling the roads, and that in its own right encourages hoon behaviour. I have been down to the waterfront with my family and seen what goes on. I have sat there for hour upon hour and not seen a single police car patrolling that area — or a Labor member of Parliament. They have not been down there to see what is going on and what is happening to Geelong as a result of this lack of police resources.

Members of the opposition are prepared to support the bill, but we call on the government to support this legislation by ensuring that adequate police resources are available to support it when it is enacted.

Dr SYKES (Benalla) — I rise to speak on the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and other Amendments) Bill. But before doing so I would like to thank the citizens of Geelong for being so generous in their welcoming of me and my parliamentary colleagues to Geelong.

I was particularly touched by the performance of the Geelong Society of Operatic and Dramatic Arts (Junior Group). It was wonderful to celebrate our cultural links with Ireland, England, Wales and Scotland with songs such as *Bound for Botany Bay* and our proud rural heritage with *Click Go the Shears*. I am a passionate support of multiculturalism and encourage the celebration of the many diverse cultures which we have. However, I am concerned that sometimes in the focus on the cultures of our more recent arrivals we tend to overlook the cultures of the countries of origin of many Australians whose roots go back to England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, so I very much appreciated today's presentation.

Moving on to the bill, The Nationals see a lot of merit in this bill, and I would like to discuss two aspects of it. First of all there is the underlying need for action, and secondly the action that is required. If you look at the need for action, there are two facets of it. One is the antisocial, irresponsible behaviour of people, mainly young people, who undertake hooning, and the second

is the horrific consequences of hooning and other reckless driving.

The antisocial behaviour has been touched on — the noise, the screeching of the tyres and often the foul language that can be associated with people who are in an excited state of mind with a high adrenaline surge fuelled by alcohol and sometimes drugs. Also related to the antisocial component of this activity is the fear and the sense of threat that many innocent people experience — be they pedestrians in the area where hooning may be taking place or even householders, people who are not able to sleep comfortably in their homes. Even yesterday there was a major car accident as a result of what appears to have been hooning-type activity. Even people in their own households are put at risk.

Moving on to look at the consequences of hooning, it is amazing with the incident that is reported in today's *Herald Sun* that that car accident did not involve serious injury to the driver. However, that is not always the case. I draw the Parliament's attention to an incident that occurred in the US. It was reported I think on *60 Minutes*. It is referred to as 'Jacquie's story'. It is an extremely moving story of a beautiful young American. It starts off with a soft voice talking behind a blank screen about her happy childhood. You only see the blank screen, then the vision of the television camera widens out and you see two gloved hands. We are not sure what they are, but they are two gloved stumps of hands, and then the screen is lowered and you see an absolutely horrific sight, like a sight from a horror movie, and this is Jacquie, Jacquie severely burnt and grossly disfigured, the subject of over 40 operations attempting to put her body back into one piece. It is absolutely horrific.

The cause — a car accident. Her friends were killed and Jacquie, as she was being roasted alive, was pulled screaming out of that vehicle. The cause of the accident — a drunken young buck, hooning. It is a tragedy, and the young buck was not the village idiot. He was not dead from the neck up. He was actually a college football hero and a high academic achiever, but he was having a night out with the boys, and he killed beautiful young women and he destroyed the life of Jacquie and her family and the family of her friends and he severely damaged his own life and the life of his family. The most moving part of that presentation was to hear Jacquie's still beautiful voice emanating from the horrifically disfigured head and body as she says, 'I'm still the same person inside'. My heart goes out to Jacquie and her family and the young man and his family and other people affected by this tragedy.

With that sort of experience, with that sort of thing going on in this world, I strongly support all actions to lower the road toll and injury toll, particularly in this case the actions attempting to address the reckless behaviour of young people hooning. I see the action as having two components. It needs a combination of legislation and education — a carrot-and-stick approach.

The bill we are discussing today provides the legislative component. It enables Victoria Police to seize and impound or immobilise motor vehicles in certain circumstances. It also allows a court to impound, immobilise or demand the forfeiture of vehicles in certain circumstances. The bill makes consequent amendments to a number of other pieces of legislation to enable that to happen. The bill has two other components. One makes amendments to the Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act 2001 to enable the seizure and removal of vehicles. There also seems to be another tack-on area of legislation with amendments to other acts in relation to drug offences. That is linking up and achieving standardisation with commonwealth legislation.

I wish to concentrate mainly on the major component of this bill, which is that relating to hooning. In addition to the general enabling powers outlined earlier, the other key component of this bill in relation to immobilisation or seizure is that a vehicle can be impounded for up to 48 hours in the first instance or up to three months if the person continues to offend, or completely seized if the person continues to offend after that. I note that similar legislation has been operating in Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales. I am aware from a Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee visit that the legislation in Queensland is working extremely well, with the recidivism rate very low. It is obviously having an impact as the young people learn that hooning is not acceptable behaviour.

I commend a couple of relevant aspects of the bill. One is the inclusion of driving whilst a person is disqualified from holding a licence as a relevant offence for the seizure of a motor vehicle. In the electorate of Benalla and in other places such as Wangaratta and Shepparton, ordinary law-abiding people, police and magistrates have had an absolute gutful of repeat offenders who drive whilst disqualified. The inclusion of that as a relevant offence for which a vehicle can be seized is a significant and desirable step to take. Another offence that allows the police to take action is the improper use of a motor vehicle. It enables the police to target people who drive in a manner that causes loss of traction of one or more of the tyres of a motor vehicle. Again that

is an attempt to target the people who are causing the problems.

I note that significant efforts have been made to clearly define offences and to make allowances for situations such as those in which young people who have borrowed their mum and dad's car are out there hooning without mum and dad's knowledge. The right balance has been achieved in targeting the offenders and protecting the rights of relevant innocent people. I know that the police support the bill because it gives them the power to act on the spot and nip the problems in the bud. Certainly Senior Sergeant Bill Gore of the Wangaratta police has been reported in the *Wangaratta Chronicle* as welcoming the chance to act promptly. He notes that currently without this legislation in Victoria young people from New South Wales come to Victoria to hoon. They will not hoon in New South Wales because they know that their vehicles will be confiscated. This legislation will stop that problem.

Interestingly, the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria objects to the proposed legislation. It appears to not like the idea of officers being both police and prosecutors. It is concerned that the proposed powers may be abused by the police. On the other hand, some people consider that the bill does not go far enough. It has been suggested in a half-joking manner that the ultimate penalty for young people would be to have their cars crushed in one of those big mechanical metal crushers, and most importantly to have them sit there and watch it happening.

Mr Smith interjected.

Dr SYKES — No, not in the car, but to have to sit there and watch their beloved toys crushed. It has been suggested also that vehicles with what are known as boom boxes should be included in the legislation. Leaving aside those suggested additions to the legislation, there is general support for the bill, because it is a good balance between targeting the perpetrators of the crime and protecting other, innocent, people.

If we now turn to the other component of achieving the desired outcome, we need to look at education. As I mentioned earlier, I have been involved in a Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee inquiry into violence associated with motor vehicles, commonly referred to as road rage. In my opinion there is a lot of commonality between road rage and hooning, in that there is an attitude of selfishness and a lack of tolerance of and concern for other road users. There is a need to address driver attitude which needs to be incorporated in a strengthened driver education program. To this effect The Nationals have made a submission to the

government's young driver safety and graduated licence discussion paper. I would like to spend a moment or two commenting on the key components of that, because it has great relevance to this legislation before us.

Firstly we believe there needs to be a package of reforms in relation to the education of young drivers. Secondly we believe we need to have compulsory driver education commencing in primary schools, whereas currently, whilst there is in some primary schools a driver education component, it is often ad hoc and whether it is included is at the discretion of an individual teacher. We believe the value of our young people's lives is such that they should be given every opportunity and exposure to learn to be responsible drivers. We also note that a critical component of that driver education is the police schools involvement program. We reiterate the importance of retaining an active police presence in our schools so that, amongst other things, they can continue to contribute to our young people learning about responsible on-road behaviour.

The Nationals also believe we should have a continuation and extension of the pre-licence driver education programs that exist in Victorian secondary schools, including those at Alexandra, Shepparton and the Alpine shire towns of Myrtleford, Mount Beauty, Bright and Beechworth. These programs have been put together by local communities, and they either educate locally or take the opportunity to have that education through the Driver Education Centre of Australia (DECA) in Shepparton or at Charlton and Mildura.

The other component we believe is very relevant is that our young people need to have a graded approach to licensing, as is proposed in the discussion paper. It is appropriate to start people young so that they become fully licensed at age 17 with some stringent conditions. These conditions relate to the hooning component. We believe if you offer young people the carrot of getting their licence earlier, that should be under very strict restrictions such as a limitation on passenger numbers, curfews and restrictions on the use of high-powered vehicles.

We believe there should be a minimum of 120 hours of such education for young people. The critical point is that it is about educating young people before they get on the road, and it needs to be followed up with ongoing education through things such as television advertisements. There is another opportunity to provide further education in programs such as the one that is operated by a young racing driver from Benalla, Martin Doxey. He is a fine young man who is a successful

racing driver in his own right, and he is committed to helping young people to learn to drive and survive. He is involved in a program established by the late motoring journalist, Jim Murcott. That is about providing young people with the driving skills they need, developing attitudes so they can be responsible drivers, and ensuring they grow up to be responsible citizens and do not become another statistic.

I referred earlier to the DECA program at Shepparton. It not only provides a venue for young people to have pre-licence and subsequent driver education but is also a legal outlet for people who enjoy the smell of petrol and the thrill of the rev of the motor car. There are things like the Springnats competition at DECA, which provides a legal, controlled environment where young people can enjoy the adrenalin surge of doing burnouts and drifts and whatever else but not endanger the lives of their mates and innocent bystanders. I believe there is another program the police are supporting along the same lines, and that is a great initiative.

At Benalla the Winton motor raceway now holds another competition for what is called drifting, which as I understand it is putting the car into a slide around corners. Again it is a controlled environment that enables people to enjoy the thrill of testing their skills but not endanger their lives or the lives of others. I have a second cousin who is very much involved in rally driving. Rally drivers do absolutely amazing things in the way they approach driving in what you would consider dangerous circumstances on gravel roads and often treed verges. But given that they are trained and responsible and have safety mechanisms built into their cars, they can enjoy the thrill without the kill. There is a young fellow over there who, when he drives down the street in his car, is criticised by his mates for being too cautious, but he has learnt from his rally driving experience that you keep the thrills and the speed to rally driving and that when you are on public roads you drive responsibly and have concern for other people's lives and wellbeing.

In conclusion, hooning is an antisocial activity. It kills, it maims and it destroys not just the lives of the victims but those of the perpetrators, friends and family — and it leaves physical and emotional scars that are never, ever removed. As those of us who are parents know, it is every parent's fear that a phone call in the middle of the night is going to tell you that your child has been injured or killed in an accident involving hooning or some other reckless activity of young people. We must work together to address this problem, and this legislation is a significant step forward. It needs to be supported by an expanded education effort as proposed by The Nationals, but at all times we must remember

that young people must take responsibility for their own actions and must learn to be considerate of other people and other road users.

Parents also have an important responsibility to be good role models in their general behaviour, to not encourage hoon-like behaviour and to not be overly generous, providing their children with high-powered, souped-up cars as status symbols in perhaps misdirected love for their kids. Parents need to make sure that their young people are supported in having appropriate motor vehicles and driver education so that they behave responsibly.

The friends of young people also need to take a responsible position. Friends of drivers must not egg them on to do crazy things. I come back to saying young people — all people — must learn to take responsibility for their own actions. This bill is a significant step forward in protecting the lives of our young people, of drivers and of innocent people, and therefore it should be supported by both sides of Parliament.

Mr LUPTON (Pahran) — I am pleased to be speaking in support of this important piece of legislation introduced by the Bracks government, which has a well-known commitment to community safety, and I am very proud to be part of a government that has done so much already in the last six years to rebuild community safety in this state, to rebuild the police force and to look at all the ways we can act as a community to make sure that Victoria is the safest place in Australia to live.

This legislation is directed towards hoon behaviour in motor cars, which is something that is abhorred by the community and should not be tolerated. Hoon behaviour in a motor car causes serious injury, death and a lot of community concern, and it is something we should be acting to eliminate. This legislation is very important and is directed towards that outcome. It will, I am confident, go towards developing a culture in our community that antisocial and hoon behaviour in motor cars is not something that is acceptable in the community. It is important to develop that culture and make sure that people in the community, young and old, understand that hoon behaviour in cars is not socially acceptable.

The Bracks government has a policy of reducing the Victorian road toll by 20 per cent by 2007 as part of the Arrive Alive road safety strategy. We also are committed to building friendly, confident and safe communities as part of Growing Victoria Together. As chair of the inner city entertainment precincts task

force, I have been an advocate for this sort of legislation, and the task force itself has done some important work in developing and recommending this legislation to the government. I am pleased to have played a role in that, and I thank the task force for its work and its support in advocating for and developing this legislation.

It is important to recognise that hoon behaviour in motor cars is not just fun — and it is certainly not just harmless fun. The available evidence suggests that hoon driving poses a significant road safety risk. For the information of the house I can say that the Victoria Police major collision investigation group identified 41 serious crashes between January 2003 and November 2004 that involved hoon driving, which was defined to include any antisocial behaviour by a driver that involved an audience either inside or outside the vehicle. Those crashes resulted in 28 deaths and over 50 persons suffering serious injuries, so we can see that hoon behaviour has extremely significant effects in the community.

This legislation allows a vehicle to be impounded or immobilised if it is being used in the commission of a hoon driving offence. The legislation creates a new offence of improper use of a motor vehicle which directly targets hoon behaviour such as burnouts and doughnuts. It is defined as intentionally losing traction of a least one wheel of the car. In addition to creating the offence of the improper use of a motor vehicle, the legislation picks up other existing offences and makes them subject to the impoundment, immobilisation and potential confiscation penalties. Those offences are: failure to have proper control of a motor vehicle; causing a vehicle to make unnecessary noise or smoke; careless driving; and dangerous driving. If they occur in circumstances where the driver intentionally loses traction of a least one wheel, they come under the hoon driving definition and hoon driving penalties may be applied to the driver of that car.

The government has done a lot of work on the development of this legislation, in particular looking at other jurisdictions. It is important to understand that this legislation is of broader application than similar legislation in other jurisdictions. It also targets high-level speeding and repeat offences of driving while disqualified. It allows police to immobilise vehicles by using wheel clamps in addition to impounding, because the police may investigate a case and take action up to 10 days after the commission of the offence.

It requires the up-front payment of costs to secure the release of an impounded vehicle, and it allows police to

substitute the vehicle used in the commission of the offence for a vehicle registered to the offender if they happen to be not driving their own vehicle at the time, so that the appropriate person pays the penalty. It also contains an appropriate safeguard by providing for the automatic review by a senior police officer of any decision to impound or immobilise a vehicle by a junior police officer. For a second offence the impoundment period goes up from the initial 48 hours to a potential three months. For a subsequent offence the car can be confiscated and sold.

These are significant robust and strong deterrents against antisocial hoon behaviour in the use of motor cars. It is very important community safety legislation. It is very well supported by the community. I know my community in Prahran strongly supports this legislation, and I commend it to the house.

Mr WELLS (Scoresby) — I join the debate on the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill. I would like to start off by congratulating the government for implementing Liberal Party policies. It could be the start of a great working relationship between the Liberal Party and the government. I cannot wait for the next policy that we put out and allow the government to take up. You never know, we could have a close working relationship.

The main provisions of this bill have been outlined. It creates a new offence of the improper use of a motor vehicle in the Road Safety Act 1986, and it targets recidivists driving whilst disqualified. It targets hoons instituting burnouts, doughnuts, excessive skidding or spinning or exceeding the limit by 45 kilometres an hour. It allows the seizure, impounding and immobilisation of motor vehicles, and it allows the forfeiture and sale of a motor vehicle when a third or subsequent offence is committed. Police retain the discretion to charge or not to charge, as offences may involve other issues. Towing and storage charges are to be established by regulation and include police and private compounds.

It has been an embarrassing week for the government on a number of fronts. The first shambles the government had to deal with was the issue of the Emergency Services Superannuation Scheme — that is, the government had to backtrack after having spoken to the Police Association at the start of the year and not quite telling the association the truth about what the ESSS was going to do. The second issue is the telephone tapping that the government implemented this week. When it first brought in the telephone-tapping powers it was going to give them to the Ombudsman, and the Ombudsman was going to oversee the Office of Police Integrity. The third

issue is what we have here today, with the government bringing in the hoon legislation which was outlined by the Liberal Party.

The Liberal Party outlined this position back on 5 April, when it released the policy. We said the first thing a Liberal government would do would be to introduce a hoon hotline in an attempt to curb the number of hoon activities in the suburbs. If people had concerns about hoons they would be able to phone through to a hoon hotline — that policy is going to be picked up — and it would be operated by Victoria Police. We believe this is going to be very effective. I will come back to it very soon — —

Mr Lupton interjected.

Mr WELLS — I notice a number of councils have picked up on that issue, which has the support of some of your Labor colleague backbenchers.

Reported drivers will also have to be repeat offenders whose dangerous behaviour has been noted and logged at least twice. We would respect police discretion in regard to that. What the government has picked up is that there is a need to confiscate cars for 48 hours after the first offence, three months for the second offence and permanently for the third offence. The driver's licence is to be cancelled at the time of the confiscation. We are very pleased the government has taken most of what we were putting out in April.

The reason we put out our policy when we did was that we had been consulting with Neighbourhood Watch and with local communities across the state, and they are fed up with such things as hoons and inappropriate behaviour by young men, mostly, in their cars on a Friday or Saturday night in the suburbs. We think one of the things that would really hurt these young men would be to take away their cars.

If you had a situation — and I would suspect this is how it would work in reality — where the young man was doing burnouts or involved in other hoon activity, the police would give him a warning, and I guess that is where police discretion would come into play. But if the driver were caught again, then you would take away the car for 48 hours. If he were caught again, then it would have to be more severe, because obviously he had not learnt his lesson from the first time, and his car would be taken away for three months. And if he were caught again, then you would have no choice: it would have to be permanent confiscation.

The member for Polwarth, who is the shadow Minister for Transport, raised the issue of hardship, and of course that is of great concern. But the reality is that in

many cases if you are going to give warnings to young men who continually break the law, then sooner or later they have to lose their cars. How many times have we seen on the news or on current affairs programs pictures of young men who go and join so-called clubs where they SMS each other or they go to a web site to find out where they will congregate. It is a dangerous activity. If you have 20 cars, for example, involved in this hoon activity, then you have situations where there are large crowds, and it only takes one car to be out of control and hit an innocent bystander and someone will be killed. That is why we published this policy back in April. We recognise the need to crack down on these hoons and take away their licences and then, as a last resort — after they have been reprimanded three or four times — take away their cars.

I note that local councils are fed up with hoons. The cities of Frankston and Casey have both introduced hoon hotlines, and one of the Labor backbenchers — either the member for Narre Warren South or Narre Warren North — is a strong supporter of the hotline in Casey. It is a good idea. It is something we should all support.

Another point referred to by the member for Polwarth is the concern about the lack of resources. This is a good piece of legislation, but do we have the police on the beat to enforce this law and get hoons off the road? Just recently, I attended a Police Association function in Geelong where the main concern of members was the shortage of police. No matter how it happened, you had the police standing up in a public forum — which I have never seen before — and traders standing up and expressing concerns about the number of thugs walking the streets and the number of hoons operating in the Geelong and Surf Coast areas.

The Premier said during question time today that there were an extra 25 police in the Geelong and Surf Coast regions, but on 25 October a district inspector told a public meeting that there were no extra police. So the Premier is saying one thing but the local police are saying another.

Dr Napthine — I know who I'd believe.

Mr WELLS — I agree with the member for South-West Coast. If you look at the front line and what the local police are saying, that is what you have to believe. The government has a reputation for going by what is on the roster, but some of the people on the roster are still in the academy; they have not actually got down here, yet the government wants to include them in the number of police. Just recently the Premier said that an extra eight police were coming to Geelong.

Geelong people want to know where they are. It is lucky we have good, honest police who have come out and told the truth and said they will not be available until after the Commonwealth Games. How is it that the Premier came out and said there would be an extra eight police for Geelong — and quite rightly the people of Geelong said that was good news — but the local police officers put the media and the local community straight by saying those eight police would not be available until after the Commonwealth Games? That is very disappointing.

While we will acknowledge that the government has done the right thing by introducing this hoon legislation, we are concerned that it has not gone that extra step with the hoon hotline. We are also concerned that it has not gone the extra step with repeat drink-drivers. There have been some awful cases just recently where people have lost their licences for a considerable time, but the reality is that they still have their cars. So although their licences have been taken from them, they can still drive their cars. I call on the government to at least look at that part of the legislation relating to the taking away of a car from a repeat drink-driver.

Mr TREZISE (Geelong) — To allow other members to speak on this bill, I will make my contribution very brief. I am very pleased to speak in support of the bill, not only as the member for Geelong but also as chairman of the parliamentary Road Safety Committee. It is another example of the numerous pieces of legislation passed through this house by the Bracks government in its commitment to ensure that our state's roads are as safe as possible. In turn, all the Bracks government legislation is being implemented under the auspices of the Arrive Alive strategy, which in essence has set a goal of reducing our road toll by 20 per cent between 2002 and 2007.

The Arrive Alive strategy of the Bracks government is producing results. In 2003 and 2004 this state saw record low road tolls despite there being record numbers of cars and trucks on our roads. It must be said that Victoria now has the safest road network in Australia. Across all states of Australia per 100 000 people an approximate average of 9 people die in a car accident. In Victoria the average has fallen from around 9 in the year 2000 to 7.6 fatalities per 100 000 people, the lowest of all Australian states.

Of course despite the low levels of road deaths in Victoria, the Bracks government is not resting on its laurels. We realise that even one death on our roads is one too many, and we are continuing to implement initiatives to further reduce the number of deaths on our

roads. This legislation is aimed at the so-called hoon drivers, as we have heard today, and is another example of our commitment to reducing the road toll.

It is very pertinent that this debate is taking place in Geelong today, because, as we have heard from a number of members including the member for Polwarth, the locals in Geelong will tell you that Geelong has had and continues to have its share of hoon drivers. For example, in the area where we are situated today locals see ongoing examples of young people, both men and women, driving in a hoon-like manner, particularly in the Eastern Beach precinct. Although other areas of Geelong are experiencing problems, it would be fair to say that the Eastern Beach precinct has, as I said, its share of hoon drivers.

I can assure the house that for the residents of the Eastern Beach area hoon driving is a real and ongoing problem that unless addressed will result in a death. I have often seen, especially in summer, the lethal combination of parents alighting from cars with young children at their feet while hoon drivers are whipping past in their cars, or worse still, performing burnouts in front of their mates. Despite what the member for Polwarth said, the police are present, and they do what they can. However, at Eastern Beach the mix of local traffic, young families and hoon drivers is a disaster just waiting to happen, hence the importance of this legislation. The people along Eastern Beach Road have suffered for many years, and I know they will applaud this bill.

Of course this hoon legislation is not the be-all and end-all. It will not completely wipe out the problem, but I believe it will go a long way towards minimising the problem, used in conjunction with other laws and measures. This is good legislation, and I wish it a speedy passage through this house.

Mr SAVAGE (Mildura) — I rise to support the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill. The main purpose of this bill is well described in its explanatory memorandum. This is probably one of the most significant road safety initiatives this government has produced, and I am not just wholehearted in my support of it, I am enthusiastically in support of it. Victoria Police has had difficulty in managing this situation over many years, and in my 29 years in the police force the question of how to deal with hoons was a perennial problem. In fact 30 years ago I think the only people who used that term were members of the Victoria Police, and it was used to good effect.

The people of Mildura are well aware of what hooligans can do to our community. In 1981 we had the Australian Hotrod Federation visit us without a great deal of warning. The riot act had to be read because of the behaviour of every hoon that had a hotrod congregating in Mildura and driving down Deakin Avenue as if it were a raceway.

I think 1981, when it was read in Mildura, was the last time the riot act was read in Victoria. There is a riverfront in Mildura where hoons use the speed humps to drive their vehicles dangerously. There is a caravan park on the other side of the river, and I have lost count of the number of complaints I have received because of the disruption hoons cause to people trying to sleep. You will see large amounts of rubber laid on the roads everywhere. I have actually been a police prosecutor when we prosecuted people for those acts of stupidity.

The bill has some very good safety provisions. I have looked at the legislation and I cannot see any defects in it; I think it is well crafted. In fact I wrote to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services in 2003 seeking consideration of similar legislation after being in Queensland on a visit. I do not think I can claim credit for it, but at least we were part of the process of getting legislation that is appropriate to manage what is a perennial problem. If any members are looking for a reason for this legislation, they merely need to have a look at today's paper. Page 3 of the *Herald Sun* shows a car that had been involved in road racing. It has been ripped in half. It is a good example of why we need measures to stop hoons at the very start of the problem. We need to impound and clamp their cars, and if they keep doing it, take the cars away. I commend the bill to the house.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr COOPER (Mornington) — Thank you for that paean of welcome from the Labor Party benches. I know they are always delighted to hear me speak. Tonight is an unusual night, because the Liberal Party is supporting this legislation and I congratulate the government for bringing it in.

It is an important piece of legislation dealing with a major social problem in this state. It is not limited to any one part of the state, and it is certainly not limited to Geelong. It is occurring right around the state, particularly outside Melbourne in provincial cities and in areas like the one I represent on the Mornington Peninsula. It was in Mornington that Victoria Police introduced the dob-in-a-hoon initiative, which was a very good attempt to deal with the problem and one that had significant benefits for the area I represent. People

who saw characters behaving badly in their motor cars could phone the local police station with the time of the event and the numberplate, and the local police went to see those drivers and speak to them. Most of them, I am informed by our local police, were quite happy to put their hands up and say, 'Yes, I was behaving inappropriately'. We saw a significant improvement in behaviour, particularly from young drivers in the Mornington area.

