

PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA

**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(HANSARD)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

FIRST SESSION

Tuesday, 14 November 2017

(Extract from book 15)

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

By authority of the Victorian Government Printer

The Governor

The Honourable LINDA DESSAU, AC

The Lieutenant-Governor

The Honourable KEN LAY, AO, APM

The ministry

(from 16 October 2017)

Premier	The Hon. D. M. Andrews, MP
Deputy Premier, Minister for Education and Minister for Emergency Services	The Hon. J. A. Merlino, MP
Treasurer and Minister for Resources	The Hon. T. H. Pallas, MP
Minister for Public Transport and Minister for Major Projects	The Hon. J. Allan, MP
Minister for Industry and Employment	The Hon. B. A. Carroll, MP
Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Innovation and the Digital Economy, and Minister for Small Business	The Hon. P. Dalidakis, MLC
Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change, and Minister for Suburban Development	The Hon. L. D' Ambrosio, MP
Minister for Roads and Road Safety, and Minister for Ports	The Hon. L. A. Donnellan, MP
Minister for Tourism and Major Events, Minister for Sport and Minister for Veterans	The Hon. J. H. Eren, MP
Minister for Housing, Disability and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health, Minister for Equality and Minister for Creative Industries	The Hon. M. P. Foley, MP
Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services	The Hon. J. Hennessy, MP
Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Family Violence	The Hon. N. M. Hutchins, MP
Special Minister of State	The Hon. G. Jennings, MLC
Minister for Consumer Affairs, Gaming and Liquor Regulation, and Minister for Local Government	The Hon. M. Kairouz, MP
Minister for Families and Children, Minister for Early Childhood Education and Minister for Youth Affairs	The Hon. J. Mikakos, MLC
Minister for Police and Minister for Water	The Hon. L. M. Neville, MP
Attorney-General and Minister for Racing	The Hon. M. P. Pakula, MP
Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Regional Development	The Hon. J. L. Pulford, MLC
Minister for Finance and Minister for Multicultural Affairs	The Hon. R. D. Scott, MP
Minister for Training and Skills, and Minister for Corrections	The Hon. G. A. Tierney, MLC
Minister for Planning	The Hon. R. W. Wynne, MP
Cabinet Secretary	Ms M. Thomas, MP

The Governor

The Honourable LINDA DESSAU, AC

The Lieutenant-Governor

The Honourable Justice MARILYN WARREN, AC, QC

The ministry

(to 15 October 2017)

Premier	The Hon. D. M. Andrews, MP
Deputy Premier, Minister for Education and Minister for Emergency Services	The Hon. J. A. Merlino, MP
Treasurer	The Hon. T. H. Pallas, MP
Minister for Public Transport and Minister for Major Projects	The Hon. J. Allan, MP
Minister for Small Business, Innovation and Trade.	The Hon. P. Dalidakis, MLC
Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change, and Minister for Suburban Development	The Hon. L. D'Ambrosio, MP
Minister for Roads and Road Safety, and Minister for Ports	The Hon. L. A. Donnellan, MP
Minister for Tourism and Major Events, Minister for Sport and Minister for Veterans	The Hon. J. H. Eren, MP
Minister for Housing, Disability and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health, Minister for Equality and Minister for Creative Industries	The Hon. M. P. Foley, MP
Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services	The Hon. J. Hennessy, MP
Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Family Violence	The Hon. N. M. Hutchins, MP
Special Minister of State	The Hon. G. Jennings, MLC
Minister for Consumer Affairs, Gaming and Liquor Regulation and Minister for Local Government	The Hon. M. Kairouz, MP
Minister for Families and Children, and Minister for Youth Affairs.	The Hon. J. Mikakos, MLC
Minister for Police and Minister for Water	The Hon. L. M. Neville, MP
Minister for Industry and Employment, and Minister for Resources	The Hon. W. M. Noonan, MP
Attorney-General and Minister for Racing	The Hon. M. P. Pakula, MP
Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Regional Development.	The Hon. J. L. Pulford, MLC
Minister for Finance and Minister for Multicultural Affairs.	The Hon. R. D. Scott, MP
Minister for Training and Skills, and Minister for Corrections	The Hon. G. A. Tierney, MLC
Minister for Planning	The Hon. R. W. Wynne, MP
Cabinet Secretary	Ms M. Thomas, MP

The Governor

The Honourable LINDA DESSAU, AC

The Lieutenant-Governor

The Honourable Justice MARILYN WARREN, AC, QC

The ministry

(to 12 September 2017)

Premier	The Hon. D. M. Andrews, MP
Deputy Premier, Minister for Education and Minister for Emergency Services	The Hon. J. A. Merlino, MP
Treasurer	The Hon. T. H. Pallas, MP
Minister for Public Transport and Minister for Major Projects	The Hon. J. Allan, MP
Minister for Small Business, Innovation and Trade	The Hon. P. Dalidakis, MLC
Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change, and Minister for Suburban Development	The Hon. L. D'Ambrosio, MP
Minister for Roads and Road Safety, and Minister for Ports	The Hon. L. A. Donnellan, MP
Minister for Tourism and Major Events, Minister for Sport and Minister for Veterans	The Hon. J. H. Eren, MP
Minister for Housing, Disability and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health, Minister for Equality and Minister for Creative Industries	The Hon. M. P. Foley, MP
Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services	The Hon. J. Hennessy, MP
Minister for Local Government, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister for Industrial Relations	The Hon. N. M. Hutchins, MP
Special Minister of State	The Hon. G. Jennings, MLC
Minister for Consumer Affairs, Gaming and Liquor Regulation	The Hon. M. Kairouz, MP
Minister for Families and Children, and Minister for Youth Affairs	The Hon. J. Mikakos, MLC
Minister for Police and Minister for Water	The Hon. L. M. Neville, MP
Minister for Industry and Employment, and Minister for Resources	The Hon. W. M. Noonan, MP
Attorney-General and Minister for Racing	The Hon. M. P. Pakula, MP
Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Regional Development	The Hon. J. L. Pulford, MLC
Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Family Violence (until 23 August 2017)	The Hon. F. Richardson, MP
Minister for Finance and Minister for Multicultural Affairs	The Hon. R. D. Scott, MP
Minister for Training and Skills, and Minister for Corrections	The Hon. G. A. Tierney, MLC
Minister for Planning	The Hon. R. W. Wynne, MP
Cabinet Secretary	Ms M. Thomas, MP

**OFFICE-HOLDERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT — FIRST SESSION**

Speaker

The Hon. C. W. BROOKS (from 7 March 2017)

The Hon. TELMO LANGUILLER (to 25 February 2017)

Deputy Speaker

Ms J. MAREE EDWARDS (from 7 March 2017)

Mr D. A. NARDELLA (to 27 February 2017)

Acting Speakers

Ms Blandthorn, Mr Carbines, Ms Couzens, Mr Dimopoulos, Mr Edbrooke, Ms Graley, Ms Kilkenny, Ms Knight, Mr McGuire, Mr Pearson, Mr Richardson, Ms Spence, Ms Suleyman, Ms Thomson, Ms Ward and Ms Williams.

Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and Premier

The Hon. D. M. ANDREWS

Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and Deputy Premier

The Hon. J. A. MERLINO

Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and Leader of the Opposition

The Hon. M. J. GUY

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

The Hon. D. J. HODGETT

Leader of The Nationals

The Hon. P. L. WALSH

Deputy Leader of The Nationals

Ms S. RYAN

Heads of parliamentary departments

Assembly — Acting Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Ms Bridget Noonan

Council — Acting Clerk of the Parliaments and Clerk of the Legislative Council: Mr A. Young

Parliamentary Services — Secretary: Mr P. Lochert

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT — FIRST SESSION

Member	District	Party	Member	District	Party
Allan, Ms Jacinta Marie	Bendigo East	ALP	McLeish, Ms Lucinda Gaye	Eildon	LP
Andrews, Mr Daniel Michael	Mulgrave	ALP	Merlino, Mr James Anthony	Monbulk	ALP
Angus, Mr Neil Andrew Warwick	Forest Hill	LP	Morris, Mr David Charles	Mornington	LP
Asher, Ms Louise	Brighton	LP	Mulder, Mr Terence Wynn ²	Polwarth	LP
Battin, Mr Bradley William	Gembrook	LP	Naphthine, Dr Denis Vincent ³	South-West Coast	LP
Blackwood, Mr Gary John	Narracan	LP	Nardella, Mr Donato Antonio ⁴	Melton	Ind
Blandthorn, Ms Elizabeth Anne	Pascoe Vale	ALP	Neville, Ms Lisa Mary	Bellarine	ALP
Britnell, Ms Roma ¹	South-West Coast	LP	Noonan, Mr Wade Matthew	Williamstown	ALP
Brooks, Mr Colin William	Bundoora	ALP	Northe, Mr Russell John ⁵	Morwell	Ind
Bull, Mr Joshua Michael	Sunbury	ALP	O'Brien, Mr Daniel David ⁶	Gippsland South	Nats
Bull, Mr Timothy Owen	Gippsland East	Nats	O'Brien, Mr Michael Anthony	Malvern	LP
Burgess, Mr Neale Ronald	Hastings	LP	Pakula, Mr Martin Philip	Keysborough	ALP
Carbines, Mr Anthony Richard	Ivanhoe	ALP	Pallas, Mr Timothy Hugh	Werribee	ALP
Carroll, Mr Benjamin Alan	Niddrie	ALP	Paynter, Mr Brian Francis	Bass	LP
Clark, Mr Robert William	Box Hill	LP	Pearson, Mr Daniel James	Essendon	ALP
Couzens, Ms Christine Anne	Geelong	ALP	Perera, Mr Jude	Cranbourne	ALP
Crisp, Mr Peter Laurence	Mildura	Nats	Pesutto, Mr John	Hawthorn	LP
D'Ambrosio, Ms Liliana	Mill Park	ALP	Richardson, Mr Timothy Noel	Mordialloc	ALP
Dimopoulos, Mr Stephen	Oakleigh	ALP	Richardson, Ms Fiona Catherine Alison ⁷	Northcote	ALP
Dixon, Mr Martin Francis	Nepean	LP	Riordan, Mr Richard ⁸	Polwarth	LP
Donnellan, Mr Luke Anthony	Narre Warren North	ALP	Ryall, Ms Deanne Sharon	Ringwood	LP
Edbrooke, Mr Paul Andrew	Frankston	ALP	Ryan, Mr Peter Julian ⁹	Gippsland South	Nats
Edwards, Ms Janice Maree	Bendigo West	ALP	Ryan, Ms Stephanie Maureen	Euroa	Nats
Eren, Mr John Hamdi	Lara	ALP	Sandell, Ms Ellen	Melbourne	Greens
Foley, Mr Martin Peter	Albert Park	ALP	Scott, Mr Robin David	Preston	ALP
Fyffe, Mrs Christine Anne	Evelyn	LP	Sheed, Ms Suzanna	Shepparton	Ind
Garrett, Ms Jane Furneaux	Brunswick	ALP	Smith, Mr Ryan	Warrandyte	LP
Gidley, Mr Michael Xavier Charles	Mount Waverley	LP	Smith, Mr Timothy Colin	Kew	LP
Graley, Ms Judith Ann	Narre Warren South	ALP	Southwick, Mr David James	Caulfield	LP
Green, Ms Danielle Louise	Yan Yean	ALP	Spence, Ms Rosalind Louise	Yuroke	ALP
Guy, Mr Matthew Jason	Bulleen	LP	Staikos, Mr Nicholas	Bentleigh	ALP
Halfpenny, Ms Bronwyn	Thomastown	ALP	Staley, Ms Louise Eileen	Ripon	LP
Hennessy, Ms Jill	Altona	ALP	Suleyman, Ms Natalie	St Albans	ALP
Hibbins, Mr Samuel Peter	Prahran	Greens	Thomas, Ms Mary-Anne	Macedon	ALP
Hodgett, Mr David John	Croydon	LP	Thompson, Mr Murray Hamilton Ross	Sandringham	LP
Howard, Mr Geoffrey Kemp	Buninyong	ALP	Thomson, Ms Marsha Rose	Footscray	ALP
Hutchins, Ms Natalie Maree Sykes	Sydenham	ALP	Tilley, Mr William John	Benambra	LP
Kairouz, Ms Marlene	Kororoit	ALP	Victoria, Ms Heidi	Bayswater	LP
Katos, Mr Andrew	South Barwon	LP	Wakeling, Mr Nicholas	Ferntree Gully	LP
Kealy, Ms Emma Jayne	Lowan	Nats	Walsh, Mr Peter Lindsay	Murray Plains	Nats
Kilkenny, Ms Sonya	Carrum	ALP	Ward, Ms Vicki	Eltham	ALP
Knight, Ms Sharon Patricia	Wendouree	ALP	Watt, Mr Graham Travis	Burwood	LP
Languiller, Mr Telmo Ramon	Tarneit	ALP	Wells, Mr Kimberley Arthur	Rowville	LP
Lim, Mr Muy Hong	Clarinda	ALP	Williams, Ms Gabrielle	Dandenong	ALP
McCurdy, Mr Timothy Logan	Ovens Valley	Nats	Wynne, Mr Richard William	Richmond	ALP
McGuire, Mr Frank	Broadmeadows	ALP			

¹ Elected 31 October 2015

² Resigned 3 September 2015

³ Resigned 3 September 2015

⁴ ALP until 7 March 2017

⁵ Nats until 28 August 2017

⁶ Elected 14 March 2015

⁷ Died 23 August 2017

⁸ Elected 31 October 2015

⁹ Resigned 2 February 2015

PARTY ABBREVIATIONS

ALP — Labor Party; Greens — The Greens;
Ind — Independent; LP — Liberal Party; Nats — The Nationals.

Legislative Assembly committees

Privileges Committee — Ms Allan, Mr Clark, Ms D’Ambrosio, Mr Morris, Ms Neville, Ms Ryan, Ms Sandell, Mr Scott and Mr Wells.

Standing Orders Committee — The Speaker, Ms Allan, Ms Asher, Mr Carroll, Mr Clark, Ms Edwards, Mr Hibbins, Mr Hodgett, Ms Kairouz, Ms Ryan and Ms Sheed.

Legislative Assembly select committees

Penalty Rates and Fair Pay Select Committee — Ms Blandthorn, Mr J. Bull, Mr Clark, Mr Hibbins, Ms Ryall, Ms Suleyman and Ms Williams.

Joint committees

Accountability and Oversight Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Angus, Mr Gidley, Mr Staikos and Ms Thomson. (*Council*): Mr O’Sullivan, Mr Purcell and Ms Symes.

Dispute Resolution Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Allan, Mr Clark, Ms Hutchins, Mr Merlino, Mr M. O’Brien, Mr Pakula and Mr Walsh. (*Council*): Mr Bourman, Mr Dalidakis, Ms Dunn, Mr Jennings and Ms Wooldridge.

Economic, Education, Jobs and Skills Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Crisp, Mrs Fyffe, Ms Garrett and Ms Ryall. (*Council*): Mr Bourman, Mr Elasmarr and Mr Melhem.

Electoral Matters Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Asher, Ms Blandthorn, Mr Dixon and Ms Spence. (*Council*): Ms Bath, Ms Patten and Mr Somyurek.

Environment, Natural Resources and Regional Development Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr J. Bull, Ms Halfpenny, Mr Richardson and Mr Riordan. (*Council*): Mr O’Sullivan, Mr Ramsay and Mr Young.

Family and Community Development Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Britnell, Ms Couzens, Mr Edbrooke, Ms Edwards and Ms McLeish. (*Council*): Dr Carling-Jenkins and Mr Finn.

House Committee — (*Assembly*): The Speaker (*ex officio*), Mr J. Bull, Mr Crisp, Mrs Fyffe, Mr Staikos, Ms Suleyman and Mr Thompson. (*Council*): The President (*ex officio*), Mr Eideh, Ms Hartland, Ms Lovell, Mr Mulino and Mr Young.

Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Hibbins, Mr D. O’Brien, Mr Richardson, Ms Thomson and Mr Wells. (*Council*): Mr Ramsay and Ms Symes.

Law Reform, Road and Community Safety Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Dixon, Mr Howard, Ms Suleyman, Mr Thompson and Mr Tilley. (*Council*): Mr Gepp and Ms Patten.

Public Accounts and Estimates Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Dimopoulos, Mr Morris, Mr D. O’Brien, Mr Pearson, Mr T. Smith and Ms Ward. (*Council*): Ms Patten, Ms Pennicuik and Ms Shing.

Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Blandthorn, Mr J. Bull, Mr Dimopoulos, Ms Kilkenny and Mr Pesutto. (*Council*): Ms Bath and Mr Dalla-Riva.

CONTENTS

TUESDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY	3741	<i>Mark Philip</i>	3769
CONDOLENCES		<i>Melton electorate health forum</i>	3769
<i>Hon. Ian Robert Cathie</i>	3741	<i>Pinkerton Forest</i>	3770
ABSENCE OF MINISTER	3748	<i>Christ the King School, Newcomb</i>	3770
VIDEO ON DEMAND	3748	<i>Weilong Grape Wine Company</i>	3770
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE and MINISTERS		<i>Ouyen Farmers Festival</i>	3770
STATEMENTS		<i>Remembrance Day</i>	3770, 3772
<i>Energy security</i>	3748, 3749	<i>Ballarat shared paths</i>	3771
<i>Ministers statements: western roads upgrade</i>	3750	<i>Buninyong electorate sporting club grants</i>	3771
<i>Energy policy</i>	3750, 3751	<i>Fire services</i>	3771
<i>Ministers statements: housing affordability</i>	3751, 3752	<i>Jackson School</i>	3771
<i>Energy supply</i>	3751, 3752	<i>Sunshine Hospital</i>	3771
<i>Electricity prices</i>	3753, 3754, 3755, 3756	<i>St Albans mural</i>	3771
<i>Ministers statements: housing</i>	3755	<i>Western roads upgrade</i>	3771
<i>Ministers statements: employment initiatives</i>	3756	<i>Country Fire Authority Kiewa brigade</i>	3772
RULINGS BY THE CHAIR		<i>3rd Wodonga Scout Group</i>	3772
<i>Constituency questions</i>	3757	<i>The Tree of Life</i>	3772
CONSTITUENCY QUESTIONS		<i>Geelong Region Scouts</i>	3772
<i>Mornington electorate</i>	3758	<i>Country Fire Authority Connewarre brigade</i>	3772
<i>Yuroke electorate</i>	3759	<i>Chelsea Kindergarten</i>	3772
<i>Euroa electorate</i>	3759	<i>Warrnambool Special Developmental School</i>	3773
<i>Williamstown electorate</i>	3759	<i>Mark Heffernan</i>	3773
<i>Brighton electorate</i>	3759	<i>Relay for Life</i>	3773
<i>Carrum electorate</i>	3759	DISTINGUISHED VISITORS	3774
<i>Melton electorate</i>	3760	PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT AMENDMENT	
<i>Pascoe Vale electorate</i>	3760	(PUBLIC LAND CONTRIBUTIONS) BILL 2017	
<i>Benambra electorate</i>	3760	<i>Second reading</i>	3774, 3802
<i>Yan Yean electorate</i>	3760	CAULFIELD RACECOURSE RESERVE BILL 2017	
ROAD SAFETY AMENDMENT (AUTOMATED		<i>Council's amendments</i>	3799
VEHICLES) BILL 2017		ADJOURNMENT	
<i>Introduction and first reading</i>	3760	<i>Forest Road, The Basin, pedestrian crossing</i>	3802
PETITIONS		<i>Wine industry</i>	3803
<i>Reservoir East Primary School</i>	3760	<i>Gippsland rail services</i>	3803
SCRUTINY OF ACTS AND REGULATIONS		<i>Upfield–Somerton rail upgrade</i>	3804
COMMITTEE		<i>Croydon Primary School</i>	3804
<i>Alert Digest No. 16</i>	3761	<i>Sports funding</i>	3804
INDEPENDENT BROAD-BASED ANTI-CORRUPTION		<i>Fetal alcohol syndrome disorder</i>	3805
COMMISSION COMMITTEE		<i>Frankston Dolphins</i>	3805
<i>Performance monitoring framework</i>	3761	<i>Mornington Peninsula Freeway</i>	3806
DOCUMENTS	3761	<i>Atkinson Street–Dandenong Road, Oakleigh</i>	3806
ROYAL ASSENT	3762	<i>Responses</i>	3807
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE			
<i>Program</i>	3762		
MEMBERS STATEMENTS			
<i>Mornington Peninsula planning</i>	3766		
<i>Vietnamese community</i>	3767		
<i>Devon North Primary School</i>	3767		
<i>Yarram Primary School</i>	3767		
<i>Sale RSL and Community Club</i>	3767		
<i>Venus Bay Surf Life Saving Club</i>	3768		
<i>School asbestos removal program</i>	3768		
<i>Cockatoo Primary School</i>	3768		
<i>Oakleigh Glendi</i>	3768		
<i>Clayton North Primary School</i>	3768		
<i>Weston Bate</i>	3769		
<i>Ambulance services</i>	3769		

Tuesday, 14 November 2017

The SPEAKER (Hon. Colin Brooks) took the chair at 12.04 p.m. and read the prayer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The SPEAKER (12:04) — We acknowledge the traditional Aboriginal owners of the land on which we are meeting. We pay our respects to them, their culture, their elders past, present and future, and elders from other communities who may be here today.

CONDOLENCES

Hon. Ian Robert Cathie

Mr ANDREWS (Premier) (12:05) — I move:

That this house expresses its sincere sorrow at the death of the Honourable Ian Robert Cathie, and places on record its acknowledgement of the valuable services rendered by him to the Parliament and the people of Victoria as a member of the Legislative Council for the electoral province of South Eastern from 1964 to 1970; member of the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Carrum from 1976 to 1988; Minister of Housing from 1982 to 1985; Minister of Economic Development from 1982 to 1983; Minister for Industry, Commerce and Technology from 1983 to 1985; Minister for Education from 1985 to 1987; Minister for the Arts from 1987 to 1988; and Minister Assisting the Minister for Education with responsibility for Post-Secondary Education from 1987 to 1988.

Ian Robert Cathie was born in Melbourne on 24 October 1932. Eighty-five years and one day later, sadly, he left us. In between, Ian lived a life defined by his commitment to achieving something better. Today as a Parliament and as a state we pause to reflect and remember his remarkable legacy.

Ian was the child of Sybil and George, an enthusiastic student at state schools and Wesley College. He went on to study teaching and share the gift of education with others. All up, he taught English at Frankston and Mordialloc Chelsea high schools for some 13 years. In doing so, he gave his students more than just the skills to succeed; he gave them the words to write their lives large. If that were the extent of his service to our state, it would still deserve our thanks and our praise. But Ian Cathie would go on to influence the life of this state and the future of our kids more profoundly than perhaps he could know.

It was in 1955 that this printer's son decided that there was a natural home for his kind of people and his kind of values; indeed, the Australian Labor Party was that place. Ian joined the Carrum branch, and within three years this newcomer was secretary. Today, as we

remember Ian, we particularly recognise the pain that the Carrum branch is feeling and the gap that his passing has left.

Ian came of age in a country that was becoming but had not yet become the one that we know today. Despite the quiet complacency of the Menzies years, our understanding of who could be an Australian was expanding. As a nation, we were taking confident strides on the world stage. It was against this backdrop of profound change that Ian Cathie's life changed too. He was blessed with children, and his kids — Jane, Steven, David and Libby — would become Ian's greatest loves. To all his family, please know we are so very sorry for your loss.

Supported by his family, inspired by his students and emboldened by the kind of experience that only the Labor Party affords, it was in 1964 that Ian decided to submit his values to the ultimate test: launching a political career. That career would span a memorable quarter of a century. But despite the glare of public office, it did not diminish his values; instead, it galvanised them.

Ian was first elected to the Victorian Legislative Council as the member for South Eastern Province. Those six years would be his first taste of representing the mighty south-east. In 1976 he won the privilege to represent the people of Carrum. Three years later, after they saw him up close, they returned him with a 24-point margin — pause for jealous sighs from all sides of the chamber, I am sure. At the next election in 1982 remarkably that margin grew further. I am sure everyone in this chamber would agree that it is quite a feat to be returned with three consecutive increased majorities. These results speak to the respect that Ian Cathie garnered, and the giant shadow that his passing has cast over Melbourne's south-eastern suburbs.

Ian Cathie's legacy was not merely local. The portfolios he held in the Cain government tell you all you need to know about who he was and who he fought for: economic development, where Ian fought to create jobs for Victorians; industry, where he fought to build up our businesses; housing, where he fought to end homelessness; and education, where Ian realised his greatest political passion. I would like to linger here just for a moment because even today the students of our state are benefiting from Ian Cathie's work.

In 1985 the Blackburn report into post-compulsory schooling shone a light on the inadequacies of our system, and as a former teacher, Ian knew the education system better than most. He saw all the ways it lifted students up and all the ways it let them down. He

understood that education was the stepping stone to a better life and a better future. So with unrivalled conviction and utter tenacity he fought for reform. He fought for a system that would enable the next generation of Victorians to, as he put it, ‘take their places confidently in a changing society’. Today we recognise Ian Cathie as an indispensable part of the confident, outward-looking, forward-facing Victoria we have today.

I have told a story of the life of Ian Cathie. It is not the definitive story; that is better left to those who knew him best. I would like to say this as I close: some in this place will be remembered when they go, but any of us would be lucky to be remembered for the same reasons as Ian — as someone who championed change; who recognised a purpose beyond himself; who never, ever compromised on his principles; and whose service to his party and this Parliament was only bettered by his love for family.

Today this place and all of Victoria remembers Ian Cathie: a proud Labor servant; a proud servant of this state; and as Ian would have wanted, most importantly, a partner, a father, a grandfather, a brother, an uncle and a friend. We are each richer for his contribution and poorer for his passing.

Mr GUY (Leader of the Opposition) (12:12) — Today we are here to pay tribute to a stand-out contributor to Victoria’s state education system, the Honourable Ian Cathie. Born in 1932, married in 1957 and then again in 1976, father to Jane, Steven, David and Libby and grandfather to Joshua, Rhiannon, Kelvin, Harley and Troy, Mr Cathie was trained as a teacher and went on to teach secondary school at Frankston High School and then Mordialloc Chelsea High School.

As a young man of 32 he contested the upper house seat of South Eastern Province for the Labor Party under Clive Stoneham’s leadership and was subsequently elected. From there he focused a number of his speeches on his lifelong passion: education policy. When I looked at his maiden speech, he outlined what was to become a career focused on education policy by stressing the necessity for a focus on science and technology in our schools; the need to educate children to their own abilities — not low-quality mass education; a desire to ensure that the state education system had quality teachers; and a need to make education accessible to all regardless of social class and, as such, a meritocracy for schools and tertiary education.

Surprisingly defeated at the 1970 election, Ian Cathie did not give up. He was returned to Parliament two elections

later in 1976 as the member for the Legislative Assembly seat of Carrum, a seat he held on to until 1988, when he then retired from parliamentary life.