I brought this to the attention of the house some months ago and was slightly staggered to hear the member for Pascoe Vale condemn the initiative as anti-Australian. It seems that she must stand alone in the Labor Party, because the Labor Party has brought in this legislation, which, as was said correctly, puts into effect the call by the Liberal Party in early April this year to introduce stronger legislation for people who behave inappropriately and dangerously in motor vehicles. Regrettably, in most instances they are young people.

If members in this house, particularly male members, cast their minds back to the time when they first got their licences, usually around age 18 or 19, and reflect upon their behaviour at the time, they will recall that they had what I call a stainless-steel mentality. When you are in your late teens or early 20s, you believe that nothing can happen to you. You really enjoy the liberty and freedom you have got — you have your driving licence and off you go.

You will do silly things. You will do inappropriate things. Everybody must now acknowledge that as the years go by things get tougher and more dangerous on the roads. In my day you could perhaps have done a lot of inappropriate things — not that I ever did, but I know people who did.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr COOPER — Thank you very much! I see the member for Ripon nodding and saying he agrees and he was in the same situation. He saw people behaving inappropriately when he was in his late teens and early 20s. But it was not as dangerous then as it is now.

With this legislation not only are we saying to young people that we believe the behaviour we are talking about is inappropriate, we are also saying to them that we value their lives and their safety. We value them so much that we are prepared to take tough action in order to keep them alive and to keep them as part of the community rather than having them end up in hospital or, worse still, dead or causing the deaths of other people. This is tough action, but it is fair action. That is why the house is supporting the legislation

In the few minutes that remain for me to speak, I want to take up the call by the member for Scoresby for tougher laws to deal with repeat drink-drivers. I suppose I do not have to refer members to this because they would all be aware of it because it received considerable publicity, but up in Nathalia or Numurkah recently a fellow was caught driving while drunk and driving without a licence. He was an absolute repeat offender, dangerous in the extreme. It is those people who need to have the point brought home to them by stronger deterrents and stronger action. The community simply cannot tolerate having people like that on the roads. Repeat drink-drivers, and regrettably there are a few of them, need to be given the same kind of lesson and have the same kind of tough action dealt out to them as the hoons we are talking about in this legislation. I urge the government to take up that issue.

This is good legislation. It is legislation that is supported by the Liberal Party, and it has my strong support.

Mr LANGDON (Ivanhoe) — It is my great pleasure to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill. I too am a member of the Road Safety Committee and have been since 1996. Hoon driving has certainly become an issue, and anything we can do to reduce the road toll across the state — and the state government has made a remarkable effort in reducing the road toll — is always most welcome. I know that other speakers have mentioned this subject briefly, but I must say that I have also observed that rarely does a week or a day go by that you do not see a car that has been smashed because of hoon driving.

One of the things I do as a local member of Parliament is try to consult as widely as I can with my local constituents. To this end I sent the government's *Have Your Say* brochure to over 3500 families with young people under the age of 25, and I got a reasonable response. To the question, 'Would you support laws that would allow vehicles to be impounded and/or confiscated for reckless and irresponsible driving offences?', the under-25-year-olds recorded 64 per cent in favour and 36 per cent against. Of the over-25-year-olds, 77 per cent supported confiscation, 17 per cent said no and 6 per cent were undecided. What was remarkable was that the under-25-year-olds had an opinion one way or the other, not in between. They had certainly made up their minds, and again the majority supported confiscation.

As I am being urged to make my contribution as brief as possible, I will conclude by saying that this is a law that I

fully support, and I think it has widespread support from under-25-year-olds and over-25-year-olds. I support the bill.

Sitting suspended 6.00 p.m. until 7.32 p.m.

Dr NAPHTHINE (South-West Coast) — It is with pleasure that I rise to speak on the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill. I strongly support this legislation and join with other members of the opposition and the Liberal Party in congratulating the government on bringing forward this legislation, which we believe will have a positive effect in improving the amenity of our local community, increasing road safety and reducing the risk to young drivers.

As other members have said, this legislation reflects Liberal Party policy. I congratulate the government on adopting Liberal Party policy. I wish it would take on board a number of other Liberal Party policies. I refer to a speech that I gave to the house on 6 October 2004, when I raised an issue with the Premier on the adjournment debate and sought action from the Premier and his government to examine road safety issues. One of the issues that I raised was the need for the introduction of hoon legislation in the style of Queensland and Western Australia which provided for the confiscation of cars belonging to people involved in hoon behaviour. I am pleased to see that, a bit over 12 months later, the government has adopted that suggestion. The Liberal Party adopted it as policy earlier this year and now the government has adopted it in this form of legislation. It is good to see the government following the lead of the innovators in this area.

I give particular recognition to Inspector John Robinson of the Victoria Police based in Warrnambool, who has been using this approach in dealing with inappropriate, hoon-style behaviour in the Warrnambool area. For some time he has been confiscating motor vehicles, and particularly for those young people —

An honourable member interjected.

Dr NAPHTHINE — Without power. He has done it with the cooperation of the young people involved. He has made them an offer they cannot refuse, and he has certainly cleaned up some of the hoon behaviour in Liebig Street. Inspector John Robinson is to be congratulated. I am pleased to see that his approach has been adopted now by the government and that it will give a head of power for this sort of action to be taken by Victoria Police across the state.

The second-reading speech also alludes to the whole issue of improving driver safety among young drivers. I refer particularly to a report prepared for me titled *Driver Education, Minimum Driving Hours and Further Driving Restrictions* by Caitlin McLean who did an internship with me. She did an excellent paper on this whole issue, a copy of which I have provided to the member for Geelong, as head of the Road Safety Committee, and to the parliamentary library. I will quote some passages out of the report which I believe provide other steps forward for improving driver education, driver training and driver safety for young drivers. The background is that:

In 2002, 30.5 per cent of driver deaths were under the age of 25, in spite of the fact that they only hold 13 per cent of all licences.

Indeed the report states:

The most dangerous thing most teenagers will ever do is drive or ride as a passenger with a teen driver. The leading cause of death among young people in motorised countries world wide is vehicle-related crashes. The main causes of young driver crashes relate to their own driving errors and inexperience.

In the report she lists several reasons why young people have higher crash rates, stating that they are inexperienced; they do not recognise or adequately assess risk; they are overconfident and overestimate their own driving ability; their cognitive and perceptual skills and other competencies needed for driving are not sufficiently developed; they are less adept at anticipating, perceiving, identifying and therefore reacting to hazards; they drive under more dangerous conditions, with more night-time driving and social driving with passenger distractions; they take more intentional or unintentional risks, such as driving at high speeds, aggressive driving, close following distances and indeed hoon behaviour.

In her paper Caitlin presents a number of suggestions about how to improve the behaviour of young drivers. One of those is more effective driver education. The report says that a combination of the most effective forms of driver education would lead to improved knowledge of the rules and conditions of the road and a heightened awareness of the risks and dangers of safer, better prepared drivers. Rather than learner drivers being taught how to prepare for a driving test, the course would ensure they are being taught how to prepare for a lifetime of driving. If Victoria were to adopt a state-run course similar to the Skilled Drivers of Australia driver-training program, it would almost certainly produce a positive outcome based on results of the current AAMI driver education course.

I would urge the government to take up the issue of compulsory driver education as part of its review of learner driver behaviour. I also suggest that the government take up the issue of minimum learner driving experience. Indeed a recent study conducted in Sweden compared the results of groups of people that had accumulated 120 hours of driver experience against a group that had accumulated 35 hours of driving experience. The outcome revealed the group with 120 hours were 30 per cent less likely to be involved in a fatal crash. If this were applied in Victoria, it could mean up to 100 lives saved per year, and that is certainly a saving worth making. I would urge the government to look at a compulsory minimum 120 hours driving training. Indeed, there are other things I think the government should look at when it is dealing with the whole issue of young driver behaviour and improving safety for young drivers and other road users. Again I quote from the report:

The two initiatives most strongly associated with a reduction in crashes amongst newly licensed drivers, include night-time and passenger restrictions. Night-time driving restrictions when there are no peer passengers, with the exception of supervising adult passengers, have been linked to crash reductions of up to 60 per cent during the typically restricted hours. A crash is 2.6 times more likely to occur at night than during the day, and this is further magnified for young drivers. Research at Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC) reveals that by having young passengers in the car, especially if they are all male, the driver is up to five times more likely to have a fatal accident. These two measures, currently not part of road law anywhere in Australia, have been proven to be effective in jurisdictions across the world.

I refer briefly to other jurisdictions. New Zealand was the first country to introduce both night-time driving and passenger restrictions, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the New Zealand restrictions was conducted which shows that there has been an absolutely significant reduction in the number of accidents and injuries involving young drivers.

Serious injury crashes were reduced by 23 per cent for 15 to 19 year olds, 12 per cent for 20 to 24 year olds and 16 per cent for drivers 25 years and older. Another study found that since the introduction of restrictions serious injuries and fatalities of those between 15 and 24 years had almost halved. There is plenty of evidence, both in New Zealand and the United States of America, where a 1997 analysis of driving statistics reported that the proportion of teenagers involved in fatal accidents was 20 per cent lower in states that imposed night-driving and passenger restrictions.

While I welcome the hoon legislation, which I called for some 13 months ago — it is a significant step forward — I call on the government to look at further

steps that can be taken in terms of compulsory, approved driver education and providing incentives to young people to undertake proper driver education before they enter the road with a licence. I also call for compulsory minimum hours of learner-driver experience, at least 120 hours, and the possibility of night-driving and passenger restrictions for young drivers. These have been effective road safety measures that have saved lives of young drivers and people across other parts of the world and they would have a significant effect on reducing the road toll in Victoria.

Dr HARKNESS (Frankston) — Hoon drivers are the scourge of residential streets — and the streets of Frankston are no exception — which makes me very pleased to be able to speak on this particular piece of legislation. There are two key issues which face Frankston residents almost on a daily basis. They are the noise that hoon drivers make, taking away their amenity. Many people in Frankston and probably many members of this house have been woken up in the early hours of the morning, particularly on Friday and Saturday mornings, and it is certainly not something which can be tolerated.

The other thing is the danger to people created by hoon drivers, whether they be pedestrians, older people walking down the street, families with their children, other motorists or the passengers in the vehicles of hoon drivers. The behaviour that they engage in is dangerous — burnouts, doughnuts, line lockups, excessive speed and loss of traction. This legislation gets to the nub of that and makes it an offence for people to drive their vehicles in such a way. Police have been hampered up until now with an inability to make significant inroads into this issue, but now this legislation will enable them to actually hit hoon drivers where it hurts the most by taking away their cars — —

Honourable members interjecting.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Barker) — Order! I am sorry to interrupt the member for Frankston. Could I ask that the level of conversation be lowered.

Dr HARKNESS — This legislation will hit hoon drivers where it hurts by either temporarily or permanently impounding or confiscating their vehicles. I should note, though, that this is not about attacking people who like to own, enjoy and spend a lot of money on their cars. I myself have a car which I like to enjoy, particularly on weekends. This is about people who engage in the type of behaviour that reduces people's amenity and is dangerous to citizens. I know this legislation will work hand in hand with a recent initiative launched by Victoria Police and the Frankston

City Council — the hoon hotline, 1800 NO HOON, and the citizens of Frankston should be very pleased with this legislation and all of the efforts the government has been making in this regard.

Mrs POWELL (Shepparton) — I am pleased to speak on this bill on behalf of The Nationals. The bill allows police to seize, impound or immobilise vehicles on the spot for up to 48 hours. The hoons then have to pay the costs to recover the vehicle. If the hoon driver is a repeat offender, courts may impound vehicles for up to three months or permanently. We hope this sends a very strong message to other hoons to say this dangerous driving will not be tolerated. The community is sick to death of antisocial behaviour and dangerous driving by some drivers, not all but some, who put the community at risk and also those annoying cars that drive around and around the streets with their radios on full blast. That annoys many people too.

Too many young people die or are severely injured on Victorian roads. There are many reasons. There are cars with too much power in the hands of inexperienced drivers. There are cars that are not roadworthy with faulty brakes or tyres with no tread and, of course, speeding on the streets which is called street racing and not drag-racing.

In a few weeks there will be an event in Shepparton called the Springnats, where hotted up cars drive around the streets. They are magnificently developed cars that have been restored to their former glory, and the event attracts large crowds, young and old alike. The drivers go to the Driver Education Centre of Australia in Shepparton and do burnouts in a controlled environment, which is really important. DECA also provides driver education. There is a new car sport called 'drifting', which involves hanging out of the back of a car at corners and smoking the tyres. It looks very impressive, but it is very dangerous on the streets.

In Victoria we have drag racing strips at Calder, Heathcote Park, Mildura, Bairnsdale and Ballarat. My husband, Ian, has raced at quite a number of them. For a while in the 1980s he had the fastest six-cylinder dragster in Australia, but he did his drag racing in the proper place, not on the streets. Victoria needs a national standard drag racing facility sanctioned by the Australian National Drag Racing Association, such as those at Eastern Creek in western Sydney, Willowbank in Queensland and Kwinana in Western Australia. The Victorian government should support and fund a national-class drag strip to enable drivers to compete at a national level and to get young drivers off the streets and into a controlled environment.

My beautiful sister, Frances, was killed at 21 years of age because the driver of the car in which she was a passenger was speeding. I applaud any initiatives to try to stop inexperienced drivers from driving at speeds they cannot handle, thereby putting themselves, their passengers and the community at risk. Young people think they are invincible and that nothing will happen to them. They do not understand the devastation that is felt by families and the community when someone dies in the prime of their life. Taking cars away from people who are hooning is a step in the right direction and may send a message that dangerous driving will not be tolerated.

Mr WYNNE (Richmond) — I rise to support the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill, and in doing so I want to indicate that the government has had this proposal under active consideration for some time. For the opposition parties to suggest that we have somehow pinched this proposal off their web site is complete nonsense. If they understood anything about the way that government policy is formed and matures through the cabinet process, they would know very well that this proposal has been under consideration for a significant length of time. Nonetheless, I welcome the bipartisanship that this piece of legislation evokes, because it is important that the house says in a clear and unambiguous way to the Victorian population that we remain deeply concerned as a Parliament about the road toll, about the dangerous behaviour that young people get up to, particularly in relation to the use of powerful motor vehicles in an inappropriate way.

As other members have indicated, there are substantial penalties associated with these offences: for an initial offence, the confiscation or immobilisation of the vehicle for 48 hours; for a second offence, a court-imposed three months confiscation; and for a third offence the permanent confiscation of the vehicle. These are quite harsh penalties, but I think they are appropriate as part of a regime that sends a signal to young people that driving irresponsibly and in a way that endangers not only themselves but also other people who may be in the vehicle and the community generally is completely unacceptable.

I listened to a very tragic interview on the Neil Mitchell program with a father the day after his son had been killed while allegedly driving at speed and in an inappropriate fashion. Ironically this person hit a lamp post outside my then adviser's home in North Fitzroy, and she saw the very direct impact of this behaviour and was very shaken by it.

A couple of days subsequent to that I listened to the interview with the father of the young man, who quite bravely came on to the radio to talk about, in an obviously very distressed state, the need for government to do something — the need for government to send a signal that this form of behaviour is unacceptable and that young people who partake in it need to understand that there will be severe sanctions that come with that form of inappropriate behaviour.

I was very moved by that interview with the father of the young man. I am pleased that this piece of legislation is passing through the house today. It is strongly supported by this side of the house, and I am pleased that there is bipartisan support. We must send a signal to our young people who are taking up the early stages of their driving career that this form of inappropriate behaviour is unacceptable, and there will be repercussions for it. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr THOMPSON (Sandringham) — The opposition strongly supports the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill. The capacity of the auditorium here almost reflects the number of people — 1029 — who were killed on Victorian roads a number of years ago. Victoria has a proud record of the implementation of a number of reforms that have served to reduce the road toll in Victoria.

The Liberal Party also has a world-leading reputation in the implementation of reforms relating to road safety, commencing with the compulsory wearing of seatbelts, the random breath-test legislation and other acts. The shadow Minister for Transport has outlined to the house the contribution of the Liberal Party to this legislation, which mirrors in part initiatives taken in other states, in Queensland in particular. A number of road safety councils some years ago were advocating for so-called hoon legislation, and I know the Inner South East Community Road Safety Council, under the chairmanship of John Moller, had been advocating reforms along these lines over 12 months ago. Likewise, in his capacity as deputy chair of RoadSafe Inner South East, Mr Moller and that organisation had been advocating for this legislation.

I note the comments of the shadow Minister for Transport that this was a policy that the Liberal Party had on its web site on 6 July.

The legislation introduces a number of measures. Firstly, it creates a new offence in the Road Safety Act of the improper use of a motor vehicle. It targets recidivist driving while the driver is disqualified. It provides for a police discretion in the implementation

and supervision of the laws. It provides recourse to court in the event of any matters that need to be reviewed. It is estimated that 1000 to 2000 vehicles a year might be impounded on a temporary basis under the legislation. It targets hooners instituting burnouts, doughnuts, excessive skidding or spinning, or speeding 45 kilometres per hour or more above the limit.

The Sandringham electorate has a number of car parks along the foreshore that are gravel in nature and have been the subject of inappropriate behaviour by young drivers, and the police and the community will strongly support this legislation.

Ms NEVILLE (Bellarine) — I am pleased to speak briefly in support of the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill. This bill is about regulating hoon behaviour, which has been a major issue in Geelong, and certainly in the Bellarine electorate. Regulating hoon drivers is not just about us trying to deal with some bad behaviour of young people. This behaviour is not harmless fun; this behaviour is life threatening both to young people and to the broader community.

Over a week ago in my electorate we had two separate incidents on the same day that were not fatal, but that was just luck. They occurred in St Albans Park in the area of Meadenhall Drive and Aldershot Road, where the cars slammed into properties — one through a fence and one through a garage. This is a family area with a large number of young people. The residents have indicated that there are hooners driving around there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. As one parent was reported as saying in the *Geelong Advertiser* on 7 November, 'I won't let my kids on the street; now I can't even let them in the backyard'. As I said, this street has been very dangerous. The council is taking some action, but traffic management and speed options are not enough to deter this behaviour. It is not just about moving young people on to other areas, it is about deterring young people from participating in this behaviour.

I will use this opportunity to take up the comments made by the members for Polwarth and Scoresby on the issue of police resources and management. I remind the house, as I have done many times, that in Bellarine under the former government we would have had seven police because it was going to close three police stations — Drysdale, Portarlinton and Queenscliff. We have kept those open and we have given a commitment to keep them open. We have an additional 15 police, and we have a new police facility. This government is serious about road safety and law and order, and I commend the bill to the house.

Mr MAUGHAN (Rodney) — Very briefly, I commend to the house this piece of legislation. I welcome and support the Road Safety and Other Acts (Vehicle Impoundment and Other Amendments) Bill, the so-called hoon education bill.

I note with pleasure the marked reduction in death and injury on our roads because of the introduction of a range of road safety initiatives, all of which have worked to change the culture and driver behaviour. Of course I am referring to things like the reduction in drink-driving, the use of seatbelts and the reduction in excessive speed. But one of the problems we have at the moment is certainly this unacceptable behaviour by a small group of irresponsible drivers who risk not only their own lives but those of innocent people on the road.

This is a good piece of legislation, and I strongly support it. However, I do not believe it goes far enough for repeat offenders. From my point of view, I would suggest that, with the permission of the court, hooners who have been caught a number of times be taken in by the police to sit in front of the crusher as their pride and joy is crushed into a heap and sent off to Japan to come back as scrap metal. That is what I would do to repeat offenders! It is a good piece of legislation, and I am delighted to be able to support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr CAMERON (Minister for Agriculture).

Debate adjourned until later this day.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Program

Mr CAMERON (Minister for Agriculture) — I move:

That the government business program agreed to by this house on 15 November 2005 be further amended by omitting '10.00 p.m.' and inserting '9.00 p.m.'

Motion agreed to.

WORKPLACE RIGHTS ADVOCATE BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed from 27 October; motion of Mr HULLS (Minister for Industrial Relations).

Mr McINTOSH (Kew) — This is an interesting bill. That is the best way I can put it without starting to

use four-letter words. It is a bill that demonstrates weak leadership in this state. It is weak leadership because, while this government is quite happy to troop around the country and extol its virtues, all the industrial relations power having been referred to the commonwealth and a raft of legislation that apparently fixed up the difficulties with that legislation having been passed, we now have a bill which will be inoperative, unworkable and oppressive.

The other thing is something that this government has probably not thought about too much, if it is fair dinkum and really wants to pass this bill, because in the hands of a Liberal government it could actually work in the opposite direction and be used as an instrument of oppression — not that that would be the case! Certainly it is a bill that has been formulated at the behest of the government's union mates — and only at the behest of its union mates — in order to be seen to be doing something. It has clearly been drafted very quickly and cheaply. It is a very thin document. Its powers are unbelievably broad and are constrained in only a small way by any degree of sense.

Apparently the principal purpose of the bill is to educate and inform workers about their rights and entitlements. What is interesting is that again we see an inconsistency between this legislation and what happens under the commonwealth legislation — the referred body, if you like. For example, the definition of 'worker' extends beyond what we normally consider to be a worker — someone who is the subject of a contract of service — to now include people with contracts for services. It is therefore arguable that it now incorporates independent contractors.

It is a matter of some note that in this country there are hundreds of thousands, even millions, of people who choose for whatever reason to be independent contractors, whether it is for taxation, family commitments or their own choice. There are more independent contractors in this country than there are members of the trade union movement. Why we have this bill that will extend the definition of 'worker' beyond the definition that exists in the federal Workplace Relations Act to now cover independent contractors is beyond me. It is bizarre in the extreme and is an indication that the bill has been cobbled together for an ulterior purpose, not necessarily just monitoring the federal industrial relations powers.

Indeed the bill goes on to talk about the functions of the workplace rights advocate and says that the advocate can make representations to appropriate persons or bodies in relation to work-related matters, without any indication in the second-reading speech and without

any indication or clear idea at the briefing about which bodies — courts, professional associations, unions — we are talking about in relation to this function.

When you turn to the provisions covering the functions of the advocate you find in clause 5(4) a matter of some significance that troubles me greatly, and that is in relation to the power of the workplace rights advocate to intervene in any court case in the state of Victoria. Later on in the bill that power is extended so that the advocate can intervene in any proceeding in the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal. The workplace rights advocate will be able to appear in any court proceeding in Victoria, including proceedings at VCAT. That means, for example, that this advocate could appear on the sentencing of someone charged under occupational health and safety legislation.

Notwithstanding that you have a prosecutor and someone appearing for the defendant, there will be an ability for the workplace rights advocate to appear in such a court case. We were told at the briefing that the advocate will not be doing anything different from the normal functions, and we are grateful for that. It is probably consistent with the bill. But surely, given that there is mention of occupational health and safety in the second-reading speech, it is clear that it is in the bill for a purpose. We need to know what that purpose is if we are going to have such a person appearing in any such case.

But the power is not limited even to issues relating to occupational health and safety. The advocate could appear in another criminal trial or common-law proceeding, for example, to advocate a position at the direction of the minister about what the minister wants to be said at that trial or proceeding, notwithstanding that it is a matter between the two private parties. What is deeply regrettable is that it is a fundamental constraint on the way our courts operate. This is not about the separation of powers, it is not about the independence of the courts and it is not about having people appointed to high judicial office because they are appropriately qualified and experienced for that appointment.

The bill is about something as fundamental as the very nature of our justice system. The way our system operates, whether it is right or wrong, is that 2, 3 or 4 parties appear in court to vindicate their legal rights. Anything less than a vindication of a party's legal rights means that they do not have a legal interest and right to appear. That has been fundamental to our notion of justice for aeons. Whether there are 2, 3, 4 or 20 parties, they must have a legal interest to vindicate their appearing before the courts. The workplace rights

advocate will be given a right to intervene in proceedings, notwithstanding the fundamental right. The bill proposes a change to the way the courts have operated for aeons.

If this is the intention of the government it should be making it clear. It is a matter of real disappointment to me that when this matter was raised with the Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee its members refused to take up this cudgel. Notwithstanding their obligation to ensure that Parliament is informed about possible infringements of rights and liberties, the members of the Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee voted it down along party lines. That again indicates to me that the bill is politically motivated and not designed to have any cogent outcome. The repercussions of such a change in our judicial system should be a matter of real concern for the entire chamber. It is a matter of real concern that when this was drawn to the attention of the members of the Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee they did not see fit to draw it to the attention of the chamber in a formal way.

I certainly propose to draw it to the attention of this chamber. While there are a few exceptions to state intervention, the convention is that the state does not intervene in a case between two private parties vindicating their legal rights unless a right sought to be vindicated by a party or parties impacts on the legislative power of this Parliament or the executive power of the government or if the government has a sufficiently great interest that it can be characterised as having a legal interest in the outcome. That does not include a political interest — that is, that the government has an interest in a policy issue that may be discussed in a particular court case. The government must have a legitimate legal interest. The one exception to that, as permitted by our constitutional matrix — and by that I mean our global Australian constitutional matrix — is where an Attorney-General is given leave to intervene in a proceeding where a constitutional issue is discussed. Nine times out of 10 that is exactly what state Attorneys-General do. It is the one exception to the rule.

I have real concerns about the bill because clearly its draftsmen did not think about the constitutional implications of the bill. They have certainly not thought about the practical outcome of allowing a state to willy-nilly direct the workplace rights advocate to intervene in matters where private legal rights are being vindicated before the courts. The bill demonstrates weak leadership, because the government is saying it is happy with and content about the referral of powers. It is within the power of the government to revoke that

reference and to fight the matter on a constitutional basis, referring to the Corporations Law or other laws, in the High Court. The government is prepared to agree with the idea of having one industrial relations system in this state, which is the correct position.