Firstly, in 1982 he was Minister of Housing and then Minister of Economic Development, and then Minister for Industry, Commerce and Technology, but it was in 1985, when Mr Cathie became the state’s education minister, that he made a name for himself that is well-known to all around this building. Mr Cathie was instrumental in the reform of the higher school certificate system. He was a pioneer of the Victorian certificate of education (VCE) system, albeit with a differentiation to many, including elements of the union movement, on the implementation and operation of the VCE, and developed the concept of self-governing schools. That concept was one that spanned another government. The concept of self-governing schools of Mr Cathie’s, as outlined in his *Taking Schools into the 1990s* paper, was then implemented by the Kennett government and has survived long past that original paper of his in the 1980s.

But he implemented many other reforms in Victoria’s education system. He abolished corporal punishment and school inspectors, he supported the Blackburn inquiry seeking to reform the senior years of schooling, including the curriculum and assessment, and he understood that kids of the future would have to be prepared for numerous jobs over their lifetime instead of the traditional one role. He was someone who was thinking well ahead of his time in his portfolio.

As a product of the state education system of the 1980s, both primary and secondary, I remember Mr Cathie as the education minister visiting my own school, then Montmorency High School, now Montmorency Secondary College, and coming along to one of our school assemblies. Like many ministers, he was greeted as a rock star. Apart from the school experience, I think that highlights one of Mr Cathie’s well-known strong points in his time as education minister. He was frequently visiting schools and refused to be captured by his department or any around him. He was frequently talking to teachers and even coming along to meet and talk to students directly. In the 1980s this was not always the done thing. Mr Cathie prided himself on speaking to those in the system, not those of the system.

On retirement from this Parliament many spoke fondly of him and fondly of his legacy, even those on this side of the house. I note that former Liberal minister Alan Hunt heaped praise on Mr Cathie’s concepts around self-governing schools, in particular the concepts of allowing schools to act as autonomously as they could from a department always wanting to centralise and

standardise a school's operation. Mr Hunt was not alone in his recognition of Ian Cathie's foresight in this space.

After politics Ian Cathie went on to be a commissioner for the City of Greater Dandenong and chair of the Victorian Homeless Fund. He leaves behind a loving family and a state that recognises his achievements and his vision for state education that will and has long outlasted his parliamentary career. Mr Ian Cathie, member for South Eastern Province, member for Carrum, Minister for Education, rest in peace.

Ms KILKENNY (Carrum) (12:17) — Ian Robert Cathie held the state seat of Carrum from March 1976, when the seat was first created, to September 1988. At that time the seat of Carrum extended north and included Chelsea and Edithvale, as well as Bonbeach, Carrum and Seaford, and Patterson Lakes was only just being established. In the 1976 state election just over 2 million votes were cast across Victoria, with Ian winning his seat with a 10 per cent margin. We have heard that in 1979 Ian returned with a massive majority, winning every booth in the electorate — something I can only dream about.

Ian was a minister in the Cain governments of 1982 and 1985 and held significant portfolios across the arts, industry, commerce and technology, economic development, housing and education. Ian was also a wonderful local representative of the Carrum electorate and a much-loved and very involved member of the local community. Ian, together with his first wife, Christine, brought up their four children in the local area: Jane, Steven, David and Libby. Tragically, Steven passed away in a car accident in 1979, aged just 19.

I had the honour and privilege of attending the state funeral service for Ian at Monash University on the Friday before last. I heard such wonderful stories from his family, including his grandchildren. These were stories and wonderful memories that spoke of a most caring family man, who took exceptional pride in even the smallest of achievements of all his children and grandchildren. He was someone who was there at every milestone and someone who clearly cherished his time at home in the garden with his roses or on the local beach with the kids and a book.

I know that Ian was celebrating his 85th birthday at a local hotel with family and friends when he became ill and an ambulance was called. His son David told us that Ian, still conscious in the ambulance, and in typical Ian style, wanted to make sure that they were not abruptly leaving the hotel without having paid for their meals. He was assured that, yes, dinner had been paid for.

What was also very clear from the beautiful tributes, including from former Victorian Premier the Honourable John Cain, who spoke so personally and so caringly about Ian, was that Ian was a man of deep integrity and empathy and that Ian was a really decent bloke.

Before entering politics Ian was a schoolteacher. He had taught at Frankston High School, Mordialloc College and Seaford Carrum High School, now Patterson River Secondary College. I always think there is something quite special about schoolteachers; it is like they have this automatic decency and integrity rating. That was Ian. Ian understood that progress is not about material things. Ian understood that progress means striving for those universal values of equality, decency and dignity, and he understood that progress and social justice are about creating opportunities. As Ian said in his inaugural speech when first elected to the Legislative Council in 1964, individuals must rely on the opportunities that organised societies offer to them. Our concern is to see that access to education, access to jobs and access to justice should not be based on privilege or wealth.

Ian was intent on lifting educational standards and funding for our schools and for ending the inequity between them. He understood the opportunities that a good education in a good school can provide, and he most certainly understood the need for additional funding to help students who may be falling behind or falling through the cracks. Ian also understood the difficulties facing school leavers and young people seeking employment. He foresaw the need for more skills in science and technology and the role for schools in this space. So many of our reforms with education and with schools we owe to Ian Cathie for his advocacy and his vision.

Of course in housing Ian also had a big role to play — something he took with him after politics as a life member with Hanover Welfare Services and Launch Housing. Ian understood the need for social and low-cost housing and for housing particularly for those who find themselves in difficult circumstances. As Ian said:

I realise ... that these areas are not profit-making. Nevertheless, they are areas of the greatest benefit to the community as a whole.

Ian also foresaw issues with housing affordability, particularly for first home buyers — something that is so very relevant today to so many young people in Carrum and across Victoria.

Locally I know that Ian was committed to seeing the creation of local jobs, particularly at a time when local industry, such as the meat processing factory in

Chelsea, was closing down. Ian's commitment to our beautiful local environment saw the start of improvements in the quality of the water in Port Phillip Bay, better care for our beaches and our amazing Kananook Creek and the restoration of the Seaford foreshore — and I am proud to say that we have continued all of this work with great local results. While the old Chelsea meat processing factory may not be around anymore, we, like Ian was, are as committed as ever to the creation of local jobs and local opportunities and improvements to public transport. We have prioritised education and we are investing in our local schools, including the old Seaford Carrum High School, now the Patterson River Secondary College. We are committed to protecting the Kananook Creek, the Edithvale-Seaford Wetlands and our beautiful bay.

So many families in Carrum have benefited from Ian's commitment and passion for education, social housing reform, social justice and great local advocacy and representation. Ian Cathie, among many other achievements, was a most passionate, committed, caring and decent local member for the Carrum community. On behalf of the Carrum electorate we most sincerely thank, acknowledge and pay tribute to the late Honourable Ian Robert Cathie for all of his work in making our local community of Carrum a much better and more socially inclusive place. Our deepest condolences to Ian's family and loved ones for the loss of Ian Robert Cathie.

Mr WALSH (Murray Plains) (12:24) — Ian Robert Cathie was born on 24 October 1932 in Melbourne. He was educated in the state primary school system, Wesley College and at Queen's College at Melbourne University, where he graduated with a bachelor of arts with honours and a diploma of education. Before entering politics, as has already been said, Ian was a teacher of some 13 years standing, including time as a senior education master at Frankston High School. As someone who was involved in public life, Ian also had many community roles as well. One notable role that I picked out was that he was an honorary probation officer for something like six years, which would have been a demanding role in that position.

As has been said, Ian was an MLC for South Eastern Province from October 1964 until June 1970, when he was defeated, and he was the MLA for Carrum from March 1976 through to when he retired in September 1988. Ian held a number of ministries in the Cain government, including Minister of Housing, Minister of Economic Development and Minister for Industry, Commerce and Technology. As has been said, his role as Minister for Education from 1985 to 1987 was probably the highlight of his ministerial career because

it was the portfolio that he had a passion for. He was also the Minister for the Arts and Minister Assisting the Minister for Education with responsibility for Post-Secondary Education, from 1987 to 1988.

When Ian stood for South Eastern Province it was a by-election and an election that the Labor Party was not expected to win. In a subsequent interview in 1985 Ian talked about the fact that it was very hard to actually find a candidate for that election and that particular seat. He put his hand up and, as has been said, with an 11.5 per cent swing he won that seat by 2 per cent and then went on to serve that area for two terms.

In his inaugural speech when elected to the Legislative Council he talked about the need for education and he talked about change. You could equally make those comments today — about how we live in a new age, the age of science, the age of technology and the age of electronics, where skills and training are important if the nation is to develop and survive in the future and the wholly competitive world of that time. I think those comments are equally applicable today.

What is also interesting when reading Ian's inaugural speech is that he had quite a bit to say about the funding of libraries. He talked about the number of shillings that were spent per book per child and the fact that government grants to libraries were capped at £100. That probably dates his speech as he is talking about pre-decimal currency at that time.

He also talked about the need to have trained bursars in schools to take the workload off teachers and keep them from dealing with administrative issues in schools. He said there was a need for these bursars. We now see those bursars are in place in schools today. They free up teachers to actually do teaching time.

Ian also talked about the disparity between more affluent schools versus some schools in his area, which had assembly halls, sporting grounds and those extra facilities that schools need. He had a particular focus on technical schools, particularly mentioning the Wonthaggi and Frankston technical schools. He was obviously very interested in education from his time as a teacher through to when he came into Parliament.

It is interesting that when Ian stood for the seat of Carrum he actually talked about the trains and buses and the need to coordinate the services better to make sure the trains ran on time and make sure the buses were clean. Equally I think many a member of Parliament in this place has probably made similar speeches in their election pitches to the people of their particular electorate. I suppose it would be applicable

down the Frankston line today as it was back at that particular time.

Ian immersed himself into parliamentary life and into Labor Party politics. I was interested to note some of the changes in the leadership of the Labor Party at that time. Ian actually lost his shadow portfolio for backing John Cain against Frank Wilkes, but they created an extra portfolio the day after so Ian could go back into shadow cabinet —

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr WALSH — It's interesting, isn't it? But the biggest loss at that time was that Ian was demoted from the eight-man administrative committee of the parliamentary Labor Party at that particular time — the true power.

Like a lot of MPs, while Ian was a member of Parliament he was immersed in his community. He was the number one member of the Chelsea Football Club. They were very happy about having Ian sign up as the number one member. In that particular news article, one of the claims to fame of the Chelsea Football Club mentioned was that the great Hawthorn star Leigh Matthews apparently started his career with that particular football club.

While Ian was in Parliament I noticed that he had the luxury of a six-week overseas study tour. I think anyone who has done an overseas study tour would only dream of having that much time. It is more like six days now. I wonder what the press of today would have written about Ian's six-week study tour, when he went to America, Canada and the UK.

It was interesting that he talked at that time about the election between Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan for President, and the comments he made were that a lot of Americans had said to him that they would prefer not to vote than to have to vote for either of those two candidates — very reminiscent of the recent election that we have just had in the US.

He spoke at one stage, having been an upper house member, about the fact that he would actually like to abolish the upper house. That was an interesting idea that obviously did not get very far.

I suppose, as has already been said, Ian was a reformer in the education portfolio, and like a lot of ministers who are reformers, if you go through the press clips, he started off when he was first appointed as the Minister for Education with the union actually wishing him the best in his new portfolio in April 1985. By 7 April 1987 the teachers had lost respect for their minister. There

was a huge fight because he was trying to drive change into the education system, and he was accused of making cuts of \$55 million in the spending of that particular portfolio.

He went on to gain the nickname of 'the truck driver' because he was trying to drive change through the education system at that particular time. I think as anyone here could relate, if a minister wants to bring change into a portfolio, it is not easy, but he was, as has been said by previous speakers, someone that was very committed to the education system and making sure that students had the best possible educational outcome over that time.

As has been said, when he retired from politics he took on a role as the chief commissioner for the City of Greater Dandenong with the council mergers in 1985, and he carried out that role with distinction. Ian did have a very lengthy parliamentary career spanning both houses from 1964 to 1988 — quite an extensive career. I pass on my condolences to Ian's family. Vale, Ian Cathie.

Ms GREEN (Yan Yean) (12:31) — It is with sadness and a great deal of respect that I join the condolence motion to honour the life of Ian Robert Cathie. I think it will be rare to see any of us in this place or even in the other chamber who will serve the Victorian Parliament for almost 30 years, like Ian Robert Cathie did. In his inaugural speech in October 1964 he began by mentioning respecting people of all political faiths — this was nine years after he had joined the Labor Party; the time of the split — but he immediately went on to mention education:

Now I wish to give a review of education, and I want to examine particularly the inequalities that are embodied in the educational structure of Victoria. After all, we live in a new age, which is an age of science, technology and electronics, where skill and training are the important needs if this nation is to develop, or even to survive, in a highly competitive world during a time which will probably go down in history as the space age.

If in our schools we fail to develop our human resources, our whole existence as a nation could be jeopardized.

To say that up-front in his inaugural speech and knowing the difficulties of being a member of the Labor Party at the time, I think it must have taken an enormous amount of strength to join the Labor Party in 1955, which was a very difficult time. In the *Age* on 26 October 1985 he was interviewed by Jill Baker:

Ian Cathie is fumbling through a thumbed black leather wallet. His brow furrows as he struggles to search all the pockets, every long-forgotten cranny.

A smile darts across his face. Triumphant, he pulls out two crumpled yellow scraps of paper. For a minute they lie on the desk, then treating them gingerly like errant jigsaw pieces, he fits them neatly together.

They make the small square of his 1955 Australian Labor Party membership ticket.

So he had held onto that for 30 years. In that very short period of only nine years from when he joined the party, he was elected to the Parliament, serving for seven years in the upper house. He was not cowed by that defeat in June 1970, and he became that classic, dogged, marginal seat campaigner. He had previously run for federal Parliament in 1961 for the seat of Flinders, then he stood for the seat of Mentone in 1973. Then he came back for it again on 20 March 1976, when he represented the district of Carrum, as the member for Carrum so beautifully outlined, until his retirement in 1988.

On coming to government — I think in the stuff that he talked about in his inaugural speech with education, with housing and with being concerned about first home buyers — you see in Ian Cathie someone who, throughout those dark years of the 1970s and early 80s, worked really hard on policy and made sure that Labor was able to get into government. He helped drive Labor out of opposition and into government in 1982.

Others have spoken about his reforms — the Victorian certificate of education — and I think every child in this state can benefit from his passion for education and his drive for success. Those of us in government now often say to each other, ‘Let’s not waste 1 minute’, and I think that is what Ian Cathie did.

I had the privilege of working alongside Ian Cathie as a young public servant in the early 1990s when, after his retirement from Parliament, he was asked to chair a ministerial advisory committee on homelessness and housing. I was a young public servant in the secretariat for that ministerial advisory committee. Ian was incredibly diligent, thoughtful, well-mannered, respectful and gave advice to those around him. He was a very humble man. He had been the honourable minister but I think he was still that family man who cared about kids education, who cared about housing affordability, and it seems like these are the values he held all his life.

Vale, Ian Cathie. It has been a privilege to have had someone like him in our Parliament.

Mr RICHARDSON (Mordialloc) (12:37) — I rise to make a contribution on the condolence motion, pay tribute to the life of the Honourable Ian Cathie and offer my heartfelt condolences to his family and loved ones.

From the moment we first enter this place, we bring with us the struggles and challenges, the hopes and aspirations of our communities and a deep desire to effect positive and lasting change for others. For Ian Cathie it was the strong belief in the power of a quality education no matter one’s circumstances and the understanding that we must embrace science and technology in the classroom to set up our children for tomorrow.

He passionately prosecuted this view in his first speech on 10 November 1964, stating:

If in our schools we fail to develop our human resources, our whole existence as a nation could be jeopardised ...

...

The amount of money being invested today in developing and training engineers, scientists ... as well as the skilled labour necessary, will govern our ability to exist as a nation tomorrow.

Ian Cathie’s journey was undertaken in our state schools before he found his passion for education, studying teaching at the University of Melbourne and teaching at some of the local schools in the bayside region, including at one of my local schools, Mordialloc College, which was formerly known as Mordialloc Chelsea High School.

His passion for politics, though, came with his joining of the Australian Labor Party at the age of 23 in 1955. Of course this was a tumultuous period for the Australian Labor Party, when the light on the hill seemed to be all but snuffed out. Despite the tumultuous politics at the time, Cathie was determined to represent those in need across his community and fight for a fairer and more equal society. He would become the president of the Peninsula Victorian Teachers Union at the age of 27, representing the rights of working teachers and their concerns, and would have a go at his first stint in Parliament in a contest against Robert Lindsay in the federal seat of Flinders. It is fair to say this campaign was always going to be a tough battle in fairly safe Liberal territory, but three short years later, at the age of 32, Cathie would get his opportunity to represent the south-eastern suburbs in 1964, which he did for six years.

On his exit from Parliament there is no doubt that Ian Cathie had unfinished business. He reflected on how disconnected the upper house was from engaging with local communities and was determined to make his mark in the Legislative Assembly. He had a burning passion and desire, which saw him follow up in the next election in 1973 in a contest in Mentone against Liberal stalwart and Mordialloc local Bill Templeton, before he once again claimed victory in the seat of

Carrum in 1976. Ironically, Bill Templeton and Ian Cathie would go toe to toe again years later, as Government Whip and Opposition Whip respectively.

Entering the Parliament on behalf of the Carrum community was where Cathie built on his already strong legacy as an upper house parliamentarian and a teacher. Whether advocating for Chelsea police station and many sporting and community organisations or fighting for more education funding and health spend, this is where Cathie was instinctive and advocated the strongest. He had an unprecedented level of support in his community. His performances at the ballot box down in the bayside region are the stuff of nostalgia and the stuff of discussion about the greatest campaigners of all time in the south-east.

But despite being a master of campaigns, Ian Cathie's ultimate honour would be when he represented the Labor Party in 1982 as a cabinet minister, some 27 years after Labor had previously been in government and after he had joined the ALP. Of course there was the support of the then incoming Premier, John Cain, and he certainly lost some political skin initially in his support of John. But as Labor pulled off one of its greatest successes, he would then go on to serve as a minister across a number of cabinet portfolios. The Premier and others have outlined some of those achievements and some of those struggles. Despite some of those challenges, he was unwavering in his determination to reform Victoria's education system in what he saw as a vision for the future that was born of his experience in the classroom.

Remarkably, Ian Cathie would retire from state Parliament at the young age of 54, some 12 days after I was born in 1988. Ian Cathie will be remembered for his understanding of the challenges facing working people in Victoria and empowering a generation to strive for a higher quality of education.

I will leave the Parliament with this timeless quote from Ian, which is as true today as it was back then when he articulated it in the *National Times* in July 1986. He said:

As industry minister I saw what is happening in robotics. It seems that the gap between what we are preparing children for in schools, and what they are going to face outside, is getting wider.

We are becoming helplessly out of touch with the problems facing Australia. We are spending a lot of money, but are we preparing young Australians for the technological world of the future?

It is a question we continue to wrestle with some 31 years on. I hope that the work of this Labor government in creating the Education State and

focusing heavily on science, technology, engineering and mathematics learning lives up to the vision and policy direction Ian Cathie was so passionate about. I offer my sincere condolences to his family and loved ones. Vale, Ian Cathie.

Ms THOMSON (Footscray) (12:42) — I rise to pay homage to the Honourable Ian Robert Cathie and the life that he led, not just in this place. I too was fortunate enough to be able to attend his funeral and learn a lot more about the private life of Ian Cathie and his commitment to his family, which was not one that came only with retirement; it was right through his role as a member of Parliament and a minister that he continued his commitment to family and community even though he had a heavy workload. With his love of culture, music and sport, he was a fully rounded human being who brought great honour and distinction to this place, to the Australian Labor Party and to his community.

I was fortunate enough to meet Ian Cathie on a number of occasions. I cannot say I was personally close to him, but I did see him at work. One of the things I want to talk about is his life from 1976 and the role he played in John Cain actually becoming Premier. In 1976 a new rash of MPs entered the Parliament on behalf of the Labor Party, and they were hungry for government. They saw the need for change. They saw that there were people going without in our community, in education, in housing, in jobs and in preparing for the future, and they set about creating the policies for that 1982 election. It took two elections to get there, but they started the work. They understood that the changes needed to be made within the caucus itself.

That group of MPs, which included John Cain himself, Ian Cathie, Tom Roper, Steve Crabb, David White, Bill Landeryou and a number of others, set about making that change. They certainly met with a lot of resistance from other members of the party at the time, but they were prepared to do what needed to be done to get into government because they believed the community needed a Labor government.

Ian Cathie never sought glory for himself. He never sought the limelight for himself. He intended to make a difference and leave legacies, and he left legacies in every portfolio he held. There is not one area that he did not address when he was a minister. We heard of his achievements in education. He was so hands on as a minister. I can recall having a constituent who was homeless when I was working as an electorate officer and ringing the then Minister of Housing's office, Ian Cathie, and finding out that they would address the issue directly and make sure that that person's family had a roof over their heads before the day was out.

There are not too many ministerial offices where you can make the call and know that that family will be looked after straight away, but Ian Cathie really did care to that extent. I admit that maybe our population has changed since then, but the issue was as strong then as it still is now.

So for me getting to meet a man who was driven to make change for the long term, not from election to election but to make change that would shape the future for generations to come, was an absolute privilege. It was a privilege to be able to meet him and see him at work, and now to be able to stand on my feet and acknowledge his role in this place.

I am one of the few members of Parliament who can say I have sat in both chambers, and I know the difference that those chambers make and that experience makes. I only hope that I can be half the person that Ian Cathie was. To his family, to his friends and to the people who loved him in the electorate of Carrum, I pay my respects and express condolences. Vale, Ian Cathie.

Motion agreed to in silence, honourable members showing unanimous agreement by standing in their places.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr ANDREWS (Premier) (12:48) — I move:

That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honourable Ian Robert Cathie, the house now adjourns until 2.00 p.m today.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned 12.48 p.m.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 2.02 p.m.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

Mr ANDREWS (Premier) (14:03) — I advise that the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Family Violence will be absent from question time for the foreseeable future. The Minister for Roads and Road Safety will answer questions in the industrial relations and Aboriginal affairs portfolios, and the Minister for Health will answer questions in the women and prevention of family violence portfolios.

VIDEO ON DEMAND

The SPEAKER (14:03) — Before calling questions, I wish to advise the house that video on demand is now in effect and available to members from today. New sessional order 15, ‘Rebroadcasting’, adopted by the house on 20 September, is now in operation. Members will receive an email later today with information about how to access and use the service, as well as the relevant contact details for queries and feedback. Sessional orders can be found at the back of the green notice paper, online or in hard copy from the procedure office.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE and MINISTERS STATEMENTS

Energy security

Mr GUY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:04) — My question is to the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change. Minister, you said in March that Victoria would not need any diesel generation power back-up over summer:

... because we are building the generation and storage necessary to protect Victorian consumers.

Minister, despite losing 1600 megawatts from Hazelwood, exactly what storage or baseload generation have you added since making those comments to guarantee there will not be any blackouts over summer?

Ms D’AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:04) — I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. He is actually wrong. That is not what was said.

Honourable members interjecting.

Ms D’AMBROSIO — Surely not! We have been absolutely clear that with the closure of Hazelwood the Australian Energy Market Operator’s (AEMO) task is to ensure that there is sufficient supply to meet all of Victoria’s energy needs for this coming summer and beyond. In fact it is the market operator that has undertaken now for a number of months —

Mr Guy — On a point of order, Speaker, on relevance, I did not ask about the market operator. In fact I asked a question with a direct quote from the minister — so if it is not true, she is saying she is wrong herself — talking about ‘building the generation and storage necessary to protect Victorian consumers’. Those are the minister’s words. I seek that the question,

being what has she done to make sure that that quote is correct, be answered.

The SPEAKER — Order! I understand the point of order. The minister has only been speaking for just over half a minute. The minister to answer the question.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — Thank you very much, Speaker. As I said, the role of the market operator is to ensure that there is more than sufficient supply to meet our energy needs. In terms of this government's agenda, in terms of this government's program —

Honourable members interjecting.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — Do you want to hear the answer?

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Forest Hill is warned.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — Our agenda is very clear. Growing more renewable energy with battery storage technologies is the way of the future. It is the cheapest —

Mr R. Smith — On a point of order, Speaker, the question went to the minister's comment on 23 March in the *Age*:

We're not considering any diesel back-up because we are building the generation and storage necessary to protect Victorian consumers.

That is where the question went to. The question needs to be answered.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Warrandyte and the Premier will come to order.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — On the point of order, Speaker, I have been very relevant to the question. I have been very clear that it is the market operator who makes the decisions about generation capacity for our network. It is not the function of government to determine and supply the necessary energy to meet the demands for any particular day of the year or any particular summer period.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! Members on my left will come to order. I do not uphold the point of order.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — Thanks very much, Speaker. We have been very, very clear that the future of our energy supply, to make sure that we have sufficient

energy to meet our future energy supplies, is to grow more energy. That is why our government is committed to growing the cheapest form and the quickest form of new energy that can be built for our system, and that is renewable energy.

Our government's commitment is quite clear. We passed legislation in the recent parliamentary sitting week which ensures that we have a scheme in place to grow the cheapest, most affordable renewable energy supply in the quickest time frame. That is what we need. Those opposite want us to believe that they are actually interested in this subject when in fact —

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — The member for Ripon is warned.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — all they have done is vote against the very scheme that will grow more energy supply and have the reliability available to meet all of our energy needs into the future.

Supplementary question

Mr GUY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:08) — Now that the AEMO is bringing in diesel generators to guarantee baseload supply for the first time in Victoria's history, Minister, isn't it a fact that these diesel generators will use almost half a million litres of diesel fuel each and every day of their operation?

Ms D'AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:09) — I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the supplementary question. The assertion that is made by the Leader of the Opposition is not based on any known facts whatsoever. Certainly the market operator is in the process —

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked the question; the minister is answering the question. The minister, to be heard in silence.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — The market operator has negotiations underway for contracted additional energy supply for this coming summer. Those matters are matters that are in confidence, and we are awaiting the market operator's announcements with respect to the security of our energy supply for this coming summer. To assert otherwise is to effectively not base the premise of the question on any facts as they are known to us today.

Ministers statements: western roads upgrade

Mr ANDREWS (Premier) (14:10) — I am pleased to advise the house about the western roads upgrade project, a project delivering Victoria’s largest ever investment in arterial roads and creating 1200 jobs for Victoria — a fantastic project. This morning I was pleased to join the Minister for Roads and Road Safety and the Minister for Industry and Employment to tour Victoria Polytechnic, where 120 trainees, cadets and apprentices will be trained as part of this project and our government’s approach to procurement, making sure that we do not just build the infrastructure we need, but beyond that we give to a new generation of workers — or those who need a second chance — the skills that are essential in a modern Victorian economy.

This is \$1.8 billion for eight road upgrades across the west and a unique model of procurement through a public-private partnership not used before in Victoria. This will see not only those capital works done but also maintenance of that road network and associated roads over the 20-year life of this agreement.

Not only will locals receive priority in terms of the supply chain, but there will be local priority given to prospective employees and there will be training opportunities as part of this project. The winning consortium, Netflow, has committed to over 96 per cent local content, utilising local firms, local materials and of course local skills. They will also use 93 per cent local steel. The list goes on.

It is a great, outstanding project, indeed not just for the infrastructure benefits and for getting people home sooner and safer, but also for creating 1200 jobs and 120 skill opportunities. It is a project that could never be delivered by those opposite — never, ever. Only Labor delivers in this fashion.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Warrandyte is warned.

Energy policy

Mr WALSH (Murray Plains) (14:12) — My question is to the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change. Minister, given that Victoria has approximately two weeks supply of diesel at any one time, what advice have you sought on the impact of using an additional 500 000 litres of diesel per day on the price of diesel and Victoria’s diesel supplies?

Ms D’AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:13) — I thank

the Leader of The Nationals for the question. The matters that have been presented through the question are based on hypotheticals.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! So the minister can be heard. The member for Hawthorn!

Ms D’AMBROSIO — They are based on hypotheticals. The Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) has a range of tools available to it to ensure that any supply issues for this coming summer can be met. They are well on the way to doing it. They have made very clear statements that regardless of issues to do with tightness of supply —

Mr Walsh — On a point of order, Speaker, on relevance, the question was very specific — it was about what impact the use of an additional 500 000 litres of diesel will have on the availability of diesel in Victoria and the price of diesel. I ask you to bring the minister back to answering the question.

The SPEAKER — Order! I rule that the minister was being relevant to the question asked.

Ms D’AMBROSIO — The market operator, as I said, is in the middle of negotiations with a whole range of potential suppliers of energy supply for this coming summer. What the source of that energy supply will be is very much a matter of negotiations and contractual settlement, which to my understanding have not occurred yet. The reality is this: it is the role of the market operator, together with any proponents who wish to provide additional supply to the market, to account for the sources of energy to be supplied to ensure that there are sufficient measures or energy supplies available to meet any contracted obligations that may be negotiated.

Mr Southwick — On a point of order, Speaker, I ask you to bring the minister back to answering the question. The question was specifically about what advice has been sought. Now if no advice has been sought by AEMO, and in fact the AEMO executive director is the minister, then the minister should just sit down and say that no advice has been sought. Has the minister sought any advice from AEMO in terms of what the diesel generation, the fuel used, will cost in terms of the environment, in terms of jobs and in terms of energy prices?

The SPEAKER — I do not uphold the point of order.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — We have been very clear about this and so has the market operator. They have the tools in place to ensure that Victorians can be confident that there is more than sufficient energy supplies available for this coming summer. Issues to do with sources of supply, cost issues and sufficiency of resources are all part of the negotiations around contract conditions, and they are matters that are in confidence. It is not for me or anyone else to provide a commentary based on hypothetical assertions about what may be included in contracts or otherwise that AEMO is overseeing.

Supplementary question

Mr WALSH (Murray Plains) (14:16) — Minister, with the grain harvest in full swing over summer and dependent on diesel supplies, as are the trucks and the trains that service the grain industry, can you guarantee that using 500 000 litres of diesel per day to secure Victoria's power supply will not see diesel prices skyrocket just when farmers need it the most?

Ms D'AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:16) — I thank the Leader of The Nationals for the supplementary question. Again, I say to any assertions that are made are made in this instance, negotiations and contracted negotiations are actually being arranged right now as we speak. How those contracts end up being concluded in terms of the sources of energy, the availability of those energy sources and the price of those energy sources are all a matter of contracted negotiations, which is currently what we are up to now. It is not in anyone's interest, and certainly it is not information that has been made available to anyone other than the Australian Energy Market Operator and those proponents who are prepared to supply additional supplies so that we can more than adequately meet the energy supplies for this coming summer. Ultimately that is what our commitment is, that is the assurance that we have received from the market operator, and we expect that they will deliver that in full.

Ministers statements: housing affordability

Mr PALLAS (Treasurer) (14:18) — I have great pleasure to rise to update the house about the progress of the Andrews government's reforms to support first home owners to get into the market — and it is working. We have made very clear where we stand when it comes to this issue. We are not content simply to sit back and watch young people and renters be marginalised in our community and in our housing markets. That is why we announced *Homes for Victorians*. Those opposite did not know about it and

they did not care. Indeed when they got their head around this policy, they reverted to the staged, tired, old approach of the Tories —

Mr Clark — On a point of order, Speaker, I fear that I have actually risen to rescue the Treasurer, but in fact he was commencing to debate the issue. I ask you to bring him back to making a ministers statement.

The SPEAKER — I uphold the point of order. I ask the Treasurer to come back to making a ministers statement.

Mr PALLAS — Gee whiz. Well, of course this policy is working, and it is working outstandingly. Not only is it working well, despite the fact that we are being called socialists by those over there, but these so-called socialist policies have been copied in New South Wales and by the federal government — and last time I checked, they were not socialist by any stretch.

In the four months from when these changes have taken place, we have seen more than 3000 young Victorians who have not paid a cent on stamp duty due to this government's efforts. Right across the board first home buyers are getting back in the market. It is not just us saying it. The Real Estate Institute of Victoria have said it. They have endorsed these policies, our stamp duty policy in particular, and said they have 'certainly worked'. Australian Bureau of Statistics data released just last week showed a 2.1 per cent increase in owner-occupier approvals in Victoria, while the rest of the nation is going backwards by 2.3 per cent. That is what good policy work does.

Energy supply

Mr SOUTHWICK (Caulfield) (14:20) — My question is to the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change. Minister, you misled Victorians about power price rises post-Hazelwood closing, claiming it would be no more than 4 per cent. You misled Victorians about the security of power supply over summer, with the Australian Energy Market Operator now ordering diesel generators. How can Victorians believe you when you say that your 40 per cent renewable energy target will not mean the closure of Yallourn power station, further compromising baseload power security?

Ms D'AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:21) — I thank the member for Caulfield for the question, but I will take issue with the question because it is full of inaccuracies. Where do I begin to actually answer a question that is full of inaccuracies — for a start,

confusing diesel generation with baseload? Anyone who understands the energy system, understands that diesel generation is not a function of baseload power. That is the fact of the matter.

In terms of what may have been said in the past, according to those people there, it is very clear. We have been very clear. We have been up-front. With the closure of Hazelwood, there was going to be an increase in energy prices as a result of that. What we said also is that the most important solution to that was to get more energy supply into the market, more new generation built. That is exactly what we are doing. We have already got 400 megawatts of new generation coming into the market as a result of our solar and wind tenders. We have got an additional 650 megawatts coming in. We are also installing energy storage technologies into the system, and we know that this coming summer is a particularly tight one.

Ms Staley interjected.

The SPEAKER — The member for Ripon has been warned.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — We have been very clear and the Australian market operator, the Australian Energy Market Commission, has been very clear that this summer is the tightest one. Getting through that is exactly what they are preparing for. In future summers not only will we have more than sufficient energy supply — so new generation coming online — but we will also have cheaper prices.

Mr Southwick — On a point of order, Speaker, on relevance. The question was on the security of Yallourn power station. Considering that the minister has now caused event after event, we have now got diesel generation being called in and we have a 40 per cent renewable energy target, will this ultimately mean that Yallourn will close down? Yes or no: very simple.

The SPEAKER — The minister is being responsive to the question asked. The minister has concluded her answer.

Mr Clark — On a point of order, Speaker, I draw your attention to sessional order 9 in relation to responsiveness of answers. As the member for Caulfield indicated in his previous point of order, this was a question about Yallourn power station and the potential for it to need to close. The minister has not addressed that point. I ask you to require her to provide a written response.

Mr Pakula — On the point of order, Speaker, the actual question was, 'How can Victorians believe

you?'. The minister's response was that the question was full of inaccuracies. When a member asks such a broad question as, 'How can Victorians believe you?' — which is ironic, by the way, coming from the member for Caulfield — when he asks a question that broad, the minister is entitled to answer it in the way that she did.

The SPEAKER — Order! I thought the minister was being responsive to the question, but I am happy to look at the matter at the conclusion of question time and come back to the house.

Supplementary question

Mr SOUTHWICK (Caulfield) (14:24) — Minister, in what locations will your government be allowing the placement of diesel generators across Victoria, using half a million litres of diesel each and every day? Have any environmental or pollution studies been started or completed about the impact of so much concentrated diesel fumes on neighbouring communities, simply to maintain baseload power supplies?

Ms D'AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:24) — I thank the member for Caulfield for the supplementary question. The reality is this: the market operator is responsible for ensuring that there is sufficient supply for this coming summer. They are also responsible for negotiating contracts with any proponents that come forward offering additional supply, whatever form of energy source that may actually be fuelling that. It is then of course up to the market operator and the proponents to ensure that they meet any environmental standards that are required to be met in the course of these actions. That is the answer to this.

But I must say that I am absolutely incredulous of the fact that those opposite actually care about environmental impacts when it was they who turned their backs on the Morwell community when the Hazelwood mine fire caught on fire. They were nowhere to be seen for days. Our government does not have that record — they do.

Ministers statements: housing affordability

Ms KAIROUZ (Minister for Consumer Affairs, Gaming and Liquor Regulation) (14:26) — I rise to address the house on the Andrews Labor government's commitment to affordable housing and a fairer deal for those Victorians who rent. The Andrews Labor government has identified problems in the rental market, and unlike those opposite and those on the sidelines — and I refer of course to the

Greens political party — we are willing to take action to make renting fair.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Malvern!

Ms KAIROUZ — Let me quickly run through a few of our initiatives. Rental bidding? Gone. Rent increases? A maximum of once per year. Pets? Yes. Bond returns? Within 14 days. Minor modifications? Yes, because we recognise that just because you rent does not mean you should not be allowed to hang a picture on a wall. That is all without mentioning the introduction of long-term leases, the capping of bonds to one month's rent, a blacklist for dodgy landlords and the establishment of a commissioner for residential tenancies. The list goes on and on.

There really is only one party that understands the structural imbalance in the rental market, and there is only one party that has the policy and the ability to make a difference for renters in our state. We know those opposite do not care, but I am also very concerned at the Greens position on the rights of renters and on housing affordability. I am reliably informed that at a recent community forum in the Northcote electorate, the Greens candidate and aspiring member of Parliament, Lidia Thorpe, said, 'Housing affordability will only happen at the federal level'. That is an astonishing statement from a person who wants to be a state member of Parliament in an electorate where over 40 per cent of voters rent.

It is easy to pass the buck, it is easy to chirp from the sidelines, but it is an entirely different thing to go in and deliver a policy outcome that makes a real difference in people's lives. The Liberal Party will not, the Greens political party cannot, we have done it and we will keep doing it.

Electricity prices

Ms KEALY (Lowan) (14:28) — My question is to the Minister for Housing, Disability and Ageing. Given heat and heatwaves can kill elderly Victorians, can you guarantee that no vulnerable senior Victorians will die from excessive heat because they could not afford to turn on their air conditioners or fans due to the massive hike in electricity prices under your government?

Mr FOLEY (Minister for Housing, Disability and Ageing) (14:29) — I thank the honourable member for her question. Can I mark this as a red letter day; this is the first question from the opposition directed to this portfolio since the election, so we have seen the level of

commitment that they have got to these important social issues. In addressing the honourable member's question, she seems to make a fundamental error in terms of how she perceives regulation of aged care in this state.

Now, we have undone the cruel cuts in aged care. I use this opportunity —

Ms Kealy — On a point of order, Speaker, the minister may not be aware, but his portfolio extends beyond people in aged-care facilities to senior Victorians who live at home and cannot afford to turn on the power. I ask the minister to not make light of this issue. People are at risk. Can he please respond to the question put?

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! Members on both sides of the house will come to order.

Mr FOLEY — On the point of order, Speaker, I would just point out to you that the honourable member's question actually spoke about people in aged-care facilities.

Mr Clark — On the point of order, Speaker, I think you will find, if you check your notes, that the member did not refer specifically to aged-care facilities in her question, and her point of order stands.

The SPEAKER — I struggle sometimes to read my notes, but in either case the minister was being relevant to the question asked.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Warrandyte is warned. The minister will take note of the point of order that was raised, but I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr FOLEY — Thank you for your guidance, Speaker. In terms of the issue, let us take a fundamental difference of opinion and difference of policy arrangements here. What the honourable member is asking the Minister for Housing, Disability and Ageing is essentially a question about electricity pricing. Now, I am happy to answer that in the context of my portfolio responsibilities, and let us be clear that support for people in aged care — all aged-care facilities — is a federal government regulated area. It has been regulated since 2013 by the commonwealth.

Ms Kealy — On a point of order, Speaker, my question specifically asked about elderly Victorians and

senior Victorians. It was not restricted to aged care in any way. Can you please ask the minister to respond? Can he guarantee that no elderly or vulnerable Victorians will die due to the heatwaves we are expected to have over summer and the shortage of electricity that will mean they simply will not be able to afford to turn on their fans and turn on the aircon? That is what he needs to address.

The SPEAKER — I again do not uphold the point of order. I ask the minister to answer the question.

Mr FOLEY — All Victorians, particularly aged Victorians, particularly our senior Victorians, need the support of all levels of government. They need support, particularly if they are on the age pension that has been cut by the federal Liberal government and particularly if they look to the benefits for those who had support from rates cut by those opposite. All of these arrangements go towards cost of living, including energy, for our senior Victorians.

Mr Hodgett — On a point of order, Speaker, the minister is not being relevant to the question that was asked, and I would ask you to please direct him back to answering the question.

The SPEAKER — Order! It was a very broad question, but I do ask the minister to come back to answering the question that was asked.

Mr FOLEY — In terms of setting that context of all seniors — whether on pensions, whether in aged-care facilities or wherever else they may be in the great state of Victoria — their income and support is from different levels of government, including local government. That is why this government, under the support of the Minister for Local Government with the rate capping policy, contributes to those arrangements.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Hawthorn!

Mr FOLEY — In terms of how all of that applies, let us be clear. This is a government that through support for energy rebates has the highest levels of support for senior Victorians when it comes to energy rebates in this state's history. That is a partnership arrangement with my good friend the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change, who does an outstanding effort in supporting senior Victorians. This government stands in support of those elderly and senior Victorians, and those opposite would be better spending their time lobbying their mates in Canberra to

increase support for aged Victorians, rather than this spurious nonsense.

Mr Clark — On a point of order, Speaker, the minister is straying further and further from the question. I do ask you to bring him back to answering it.

The SPEAKER — The minister did stray from answering the question. I ask the minister to come back to answering the question.

Mr FOLEY — In terms of what the honourable member is trying to I think assert in her question, we reject the entire premise of that question. This is a government that at all levels acknowledges and supports the role that senior Victorians play and acknowledges the cost-of-living pressures, whether it is in electricity or in any aspect of their lives, and that is why we are supporting them.

Mr Clark — On a point of order, Speaker, I submit that the minister's answer was not at all responsive to the question, and under sessional order 9 I ask you to direct him to provide a written answer.

The SPEAKER — Order! I will review the matter and report back to the house.

Supplementary question

Ms KEALY (Lowan) (14:35) — Minister, what did you do to stop or warn against the energy policies of the Andrews government massively hiking up power bills, which put at risk the lives of elderly and vulnerable Victorians?

Mr FOLEY (Minister for Housing, Disability and Ageing) (14:36) — I tell you what I did not do, and that is contract out and sell the aged-care facilities that aged Victorians need to live in. I will tell you what I did not do: I did not do that.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Mordialloc is warned.

Ms Staley — On a point of order, Speaker, my point of order is that in just his first sentence he is debating the question. Could you please ask him to answer it instead of debating it?

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Footscray is warned. It is very early in the answer, but I do uphold the point of order.

Mr FOLEY — I know we are at the introduction of the cricket season, but when you get bowled a full toss outside leg stump, you have to have the opportunity to smash it over the boundary, and with the greatest of respect to the member for Lowan, that is precisely what she has dished up here.

I support the sensible cost-of-living focus and renewable energy policies that the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change has, with this government's full support, delivered because it will lock in supply, security and affordability for all Victorians, particularly our senior Victorians. This is a policy that will reduce energy costs for senior Victorians in the long term, as opposed to these troglodytes, these backward-looking poll addicts, who have no intention whatsoever of genuinely supporting aged Victorians in any way, shape or form.

Ministers statements: housing

Ms ALLAN (Minister for Major Projects) (14:37) — I rise to update the house on the terrific progress the Andrews Labor government is making in providing increased housing options for all Victorians. Whether it is in affordable housing, public housing, social housing or community housing or through integrated development opportunities close to jobs and transport, we are supporting a range of housing developments to support all of these Victorians.

Not only do these projects support housing, as I have indicated, but they create important jobs as well for our economy. Of course these projects go through proper planning processes and public consultation. There are particularly two projects that have gone through this — at Markham and at Ormond. We as a government believe that the Parliament should not be interfering with these projects, and others in this place have previously agreed with this approach. On 14 April 2010 the Parliament was told:

We have clearly stated that we do not want to turn the upper house of Victoria into a responsible authority —

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The member for Ripon has been warned twice already to cease shouting across the chamber.

Ms ALLAN — On 14 April 2010 the Parliament was told:

We have clearly stated that we do not want to turn the upper house of Victoria into a responsible authority on every planning matter around the state.

We certainly agree with those claims made by the now Leader of the Opposition.

There are a couple of projects that are at risk. Our projects at Markham and at Ormond tick all the boxes for increasing supply, supporting jobs, connecting to transport and supporting affordability, but we know that there are politics in the upper house. As Sally Capp, the executive director of the Property Council of Australia, told the *Age* today:

This is not a political game.

We are disappointed, concerned and frustrated. One of the main things that really drives affordability and supply of housing is planning certainty and these motions against Ormond ... and Markham ... will throw everything up in the air.

Stand up for these developments, or the opposition stands condemned for not standing up for more housing in Victoria.

Electricity prices

Mr SOUTHWICK (Caulfield) (14:40) — My question is to the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change. In November 2015 Thomastown business Kestrel Manufacturing received a grant from the Melbourne's North Innovation and Investment Fund, where you visited to make the media announcement. The grant led to extra staff being employed. In April 2017 Kestrel was notified that their electricity price would dramatically increase by almost \$100 000, almost double their current bill. Minister, what do you say to Robert Watson, the owner of Kestrel Manufacturing who, after bringing on extra staff, now has to lay them off because his energy bill has exploded after the closure of Hazelwood?

Ms D'AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:41) — I thank the member for Caulfield for his question. Our government is absolutely committed to do all we can to help communities, to help families and to help businesses meet the rising energy cost challenges that are before them. That will never change, and in fact we are doing more and more to do just that.

Let me be very clear about which side we are on when it comes to assisting not just families but businesses such as those that have been mentioned by the member for Caulfield. We are there in the good times and in the bad times. In the times when the auto industry was sent packing overseas, we were there with significant funds to assist businesses to manage the transition. That is why we are in government — to do the work that those opposite left. They had basically nothing to say on this front and in fact only looked towards their mates in

government federally to take the call in terms of where their efforts should go, which is basically nowhere when it comes to businesses.

Our commitments are very, very clear. We are providing the support necessary, whether it is through a range of programs through Sustainability Victoria or whether it is through support in terms of improving outcomes for businesses so that they can actually become more productive. All of these things add up to significant record assistance to businesses to help meet the challenges of rising energy bills.

I am absolutely open to a conversation or a meeting with any business that has difficulties in being able to meet their energy bill challenges. The final solution to this is to actually grow more supply into the market, which is what our Victorian renewable energy target scheme actually does, and to do that in a way that is quick and produces the most affordable energy supply that anyone can invest in right now, today.

The other important element in this is to not forget the fact that we have seen significant rises in gas prices because of the failure of national government leadership, which has allowed two-thirds of our gas reserves to be exported to other countries that have now got cheaper access to our gas than domestic businesses right here in our state.

Mr Southwick — On a point of order, Speaker, I would be happy for the minister to talk about gas, which she keeps referring to when we ask about energy, but this is particularly about electricity prices. This is specifically about Hazelwood power station closing, and with Hazelwood power station closing we have Kestrel Manufacturing now facing a \$100 000 bill increase — a doubling of their energy bill. What is the minister doing for Kestrel Manufacturing to ensure the jobs that were initially created are maintained and that the owner does not have to lay off jobs thanks to her incompetent government?

The SPEAKER — Order! The member's question asked for what the minister would say to the owner of a particular company, which is a very broad question, so I do not uphold the point of order.

Ms D'AMBROSIO — It just beggars belief. I do not know how many times the energy minister needs to explain to the member for Caulfield that gas is actually part of the energy system and that gas is a fuel that creates electricity and has an impact on electricity prices. Heaven help us if those opposite ever get into government, because they do not know how to fight their way out of a paper bag.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER — Order! The minister will resume her seat. The member for Ripon will leave the chamber for the period of 1 hour.

Honourable member for Ripon withdrew from chamber.

The SPEAKER — This is the last question. I will remove members from the chamber if they keep shouting across the chamber. The minister has concluded her answer.

Supplementary question

Mr SOUTHWICK (Caulfield) (14:45) — Minister, at the time of the Hazelwood closure the Premier said that the increase in power bills was more in the order of 4 per cent or 85 cents a week. Given that you and the Premier have misled Victorians about the price rises and now need emergency diesel generators to get through the summer without blackouts, how do you propose businesses like Mr Watson's — already competing on tight margins — can remain competitive, when you have misled them yet again?

Ms D'AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (14:45) — I thank the member for Caulfield for the supplementary question. The basis of his question is actually wrong. We were absolutely clear at the time that the private business made a decision to close the Hazelwood plant that there would be price increases as a result of that. However, as more energy supply comes into the market and comes into the system, we will start to see energy prices coming down.

It is not just the Victorian government that is saying that; it is the Australian Energy Market Operator and it is the Australian Energy Market Commission, whose role it is each year to report on the energy supply and pricing trends for every state. The pricing trend for Victoria, according to the Australian Energy Market Commission, is that once the Hazelwood increases have gone through the system, we will start to see a reduction in energy prices as a result of more renewable energy coming into the system.

Ministers statements: employment initiatives

Mr CARROLL (Minister for Industry and Employment) (14:47) — I rise to inform the house of how the Andrews Labor government is putting more people into a job so that they can support their families and, most importantly, purchase their first home. As we know, employment leads to purpose, meaning and

belonging. People who have a job feel that they are part of the community and that they are making a meaningful contribution. For those that need to buy a home, an income is an essential source that they need.

Our \$68 million Jobs Victoria program is designed to help those Victorians who need a job most — from auto workers to disadvantaged Victorians to Aboriginal Victorians. It has only been going one year; we recently celebrated 2300 people that had been on the long-term unemployment list being put into work — that is 40 jobs a week since Jobs Victoria started 12 months ago.

With the member for Essendon we welcomed five new hospitality workers only last week. With the member for Dandenong we visited Volgren buses. The passengers over there love a good bus service, and Volgren is now expanding to Japan. Supported by the member for Broadmeadows I visited Fairfield and saw Shiny Embroidery, where nine former Ford workers with 100 years of Ford experience are back in employment, back in manufacturing, thanks to the Andrews Labor government.

Our major projects have a major role as well. Out in the western suburbs today, with the Minister for Roads and Road Safety and the Premier, we announced a significant \$1.8 billion investment in local roads — something Andrew Elsbury could only dream of. But it is not just that; the member for Altona, the member for Footscray and the member for St Albans are all very proud of the Joan Kirner hospital redevelopment and the E. J. Whitten Bridge redevelopment.

There was a reference made today to housing affordability and looking to Canberra for guidance. Who said the way forward for housing affordability is, 'Just get your parents to shell out'? Who said that? It was none other than the Liberal Prime Minister. So for those looking for inspiration in Northcote, the solution is not to get rich parents. The solution is jobs, and what is at the heart of all our local policies? Jobs.

RULINGS BY THE CHAIR

Constituency questions

The SPEAKER (14:49) — Order! Before moving to constituency questions and calling the first question, last sitting week on 2 November at the end of constituency questions the member for Burwood took a point of order about the admissibility of the member for Carrum's constituency question. In referring the member for Burwood's point of order to me, the Acting Speaker at the time asked me to review all constituency questions that day. So here goes.

The member for Evelyn sought information about a local issue but phrased her question as 'could the minister advise' — that is, when an action would take place. The way the question was framed is somewhat similar to the way a member seeks action from a minister in the adjournment debate. However, it is clear from the context that the member is asking for information, and the member's question does not breach any previous rulings or appendix 4 of *Rulings from the Chair*. I rule the question is in order, but I ask members to avoid using language that may be construed as asking for an action.

The member for Yuroke's question was in order.

The member for Gippsland South asked a minister to provide a list of funding of works in his electorate. While the point of the question is clear — the member was asking about progress on local projects — the way the question was phrased does not conform to requirements set by rulings about constituency questions, which have said that asking a minister to provide something is an action. The member is raising an important issue for his electorate, and it gives me no pleasure to rule it out; however, the question is not consistent with previous rulings, so it is out of order.

The member for Carrum sought information about single-use plastic bags and managing plastic waste, which is information readily available in an October press release from the Premier. The member for Burwood is correct that questions cannot seek information that is already available elsewhere, and I remind members of this requirement. However, I do not uphold the point of order in relation to this question, as the Premier's press release covered the government's policy generally and did not go to matters particularly relating to the Carrum electorate. That was the substance of the member's question, which cited local environment groups and two specific waterways.

I rule that the member for Mount Waverley's question is inadmissible because it asks the minister to continue to do what she can to resolve a local dispute safely. While I acknowledge this is a serious matter raised in good faith by the member, it is a request for an undertaking rather than seeking information, and I rule it out of order.

The member for Sandringham's question is in order.

The member for Thomastown's question was phrased in a similar way to that of the member for Gippsland South in that it sought the minister to provide data. Again, while the point of the question is clear, it is

unfortunately out of order because of the precedents of this place.

The member for Bass sought information about a local issue but phrased his question as ‘can the minister please clarify’. While the wording does not breach previous rulings, I ask the member to be careful in the choice of words in future constituency questions to avoid having questions ruled out. The question is in order.

The member for Narre Warren South’s question is in order. The member for Yan Yean’s question is in order.

Requirements for constituency questions are clearly set out in *Rulings from the Chair*, but I am concerned that even with those rules in place questions of importance to members’ communities are being ruled out on technicalities. I ask all members to take care in how they ask constituency questions and to seek advice from the clerks or party whips if they are unsure about the wording of a question that they propose to ask.

Mr D. O’Brien — On a point of order, Speaker, I seek your advice or clarification in ruling out my particular constituency question.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr D. O’Brien — Yes, I am asking for an action. My question was specifically what projects are being funded on certain roads in my electorate in the coming summer season.

Mr Richardson — Don’t you know?

Mr D. O’Brien — No, I’m not the minister, so I don’t know. I am completely perplexed as to how that is not a question that relates to constituency matters, and it is asking for factual information, not for action.

The SPEAKER — I take the member’s point of order quite genuinely, even though I have ruled on the matter. It goes to the very heart of this issue, which is that the previous rulings in relation to constituency questions are ones that people in this house may not necessarily agree with but preclude people from asking for anything that is interpreted as an action. The member’s constituency question, from *Hansard*, asked ‘can the minister provide’. The interpretation in *Rulings from the Chair* is that in the act of providing something the minister is acting.