But the bill is a very thin, badly put together, ill-conceived, ill-thought-out, unconstitutional, illegal and unprincipled document, and at the end of the day it is a disgrace. It will not have the effect it is supposed to have. Members on this side are expected to stand in this place and participate in the government's political stunt so that its members can turn to their union mates and say, 'Look what we are doing for your rights: we are standing up for your rights', when they cannot do so. The bill is illegal, unconstitutional, unworkable, impracticable and a complete disgrace. The opposition is opposing this bill.

Mr RYAN (Leader of The Nationals) — It is my pleasure to join the debate in relation to the Workplace Rights Advocate Bill. The member for Kew has done a careful analysis of the legislation and has encapsulated it in the sense that he has raised the issues about which The Nationals are concerned and which are partially the rationale behind our opposition to this legislation. I do not propose to go through all that again, but there are some general principles that I would like to address. The first thing is it is a complete throwback by the Labor Party. This is one of those pay-off things that Labor governments do.

Mr Hudson interjected.

Mr RYAN — As the member for Bentleigh quite rightly says, it is a pay-off for the old mates. It is just a pay-off for the old mates. It is a sad state of affairs because at the time when the rest of the world has bypassed the basic arguments which underpin this whole Henny-Penny syndrome by the Labor Party, at a time when Australia needs to be as competitive as possible in the international markets in which we trade, at a time when reformation of this order is not only happening in many other countries but is also being urged in those that do not have it, the Labor Party in Victoria has a throwback trying to pay homage to the union movement. It is a sad thing. This is irrelevant, redundant legislation. Under the federal legislation there is already an advocate for workers. An advocate has already been appointed.

Mr Wynne interjected.

Mr RYAN — The question is, 'Would you trust them?'. The fact of the matter is there is already an advocate established under the federal legislation. Why

would you on the merits establish a duplicate office for Victoria only, with all the attendant costs, expense and bureaucracy that goes with it, when we already have in place under the federal legislation an individual who is doing precisely the sort of job which in a general sense is contemplated by the terms of this legislation? Why would you do it?

The other basic thing to ask is why, if Labor members are fair dinkum about it, they do not take back the powers back were ceded in 1996. If they are fair dinkum, why do they not go off to the federal government and say it was done by that lot about whom they speak so favourably and fondly so often, but they want it all back now. Have we heard a boo from them about that? Absolutely not; not a single word. It just goes to show once again all the rubbish that underpins this is just a pay-off to those to whom homage is due by the Labor Party in Victoria.

The very worst thing is that it is taking us back to the bad old days of them and us, of employers and employees. The world has passed the Labor Party by in relation to this. We are down to about 20 per cent work-force participation in unions — something of that order. These union officials are frightening the daylight out of the poor people who are paying their union dues. Those officials are running this ridiculous campaign which resulted in the rallies that took place the other day. The whole world has passed them by. The world has moved on. The days when it was a them-and-us situation are long gone if for no other reason than the fact that employers well understand the position.

I was an employer for 20 years and took great pride in doing it and I gave people an ownership of the business in which we were jointly involved. I established a system long before this stuff came out that enabled you to sit down with people and have a good talk to them about what you wanted to do. Why? Because even if you look at it in the most clinical terms, the investment that employers have to make in employees now is such that unless you do that and have proper relationships with your employees, you are never going to have a productive situation with them. It will never happen. This is a period of time when, thankfully, we have a federal government of a conservative nature leading the nation, strong employment, low inflation and all those sorts of criteria that make the economy as strong as it is. That enables Victoria to tag onto the coat-tails and be dragged along by it.

All that is terrific, but the fact of the matter is if you do not have that relationship between employer and employee, it is never going to work. It simply will not

work. In the environment of the existing economy an employer simply cannot rely on doing all the dastardly things that the Labor Party is talking about in this Henny-Penny approach and then expect to be able to go out and simply get people to fill the job. It does not work that way. In the real world of what makes the economy go round it just simply does not work that way. To have the Premier down at the march the other day urging people on and then docking the pay of those who were there was a bit tough. Hands up all members of the government who actually kicked in their money for the day to contribute to the cause — one!

Honourable members interjecting.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Barker) — Order! The Leader of The Nationals should not encourage interjections or participation by the other side. He has the call, and I would encourage him to contribute to the debate.

Mr RYAN — Indeed, Acting Speaker, but I must say I am amazed. I saw them all troop off down Bourke Street. I saw them off. I am sure many of them turned back even as they were standing on the steps, and I reckon the member for Ripon was one of them who waved to me and asked me questions about why I was not joining them, and I thought, ‘There goes a fervent bunch really wedded to the cause’. Now I find out they have gone down there to join these people, most of whom are going to have their pay docked for being there, and this lot who have urged them to go out there have docked the pay of the people who went and then have not kicked the tin themselves, except for the good old member for Ripon. Good for you, Joe! Great effort. Congratulations!

The contradictions in it are absolutely ridiculous. Why are people out there? Because they are getting the pants scared off them by the union movement and the Labor Party. I will tell the house the ultimate irony from the point of view of those people. The house may remember during the time of the former government that the Labor Party ran a scare campaign about common-law rights, and 100 000 people turned up in the streets. What was the first order of the day by the then Labor opposition in relation to common-law rights? The first order of the day to those people was, ‘If we are in government, we will return common-law rights’.

What have they done? What an absolute sham! The County Court annual report was tabled yesterday; members should pick it up and have a read of it. Have a look at how many common-law actions have been instituted. What an absolute sham! Why does the union

movement not speak up about it? I have spoken to senior union members about it, and the answer is basically, 'Because we know what side our bread is buttered on' — that is why. They know they cannot go kicking the can about this, so they are not going to say anything about it. But is it not typical? They are out there promising the world to these people but in fact would deliver absolutely nothing even if they were in a position to be able to do something.

What in the context of this legislation is going to be done by the proposed federal laws? We are going to have three essential things. An article written by Neil Coulson in the *Herald Sun* of Tuesday, 15 November, is a good write-up, and there is another by Brian Boyd. I know Boydie; he is a good bloke. I get on well with him. We differ —

An honourable member interjected.

Mr RYAN — No, I do. I get on well with him, but we have a hell of a difference over issues in relation to this sort of thing. The article by him is on the same page of the newspaper.

But let us go to the Neil Coulson article, because it is a good summary of what is proposed to happen under this legislation. Essentially he says there will be three things: firstly, the creation of a single national industrial relations system, which I believe ought to be an aspiration for everybody; secondly, a simplified agreement-making process, and that should also be an aspiration for everybody; and thirdly, reforms to the unfair dismissal laws, and that should certainly be an aspiration for everybody.

You wonder why in this day and age we are getting the sorts of objections we are getting. I had the opportunity recently to read the *Financial Times*, which I am sure is read widely by the ranks of the government, and the editorial published on Tuesday, 8 November, was in the context of the terrible riots that are happening in the suburbs of Paris. I made reference to them earlier today in another context. It is terrible. We would all agree, I am sure — putting aside the current issue under debate — that what is happening over there is a terrible situation and it is happening because these poor folk — these Muslim people — have been marginalised in that society, and it is an awful tragedy for everybody.

Mr Hudson interjected.

Mr RYAN — The member for Bentleigh says that is what our laws will do, but unfortunately that is just not the way of it. What this editorial goes on to say in talking about the problem is this — and the member for

Bentleigh might like to listen to this. I will give a copy of the article to him later if he likes. It goes on to say that changes are going to be made. It says:

However, the essential point is that the French labour market system marginalises young, less qualified and less mainstream people by design. These would-be workers are prevented from competing with fortunate insiders by minimum wages and payroll taxes that price them out of the market.

They also suffer disproportionately from firing restrictions that make employers reluctant to hire new workers in general, and those of whom they may have doubts in particular.

The article says further on:

The state should also reduce the job protection rights of those in work, to create more of a level playing field for those without.

These things are an absolute anathema to the current government here in Victoria, but my point is simply that it is not having this conversation in China and it is not having this conversation in India, and unless we can compete in the sorts of markets where increasingly our future lies, we are going to be in awful trouble. That is the fact of the matter. You can see that in France, where an even more restricted situation applies, they are alive to the fact that people have just got to get with it and make sure they have a flexible system for the employment of the people who are working in the particular industries. We have to allow for the fact that if people are given the sort of freedom that this proposed legislation contemplates, they will be able to work out appropriate arrangements between themselves with safety nets in place and everybody will be the absolute better for it.

I said that I would come back to Brian Boyd's article. I do not want to do him a disservice by not doing so. He says in part in his article —

Mr Bracks interjected.

Mr RYAN — No, no. He says in part in his article when he seeks to explain why people are concerned:

A key reason why trade unions came into existence, to achieve the best price for labour possible and maintain gains won over time, is also under threat.

I am sorry, but the world does not operate that way any more. If we are going to have a flexible economy and be able to adapt and structure our industries in the best way so we can compete, we have to do away with a lot of this material. I am certainly not talking about the safety net provisions and the basics, but the fact is this is yesterday's news. The world has absolutely moved on.

In his *Herald Sun* article Brian Boyd complains about the abolition of right-of-entry provisions. What an absolute anathema that has been! What did the Labor Party here in Victoria do? Not satisfied with having burdened employers with right-of-entry provisions in relation to workplace relations, in November last year, 12 months ago, the government put right-of-entry provisions into occupational health and safety legislation, where an absolute raft of other people, most of them from union backgrounds, involved in inspectorates and in all sorts of positions for different agencies, are doing this sort of job. But the government cannot help itself — it still had to put right-of-entry provisions into the occupational health and safety legislation. There are various other elements in the Brian Boyd article, but I have made my reference to it so I have done the right thing by him.

I shall finish by saying that this legislation is redundant; it is not necessary in the state of Victoria. It is being introduced as a stunt. There is already provision under the federal legislation to do exactly what the tenor of this legislation intends to achieve. This is going to result — —

Mr Bracks interjected.

Mr RYAN — The Premier says ‘Not really’. No, I have the call; you have to give me a go now. The fact is that the legislation is there. The tenor of it is not as strong as this — I grant that — but we do not want it as strong as this. It is not going to serve anybody’s practical purposes to have it as strong as this with this appointed individual sticking his or her bib into all sorts of areas in relation to disputes, particularly in courts, which are simply not the place for that person to be involved.

The Nationals oppose this legislation and are going to vote against it. We think its inevitable passage — because the government has the numbers — will be a sad state of affairs and more particularly, it will be another one of those clear signals to business about having to be very careful about doing business in the state of Victoria. Today I put a question to the Minister for State and Regional Development about 260 000 pages — do you mind! — of Victorian laws and regulations presently applying to business, yet here we are adding another few. It is a sad day.

Mr HELPER (Ripon) — We are having a defining debate here in Geelong, one that defines opposition members as wanting to slip back in the industrial relations area to the 1800s. This side of the chamber is fighting to protect the rights that are so savagely under

attack by the federal government. That is what the defining argument is about.

I refer to the comment made by the member for Kew that this legislation could be used by a future Liberal government as an instrument of oppression. I wonder how much design and intent is in that comment? I refer to the comments of the Leader of The Nationals who said, ‘They are not having this debate in China’. Is that what this is about? Is it the race down to Third World pay rates? Is it a race for the lowest common denominator in terms of employment conditions? No, it is not.

I was proud to join the entire Labor Party caucus in the march on Tuesday when more than 150 000 people marched in the streets of Victoria to express their outrage at what the federal government is doing, which this legislation attempts to temper to some degree. Across the state of Victoria it is not unreasonable to claim that 200 000 marched in the streets in opposition to that, including 15 000 here in the proud city of Geelong.

I inform the opposition that 200 000 equals 10 per cent of the entire Victorian labour force. Never before has 10 per cent of the Victorian labour force walked on the streets of Victoria in opposition to a federal government that is driven by obscene ideology to drive down the working conditions of Victorian, and indeed Australian, workers to the absolute lowest common denominator. What an outrageous snub by the Prime Minister to dismiss the expression of 200 000 people in Victoria marching in the streets just because he has an ideological bent. This may well be the Prime Minister’s ideological swansong. At the end of the day it is a pity that Australian workers have to suffer as a consequence.

I am proud to be part of a government that tries as best as it can within its jurisdiction to protect the rights of Victorian workers. Why are the Liberal Party and The Nationals in Victoria — the lackeys of the ideological zealots of the federal coalition government — opposing the intent of this bill, which is to provide education and information to people who participate in the industrial relations system? Why are they opposed to facilitating and encouraging the fair industrial relations treatment of workers? I will tell you why they oppose those matters being in the legislation, Speaker. They oppose them because they are the same as the ideological zealots in the federal government, which has foisted on the Australian workplace the outrageous WorkChoices legislation. I commend the legislation to the house.

Mr HONEYWOOD (Warrandyte) — Prior to entering Parliament some 17 years ago, I worked for two and a half years in industrial relations across the bay at the Shell Geelong refinery. I can well recall, referring to the member for Ripon's statement a moment ago which looked back on the past, a dispute we had because Shell wanted to pay all workers pay directly into bank accounts. What was the main reason given by the trade union in opposing that? They did not want their wives to know how much money they earned and how much they put into gambling and other vices. It was a typical example of how the trade union movement preaches one thing and yet wants to deny rights to their partners et cetera on the domestic front.

There is already ample case law that supports the notion that an employer can say to a new employee that if they want this job, they have to sign an Australian workplace agreement. The federal workplace relations bill, which is currently going through the federal Parliament, will clarify that this is already well-established case law that has been decided upon by former Labor Party-involved judges.

At the end the day where does that therefore leave the proposed powers of the workplace rights advocate (WRA) in this bill? How do you define 'victimisation' under this bill because there is no mention of the employer being victimised; it is only about the employee potentially being victimised. Will the WRA be able to intervene in an industrial relations commission matter before the federal court? Of course not. We already have the Office of the Employment Advocate. That office already has the power to approve certified agreements instead of the commission, and it also currently monitors freedom of association. The mechanisms are already there. We do not need another mechanism to provide a job for Leigh Hubbard, who is currently unemployed, or for Tim Pallas.

Mr ROBINSON (Mitcham) — This bill deserves very strong support. The minister's second-reading speech outlined clearly the need for an advocate for Victorian workers because of the federal government's unprecedented draconian changes, which have, of course, gone well beyond the mandate it was granted at the last federal election. Earlier today we were reminded by the mayor of the City of Greater Geelong about the honest toil of working men and women who helped establish this great town. The bill the government is introducing seeks to assist those honest toilers who really are up against it in the face of this federal legislation.

There are very few benefits in the federal government's proposed changes for Victorian workers. Most of its

advertising campaign has been based around the notion that its changes will simplify a system. That might be the case in other states; it cannot be the case in Victoria because we achieved a unitary system many years ago. But there is in contrast a very substantial downside to the federal government changes. Evidence is everywhere. In fact just yesterday I received a booklet from the Australian Catholic Commission for Employment Relations. I will quote from it:

On the basis of the current information provided by the government, there are concerns about various aspects of its proposals: wage fixing, unfair dismissals, minimum conditions, awards and agreement making, and the functions of the Australian Industrial Relations Commission.

This bill deserves strong support. It is disappointing to hear that The Nationals and the Liberal Party are opposed to it. A few minutes ago the Leader of The Nationals talked about contradictions and tried to paint Labor members as being hopelessly contradicted on this. I thought that was a pretty brave claim coming from the Leader of The Nationals, because it is a fact that while the Tories will not agree to an advocate at fairly modest cost to assist the honest toilers, the Tories in this state have had no compunction about sponging off workers, the honest toilers in this state, for years. They have been bludging off workers in this state for years.

Mr Smith interjected.

Mr ROBINSON — I see the member for Bass is animated now. It is called the Labour Day holiday. The member for Bass knows all about it — it is called a long weekend. Do you know who earned it? The honest toilers in this state, at about the same time as the Parliament of Victoria was established. Despite the lousiness of Tories in this state, they will not agree to fund an advocate for the honest toilers who are up against it. Year after year they have no compunction in taking that holiday, a day they never earned. They have been bludging off workers in this state forever.

I want to say that the suggestion by the Leader of The Nationals has given me the idea that we should do our own survey. Indeed with a few other members we might get on the telephone on the next Labour Day and ring the offices of every single Nationals and Liberal Party member and find out who is continuing to bludge off the honest toilers of this state. This is a very good bill, and it deserves our strongest support.

Ms ASHER (Brighton) — The Liberal Party opposes the Workplace Rights Advocate Bill, unsurprisingly. If the member for Mitcham wishes to talk about the Tories, perhaps even I may start talking

about the socialists whom he represents. This of course is a response by the Labor Party to the Howard government's industrial relations improvements currently before the federal Parliament. What this bill does is waste taxpayers money.

The bill establishes the position of workplace rights advocate, and it will be very interesting to see who actually gets that position. Will it be someone sympathetic to business? I do not think so. Will it be an ex-union hack? Possibly so. Let's see who this person will be. The advocate will have very wide powers and functions. The proposal is uncoded, and I note that Victorian taxpayers already provide \$800 000 for the Job Watch legal centre. There is already a commonwealth Office of the Employment Advocate, and now we have this. The funds are uncoded and the bill provides for unlimited staff. In reality this will be a slush fund of money to oppose and politically agitate and advertise against the commonwealth government's industrial relations changes.

I also note that anybody will be able to direct the workplace advocate to do work. For example, I would expect, according to my reading of the bill, that the Australian Council of Trade Unions will be able to give a brief to this person. The Liberal Party is extremely concerned about clause 15, which gives this person the power to intervene in Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal cases. We think that is extreme. The codes of practice outlined in clause 13 also cause us concern.

We have an agreement on time that I want to keep to, but in conclusion I endorse the comments of the Victorian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry issued on 23 August 2005. VECCI called this piece of legislation a 'bizarre overreaction' to the commonwealth government's changes. It also said:

What we do not need is another layer of taxpayer-funded bureaucracy telling employers and employees what is best for their workplace.

We completely and utterly oppose this bill.

Ms MORAND (Mount Waverley) — The first thing to say about this bill is that it is a pity we need such legislation in Victoria; but such is the state of this nation that this Parliament needs to introduce a bill to ensure that Victorian workers rights are protected. Of course we hear the usual anti-union rhetoric rolled out by members on this side, which I happen to sit on but am not part of.

I do not need to make the argument as to why this bill is necessary. I need only refer to what has been said

by people outside the Parliament to make the case for this bill. I want to refer to a media release earlier this month from the Anglican diocese of Melbourne's Social Responsibilities Committee, which says that the federal government has shown serious disregard for the Australian public by rushing through controversial legislation. Dr Cleary, the chair of the committee, said:

... the economic benefits of the reforms were unlikely [to] benefit many of the Prime Minister's battlers ...

It is unacceptable for the government to talk about economic prosperity when there are already well over 1 million Australian families missing out on a share of the pie. How will these —

industrial relations reforms —

address the needs of 700 000 children in poverty?

Secondly, I refer to a media release from Anglican Media on 8 November that says that the federal government had yet to prove its industrial reforms would benefit the economy in Victoria. The federal government has simply not made the case. The economy is going very well, and the federal government should be spending time and money investing in skills development.

Philip Huggins, the bishop of the northern region of the Anglican diocese of Melbourne, called on the federal government to withdraw the WorkChoices legislation in a submission to the Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee on 8 November, also saying that the federal government had failed to make the case for industrial reforms. I will finish by referring to the media release:

Bishop Huggins said that the government has not eased anxieties that these radical reforms will leave many people worse off, particularly 'those who aren't in a strong negotiating position, individuals who face being unfairly dismissed, and those whose wages may be driven down so their work still leaves them poor'.

That is all that needs to be said. I cannot say it any better than Bishop Huggins. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr SMITH (Bass) — I have come all the way to Geelong to debate this bill with this mob from the other side, and I can only say to you that this is the most draconian piece of industrial relations legislation that you have introduced into the Parliament since the last one you introduced, which was of no use at all to the workers, no use at all to industry in this state. I can only say that is the sort of thing that I would expect to have introduced into a Parliament by people like the Premier and the minister and the mushrooms on the back bench

who stood shoulder to shoulder with those red-ragging trade unionists last Tuesday. Do you know why you did not have a strike on the Monday? Because it was a rostered day off and they were too lazy to get out of bed! That is what the problem was.

I cannot believe what you people are doing. You are going to put an advocate in that will have more power than a judge. You are going to put an advocate into place who will be in a position to enter into any court in Victoria from the Supreme Court down. This advocate will be able to intervene, but only on behalf of the rights of the workers, never on the rights of the employers. You are going to go in and beat up the small business people again with what you are doing.

Fair dinkum! I cannot believe you pinko socialists of this government. You are really a disgrace. Pinkos, that is what you are! You are leading this state down the road to doom and gloom. You are not doing this for the workers; you are doing this for your trade union mates, those troglodytes from Trades Hall. You are an absolute failure. I can only say to you, you will live to rue the day with what you are doing to the state of Victoria and to industrial relations.

The SPEAKER — Order! Through the Chair!

Mr SMITH — It is just about over for you. On 25 November it is over for them too, Speaker. On 25 November next year the workers, the small business people, are going to throw you lot out of government. For you backbenchers — those backbenchers on that side over there — it will be no good coming back and crying to us later. I can tell you, you will pay the price. This sort of legislation is in fact doing it, so you can —

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! I think this is an appropriate time for the member for Bass to sit down!

Mr HULLS (Attorney-General) — I thank all members but one for their contributions!

This is important legislation, and I guess this basically defines the difference between us and them. We care about Victorian workers; we care about the Victorian families. We all know the dirty secret of those sitting opposite; the dirty, dirty, secret, and we know why they refused to stand up and defend decency. We know why they squirm about this sort of legislation. They squirm because they cannot look Victorian families in the eye because they know full well that Victorian families have already been the guinea pigs for the type of legislation that the federal government wants to introduce.

We know that when Jeff Kennett deregulated the industrial relations system in this state there were something like 350 000 Victorian workers left on an industrial relations scrapheap, with only five lousy conditions. We know that occurred, and finally we were able to do a deal with the federal government to lift those workers up into the federal regime on the basis that they had an award safety net to protect them; on the basis that they had an independent umpire to protect them. What the federal government has done is to renege on a deal. That is what it has done; it has reneged on a deal. It has decided to leave not just Victorian workers but all Australian workers on an industrial relations scrapheap.

That is what the federal legislation is all about. We are very proud on this side of the house to be introducing legislation that will at least try to ameliorate the worst aspects of the federal legislation. The workplace rights advocate will indeed be able to advise workers how they will be worse off in relation to the federal government legislation. I am very proud to stand here in Geelong and be on the side of Victorian workers — and the side of Victorian families — rather than Victorian workers and families just being decimated and assigned to an industrial relations scrap heap.

Some of the paranoia and the anti-worker speeches that have been given from the other side that I have listened to are an absolute disgrace. I was also proud, with my colleagues sitting on this side and those sitting on the other side of the house today, to march with those 175 000 Victorian workers and families earlier this week to send a message to John Howard that we are not prepared to return to the dark, dirty days of the Kennett regime. I certainly wish this legislation a very speedy passage.

House divided on motion:

Ayes, 51

Allan, Ms	Hulls, Mr
Andrews, Mr	Jenkins, Mr
Barker, Ms	Langdon, Mr
Beard, Ms	Languiller, Mr
Beattie, Ms	Leighton, Mr
Bracks, Mr	Lim, Mr
Brumby, Mr	Lobato, Ms
Buchanan, Ms	Lockwood, Mr
Cameron, Mr	Loney, Mr
Carli, Mr	McTaggart, Ms
Crutchfield, Mr	Marshall, Ms
D'Ambrosio, Ms	Maxfield, Mr
Delahunty, Ms	Merlino, Mr
Donnellan, Mr	Mildenhall, Mr
Duncan, Ms	Morand, Ms
Eckstein, Ms	Nardella, Mr
Garbutt, Ms	Neville, Ms
Green, Ms	Overington, Ms

Haermeyer, Mr
Hardman, Mr
Harkness, Dr
Helper, Mr
Herbert, Mr
Holding, Mr
Howard, Mr
Hudson, Mr

Perera, Mr
Robinson, Mr
Seitz, Mr
Stensholt, Mr
Trezise, Mr
Wilson, Mr
Wynne, Mr

Noes, 23

Asher, Ms
Baillieu, Mr
Clark, Mr
Cooper, Mr
Delahunty, Mr
Dixon, Mr
Doyle, Mr
Honeywood, Mr
Kotsiras, Mr
McIntosh, Mr
Maughan, Mr
Mulder, Mr

Naphine, Dr
Perton, Mr
Plowman, Mr
Powell, Mrs
Ryan, Mr
Shardey, Mrs
Smith, Mr
Sykes, Dr
Thompson, Mr
Walsh, Mr
Wells, Mr

Motion agreed to.**Read second time.***Remaining stages***Passed remaining stages.****HEALTH PROFESSIONS REGISTRATION
BILL***Consideration in detail***Debate resumed from 15 November; further
discussion of clause 5 and Mrs SHARDEY's
amendment:**

1. Clause 5, page 14, lines 7 to 33, omit all words and expressions on these lines.

**House divided on omission (members in favour vote
no):***Ayes, 54*

Allan, Ms
Andrews, Mr
Barker, Ms
Beard, Ms
Beattie, Ms
Bracks, Mr
Brumby, Mr
Buchanan, Ms
Cameron, Mr
Carli, Mr
Crutchfield, Mr
D'Ambrosio, Ms
Delahunty, Ms
Donnellan, Mr
Duncan, Ms
Eckstein, Ms

Jenkins, Mr
Langdon, Mr
Languiller, Mr
Leighton, Mr
Lim, Mr
Lindell, Ms
Lobato, Ms
Lockwood, Mr
Lupton, Mr
McTaggart, Ms
Marshall, Ms
Maxfield, Mr
Merlino, Mr
Mildenhall, Mr
Morand, Ms
Munt, Ms

Garbutt, Ms
Green, Ms
Haermeyer, Mr
Hardman, Mr
Harkness, Dr
Helper, Mr
Herbert, Mr
Holding, Mr
Howard, Mr
Hudson, Mr
Hulls, Mr

Nardella, Mr
Neville, Ms
Overington, Ms
Perera, Mr
Robinson, Mr
Seitz, Mr
Stensholt, Mr
Thwaites, Mr
Trezise, Mr
Wilson, Mr
Wynne, Mr

Noes, 25

Asher, Ms
Baillieu, Mr
Clark, Mr
Cooper, Mr
Delahunty, Mr
Dixon, Mr
Doyle, Mr
Honeywood, Mr
Ingram, Mr
Kotsiras, Mr
McIntosh, Mr
Maughan, Mr
Mulder, Mr

Naphine, Dr
Perton, Mr
Plowman, Mr
Powell, Mrs
Ryan, Mr
Savage, Mr
Shardey, Mrs
Smith, Mr
Sykes, Dr
Thompson, Mr
Walsh, Mr
Wells, Mr

Amendment defeated.**Clause agreed to; clauses 6 to 61 agreed to.****Clause 62****Mr DELAHUNTY** (Lowan) — I move:

2. Clause 62, line 30, omit "no" and insert "a".

Speaking quickly to the amendment, we have had many letters from the nurses association, the Australian Medical Association, the psychologists association and others about procedural fairness. We believe it is only right that legal representation be allowed at health panel hearings. This is allowed with approval of the panel but we do not think it should be up to the panel to make that decision. It should be an individual person's right to take a legal representative to a panel hearing.