Mr Clark — On the point of order, Speaker, the wording that you have quoted was ‘can the minister provide’. It is the form of a question; the minister can get up and say yes or no to what has been put to them. It is a question. As you say, it can sometimes be quite

technical as to whether or not the phraseology is within or without the previous rulings or indeed the point of asking questions, but as I have indicated on previous occasions, it is very similar to the questions asked in this house during the main part of question time, and if the minister is able to respond by answering yes or no or giving other information in response to what has been asked, then it is a question. A form of words that is ‘can the minister do certain things’ is a question and therefore, I submit, is in order.

The SPEAKER — I understand the point being made by the manager of opposition business. The extension of that point of order is that the answer from the minister could be a simple yes or no, which would be entirely unacceptable to the member, as we know. The point of these constituency questions is the provision of information to members that is important to their constituencies, so I think the best way forward would be if the house were to agree on a better set of rulings, if you like, to be able to deal with this matter. My commitment to this house is to apply the rulings as they currently stand. If there is an appetite for the house to adjust how they consider constituency questions, I am happy to facilitate that.

Mr McGuire — On a point of order, Speaker, I think that that is a wise decision you have come to — that we need to address this issue. We do not want the house run by pedants, because the issue is that we need to get a more commonsense approach to what the definitions are. Even if you go to authorities like the Oxford concise dictionary, they conflict with the rulings that have happened in this chamber, so I would applaud you on that matter and would ask for that to be upheld.

The SPEAKER — I will endeavour to discuss this matter with both the manager of opposition business and the Leader of the House at a convenient time to see if there is a way forward in relation to the house’s will in regard to this matter.

CONSTITUENCY QUESTIONS

Mornington electorate

Mr MORRIS (Mornington) (14:57) — (13 549)
My question is to the Minister for Roads and Road Safety. In response to repeated requests from me for the minister to act on two intersections with Nepean Highway in Mount Martha, one at Forest Drive and one at Uralla Road, the minister finally asked VicRoads to investigate the problems and conduct what became the Mount Martha access and safety study. That study is now completed, but no funding has been provided to undertake the necessary works. I note that, despite the

government's inaction, the commonwealth government has made \$200 000 available towards some works. I further note that the work proposed to be undertaken by VicRoads with this money has not yet commenced. I understand the works include a reduction of the number of lanes, a longer turn lane into Forest Drive to improve sight distances and also some new large signs. So I ask: on what date will works funded by the federal government be undertaken by VicRoads? On what date will they be commenced?

Yuroke electorate

Ms SPENCE (Yuroke) (14:58) — (13 550) My constituency question is for the Minister for Education. What support is available for year 12 students in the Yuroke electorate currently undertaking their Victorian certificate of education (VCE) exams? Often the pressure of exams can make finding the positives difficult. While academic achievement is important, young people in the Yuroke electorate and across Victoria should also feel proud of how far they have come in their studies to date. As many in this place know, there is more than one way of getting the qualifications or job you want, especially as the Andrews Labor government is making Victoria the Education State by restoring TAFE and improving our education system across the board. I congratulate all Yuroke VCE students on their efforts, and I look forward to passing on any information that the minister can provide to students in the Yuroke electorate.

Euroa electorate

Ms RYAN (Euroa) (14:58) — (13 551) My constituency question is for the Minister for Education. Does the minister's department have any plans to modify the school bus program to make it more flexible to meet the needs of rural students? I would like to acknowledge a number of schools from my electorate in the gallery today, Speaker, including Longwood Primary School, Euroa Secondary College, Euroa Primary School and also Nagambie Primary School. This question does not specifically relate to them. It relates to students who are currently attending school at Greta Valley Primary School. Those families live at Tatong. They have been told that their closest school is Peranbin Primary College at Swanpool. The department is applying the guidelines in absolutely ridiculous fashion. It is an issue I have raised with the minister previously, but those students spend half of their time at Baddaginnie, which is a campus twice the distance from Greta. Therefore the rules as they are being applied are just purely ridiculous.

Williamstown electorate

Mr NOONAN (Williamstown) (14:59) — (13 552) My question is for the acting Minister for the Prevention of Family Violence. In the last data released by the Crime Statistics Agency Victoria, there were 1260 offences related to family violence incidents recorded in the Hobsons Bay local government area, which includes my electorate of Williamstown. With White Ribbon Day occurring next week, it is a timely reminder that women's safety is a men's issue, and we all need to play our part in addressing violence against women. My question to the minister is: what action is the government taking to target positive behavioural change among men in implementing the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Family Violence, particularly in Melbourne's west?

Brighton electorate

Ms ASHER (Brighton) (15:00) — (13 553) My question is to the Minister for Public Transport. My question is: when will the minister provide more parking spots along the Sandringham train line, in particular for Hampton, Brighton Beach, Middle Brighton, North Brighton and Gardenvale stations in my electorate?

The minister is in receipt of correspondence from both me and Bayside City Council about the need for more parking spots at train stations in the bayside area along the Sandringham line, and I have previously raised this matter with her in the Parliament in 2016. Now that the minister has had adequate time to reflect on the merits of the case put by Bayside City Council and indeed put by me, I hope, my question to the minister is: when will she be able to provide these additional car parking spots which are much needed by commuters along the Sandringham line?

Carrum electorate

Ms KILKENNY (Carrum) (15:01) — (13 554) My constituency question is for the Minister for Roads and Road Safety. Minister, my constituents would like to know what can be done to minimise congestion, improve capacity and improve safety along Lathams Road from Frankston-Dandenong Road to Oliphant Way, Seaford? There is significant congestion along the road as it is surrounded by industrial and commercial use. The road provides direct access from the Seaford industrial area to EastLink. What improvements can be made to relieve congestion, improve intersections, promote cycling and better cater for truck and vehicle movements heading to and from EastLink?

Melton electorate

Mr NARDELLA (Melton) (15:02) — (13 555) My question is to the Minister for Public Transport. Last week workers went on site in Rockbank to begin construction of the duplication of the Caroline Springs–Melton rail line, which was initially developed as policy in the 2008 *Victorian Transport Plan*, which was interrupted by the four wasted years under the Liberals. Also there was a report that was put together by Myles Bentley through my office to support that, which was adopted by the government back then. My question is: will the concrete pads for the future electrification of wire gantries be constructed along the line whilst the rail duplication work is being done?

Pascoe Vale electorate

Ms BLANDTHORN (Pascoe Vale) (15:02) — (13 556) My constituency question is for the Treasurer. I understand that \$100 million in unclaimed money is currently sitting with the State Revenue Office in the form of wages, bonds, dividends, interest and proceeds of sales, and that this money has remained unclaimed by residents, businesses or community groups for more than one year. I am concerned as to how much of this money belongs to hardworking constituents in the Pascoe Vale district. I ask: is the Treasurer able to identify who this money belongs to, and also: how can people claim the money that is owed to them?

Benambra electorate

Mr TILLEY (Benambra) (15:03) — (13 557) My question is to the Minister for Industry and Employment, straight off the back of his ministers statement during question time. In the last financial year, how many people aged 15–24 have been employed in the Benambra district as a result of the Jobs Victoria Employment Network? The recent all-of-government response to the recommendations for the lowering of the P-plate age to 17 or even allowing exemptions for regional and rural teenagers rejected the notion that the present probationary driving age of 18 was an impediment to employment. It justified its stance on the grounds that the Jobs Victoria Employment Network, which has now been operating for 18 months, was linking young people to jobs and overcoming their transport difficulties. My electorate wants facts rather than spin, numbers rather than rhetoric.

Yan Yean electorate

Ms GREEN (Yan Yean) (15:04) — (13 558) My constituency question is to the Minister for Planning, and I ask: when will a decision be made in relation to

Nillumbik C108? C108 has been submitted by the Shire of Nillumbik to amend its planning scheme in order to facilitate the construction of a multi-use trail between Diamond Creek and Hurstbridge, which the community has been campaigning to achieve for more than a decade. I am concerned that Nillumbik's delayed C108 submission to the planning minister may impact on the council's ability to successfully secure grant funding from a range of government bodies to finally build this trail. I am seeking the support of the planning minister to expedite this matter to make this long-awaited trail a reality. Well done to Trail Blazers, who have kept up the campaigning pressure to make this trail happen.

ROAD SAFETY AMENDMENT (AUTOMATED VEHICLES) BILL 2017

Introduction and first reading

Mr DONNELLAN (Minister for Roads and Road Safety) — I move:

That I have leave to bring in a bill for an act to amend the Road Safety Act 1986 to establish a regime for the trialling of automated vehicles on highways, to make a consequential amendment to the Crimes Act 1958 and for other purposes.

Mr HODGETT (Croydon) — Could I have a brief explanation of the bill, please?

Mr DONNELLAN (Minister for Roads and Road Safety) — The bill will be known as the Road Safety Amendment (Automated Vehicles) Bill 2017, and it will provide a framework for the safe on-road testing and development of automated driving technology to enable technology to be developed for local traffic conditions. It will position Victoria as the leader in automated driving technology, which will help to create investment opportunities and hopefully develop an industry in relation to parts and manufacture, and enable the impacts of automatic driving technology in Victoria's legal framework and transport network to be assessed.

Motion agreed to.

Read first time.

PETITIONS

Following petition presented to house:

Reservoir East Primary School

To the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

The petition of parents and friends of Reservoir East Primary School draws to the attention of the house their concern about the poor physical state of Reservoir East Primary School which is in abject disrepair. The school is physically unsuitable for the

students learning there, despite the inspirational and visionary efforts of the school leadership and staff.

The petitioners therefore request that the Legislative Assembly of Victoria provide adequate funds to replace and upgrade the school's buildings, ensuring that the school provides a contemporary, comfortable and safe environment for its students.

By Mr SCOTT (Preston) (308 signatures).

Tabled.

**SCRUTINY OF ACTS AND REGULATIONS
COMMITTEE**

Alert Digest No. 16

Ms BLANDTHORN (Pascoe Vale) presented *Alert Digest No. 16 of 2017* on:

**Crimes Legislation Amendment (Protection of
Emergency Workers and Others) Bill 2017**
**Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances
Amendment (Medically Supervised Injecting
Centre) Bill 2017**
Service Victoria Bill 2017
**State Taxation Acts Further Amendment
Bill 2017**
**Transport Legislation Amendment (Road Safety,
Rail and Other Matters) Bill 2017**
**Water and Catchment Legislation Amendment
Bill 2017**

together with appendices.

Tabled.

Ordered to be published.

**INDEPENDENT BROAD-BASED
ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION
COMMITTEE**

Performance monitoring framework

**Mr WELLS (Rowville) presented report, together
with an appendix.**

Tabled.

Ordered to be published.

DOCUMENTS

Tabled by Acting Clerk:

Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978:

Orders under s 17B granting licences over:

Paine Reserve

Watery Gully Creek Reserve

Orders under s 17D granting leases over:

Esplanade Public Park

Waratah Bay Caravan Park

Planning and Environment Act 1987 — Notices of approval of amendments to the following Planning Schemes:

Ballarat — GC75

Banyule — C113, C122

Baw Baw — GC75

Cardinia — C209 part 1, GC75

Casey — GC75

East Gippsland — GC75

Hobsons Bay — GC75

Hume — GC75

Latrobe — C100, GC75

Melbourne — C300

Melton — GC75

Mitchell — C113, GC28, GC61, GC75

Stonnington — C227

Surf Coast — GC75

Wellington — C98

Whittlesea — GC28, GC61, GC75

Wyndham — GC75

Professional Standards Act 2003 — Instrument Amending the Australian Property Institute Valuers Limited Scheme under s 14 (*Gazette G45, 9 November 2017*)

Subordinate Legislation Act 1994 — Documents under s 15 in relation to Statutory Rules 108, 109

Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal — Report 2016–17

Victorian Catchment Management Council — Catchment Condition and Management Report 2017.

The following proclamations fixing operative dates were tabled by the Acting Clerk in accordance with an order of the house dated 24 February 2015:

Corrections Legislation Miscellaneous Amendment Act 2017 — ss 23, 29, 41, 43(3), 46 and 48 to 60 — 1 November 2017 (*Gazette S367, 31 October 2017*).

ROYAL ASSENT

Message read advising royal assent on 8 November to:

Justice Legislation Amendment (Body-worn Cameras and Other Matters) Bill 2017
Ports and Marine Legislation Amendment Bill 2017
Renewable Energy (Jobs and Investment) Bill 2017
Serious Sex Offenders (Detention and Supervision) Amendment (Governance) Bill 2017.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Program

Ms ALLAN (Minister for Public Transport) (15:09) — I move:

That, under standing order 94(2), the orders of the day, government business, relating to the following bills be considered and completed by 5.00 p.m. on Thursday, 16 November 2017:

Crimes Legislation Amendment (Protection of Emergency Workers and Others) Bill 2017

Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Medically Supervised Injecting Centre) Bill 2017

Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017

Service Victoria Bill 2017

State Taxation Acts Further Amendment Bill 2017

Transport Legislation Amendment (Road Safety, Rail and Other Matters) Bill 2017.

I will make only a couple of brief observations on the government business program that is before the Assembly for its support and consideration for the rest of this week. There are six bills on the program, giving us a substantial agenda to work through during the course of this sitting week. Of course our day started today with a condolence motion for former Cain government minister and long-serving Labor member Ian Cathie, and that was an appropriate recognition of his service. We now have a number of bills for us to consider during the course of the week. There are also potentially a couple of bills that we will need to deal with that have returned from the upper house, but we will deal with them in due course over the passage of the week. I will advise members of when the government intends to have those bills considered on the program.

The only other observation I wish to make — and I make it in the ongoing fervent hope that the opposition will find it in their hearts and minds to support the government business program — is that the opposition have sought that the Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Medically Supervised Injecting Centre) Bill 2017 be one that is considered in detail during the course of this week. The government is happy to. We are keen to have that bill examined. It is a very important piece of legislation, and we are happy to accommodate that request. Time will be made available, as has become a bit of a practice in this place, for that to happen on Thursday afternoon.

I say that in the hope that the opposition will support the government business program. We have accommodated their request on the consideration in detail of the one bill that they have identified for the course of this week, and we continue to demonstrate great cooperation across the chamber as we work through our legislative program. With that level of optimism, I urge and encourage all members to support the motion put before the house.

Mr CLARK (Box Hill) (15:12) — The opposition appreciates the willingness of the government to consider the Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Medically Supervised Injecting Centre) Bill 2017 in detail. However, to win the support of the opposition for the government business program, it would need to deal with the other longstanding matter that remains unresolved by this house — namely, the serious allegations of rotting that remain outstanding in relation to the Speaker and Deputy Speaker.

The program that is proposed by the government is one of complex and, in many instances, controversial pieces of legislation that raise many issues that the house will need to deal with. The Crimes Legislation Amendment (Protection of Emergency Workers and Others) Bill 2017 is a belated and complex response to the coalition's initiative to bring in clear and strong penalties for those who ram police vehicles. There are many aspects of that bill that will need to be explored during the course of debate. The Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Medically Supervised Injecting Centre) Bill 2017 is another piece of radical social policy from the Andrews government, and again there will be many aspects of that that I am sure many members will have a lot to say about in terms of the concerns about that bill and the direction in which that bill would take this state.

The Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017 raises a range of issues that have been canvassed in this house in the course of

previous planning bill debates, but in particular it proposes yet again to try and leverage up various fees and charges that are collected by the government. There is no doubt that will receive considerable attention.

The Service Victoria Bill 2017 is a bill that relates to a very complex and expensive IT-related service delivery project that the government is attempting. As many members will know, public sector IT projects can often prove to be fraught, highly expensive and highly ineffective, and I am sure many aspects of that issue will need to be assessed in relation to the Service Victoria Bill.

The State Taxation Acts Further Amendment Bill 2017 is yet another attempt by the government to leverage up its land tax collections through the introduction of annual centralised valuations. I am sure that will be closely explored also.

The Transport Legislation Amendment (Road Safety, Rail and Other Matters) Bill 2017 attempts to tackle issues relating to drink-driving, which is clearly a very important social issue. Again, whether or not the bill tackles that issue in the most effective manner is something that will no doubt be considered during the course of the week.

However, as I said at the outset, one issue that remains undealt with on this government business program is the very serious allegations of rotting and abuse of office that have led to the resignations of the former Speaker and Deputy Speaker. I say over and over again that this is a matter that the house does need to deal with, and the government has come up with no good reason why it should not deal with this matter.

In the last sitting week the member for Essendon criticised the fact that we on this side of the house continue to raise that point, and in the course of his contribution he went back to republican Rome to draw some support for the remarks that he made in support of that week's government business program. He may, in anticipation of this week's debate, wish to google the phrase 'ceterum censeo' and 'Cato the Elder' to see a precedent for what sometimes persistence can achieve. But I do draw to his attention the fact that what we are seeking is not *deletio* but *justitia*, and we will continue to seek *justitia* — seek justice — in terms of accountability for the rotting and abuse that appear to have gone on.

I should say as an aside that last week the member for Essendon urged on us the policies of Publius Clodius Pulcher as a precedent for the government business program and an analogy between our Premier and the

said Clodius. In fact this individual was a ruthless demagogue who pursued socially and economically destructive policies and who maintained his rule by relying on gangs of union thugs from the Roman equivalent of trade unions, the *collegia*. I am not sure if that is exactly the analogy that the member for Essendon wished to draw, but perhaps he will care to elaborate on that when he makes his contribution to this debate.

Mr PEARSON (Essendon) (15:17) — We will drape the member for Box Hill in purple and name him a Roman senator after that contribution. What a magnificent contribution. But I am disappointed that the member is not supporting the government business program. This is an outstanding government business program, as you would expect.

It is interesting to note that since we last met a couple of notable anniversaries have occurred. I remember being a staffer here in this place on Remembrance Day in 1997. The house was sitting on that day, and the member for Box Hill was indeed a member then. He may have actually occupied the middle benches in those days when he was the parliamentary secretary to the Treasurer. That date was significant of course because that was the day that Roger Pescott, who was the member for Mitcham, signed his resignation letter to the Speaker under the title 'Armistice Day' which of course then triggered the Mitcham by-election. If there had been no Mitcham by-election, it is reasonable to suggest there would have been no Bracks government.

It was interesting to note when I did look at the government business program debate on Remembrance Day in November 1997 that former member for Hawthorn and former Leader of the House Phil Gude merely moved the motion. He did not speak to the motion, nor did any other government member speak on the business program on that day. I am not quite sure, and the member for Box Hill may enlighten me, whether it was customary practice at that time for government members or the Leader of the House to actually speak to a government business program. In that case, on Remembrance Day 1997, those who spoke against the then government business program were Peter Batchelor, Steve Bracks, Dimitri Dollis, Rob Hulls, Carlo Carli and Craig Langdon. They were the only members who spoke on the government business program.

But as a member of the Andrews Labor government I am delighted to speak on behalf of the government in this important debate. The government has a very full and expansive legislative agenda before the house that is not only continuing to deliver on the promises that we took to the electorate back in 2014 but is being responsive to the issues and demands of the

community. A case in point is obviously the medically supervised injecting rooms legislation. I understand that that will be a very topical piece of legislation that will come before the house, and I think it is indeed appropriate that a consideration-in-detail stage be allowed for that.

There is a very full and expansive program before the house. Taking up the contribution from the member for Box Hill, I think it is about making sure that as a government you have got a clear legislative agenda and have a clear idea as to what it is you are seeking to do when you actually arrive here, in the same way that I think, if you look at it, Publius Clodius did with the grain laws, ensuring that the impoverished members of ancient Rome could be fed. Having hungry masses does not lead to good, stable administration, and despite the member's contribution, I think those laws were brought in in the late republic period; the Roman Empire really did not fall until 475 AD, so clearly having a good, stable food supply for the masses was important.

In actual fact, in taking up the contribution of the member for Box Hill, one of the key reasons why the Roman Empire fell when it did was as a consequence of the loss of the African provinces, which were effectively the grain belt that fed the people of Rome. That obviously came about as a consequence of the capture of Carthage — 'Carthage must fall' — because a grapefruit was provided to Rome and it was said, 'It took only two days for this grapefruit to come here', so therefore that led to Carthage being destroyed.

This is an outstanding government business program. I am delighted to be a member of this government. On this side of the house, in this day and age, we stand up and we support the government business program. We are very proud of the government business program. It is not a case of the Leader of the House just moving the motion, as Phil Gude did, and then leaving the place and leaving the opposition to have its say. No, we are very proud of this government business program.

Twenty years has just gone in the twinkle of the eye, I have to say. It has gone so incredibly quickly. I could not have foreseen back in 1997, nor I dare say could the member for Box Hill have foreseen, the defeat of the Kennett government only two years later, nor the fact that we would be looking at a very lengthy period of Labor government that ensued from the following election.

This is a great government business program, and I commend it to the house.

Mr KATOS (South Barwon) (15:22) — It is always interesting to follow the member for Essendon on the government business program.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr KATOS — Actually the member for Hawthorn raises a good point. I might have to do a bit of research on my Greek heritage and maybe name a few of my ancient Greek ancestors in the next debate on a government business program.

Back to reality now, as the manager of opposition business has stated, we will not be supporting the government business program. That is primarily because of the government's inaction in dealing with the roting members for Tarneit and Melton, the former Speaker and Deputy Speaker. Until the government does so it would probably be very unlikely that we would support the government business program.

There are six bills up for debate this week, including the Crimes Legislation Amendment (Protection of Emergency Workers and Others) Bill 2017, which is finally following the opposition's lead with regard to the ramming of police vehicles. I think it was about 18 months ago that we announced that policy. The Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Pilot Medically Supervised Injecting Centre) Bill 2017, as the manager of opposition business said, is a very controversial bill, and certainly in my opinion is very much geared towards a by-election that we have this Saturday.

The Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017 provides for another increased tax on the development industry, so another new tax. Then we have the Service Victoria Bill 2017. I am sure members on our side who will be speaking will be seeking assurances from the government. Labor governments have a history of IT bumbles so it will be an interesting debate on that one. Obviously the primary element of the State Taxation Acts Further Amendment Bill 2017 is the yearly valuations on properties, so another tax grab by this government, increasing land tax. Then there is the Transport Legislation Amendment (Road Safety, Rail and Other Matters) Bill 2017, which I believe primarily is around toughening up the 0.05 drink-driving laws.

As I said earlier, the government is not dealing with the members for Melton and Tarneit in the appropriate manner and as such the opposition parties, the Liberal-Nationals coalition, will not be supporting the government business program.

Mr McGuire (Broadmeadows) (15:24) — Labor values and the priorities of the Andrews government are underscored in this week's parliamentary business program. On law and order the government is fast-tracking new laws to protect police and emergency workers from violence that could prove fatal. The Crimes Legislation Amendment (Protection of Emergency Workers and Others) Bill 2017 addresses incidents where offenders use motor vehicles to harm police and emergency workers. This bill creates new offences subject to significant penalties. This is important to protect our first responders, who place themselves in harm's way to protect our community. I look forward to bipartisan support for this important piece of legislation.

The government is also confronting a long-controversial issue that has cost many lives. The Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Medically Supervised Injecting Centre) Bill 2017 provides for the licensing and operation of a single medically supervised injecting centre on a two-year trial basis at North Richmond Community Health. This is the point: it is for one centre, for a trial for a two-year period. This is an issue that the government is now confronting. It has been controversial and contentious for a long time, but it needs to be addressed.

The government is also dealing with booming population growth by addressing the need for more infrastructure. The Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017 makes changes to the infrastructure contribution plan system that will allow industry to provide public land as a direct contribution rather than cash only as under the current system. This bill also increases the cap on the community infrastructure levy, which has not increased since 2004. As the member for Parliament for Broadmeadows, the designated capital of Melbourne's north, where it is predicted that one in 20 Australians will live within two decades, this is of great significance. I look forward to that debate.

The Treasurer has brought forward a bill to improve the operations of Victoria's taxation and valuation laws. In line with government policy these amendments will help to maintain the integrity and sustainability of the taxation and valuation system, and limit the burden of government regulation on taxpayers. That is important on limiting regulation. Cutting bureaucratic red tape and the cost to Victorians is also the aim of the Service Victoria Bill 2017. This legislation will establish Service Victoria as a central access point for individuals to transact with various Victorian government agencies and to verify their identity. This is important because it

should streamline the system and save members of the public money.

On public safety, the Transport Legislation Amendment (Road Safety, Rail and Other Matters) Bill 2017 aims to make mandatory the cancellation of drivers licences and learners permits and the disqualification from driving for all drink-driving offenders. It will also introduce mandatory alcohol interlocks for all drink-drivers over the legal limit on being relicensed.

Summing up, on law and order this government business program aims to protect police and emergency workers; make our roads safer; establish one medically supervised injecting centre for a two-year trial; provide new infrastructure in growth areas, which is critical as Victoria's success attracts more people; cut red tape and cost to the public; and improve taxation and valuation laws. This is a comprehensive government business program that addresses a whole range of issues that are critical to the state.

I would like to acknowledge the duty, vision and dedication of the late Ian Cathie, who was a minister in the Cain government. From the contributions we had on the condolence motion you could see what a big-picture thinker he was. He was a man for his time, and a man before his time in what he said about trying to take care of technical schools and trying to get more science and innovation. He was arguing and advocating for those causes back in the 1980s, and they are the causes that we are still addressing today.

This is a strong government business program in the public interest, and I recommend it to the house.

Mr D. O'Brien (Gippsland South) (15:29) — I am pleased to rise to speak on the government business program. I do not believe I have had the privilege before to speak on the government business program, unlike those who have gone before me. I particularly refer to the member for Box Hill and the member for Essendon. To use a colloquial phrase, I think the member for Box Hill just owned the member for Essendon earlier. But the member for Essendon should not feel bad as that is not something that anyone should be embarrassed about, because the member for Box Hill is, I believe, unparalleled in this chamber when it comes to parliamentary process, history and a whole range of matters in this place.

In the opportunity afforded to me, I will say that in the voluntary assisted dying legislation debate we had a number of weeks ago, what a performance we saw from the member for Box Hill, particularly over the last 26 hours — an absolutely gruelling time it was for all

of us. I give credit to the Minister for Health as well for sticking to it at the table, and the Attorney-General, but the performance of the member for Box Hill was outstanding and the mark of a truly great parliamentarian.

The member for Essendon should not feel bad. As the member for Essendon knows, I am actually studying for an economics degree at the moment, and as part of one of my electives I confess to studying public speaking. So I set the challenge for the member for Essendon because I have been learning a little bit about Demosthenes — I think I got it out — the ancient Greek orator. I expect that in the next debate on the government business program, the member for Essendon will have something to say about Demosthenes.

We are opposing this government business program for the reasons that the member for Box Hill and the member for South Barwon have outlined — that is, in particular the failure of this government to allow the chamber to deal with the behaviour of the members for Melton and Tarneit. That remains a blight on this Parliament, what has happened in that situation.

In addition I make the point that there are six bills on the agenda this week. I believe only one of them can be debated today, which means there are five for the next two days. We have this regular situation under this government where we have a crush of bills at the end of the year, including a number that should not be rushed.

The debate on the Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Pilot Medically Supervised Injecting Centre) Bill 2017 is a significant step for the state to take and until recently — until only a month ago — was indeed one that was not supported by either of the major parties in this house, and yet now we are seeing that legislation come forward. I do acknowledge the Leader of the House's decision to allow a brief consideration-in-detail stage on that, but this is a very significant bill, and to have five bills being debated over the next two days does put pressure on all of us as parliamentarians.

I note, as the member for South Barwon did, that I do not think we would be debating that particular bill, with respect to supervised injecting rooms, if it were not for the by-election due in Northcote this week. Indeed I am concerned for the Labor Party. If this by-election went on any further, the Labor Party would simply morph into the Greens. It seems that the Labor Party is no longer trying to beat the Greens — it is just trying to become them — because we have had the supervised injecting rooms, we have had more things on planning,

we have had more things on rental laws and we have had more announcements on plastic bag bans. The government is not only trying to out-green the Greens; it is becoming the Greens. Let us see what happens after the by-election. But, as has been mentioned, the opposition is opposing this business program.

House divided on motion:

Ayes, 43

Allan, Ms	Languiller, Mr
Andrews, Mr	Lim, Mr
Blandthorn, Ms	McGuire, Mr
Bull, Mr J.	Merlino, Mr
Carbines, Mr	Nardella, Mr
Carroll, Mr	Neville, Ms
Couzens, Ms	Noonan, Mr
D'Ambrosio, Ms	Pakula, Mr
Dimopoulos, Mr	Pallas, Mr
Donnellan, Mr	Pearson, Mr
Edbrooke, Mr	Perera, Mr
Edwards, Ms	Richardson, Mr
Eren, Mr	Scott, Mr
Foley, Mr	Spence, Ms
Garrett, Ms	Staikos, Mr
Graley, Ms	Suleyman, Ms
Green, Ms	Thomas, Ms
Halfpenny, Ms	Thomson, Ms
Howard, Mr	Ward, Ms
Kairouz, Ms	Williams, Ms
Kilkenny, Ms	Wynne, Mr
Knight, Ms	

Noes, 38

Angus, Mr	Northe, Mr
Asher, Ms	O'Brien, Mr D.
Battin, Mr	O'Brien, Mr M.
Blackwood, Mr	Paynter, Mr
Britnell, Ms	Pesutto, Mr
Bull, Mr T.	Riordan, Mr
Burgess, Mr	Ryall, Ms
Clark, Mr	Ryan, Ms
Crisp, Mr	Sandell, Ms
Dixon, Mr	Sheed, Ms
Gidley, Mr	Smith, Mr R.
Guy, Mr	Smith, Mr T.
Hibbins, Mr	Southwick, Mr
Hodgett, Mr	Thompson, Mr
Katos, Mr	Tilley, Mr
Kealy, Ms	Victoria, Ms
McCurdy, Mr	Walsh, Mr
McLeish, Ms	Watt, Mr
Morris, Mr	Wells, Mr

Motion agreed to.

MEMBERS STATEMENTS

Mornington Peninsula planning

Mr MORRIS (Mornington) (15:40) — For almost 40 years the green break between Mount Eliza and Mornington has endured, but not without challenge. Only two weeks ago the trustees of the RM Ansett

Trust advertised for expressions of interest for the remaining 22.3 hectares of land from Sir Reginald's estate. The land is zoned green wedge in its entirety, yet amazingly it is described in the material as:

... one of the last available green wedge land bank sites on the Mornington Peninsula ...

and as having:

Potential for redevelopment and incorporation of a range of uses, including commercial, leisure, hospitality, health care, education and a cliff top dwelling/s (subject to approval).

Of course anything can be done in a planning sense subject to approval. In this case, to achieve most of those uses will require the approval not just of the local council but also of a planning scheme amendment approved by the Minister for Planning and of course the approval of this Parliament.

The area is also subject to the *Mornington Peninsula Localised Planning Statement*, which says in part:

Areas of special character, beauty and significance, including areas of strategic importance necessary to maintain the sense of separation between townships, will be designated and protected.

I wish to place on record my total opposition, and that of the Liberal Party, to any change in the longstanding urban boundary south of Mount Eliza. The boundary has been in place for decades, and it has been understood by successive generations of peninsula residents that its location is permanent. I invite the Minister for Planning to join me in opposing any proposals that would change in any way the permitted uses in this sensitive location.

Vietnamese community

Mr DONNELLAN (Minister for Roads and Road Safety) (15:41) — I would like to highlight concerns raised by the Vietnamese community in my electorate in regard to their relationship with the Vietnamese government and the local community who live in Vietnam. Since the Formosa environmental disaster in central Vietnam in April 2016, there has been a global outcry from Vietnamese communities around the world. The significant environmental and economic impact of this disaster on the Vietnamese people was met with silence and inaction by the Vietnamese government, and as people took to the streets demanding action, the government's response was brutal: over 500 peaceful protestors were arrested.

I want to specifically look at some cases, including the arrest of the Hoa Hao Buddhist follower Nguyen Huu Tan one night recently. Nguyen Huu Tan's body was

returned the next day. The police forcibly entered the death anniversary ceremony of Hoa Hao Buddhist follower Bui van Trung's mother, attacked him and injured many other Hoa Hao members in attendance. Catholic priests Nguyen Dinh Thuc and Dang Huu, who led the protests in February, were physically abused and denounced as traitors. Victims of the Formosa disaster in the Xuan Nghia parish, Quang Binh, were also met with violence as they continue to seek compensation, supported by priest Than Van Chinh.

In light of the current situation in Vietnam, I call upon the immediate release of prisoners of conscience, including Mrs Tran Thi Nga, Pham Kim Khanh and Mother Mushroom, who is a blogger serving 10 years for highlighting environmental issues and deaths in police custody.

Devon North Primary School

Mr D. O'BRIEN (Gippsland South) (15:43) — It is with some sadness that I rise to pay tribute to teachers and school community members for over 130 years of service at the Devon North Primary School and to the current principal, Helen Dwyer. The school has made the difficult decision to de-staff next year after falling numbers of students made it no longer tenable to keep operating. The school first opened at Devon North in 1885, but the school was down to just three students this year. The school is not formally closing, with the option open to re-staff in 2019 if there is high enough student demand. I know this news will be greeted with sadness by many who are concerned at the continued dwindling of population and services in small rural communities.

Yarram Primary School

Mr D. O'BRIEN — However, on a brighter note I visited the construction works at the nearby Yarram Primary School last week, and the students and teachers there will have an incredible new facility when it opens next year.

Sale RSL and Community Club

Mr D. O'BRIEN — Congratulations to the Sale RSL and Community Club for unveiling its magnificent new mural dedicated to those who have served our country. The mural was unveiled on Remembrance Day on Saturday and is a fantastic piece of work by local street artist and businessman Jeremy Kasper. The work is a tribute to our servicemen and women through the ages and ensures that our Indigenous servicemen and women are also not forgotten. The mural was a true community effort, with

many volunteers helping out along with state and federal government funding to get it completed.

Venus Bay Surf Life Saving Club

Mr D. O'BRIEN — Congratulations to the Venus Bay Surf Life Saving Club for winning the national Club of the Year award at the recent Surf Life Saving Australia awards of excellence. To win this prestigious honour the club beat out 300 other clubs from all around Australia. It is a rare feat that a Victorian club wins over the competition from New South Wales and Queensland, and it is a great credit to club president Craig Watson and the 540 members.

School asbestos removal program

Ms THOMSON (Footscray) (15:44) — The Labor government's asbestos removal program in schools is hugely welcomed in my electorate, where two schools are now recipients of funding for the removal of asbestos. The first one of those is Glengala Primary School, which will receive \$1.5 million to remove the south wing of the school and to create new classrooms and a multifunction room to enable their students to get the best of quality facilities with the best, of course, of teacher care.

The other school is Footscray West Primary School. I was very fortunate to be able to go to their two school assemblies on Monday to actually tell them that they are getting close to \$2 million to remove their arts wing and to produce a new arts wing and classrooms for them at their school. I have got to tell you it was a real delight, because the classes at three and four, who I spoke to, had lots of questions about what it would mean for them, what it would mean for the classrooms that they will get, how long it will take and how it is going to be removed — all those questions from inquiring minds.

I am so proud of the fact that this Labor government and the Minister for Education have put in a program that will benefit the kids in the western suburbs and particularly benefit the kids in the Footscray electorate, who have been spending far too long in buildings that are substandard and do not provide for the educational needs of our children.

Cockatoo Primary School

Mr BATTIN (Gembrook) (15:46) — I rise on behalf of Cockatoo Primary School, where I recently met with the principal, Darrelyn Boucher. Darrelyn has been up at the school for many years and has created a wonderful community feel within the school. They

have raised an issue in relation to extreme fire days. Currently with code red, educational facilities will close. It is a known possibility, but it has not had to happen up there as yet, with what has happened. However, when it gets to below a code red day there are issues around what will happen with students.

Currently there is a program in place up at the school where they have got a very good network where they can communicate with parents. It has a 100 per cent strike rate and is very effective. Their concern is that the changes within the modelling now done by the minister will mean the school will have to relocate on those days. Now, when the program was originally brought in for discussion the relocation that was given to the school was to Upper Beaconsfield Primary School. Those with any local knowledge up there would understand that if Cockatoo primary is in danger, Upper Beaconsfield primary is probably in as much, or more, danger. Both are where Ash Wednesday went through.

They relocated that and decided they are going to go down to Pakenham Hills Primary School. Pakenham Hills has to go through the main thoroughfare, one of the main roads, which again is affected from high fire danger and will put students at risk, with many cars on the road going down to Pakenham Hills. When the principal of Pakenham Hills requested to have a discussion around this, he had not been consulted with it.

Darrelyn just wants to make sure that her students are safe. She wants the minister to go out there, to meet up with the students and to meet up with the parents to make sure they can have a safe outcome so that on extreme fire days we are not putting students on the roads in a place of danger.

Oakleigh Glendi

Mr DIMOPOULOS (Oakleigh) (15:47) — Yet another fantastic turnout at the Oakleigh Glendi on the weekend, a festival that celebrates the best that is multicultural that this state has to offer. I would like to recognise the Greek Orthodox community of Oakleigh, Oakleigh Grammar, Monash council and the Victorian government for the role that they have all played to make this such a vibrant annual event in Oakleigh.

Clayton North Primary School

Mr DIMOPOULOS — Yet again this is a government that backs up the slogan of the Education State. It is not just words; it is action. A few weeks back I was delighted again to be the principal for a day at Clayton North Primary School, another excellent school in my electorate and a school with passionate

and dedicated staff and really smart kids. Last week I had the pleasure of informing the school that this government has provided the school with \$150 000 for much-needed maintenance and improvements. This is on top of the \$160 000 provided to the school in the 2016 budget.

I have done some rough calculations. Over the last three years the Andrews Labor government has provided over \$44 million in upgrades and maintenance to schools in or servicing the electorate of Oakleigh. This is in stark contrast to the previous four years of the Liberal government, where I understand less than \$1 million was provided to schools locally. It is a very damning assessment of the record of those opposite when it comes to education, in contrast to the proud, proud record, as the member for Footscray said, on our side, with the Andrews Labor government and the excellent Minister for Education doing a fantastic job for Victorian schools and Victorian schoolchildren.

Weston Bate

Ms ASHER (Brighton) (15:49) — On 31 October this year Brighton lost one of its finest citizens, Professor Weston Bate. Brighton residents are indebted to Weston Bate for his authorship of *A History of Brighton*, which was his masters thesis at the University of Melbourne, which was first published in 1962.

Weston Bate had a stellar academic career, initially as a teacher at Brighton Grammar School and later at the University Of Melbourne, where I was one of the students. He wrote many books in addition to Brighton's history. He wrote two books on the history of Ballarat, a history of metropolitan and Barwon Heads golf clubs and a history of Geelong Grammar School.

He recorded the history of Brighton's significant citizens, such as Henry Dendy, who started the original Brighton estate. He detailed the role of Jonathan Binns Were in developing the suburb. In his book he spoke about Higinbotham, Bent and Elizabeth Bleasby, daughter of Thomas Bent, who had a history in local government. He outlined in his history many of Brighton's significant institutions, the history of road and rail, Brighton baths, churches, schools and the yacht club. He also spoke about the history of Brighton's market gardeners, and my great-grandfather was one of them. He provided various maps of subdivisions, dating way back.

I thank Weston for his contribution to Brighton, and my condolences go to his family, especially Chris, who worked with me at Tourism Victoria. Vale, Weston Bate.

Ambulance services

Mr NOONAN (Williamstown) (15:50) — Today I rise to commend Ambulance Victoria for the life-saving work they do and the Andrews Labor government for investing in the ambulance service and improving code 1 response times. We all know that paramedics save lives; however, their ability to do this is impacted by the support they receive from the government. Under the previous Liberal government too many ambulances were unable to respond to code 1 emergencies within the critical 15-minute response time, subjecting too many families to tragedies that could have been avoided had our paramedics received the support they needed. The Andrews government has had the responsibility of rebuilding Victoria's ambulance service after four years of the Liberal Party's neglect and its war on our paramedics.

Our \$500 million plan to improve ambulance response times, employ 450 more paramedics, buy new vehicles and build more stations is working. I am proud that today in Hobsons Bay 85.5 per cent of ambulances arrive in less than 15 minutes, while in Maribyrnong 88.3 per cent of ambulances arrive in 15 minutes. That is in line with the performance across the state. In Maribyrnong the average wait time for an ambulance is 57 seconds less than it was under the previous Liberal government, while the wait in Hobsons Bay is now 70 seconds less on average — and during life-threatening emergencies every minute matters. That is why we are so proud on our side, as the Andrews Labor government, to be undoing the damage caused by the previous Liberal government.

Mark Philip

Mr NARDELLA (Melton) (15:52) — I acknowledge the passing of a great community volunteer, Mr Mark Philip, who was a station presenter at the Bacchus Marsh Apple FM radio station along with Tonia Dudzik and Kathy Hughes from the Darley Neighbourhood House. He was a person who would help anybody but was embarrassed by any form of recognition. A truck driver-cum-radio announcer, a true gentleman — he is sadly missed.

Melton electorate health forum

Mr NARDELLA — I want to thank all the people from Bacchus Marsh who attended the health forum organised by the Honourable Catherine King, MHR, the federal member for Ballarat, and attended by the Djerriwarrh Health Services CEO Andrew Freeman, who fielded many of the queries and questions from the floor. Ms King had to field many questions about the

changes to Medicare and the increases to the co-payments of many procedures due to the freeze on payments to GPs and specialists by the federal Liberal Turnbull government. I call on the temporary Turnbull Liberal government to raise the Medicare schedule and reverse these vicious cuts. As always, Liberals cut funding to necessary and important health services, and it should stop.

Pinkerton Forest

Mr NARDELLA — I also attended the opening of the 1992 time capsule at Pinkerton Forest, which included a history of Pinkerton Forest; photos of councillors at the time, including my late friend Leo Johnson; and photos from the time of Pinkerton family members and volunteers, including a very young Frances Overmars, who to this day volunteers to protect the forest. Pinkerton family members were in attendance, and I thank Western Water and Melton council, especially the new mayor, Cr Bob Turner, for putting on this opening celebration.

Christ the King School, Newcomb

Ms COUZENS (Geelong) (15:53) — I was delighted to visit Christ the King School yesterday to meet with eight students who are participating in the First Lego League competition. This amazing group of year 5 and 6 students, the Cre8te the Future team, pitched their project to me with great passion and enthusiasm. The students — Zali Mew, James Sells, Makaira Le, Joshua Walpole, Will Scott, Jacob Pearce, Jack Bond and Jessica Sullivan — will face the judges this Sunday supported by their wonderful teacher, Aisha Kristiansen.

Their project is focused on the Point Henry site and incorporates tourism and the environment. They have spent many months researching, planning and developing their proposal, which is inspired by the Singapore Supertrees and which they have called Gardens of Change. The project includes a series of 50-metre supertrees covered in plants; students had to research the best plants to use. The supertrees collect rainwater, which runs through the internal mechanism of the supertrees to keep the plants watered, and they are supported by a wind turbine to create energy and light up the trees.

The students wanted to design a tourist attraction for the Geelong region but did not want to waste Geelong's water supplies, so they set about researching what they could do. They have taken great initiative in their research, utilising experts, including the UK company that designed the Singapore Supertrees. The team was

very surprised to hear back from the company, which provided them with the supertree specifications so that they were able to build their model.

Through this project the students have engaged the community —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Edbrooke) — The member's time has expired.

Weilong Grape Wine Company

Mr CRISP (Mildura) (15:55) — It was my pleasure to attend the earth-turning ceremony for the Weilong winery project at Yatpool last week. The Weilong Grape Wine Company was represented by the company president, Mr Wang. Weilong Grape Wine Company is one of the three largest wine companies in China, and it is planning a staged investment of \$110 million in the construction of a new winery. To my knowledge this is the first major investment in a winery project in south-eastern Australia for a very long time. Weilong's confidence in the Australian wine industry comes after a very long period of great challenges in the wine industry in the Mildura region. The winery hopes to receive its first grapes in the 2019 vintage and grow to employ 60 full-time workers and 40 casuals during vintage.

I thank the president of the Weilong Grape Wine Company, Mr Wang, for attending the ceremony and his generous words. This investment will boost confidence in both our wine industry and the Mildura region. I would also like to thank Bruno Zappia for a decade of work to see the Weilong winery established in Mildura.

Ouyen Farmers Festival

Mr CRISP — I once again attended the Ouyen Farmers Festival on Melbourne Cup Day. The festival is one of the highlights of the Ouyen community calendar and is a showcase of local craft, cookery, fleece judging and the famous Mallee lamb competition. The farmers festival provides a valuable contribution to the Mallee Track Health and Community Service, which provides Ouyen and the vast outlying area with medical care, allied health and community support.

Remembrance Day

Mr CRISP — It was my honour to attend the Remembrance Day service at the Mildura Cenotaph on Saturday, where this year an updated honour roll was unveiled. Many thanks to the RSL for the work undertaken to ensure the lives lost are remembered.

Ballarat shared paths

Mr HOWARD (Buninyong) (15:56) — Last Friday I joined the member for Wendouree to announce \$9.3 million from the Andrews government to create 12 kilometres of cycling and walking paths through the Ballarat CBD via Sturt Street and a dedicated route along the Wendouree rail corridor.

This project will connect the many existing off-road paths, which have been constructed across Ballarat along creeks, disused rail lines and through many other tracts of public land, by providing safer links through Ballarat's CBD. The creation of this significant new network of bike paths will encourage more people to enjoy the opportunity of appreciating our beautiful city by bike. Plans for the new cycling network are being developed by VicRoads and the City of Ballarat. A public drop-in session will be held tomorrow to kick off a month-long consultation. Following this community consultation, final designs are expected to be released in early 2018, with works to commence soon after.

Buninyong electorate sporting club grants

Mr HOWARD — I visited the Ballan Brumbies Basketball Club training session last Thursday to announce a grant of \$1000 for new uniforms for the club. The funding is being provided from the Andrews government's sporting club grants program. Club president Renee Baker does a fantastic job. It was great to see so many enthusiastic boys and girls at the after-school training session last week. Springbank Football Netball Club also received \$1000 for new equipment from the program. I am proud of our clubs in the Shire of Moorabool for their great work.

Fire services

Mr WELLS (Rowville) (15:58) — This statement condemns the Andrews Labor government for its selective and misleading reporting of firefighting response times. Labor's release of data is not about transparency but is a malicious attack on the service delivery model of the Country Fire Authority (CFA), directed at undermining the efforts of our hardworking CFA firefighters. The government is deeply critical of the CFA response times, while holding the CFA to vastly different standards from the Metropolitan Fire Brigade (MFB). Each CFA brigade is examined right down to the number and percentage of incidents where the brigade attends within the expected service delivery standards. There are statistics for significant urban areas, urban areas and rural areas, and maps of the aggregates of these statistics.

The Premier has cherry-picked which statistics to release, scrutinising the CFA brigade by brigade, while ignoring that CFA brigades are dispatched by 000 to work side-by-side with neighbouring brigades and neighbouring MFB stations. The CFA website states that 000 usually dispatches two brigades to provide immediate assistance, yet these CFA brigade area statistics do not include any of the times where a CFA brigade responds to incidents in neighbouring brigade areas. We do not even know how many times this occurs. In my own electorate, the Rowville and Scoresby CFA brigades often attend road accidents, chemical spills and other incidents on major roads. Emergency medical callouts are not counted in these statistics either. This data is a complete smokescreen by the Premier.

Jackson School

Ms SULEYMAN (St Albans) (15:59) — Recently my office welcomed Alexandra from Jackson School on work experience. It is so important that young kids have the opportunity of undertaking workplace experience. I thank Alexandra and wish her the very best. Jackson School would also like to pass on their thanks to the Minister for Education for helping to fund the new sensory garden, which is now completed. Students love the new learning space and are thankful for the Andrews Labor government's commitment to our state's special needs schools.

Sunshine Hospital

Ms SULEYMAN — I would also like to thank all the maternity staff at Sunshine Hospital. Last month a record number of births were welcomed. The hospital delivered over 530 new babies, which is 111 more than at the same time last year. This is why the new Joan Kirner Women's and Children's Hospital, currently being constructed by the Andrews Labor government, is so vital in keeping up with the growth of the west.

St Albans mural

Ms SULEYMAN — A big shout-out to St Albans Primary School for their fantastic contribution to the mural at the Ruth Street overpass in St Albans. With local artist Sebastian Fransz spreading his magic touch and artistic flare, we are seeing more and more of his fantastic murals across Sunshine and St Albans.

Western roads upgrade

Ms SULEYMAN — A big thanks also to the Premier, who today was at Victoria University in Sunshine to announce the western roads upgrade and

jobs project. This announcement shows our government is committed to the west, with upgrades of our roads to ease congestion and importantly to create job opportunities for local apprentices.

Country Fire Authority Kiewa brigade

Mr TILLEY (Benambra) (16:01) — Despite the best efforts of this Melbourne-centric government, the community building and solidarity of constituents in the Benambra district is no better emphasised than in our volunteer Country Fire Authority brigades and their young men and women. Last Sunday week I had the opportunity to celebrate a host of service awards at the Kiewa fire brigade. The awards started at five years service and went all the way to 70 years service for former captain Micky Bartel. What is even more incredible is that the fire brigade itself is only 75 years young and Mr Bartel has been there for seven decades. It also reminded me that volunteerism is not just about the individual but often the family support network that sits behind that and allows that to happen.

3rd Wodonga Scout Group

Mr TILLEY — On another matter, and at the other end of the age scale, was a night with the 3rd Wodonga Scout Group, organised by Mr Read Hedditch. It was a night designed for them to ask their local state politician about some of the work that goes on in this place, in the other place and in the halls of Parliament. Questions were intuitive and topical. This government's recent rejection of lowering the P-plate driving age to 17, or even allowing exemptions for country and rural Victorians, is a prime example of how issues impact our young people. They too want change and an end to the discrimination that limits their part-time job opportunities, apprenticeships and further education.

The Tree of Life

Mr STAIKOS (Bentleigh) (16:02) — It was a pleasure to be at my old primary school, St Peter's, recently to see *The Tree of Life*, written by their performing arts teacher Drew Lane. Hopefully I will have enough time to name each and every cast member. Congratulations to Olivia Younes, Isabelle Madgwick, Jordan Genovese, Maxwell Chable, Deanne Brooker, Liam Vergers, Riana Tzolakis, Niamh Mitten, Victoria Ikonomou, Ethan Hepworth, Markayla Iatrou, Syanne Ancora, Jasmyn Asmar, Tess Baxter, Amelie Brasacchio, Jack Bonello, Leilani Buttié, Madison Campbell, Annabelle Chapman, Simone Dey, Anastasia Djukic, Quinn Foley, Ava Flavian, Isabella Hoad, Emma Ianzano, Keiva Kell, Connie Kimball, Charlotte King, Noah Lazzaro, Savannah Lebbon,

Amelia Melita, Charlotte Moroney, Joel Manakkil, Tahlia Mercuri, Gisele Machuca, Alexandra Okoumousis, Bridget Rahaley, Ciara Scahill, Sienna Shepard, Tara Strik, Lidia Salasinski, James Topliff, Victoria Tzilianis, Alex Tanti, Catriona Werny and Joseph Zoghbi. Well done!

Geelong Region Scouts

Mr KATOS (South Barwon) (16:03) — Well done to Wayne Gunn, the Geelong Scouts regional commissioner, who led Geelong Region Scouts annual reports and presentation function, which I attended recently in East Geelong. Scouting is well and truly alive in the Geelong region, with scout groups holding good numbers in all areas. With strong leadership within the cub scouts, joeys, venturers and rover scouts, the scouts program provides opportunities for boys and girls to learn bush skills as well as leadership and personal development for all. Congratulations to all those who received awards.

Remembrance Day

Mr KATOS — I was pleased to attend the Remembrance Day service hosted by Torquay RSL at Point Danger on Saturday. The service was held at Point Danger, Torquay, and was well attended, offering a magnificent backdrop for quiet reflection overlooking the cliffs and the mighty Surf Coast. Commemorating 99 years since the Armistice, there was also mention of the Battle of Beersheba, which occurred on 31 October 1917. With this in mind, there were also two mounted light horsemen re-enactors at the service, which was a touching tribute. I thank the entire team at Torquay RSL, particularly president Ian Gilbank for his leadership.

Country Fire Authority Connewarre brigade

Mr KATOS — On Saturday, 11 November, I also attended the Connewarre Country Fire Authority (CFA) 75th anniversary dinner, held at the memorial hall in Connewarre. I was pleased to present a certificate to the brigade and to speak, thanking all its members for their continued years of service to the community. I would especially like to thank all CFA members of the brigade for having me at the dinner. I give special thanks to captain Leigh Wicks, brigade president David Baker, manager Geoff Blyth and Phil Stewart for a terrific event and evening of celebration. I wish them many more years of service to come.

Chelsea Kindergarten

Mr RICHARDSON (Mordialloc) (16:05) — Recently I had the honour of joining the Minister for

Early Childhood Education, Jenny Mikakos, to officially open the Chelsea Kindergarten. This has been an extraordinary journey for our community. It has been two years in the making and there has been some incredible work done by three education providers in our area. It was Chelsea Heights Kindergarten that was given a commitment of \$2 million by the previous government. That happened without talking to the kinder about making that commitment and whether they would close or move. After becoming the member for Mordialloc I undertook negotiations with the kindergarten to swap this funding arrangement to co-locate Chelsea Kindergarten with Chelsea Primary School. It took a number of petitions and a number of speeches in this place to raise that issue and to highlight the needs of our local community.

Two years later it was a joyous occasion when we officially opened the two-room kindergarten for our local community. I want to thank all the committee members over the years who have been on this journey to achieve this two-room kindergarten. We have also managed to upgrade Chelsea Heights Kindergarten, which is soon to have its first sod turned. This is about the Labor government investing in early childhood services and early childhood education in our area.

Warrnambool Special Developmental School

Ms BRITNELL (South-West Coast) (16:06) — I rise to share the disgust that members of my community are feeling towards the Andrews Labor government and the handling of the Warrnambool Special Developmental School (SDS) rebuild. During a visit to Portland recently the Premier said work was being done so funding for the school's new build could be properly considered as part of the next state budget. Since then around \$40 million worth of funding for schools has been delivered outside the budget process. But still, disabled children in Warrnambool wait for news about when their long-awaited new school that they were promised three years ago will be funded so building work can start. At this rate the children there for the minister's photo opportunity in 2014 will be finished their schooling and never get to enjoy a new school.