Mr ANDREWS (Mulgrave) — The member for Lowan has raised an important point, and I make the following comment. Currently no legal representation is available at informal hearings. Under the new arrangements informal hearings are replaced by professional standards panels and health panels. In relation to professional standards panels, the status quo will be maintained and no legal representation will be available. In relation to health panels, where conditions can be placed on a respondent's registration, leave can be sought for legal representation. If leave is sought, leave will be granted.

Amendment defeated; clause agreed to; clauses 63 to 79 agreed to.**Clause 80**

Mrs SHARDEY (Caulfield) — I move:

- Clause 80, page 93, in the Table, omit “psychologist registered psychologist”.

The reason for this amendment is that psychologists around Victoria have complained about this legislation. They have complained that under the current legislation they are totally covered, but they believe many psychologists will not be properly covered under this legislation.

They hold registration under the current act, but not all psychologists are health practitioners; they can be educational psychologists, organisational psychologists and other non-clinical psychologists. The government appears not to have understood the impact of this legislation on these practitioners and has not offered any feasible alternative approach that would accommodate the legitimate questions psychologists have raised. I have an email from a registered psychologist, Penny Brabin, on this issue which says:

The Minister for Health has been misinformed where she believes that psychologists can readily be included in the proposed health professionals registration legislation. As both a discipline as well as a profession, psychologists practise in many domains other than health. The minister is suggesting that those who do not practise in health can be registered as ‘non-practising’ psychologists under the proposed legislation.

However —

Mr Andrews interjected.

Mrs SHARDEY — ‘Non-practising’. If the member likes to refer to clause 11 in the bill, it is very clear. I shall refer to clause 11 where it says that psychologists can be registered as non-practising health practitioners. An educational psychologist suggested to me that the idea was ridiculous in that if you are an educational psychologist should your shingle read, ‘Non-practising psychologist’?

Business interrupted pursuant to standing orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The time set down for consideration of items on the government business program has arrived and I am required to put the following questions. The member for Caulfield has moved an amendment to clause 80. Because this amendment deletes words from the clause the question is:

That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause.

House divided on omission (members in favour vote no):

Ayes, 56

Allan, Ms	Jenkins, Mr
Andrews, Mr	Langdon, Mr
Barker, Ms	Languiller, Mr
Beard, Ms	Leighton, Mr
Beattie, Ms	Lim, Mr
Bracks, Mr	Lindell, Ms
Brumby, Mr	Lobato, Ms
Buchanan, Ms	Lockwood, Mr
Cameron, Mr	Lupton, Mr
Carli, Mr	McTaggart, Ms
Crutchfield, Mr	Marshall, Ms
D’Ambrosio, Ms	Maxfield, Mr
Delahunty, Ms	Merlino, Mr
Donnellan, Mr	Mildenhall, Mr
Duncan, Ms	Morand, Ms
Eckstein, Ms	Munt, Ms
Garbutt, Ms	Nardella, Mr
Green, Ms	Neville, Ms
Haermeyer, Mr	Overington, Ms
Hardman, Mr	Perera, Mr
Harkness, Dr	Robinson, Mr
Helper, Mr	Savage, Mr
Herbert, Mr	Seitz, Mr
Holding, Mr	Stensholt, Mr
Howard, Mr	Thwaites, Mr
Hudson, Mr	Trezise, Mr
Hulls, Mr	Wilson, Mr
Ingram, Mr	Wynne, Mr

Noes, 23

Asher, Ms	Napthine, Dr
Baillieu, Mr	Perton, Mr
Clark, Mr	Plowman, Mr
Cooper, Mr	Powell, Mrs
Delahunty, Mr	Ryan, Mr
Dixon, Mr	Shardey, Mrs
Doyle, Mr	Smith, Mr
Honeywood, Mr	Sykes, Dr
Kotsiras, Mr	Thompson, Mr
McIntosh, Mr	Walsh, Mr
Maughan, Mr	Wells, Mr
Mulder, Mr	

Amendment defeated.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The question is:

That clause 80, clauses 81 to 182 inclusive and schedules 1 to 4 inclusive be agreed to, that the bill be agreed to without amendment and that the bill be read a third time.

House divided on question:

**Ayes, 56*

Allan, Ms	Jenkins, Mr
Andrews, Mr	Langdon, Mr
Barker, Ms	Languiller, Mr

Beard, Ms	Leighton, Mr
Beattie, Ms	Lim, Mr
Bracks, Mr	Lindell, Ms
Brumby, Mr	Lobato, Ms
Buchanan, Ms	Lockwood, Mr
Cameron, Mr	Lupton, Mr
Carli, Mr	McTaggart, Ms
Crutchfield, Mr	Marshall, Ms
D'Ambrosio, Ms	Maxfield, Mr
Delahunty, Ms	Merlino, Mr
Donnellan, Mr	Mildenhall, Mr
Duncan, Ms	Morand, Ms
Eckstein, Ms	Munt, Ms
Garbutt, Ms	Nardella, Mr
Green, Ms	Neville, Ms
Haermeyer, Mr	Overington, Ms
Hardman, Mr	Perera, Mr
Harkness, Dr	Robinson, Mr
Helper, Mr	Savage, Mr
Herbert, Mr	Seitz, Mr
Holding, Mr	Stensholt, Mr
Howard, Mr	Thwaites, Mr
Hudson, Mr	Treize, Mr
Hulls, Mr	Wilson, Mr
Ingram, Mr	Wynne, Mr

Noes, 23

Asher, Ms	Naphine, Dr
Baillieu, Mr	Perton, Mr
Clark, Mr	Plowman, Mr
Cooper, Mr	Powell, Mrs
Delahunty, Mr	Ryan, Mr
Dixon, Mr	Shardey, Mrs
Doyle, Mr	Smith, Mr
Honeywood, Mr	Sykes, Dr
Kotsiras, Mr	Thompson, Mr
McIntosh, Mr	Walsh, Mr
Maughan, Mr	Wells, Mr
Mulder, Mr	

[Division list subsequently corrected; see page 2297]

Question agreed to.

Bill agreed to without amendment.

Remaining stages

Passed remaining stages.

**ROAD SAFETY AND OTHER ACTS
(VEHICLE IMPOUNDMENT AND OTHER
AMENDMENTS) BILL**

Second reading

**Debate resumed from earlier this day; motion of
Mr BATCHELOR (Minister for Transport).**

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The question is:

That this bill be now read a second time and a third time.

Question agreed to.

Read second time.

Remaining stages

Passed remaining stages.

**SUPERANNUATION LEGISLATION
(GOVERNANCE REFORM) BILL**

Second reading

**Debate resumed from 16 November; motion of
Mr BRUMBY (Treasurer).**

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The question is:

That this bill be now read a second time, that circulated government amendments 1 to 12 inclusive be agreed to, and that the bill be read a third time.

Question agreed to.

Read second time.

Circulated amendments

**Circulated government amendments as follows
agreed to:**

1. Clause 6, page 8, line 14, omit "member contributions" and insert "changes to the rate or amount of member contributions made at the direction of a member".
2. Clause 7, page 12, line 1, after "investment of" insert "all or part of the".
3. Clause 9, page 17, after line 33 insert —
 - “(5) Despite sub-section (1)(e) —
 - (a) each of the members of the Board, not being an elected member, in office immediately before the commencement of the **Superannuation Legislation (Governance Reform) Act 2005** continue in office for the remainder of the term for which the member was appointed; and
 - (b) 3 of the members appointed for the purposes of that sub-section as from 1 December 2005 are to be the persons appointed under section 10(1)(b) of the Government Superannuation Act 1999 and in office as members of the Board of Directors of the Government Superannuation Office immediately before the commencement and who are to be members for the remainder of the term for which the member was appointed as a member of the Board of Directors of the Government Superannuation Office —

unless the member ceases to be a member for any of the reasons specified in section 8(1) or is suspended or removed from office.

(6) Despite sub-section (2), the person who immediately before the commencement of the **Superannuation Legislation (Governance Reform) Act 2005** was the President continues, subject to this Act, in office for the remainder of the term for which the person was appointed to be the President.”.

4. Clause 9, page 18, line 1, omit “(5)” and insert “(7)”.
5. Clause 9, page 18, line 5, omit “(6)” and insert “(8)”.
6. Clause 9, page 18, line 5, omit “(5)” and insert “(7)”.
7. Clause 9, page 18, line 11, omit “(7)” and insert “(9)”.
8. Clause 9, page 18, line 13, omit “(8)” and insert “(10)”.
9. Clause 9, page 18, line 16, omit “(9)” and insert “(11)”.
10. Clause 9, page 18, line 23, omit “(10)” and insert “(12)”.
11. Clause 9, page 18, line 27, omit “(11)” and insert “(13)”.
12. Clause 11, page 21, line 24, omit “directly”.

Remaining stages

Passed remaining stages.

DUTIES AND LAND TAX ACTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed from 16 November; motion of Mr BRUMBY (Treasurer).

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The question is:

That this bill be now read a second time, that circulated government amendments 1 to 6 inclusive be agreed to, and that the bill be read a third time.

House divided on question:

Ayes, 55

Allan, Ms	Langdon, Mr
Andrews, Mr	Languiller, Mr
Barker, Ms	Leighton, Mr
Beard, Ms	Lim, Mr
Beattie, Ms	Lindell, Ms
Bracks, Mr	Lobato, Ms
Brumby, Mr	Lockwood, Mr
Buchanan, Ms	Lupton, Mr
Cameron, Mr	McTaggart, Ms
Carli, Mr	Marshall, Ms
Crutchfield, Mr	Maxfield, Mr
D'Ambrosio, Ms	Merlino, Mr

Delahunty, Ms	Mildenhall, Mr
Donnellan, Mr	Morand, Ms
Duncan, Ms	Munt, Ms
Eckstein, Ms	Nardella, Mr
Garbutt, Ms	Neville, Ms
Green, Ms	Overington, Ms
Haermeyer, Mr	Perera, Mr
Hardman, Mr	Robinson, Mr
Harkness, Dr	Savage, Mr
Helper, Mr	Seitz, Mr
Herbert, Mr	Stensholt, Mr
Holding, Mr	Thwaites, Mr
Howard, Mr	Treize, Mr
Hudson, Mr	Wilson, Mr
Hulls, Mr	Wynne, Mr
Jenkins, Mr	

Noes, 24

Asher, Ms	Mulder, Mr
Baillieu, Mr	Napthine, Dr
Clark, Mr	Perton, Mr
Cooper, Mr	Plowman, Mr
Delahunty, Mr	Powell, Mrs
Dixon, Mr	Ryan, Mr
Doyle, Mr	Shardey, Mrs
Honeywood, Mr	Smith, Mr
Ingram, Mr	Sykes, Dr
Kotsiras, Mr	Thompson, Mr
McIntosh, Mr	Walsh, Mr
Maughan, Mr	Wells, Mr

Question agreed to.

Read second time.

Circulated amendments

Circulated government amendments as follows agreed to:

1. Clause 20, page 41, line 4, after “trust” insert “in respect of which a notice is in force under section 52”.
2. Clause 20, page 41, line 15, after “scheme” (where first occurring) insert “in respect of which a notice is in force under section 52A”.
3. Clause 20, page 49, lines 12 to 17, omit all words and expressions on these lines and insert —

“(8) This section does not apply to a unit trust scheme if a notice is in force for the scheme under section 52A.”.

4. Clause 27, page 70, line 4, after “trust” insert “in respect of which a notice is in force under section 46B”.
5. Clause 27, page 70, line 15, after “scheme” (where first occurring) insert “in respect of which a notice is in force under section 46C”.
6. Clause 27, page 78, lines 5 to 10, omit all words and expressions on these lines and insert —

“(8) This section does not apply to a unit trust scheme if a notice is in force for the scheme under section 46C.”.

Remaining stages

Passed remaining stages.

Mr Langdon — On a point of order, Deputy Speaker, I would like to correct the record regarding the division on the Health Professions Registration Bill. I should have recorded 54 ayes but inadvertently said 55.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! I ask the Clerk to correct the record.

Remaining business postponed on motion of Mr CAMERON (Minister for Agriculture).

ADJOURNMENT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The question is:

That the house do now adjourn.

Greater Geelong: child-care centre application

Mr MULDER (Polwarth) — The matter I wish to raise, which is for the attention of the Minister for Local Government in the other place, comes at a most opportune time as this issue also concerns the City of Greater Geelong and its planning department. The matter comes about as a result of an approach by the operators of the Montessori preschool in Yarra Street, which needs the minister’s and the council’s help. The action I seek is for the minister to coordinate with the City of Greater Geelong planning department a process to assist the Montessori preschool, at 221A Yarra Street, Geelong, with its plans to provide a 60-placement child-care centre next door to the preschool centre at 223 Yarra Street.

The reason I raise the matter with the minister is that the success or otherwise of the project could depend on input by the Minister for Community Services and the Minister for Transport. The proponent, Yaso Rasanayagam, faces the problem of having to put together plans for the centre without any assurances from the council as to the number of parking spaces required for the centre. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the facilities are alongside one another, and there is the matter of drop-off and collection times.

There is the potential to share the existing parking spaces between the two facilities and also for the

parents who use the child-care facilities and who work in Melbourne and travel by train to utilise the railway car park adjoining the preschool for parking. The preschool operates from 9.00 a.m. until 3.15 p.m., and the proposed child-minding centre will open at 6.30 a.m. and close at 6.30 p.m. The proponents are prepared to push forward with the development and invest some \$3500 to \$5000 in plans, permits and notices to residents, but it would be of enormous assistance to them if the matter relating to car parking could be resolved prior to this investment taking place. Any requirement to have on-site parking at 223 Yarra Street would jeopardise the placement ratio and business plan.

There are 15-minute car parking spaces allocated for the existing preschool, and it is proposed that council would provide a further five 15-minute car parking spaces on Verner Street, but consideration needs to be given to the following: not all children will be driven to the centre; the child-care centre and the preschool will open and close at different times; and there is available parking on the adjoining railway land for bona fide rail travellers who will use the child-care facility.

There is a growing demand for child care, and this centre would assist parents wishing to work in Melbourne, whereby they would simply drop their children off at the centre and then catch the train. I will forward a copy of the proponent’s information to the planning department of the City of Greater Geelong, but I call on the minister to ensure that any negotiations involving other ministers and departments are carried out swiftly so as not to delay this vital project for Geelong.

There are six Labor Party members in Geelong, and I am sure that all the hard work has been done on this proposal. I have had discussions about it with the mayor and the planning department at the Greater Geelong City Council. I am not sure which one of them wants to go down tomorrow and try to pull the door handle off and work this proposal through, but I am sure the proponent would be grateful if they could get some assistance from the local members as well. It is a very worthwhile project. It enables you to park the car, park the kids and go to work and to reverse the procedure when you are coming home at night.

Geelong Football Club: pre-season competition

Mr TREZISE (Geelong) — I raise an issue for action by the Minister for Sport and Recreation in another place, who is down at Colac today. The issue I raise is the scheduling — or should I say, non-scheduling — of Australian Football League

(AFL) pre-season cup games in 2006 at Skilled Stadium, or, as we know it, Kardinia Park.

As this house is well aware, in March 2006 the focus will be very much on the Commonwealth Games at the Melbourne Cricket Ground, and matches that are part of the Australian Football League pre-season competition will not be played at the MCG, leaving Telstra Dome and Kardinia Park as the only viable arenas in Victoria at which those games could be held. Hence it was very disappointing recently to learn that no games for the pre-season competition have been scheduled at Kardinia Park, despite the Geelong Football Club's request to hold at least Geelong's first-round match there. Instead Geelong's first-round match will be held at night at Telstra Dome against Carlton on 25 February, and to make things worse this match is in fact the second match of a double-header, with Hawthorn and Richmond to play the match prior to the Cats versus Carlton game.

The action I seek is for the minister to work in conjunction with the Geelong Football Club and support its push in seeking to have the AFL reverse this disappointing decision. I describe it as a disappointing decision because I fail to understand it, given that the Geelong Football Club, the Bracks government, the City of Greater Geelong and the AFL have combined to contribute to the \$28 million redevelopment of Kardinia Park. It is a magnificent redevelopment, as you, Deputy Speaker, well know. It has transformed Kardinia Park into a superb football stadium that must be utilised to the maximum degree by the AFL.

As I said, I cannot understand why the AFL did not support the Geelong Football Club's application. As this house is well aware, Geelong is very much a football town committed to supporting the Cats. It is very much a navy blue and white city, and no doubt thousands would have flocked down to Kardinia Park on a warm February afternoon to watch the Cats commence their 2006 campaign.

This decision of the AFL has disappointed not only football followers but also the football club itself. As Brian Cook, the chief executive officer, said recently in the *Geelong Advertiser*:

... both the officials and players are extremely disappointed with the league's decision.

As I said, I can assure the AFL that it is not only the officials and players who are disappointed with the decision — so are the thousands of Cats fans who will follow the Cats throughout 2006.

Schools: apprenticeship project officers

Mr MAUGHAN (Rodney) — I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Education and Training concerning funding for school-based new apprenticeships. There are 38 school-based new apprenticeship project officers throughout the state. Their job is to liaise with industry and provide training opportunities for young people in industry. The project is for students who are not academically inclined but continue with their schooling while they are learning new skills and getting some experience in the work force. It is very strongly supported by schools, and it engages students most of whom would drop out of education without this opportunity. So it keeps them in school, it gives them some good opportunities to gain some training, it provides training where they can get awards for their apprenticeships and so on.

The project provides for 10 to 15 hours per week each week in the work force, and complete modules which are nationally accredited can be credited towards apprenticeships. Some of the opportunities are in the hospitality industry, business administration, the automotive industry, retail, information technology, engineering, turf management and so on. The point is that it takes a great deal of time for these project officers to establish a rapport with employers to build up confidence and trust and to liaise with the school.

As I said, there are 38 of these people around the state. A letter from the deputy secretary of the Office of Tertiary Education and Training states:

I am pleased to advise that an independent review of the initiative has confirmed that this program has successfully achieved the intended outcomes, with preliminary —

numbers —

exceeding 3530 as at 1 August 2005.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your contribution to the success of the program and confirm that the funding of the program will conclude on 31 December 2005.

As I have said, this program has been warmly welcomed by schools. I have had representations from all the secondary colleges in my electorate — Echuca High School, Echuca Secondary College, Key Secondary College, Cohuna Secondary College, St Joseph's Secondary College and Rochester Secondary College, as well as — —

Ms Allan interjected.

Mr MAUGHAN — There are more than that, and I will go on with the list.

Ms Allan — Cheerio time!

Mr MAUGHAN — There is also the Campaspe-Cohuna local network — and I could go on. It has been a great program, and it has been very well received in the community. I ask that the minister review the decision to cut government funding with a view to keeping this excellent program going. That would be warmly welcomed by the students and by the community.

Child care: Churchill

Mr JENKINS (Morwell) — The action I seek is for the Minister for Community Services, who is also the Minister for Children, to do what she can to provide capital assistance for early childhood services in Churchill, and in particular the Churchill Intergenerational Hub and its child-care services. Churchill is a great community, and just last week it celebrated its 40th year. It is a new town, a development that came out of nothing, but it has a great community. Not only that, it has a great number of people who are working together and working with this government on a neighbourhood renewal program.

As many members would know, we have a number of neighbourhood renewal projects going on right across the state, but there is none better than the one in Churchill. At the moment Churchill has a couple of kindergartens, and the Monash University Churchill campus has been able to provide child care for all those people attending the university. Importantly, it has been able to provide child care for the many women who are in continuing education and who would not be able to continue without that child care.

Monash University, the community of Churchill, the Latrobe City Council and the state government have been working for some time as part of the neighbourhood renewal program to see what can be done to make sure that those services, particularly the services provided to young people, children and families, can be coordinated in one place. Currently they are working together under the title 'intergenerational hub' to provide a facility that can bring together child-care services, kindergartens and child welfare and infant welfare nurses, who provide such a great service right across the Latrobe Valley and the Morwell electorate but importantly to the Churchill community, which is isolated from a great number of the services in the central Latrobe Valley.

I ask that the government and the minister do what they can to work with the Latrobe City Council, Monash University and the Monash University student union —

which as we know is under attack from the federal government and which supports women and parents coming back to the work force — and to interact with the community to see what they can do to create a great intergenerational hub but more importantly to provide child-care services to the community.

Police: Geelong and Surf Coast

Mr WELLS (Scoresby) — I raise a matter of concern for the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. The action I ask him to take is to fix the issue of police numbers in the Geelong and Surf Coast area. I have raised this matter on a number of occasions, but the issue has still not been resolved. The Liberal candidate for South Barwon, Michael King, recently circulated a petition in the area which has been lodged in Parliament. It expressed quite clearly the concern in the Surf Coast area about the lack of police.

The Police Association has had an independent report carried out, and it believes the Geelong and South Coast area is understaffed by about 76 officers. It is interesting to note that in answer to a question during question time the Premier stated very clearly that Geelong and Surf Coast had received 25 additional police under Labor. However, at a public meeting in Anglesea on 25 October the district inspector told a public meeting there had been no increase in the number of police in Torquay.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr WELLS — It is interesting to note that Labor members on the back bench are interjecting and saying quite clearly that the local police do not know what they are talking about and have their numbers wrong. The mushrooms on the back bench are very keen to believe what the Premier is saying but not to take the advice of the local police. That might be part of the problem: the local Labor MPs in this area are not batting for the local community and are not taking up the issue with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services or the Premier in order to resolve it.

The Premier also made a commitment that police numbers in Geelong will increase by a further eight. But unfortunately the chief inspector had to come out and make an announcement in the *Geelong Independent* of Friday, 4 November, admitting that the additional police will not be available to Geelong until after the Commonwealth Games. Why would the Premier make an announcement about extra police in Geelong, only to be contradicted by local senior police members, who are saying the extra police will not be available until after the Commonwealth Games?

It is embarrassing for the Premier, for the Minister for Police and Emergency Services and for the Bracks government that they have let down the Geelong area. I call on the police minister to fix this problem. I also call on local Labor MPs to take the issue of police numbers straight to the police minister and the Premier to make sure it is fixed.

Footscray West Primary School: upgrade

Mr MILDENHALL (Footscray) — I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Education Services, representing the Minister for Education and Training. I ask the minister to review and confirm the priority of the second stage of the Footscray West Primary School refurbishment in the lead-up to the 2006 state budget. The school received \$995 000 for stage 1 of the redevelopment in 2004. The second stage of approximately \$2.3 million is eagerly awaited by the school community.

Footscray West Primary School is a leading primary school in the area. It is one of the largest schools and is experiencing steady and strong growth. It is known for its innovative programs in core curriculum areas, but it also has a strong reputation in performing arts and sport in particular. Indeed one of the better known parents and former school councillors is the actor William McInnes, who is an active and enthusiastic community member. Appropriately for my community there are also some family support programs that have been making a real difference for students and their parents.

In the lead-up to the budget considerations the Department of Education and Training has responded sympathetically to a request from the school for urgent repairs to the school roof and the retention of portable classrooms to assist during the construction phase of stage 1.

I request that the minister closely examine the merits of the redevelopment. This is an outstanding school, ably led by the principal, Jeannette Fielding, and an active school council which has augmented this building program with a first-rate fundraising exercise. If organisation, self-help, quality programs, community support and advocacy are taken into account, this school is headed for success.

Timber industry: Otways

Mr PLOWMAN (Benambra) — The logging trucks parked outside this venue this morning were not here by chance. They were here to beg on behalf of their members for fair compensation. On this basis, the issue I wish to raise is for the attention of the Minister

for Environment. It relates to the laying off of timber harvesting and cartage contractors and their employees. I ask that the minister meet with their representatives and negotiate compensation that is commensurate with the loss of income for employees and the financial loss of business suffered by employers.

There are 5 harvesting contractors, 5 cartage contractors and 15 employees of these contractors who are directly involved, and they will lose their jobs or their businesses as a result of the Bracks government's decision to cease timber harvesting in the Otways, as proposed, in 2008.