I cannot understand why this government is dragging its feet on this project. There are 130 students in a school that was originally built for 30. Because there is not enough room there are three separate lunch periods, no room to kick a football or play cricket, and the renowned children's author Jackie French recently commented on a picture of the school's library, saying:

This is not a library, it is a cupboard. Every child deserves better than this.

Every teacher deserves better than this. Every child has the right to learn to read, to access books, and to have help to find the books they love.

The community is upset, and rightly so. Why is funding being delivered to other schools when Warrnambool was told they had to wait until the state budget? This should be above politics; this is about making sure every child is equal and has the best facilities to get the best education. Unfortunately that is not happening for the children at the Warrnambool SDS, and I would urge the Premier and minister to stop moving at a snail's pace and get this project started.

Mark Heffernan

Ms GREEN (Yan Yean) (16:08) — Just over a month ago, on 11 October, I lost a friend and mentor, Mark Heffernan — a giant bear of a man with the biggest of hearts. He was loved by his family, his colleagues and his many, many clients, of which I was just one.

Mark began managing my and my first husband Michael Rizzo's tax affairs as near as we can remember, around 1989, even before our son Carlo was born. It may seem strange to many but I always look forward to tax time. He would greet me with a big bear hug and immediately make or collect me a cafe latte. Then we would launch into our annual catch-up and swap stories about our families, the world and just life. Importantly, he always made me laugh, especially when I invariably forgot to bring all my records. He would call me a week or two later and growl, 'You won't get a seat on a toilet, let alone that seat in Parliament if you don't send me x, y or z paperwork'.

He was devoted to his wife, Donna, and his children Simon, Claire, Madeline, Tim and Stephanie. I especially remember his excitement at son Simon representing Australia in wrestling, and his delight in reducing his work days to enjoy being a grandfather. I loved the stories of his early life, especially working his dad's newsagency and driving people with disabilities at Turinga in Greensborough while he was at university. Mark's brother Vin served in this place as the Liberal member for Ivanhoe, but Mark was a Labor man, the preferred accountant for many union members. He was so much more than my accountant. Mark, I will miss you so much. Thank you for being such a great friend.

Relay for Life

Mr McCURDY (Ovens Valley) (16:09) — It was another awesome community effort at this year's Yarrowonga-Mulwala Relay for Life. Rain, lightning,

smiles and tears all resulted in \$38 414 being raised for the Cancer Council, which was simply brilliant. I was honoured to close the event ceremony by leading the last lap alongside many of the people involved in the relay. Well done to the relay organisers, Diane Tregoning and her hardworking committee, and all the members of the 18 teams who participated.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (16:10) — Order! Can I acknowledge in the gallery His Excellency Dr Bernhard Zimberg, the ambassador for Austria. Welcome.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT AMENDMENT (PUBLIC LAND CONTRIBUTIONS) BILL 2017

Second reading

Debate resumed from 20 September; motion of Mr PAKULA (Attorney-General).

Mr BATTIN (Gembrook) (16:11) — I rise to speak on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017, and I will put on the record from the start that we will not be opposing the legislation that is before the Parliament today.

Victoria over a long period of time has seen growth. I represent the area of Gembrook, but I also cover the areas of Berwick, Pakenham and Officer, where we see about 10 families a day moving in. So the growth through Victoria has been unbelievable: the growth through the northern parts of Victoria and the growth through the south-east corridor. The numbers of people moving in, not just from within other districts — we have got locals with their children now moving into other local areas, a lot of Berwick families are now relocating down to areas in Officer — creates a lot of pressure on our infrastructure. It creates a lot of pressure on the development within those areas, whether it is roads or schools, and we have seen this for a long period of time and the pressure that creates.

I think it is important that we cannot continue the same way we are going. They say that you have got to be planning for the future, not just for the next election cycle but for the full future, to see where we are going to be heading in 10, 20, 30 and 50 years time. I think it is vital that when you start to have these discussions you talk about what you are going to do with population growth, and as part of managing population growth I know we have spoken about decentralisation.

We want to make sure that we can create environments where people do want to move to just outside of metro Melbourne. We cannot continue to put people on the Monash — there are only so many lanes you can put on the Monash, so if you are going to continue to expand it, you can only go so far before eventually you end up with Los Angeles-style car parks effectively, where people take hours and hours to get to work. That is not the life we want to have in Victoria. We want to make sure that Victoria remains one of the best places in the world to live, and to do that, as I said, we need to have that plan.

Just recently I went down to Warrnambool with the member for South-West Coast, and we had a discussion down there with a few of the groups in relation to development and what is happening in Warrnambool. It is amazing. It is fantastic to see some people moving out to regional parts and rural parts of Victoria. Warrnambool is one of those places where they are not only building some fantastic affordable housing and making sure that the land is remaining affordable for all people in that area but they have also got something that not every electorate has — they have got some magnificently different views of the ocean that not every electorate can have. However, they have made sure that they have got those views in that area — and there are other areas close to the ocean.

The developers are putting some genuine thought into affordable housing and working with the council, working with other local groups down there and are very keen to see this continue in that direction going forward. They want to make sure that that regional and rural development continues. They want to make sure the people are building within those areas.

Obviously in Ballarat we have seen the employment zone put up there. These are other areas that governments can be involved in to make sure decentralisation does occur, and we can see people moving into those areas like Bendigo, Ballarat, Warrigal, Sale and other areas throughout Victoria. You can create employment — I think government has to play a lead role in that — and make sure it is available for all people to move to.

Today I will go through some specific issues with the bill. As I said, we are not opposing it, but we do want to raise a few issues with this bill, and I will be putting forth amendments shortly that we believe should take place to ensure protection for Victorians.

We are not opposing this, but I think everybody needs to be aware that we should be cautious when we are talking about compulsory acquisitions. Compulsory

acquisition powers have been there for governments and local councils in the past. I just want to get that on the record, that we have to be very cautious when we are talking about compulsory acquisitions and how far that compulsory acquisition can go.

People in Australia are very proud. We all know the movie *The Castle*. We do not need to go down that path; we all know that your home is your castle. Your home is something that is safe and secure, and we want to make sure when we are introducing legislation around compulsory acquisitions in the future that it is used very sparingly and with the best intentions for the whole community. I think that needs to be taken into consideration.

One of the main issues we have is with the increase in the value of the levy and putting in place the indexation of the levy. I will say right here that we disagree with the bill indexing the levy going forward. We want to make sure that that is not there. If the government would like to increase fees going forward, they should bring it back to the Parliament and not just put it out there that it is going to continue to increase at a set indexation without considering other growth factors from within the community or wage increases. Under standing orders I advise the house of our proposed amendments to the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017 and request that they be circulated.

Opposition amendments circulated by Mr BATTIN (Gembrook) under standing orders.

Mr BATTIN — When we are talking about increases in fees and we are talking about taxes of the state, we all know that this Andrews government has got a very, very good record of increasing taxes and adding new taxes across Victoria. We know that on 4 September 2014 the then Leader of the Opposition, the current Premier, was asked by Jon Faine:

Are you going to put taxes up?

The then Leader of the Opposition replied:

Of course we're not. We're not going to tax our way into — we reduce taxes, Jon, we reduce WorkCover premiums. We ran a AAA budget, that's the fact of the matter.

So before the 2014 election when he was asked about that, the current Premier said straight out that he would not be adding new taxes and he would not be increasing taxes.

On 5 November a caller, David, asked:

Morning, Jon. Mr Andrews, if you don't get the federal funds, will you either cut your infrastructure program for public transport or will you raise taxes?

The Leader of the Opposition said:

Well, David, we're not — thank you for your call, firstly, David. I'm not interested in raising taxes.

He was not interested in raising taxes at the time, but we have seen now again and again and again that this government continues to raise taxes in our state. We have seen 11 taxes directly — new taxes — and I will go through some of the other taxes that are affecting the property industry all around Victoria, taxes which are putting pressure back on family homes, and those families are the ones that have to pay in the end.

On 19 November 2014 David Speers asked:

So, any higher taxes, levies?

The then Leader of the Opposition answered:

Absolutely not. We're not in the business of trying to solve problems in TAFE and schools and ambulances that don't arrive, higher taxation will not fix those problems —

I repeat, 'will not fix those problems'. David Speers continued:

I just want to nail this down ...

The Leader of the Opposition said:

The answer is a very simple one: no increases. And the question also related to new charges: I have no intention of introducing new charges.

When I refer to my next lot of notes members will hear about how many new charges have been put on the building industry, and I know the Labor government would love to say that these are charges that have been put onto the developer or put onto a builder. These are charges put onto families. These are charges put onto the cost of living. These are charges that are put onto a block of land. If you increase the tax on a block of land by \$200, that is going to go straight through to whoever buys the property, not the developer in between. Trust me, their profits will stay the same and these costs will be directly passed on, because this government is introducing these taxes.

On 20 November 2014 the then Leader of the Opposition said he would release his costings later the next week and promised his plans would include 'no increases' to taxes and fees. He added, 'I have no intention of introducing new charges'. Then we cannot forget the final interview. That was on 28 November 2014, the night before the election.

Peter Mitchell said:

Do you promise Victorians here tonight that you will not increase taxes or introduce any new taxes?

We all know our media training. You just look down the side of the camera. On this occasion the then Leader of the Opposition looked directly down the camera. He wanted to look into the eyes of every family in Victorian homes, and he said:

I make that promise, Peter, to every single Victorian —

every single Victorian. We know that promise has been broken. We know that indexation has been added into this legislation. The reality is these tax increases have hurt the building industry and have hurt development industries across our state. I know the Northcote by-election campaign is on at the moment and the government is very keen to talk about housing affordability. If they want to talk about housing affordability and prices, we should start by discussing some of these.

The infrastructure contribution on new estates has been jacked up since this government was elected. They have continued to increase the fees, and again that directly goes back to impact the affordability of houses. Planning fees charged by councils have hugely increased, some by between 100 per cent and up to 1000 per cent. These are massive increases on family homes, and this government is standing idly by and letting it happen. The increase means family homes are getting almost unaffordable — and this government is standing by.

Axing of the longstanding Victorian off-the-plan stamp duty exemption is effectively a new tax. They have taken away the exemption that was there and have put this back onto families. It is an absolute disgrace. It was a great opportunity for those who wanted to go into the market, and who would not want to encourage more building? Who would not want to encourage people to build rather than always buying an established home? It is a great opportunity and also creates employment.

I spoke about Warrnambool before. When you talk about new homes down in Warrnambool, one of the things that is keeping a lot of people employed down there is the building. I think it is important that we support that building industry and do not start to work against it.

Then there is axing of the stamp duty concession on investment property transfers between spouses. The stamp duty concession has been axed for investment properties that have been transferred between spouses,

so it is basically another cash grab from this government which adds costs to investment properties — and where does that end up? That ends up back on the renter, someone who is renting a property. Their costs are going to go up with transfers, and the costs are going to go up with stamp duty. That is directly impacting on local families, and these are the people who end up being punished for this.

The growth areas infrastructure contribution, which everybody knows as the GAIC, was jacked up and brought forward. People may recall back in 2009 signs all over Victoria which said 'Axe the tax'. That was a very, very strong campaign. This government brought it in, and since then the idea is to have funding available for growth areas infrastructure contributions, to have money there for upgrades within those communities to support community facilities, to support public transport et cetera, but the worst thing is that there are hundreds of millions of dollars sitting idly by and the government will not use it. It should be spent in those communities. The developers have done the right thing. The people who have sold the properties have done the right thing. They have all paid their taxes along the way. The people who have moved in have had to pay that tax, because of course it has been added onto the price of the land, but they are not seeing the infrastructure from it.

There are new community infrastructure charges as an increased infrastructure contribution on new estates; a land tax surcharge on foreigners, which was introduced in 2015 and further increased in 2016; a stamp duty surcharge on foreigners introduced in 2015 and further increased in 2016; and a \$220 million levy imposed on the Victorian Managed Insurance Authority (VMIA) over four years. The building component on the VMIA's business is 12 per cent. That is a \$50.2 million hit on the property sector over four years — a \$50.2 million hit on the property sector over four years. Again this will effectively go straight to households. It is going to affect the mums, the dads, the first home buyers and the young people who are trying to save up and move into their first home. The price of land is going up and the price of building is going up because this government continues to put these taxes on them. The increase in the fire services levy has also gone well and truly above CPI. They are just a few of the taxes, and if you put them together it comes to just over \$4 billion. That is just over \$4 billion that this government is taking in extra taxes from the building industry and the development industry.

We have a piece of legislation before us today. The government is trying to say that what it wants to do now is to have an index. It wants an index so it does not

have to worry about coming back before Parliament. It is just going to continue to increase the taxes on local families. It is going to increase the taxes on those who are trying to buy a property. As I have said, many people are moving to Officer, which is in my electorate, and it is a genuine first home buyers market. These are the people who are being hit by these taxes going through and the tax increases on the growth corridor.

I look forward to contributions from the members for Narre Warren South and Narre Warren North, and I know the member for Cranbourne is in the chamber. If those members have spoken to their communities, the one message they would be getting from local families moving into the area is that it is becoming unaffordable. In Officer alone, which is a reasonably new area and has got a precinct structure plan that was signed off on whilst we were in government, 30 000 new homes are going up. The price of land in that area has gone up dramatically just in the last few years. It is about demand and supply. We all know that, but the taxes are continuing to add to that and put pressure on it.

Another issue we have is in relation to the valuation method for this, and it needs to be clear and consistent. We are not asking for too much on this, I do not think, and I know we have had support here from the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA), which has said about the valuations:

While the proposed methodology generally matches the agreed compromise between industry and government, further information regarding the valuation is required. While the UDIA understands the government will provide a valuation method in a ministerial direction, more detail is needed on the proposed broad-hectare and site-specific valuation.

This is directly from the UDIA. They have raised a concern mainly around transparency. They are saying the legislation is going through now but that we are putting a lot of faith in the minister at a later date to come up with the method for the calculation of the sums going forward, particularly on broadacre land. The UDIA is obviously representing the developers. The developers are going to have costs imposed on them. They do not know what those costs are going to be. Eventually when they are charged those costs, they are going to divide them among the blocks. The price of a block is going to increase by the amount that is actually put forward, and again it will fall to local families to pay it.

We understand there will be transition arrangements for this. The industry believes that a period of one year is enough to have minimal impact on development feasibility and therefore commercial reality of development sites already transacted. However, a draft of

the proposed amendments to the infrastructure contributions plan guidelines take into account that these changes should be made available to the industry for review and comment. The industry is just asking that all of these guidelines et cetera during that transition period be made available to the industry groups.

We have had consultations with the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders, the Urban Development Institute of Australia, the Property Council of Australia, the Victorian Local Governance Association and the Planning Institute of Australia, and a lot of them are raising concerns around making sure that it is transparent and making sure the message gets out there for them to have a say in what is happening in the forward estimates et cetera. They need to be able to have a say about the legislation, and they do not have trust in the minister to deliver on what they have said in here. They do not have faith that they are going to have a method to calculate it on those broad acres. They are worried they could end up in a position which is unfair to them and also obviously to the final house buyers later on.

The next issue raised was in relation to surveyor delays. Currently surveyors cannot issue permits until land is transferred. Obviously the bill covers transfer of land instead of cash when you are talking about infrastructure. If a developer is transferring land to government or council for community infrastructure or a community park and that is part of the payment, until that land is transferred the permits cannot be issued. Again, that is going to tie things up. It is more red tape and delay and, with what we have seen in the past, when you delay precinct structure plans and you delay developments, that increases the price because it takes away the opportunity to put a lot of land on the market at once or it may actually filter it through. Therefore when you are filtering it, there is an opportunity to increase the prices, particularly from a developer's point of view, as those developments happen. I think that really needs to be addressed. We do not want it to lead to increased costs from delays and increased costs back to the developer. As I said, we keep talking about the developer, but it is not going to be with the developer; it is going to go far from there.

There was concern raised about the excessive ministerial discretion and about vague terms like 'as soon as practical'. We would like to see in legislation taking out terms like 'as soon as practical'. We would like to see clearer guidelines set to ensure that the development community can have a direct understanding of what the bill is, rather than things like, 'We'll get back to you as soon as possible', particularly with time lines for getting back to them. If you are

talking about set time lines, if it is a permit et cetera, it should be a 45-day or a 30-day time line. Then they can have consistency within their planning and would hopefully avoid delays by saying there was a set time line in which things have to be answered, and they can get that out there from there.

The bill in itself, as we have said — I have spoken to a few of the developers — is supported mostly through the sector. They do have issues with it, but they mostly support it. They do support the idea of handing across land or assets rather than cash. I think, at the end of the day, for a lot of these community assets you can get better value for money if you are working with developers rather than government. I think there is an opportunity there for us to expand in the future how developers can deliver better infrastructure for the community whilst they develop, rather than developing the infrastructure when a government gets involved. Most of us know that once government or council is involved the price can increase quite dramatically when you are talking about some of the infrastructure. There is an opportunity here for us to start to work with developers and get better bang for our buck, and that then reduces the cost of local developments. Again, that is how you are going to maintain the price restraints or price restrictions that are happening within areas such as my own in Gembrook.

In my contribution today, as I said, I think it is important we do continue going forward. I have spoken about growth. I have spoken about decentralisation. I have said we do not oppose the bill for those reasons, but the main things in there that I think need to be addressed particularly are indexation around the taxes — it is one that we are very, very concerned about — and valuation. We just need to make sure the transparency is out there and make sure there are going to be no delays in any development going forward. It will best benefit the Victorian community if we ensure we are getting land onto the market in a reasonable time and at a reasonable price to allow people to buy into those markets where they would like to.

Ms D'AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (16:30) — I am pleased to lend my support to the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. I do want to commend the minister for bringing forward an important bill, and he is certainly doing a fantastic job in ensuring that our planning arrangements in Victoria are fit for purpose and for the growing needs of our communities, no matter where they are in Victoria. This is certainly with a keen eye to ensuring that they have sufficient contributions made available to ensure that we can provide the necessary

infrastructure that is required for a growing population in a state that is doing so fantastically economically compared to the rest of the nation. I do want to make that point very clearly in support of the fine work that is in hand by the minister.

I am also very pleased to lend my support as the first Minister for Suburban Development. I am very excited by the prospects of some terrific work that is coming down the pipeline on behalf of our government. Certainly the suburban development portfolio works very well in conjunction with the planning portfolio in terms of ensuring that we are able to deliver services and infrastructure in a more timely way and in a way that prioritises the greatest needs across metropolitan Melbourne, because that is certainly the area that my portfolio is responsive to.

This is one of many policies that will ensure that infrastructure meets growth needs here in Victoria. The bill introduces the land contributions model, which will streamline the current infrastructure contributions plan (ICP). That is often referred to of course as ICP. It also streamlines the delivery of public land with an approach that benefits both the community and developers. This is important in terms of getting the social licence and the support of industry and the community behind really important actions of the government, ensuring that as we continue to grow we are able to deliver. The ultimate test of successful governments is getting services and infrastructure in place as people need them.

This bill certainly goes hand in hand, as I mentioned earlier, with the work of the suburban development portfolio. On that front, I am very pleased to report that the government has recently hosted about six metropolitan assemblies across metro Melbourne. We are listening to communities when they tell us their priorities for their regions. People from all walks of life are coming forward wanting their voices to be heard as well as the voices of the communities they represent, whether they are industry, local government, community-sector organisations or all manner of groups that really have a very clear view about how government ought to function to ensure that they are able to continue to enjoy and to access the prosperity that comes from a really strong and capable government that is doing so well economically.

The first of these metropolitan assemblies was held in the inner south-east. I was very pleased to have been joined by the member for Bentleigh and also the members for Yan Yean, Thomastown, Broadmeadows, Ivanhoe and Eltham. The assemblies will certainly help inform our government of what actions can be

undertaken to make a difference to the livability and prosperity of our metropolitan regions and the communities for whom those terrific places are their home or indeed their place of work.

Our government is certainly working in partnership with local communities to ensure that those in our suburbs have access to the transport, health, education and social infrastructure that they need. This bill, in conjunction with the work undertaken through the suburban development portfolio, ensures that Victorians will have access to community facilities, parks and transport that are relevant and appropriate to specific suburbs. So it is about understanding all of the levers the government has available to it, putting in place those levers and utilising them in a way that is the most appropriate and that has a very clear eye on fair outcomes and good outcomes for people no matter where they live. Ultimately and fundamentally this is about good planning. It is about good planning and delivering the services, and it is about government spending money in a way that produces the best outcomes for communities.

The new land contribution model provides a more cost-effective and efficient model for securing public land. This new ICP model requires developers to directly contribute land for public purposes, with the additional benefit of a lowered levy. This will ensure that communities have quicker and earlier access to public land as well as essential infrastructure such as roads, community facilities, sports ovals and parks.

I do want to reflect on my own time growing up in what was an outer metropolitan part of Melbourne a number of decades ago, which is now very much an inner middle suburb. That was Fawkner. There was always a massive lag between housing development that went up and young families moving in and really needing access to kindergartens, primary schools and public transport. I remember, and I will never forget it, asking my mum when I was very, very young, 'Why is it that my brother ended up going to kindergarten and I wasn't able to?'. She basically said there was not enough space the year I was born and subsequent to that for me to have gotten a place in kindergarten.

That really makes you wonder about how governments can better prioritise the way that public land is used for a whole range of services that communities are entitled to expect, especially new communities that call growing suburbs their home. It really needs to be home. That means trying to get that infrastructure and those services in there at the time that they are needed. That is really the main focus of the bill we have got in front of us. It is not good enough for people to have to wait

generations before they can get some of those basic services in there. That is not to say it is easy; it is absolutely not easy. If it was easy, many governments in the past would have done it well and truly before now. But the fact is we do need new approaches. We need a very clear eye on identifying a whole range of tools and opportunities to create greater availability of public land sooner so we can actually start to create and build those new facilities. This of course goes to those very basic needs.

The bill supports the collective benefit of public land. That is really about why public land is so important. The bill recognises the positive financial and social outcomes of having a sufficient amount of community infrastructure to match the growing population. When suburbs are connected to our transport system and have childcare centres, schools and health services, that makes these areas more desirable to live in, and ultimately it is about fair outcomes. That is at the centre of not just this bill but also other government initiatives that complement the objectives of this bill. One of those that is important, as an example — not the only example, but still an important one — is the commitment of our government to produce five-year plans for infrastructure services and jobs across regional areas of metropolitan Melbourne. Those plans will set very, very clearly what our government's objectives are and what our commitments are. We will be measured by that, and governments should be measured by that.

I am very much looking forward to our government finalising those plans, getting them out to the community and importantly building on those. We know that we can never deliver everything at once, but we are certainly setting a very strategic approach to the delivery of services and infrastructure — trying to get more jobs available where people live. They are really important ways for us to focus our efforts. That is absolutely our commitment, and it certainly sets us distinctly apart from those opposite. Suburbs that are connected to our transport system and have childcare centres, schools and health services make, as I said before, areas more desirable places in which to live. Our government is looking towards the future. We understand that suburbs need to be adaptable to future changes. The new ICP model makes sure that every Victorian has equality of access to services. That is why I am very excited with this bill, and I certainly wholeheartedly congratulate the minister for bringing it forward and for all the fine work that he does. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr McCURDY (Ovens Valley) (16:40) — I rise to make a contribution on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. As

was mentioned by our lead speaker, the member for Gembrook, we will not be opposing this legislation. I will get to some of the issues that I want to discuss in more detail. Certainly the purpose of the bill is to amend the Planning and Environment Act 1987 to introduce a land contribution model for the infrastructure contributions plan scheme, to increase and provide for the indexation of the community infrastructure levy, and to make other amendments, including amendments to the Subdivision Act 1988 and the Building Act 1993.

This bill makes changes to the infrastructure contributions plan — the ICP, as has been mentioned earlier — system that will allow industry to provide public land as a direct contribution rather than cash only as under the current system. Those who understand the planning system will certainly understand that it is not always practical to find land; sometimes it is more practical to find cash, and this bill actually introduces the opportunity for a combination of both, or one or the other. The Planning and Environment Act 1987 will be changed and will require the land identified for public purpose under the ICP to be provided as a land contribution rather than a monetary contribution.

As I say, parts of this act will also be changed to allow for equalisation between different landowners within each precinct to enable some land to come from outside the precinct. I think that is actually quite a practical outcome in this bill — as I say, either a combination of land or dollars, or land outside of that which is being developed — because sometimes it is not practical to hand over land for parks and gardens or public open space in the actual precinct where the development is going ahead. It is certainly always agreed that developers contributions to public open space should be there, but to have that flexibility is certainly a benefit, I would see, to the developers.

However, in October 2016 an order was made by the Governor in Council to increase the community infrastructure levy, and that went from \$900 to \$1150 for each dwelling constructed. This bill amends the Planning and Environment Act to increase the cap set in that act to \$1150 per dwelling, and consistent with that order to provide for the annual indexation of that capped amount in accordance with the construction producer price index. The bill provides for that annual indexation of the community infrastructure levy specified in the development contribution plan.

As the member for Gembrook said, we certainly do not agree with the indexation because it is just another tax, and I suppose it is the unknown: there is a level of unknown as to what that tax might grow to over time.

Growth in Victoria continues to occur; development is important whether it is in metropolitan Melbourne or regional Victoria, and we need to keep development affordable.

I still have my concerns about local councils' complete understanding of the benefits of development in their regions and how they can increase rates and ratepayers, but at the same time we have to make sure housing is affordable in those communities. Certainly the tax increases like this indexation hurt developers, which then flow on to hurt communities and families because the buck always stops with the final purchaser in the end.

The member for Gembrook did go through all those extra taxes. I will not go into detail about all of them, but the \$4 billion in extra taxes on property is an awful lot of money when the would-be Premier did say to us prior to the last election that there would be no increase in taxes or no new taxes. So to then apportion a \$4 billion tax to this industry over time and then I suppose give some sweeteners by giving a few hundred million dollars back in different programs is really a drop in the ocean compared to what is coming out of the industry. So again it is more taxes, which we thought were not going to be the case, but it appears they are certainly part of this government's agenda.

In the Ovens Valley electorate, which I represent, certainly considerable development goes on and this flexibility will be well supported in that respect. Wangaratta is the largest town in my community, or the only rural city in my electorate, and there is certainly enormous growth going on there. As I say, this will benefit that community. But in Yarrowonga, which is a much smaller town but which is one of the fastest if not the fastest growing rural town in Victoria, they will also see the benefits because again, when you have a lake, a river and natural assets that you want to take advantage of as a developer, sometimes it is not always ideal to give away prime land for public open space or other things — cash might be a better option in this instance. So I can see where the benefits lie.

Coalition support for decentralisation is very clear, and we have a responsibility to ensure that affordable regional growth can continue. There was consultation provided under this bill, certainly with the Master Builders Association of Victoria, the Housing Industry Association, the Property Council and the Victorian Local Government Association, so there has been support from those bodies. The bill is supported by the local government sector and broadly accepted by the property industry, but we do have to make sure that assurances are sought on a number of matters, particularly on that indexation, as I mentioned a bit

earlier. So again, from a government that promised each and every Victorian that there would be no new taxes, here is another one coming up. But I do say that there will be some benefits for our developers with the introduction of this bill.

Mr PEARSON (Essendon) (16:46) — I am delighted to make a contribution on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. I note the opposition have indicated that they will be moving amendments to the proposed bill.

In preparing for this debate today I did reflect upon the state of affairs and the way in which a government of the day has opportunities to fund critical infrastructure. You can look at trying to fund that infrastructure via a user-pays model. Effectively when you are looking at a bill like this you say to a developer, ‘Look, you are developing the land, you are going to get in all likelihood a significant profit. You might get a windfall gain’ — particularly if it is land that had previously been outside the urban growth boundary and was farmland and has been rezoned as residential — ‘therefore we ask that you make a contribution and you pay’.

The alternative of course is that you do not have these measures in place, and you make it entirely an obligation of the state to fund. That certainly was the case under the Hamer-Thompson government. When the Kennett government was commissioned in 1992, the commission of audit found that in 1992–93 dollars the debt of the state of Victoria in 1981–82 was \$20 billion. So you had \$20 billion worth of debt, in 1992–93 dollars, back in 1981–82. A significant factor of that was when the government said to developers, who were making windfall gains on the then urban growth boundary, ‘Look, pocket your profit. Don’t worry about funding this infrastructure; we will fund it’.

As a consequence of that the Victorian taxpayer was on the hook. Of course those opposite love to remind those of us on this side of the house about the wastefulness and the profligacy of the Kirner government, but when you come into office in 1982–83 in a recession — what was then the worst recession since the Great Depression — and in 1992–93 dollars you are carrying \$20 billion worth of debt, then I would suggest there was a significant amount of lead in the saddlebags of the Cain government when it arrived.

So you have a choice. You can turn around and basically say to the developers who are developing this land, and invariably it is on the fringe, ‘You are going to make a significant profit; we are asking that you make an appropriate level of contribution to pay for that’. I think

that is a fair and reasonable thing to do. I think that is the hallmark of a progressive taxation regime.

I note that the member for Gembrook in his contribution talked about his own electorate of Gembrook being an area of higher levels of residential growth and development. I know a little bit about his electorate; I do not profess to know as much about it as he does. But listening to the member’s contribution, you would have thought that the only people who are moving out to his electorate are first home buyers. Undoubtedly there will be a percentage of people who are residing in his electorate, in a suburb like Officer, who are first home buyers, but I would hazard a guess that there would be others who might be downsizers or people upgrading to a second or third home — people who, for example, may well have already had a significant profit on the sale of their previous home, particularly if they had purchased that home some time past.

So the notion that — again this is from listening to the member for Gembrook — taxation like this is bad because you are hitting the first home owner does not seem to take into account that there would be people who are not first home owners in his electorate. There will be people who may well have turned around and had a significant profit from the sale of their previous home. If you are going into these communities, you do want to make sure that you have appropriate services, you do want to make sure that you have got open space and that you have got appropriate community infrastructure so that it is not like it was when I was growing up in the outer suburbs in the 1970s, where there was little.

I note that the member for Gembrook also indicated he is specifically concerned about the indexed nature of the levy and suggested that the amendments he will move require a future Parliament to vote on legislation that seeks to increase that levy. It is a truism in politics that power reveals. Traditionally in this state you have had to regularly introduce legislation when you are seeking to increase taxes and charges. I seem to recall that that was changed under the Brumby government so that those sorts of taxes and charges are indexed on an annual basis. From a household budgeting perspective and from a general management perspective, the notion of gradual CPI changes is far more preferable than having flatlined taxes and charges which then dramatically jump every five to 10 years.

The other point I would make in relation to the operation of this place and the other place is I am not quite sure whether it is the best use of our time as legislators to every six months, 12 months or two years have a taxation omnibus bill where we have got to vote

on specific increases in relation to a specific charge. I actually do not think that is a good use of our time. I think that when you bring a bill into this place you determine that, 'Yes, we're going to set up a levy or charge. It should be increased at the CPI or a commensurate rate so that it keeps track of inflation' — that is the way you should deal with it. I just do not think it is a good use of this place's time to be expected to have to revisit this matter on what would be a fairly regular basis.

The other point I would make is about those changes which were brought in by the Brumby government. If those opposite, when they were in government, felt so violently opposed to the concept of indexation, they could have amended it. Those opposite, when they were in government, controlled the numbers in the Legislative Assembly briefly, but they controlled the numbers in the Legislative Council. If they were really serious about indexation, if they really took violent offence at the notion that you could have an annual taxation increase year in, year out, then they could have easily introduced legislation in 2011 or 2012 and passed it through both chambers quickly, and we could have dealt with those sorts of issues on a case-by-case basis. But they did not do that, because they recognised that this is a far better and more efficient way of collecting taxation revenue than having to bring in individual pieces of legislation on an annual basis to increase a whole range of taxes and charges.

I think as legislators we have got better things to do. Once we determine that we are going to set up a fund that is to raise taxation for a specific purpose, I think our job as legislators is done. Clearly if you have a set of circumstances where the Treasurer of the day turns around and says, 'Look, we're not going to increase on an annualised basis these funds by CPI, but we're going to look at gouging the tax base; instead of saying it is 1.5 per cent or 2 per cent, we're going to make it 5 per cent or 10 per cent', I think of course that is something that should be dealt with and should be brought to the Parliament's attention and the matter debated. But when you are looking at this level of modest, annualised increases, it is only fair and reasonable.

This is an important bill. Again, I am particularly attracted to the idea of being able to turn around and say to developers, 'Look, if you can't pay cash or if we don't want cash — we actually want land — we've got the ability to do that'. I think having that level of flexibility in these negotiations is important. I do note the member for Gembrook's statement early on in his contribution about trying to partner with the private sector. Many of us on this side of the house have no

aversion to the notion of partnering with the private sector to deliver outcomes. The questions I would ask are: what is the method of engagement for partnering with the private sector? How do you make sure that taxpayers are not going to be gouged by that level of engagement? What are the checks and balances that you put in place to make sure the taxpayer is getting a fair deal? It is fine to have these sorts of broad statements like 'We think it's better to partner', but how do you structure these agreements? Is it a formal section 173 agreement? Does the state have the ability to do that efficiently and effectively? It was not clear from the member for Gembrook's contribution, which I think lasted for about 18 minutes, that he could enunciate that in any great detail.

This is an important piece of legislation. The reality is if you want to create a civilised society, you have to make taxation, and progressive taxation, a centrepiece of that. Where you are seeing significant population growth, where you are seeing significant rises in land values and in the profits that are flowing to developers, it is fair and reasonable that there is a level of capture by the state of those profits so that we can make the fundamental infrastructure investments that are required. On that note, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WAKELING (Ferntree Gully) (16:56) — It gives me pleasure to rise to contribute to this debate on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. I note the comments that were provided to the house by the member for Gembrook in regard to the opposition's position on this bill. I also note the amendments proposed by the member for Gembrook which deal with the important issue of indexation, and I would like to come to them in a moment.

It is always interesting to stand in this house and talk about this government's approach when we are looking at issues of taxation and the ways in which the government goes about seeking to increase taxes and create new taxes and charges. Let us not forget that it was the then opposition leader, now Premier, who, when asked prior to the election whether a future government that he would lead would seek to introduce or increase taxes and charges, looked down the barrel of the camera and gave a very clear guarantee to the Victorian community on Channel 7. I believe it was the night before the election, so you would have thought that this issue was pretty much front and centre, given the fact that the then opposition leader was seeking to become the Premier of the state of Victoria. He gave a very clear commitment to Victorians that under a government he would lead there would be no new taxes or charges or increases thereof.

As we know, that was simply a lie, or if that is unparliamentary, that was simply a mistruth. We know that this government has sought to significantly increase taxes and charges on the Victorian community, and there have been a range of new taxes and charges. I know that the bill is seeking to provide a level of indexation. The member for Gembrook has circulated amendments to deal with that issue of indexation, because we think it is important. All we are simply asking the government to do is to actually live up to the expectations it has raised. Nobody on this side of the house asked the now Premier to stand out on the steps of Parliament and make a commitment to the fact that under a government he would lead there would be no new taxes or charges or that he would seek to increase taxes and charges on Victorians. He has gone out and exactly broken his own commitments. So we have sought to introduce amendments to this bill that will simply require government members to agree to commit to deliver on what their leader promised prior to the last election.

The bill before the house deals with public land contributions, and it goes into the area of developer contributions at the time of the establishment of new housing estates. We know that this has been a very vexed issue, particularly for landowners in the south-east. We remember too well the issues that landholders faced with the growth areas infrastructure contribution (GAIC). The member for Hastings is sitting beside me at the table. His community was severely impacted by the Brumby and Bracks governments, which sought to impose a significant cost on landowners for the future development of land, even though that may not occur for significant periods of time.

We know that those Labor governments were seeking to gouge communities, to extract dollars, in order to fund assets that were technically not being delivered to the community for which they were actually being paid. There were significant concerns raised about that. In fact we saw the then governments to some degree back down, backflip and acknowledge that they got it wrong. Given the fact that the then Labor governments were forced to make changes in their operations with the GAIC as it applied at the time, you would hope that government members in this house would seek to follow the same approach by agreeing to the necessary changes that have been proposed by the member for Gembrook.

This bill introduces a land contribution model for the infrastructure contributions plan scheme, to provide for and increase the indexation of the community infrastructure levy and to make a range of other amendments. The member for Gembrook also

highlighted the opportunity for the private sector to be involved in the delivery of infrastructure.

One thing I know from speaking to developers is that there is often great angst from local residents about the fact that there is a lack of delivery of government services within new communities, particularly in the areas of education and other areas delivered by the state government. You will often find a situation where in a new housing estate you will have wetlands, you will have playgrounds, you will have shopping centres and you will have medical precincts. You might have a pre-school facility being delivered through local government in concert with private development, but a range of state government-delivered services are left bare. I am reminded of the situation in Geelong, in Armstrong Creek, where there are housing developments. Developers had set aside land for the establishment of new schools. We still see that there are areas in Armstrong Creek where this government had committed to opening new schools. They have not even purchased the land.

Herein lies the problem that we face. We see a lack of direction from this government when we are talking about the establishment of new assets within our growth corridors. The way in which that relates to the issues I have raised about this bill is that there is an opportunity for the private sector to be working in concert with government to assist in the delivery of important community assets. As you, Acting Speaker Pearson, mentioned, obviously those matters need to be spelt out. That is clear, and that is right and just. The important thing though is that you need to have a mindset where you are willing to visit that, you are willing to engage in that, you are willing to look at that. And, as we know, under this current government that has not been the case.

What we are seeing is that this is a government that is more than happy to take the money. It is more than happy to impose increased costs and charges on Victorians. It is more than happy to levy charges, which it did not say it would do prior to the election. It is more than happy to impose new taxes and charges, which it said it would not do prior to the last election. Again we are seeing another issue before this house where this government has not sought to justify why it is introducing this impost.

This is against the backdrop of a government that is unwilling to come clean when it comes to the issue of taxes and charges. If the then Leader of the Opposition had laid it bare back in November 2014 and said, 'Under a future government that I lead, I acknowledge that there will be increased taxes and charges; I

acknowledge that I will be imposing new taxes on Victorians; that is the government that I will be leading', then at least when we have legislation like this before the house Victorians would know exactly what they are getting. We were promised the direct opposite.

Members of the government will stand up in this house and they will justify the reasons why they are increasing these imposts on Victorians, and they will justify why it is they have to introduce new taxes and charges. That all might be legitimate, but what is not legitimate is that they gave a commitment to do something completely opposite. If you stand up before an election and tell Victorians to vote for you because you are not going to do something, you cannot then come into this house and start lecturing Victorians about why it is you have broken that promise. If you never sought to deliver on that commitment, then you should not make the commitment before you go to an election. That is what Victorians are judging this government on. As in so many areas where this government has failed, this is just another example.

Yes, this bill is introducing an increase with indexation, and I have dealt with that issue. It is important that we look at other options that are available to the government, such as working with developers to ensure that we have a better outcome with developer contributions. We know the history of this government when it was last in power was that it was unable to manage them properly. I am only concerned that this matter will be back before the house because we will need to try to fix another potential problem. I call on this government to take on board the issues of indexation, because unfortunately this is a government that is happy to tax Victorians.

Mr DIMOPOULOS (Oakleigh) (17:06) — It gives me pleasure to speak on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contribution) Bill 2017. As colleagues have said, and obviously the Minister for Planning in the second-reading speech said, this bill proposes a couple of key changes. One is to allow developers and landowners to provide public land as a direct contribution rather than as cash as it applies under the current system.

Secondly, the bill also seeks to increase the cap on the community infrastructure levy under existing development contribution plans, which has not increased since 2004. As I think you said, Acting Speaker Pearson, when you were making your contribution, it also builds in an indexation mechanism, which is entirely appropriate.

Before I go into a bit more detail about those aspects of the bill and why they are important, I just have to make a comment in relation to the member for Gembrook's and the member for Ferntree Gully's contributions. The previous government looked at this issue, introduced a bill but could not pass it, so it lay on the notice paper. It could not pass it, and this is quite endemic. I seem to get up every few bills and say that the previous government left unfinished business. We know why of course, because the chamber was in chaos under the previous government, both with the rogue then member for Frankston and also the speakership all over the place.

It is only the Liberal Party that can make a debate about community infrastructure one about taxation, because that is about the extent of their narrative. It is almost like in the 1950s and 60s, when the way you would win elections if you were in the Liberal Party was to talk about the Reds under the bed — communism. Now, it is talking about increased taxation. They forget the value of being on the Treasury benches and actually doing things for the community, achieving outcomes and investing in community infrastructure. This is absolutely about community infrastructure, but the member for Ferntree Gully talks about taxation.

I will tell you what a tax is. A tax, in many other ways, is letting unemployment run rampantly like they did under the four years of the Baillieu-Napthine government. I will tell you what a tax is. It is letting debt triple. Under their regime they let unemployment go up, debt tripled and they also struggled to balance the books, all the while not investing in a whole range of community assets, infrastructure and social reform that this government is proudly known by. That is a tax in any other name on the people of Victoria — squandering the opportunity of government, all the while not providing tax relief to the Victorian public, presiding over the ambulance crisis and presiding over the public transport crisis. It was a crisis in terms of the congestion on the public transport system in Victoria that they did very, very little about. They talk about taxation and say we are imposing a tax, but they as a government were a tax on the Victorian people.

I am very proud of this bill. It is a bill that the local government sector has called for, and developers also in terms of providing housing for Victorians going into the future and what they need for their modelling work. This is a bill that is very important for the building of future schools, park lands, community health centres, maternal and child health centres, sporting fields and a whole range of other community assets that we have come to know in a society that not only are we pleased to call socially progressive but it seems to attract people from internal migration and externally from overseas.

As the minister said in his second-reading speech:

The bill addresses this longstanding issue by implementing a land contributions model that requires land identified for public purposes in an infrastructure contributions plan to be provided as a land contribution, instead of a monetary levy. Where such land is identified in the plan, the landowner must provide that land as part of their infrastructure contribution when developing the land.

Importantly, the land contributions model is confined to securing land necessary for meeting the basic and essential infrastructure needs of new development in the plan area, such as land for roads and intersections, community facilities, sports ovals, parks and drainage.

The advantages of a land contribution model are that it secures the transfer of land for public purposes early in the development of a new community, reduces the financial risk to councils through escalating land prices over time, overcomes the longstanding issue of developers contesting the compensation that is payable when land for public purposes is acquired, and reduces the overall monetary levy paid by developers under an infrastructure contributions plan.

If only Victorian governments of decades and centuries past had this foresight. If they did, we would not be playing catch-up as we have been in the last 20 to 30 years. Particularly under this government we have doubled the infrastructure spend from about \$4.5 billion annually under the previous government to close to \$10 billion annually, and we would not have needed to do that, and continue to do that, if previous governments had made sufficient provisions, particularly in new housing estates and new developments for the social and community infrastructure that is required for any community.

I am very, very proud that in my community — although my community is not one of the sites that generally would come under the ambit of this bill, because it is not a new development site generally — despite the fact that there was not foresight by the previous government in providing for my community, we are spending millions of dollars both to increase existing community infrastructure and also to plan for new infrastructure where it can be built. That of course includes schools, and in my community at least four schools have been funded under this government in three years alone, with further commitments to come. In my community four level crossings will have been removed by next year, which will free up the roads and will contribute to the Cranbourne-Pakenham line's capacity to deal with the growth of Melbourne and the growth of passenger numbers, with longer trains and 40 per cent extra capacity.

This is the kind of investment that governments need to make and this government has made every single day since it was elected. On top of that we are now ensuring

through this bill that future governments will not be encumbered by the lack of action and the lack of foresight of governments in the past in terms of planning for community infrastructure and new growth areas.

This bill is supported by the sector. The local government development industry supports this land contributions model in principle because it secures the transfer of land for public purposes and, as the minister said in his second-reading speech, it reduces the financial risk to councils. The Municipal Association of Victoria and the Planning Institute of Australia support the increased community infrastructure levy (CIL) capped amount of \$1150 per dwelling and annual indexation of that amount. Of course, as I think other speakers have said, the Urban Development Institute of Australia supports the indexation of the CIL cap but does not support the adjustment to \$1150. That is fair enough — everybody has a view — but this government has to do what is important for the community and for the future.

In conclusion I just want to go back to what you said when you were making a contribution, Acting Speaker Pearson — that it is interesting that those on the opposite side find convenience in criticising a mechanism they have employed in the past when they have been in government, as you rightly pointed out. The indexation mechanism applies generally across the statute books when it comes to not only this type of public policy but also fines in the criminal justice system — it applies in a whole range of areas. It is absolutely appropriate in this context. Not only is it appropriate, it is actually something that funds our future infrastructure needs. As I said earlier, we are the fastest growing state in Australia and the fastest growing city by immigration both internal and external — from outside Australia. I think this government is showing incredible foresight in planning for that future as well as investing for today. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WATT (Burwood) (17:17) — I rise to speak on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. I just thought I would start with the member for Oakleigh. He, like many other people, talked about indexation. It is fine to say, 'Well, certain previous governments have done things like indexation, so why shouldn't we be allowed to do it?'. I think the basic premise that I have always come into this place with is to do what you say and say what you will do. Stick to what you said you would do before an election, because people do not like it when you lie if you are the Premier.

The day before the last election, when he was the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier made a solemn promise. I have stood in this place and mentioned this interview with Peter Mitchell on Channel 7 news more than once. I have mentioned it a few times, and it is not just that particular interview that I have mentioned; it is also the forum that was on Sky News. It was a similar context and a similar question, but Peter Mitchell interviewed the then opposition leader, the member for Mulgrave, and said to him, 'So, no new taxes, no increase in taxes? Do you promise you won't do that?', and the then opposition leader, now Premier, said very clearly, 'I make that promise to every single Victorian'.

So every single Victorian has the right when they see this bill to feel cheated. Every single Victorian has a right when they see this bill to feel as though they were lied to the day before the election. Regardless of whether or not you think indexation is a good thing or a bad thing, that is irrelevant when it comes to a solemn promise that was made the day before the election. I know that people in my electorate understood the Premier when he said, 'No new taxes' — and this is not a new tax; we accept that — 'and no increase in taxes'. You can use weasel words about whether a contribution is a tax or not, but it is a charge by the government, and this bill clearly increases that charge. The Premier, the then opposition leader, has either done a backflip or he lied through his teeth when he said, 'I make that promise to every single Victorian'.

Every member of the government should have to stand here and explain why they support a Premier who willingly lied to my electorate and to theirs, because if you are willing to stand here and say that, yes, you accept the bill holus-bolus and that, no, you will not accept the contribution of the member for Gembrook and the amendment that he has put forward, then what you are willing to say is, 'We are happy that the Premier lied before the election and we are happy to allow him to continue down this path of lying to the people of Victoria'. I do not think it is appropriate that the Premier —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pearson) — Order! The member for Burwood cannot make those comments about another member of this place.

Mr WATT — I do not think it is appropriate for members of Parliament to lie to the people of Victoria just so they can get elected. It is not appropriate, and people need to stand in this place and make it clear that if they have said something before an election, regardless of what it is, they will stick by it.

I accept the fact that there are sometimes changes and that sometimes things happen and that sometimes you might say, 'Actually, there is new information that we could not possibly have known before the election. There are things that have happened since the election and we have had to change our mind', but this is not one of those cases. I have not heard members of the government stand in this place and say, 'Yes, we are doing something different to what we said we would do at the election and this is why we are doing it'. Just before me was the member for Oakleigh, and the member for Oakleigh certainly did not stand in this place and say, 'I know that the Premier said he wouldn't do these types of things, but we are, and this is why'. I have not heard it.

On the substance of the bill, the concept of being able to say to a developer, 'Rather than give us cash, give us land', I do not think many people would disagree with that concept. But that is not the only thing this bill does. This bill also helps the government break a promise, a solemn promise, and one which the people of Burwood, along with the rest of the people in Victoria, will understand, can understand and should understand, was a lie. You cannot say, 'I won't introduce new taxes, I won't increase taxes and charges. But actually, look over there, don't worry about this. Don't look while we lie through our teeth'.

I think it is convenient that this particular bill comes through this place while media attention is focused on the other chamber and on other bills in the other chamber. You slid the first reading of this bill through while this chamber was busy talking about a particular piece of legislation that was controversial. Then in the second reading in this chamber you are trying to slide through some tax increases while the other chamber is occupied, some of the community is preoccupied and the media is preoccupied.

It is not acceptable to lie. When you say you will not do something, do not do it. Do not just pretend when you have lied. Do not pretend that you are not doing something. I will be interested to hear the contributions afterwards. I will be interested to hear them because I have heard the contributions before. I noticed that members on this side of the house, members of the opposition, mentioned the same thing I have mentioned. It is actually an important point. I think we need to ram this home.

The now Premier said, 'No new taxes. No increase in taxes'. I know I have missed a few, but I think I have gotten up to 13 new taxes or 13 increases in taxes across the spectrum. I know that I have not caught them all because some of these changes are so insidious that I

just missed them. I know that the government has tried to be shifty in other ways like, 'These are just some indexation changes. It's just index changes'. As the member for Oakleigh said, 'The previous government did indexation changes'.

Well, here is the point: an indexation change actually increases the rate, it increases the amount of money charged, it increases the tax or the charge or the levy or whatever you want to call it. It is an increase, and when you said that you would not do it, then you should not do it.

As I said, and I know the member for Gembrook has also made it very clear, we do not seek to oppose this bill. All we do seek to do is to hold the government to account. That is why we have this amendment and that is why it is important that any member with any integrity in this place stands and supports the amendment and says to the Premier, 'Keep your promises'.

That is all we ask — we are just asking you to keep your promises. Whether you are in Frankston or whether you are in Broadmeadows or whether you are in Bentleigh we want you to walk into your community and say, 'I made the Premier do what he said he would do. I made him keep a promise'. That is all we want. We want the Premier to keep his promise. He said, 'No new taxes'. He said, 'No increases in taxes'. It is a disgrace that we have a Premier who wilfully will lie and who wilfully will go around and tell people one thing —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pearson) — Order! The member for Burwood cannot attribute those actions against another member in this place. You can only do that under a substantive motion.

Mr WATT — Thank you very much. I am sure the people of Essendon would appreciate you going into your community and saying, 'No, the Premier didn't lie and this is why'. At the end of the day I think every member of the chamber who supports this bill in its current form, without an amendment, needs to go to their community and say to them, 'The Premier did not lie and this is why'. Or 'The Premier may have said' —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pearson) — The member for Burwood is not to attribute —

Mr WATT — I didn't say the Premier lied; I said you had to go to your electorate —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pearson) — Order!

Mr WATT — As the member for Essendon, you need to go to your electorate and explain to them that the Premier did not lie —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pearson) — Order!

Mr WATT — I am not saying he lied.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pearson) — Order! I have repeatedly warned the member he is not to make allegations against a member of this place in relation to lying.

Mr WATT — But I did not; I actually did not do that. What I said is that you as the member for Essendon would have to go to your community and explain to them that he did not lie. I am not saying he lied; I said you would have to go and explain that to your electorate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pearson) — The member for Broadmeadows.

Mr McGUIRE (Broadmeadows) (17:27) — Victoria is booming. Economic growth drives population growth and the economy is AAA rated, according to international rating agencies. With a population of 6.3 million people, Victoria exports almost \$50 billion in goods and services and we have the highest annual employment surge in the nation. In just under three years we have created more than 280 000 jobs, the majority of them full-time. Business is buoyant, with business investment in the year to June 2017 up by more than 20 per cent. This reflects the confidence in a strong economy that is creating jobs.

We operate a fiscally responsible budget with low net debt, to the credit of the Treasurer. This has allowed us to invest in the largest public infrastructure works program in Victorian history, including major new roads and rail projects. These projects provide local workers with new skills, training and apprenticeships, supporting our record jobs growth. These are the key reasons why Victoria is undergoing such population growth, which must be served by infrastructure where it is needed most.

A key action in *Plan Melbourne* is better funding of infrastructure in Melbourne's strategic development areas, with substantial housing and employment growth. The Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017 makes changes to the infrastructure contribution plan — the ICP system — that will allow industry to provide public land as a direct contribution rather than cash only as under the current system. This bill also increases the cap on the community infrastructure levy, which has not increased since 2004. As the member for Broadmeadows, the designated capital of Melbourne's north, where one in 20 Australians is expected to live

within two decades, this is of great significance. This is why addressing this bill and these issues is critical.

The Andrews government has committed \$144 million from the growth areas infrastructure contribution fund, unlike those opposite, who only spent \$4 million. The opposition had no process for spending this money, so the Andrews government had to put one in place once Labor came to power. The Andrews government established a transparent process with public service officers to assess each potential project, which were then signed off by the Minister for Planning, the Minister for Suburban Development and the Treasurer. This contrasts with the previous regime.

I refer to a contribution I made in this house, which then became an article in the *Age* of 4 August 2011. The headline was 'Everybody loses under new rules — even the winners'. The subheading says:

The government has given one minister the power to make a deal.

This refers to what happened in that period, so it is worth comparing and contrasting. I quote from the article:

The Baillieu government has effectively established a 'favour bank' with property developers — opening the door to secret deals and potential corruption — with its changes to provision of public infrastructure.

Planning minister Matthew Guy has new powers to negotiate in secret with developers on the value of open space, schools, health and recreational facilities — in lieu of cash payments totalling up to \$200 million.

This became law on June 30 after the government refused to answer the critical question that I raised in Parliament: how can taxpayers and developers know whether the minister has provided a rotten, fair, good or sweetheart deal if there is no transparency on how each deal was valued and no way to compare it to similar deals?

Under the government's amendments to the Planning and Environment Act covering the contributions developers make in growth areas, the public cannot decide whether the minister has treated developers equally and appropriately if the deals remain hidden. This opens the door to a favour bank where secret deals can be traded for contributions to the coalition.

The concerns the *Age* has identified between Liberal Party fundraisers and property developers ... have now become legal and systemic.

Because there is no mechanism for scrutiny and accountability of the value of each developer's infrastructure contribution, any developer who makes donations to coalition parties will come under suspicion that they are payoffs for sweetheart deals on infrastructure projects in Melbourne's growth areas.