Despite every effort by Gary Blackwood, the executive officer of the Victorian Forest Harvesting and Cartage Council, he was unable to meet with the Minister for Environment or members of his department. Mr Blackwood was referred to Ian Miles by the minister's adviser, Cameron Robinson, and met with him on 29 August. There has been no response from the minister, Mr Miles or any other member of the department about this issue since that meeting. In an email of 15 November Mr Blackwood said:

We need to keep the pressure on Thwaites to not only provide compensation to these people, but provide the appropriate coupes that will keep them in work until 2008 and take steps which will stop any further protest action between now and 2008. Labor has sacrificed the jobs of country Victorians for a handful of green votes, so at least have the guts to tell the Greens to bugger off and let these forest workers finish their last days in the bush in peace.

I ask the minister to respond to this request, not just on behalf of contractors but for all those employees who are looking at a very sad future.

Lake Connearre: environmental values project

Ms NEVILLE (Bellarine) — I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Environment. The action I seek is that he provide funding to the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA) to implement the Lake Connearre values project. Lake Connearre is an important environmental asset in my community. It forms part of the Port Phillip Bay western shoreline and stretches through Leopold, Wallington and Barwon Heads. The lake is listed under the Ramsar convention on wetlands. It has high vegetation richness, with 137 native plant species recorded. Of the salt marsh species which occur in Victoria, 85 per cent occur around Lake Connearre, and over the years the site has supported significant recreational activity.

Over the last 10 years local residents, particularly in Leopold, have raised concerns about the changes occurring in the lake. They have been concerned that both environmental and recreational values are being impacted by these changes. In 2004 the residents established the Lake Connewarre restoration group through the efforts of Ron Scotland as president, Bob Pohlman, Frant Bucek and Barb Dennis. I wrote to the minister asking for his assistance in addressing their concerns, and as a result in 2004 he established a working group, which I chair. The group has brought together the local residents and the key agencies such as the CCMA, Parks Victoria, the City of Greater Geelong and the Department of Sustainability and Environment.

The working group has a brief to undertake research to understand the causes of the changes over the last 150 years, to better understand the current health of the lake and to establish a plan for its better management into the future. One of the key elements agreed to by the group has been to undertake the Lake Connewarre values project. This project has a number of objectives, including the utilisation of existing information to develop a health report card for the lake; to assist in identifying knowledge gaps and whether further monitoring and investigations are required; to identify assets or values associated with the lake; to develop health indicator parameters and identify actual or potentially threatening processes; and to enable the development of an agreed action plan to mitigate the risks and improve the health of the lake. This project requires funding additional to the current capacity of the agencies.

The working group has developed the objectives and is ready to proceed, but it requires a commitment of additional resources. The local community has worked hard to protect the future of the lake, and we are making significant progress. However, I again ask the minister to support this important project for the residents of Leopold, Wallington and Barwon Heads by providing resources to undertake this very important work.

Hamilton Special Development School: traffic management

Mr DELAHUNTY (Lowan) — I wish to raise a matter for the Minister for Education Services, and I am pleased to see she is at the table tonight. The matter relates to the Hamilton Special Development School, which I visited to present it with a Commonwealth Games flag about a month or so ago. It is one of 54 schools in my electorate. I was dismayed at the traffic management issues, the state of Kerr Street and the pick-up areas for students at the school.

The action I ask of the minister is that she direct resources to address three issues: firstly, the development of Kerr Street to a sealed road and the establishment of a footpath to cater for students in wheelchairs; secondly, to provide a pick-up and drop-off drive-through area on the site; and thirdly, to finalise the school boundary line and provide a safe school site which is securely fenced.

Back in August the school president, Karen Collins, wrote to inform me that the school had been allocated a 1.2-hectare site at the old Kent Street primary school. The school has been working patiently with the Department of Education and Training and Southern Grampians shire to address the issues I have outlined. Unfortunately, the school has been in limbo for the last three years while trying to resolve these issues. The property is on a private street, which means that the adjoining land-holders have to construct the road, and the education department is a land-holder on one side of the street. When I visited the school a month or so ago, it was the day after some good country rain. There was mud everywhere, and it was making it very difficult for taxis and parents to pick up students. There were major concerns not only for the parents but also for the staff at the school.

Today I received a letter from Jan Uebergang, the secretary of Taxis of Hamilton Pty Ltd, who has also written to the minister and other ministers on this matter, and I will quote from that letter, which states:

I am writing in regard to the congestion our drivers are facing with the loading and unloading at our special development school in Hamilton. We have serious concerns for the safe operating of our drivers and students alike.

I also received a letter from the school, which states:

At the moment we are negotiating with the education department and discussions are progressing quite well in relation to our proposed new boundaries. We are also having dialogue with the shire council regarding a new design for the Kerr Street streetscape. This design needs to incorporate a safe way of delivery and picking up students each day. Perhaps a drive-through effect at the front of the school.

I believe the minister needs to fast-track this matter and, in cooperation with the school, resolve the issues with the Southern Grampians shire. It is a diabolical situation and these issues must be addressed not only for the safety of the students, staff and taxi drivers, but also the parents.

Disability services: legislation

Mr PERERA (Cranbourne) — I rise to bring a matter to the attention of the Minister for Community Services, who is also the Minister for Children. I note

the minister has just released an exposure draft for new disability legislation as part of the Bracks government's ongoing revitalisation of support services for people with disabilities in Victoria. I have only had a fairly quick look at the draft so far but it certainly looks very promising. I see that it includes a number of changes which reflect the government's new approach to people with disabilities, an approach which is based on the individuality and citizenship of every person with a disability, and the importance of building a more inclusive and accessible community.

While I commend the minister for accompanying the bill with some really excellent resources that help explain the legislation in simple language, I also ask her to take action to ensure that members of the public who are not able to meet the consultation deadline of 23 December are given extra time to provide their feedback. I am sure the community will be very pleased to see this legislation, but I am also aware that people will want to make some comments about it. Given the complexity of the issues I imagine that is going to take some time, especially for people with disabilities and their carers who might not be used to wading their way through complex legislation.

I see this as landmark legislation underpinning the landmark policies that have already been set out in the state disability plan. It reinforces what this government has been saying and doing ever since it came to office: that disability is everybody's issue across government and across the community. It is a great opportunity for Victoria to again show itself to be a national leader when it comes to innovation and good ideas in supporting people with disabilities. I ask the minister to ensure that we make the most of the opportunity and that everyone gets a chance to have their say.

Responses

Ms ALLAN (Minister for Education Services) — The member for Footscray raised a matter for me to take up with the Minister for Education and Training regarding Footscray West Primary School. I agree with the member for Footscray's comments that Footscray West is a leading school and has a terrific performing arts and sports program. I understand that the member has a close interest in the capital works program under way at the school and has made vigorous representations to the minister on the need for approvals for the second stage. I can assure the member for Footscray that I will also make clear his views to the Minister for Education and Training, and I am sure a response will be forthcoming for the local member.

Also on behalf of the Minister for Education and Training I wish to respond to the matter raised by the member for Rodney regarding the school-based new apprentice coordinator positions, which are finishing up at the end of this year. The member outlined the benefits of the program in his electorate over the last three years. I understand that he has written to the minister requesting a review of this decision. I will pass the concerns of the local member along to the minister. The member for Rodney has always taken a very strong interest in young people in his electorate. I know that from experience, having visited the Campaspe shire in the last couple of years. I understand his concerns, and I will be raising those with the Minister for Education and Training.

The member for Lowan raised a matter for me as the Minister for Education Services. In responding to these matters I wish The Nationals a very merry Christmas and look forward to being with them next year.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms ALLAN — I think The Nationals' wish is that Santa brings them a Liberal Party eradication program for their own electorates. But we will leave that one there.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms ALLAN — The Liberal Party eradication program: they are the pests in The Nationals' electorates!

The member for Lowan raised a matter regarding the Hamilton Special Developmental School. Certainly the member for Lowan is a strong advocate for the schools in his electorate, and in particular the Hamilton Special Developmental School, which does a great job in supporting students with special needs in his community. He highlighted three issues, and I have been advised by the department this afternoon that it is working closely with the school to resolve the issues he is concerned about.

Going to each of those issues, he firstly spoke about the upgrade of Kerr Street, looking for the sealing of the road to enable access to the school. The department is engaged in discussions with the Southern Grampians shire in planning for those works to be undertaken, and there is the capacity for the Department of Education and Training to assist the shire through its Good Neighbour program. I would encourage the local member to take up those discussions with the department and the shire.

The second matter was about further work on parking and drop-off facilities for students at Hamilton Special Developmental School. I understand that the need for bus drop-off facilities and staff parking is going to be addressed as part of the negotiations that are under way between the department and the shire.

The third matter was about the school boundaries. The advice from the department is that it has recently received confirmation from the school about its desired boundaries, and it is now going through the necessary process to facilitate the required subdivision to enable that to progress. It anticipates that there will be no problems with this process regarding the department's land. I trust that these responses clarify the matter for the member for Lowan.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The Minister for Community Services, responding to matters raised by the members for Morwell and Cranbourne, and then as the minister at the table responding to matters raised for the Minister for Environment by the members for Benambra and Bellarine, for the Minister for Police and Emergency Services by the member for Scoresby, for the Minister for Sport and Recreation in another place by the member for Geelong, and for the Minister for Local Government in another place by the member for Polwarth.

Ms GARBUTT (Minister for Community Services) — The member for Morwell raised with me an issue of funding for Churchill Intergenerational Community Hub. He has followed this project for a long time now and spoken to me before about it. Indeed he has been lobbying very vigorously for it. He has asked for funds for the children's part of it and has indicated an application has been put in for funding from our children's hub projects, which is part of a \$16 million fund for early learning centres, where we are providing integrated, more accessible and a better range of children's services all coming together on the one site. The proposal certainly sounds very exciting and innovative and has a lot of support. I will certainly be giving that application very serious consideration.

The member for Cranbourne has raised an issue about the exposure draft of the new disability bill that I released yesterday. He has taken a great interest in the review process, which has led to major reforms being proposed in the exposure draft. This has taken two years of work, led by the member for Derrimut on this occasion, with a range of reform proposals including residential tenancy rights for disabled people living in community residential units; a disability services commissioner to address complaints issues; disability action plans being compulsory for government departments; and a vast

range of other issues that we have addressed as well. Submissions at this stage are to close on 23 December, but I indicate to the member for Cranbourne that if people or organisations need extra time, they should contact the Department of Human Services to arrange for that.

The members for Polwarth, Geelong, Scoresby, Benambra and Bellarine raised a number of issues — —

Mr Walsh — On a point of order, Deputy Speaker, I would like to point out the fact that we have all had a great day here in Geelong. The ministers have enjoyed the social events of the day but have gone home — —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! There is no point of order.

Ms GARBUTT — I will refer those matters to the appropriate ministers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! Before adjourning the house I first bring to the notice of the house the mace holder that has been used in today's session. It is a special mace holder which has been made from native Geelong timbers designed and made especially for today's sitting by Mr Mark McDonald and students of the Gordon TAFE college. It will become a lasting memento of this special day and will go into the Parliament's collection.

On behalf of the Speaker, I believe members on all sides of the house wish to thank parliamentary staff for their contribution to today's sitting both in the lead-up to today — and there were many hours of work required in order to put the sitting into place — and for the work today to make this day a success. Some will still have some hours of work to do when we leave this place. A great deal of work has been done to make a day such as this run smoothly and successfully. I am sure all members would pass on their thanks to all of the parliamentary staff who have contributed to the day. Finally, I wish all members a safe trip home.

The house stands adjourned.

House adjourned 9.54 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

*Answers to the following questions on notice were circulated on the date shown.
Questions have been incorporated from the notice paper of the Legislative Assembly.
Answers have been incorporated in the form supplied by the departments on behalf of the appropriate ministers.
The portfolio of the minister answering the question on notice starts each heading.*

Tuesday, 15 November 2005

Employment and youth affairs: ministerial international travel

575. Ms ASHER to ask the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs —

- (1) Did the Minister take any international trips in —
 - (a) 2003–2004;
 - (b) 2002–2003.
- (2) If so —
 - (a) what were the dates of travel;
 - (b) what were the destinations of travel;
 - (c) what were the purposes of the travel.

ANSWER:

I am informed as follows:

The response is nil.

WorkCover: Shannon's Way Pty Ltd

596(ao). Ms ASHER to ask the Minister for WorkCover — with reference to Shannon's Way Pty Ltd —

- (1) What payments have been made to the company by the Minister's department or private office or any agency or statutory body under the Minister's administration since 28 October 2003.
- (2) On what dates were the payments made.
- (3) Briefly describe the project for which payment was made.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This information has been previously provided to the Member under Freedom of Information.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Answers to the following questions on notice were circulated on the date shown.

Questions have been incorporated from the notice paper of the Legislative Assembly.

Answers have been incorporated in the form supplied by the departments on behalf of the appropriate ministers.

The portfolio of the minister answering the question on notice starts each heading.

Thursday, 17 November 2005

Transport: unanswered questions on notice

441. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — when will questions 77, 225, 253, 254, 343, 350, 352, 372, 373, 375, 381, 382, 388b and 389 asked between 25 March 2003 and 25 November 2003 be answered.

ANSWER:

All questions mentioned above have been answered.

Transport: rail — Ararat/ Bairnsdale services

713. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — since the resumption of V/Line passenger rail services to Bairnsdale on 3 May 2004 and Ararat on 11 July 2004 until 18 May 2005, for each of first class and economy tickets for both adult and concession fares, how many single, ordinary return, weekday Super Saver and Weekend saver journeys were made between Spencer Street; Flinders Street; Caulfield; Dandenong; North Melbourne; Footscray; Ballarat; Warragul; Moe; Morwell; Traralgon and —

- (1) Rosedale.
- (2) Sale.
- (3) Stratford.
- (4) Bairnsdale.
- (5) Lakes Entrance.
- (6) Beaufort.
- (7) Ararat.
- (8) Stawell.
- (9) Murtoa.
- (10) Horsham.
- (11) Dimboola.
- (12) Nhill.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is as per the attached table.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 713

Total journeys between Spencer Street, Flinders Street, Caulfield, Dandenong, Warragul, Moe, Morwell, Traralgon and Rosedale, Sale, Stratford, Bairnsdale, Lakes Entrance between 03/05/04 and 18/05/05									
From	To	Class	Adult Single	Adult Return	Adult OFF Peak	Adult Weekend Saver	Concession Single	Concession Return	Concession OFF Peak
Caulfield	Bairnsdale	F	207	40	13	5	205	200	18
	Bairnsdale	Y	582	110	32	4	783	516	77
	Lakes Entrance	F	12	8	3	1	13	22	5
	Lakes Entrance	Y	38	16	5	0	61	160	9
	Rosedale	F	1	1	0	0	4	1	0
	Rosedale	Y	19	4	0	1	21	9	4
	Stratford	F	9	1	0	0	8	3	3
	Stratford	Y	21	7	2	0	50	25	3
	Sale	F	156	53	18	5	122	88	27
	Sale	Y	674	133	29	8	654	348	69
Dandenong	Bairnsdale	F	119	24	8	0	225	189	14
	Bairnsdale	Y	890	167	45	16	1,615	967	123
	Lakes Entrance	F	5	3	0	0	25	40	2
	Lakes Entrance	Y	76	30	9	1	219	340	33
	Rosedale	F	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Rosedale	Y	16	1	0	0	58	22	2
	Stratford	F	3	0	0	0	10	9	0
	Stratford	Y	40	10	1	1	61	42	1
	Sale	F	146	32	12	2	183	52	10
	Sale	Y	959	188	36	9	1,492	838	134
Spencer Street	Bairnsdale	F	1,123	427	240	23	1,185	1,568	164
	Bairnsdale	Y	4,728	1,551	616	102	4,794	5,013	837
	Lakes Entrance	F	44	24	11	0	64	201	40
	Lakes Entrance	Y	364	165	37	0	485	1,608	164
	Rosedale	F	21	1	1	3	19	38	15
	Rosedale	Y	135	25	8	3	160	102	26
	Stratford	F	61	27	12	7	40	58	11
	Stratford	Y	242	74	53	20	204	176	73
	Sale	F	1,283	493	207	14	4,735	769	233
	Sale	Y	4,891	1,192	568	180	5,230	3,263	859
Flinders Street	Bairnsdale	F	137	25	13	2	219	20	7
	Bairnsdale	Y	709	75	33	7	926	102	30
	Lakes Entrance	F	12	1	0	0	30	2	0
	Lakes Entrance	Y	80	9	7	0	118	33	4
	Rosedale	F	5	1	2	0	8	3	1
	Rosedale	Y	22	2	4	0	56	3	2
	Stratford	F	12	3	1	0	16	0	0
	Stratford	Y	72	3	1	0	90	2	0
	Sale	F	293	19	21	3	168	9	6
	Sale	Y	672	73	39	10	802	129	37
Moe	Bairnsdale	F	17	3	2	0	95	11	4
	Bairnsdale	Y	142	27	15	1	383	210	56
	Lakes Entrance	F	2	0	0	0	2	1	0

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 713

Total journeys between Spencer Street, Flinders Street, Caulfield, Dandenong, Warragul, Moe, Morwell, Traralgon and Rosedale, Sale, Stratford, Bairnsdale, Lakes Entrance between 03/05/04 and 18/05/05									
Moe	Lakes Entrance	Y	19	4	0	0	71	62	3
	Rosedale	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rosedale	Y	2	2	0	0	27	4	9
	Stratford	F	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Stratford	Y	3	1	1	0	12	6	2
	Sale	F	3	0	0	0	27	13	1
	Sale	Y	185	24	22	1	326	115	119
Morwell	Bairnsdale	F	19	2	0	0	43	22	0
	Bairnsdale	Y	232	28	10	2	642	253	81
	Lakes Entrance	F	0	0	0	0	1	31	0
	Lakes Entrance	Y	22	2	2	0	61	58	10
	Rosedale	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rosedale	Y	66	11	4	1	82	9	2
	Stratford	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Stratford	Y	5	0	1	1	19	3	5
	Sale	F	9	0	0	0	26	5	2
	Sale	Y	367	48	60	8	1,022	296	367
Traralgon	Bairnsdale	F	20	4	8	1	83	46	11
	Bairnsdale	Y	478	64	39	8	985	317	108
	Lakes Entrance	F	1	0	0	0	9	3	2
	Lakes Entrance	Y	33	9	6	0	116	74	22
	Rosedale	F	0	0	0	2	3	0	0
	Rosedale	Y	252	7	22	2	383	78	15
	Stratford	F	1	0	0	2	1	0	0
	Stratford	Y	19	1	0	2	35	2	0
	Sale	F	31	1	10	1	42	9	7
	Sale	Y	969	136	255	37	2,288	397	554
Warragul	Bairnsdale	F	13	3	3	0	31	29	7
	Bairnsdale	Y	184	25	14	1	513	225	36
	Lakes Entrance	F	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
	Lakes Entrance	Y	17	2	1	0	39	40	3
	Rosedale	F	1	0	0	0	2	1	0
	Rosedale	Y	7	0	0	0	17	2	2
	Stratford	F	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
	Stratford	Y	9	0	0	0	3	1	1
	Sale	F	5	1	0	0	9	13	6
	Sale	Y	170	15	4	7	292	78	55

Note: (F) Full Fare
(Y) Economy Fare

Attachment LA 713

Total journeys made between Spencer Street, Flinders Street, North Melbourne, Footscray, Ballarat, and Beaufort, Ararat, Stawell, Murtoa, Horsham, Dimboola, Nhill from 11/07/04 to 18/05/05									
Flinders Street	Ararat	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ararat	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Beaufort	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Beaufort	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Dimboola	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Dimboola	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Horsham	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Horsham	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Murtoa	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Murtoa	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Nhill	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Nhill	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Stawell	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Stawell	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Melbourne	Ararat	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ararat	Y	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Beaufort	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Beaufort	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Dimboola	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Dimboola	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Horsham	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Horsham	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Murtoa	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Murtoa	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Nhill	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Nhill	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Stawell	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Stawell	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: (F) Full Fare
(Y) Economy Fare

Transport: V/Line — revenue

714. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — since the resumption of V/Line passenger rail services to Bairnsdale on 3 May 2004 and Ararat on 11 July 2004 until 18 May 2005, what has been the total revenue for each of first class and economy tickets for both adult and concession fares for single, ordinary return, weekday Super Saver and Weekend saver tickets from the following stations —

- (1) Spencer Street.
- (2) Flinders Street.
- (3) Caulfield.
- (4) Dandenong.
- (5) North Melbourne.

- (6) Footscray.
- (7) Ballarat.
- (8) Warragul.
- (9) Moe.
- (10) Morwell.
- (11) Traralgon.
- (12) Rosedale.
- (13) Sale.
- (14) Stratford.
- (15) Bairnsdale.
- (16) Lakes Entrance.
- (17) Beaufort.
- (18) Ararat.
- (19) Stawell.
- (20) Murtoa.
- (21) Horsham.
- (22) Dimboola.
- (23) Nhill.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is shown on the attached Table.

There is no Weekend Saver Concession ticket category, the Weekend saver ticket category applies to Adult fares only.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 17 November 2005

ASSEMBLY

2313

Attachment LA 714

Revenue from tickets sold for Bairnsdale line services from selected stations, selected ticket types between 03/05/2004 & 18/05/2005

Location	Class	Single Adult	Off-Peak Saver Adult	Week-End Saver Adult	Return Adult	Single Concession	Off-Peak Saver Concession	Return Concession
Ararat Station	First	115.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ararat Station	Econ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.90	0.00	125.20
Bairnsdale Station	Econ.	128,962.20	34,184.50	6,045.00	163,588.90	93,354.50	29,064.20	171,619.85
Bairnsdale Station	First	50,033.10	14,098.40	2,523.80	38,174.20	18,775.40	5,659.30	41,901.10
Ballarat Station	Econ.	114.30	247.40	0.00	3,050.00	96.40	240.90	5,033.70
Ballarat Station	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	143.10	0.00	0.00	432.50
Beaufort	Econ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Beaufort	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Caulfield	Econ.	9,246.60	595.00	216.10	18,102.90	5,404.90	785.90	14,564.40
Caulfield	First	5,483.70	595.80	86.20	3,828.10	2,064.80	122.90	3,323.30
Dandenong	Econ.	10,986.50	558.80	294.30	26,493.00	9,406.80	969.30	29,646.30
Dandenong	First	1,788.00	241.80	0.00	2,520.80	1,131.90	250.70	3,126.10
Dimboola	Econ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dimboola	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Flinders Street Station	First	5,930.40	1,424.40	172.40	8,517.70	2,211.60	653.10	3,366.25
Flinders Street Station	Econ.	20,948.10	4,070.40	0.00	43,313.00	14,192.30	1,748.30	28,171.15
Footscray	Econ.	47.10	58.60	0.00	1,137.60	41.40	28.70	1,105.60
Footscray	First	58.80	0.00	0.00	82.00	28.80	0.00	59.30
Horsham	Econ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	396.90	24.70	105.50	294.10
Horsham	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lakes Entrance	First	469.20	382.60	270.50	1,179.80	265.00	572.90	2,183.60
Lakes Entrance	Econ.	669.90	1,532.70	370.10	19,702.10	1,103.20	4,808.90	34,321.10
Moe Station	First	153.10	0.00	0.00	193.40	402.70	84.10	615.30
Moe Station	Econ.	1,077.80	152.20	0.00	2,651.90	1,217.20	566.90	6,893.80
Morwell Station	First	233.20	0.00	0.00	256.90	179.90	0.00	196.40
Morwell Station	Econ.	892.90	97.80	56.60	4,068.70	2,086.60	502.90	7,004.90
Nhill	Econ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nhill	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
North Melbourne Station	Econ.	41.00	0.00	0.00	80.30	41.80	0.00	175.70
North Melbourne Station	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.80	0.00	0.00
Rosedale	First	18.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rosedale	Econ.	0.00	18.70	0.00	46.60	40.70	0.00	52.60
Sale Station	Econ.	3,285.30	701.20	88.40	7,806.20	4,309.70	797.20	9,356.30
Sale Station	First	680.00	0.00	38.80	699.90	61.00	12.60	101.70
Spencer Street Station	Econ.	35,380.00	5,654.60	404.20	114,765.70	11,383.80	2,585.00	51,499.35
Spencer Street Station	First	12,267.60	2,127.50	86.20	13,607.80	2,678.00	342.60	5,064.00
Stawell Station	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stawell Station	Econ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	179.00
Stratford Station	First	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stratford Station	Econ.	376.70	51.20	0.00	2,628.00	554.20	84.50	2,632.30
Traralgon Station	Econ.	3,282.60	596.80	72.70	7,070.10	3,643.80	672.50	9,252.20
Traralgon Station	First	321.40	131.70	0.00	535.60	360.00	35.30	448.60
Warragul Station	Econ.	2,099.30	329.10	0.00	3,276.40	2,314.90	236.20	5,077.90
Warragul Station	First	281.80	55.20	0.00	234.20	118.00	27.60	535.10

Transport: pensioner concession vouchers

716. **Mr MULDER** to ask the Minister for Transport — since 3 May 2004 for the Bairnsdale service and 11 July 2004 for the Ararat service, how many free pensioner concession vouchers have been issued between Spencer Street; Flinders Street; Caulfield; Dandenong; North Melbourne; Footscray; Ballarat; Warragul; Moe; Morwell; Traralgon and —

- (1) Rosedale.
- (2) Sale.
- (3) Stratford.
- (4) Bairnsdale.
- (5) Lakes Entrance.
- (6) Beaufort.
- (7) Ararat.
- (8) Stawell.
- (9) Murtoa.
- (10) Horsham.
- (11) Dimboola.
- (12) Nhill.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

V/Line has provided the following data on the number of vouchers issued for travel to and from the listed stations (1–12) where journeys originate or terminate at any of the following stations: Spencer Street, Flinders Street, Caulfield, Dandenong, North Melbourne, Footscray, Ballarat, Warragul, Moe, Morwell and Traralgon since 3 May 2004 for the Bairnsdale service and 11 July 2004 for the Ararat service to 18 May 2005.

- (1) Rosedale 140;
- (2) Sale 6,482;
- (3) Stratford 240;
- (4) Bairnsdale 12,006;
- (5) Lakes Entrance 124;
- (6) Beaufort 80;
- (7) Ararat 3,112;
- (8) Stawell 519;
- (9) Murtoa 27;
- (10) Horsham 601;
- (11) Dimboola 99 and
- (12) Nhill 104

Transport: traffic growth

725. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to each of Stud Road, Springvale Road, Canterbury Road, Burwood Highway and Monash Freeway —

- (1) What is the estimated growth of vehicular traffic for —
 - (a) 2004–05;
 - (b) 2005–06;
 - (c) 2006–07.
- (2) At what points on each road is traffic counted.
- (3) What was the date of the most recent survey and how many vehicles were using each road at each traffic counting point on that date.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

1. There is no information available.

2. & 3.

Information is contained in the attached tables.

12HR – The typical mean midweek 12 hour volume from 7AM to 7PM.

24HR – The typical mean midweek 24 hour volume.

Attachment LA 725

Question 2 & 3

Abbreviations used:

Movement Type	
AllMvs	All vehicle movements counted
L.Miss	Left turns missing for this approach
R.Miss	Right turns missing for this approach
OffRmpLM	Off Ramp Volume – Left turns missing for this approach
OffRamp	Off Ramp Volume

Table 1 – Stud Road

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
79	1	0267	Stud Rd N of S.E.Arterial	S	L.Miss	081 G12	11482	14454	9-Apr-2000
79	5	0267	Stud Rd S of S.E.Arterial	N	L.Miss	081 G12	11363	14323	9-Apr-2000
131	1	0456	Stud Rd N of Ferntree Gully Rd	S	L.Miss	072 J07	19646	29141	20-Feb-2005
131	5	0456	Stud Rd S of Ferntree Gully Rd	N	L.Miss	072 J07	23093	28889	20-Feb-2005
141	1	0646	Stud Rd N of Clow St	S	L.Miss	090 F07	12609	15885	16-Nov-2003

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 17 November 2005

ASSEMBLY

2317

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
141	5	0646	Stud Rd S of Clow St	N	L.Miss	090 F07	13592	16827	16-Nov-2003
149	1	0661	Stud Rd N of Heatherton Rd	S	L.Miss	090 F03	16921	21567	7-Dec-2003
149	5	0661	Stud Rd S of Heatherton Rd	N	L.Miss	090 F03	15213	19689	7-Dec-2003
150	1	0662	Stud Rd N of Brady Rd	S	L.Miss	081 G11	20217	26229	13-Feb-2005
150	5	0662	Stud Rd S of Brady Rd	N	L.Miss	081 G11	19085	24781	13-Feb-2005
150	11	0662	Stud Rd N of Brady Rd	S	AllMvs	081 G11	19202	24651	2-Apr-2000
150	15	0662	Stud Rd S of Brady Rd	N	AllMvs	081 G11	20745	26408	2-Apr-2000
161	1	0784	Stud Rd N of Wellington Rd	S	L.Miss	081 J03	22095	27772	20-May-2001
161	5	0784	Stud Rd S of Wellington Rd	N	L.Miss	081 J03	19361	24728	20-May-2001
1150	93		Stud Rd btw High St Rd & Mockridge St	N	AllMvs	072 J02	25238	31846	21-Nov-2004
1150	94		Stud Rd btw High St Rd & Mockridge St	S	AllMvs	072 J02	22465	29712	21-Nov-2004
1520	1	0671	Stud Rd N of David St	S	AllMvs	090 F05	16182	20380	13-Feb-2005
1520	5	0671	Stud Rd S of David St	N	AllMvs	090 F05	15310	18946	13-Feb-2005
1531	1	0785	Stud Rd N of High St Rd	S	AllMvs	072 J01	20679	26229	20-Feb-2005
1531	5	0785	Stud Rd S of High St Rd	N	L.Miss	072 J01	18800	23836	20-Feb-2005
1729	1	0175	Stud Rd N of TAFE College Ent	S	AllMvs	063 J12	20533	25699	21-Jun-2000
1729	5	0175	Stud Rd S of TAFE College Ent	N	AllMvs	063 J12	21473	26432	21-Jun-2000
2002	1	0782	Stud Rd N of Turramurra Dr	S	AllMvs	081 J02	24071	30257	13-May-2001
2002	5	0782	Stud Rd S of Turramurra Dr	N	AllMvs	081 J02	23749	29910	13-May-2001
2106	1	0781	Stud Rd N of George St	S	AllMvs	072 J04	21588	27370	30-Jul-2001
2106	5	0781	Stud Rd S of George St	N	L.Miss	072 J04	22254	27533	30-Jul-2001
2642	1	0795	Stud Rd N of Fulham Rd	S	L.Miss	072 J12	19832	25254	22-Jun-1999
2642	5	0795	Stud Rd S of Fulham Rd	N	AllMvs	072 J12	20201	25494	22-Jun-1999
3220	3		Stud Rd SW of Burwood Hwy	NE	AllMvs	063 J11	22651	0	29-May-2002
3458	1		Stud Rd N of Brady Rd	S	AllMvs	081 G11	18708	24320	29-Mar-2000
3458	3		Stud Rd S of Brady Rd	N	AllMvs	081 G11	20469	27019	29-Mar-2000
5175	1	0786	Stud Rd N of Kelletts Rd	S	L.Miss	072 J10	21758	28691	13-Feb-2005
5175	5	0786	Stud Rd S of Kelletts Rd	N	AllMvs	072 J10	23726	30818	13-Feb-2005
5432	1	0799	Stud Rd N of Nubrik Ent	S	AllMvs	072 J03	22005	28306	7-Mar-2000
5432	5	0799	Stud Rd S of Nubrik Ent	N	AllMvs	072 J03	23225	29240	7-Mar-2000
5893	4	0391	Stud Rd SE of Centre Rd	NW	L.Miss	072 J08	28160	35035	11-Jun-2000
5893	8	0391	Stud Rd NW of Centre Rd	SE	AllMvs	072 J08	27295	34625	11-Jun-2000
14145	7996		Stud Rd btw Wellington Rd & Seebeck Rd	N	AllMvs	081 H08	21887	28347	23-Mar-2005
14145	7997		Stud Rd btw Wellington Rd & Seebeck Rd	S	AllMvs	081 H08	21433	28405	22-Mar-2005
20363	1		Stud Rd N of Ferntree Gully Rd	S	AllMvs	072 J07	22141	0	16-May-2002
20363	3		Stud Rd S of Ferntree Gully Rd	N	AllMvs	072 J07	26566	0	16-May-2002
20365	1		Stud Rd N of Wellington Rd	S	AllMvs	081 J03	24153	0	9-May-2002

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
20365	3		Stud Rd S of Wellington Rd	N	AllMvs	081 J03	21526	0	9-May-2002
20367	1		Stud Rd N of Clow St	S	AllMvs	090 F07	14892	0	14-May-2002
20367	3		Stud Rd S of Clow St	N	AllMvs	090 F07	15562	0	14-May-2002
20458	1		Stud Rd N of Bergins Rd	S	AllMvs	081 H03	20753	0	27-May-2003
20458	3		Stud Rd S of Bergins Rd	N	AllMvs	081 H03	22246	0	27-May-2003
20478	1		Stud Rd N of Monash Fwy	S	AllMvs	081 G12	24507	31367	25-Nov-2003
20478	3		Stud Rd S of Monash Fwy	N	AllMvs	081 G12	17344	22207	25-Nov-2003

Table 2

Springvale Road

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
58	1	0117	Springvale Rd N of Maroondah Hwy	S	AllMvs	048 F09	26255	35681	16-Mar-2004
58	5	0117	Springvale Rd S of Maroondah Hwy	N	L.Miss	048 F09	20323	27502	16-Mar-2004
77	1	0265	Springvale Rd N of S.E.Arterial	S	L.Miss	071 B10	21804	26983	8-Jun-2003
77	5	0265	Springvale Rd S of S.E.Arterial	N	AllMvs	071 B10	22497	27564	8-Jun-2003
109	1	0411	Springvale Rd N of Hawthorn Rd	S	AllMvs	062 D05	25320	33329	21-Mar-2004
109	5	0411	Springvale Rd S of Hawthorn Rd	N	AllMvs	062 D05	22894	30500	22-Mar-2005
110	1	0413	Springvale Rd N of Springfield Rd	S	AllMvs	048 F08	24520	32833	15-Mar-1998
110	5	0413	Springvale Rd S of Springfield Rd	N	AllMvs	048 F08	26226	34758	13-Aug-2001
113	1	0417	Springvale Rd N of Canterbury Rd	S	L.Miss	062 E02	19938	25892	8-Jun-2003
113	5	0417	Springvale Rd S of Canterbury Rd	N	L.Miss	062 E02	16020	21522	8-Jun-2003
115	1	0420	Springvale Rd N of Highbury Rd	S	L.Miss	062 D09	24941	31780	8-Jun-2003
115	5	0420	Springvale Rd S of Highbury Rd	N	L.Miss	062 D09	23928	29971	8-Jun-2003
120	1	0429	Springvale Rd N of Ferntree Gully Rd	S	L.Miss	071 B08	22859	29199	8-Jun-2003
120	5	0429	Springvale Rd S of Ferntree Gully Rd	N	L.Miss	071 B08	19684	26025	20-Feb-2005
121	1	0430	Springvale Rd N of Monash Dr	S	L.Miss	071 B10	21248	26996	27-Feb-2005
121	5	0430	Springvale Rd S of Monash Dr	N	R.Miss	071 B10	17856	23121	27-Feb-2005
124	1	0436	Springvale Rd N of Windsor Av	S	AllMvs	079 K10	13726	17527	23-Sep-1998

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 17 November 2005

ASSEMBLY

2319

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HRI Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
124	5	0436	Springvale Rd S of Windsor Av	N	AllMvs	079 K10	13179	16959	23-Sep-1998
126	1	0438	Springvale Rd N of Heatherton Rd	S	L.Miss	079 K12	11233	14215	12-Oct-2003
126	5	0438	Springvale Rd S of Heatherton Rd	N	L.Miss	079 K12	11042	13814	12-Oct-2003
127	1	0440	Springvale Rd N of Paterson Rd	S	AllMvs	088 J05	11524	14885	13-Sep-1998
127	5	0440	Springvale Rd S of Paterson Rd	N	AllMvs	088 J05	10962	13642	13-Sep-1998
128	1	0441	Springvale Rd N of Springvale Bypass	S	AllMvs	088 J06	11647	15150	12-Oct-2003
128	5	0441	Springvale Rd S of Springvale Bypass	N	AllMvs	088 J06	22660	28885	12-Oct-2003
129	5	0442	Springvale Rd S of Cheltenham Rd	N	L.Miss	088 J08	15044	19955	20-Feb-2005
235	1	0426	Springvale Rd N of Waverley Rd	S	L.Miss	071 C04	25133	32471	8-Jun-2003
235	5	0426	Springvale Rd S of Waverley Rd	N	L.Miss	071 C04	22499	28778	8-Jun-2003
236	1	0431	Springvale Rd N of Magid Av	S	L.Miss	071 B09	26373	34527	27-Feb-2005
236	5	0431	Springvale Rd S of Magid Av	N	AllMvs	071 B09	26677	34656	27-Feb-2005
525	1	0422	Springvale Rd N of High Street Rd	S	AllMvs	062 D12	24961	32473	22-Mar-2005
525	5	0422	Springvale Rd S of High Street Rd	N	L.Miss	062 D12	16107	23365	22-Mar-2005
1046	1	0433	Springvale Rd N of Ingram Av	S	AllMvs	071 C03	26381	33984	14-Nov-2004
1046	5	0433	Springvale Rd S of Ingram Av	N	L.Miss	071 C03	28050	35926	14-Nov-2004
1124	42		Springvale Rd btw Waverley Rd & Wilson Rd	N	AllMvs	071 C04	28558	36289	29-Aug-2004
1124	43		Springvale Rd btw Waverley Rd & Wilson Rd	S	AllMvs	071 C04	28766	37568	29-Aug-2004
1147	87		Springvale Rd btw Mock St & Jolimont Rd	N	AllMvs	062 E04	24305	31670	29-Aug-2004
1147	88		Springvale Rd btw Mock St & Jolimont Rd	S	AllMvs	062 E04	25472	33121	29-Aug-2004
1148	89		Springvale Rd btw Watt St & Rosalie St	N	AllMvs	080 A08	13174	16719	29-Aug-2004
1148	90		Springvale Rd btw Watt St & Rosalie St	S	AllMvs	080 A08	13580	16998	29-Aug-2004
1693	1	0943	Springvale Rd N of Spotlight Ctr	S	AllMvs	080 A05	14200	17744	29-Jun-2003
1693	5	0943	Springvale Rd S of Spotlight Ctr	N	AllMvs	080 A05	13354	16874	29-Jun-2003
2086	2	0280	Springvale Rd NE of Onramp Morn Pen Fwy	SW	L.Miss	093 F06	6190	8014	17-Aug-2003
2328	1	0409	Springvale Rd N of Milton St	S	AllMvs	048 E12	25430	33885	27-Feb-2005
2328	5	0409	Springvale Rd N of Milton St	N	AllMvs	048 E12	24129	32727	27-Feb-2005

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR1 Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
3214	1		Springvale Rd N of Cheltenham Rd	S	AllMvs	088 J08	18794	24526	24-Nov-1998
3214	3		Springvale Rd S of Cheltenham Rd	N	AllMvs	088 J08	18538	24452	24-Nov-1998
3250	1		Springvale Rd N of Burwood Hwy	S	AllMvs	062 D07	25053	0	4-Sep-2002
3250	3		Springvale Rd S of Burwood Hwy	N	AllMvs	062 D07	26630	0	4-Sep-2002
3262	1		Springvale Rd N of Ferntree Gully Rd	S	AllMvs	071 B08	24720	31296	10-Sep-1998
3262	3		Springvale Rd S of Ferntree Gully Rd	N	AllMvs	071 B08	26105	32736	10-Sep-1998
3392	1		Springvale Rd NE of Morn. Penin. Fwy	SW	AllMvs	093 F06	16993	22176	24-Nov-1998
3731	1		Springvale Rd No of Maroondah Hwy	S	AllMvs	048 F09	24832	33200	17-Feb-1998
3731	3		Springvale Rd So of Maroondah Hwy	N	AllMvs	048 F09	25307	33127	17-Feb-1998
3893	1		Springvale Rd N of Hutton Rd	S	AllMvs	093 H02	17260	22438	16-Jul-1999
3893	3		Springvale Rd S of Hutton Rd	N	AllMvs	093 H02	20672	27287	16-Jul-1999
4800	1		Springvale Rd N of Highbury Rd	S	AllMvs	062 D09	25275	32579	9-Sep-1998
4800	3		Springvale Rd S of Highbury Rd	N	AllMvs	062 D09	25158	32932	9-Sep-1998
4803	1		Springvale Rd N of Wellington Rd	S	AllMvs	080 B01	19602	24953	8-Sep-1998
4803	3		Springvale Rd S of Wellington Rd	N	AllMvs	080 B01	19088	24318	8-Sep-1998
5151	1	0283	Springvale Rd N of Hutton Rd	S	L.Miss	093 H02	16034	20562	27-Feb-2005
5151	5	0283	Springvale Rd S of Hutton Rd	N	L.Miss	093 H02	16017	22401	27-Feb-2005
5390	1	0408	Springvale Rd N of The Glen Shopping	S	AllMvs	071 C01	25039	31942	13-Sep-1998
5390	5	0408	Springvale Rd S of The Glen Shopping	N	AllMvs	071 C01	23989	30563	13-Sep-1998
5391	5	0439	Springvale Rd S of Athol Rd	N	AllMvs	088 K03	11846	15102	13-Sep-1998
5725	4	0576	Springvale Rd Dep S from Eastern Fwy	NW	AllMvs	048 F05	24821	33269	8-Jun-2003
5725	5	0576	Springvale Rd S of Eastern Fwy Ramp	N	AllMvs	048 F05	17747	23683	8-Jun-2003
6341	1		Springvale Rd N of Wellington Rd	S	AllMvs	071 B12	20477	25925	3-May-2001
6341	2		Springvale Rd N of Wellington Rd	N	AllMvs	071 B12	19125	24217	3-May-2001
6425	1		Springvale Rd N of Worrell St	N	AllMvs	048 F06	24222	32292	24-Feb-1998
6425	2		Springvale Rd N of Worrell St	S	AllMvs	048 F06	26158	34387	24-Feb-1998
13674	7038		Springvale Rd btw Hillcrest Gv & Andrew St	N	AllMvs	079 K11	14339	16878	7-Sep-2004

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HRI Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
13674	7039		Springvale Rd btw Hillcrest Gv & Andrew St	S	AllMvs	079 K11	14528	17140	7-Sep-2004
14144	7994		Springvale Rd btw Cheltenham Rd & Princeton Dr	N	AllMvs	088 H09	19887	26367	22-Mar-2005
14144	7995		Springvale Rd btw Cheltenham Rd & Princeton Dr	S	AllMvs	088 H09	19940	25321	22-Mar-2005

Table 3

Canterbury Road

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HRI Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
113	3	0417	Canterbury Rd E of Springvale Rd	W	L.Miss	062 E02	16364	20461	8-Jun-2003
113	7	0417	Canterbury Rd W of Springvale Rd	E	L.Miss	062 E02	14976	18049	8-Jun-2003
139	3	0631	Canterbury Rd E of Dorset Rd	W	L.Miss	051 A11	12717	16716	7-Dec-2003
139	7	0631	Canterbury Rd W of Dorset Rd	E	L.Miss	051 A11	11930	15182	7-Dec-2003
162	3	0842	Canterbury Rd W of Orchard Gv	W	AllMvs	061 J01	24242	31814	25-Oct-1998
163	3	0844	Canterbury Rd E of Blackburn Rd	W	L.Miss	062 A01	15428	18922	13-Mar-2005
163	7	0844	Canterbury Rd W of Blackburn Rd	E	L.Miss	062 A01	15220	18522	13-Mar-2005
165	3	0846	Canterbury Rd E of Mahoneys Rd	W	AllMvs	062 D01	18385	22408	20-Aug-2001
165	7	0846	Canterbury Rd W of Mahoneys Rd	E	AllMvs	062 D01	17462	21211	20-Aug-2001
167	3	0849	Canterbury Rd E of Mitcham Rd	W	L.Miss	062 K02	14977	18668	30-Dec-2003
167	7	0849	Canterbury Rd W of Mitcham Rd	E	AllMvs	062 K02	23064	28467	30-Dec-2003
169	3	0853	Canterbury Rd E of Wantirna Rd	W	L.Miss	063 G01	12098	15071	17-Aug-2003
169	7	0853	Canterbury Rd W of Wantirna Rd	E	L.Miss	063 G01	13933	17316	17-Aug-2003
170	2	0854	Canterbury Rd SW of Allens Rd	SW	AllMvs	050 B12	14720	18580	28-Mar-2004
170	6	0854	Canterbury Rd SW of Allens Rd	NE	AllMvs	050 B12	14619	18424	28-Mar-2004
172	4	0857	Canterbury Rd SE of Bedford Rd	NW	AllMvs	050 C11	17547	22202	18-Feb-2001
172	7	0857	Canterbury Rd W of Aringa Ct	E	L.Miss	050 C11	12731	16492	18-Feb-2001
173	3	0865	Canterbury Rd E of Rooks Rd	W	AllMvs	062 H02	25240	31738	13-Mar-2005
173	7	0865	Canterbury Rd W of Rooks Rd	E	AllMvs	062 H02	23581	29296	13-Mar-2005
496	3	3120	Canterbury Rd E of Burke Rd	W	AllMvs	045 J10	12051	15110	22-Mar-2005
498	3	3122	Canterbury Rd E of Stanhope Gv	W	AllMvs	046 A10	13518	17206	5-Apr-1998
501	3	3125	Canterbury Rd E of Union Rd	W	AllMvs	046 H11	14552	18541	29-Mar-1998
501	7	3125	Canterbury Rd W of Union Rd	E	R.Miss	046 H11	11183	14473	29-Mar-1998
502	3	3127	Canterbury Rd E of Balwyn Rd	W	AllMvs	046 D11	13523	17042	4-Mar-2001
502	7	3127	Canterbury Rd W of Balwyn Rd	E	AllMvs	046 D11	12647	16322	4-Mar-2001

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR1 Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
503	3	3128	Canterbury Rd W of Rochester Rd	W	AllMvs	046 D11	13972	17398	22-Feb-2004
503	7	3128	Canterbury Rd W of Rochester Rd	E	AllMvs	046 D11	12404	15500	22-Feb-2004
504	3	3129	Canterbury Rd W of Stanley Tce	W	AllMvs	046 F11	13335	16528	20-Aug-2001
504	7	3129	Canterbury Rd W of Stanley Tce	E	AllMvs	046 F11	11518	14499	20-Aug-2001
505	3	3130	Canterbury Rd E of Elgar Rd	W	AllMvs	047 A12	13251	16529	25-Apr-2004
505	7	3130	Canterbury Rd W of Elgar Rd	E	AllMvs	047 A12	11322	14334	25-Apr-2004
506	3	3131	Canterbury Rd E of Station St	W	AllMvs	047 C12	14108	17998	21-Mar-2004
506	7	3131	Canterbury Rd W of Station St	E	AllMvs	047 C12	13043	16578	27-Feb-2005
507	3	3132	Canterbury Rd E of Middleborough Rd	W	L.Miss	047 G12	14011	17974	8-Apr-1998
507	7	3132	Canterbury Rd W of Middleborough Rd	E	L.Miss	047 G12	12972	16537	8-Apr-1998
942	3	3126	Canterbury Rd E of Warrigal Rd	W	AllMvs	046 H11	12385	15908	29-Mar-1998
942	7	3126	Canterbury Rd W of Warrigal Rd	E	AllMvs	046 H11	13612	18452	29-Mar-1998
1007	3	0851	Canterbury Rd E of Heatherdale Rd	W	AllMvs	063 D01	16198	20555	13-Mar-2005
1007	7	0851	Canterbury Rd W of Heatherdale Rd	E	AllMvs	063 D01	15880	19344	13-Mar-2005
1048	7	0843	Canterbury Rd W of Glebe St	E	AllMvs	062 C01	18065	22304	2-Apr-2000
1173	141		Canterbury Rd btw Hylton Cr & Mt. Pleasant Rd	E	AllMvs	062 F02	21457	26766	27-Aug-2004
1173	142		Canterbury Rd btw Hylton Cr & Mt. Pleasant Rd	W	AllMvs	062 F02	22509	28479	27-Aug-2004
1522	3	0859	Canterbury Rd E of Gatwick Rd	W	AllMvs	051 C11	16301	20847	25-Apr-2004
1522	7	0859	Canterbury Rd W of Gatwick Rd	E	AllMvs	051 C11	15778	19729	25-Apr-2004
1657	3	0863	Canterbury Rd E of Colchester Rd	W	AllMvs	051 E10	14449	18692	4-Feb-2001
1657	7	0863	Canterbury Rd W of Colchester Rd	E	L.Miss	051 E10	12942	16333	4-Feb-2001
2065	2	0139	Canterbury Rd NE of Bayfield Rd	SW	AllMvs	050 K12	16816	21202	28-Oct-2001
2065	6	0139	Canterbury Rd SW of Bayfield Rd	NE	AllMvs	050 K12	17448	22190	28-Oct-2001
2370	3	0864	Canterbury Rd E of Liverpool Rd	W	AllMvs	051 H09	13143	17277	15-Feb-2004
2370	7	0864	Canterbury Rd W of Liverpool Rd	E	L.Miss	051 H09	10822	13559	15-Feb-2004
2866	3	0860	Canterbury Rd E of Bayswater Rd	W	L.Miss	064 G01	9872	13030	7-Dec-2003
4602	2		Canterbury Rd E of Middleborough Rd	W	AllMvs	047 G12	16006	20488	24-Mar-1998
4602	4		Canterbury Rd W of Middleborough Rd	E	AllMvs	047 G12	15043	19225	24-Mar-1998
4903	1		Canterbury Rd E of Terrara Rd	W	AllMvs	062 J02	28401	37489	15-Jun-1999
4903	3		Canterbury Rd W of Terrara Rd	E	AllMvs	062 J02	19468	25308	15-Jun-1999
6372	1		Canterbury Rd W of Springvale Rd	W	AllMvs	062 D02	18559	22916	31-Mar-1998
6372	2		Canterbury Rd W of Springvale Rd	E	AllMvs	062 D02	18193	22639	31-Mar-1998

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 17 November 2005

ASSEMBLY

2323

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
6408	1		Canterbury Rd E of Clydesdale St	W	AllMvs	047 E12	14683	19074	26-Mar-1998
6408	2		Canterbury Rd E of Clydesdale St	E	AllMvs	047 E12	14325	18351	26-Mar-1998
8814	1		Canterbury Rd W of Union Rd	E	AllMvs	046 G11	11402	14489	1-Apr-1998
8814	2		Canterbury Rd W of Union Rd	W	AllMvs	046 G11	13084	16349	1-Apr-1998
8864	1		Canterbury Rd W of Dorset Rd	NE	AllMvs	050 K12	18348	22868	4-Nov-2001
8864	2		Canterbury Rd W of Dorset Rd	SW	AllMvs	050 K12	17057	21560	4-Nov-2001
13941	7598		Canterbury Rd btw Dorset Rd & Bayfield Rd	NE	AllMvs	050 K12	16710	21144	2-Mar-2004
13941	7599		Canterbury Rd btw Dorset Rd & Bayfield Rd	SW	AllMvs	050 K12	16987	21685	2-Mar-2004
13942	7600		Canterbury Rd btw Bayswater Rd & Ramsay St	NE	AllMvs	064 G01	15805	20119	2-Mar-2004
13942	7601		Canterbury Rd btw Bayswater Rd & Ramsay St	SW	AllMvs	064 G01	15882	20319	2-Mar-2004

Table 4

Burwood Highway

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
65	3	162	Burwood Hwy E of Blackburn Rd	W	L.Miss	061 K07	16523	22439	20-Feb-2005
68	8	169	Burwood Hwy NW of Mountain Hwy	SE	L.Miss	063 C08	14631	18635	8-Jun-2003
70	4	176	Burwood Hwy SE of Commercial Rd	NW	L.Miss	073 J03	12904	15878	5-Mar-1999
70	8	176	Burwood Hwy NW of Commercial Rd	SE	AllMvs	073 J03	12974	16541	5-Mar-1999
96	3	166	Burwood Hwy E of Hanover Rd	W	AllMvs	062 G08	23809	31013	13-Apr-2003
96	7	166	Burwood Hwy W of Hartland Rd	E	AllMvs	062 G08	24475	32245	21-Mar-2004
97	4	172	Burwood Hwy SE of Tyner Rd	NW	AllMvs	063 K11	13152	17272	8-Feb-1999
97	8	172	Burwood Hwy NW of Tyner Rd	SE	L.Miss	063 K11	12521	16139	8-Feb-1999
185	3	2000	Burwood Hwy E of Warrigal Rd	W	AllMvs	060 H06	12256	17108	13-Mar-2005
185	7	2000	Toorak Rd W of Warrigal Rd	E	AllMvs	060 H06	11412	15298	13-Mar-2005
186	3	2006	Burwood Hwy E of Station St	W	AllMvs	061 C06	17775	23382	13-Mar-2005
186	7	2006	Burwood Hwy W of Station St	E	AllMvs	061 C06	17969	23127	13-Mar-2005
187	4	2009	Burwood Hwy SE of Templeton St	NW	AllMvs	063 G10	14234	18665	13-Mar-2005
187	8	2009	Burwood Hwy NW of Templeton St	SE	L.Miss	063 G10	12197	15452	13-Mar-2005
383	3	4043	Toorak Rd E of Burke Rd	W	AllMvs	059 H05	10951	14548	27-Feb-2005
383	7	4043	Toorak Rd W of Burke Rd	E	AllMvs	059 H05	11239	14966	25-Feb-2005
385	3	4045	Toorak Rd E of Glen Iris Rd	W	AllMvs	060 A05	10119	13889	5-Apr-1998
385	7	4045	Toorak Rd W of Glen Iris Rd	E	AllMvs	060 A05	11059	14977	5-Apr-1998

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR1 Midweek	Date of Count
386	3	4048	Toorak Rd E of Highfield Rd	W	AllMvs	060 E05	12740	17076	13-Mar-2005
386	7	4048	Toorak Rd W of Lithgow St	E	AllMvs	060 E05	12960	17346	13-Mar-2005
388	3	4050	Toorak Rd W of Myrmiong St	W	AllMvs	060 G06	13619	18220	20-Aug-2001
388	7	4050	Toorak Rd W of Myrmiong St	E	AllMvs	060 G06	11441	15486	20-Aug-2001
659	3	4273	Toorak Rd E of Tooronga Rd	W	AllMvs	059 F05	12247	15687	13-Jun-2004
659	7	4273	Toorak Rd W of Tooronga Rd	E	AllMvs	059 F05	10132	13469	10-Jun-2004
910	4	173	Burwood Hwy SE of Knox City Ent	NW	AllMvs	063 K11	13319	16783	11-Jun-2000
910	8	173	Burwood Hwy NW of Knox City Ent	SE	L.Miss	063 K11	13202	16478	11-Jun-2000
930	3	4046	Toorak Rd E of Summerhill Rd	W	AllMvs	060 C05	13680	18528	4-Mar-2001
930	7	4046	Toorak Rd W of Camberwell Rd	E	AllMvs	060 C05	8711	12038	4-Mar-2001
934	3	2004	Burwood Hwy E of Elgar Rd	W	AllMvs	061 A06	17591	22703	30-Jul-2001
934	7	2004	Burwood Hwy W of Elgar Rd	E	AllMvs	061 A06	13829	18038	30-Jul-2001
935	3	2005	Burwood Hwy E of Victoria College Ent	W	AllMvs	061 B06	19345	25396	26-Mar-2000
935	7	2005	Burwood Hwy W of Victoria College Ent	E	AllMvs	061 B06	18717	24428	26-Mar-2000
937	3	2008	Burwood Hwy E of Middleborough Rd	W	L.Miss	061 F06	17221	22831	13-Mar-2005
937	7	2008	Burwood Hwy W of Middleborough Rd	E	L.Miss	061 F06	17037	22036	13-Mar-2005
980	4	178	Burwood Hwy SE of Tyner Rd	NW	AllMvs	064 A12	15269	18387	30-Jul-2001
980	8	178	Burwood Hwy NW of Tyner Rd	SE	L.Miss	064 A12	13670	16469	30-Jul-2001
1117	27		Burwood Hwy btw Mont Ct & Morack Rd	E	AllMvs	062 K08	25542	32964	21-Nov-2004
1117	28		Burwood Hwy btw Mont Ct & Morack Rd	W	AllMvs	062 K08	24174	31846	21-Nov-2004
1594	3	161	Burwood Rd E of Lakeside Drv	W	L.Miss	062 C07	20004	26021	18-Aug-2002
1594	7	161	Burwood Rd W of Lakeside Drv	E	L.Miss	062 C07	20263	26479	18-Aug-2002
1598	3	4283	Toorak Rd E of Tooronga Park Ent	W	L.Miss	059 G05	11923	15741	11-Aug-1998
1598	7	4283	Toorak Rd W of Tooronga Park Ent	E	AllMvs	059 G05	11539	15653	11-Aug-1998
1648	4	177	Burwood Hwy SE of Dorset Rd	NW	AllMvs	073 K04	20857	26603	5-Mar-1999
1648	8	177	Burwood Hwy NW of Dorset Rd	SE	L.Miss	073 K04	16985	21638	5-Mar-1999
2273	3	182	Burwood Hwy E of Dawson St	W	AllMvs	074 F06	13304	17044	2-Mar-2003
2273	7	182	Burwood Hwy W of Dawson St	E	AllMvs	074 F06	12744	16662	2-Mar-2003
2358	4	180	Burwood Hwy SE of Knox City Ent 4	NW	AllMvs	064 A12	13697	16967	5-Dec-2004
2358	8	180	Burwood Hwy NW of Knox City Ent 4	SE	L.Miss	064 A12	11148	14015	5-Dec-2004
2534	3	179	Burwood Hwy E of Forest Rd	W	AllMvs	074 C04	15933	20444	21-Mar-2004
2534	7	179	Burwood Hwy W of Lysterfield Rd	E	AllMvs	074 C04	12737	16428	21-Mar-2004
3220	2		Burwood Hwy SE of Stud Rd	NW	AllMvs	063 J11	15825	0	29-May-2002
3220	4		Burwood Hwy NW of Stud Rd	SE	AllMvs	063 J11	15046	0	29-May-2002
3250	2		Burwood Hwy E of Springvale Rd	W	AllMvs	062 D07	23757	0	4-Sep-2002
3250	4		Burwood Hwy W of Springvale Rd	E	AllMvs	062 D07	21997	0	4-Sep-2002

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 17 November 2005

ASSEMBLY

2325

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR1 Midweek	Date of Count
4062	1		Toorak Rd E of Monash Fwy	W	AllMvs	059 E04	17927	22763	27-Jun-2002
4523	2		Burwood Hwy E of Blackburn Rd	W	AllMvs	061 K06	20888	0	14-Aug-2002
4523	4		Burwood Hwy W of Blackburn Rd	E	AllMvs	061 K06	19718	0	14-Aug-2002
4854	1		Toorak Rd E of Monash Fwy	W	AllMvs	059 E04	16036	20829	23-Feb-1999
4912	1		Burwood Hwy E of Glenfern Rd	W	AllMvs	074 A04	16670	21671	23-Jul-1999
4912	3		Burwood Hwy NW of Glenfern Rd	SE	AllMvs	074 A04	19002	24703	23-Jul-1999
4973	3		Burwood Hwy S of Monbulk Road	N	AllMvs	075 F10	6544	8507	25-Nov-1999
5084	4	174	Burwood Hwy SE of Scoresby Rd	NW	L.Miss	073 D01	15183	18926	8-Dec-2002
5084	8	174	Burwood Hwy NW of Scoresby Rd	SE	L.Miss	073 D01	14791	18258	8-Dec-2002
5452	3	919	Burwood Hwy E of Glenfern Rd	W	AllMvs	075 C09	9611	12477	10-Mar-2002
5452	7	919	Burwood Hwy W of Glenfern Rd	E	AllMvs	075 C09	8486	11110	10-Mar-2002
5453	4	920	Burwood Hwy SE of Morris Rd	NW	AllMvs	075 A08	7393	9402	25-Apr-2004
5453	8	920	Burwood Hwy NW of Morris Rd	SE	AllMvs	075 A08	8749	11148	25-Apr-2004
5471	4	2012	Burwood Hwy SE of Lewis Rd	NW	L.Miss	064 B12	15470	18796	8-Jun-2003
5471	8	2012	Burwood Hwy NW of Lewis Rd	SE	AllMvs	064 B12	15615	19092	8-Jun-2003
6371	1		Burwood Hwy E of Mahoneys Rd	W	AllMvs	062 C07	21691	28033	9-Aug-2001
6371	2		Burwood Hwy E of Mahoneys Rd	E	AllMvs	062 C07	21409	28260	9-Aug-2001
6378	1		Burwood Hwy SE of Westley St	SE	AllMvs	073 K03	21125	27248	25-Oct-2001
6378	2		Burwood Hwy SE of Westley St	NW	AllMvs	073 K03	23685	29592	25-Oct-2001
6447	1		Toorak Rd E of Auburn Rd	E	AllMvs	059 F04	11377	14994	11-Oct-2001
6447	2		Toorak Rd E of Auburn Rd	W	AllMvs	059 F04	13117	16699	11-Oct-2001
9168	1		Burwood Hwy NW of Acacia Rd	SE	AllMvs	074 D05	15536	19887	21-Mar-2004
9168	2		Burwood Hwy NW of Acacia Rd	NW	AllMvs	074 D05	15915	20217	21-Mar-2004
20131	2		Burwood Hwy SE of High Street Rd	NW	AllMvs	064 B12	20506	27067	27-Jul-2000
20131	4		Burwood Hwy NW of High Street Rd	SE	AllMvs	064 B12	15205	19766	27-Jul-2000
20403	2		Burwood Hwy E of Lakeside Dr	W	AllMvs	062 C07	22989	0	14-Aug-2002
20403	4		Burwood Hwy W of Lakeside Dr	E	AllMvs	062 C07	20592	0	14-Aug-2002

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Table 5
Monash Freeway

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
9	5000		Monash Fwy btw Toorak Rd and Yarra Blvd Inbound	W	AllMvs	059 E03	51213	63822	14-Nov-2004
9	5001		Monash Fwy btw Toorak Rd and Yarra Blvd Outbound	S	AllMvs	059 E03	52732	66008	14-Nov-2004
9	5002		Monash Fwy btw Burke Rd and Toorak Rd Inbound	NW	AllMvs	059 G06	58731	76275	19-Feb-2005
9	5003		Monash Fwy btw Burke Rd and Toorak Rd Outbound	SE	AllMvs	059 G06	56936	74044	19-Feb-2005
9	5004		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd & High St Inbound	NW	AllMvs	059 K10	58643	76619	14-Nov-2004
9	5005		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd & High St Outbound	SE	AllMvs	059 K10	57776	74132	14-Nov-2004
9	5006		Monash Fwy btw Forster Rd and Huntingdale Rd Inbound	NW	AllMvs	070 C05	63353	82117	14-Nov-2004
9	5007		Monash Fwy btw Forster Rd and Huntingdale Rd Outbound	SE	AllMvs	070 C05	62811	81961	14-Nov-2004
9	5036		Monash Fwy btw Wellington Rd & Jacksons Rd Inbound	NW	AllMvs	080 G03	46292	62499	14-Nov-2004
9	5037		Monash Fwy btw Wellington Rd & Jacksons Rd Outbound	SE	AllMvs	080 G03	47539	61978	14-Nov-2004
9	5046		Monash Fwy btw Springvale Rd & Ferntree Gully Rd Inbound	NW	AllMvs	071 A09	41897	56424	14-Nov-2004
9	5047		Monash Fwy btw Springvale Rd & Ferntree Gully Rd Outbound	SE	AllMvs	071 A09	42882	56316	14-Nov-2004
9	5048		Monash Fwy btw Springvale Rd & Wellington Rd Inbound	NW	AllMvs	071 D12	48301	65277	14-Nov-2004
9	5049		Monash Fwy btw Springvale Rd & Wellington Rd Outbound	SE	AllMvs	071 D12	48988	66437	14-Nov-2004
9	5058		Monash NW of Sth Gipp/Hallam Inbound	NW	AllMvs	091 B07	49334	67306	14-Nov-2004
9	5059		Monash NW of Sth Gipp/Hallam Outbound	SE	AllMvs	091 B07	50258	64996	2-Dec-2003
9	5060		Monash Fwy Bwtn Sth Gipp & Belg-Halm Inbound	W	AllMvs	091 F10	25520	35345	14-Nov-2004
9	5061		Monash Fwy Bwtn Sth Gipp & Belg-Halm Outbound	E	AllMvs	091 F10	23328	30778	15-Aug-2004
9	5071		Monash Fwy E of Belgrave Hallam Rd Inbound	W	AllMvs	091 F10	26481	36414	14-Nov-2004
9	5072		Monash Fwy E of Belgrave Hallam Rd Outbound	E	AllMvs	091 F10	26597	34376	14-Nov-2004

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 17 November 2005

ASSEMBLY

2327

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
9	5073		Monash Fwy W of Narre Warren Nth Rd Inbound	W	AllMvs	110 D02	22253	30361	14-Nov-2004
9	5074		Monash Fwy W of Narre Warren Nth Rd Outbound	E	AllMvs	110 D02	22293	28654	14-Nov-2004
9	5075		Monash Fwy E of Narre Warren Nth Rd Inbound	W	AllMvs	110 G05	20150	27077	10-Nov-2004
9	5076		Monash Fwy E of Narre Warren Nth Rd Outbound	E	AllMvs	110 G05	20853	26512	15-Aug-2004
9	5111		Monash Fwy btw Ferntree Gully Rd & Blackburn Rd Inbound	NW	AllMvs	070 K07	51535	68511	14-Nov-2004
9	5112		Monash Fwy btw Ferntree Gully Rd & Blackburn Rd Outbound	SE	AllMvs	070 K07	53609	70875	14-Nov-2004
9	5113		Monash Fwy btw Blackburn Rd & Forster Rd Inbound	W	AllMvs	070 G06	59081	77565	14-Nov-2004
9	5114		Monash Fwy btw Blackburn Rd & Forster Rd Outbound	E	AllMvs	070 G06	52297	68361	14-Nov-2004
9	5115		Monash Fwy btw Huntingdale Rd & Warrigal Hwy Inbound	W	AllMvs	069 H03	59398	77005	14-Nov-2004
9	5116		Monash Fwy btw Huntingdale Rd & Warrigal Hwy Outbound	E	AllMvs	069 H03	58362	76804	14-Nov-2004
9	5117		Monash Fwy btw High St & Burke Rd Inbound	NW	AllMvs	059 H08	60930	79226	14-Nov-2004
9	5118		Monash Fwy btw High St & Burke Rd Outbound	SE	AllMvs	059 H08	56952	72961	14-Nov-2004
78	8	0266	S.E.Arterial Exit NW of Jacksons Rd	SE	OffRmpLM	080 J05	6789	8845	8-Jun-2003
911	1	2843	S.E.Freeway Offramp N of Toorak Rd	S	OffRamp	059 E04	5174	7089	23-Jun-2000
911	5	2843	S.E.Freeway Offramp S of Toorak Rd	N	OffRmpLM	059 E04	3808	4750	23-Jun-2000
1231	412		Monash Fwy btw Police Rd and Gladstone Rd	E	AllMvs	080 K06	48723	62738	12-Nov-2004
1231	413		Monash Fwy btw Police Rd and Gladstone Rd	W	AllMvs	080 K06	43830	60436	12-Nov-2004
1274	621		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd & Huntingdale Rd	E	AllMvs	069 J04	56666	73622	12-Nov-2004
1274	622		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd & Huntingdale Rd	W	AllMvs	069 J04	57835	76040	12-Nov-2004
1359	892		Monash Fwy btw Springvale Rd and Ferntree Gully Rd	NW	AllMvs	071 A09	40837	55120	12-Nov-2004
1359	893		Monash Fwy btw Springvale Rd and Ferntree Gully Rd	SE	AllMvs	071 A09	43163	56846	12-Nov-2004
1553	3	2845	S.E.Arterial Offramp E of Burke Rd	W	OffRmpLM	059 H07	4362	5813	16-Nov-2003
1553	7	2845	S.E.Arterial Offramp W of Burke Rd	E	OffRmpLM	059 H07	1586	2047	16-Nov-2003

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
1771	6	4150	S.E.Fwy Offramp SW of Barkly Av	NE	OffRamp	002HD12	732	934	16-Sep-2001
4062	2		Monash Fwy SE of Toorak Rd	NW	AllMvs	059 E04	50173	64345	27-Jun-2002
4062	4		Monash Fwy NW of Toorak Rd	SE	AllMvs	059 E04	47757	59890	27-Jun-2002
4854	2		Monash Fwy SE of Toorak Rd	NW	AllMvs	059 E04	41127	54623	23-Feb-1999
4854	5		Monash Fwy N of Toorak Rd	S	AllMvs	059 E04	39441	53102	23-Feb-1999
5407	1	0614	Monash Fwy Offramp N of Heatherton Rd	S	L.Miss	090 K03	190	223	16-Nov-2003
5407	5	0614	Monash Fwy Offramp S of Heatherton Rd	N	L.Miss	090 K03	1036	1348	16-Nov-2003
6141	898		Mulgrave Fwy S of Ferntree Gully Rd (Mulgrave) @ 22.0 km Post	E	AllMvs	C079D08	41463	0	24-Mar-1998
6141	899		Mulgrave Fwy S of Ferntree Gully Rd (Mulgrave) @ 22.0 km Post	W	AllMvs	C079D08	37545	0	24-Mar-1998
8647	1		South Gippsland Fwy N of Princes Hwy	N	AllMvs	091 C08	33717	46215	22-Nov-1999
8647	2		South Gippsland Fwy N of Princes Hwy	S	AllMvs	091 C08	36601	48514	23-Nov-1999
10097	1003		Monash Fwy btw Burke Rd & High St	SE	AllMvs	059 H07	46635	64184	29-Mar-1998
10098	1004		Monash Fwy btw Tooronga Rd & Toorak Rd	NW	AllMvs	059 E05	36760	50346	29-Mar-1998
10098	1005		Monash Fwy btw Tooronga Rd & Toorak Rd	SE	AllMvs	059 E05	38281	53757	29-Mar-1998
10152	1132		Monash Fwy (CityLink) btw Toorak Rd & Yarra Blvd	E	AllMvs	059 B02	55464	70438	20-Feb-2005
10152	1133		Monash Fwy (CityLink) btw Toorak Rd & Yarra Blvd	W	AllMvs	059 B02	49807	61418	20-Feb-2005
10304	1460		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd and High St	NW	AllMvs	059 K10	60181	78397	20-Feb-2005
10304	1461		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd and High St	SE	AllMvs	059 K10	58250	75864	20-Feb-2005
10782	2328		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd and Huntingdale Rd	W	AllMvs	069 H03	50374	67405	22-Nov-1998
10783	2329		Monash Fwy btw Warrigal Rd and Waverley Rd Underpass	NW	AllMvs	069 E02	44310	60922	22-Nov-1998
10784	2330		Monash Fwy btw Waverley Rd U/Pass and E.Malvern Stn Ped O/Pass	NW	AllMvs	069 C01	44395	60958	22-Nov-1998
12987	3875		Monash Fwy Onramp from Heatherton Rd	NW	OnRamp	090 J03	12585	18299	29-Oct-2000
12988	3876		Monash Fwy Offramp to Heatherton Rd	SE	OffRamp	090 J03	9471	12767	29-Oct-2000
14044	7809		Monash Fwy Off Ramp to Stud Rd	SE	OffRamp	081 F11	5953	7740	21-Nov-2004

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 17 November 2005

ASSEMBLY

2329

Attachment LA 725

VicRoads Reference			Location and Volume Information						
Traffic Survey Number	Location Traffic Survey Number	Intersection No.	Location Description	Flow Direction	Movement Type	Melway	12HR Midweek	24HR Midweek	Date of Count
14045	7810		Monash Fwy on Ramp from Police Rd	SE	OnRamp	081 A06	5793	7735	21-Nov-2004
20466	2		Monash Fwy SE of Heatherton Rd	NW	AllMvs	090 J03	48800	66223	25-Nov-2003
20466	4		Monash Fwy NW of Heatherton Rd	SE	AllMvs	090 J03	53780	70955	25-Nov-2003
20478	2		Monash Fwy SE of Stud Rd	NW	AllMvs	081 G12	48939	67684	25-Nov-2003
20478	4		Monash Fwy NW of Stud Rd	SE	AllMvs	081 G12	47615	62730	25-Nov-2003

Transport: V/Line — compensation claims

771. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport —

- (1) How many claims for compensation did V/Line Passenger Corporation, V/Line Passenger Pty Ltd, Metlink or the Department of Infrastructure receive for each month between April 2005 and June 2005 for the lines —
 - (a) Geelong–Colac–Warrnambool;
 - (b) Ballarat–Ararat;
 - (c) Sunbury–Kyneton–Bendigo–Swan Hill–Echuca;
 - (d) Seymour–Shepparton–Albury;
 - (e) Warragul–Traralgon–Bairnsdale.
- (2) How much has been paid each month in compensation for the period April 2005 and June 2005 for the lines —
 - (a) Geelong–Colac–Warrnambool;
 - (b) Ballarat–Ararat;
 - (c) Sunbury–Kyneton–Bendigo–Swan Hill–Echuca;
 - (d) Seymour–Shepparton–Albury;
 - (e) Warragul–Traralgon–Bairnsdale.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

- (1) Only V/Line receives and processes claims for passenger compensation on the services nominated. The number of claims and amounts paid are shown in the following table.

	April	May	June
(a) Geelong–Colac–Warrnambool	40	30	32
(b) Ballarat–Ararat	17	15	29

	April	May	June
(c) Sunbury–Kyneton–Bendigo–Swan Hill–Echuca	3	2	0
(d) Seymour–Shepparton–Albury	3	6	5
(e) Warragul–Traralgon–Bairnsdale	18	14	14

(2)

	April \$	June \$
(a) Geelong–Colac–Warrnambool	1,195.00	1,578.00
(b) Ballarat–Ararat	758.80	958.30
(c) Sunbury–Kyneton–Bendigo–Swan Hill–Echuca	399.60	Nil
(d) Seymour–Shepparton–Albury	37.20	169
(e) Warragul–Traralgon–Bairnsdale	772.20	1,261.00

Note: Compensation claims received during a specific month may not always be paid in the same month.

Transport: trams — route 75 passenger numbers

799. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to the route 75 tram between Blackburn Road, Burwood East and the Vermont South terminus — on Wednesday 3 August 2005 —

- (1) How many passenger trips were recorded in each direction.
- (2) What percentage of passengers paid an adult fare.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

1. The data provided by the Automatic Ticketing System (ATS) is based on ticket validations only. On 3 August 2005, there were 609 validations onboard trams operating between Vermont South and Blackburn Rd in the inbound direction and 46 validations in the outbound direction. The actual number of passengers travelling in the outbound direction will have been much higher because many passengers alighting after Blackburn Road will have boarded at an earlier point in the journey.
2. The percentage of ticket validations that were full fare tickets was 42 per cent.

Transport: trams — route 75 low-floor trams

801. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport —

- (1) When will potential passengers in wheelchairs or with other disabilities see low floor trams on every service on route 75.
- (2) Are there any plans to transfer low floor trams from Kew, Malvern or Southbank Depots to Camberwell Depot to operate on route 75; if so —
 - (a) when;
 - (b) how many;
 - (c) from which depot.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

- (1) Route 75 will be considered for low floor trams as part of the deployment of the next tram order.
- (2) No.

Transport: rail — Sandringham crossing

802. Mr THOMPSON to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to the railway crossing installed on the Sandringham line near Crop Street in 2004 following a fatality that occurred on the line —

- (1) What was the date of the initial works being done.
- (2) Why do the works remain outstanding.
- (3) When will the works be completed.
- (4) Noting that the gates do not operate after 12 months, what is the purpose of having them there.
- (5) What is the cost of the project to date.
- (6) What is the cost of the work remaining to be completed.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

The question refers to a railway crossing on the Sandringham Line which identifies a location near Crop Street. A search in VicTrack Project Scopes, the Melway, and other search methods on the Web have failed to identify a Crop Street on the Sandringham Line.

As Crop Street on the Sandringham Line cannot be identified the question cannot be answered.

Transport: rail — pedestrian fatalities

803. Mr THOMPSON to ask the Minister for Transport — how many pedestrian fatalities have occurred on the Sandringham line between Sandringham Station and Brighton Beach Station in the last three years.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

One.

Transport: V/Line — link services

807. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — on Thursday 4 August 2005 how many passengers were conveyed over any part of the —

- (1) ‘Speedlink’ (Albury–Adelaide) route.
- (2) ‘Daylink’ (Bendigo–Adelaide) route.
- (3) ‘Canberra Link’ (Albury–Canberra) route.
- (4) ‘Sapphire Coast Link’ route —

- (a) between Narooma and Bairnsdale;
- (b) between Bairnsdale and Batemans Bay.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

- (1) 24
- (2) 19
- (3) 12
- (4) (a) 11
- (b) 7

Transport: V/Line — link services

810. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — does V/Line advertise its ‘Link’ coach services on either radio, television, the Internet or in newspapers; if so, what was the total amount spent in 2004–05.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

No, V/line does not undertake any promotional advertising of the ‘Link’ services. There is no specifically identified advertising or promotional budget for the ‘Link’ services.

Transport: V/Line — link services

812. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — have any of the V/Line ‘Link’ services been impacted by increased Virgin Blue or Jetstar air services; if so, what strategies are being adopted to increase patronage.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

No data is available that can provide any evidence of the impact of increased Virgin Blue or Jet Star air services.

Transport: Midland Highway — roadworks

834. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to each section of the Midland Highway between Shepparton, Pine Ridge and Benalla —

- (1) When was each section of the highway last resurfaced.
- (2) What is the name of each bridge on the section of the highway.
- (3) What year was each bridge on the highway constructed.
- (4) What, if any, further works are planned or proposed for each section of the highway.
- (5) When is it expected that any further works will occur on the highway.
- (6) What is the anticipated cost of any planned works on each section of the highway.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

(1) Sections of the highway between Shepparton, Pine Lodge (referred to in the Question as Pine Ridge) and Benalla were resurfaced as follows (distances are measured from Shepparton, towards Benalla):

- In 2004, generally between 55km and 60 km.
- In 2003, generally between 40 km and 45 km and between 6 km and 9 km.
- In 2002, generally between 10 km and 15 km and between 45 km and 50 km.
- In 2001, generally between 15 km and 20 km and between 35 km and 40 km.
- In 1999, generally between 25 km and 30 km.
- Prior to 1999 but after 1995, generally between 20 km and 25 km, 30 km and 35 km, and temporary works between 6 km and 9 km.

(2&3)

There are seven bridges on the section of the Midland Highway between Shepparton and Benalla as follows:

Bridge Name	Distance from Shepparton	Year Constructed
East Goulburn Main Channel	9.8 km	1956
Un-named Creek	29.3 km	1990
Sheepwash Creek	36.8 km	1960
Sheepwash Creek Anabranh	37.4 km	1960
Cowans Floodway	42.2 km	1964
Broken Creek	49.5 km	1966
Channel Stockyard Creek	51.3 km	1957

(4&6)

Various maintenance and periodic road works are programmed to be undertaken on this section of the Midland Highway during 2005/06 as follows:

Bridge works

- Repairs to Sheepwash Creek and Sheepwash Creek
- Anabranh bridges \$8,000
- Repair works to the bridge over Cowans Floodway \$10,000
- Repair works to the bridge over Broken Creek \$5,000

Periodic roadworks

- Asphalt overlay and patching in Shepparton: \$164,000
- Asphalt Regulation in Benalla: \$3,000
- Pavement Texture Restoration, Various locations: \$41,000
- Final Seals and Patches: \$27,000
- Asphalt Major Patching: \$32,000
- Minor patching prior to reseals: \$2,000

Routine Maintenance

- Pavement: \$108,500
- Roadside: \$40,000
- Bridge: \$8,000

(5) Bridge, Periodic and Routine works will occur throughout the 2005/06 financial year.

Transport: Midland Highway — condition

835. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to the Midland Highway — have sections of the highway become overly worn.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

Sections of the Midland Highway are at various levels of wear, and deteriorate at different rates depending on factors such as type of road construction, traffic loadings and climatic conditions.

VicRoads undertakes frequent road inspections along the Midland Highway to identify any sections that meet wear criteria and as a result, maintenance works are programmed on a needs basis.

Transport: speed limit changes

838. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — how much has been expended on the roll out of the 40 km/h speed zone changes around schools and shopping centres, including the costs for purchase, administration and installation of new signage, up until 16 August 2005.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

(1) Expense on the 40km/h Signs for School Speed Zones

In relation to speed limit changes for school speed zones, the expenditure including the costs for purchase, administration and installation of signage up to 16 August 2005 is \$14.1M.

(2) Expense on the 40km/h Signs for Shopping Centres

In relation to speed limit changes for strip shopping centres, the total cost including the costs for purchase, administration and installation of signage up to 16 August 2005 is \$1.36M.

Transport: speed limit changes

839. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to contracts to supply 40 km/h speed zone signs for schools and shopping centres —

- (1) What entity has any contract/s to supply the signs.
- (2) What is the total value of the contract/s.
- (3) Which VicRoads area does each contract cover.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

(1) Supply of 40km/h static School Speed Zone Signs

The Metropolitan North West Region administered the contract for the supply of *electronic* school speed signs across the State, while the supply of *static* school speed signs across the State was administered via separate contracts by each VicRoads Region.

VicRoads Region	Contractors (for supply of signs only)	Total Contract Value
Metro North West	Four contractors as listed below:	\$8,238,779
	RMS Roadsigns P/L FRH Standard Roads Pty Ltd De Neeffe Signs Pty Ltd Axent Holdings P/L Trading as Axent Global	
Metro South East	Three contractors as listed below:	\$1,021,031
	FRH Standard Roads Pty Ltd Artcraft P/L RMS Roadsigns P/L	
Eastern	One contractor as listed below:	\$595,000
	Toongabbie P/L	
North Eastern	Three contractors as listed below:	\$101,472
	RMS Roadsigns P/L De Neeffe Signs P/L Urban Maintenance Systems Pty Ltd	
Northern	Two contractors as listed below:	\$143,000
	Urban Maintenance Systems Pty Ltd Artcraft P/L	
Western	One contractor as listed below:	\$248,260
	RPC Roads Pty Ltd	
South Western	One contractor as listed below:	\$613,537
	Roadcon Pty Ltd	
	Total	\$10,961,079

(2) Supply of 40km/h Speed Zone Signs for Shopping Centres

The contract for the supply of 40km/h speed zone signs for shopping centres was administered by the two VicRoads metropolitan regions.

VicRoads Region	Contractors (for supply of signs only)	Contract Value
Metro North West	Two contractors as listed below:	\$807,693
	Gordon McKay Pty Ltd DESA Australia Pty Ltd	
Metro South East	Two contractors as listed below:	\$179,232
	DESA Australia Pty Ltd Axent P/L	
	Total	\$986,925

Transport: VicRoads — signs

841. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport —

- (1) What was the total cost of VicRoads signage purchased in —
 - (a) 2002–03;
 - (b) 2003–04;
 - (c) 2004–05.

- (2) What is the estimated total cost of VicRoads signage to be purchased in 2005–06.
- (3) How many VicRoads signs were purchased in —
 - (a) 2002–03;
 - (b) 2003–04;
 - (c) 2004–05;
 - (d) 2005–06 to date.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

- (1) The VicRoads on-road budget provides funding for the implementation of numerous capital projects and recurrent activities, such as road maintenance and incident management. Each of these involve the purchase of many signs over the course of the year.

(2&3)

VicRoads systems do not provide details of the numbers of signs associated with road projects or the total costs of purchase of the signs.

Note:

The above response relates only to signage used on road projects rather than signage at VicRoads offices or for advertising purposes.

Transport: V/Line — carriage cleaning

844. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to the cleaning of V/Line carriages and railcars —

- (1) Are V/Line carriages and railcars cleaned —
 - (a) between each service;
 - (b) at the end of the day.
- (2) If V/Line carriages and railcars are not cleaned between each service or at the end of the day, how often are they cleaned.
- (3) Do cleaning frequencies differ between the terminating points of Spencer Street, Geelong, Warrnambool, Melton, Bacchus Marsh, Ballarat, Ararat, Sunbury, Bendigo, Swan Hill, Shepparton, Seymour, Craigieburn, Kilmore East, Albury, Warragul, Traralgon, Sale and Bairnsdale and, when trains are operating, Echuca and Kyneton.
- (4) Who, if anyone, inspects the cleaning work when cleaners have completed their work.
- (5) How often are exteriors cleaned.
- (6) Who is the current contractor for exterior cleaning.
- (7) What is the value and term of each contract for exterior cleaning.
- (8) Are many of the exteriors still cleaned by hand; if so, at what locations.
- (9) Are automated means of cleaning such as carriage washing plants still used; if so —

- (a) at what locations;
 - (b) how often is each set of cars or individual railcars washed at each location;
 - (c) who inspects the cleaners' completed works.
- (10) What is the value and term of each contract for interior cleaning.
- (11) Is the accumulated dirt on V/Line's carriage and railcars partly the result of difficult-to-reach 'interior' surfaces of double glazed windows; if so, what can be done to improve the cleanliness of these windows.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (2) Not Applicable.
- (3) No, all trains are cleaned daily at terminating locations.
- (4) Inspections are conducted by regional management and on-train staff.
- (5) On average, train exteriors are cleaned fortnightly, with the facility and flexibility to clean more frequently, as may be required.
- (6) EDI Rail V/Line Maintenance Pty Ltd.
- (7) V/Line does not have an individual contract specifically for the exterior cleaning of the fleet as this component is incorporated in V/Line's total fleet maintenance and cleaning contract. Details of this contract are not held with the Department of Infrastructure.
- (8) Yes, locomotives are washed by hand, as their design does not allow for effective machine washing. There are 42 locomotives in the fleet and they are washed on an as needs basis at West Melbourne and Newport.
- (9) Yes
 - (a) Geelong and West Melbourne.
 - (b) At Geelong there are, on average, 15 carriages washed each week night, generally this involves a mixture of N, FN, VN and VZ carriages.

At West Melbourne the remainder of the fleet is washed and numbers fluctuate on a daily basis. These include H sets, Sprinters and locomotives.
 - (c) Both EDI Rail V/Line Maintenance Pty Ltd and V/Line supervisors monitor the effectiveness of the cleaners to ensure the rolling stock is properly cleaned.
- (10) There are 12 contracts totalling approximately \$2.3m. The largest individual contract is \$970,000. Contract terms range between one and two years. No further details on these V/Line contracts are held within the Department of Infrastructure.
- (11) No. Double glazed windows are sealed. If the seal is damaged, the windows are replaced.

Transport: taxidriver complaints

853. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport —

- (1) How many complaints against taxi drivers during 2004–05 were not investigated within 14 days of the complaint being laid.
- (2) How many complaints against taxi drivers during 2004–05 took more than —
 - (a) 30 days to be finalised;
 - (b) 60 days to be finalised;
 - (c) 90 days to be finalised;
 - (d) 120 days to be finalised.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

- (1) 159
- (2) (a) 181
(b) 134
(c) 96
(d) 470

Transport: V/Line — compensation claims

861. **Mr MULDER** to ask the Minister for Transport — for July 2005 how many claims for compensation did V/Line Passenger Corporation, V/Line Passenger Pty Ltd, Metlink or the Department of Infrastructure receive and what amount was paid in compensation for each of the following lines —

- (1) Geelong–Colac–Warrnambool.
- (2) Ballarat–Ararat.
- (3) Sunbury–Kyneton–Bendigo–Swan Hill and Echuca.
- (4) Seymour–Shepparton and Albury.
- (5) Warragul–Traralgon–Bairnsdale.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

Claims received and amounts paid in July 2005 for the lines specified were as follows:

- (1) 26 claims – \$1,033.00 Paid
- (2) 18 claims – \$513.60 Paid
- (3) 2 claims – \$524.40 Paid
- (4) 5 claims – \$92.60 Paid
- (5) 16 claims – \$829.80 Paid

All passenger compensation claims are directed to V/Line Passenger P/L.

Note: Compensation claims received during a specific month may not always be paid in the same month.

Transport: Spencer Street station public address system

866. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to recorded public address system announcements at Spencer Street Station —

- (1) Are recorded announcements such as ‘please do not join the train on platform 3’ being repeated ad nauseam when a V/Line train arrives, or is being cleaned, at any of platforms 1 to 8 south inclusive.
- (2) Have some announcements been repeated up to 30 times in the space of 10 minutes.
- (3) Have staff been counselled to reduce the number of times announcements are played; if not, why not.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

- (1) Recorded platform announcements are repeated to provide advice regarding arrivals and departures to a constant flow of passengers. However these announcements are only repeated as often as is reasonably necessary. Some announcements are for safety reasons and if not heard could result in injury to passengers or delays to services.
- (2) No.
- (3) In line with customer feedback, V/Line is not lessening the number of announcements being made. V/Line has not advised or counselled staff to reduce the number of announcements being made.

Transport: Great Ocean Road — concrete kerbing

867. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to the installation of kerbing along the Great Ocean Road since January 2000 —

- (1) At what locations has VicRoads installed kerbing and what length of road was treated on each occasion.
- (2) What was the cost of each provision of kerbing.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

1. Shoulder sealing and kerb installation has been completed by VicRoads between Aireys Inlet and Skenes Creek since January 2000. The total length treated to date is 48 kilometres.

Locations at which kerb and channel works have been completed are as follows:

- (a) 125.0 – 141.0 km (Aireys Inlet to Lorne).
 - (b) 143.0 – 144.0 km (West of Lorne to St George River)
 - (c) 144.0 – 149.0 km (St George River to Cumberland River)
 - (d) 149.0 – 152.0 km (Cumberland River to Mt Defiance)
 - (e) 152.0 – 155.0 km (Jamieson Creek to Boggaley Creek)
 - (f) 158.0 – 161.0 km (Wye River to West of Wye River)
 - (g) 161.0 – 167.0 km (West of Wye River to Grey River)
 - (h) 167.0 – 178.0 km (Grey River to Browns Creek).
2. The total cost of the works is \$7.714M. This is broken down as follows:

- (a) 125.0 – 141.0 km – \$1,194,000
- (b) 143.0 – 144.0 km – \$68,000
- (c) 144.0 – 149.0 km – \$1,262,000
- (d) 149.0 – 152.0 km – \$370,000
- (e) 152.0 – 155.0 km – \$658,000
- (f) 158.0 – 161.0 km – \$1,110,000
- (g) 161.0 – 167.0 km – \$682,000
- (h) 167.0 – 178.0 km – \$2,370,000.

Transport: Great Ocean Road — concrete kerbing

868. **Mr MULDER** to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to the cleaning of concrete kerbing along the Great Ocean Road —

- (1) Does responsibility for cleaning debris from the kerbing rest with VicRoads, a particular shire, or another entity.
- (2) How often is cleaning undertaken.
- (3) Does water scour the road during and after periods of heavy rain if debris builds up at kerbing; if so —
 - (a) what maintenance issues result;
 - (b) what safety issues result.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

- (1) The responsibility for cleaning concrete kerbing along the Great Ocean Road rests with VicRoads.
- (2) Cleaning is undertaken in accordance with VicRoads Road Management Plan (RMP) for the Great Ocean Road (GOR) as follows:
 - debris in kerbing or in drainage pits is cleared out within 8 weeks of its identification,
 - debris which could be a “hazard” as defined in VicRoads RMP (i.e. debris in the running lane on the GOR) is cleared or marked with appropriate warning signs, within 24 hours of its identification.
- (3) Water does not scour the road pavement during heavy periods of rain. Heavy rain will generally clear the kerbing of debris.

Transport: Skenes Creek and Forrest-Apollo Bay roads

869. **Mr MULDER** to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to works other than minor works on Skenes Creek Road and Forrest-Apollo Bay Road —

- (1) When were works other than minor works last undertaken on each road.
- (2) What was the extent of the works.
- (3) What was the cost of the works.
- (4) Are sections of the first five kilometres from the Skenes Creek end in a poor state; if so —

- (a) what works are required;
- (b) when will works be scheduled;
- (c) what is the estimated cost of works.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

- (1) Works were last undertaken on both roads in the 2004/2005 financial year.
- (2) The works on the Skenes Creek Road involved shoulder sealing between 0.0 and 14.7 km and pavement rehabilitation works between 1.05 and 1.65 km, 4.05 and 4.38 km, 8.5 and 9.5 km and 12.26 and 12.98 km

The work on the Forrest — Apollo Bay Road involved several sections of road at 11.3 km and 15.3 km being repaired with asphalt patching and resurfacing.

- (3) A total of \$1,145,000 was spent on Skenes Creek Road during 2004/05. Total expenditure for rehabilitation works on Forrest — Apollo Bay Road for the period was \$117,000.
- (4) The first five kilometres of the Skenes Creek Road from the Great Ocean Road require minor maintenance activities and these will be progressively addressed in accordance with the requirements of the maintenance plan for this road over the next twelve month period.

The Government has committed \$400,000 to pavement repair and resurfacing work on the Skenes Creek Road this financial year. It is expected that this work will be completed by April 2006.

Transport: Great Ocean Road — Kennett River

870. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to works other than minor works on the Kennett River area of the Great Ocean Road —

- (1) When were works other than minor works last undertaken in the Grey River area.
- (2) Are sections of any such works now breaking up; if so —
 - (a) will rectification works be scheduled;
 - (b) when will rectification works be scheduled;
 - (c) what is the estimated cost of rectification works.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

- 1. Works have been conducted in the Grey River area in 2004 and are ongoing in 2005. Works recently completed include shoulder sealing and guardrail installation as well as other safety improvement initiatives.
- 2. There is no evidence to suggest that sections of the recently completed works in the Grey River area have been breaking up.

Transport: rail — average dwell times

884. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — have any studies been undertaken to determine average dwell times of Siemens, X'trapolis or Comeng trains on each of Melbourne's 15 electrified rail

lines; if so, for how many seconds does each type of train typically stop at intermediate stations on each of the 15 lines on the —

- (1) 'Up' during —
 - (a) the weekday peak;
 - (b) the weekday off-peak;
 - (c) weekend hours.
- (2) 'Down' during
 - (a) the weekday peak;
 - (b) the weekday off-peak;
 - (c) weekend hours.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

Connex regularly audits train running times, including dwell times, to ensure the schedules provided in the timetable can be delivered.

The typical dwell time for all trains, at all locations, on all days is approximately 20 seconds. There are slightly longer dwell times for peak period services at Richmond, North Melbourne, Melbourne Central and Parliament Stations.

Details of average dwell times by train type are not maintained by Connex.

Transport: VicRoads — traffic controller jobs

888. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to VicRoads 'traffic controller' jobs for each of August and September 2005 — how many jobs were for —

- (1) Traffic signals.
- (2) Major signal fault.
- (3) Hardware failure.
- (4) Causing traffic delays.
- (5) Accident damage.
- (6) Graffiti.
- (7) Programmed works.
- (8) Other damage such as vandalism.
- (9) Other causes.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

In relation to traffic controller jobs, the following table shows the total numbers by job category for the months of August and September 2005.

VicRoads Traffic Signal Controller Jobs	August 2005	September 2005
Traffic signals	47	34
Major signal fault	0	1
Hardware failure	0	1
Causing traffic delays	0	0
Accident damage	0	1
Graffiti	98	71
Programmed works	37	75
Other damage such as vandalism	4	16
Other causes	398	404
TOTAL	584	603

Transport: Monash Freeway noise walls

899. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to the gap of approximately 250 metres in noise walls along the Monash Freeway on the south side close to Kooyong railway station and Talbot Crescent Kooyong —

- (1) Is the gap the result of a demarcation dispute between VicRoads and CityLink.
- (2) Travelling from the central business district, does CityLink end at a point just east of Glenferrie Road.
- (3) How many metres from Glenferrie Road does the changeover in responsibility occur.
- (4) When were decibel readings last conducted for homes in Talbot Crescent Kooyong by VicRoads and what decibel readings resulted for each measured time span;
- (5) Will VicRoads conduct further decibel readings for homes in Talbot Crescent Kooyong; if so, when.
- (6) What is the anticipated cost of filling in the gap.
- (7) Is funding available in 2005–06 for filling the gap; if not, when is it likely that an allocation can be provided.
- (8) What relative priority would works to fill the gap at this location have.
- (9) What VicRoads sites would rank above this site in priority.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

1. There is no demarcation dispute between VicRoads and the City Link Authority.
2. The boundary between the City Link Authority and VicRoads on the Monash Freeway is at an expansion joint on the elevated structure (bridge deck) of the Freeway, about 220 metres east of Glenferrie Road.
3. The boundary is about 220 metres east of Glenferrie Road.

4. The most recent noise measurements carried out at properties along Talbot Crescent, Kooyong, were done from Friday 30 September to Thursday 6 October 2005. Of the five days of complete noise measurements, only 4 & 5 October 2005 were not adversely affected by excessive wind. The results for these two days are:
- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1/17 Talbot Crescent, Kooyong | 59.5 and 58.0 dB(A) L ₁₀ (18hrs) |
| 2/19 Talbot Crescent, Kooyong | 65.9 and 66.1 dB(A) L ₁₀ (18hrs) |
| 31 Talbot Crescent, Kooyong | 61.5 and 62.1 dB(A) L ₁₀ (18hrs) |
| 33 Talbot Crescent, Kooyong | 62.9 and 63.4 dB(A) L ₁₀ (18hrs) |
| 35 Talbot Crescent, Kooyong | 61.7 and 62.0 dB(A) L ₁₀ (18hrs) |
5. VicRoads will monitor traffic noise levels at properties along Talbot Crescent again in approximately two years.
6. There is no funding estimate for noise barriers at this location.
7. VicRoads has no funding allocation in the 2005/06 financial year for noise barrier retrofitting works in this area. As the retrofitting trigger noise level has not been exceeded in this area, there is no current proposal or estimate for noise barriers at this location.
8. It has no priority.
9. Sites that have noise levels that exceed the noise barrier retrofitting trigger level of 68 dB(A) L₁₀ (18hr) would be a higher priority.

Transport: Spencer Street Station — platforms

- 915.** Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport — will the finish to the stairs from platforms five and six to the Bourke Street Bridge be improved.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

The stairs connecting Platforms 5 and 6 to the Bourke Street Bridge at Spencer Street Station are not in their final configuration. The stairs will have a slip resistant epoxy finish at this location.

Transport: VicRoads — speed zone complaints

- 919.** Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport —
- (1) How many complaints did VicRoads receive between 1 January 2005 and 18 October 2005 regarding speed zones in metropolitan Melbourne about —
 - (a) 40 km/h school zones;
 - (b) 40 km/h strip shopping zones;
 - (c) 50 km/zones.
 - (2) How many complaints did VicRoads receive between 1 January 2005 and 18 October 2005 regarding speed zones in rural Victoria about —
 - (a) 40 km/h school zones;
 - (b) 40 km/h strip shopping zones;
 - (c) 50 km/zones.

- (3) Were there any locations in metropolitan Melbourne or rural Victoria that were the subject of three or more complaints about speed zones by different individuals or stakeholders; if so, for each location —
- (a) what is the location of the speed zone, including cross streets;
 - (b) what is the current speed limit at the location;
 - (c) from what date did this speed zone take effect;
 - (d) what was the previous speed limit.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

VicRoads does not have a single system to record such complaints. Any complaints could be received via a number of channels and recorded in a number of systems.

To collate the records to provide a consolidated response would involve an unreasonable diversion of resources.

Transport: V/Line — taxis

921. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to V/Line's use of taxis in September 2005 —

- (1) What was V/Line's total bill for taxis.
- (2) What total amount was spent on taxis to convey —
 - (a) passengers;
 - (b) V/Line train drivers;
 - (c) other V/Line staff such as staff of V/Line managers or administrative staff.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is :

- (1) The total V/Line bill for taxis for September 2005 was \$21,997.14 (exclusive of GST).
- (2) The total amount spent on taxis to convey:
 - (a) Passengers was \$5,015.34
 - (b) V/Line train drivers was \$10,404.22
 - (c) Other V/Line staff was \$6,577.58

Transport: rail — carriage defects

925. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to defective doors on the 7.35am 'up' Sandringham train on Thursday 20 October 2005 —

- (1) Was the train cancelled from Balaclava to Flinders Street due to defective doors.
- (2) Was the train a six-car 'Comeng'.
- (3) How many doors were defective.

- (4) In what cars were the defective doors.
- (5) How many minutes late, if any, were the following three 'up' Sandringham trains upon arrival at Flinders Street that morning.
- (6) Were any further 'up' or 'down' Sandringham or other Connex services cancelled as a consequence of the initial cancellations; if so, what time was each train scheduled to depart and what were its stations of scheduled departure and arrival.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) One.
- (4) The third carriage (in leading order).
- (5) Eight minutes late, five minutes late, and two minutes late.
- (6) No.

Transport: Peninsula Bus Lines

928. Mr MULDER to ask the Minister for Transport with reference to routes 782 and 783 —

- (1) How many passenger journeys were made on the routes using Metlink (OneLink) tickets between any two points on each route in —
 - (a) August 2004;
 - (b) September 2004;
 - (c) August 2005;
 - (d) September 2005.
- (2) What percentage of each route's passengers travel on an adult ticket.

ANSWER:

As at the date the question was raised, the answer is:

- (1) Data reflects total passengers travelling on Route 782 between Balnarring and Frankston and on Route 783 between Hastings and Frankston.

(a) August 2004	Route 782 – 13,838.	Route 783 – 3,478.
(b) September 2004	Route 782 – 13,575.	Route 783 – 3,505.
(c) August 2005	Route 782 – 14,240.	Route 783 – 3,742.
(d) September 2005	Route 782 – 13,010.	Route 783 – 4,265.
- (2) Route 782 – 15.8 per cent. Route 783 – 13.5 per cent.