Business craves certainty, not secret deals. These changes place developers in an invidious position and are dangerous

for democracy. I support a process between government and developers to deliver community infrastructure, but it must be assessed independently. It also needs to be transparent so that the value of contributions to respective projects can be compared and contrasted in the best interests of the public, for the probity of government and in fairness to developers.

These changes threaten to repeat one of the biggest social failures in Victoria in half a century, which Broadmeadows is still trying to fix. That was the lack of coordination between government departments to deliver the infrastructure needed for cohesive and prosperous communities. It beggars belief that the Baillieu government is repeating this scenario with changes that also exclude local government and communities from any say in these infrastructure deals.

The minister has placed himself above the traditional layers of negotiation and consultation.

He steadfastly refused any amendments to provide scrutiny and accountability and by excluding local councils is robbing communities of input by that tier of government best placed to understand their wants and needs.

That was the former regime, and this is why it is important to get the infrastructure contributions right, because we do not want to see history repeating itself. The reference that I made as the member for Broadmeadows is that one in 20 Australians is predicted to live in Melbourne's north within two decades, where the increase of half a million people means the population — already more than four times the size of Victoria's second-largest city, Geelong — will match the current size of Adelaide. That is the significance of the population boom. Boasting Australia's largest concentration of advanced manufacturing, Melbourne's north also features the highest proportion of underdeveloped industrial land in Melbourne — about 60 per cent — defining it as the most sustainable and affordable region to cope with population growth.

These are the key drivers for population growth; this is what is happening in these suburbs. We have to address the infrastructure deficit from the past and also keep up with the growth and the development that is going on now. What is needed is these amendments which will actually address how we get that critical social infrastructure. To make the point: Broadmeadows did not even have a public library — the foundation of any enlightened community — until this was actually put into place.

Mr Burgess interjected.

Mr McGuire — I am going back to when the Kennett government was in power, just to address the interjections from those opposite — that was the critical time. This is what needs to be done now. The existing development contribution plan system enables a community infrastructure levy to be imposed to fund

projects involving the construction of community buildings or facilities. Community infrastructure covered by the community infrastructure levy includes community health centres; leisure and recreational facilities on public open spaces; cultural and education facilities such as libraries; sporting facilities such as tennis courts, change rooms, pavilions, grandstands and goalposts; and public facilities such as public toilets. The community infrastructure levy cannot be used to fund land for community infrastructure.

These are the essential building blocks of communities, and they have been neglected. To address the members opposite: the gaming of the political system has led to the point where we have managed decline from the federal government because these are safe Labor seats in Melbourne's north. If you have a look at it: \$70 billion was provided to Adelaide with the demise of the automotive industry there; I have found an unspent \$1.324 billion that could have been reinvested to take care of the automotive transition scheme, to make sure that this could be delivered for — dare I say it — jobs and growth in the areas that need it the most. But they have abandoned these communities.

We had the one-term coalition state government that did the reverse Robin Hood: it took the money out to sandbag marginal seats. The choice is clear for Victorians on who actually delivers, who has the commitment, who will actually invest and provide the critical social infrastructure that helps build communities, that gives people a chance in life, gives them a chance for lifelong learning, gives them a chance to be connected rather than disconnected and gives them the best opportunity in life.

Mr CRISP (Mildura) (17:37) — I rise to make a contribution on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. I will be supporting the amendment standing in the name of the member for Gembrook.

Firstly, the purpose of the bill is to amend the Planning and Environment Act 1987; to introduce a land contribution model for the infrastructure contributions plan scheme; to increase and provide for the indexation of the community infrastructure levy; and to make other miscellaneous amendments and consequential amendments to a number of other acts.

There are a couple of issues that we need to discuss, particularly the land contribution model. The bill makes changes to the infrastructure contributions plan system that will allow industry to provide public land as a direct contribution rather than cash only as under the current system. The Planning and Environment Act will

be changed to require that land identified for a public purpose under the infrastructure contributions plan will be provided as a land contribution rather than a monetary contribution. Much of the mechanics of the bill is about how that works if the value of the land is higher than the contribution and what to do if the value of the land is lower than the contribution. There are the mechanics in there to allow a mixture of both land and cash or perhaps having your land put in and getting some credits. Parts of the act will also be changed to allow for equalisation between the different landholders within the precinct to enable some land to come from outside the precinct. I think we all understand that there should not be tight control over where public infrastructure needs to go within some of these districts.

There will be an increase to and provision for indexation of the community infrastructure levy. In October 2016 an order was made by the Governor in Council to increase the community infrastructure levy from \$900 to \$1150 for each dwelling constructed. The bill amends the Planning and Environment Act to increase the cap to \$1150 and, consistent with audit, provide an annual indexation that caps the amount of increase in accordance with a construction producer price index.

The bill provides for an annual indexation of the community infrastructure levy specified in the development contributions plan (DCP). This is an area that I know several speakers before me have spoken about — whether this is in fact an increase in tax — and the essence of the amendments that are before the house is to deal with that indexation. It appears from some of the consultation out there that this bill is sitting reasonably comfortably with the various bodies that were consulted. Although it certainly would be supported by the local government sector and has been broadly acceptable to the property industry, there are a certain number of matters of concern particularly around that indexation.

When it comes to local government I am going to put this in the Mildura context. The development contributions plans have been widely used by local government for a long time, and they were the subject of an Auditor-General's report in 2009. The overall conclusion from that report in 2009, and I will quote from the report, is:

There is little assurance that the development contributions system is operating as intended across local government. A lack of effective oversight and transparent reporting remain, despite similar issues being identified in 2005. Greater accountability for what has been delivered is needed, as is a better understanding of the future obligations that arise from the contributions received.

That was back in 2009, going back to 2005, and we are in 2017. Again in the Mildura context, in 2013 the Mildura Rural City Council commissioned its housing and settlement strategy, something which the coalition government supported with some funding. That allowed it to then go on and prepare planning amendments C89 and C92 for the Mildura area. As part of those particular amendments there was a Mildura east growth area as well as a Mildura south growth area, but I am going to talk on the Mildura east growth corridor.

You would think that with a housing strategy underway and then with the amendment there should not be any delays in getting on with developing that land; however, Mildura Rural City Council has decided to review its development contributions plan, particularly for that area. This has caused delays to the development at Nichols Point. Nichols Point has land that is in demand, and developers have expressed frustration at some of the delays that have been occurring. First it was the housing strategy, then it was amendments C89 and C92 and now it is the review of the development contributions plans. This is, as I said, causing frustration amongst our development community, particularly when there is in fact demand for land in that area.

Looking at what a development contributions plan looks like, I have one here which is for roughly the Irymple-Nichols Point area, and the things that local government uses this money for range from roadworks, intersection works, community centres, a skate park, some change rooms, a recreation precinct plan, some drainage works, preschools, stormwater, playgrounds, reserves and parks, and some various open spaces. When you look at those issues, these plans should not be difficult, firstly, to maintain.

That is when we come back to that concern that was raised by the Auditor-General back in 2009 — that is, there was certainly good warning to councils that they needed to review their development contributions plans. I think the frustrating part for the development community of Mildura in one aspect is that they have just chosen to do it at this time, when it is something that perhaps with good governance should and could have been carried out gradually over time and not cause yet another frustrating delay for our development community.

Mildura is a growing town and has recently received some very positive news from the Victorian skills commissioner report on employment growth to be expected in Mildura. Certainly that will mean that there will be continuing demand for housing and of course a continuing demand for services and open spaces that

support it. So I well understand why this bill is welcomed by local government, because it does formalise a little more or give them some flexibility in what they are doing in accepting land rather than cash, but they also do need to make sure that they have a plan on how to utilise that land and that these contribution plans are kept up-to-date as they go so that you do not have frustrating delays, as we are now experiencing.

Confidence has returned to Mildura, so our housing industry is strong. That confidence has returned on the back of federal government free trade agreements that have increased demand for our horticultural exports. Also, with the end of the mining boom the Australian dollar has come back to manageable levels, and the drought is slowly fading in people's minds, but if we do not have all the other ducks lined up, then Mildura will not be able to take advantage of what the future offers as well as it should and could. That is certainly the part I want out of this — that is, that we understand in Mildura the context of these DCPs and ensure that the delay in the Mildura plan does not hold up Nichols Point in other areas any longer.

Mr STAIKOS (Bentleigh) (17:47) — It is a pleasure to speak on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. It is very much legislation that well learns from the past. It learns from things like the debacle at Fishermans Bend where a lot of people made a lot of money but there was very, very little community benefit. This is all about community need when it comes to developing housing and developing infrastructure. It is also about the future of our state.

We have a very fast-growing state. According to *Plan Melbourne*, Melbourne's population is projected to grow from 4.5 million to almost 8 million, with Victoria's total population set to top 10 million, by 2051. The economy will need to create another 1.5 million jobs in that time for a changing workforce. The city will need to build another 1.6 million homes in places where people want to live, and our transport network will need to grow to cater for around 10 million more trips per day — an increase of more than 80 per cent. So it is clear that Melbourne — and Victoria for that matter — will be experiencing a number of challenges when it comes to our growing population.

As a government we are very proud that we have been investing record amounts of money in the infrastructure that Victoria needs. The budget papers for this year show that the Victorian government on average is investing \$9.6 billion a year on infrastructure — level crossing removals, the metro rail tunnel, \$2.5 billion for schools,

many new schools in growth areas. These are all things that we need for a growing city and a growing state.

This bill does a number of things. It makes changes to the infrastructure contributions plan system to make it fairer in dealing with the complexity of situations that arise. These changes will allow developers and landowners to provide public land as a direct contribution rather than cash under the current system. The bill also increases the cap on the community infrastructure levy under existing development contributions plans, which has not increased since 2004.

I will go straight to that part of the bill because there certainly has been some disagreement in the chamber tonight about that particular direction. The community infrastructure levy, or the dwelling cap on the community infrastructure levies, will increase from \$900 per dwelling to \$1150 per dwelling and will be indexed annually. The increase reflects indexation for the period since the \$900 rate was struck back in 2004 — 2004 was a very, very long time ago and the landscape in Victoria has certainly changed significantly in that time. When we talk about indexing that cap annually, perhaps it is something that should have been done a while ago because we do need to make sure, as we are expanding out and as new housing is being developed in our growth areas, that contributions are being made to infrastructure that is desperately needed in those communities.

Every opposition speaker has called this a new tax. It most certainly is not a new tax. If the opposition members had read the bill, they would know this is not a new tax. The previous Minister for Planning, now the Leader of the Opposition, tried and failed to reform the development contributions system. The Andrews government implemented the first stage of reform in 2015, which was well accepted by industry, as is this bill. We set a flat rate for contributions to make it easier for developers to understand their obligations, saving time, money and protracted negotiations. These rates are less than those signed off by the Leader of the Opposition in his previous failed attempt. We are delivering on reforming the system to better our communities where those opposite failed.

It is worth pointing out that, if we are going to talk about new taxes and increased taxes, in 2013–14 under the former government, state taxation revenue grew by 8.8 per cent. In 2014–15 it grew again, by 8.5 per cent. In 2014 alone the member for Malvern hiked motor vehicle taxes by over \$580 million. If we want to talk about new taxes and about increasing taxes, those opposite certainly have a lot of form.

I now want to turn to another part of the bill, which extends the infrastructure contributions plans to regional developments and particularly strategic development sites in Melbourne. What this may mean in the future is that we can have this level of contribution to major development in strategic sites in well-established areas, possibly like my electorate of Bentleigh. We refer to growth areas all the time but in my view I represent an area that is also growing — growing significantly.

You only have to drive through the area to discover just how much it is growing. The City of Glen Eira, over the next 15 years, is expected to have an additional 22 000 residents and an additional 9000 households. Obviously, being an established area, there is a lot of concern from the community who do want to make sure that the inevitable growth — and people do expect that growth — will be managed well and managed appropriately, that development will be appropriately sited and that infrastructure is invested in by not only government but also landowners and the people who will be receiving significant windfalls out of development.

Just last night I was at a session with the City of Glen Eira on the Bentleigh structure plan. There were probably 60 or 70 local residents there. All were interested in the future of their local community, given the significant growth that Melbourne is experiencing. Running parallel to that process is the current process at East Village, an old industrial estate on East Boundary Road in East Bentleigh of over 24 hectares, which is currently being structure planned with the Victorian Planning Authority, in partnership with the Glen Eira City Council.

Unfortunately some of the new provisions we might see as a result of this bill to extend this sort of strategic site probably will not apply to East Village. East Village has had to rely on the goodwill of parties, but thankfully there has been a lot of goodwill amongst the parties involved in that potential rezoning. But what I think that says is — when we are growing at the rate that we are and when we are talking about an additional 3000 or 4000 dwellings on the one site, however that may be — that raises all sorts of infrastructure needs like parks and gardens. The City of Glen Eira has the lowest amount of public open space per capita.

Experiencing such significant growth raises all sorts of needs when it comes to new schools and education infrastructure — kindergarten, childcare, you name it. When you are going to increase the population of a community by that much, there is a lot of work that needs to be done. It is unfair that the community at

large should have to be burdened with some of the costs of providing this infrastructure. That infrastructure does need to be contributed to by developers and by landowners who are going to receive significant windfalls out of their developments. This is a sensible bill. I commend it to the house, and I wish it a speedy passage.

Mr THOMPSON (Sandringham) (17:56) — I am pleased to make a contribution to the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. I note that its main purposes are to amend the Planning and Environment Act 1987, to introduce a land contribution model for the infrastructure contributions plan scheme, to increase and provide for the indexation of the community infrastructure levy and to make other miscellaneous amendments. The coalition opposes the indexation of the community infrastructure levy.

The provision of public land for community benefit is very important in the development of Victoria. One of the great features of the state of Victoria has been its regard for not only national parks, state parks and regional parks but also the parklands and open spaces which have served the City of Melbourne and metropolitan Melbourne over many years. Victoria was once known as the garden state, and Melbourne parks are a great feature of our city. They are not due to any chance happenings but are a consequence of the vision and foresight of those who laid out the City of Melbourne.

I again place on record the great contribution made by Charles La Trobe in his contribution to the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kings Domain, the area of Studley Park and Royal Park and the pattern that was set in motion for the development of the great parks of metropolitan Melbourne, which I would attribute in large part to his vision. In his early life he travelled to the great cities of the world, including London, Paris, Rome, Venice, Bern in Switzerland and Washington, New York, Philadelphia and Boston in America. Before he landed in Melbourne in 1839 he had a sense of space, proportion and open space.

In his 94 or so surveys across Victoria he saw the great features of the natural environment and what the contribution of that could be for the wellbeing of the community. Just before he sailed out of Melbourne in 1854, having spent 15 years in the Port Phillip district and later as the colony of Victoria's governor, he had done a horseriding survey of Royal Park. Near the botanic gardens observatory, not far from La Trobe's Cottage, there is a quotation that records his obligation to his conscience in terms of the fulfilment of the open

space provided for the new city. There has certainly been a very great legacy left to the people of Melbourne.

I note also that Charles La Trobe had written eight books recording in part his travels or his study reports in another context. His uncle Benjamin Latrobe had helped design the White House and Capitol Hill buildings in Washington, which he had the opportunity to observe. So he had this great sense of space, the life of a city and the space for a city and of very strong urban planning, as we would call it today.

It is imperative, as we move forward as a legislature, to ensure that there is an ongoing provision of strong public open space — strong recreational land. With our population expected to double over the next 30 years or thereabouts and with the proportionate share of that population increase being absorbed by all the municipalities in metropolitan Melbourne, I trust that through decentralisation to regional areas well-served by public transport there will be the opportunity for access to good recreational lands, whether that be the great botanic gardens that exist in Melbourne and also out at Cranbourne and throughout many municipal shires in Victoria, for not only passive recreation and conservation values but also for sporting pursuits, whether that be young children being able to access a local tennis club, hockey club, lacrosse club, cricket club, netball club or basketball club — whatever the sporting interest or pursuit of people might be. Future generations should have excellent opportunities for recreational purposes, as currently exist throughout country Victoria and have existed for many in metropolitan Melbourne.

Sadly, we are reaching a point in metropolitan Melbourne where there is a lack of access to recreational land. Many of the junior sporting clubs in my electorate struggle to find space for their junior teams. The Beaumaris Football Club, one of the largest junior football clubs in Australia, has had difficulty finding space for all its teams to play. Then we have the advent of the participation and engagement of women's football teams and the problems that we encountered just a decade or so ago in trying to find good open space. The problem has been doubled in terms of struggling to find suitable ovals at which games can be pursued.

I am pleased to note, in terms of the contribution to open space, that a number of years ago when there was a marine park study there was the establishment of the Ricketts Point Marine Sanctuary. This particular sanctuary was originally left off a government bill circa 2002, along with Cape Howe. The *Hansard* record records my comments: 'Cape Howe — Cape Why'. Why was it left off a scheme of marine parks and

sanctuaries in Victoria? Also Ricketts Point was left off. As a result of the good work of the then opposition, the coalition, those particular precincts were put back on the agenda and there was the reinstatement of recommendations by the Environment Conservation Council and perhaps a successor body as to the merit of those areas being included. But for the great work of Bob Whiteway, a Sandringham electorate teacher and constituent, and the numbers of people who worked closely with him — a very small group of people who worked closely with him — and the good work of Michael Norris in helping to define the importance of conservation areas, the marine sanctuary at Ricketts Point would not have been established as part of a system of parks.

Then there is the work in relation to the CSIRO land, some 9 hectares of land that was owned by the commonwealth. It still is owned by the commonwealth. I flew to Canberra on one occasion to advocate for the retention of part of that land for recreational community open space purposes. With some great work by the Bayside City Council as well, the notion of conservation land, passive recreational land and active recreational land was developed. That is still to be drawn forward, but over 4 hectares of a 9-hectare site was organised by Andrew Robb to be retained in commonwealth ownership for recreational land. That is an extraordinary outcome that will be of benefit to the people of Victoria into the future. Originally I think Kim Carr might have been the minister of state or the person in charge at the time, and I suggested to him that if he sought to set the land aside, it could have been called the Carr Park. Sadly, he did not take up that option, and it was Andrew Robb who, as the then federal member for the area, set aside that land.

That takes me then to the other side, the Gas and Fuel land, where it is imperative. There is over 6 hectares of land that is currently with the Department of Treasury and Finance, and there are going to be some parameters set on the intensity of development that will take place on the Gas and Fuel land, which is between Highett and Southland railway stations. There is not only an important need to ensure that there will be recreational land serving well the increased population in that area, including community infrastructure, but also tremendous scope to establish a car park — ‘car’ with one ‘R’ in this particular circumstance — to make up for the failure to expand car parking alongside railway stations on the Frankston line.

This legislature must have a sense of vision and purpose that enhances the legacy of those that have gone before us, and in particular the legacy bequeathed to us by Charles La Trobe, the first

superintendent of the colony and the first Lieutenant-Governor of Victoria.

Mr CARBINES (Ivanhoe) (18:06) — In the dying refrains there was mention of the Lieutenant-Governor, and we certainly welcome Ken Lay to his new role as Lieutenant-Governor here in Victoria.

It is a pleasure to make a contribution on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. Certainly as a past Banyule city councillor, developer contributions are something that have exercised my mind many times over the years. While it is interesting to watch and listen to the debate and discussion from those who represent what they call growth area suburbs, electorates and regions, can I say that all things being relative, in inner-city electorates like Ivanhoe, which is a mere 10 kilometres from the city, we have certainly seen pressures around development and expectations to defend and advance the interests of public open space — very critical open space — that has been protected by our forebears, as our area has been developed.

Can I say in relation to that we have seen some creative work done in more recent times. What we saw in particular in my time at Banyule City Council — but it has also happened previously and since then — around developer contributions is there may have been developments that were approved by our local council where perhaps developer contributions were made to public open space funds in lieu of developments. While it is all well and good to seek contributions, that does not mean that the funds that might end up being in that public open space account run by local government or local council necessarily get expended or invested in the areas where the development has occurred; they can be spent right across a municipality.

That can mean that perhaps the intensive wealthy land areas that are competitive for developer development and developer contributions in the south of my electorate, down towards Ivanhoe, East Ivanhoe and Eaglemont, might not necessarily be where the municipality determines to spend its open space contributions; it may choose to spend them in other parts of the municipality where there are development pressures and certainly infrastructure pressures for community infrastructure, such as areas further to the north.

That is a debate that we have seen unwind with things like the Yarra Valley Water tank site development in Ivanhoe, where we have seen community benefit and open space contributions — another contribution by developers that has been used to invest in community facilities. Sometimes it has been felt that closer to town,

where there have been compromises with developers and developer contributions, we have not necessarily seen those open space contributions in cash or in kind returned to the southern end of the municipality, where the wealth and the desire for development is the greatest and the strongest. So of course it has been very welcome that in trying to address some of those issues we have seen the inclusion just in the past week or so in Ivanhoe of mandatory height limits in Banyule City Council across the Ivanhoe structure plan area.

We shut down a draft Ivanhoe structure plan of the previous government and the council — I was in opposition at the time; we shut down that draft, and we got them to go back out to the community. The previous government and the previous Minister for Planning, who is now the Leader of the Opposition, ticked off the Ivanhoe structure plan, but with preferred height limits, not mandatory height limits, for Ivanhoe, which was not what the community, the Banyule City Council or I wanted. It meant that it became a laughing-stock.

It became something that was a workaround for developers. It would have fatigued advocates in my electorate with the work they would have had to do as watchdogs on development and in trying to ensure that neighbourhood character was protected and advanced and that the Ivanhoe structure plan was enforced. With the preferred height limits that the previous government and the previous minister chose to implement, there was a bit of a nod and a wink to developers that, 'It's okay; bleed people dry at VCAT and through the other processes and fatigue them, but in the end don't worry — they're just preferred height limits'.

It has actually taken not only the continued work of Banyule City Council and many well-known advocates locally, including groups like Save Ivanhoe, but also our own advocacy here as a government. The Minister for Planning, the member for Richmond, understands these matters, and he took that work from the Ivanhoe structure plan — all those community conversations, all that work of the Banyule City Council, all that work of the community and the government — and he said, 'You know what? We're going to enforce a structure plan with mandatory height limits that says what the community wants. What the council has approved is what you get'. Developers know when they walk into Ivanhoe what the height limits are. They are mandatory; there are no workarounds; there are no get-arounds. What you see is what you get, and this is giving certainty in Ivanhoe, an area 10 kilometres from the city with massive pressures and extreme increases in the value of land.

What we have now been able to see and commit to is mandatory height limits for Ivanhoe. Not only that, but it also applies to height applications. That means applications are not determined by the responsible authority, not determined by VCAT, but those applications are also captured by this decision by the minister that was gazetted just in the past week.

Can I say to the people in my community who have fought for and advanced the interests of neighbourhood character in my electorate for very many years that what we have been able to achieve in the Ivanhoe structure plan is we have engaged people who are not familiar with government processes and planning processes. It is red tape, it is difficult, it is hard to understand, it takes a lot of effort to work your way through all of that against multimillion-dollar developers only to find that you get let down by responsible authorities at some point, because you just cannot win against preferred height limits. What you need is for your government to stand behind you to legislate and give effect to mandatory height limits.

That is what we have done. It does not mean that everything is perfect. It does not mean we can wind back some of the atrocities that have been developed locally in our community, but we can let them stand as a testament to those who have gone before who did not deliver mandatory height limits, who delivered preferred height limits, who gave a nod and a wink to developers, saying, 'You can bleed local communities dry; you can run them ragged, and then you can get what you want'. It does not happen in Ivanhoe. We have drawn a line in the sand, and we have made it very clear: 'If you come to this community, we have expectations about our neighbourhood character and what is expected'.

We are working very hard also on other developments, including the water tank site, which is land owned by Yarra Valley Water. Development Victoria is working hard with the community to make sure we get a development there that meets community expectations, that meets the desire to ensure that we get a return on that land that is owned by Yarra Valley Water customers, people in my electorate. We need to get a good return for the community on that site, but we also need to make sure that the statutory authority, Development Victoria, the government's land developer, will make sure that we get an outcome that is a good development that actually more than doubles the open space on that site for the community.

This is an example of what could be achieved through development contributions when you provide a broader opportunity for private developers around not just cash

contributions but land contributions. That site up there in Ivanhoe is a critical site that we are working through at the moment. I think if we work with statutory authorities like Development Victoria, we will get a better outcome for the community than we would if it were just thrown open to private developers. The Caydon development on the Heidelberg hill is a pretty strong example of what happens when you throw it open to private developers, although even with that development we were able to negotiate a consensus position that was a binding decision at VCAT.

I think it is churlish of the opposition to put forward amendments that seek to cut back on the indexation of what the government is proposing here in these growth areas. That would virtually cut off the opportunity for councils to get funding that is indexed over time for community facilities such as maternal and child health services and kindergartens. We would be stuck with a 2004 fee. The government seeks to increase that and to index it every year to give it true value. The opposition are opposing that. No-one should misunderstand that. Essentially the opposition are supporting an ongoing cut to the contribution that developers make to community infrastructure which councils need to provide for families who want to live in these communities. These communities work because of the investment in community infrastructure. That is what the government supports in relation to the amendments in this bill. I commend the bill to the house, and do not forget the inner-city suburbs — we have our pressures too.

Mr KATOS (South Barwon) (18:16) — It is my pleasure to rise and make a contribution on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. As our shadow minister has indicated, we are not opposing the bill but we are seeking to make amendments with regard to the indexation of infrastructure levies. There are two main aspects of the bill, which I will touch on. A land contribution model will be introduced so that a developer can actually provide land instead of cash, which I think is quite sensible, particularly in growth areas where you might need it for schools, maternal and child health or sporting infrastructure. Rather than having to give over cash the developer can hand over land in lieu of that, which I think is quite sensible. The other aspect of the bill is to increase the community infrastructure levy and also provide for the indexation of that levy, and that is the point that the opposition is opposing and seeking to amend.

When you look at my electorate of South Barwon, for example, we have Armstrong Creek, which is the largest growth area in the state outside metropolitan Melbourne. At the moment it has approximately 22 000 house lots

with an estimated 55 000 people, and I know development is going on very strongly there. Some of the developers' land will be sold a lot more quickly than anticipated. Warralily, for example, will probably be out of land by about 2020 or 2021 — the actual Warralily developer, and probably Villawood with them. There are still others that have substantial landholdings that will continue, but it is coming along more quickly than anticipated. A lot of change-up buyers are certainly coming out to the suburbs of Armstrong Creek, including me; I live in Armstrong Creek.

The problem is also that local government have actually got to build some of this infrastructure they are collecting levies for. I will use an example of a community centre and children's services hub in Armstrong Creek. I remember that in June 2013 the member for Bulleen, now Leader of the Opposition and then Minister for Planning, and I provided \$7.1 million in state money for that. We still just have a simple sign on a bit of dirt and not a sod has been turned.

It is one thing to collect this infrastructure levy — and fair enough, I take the point that it has not been increased for quite a while, so we have gone to \$1150 from \$900 — but then it is incumbent on councils to actually build this infrastructure. We are talking about well over four years with \$7.1 million of state funding and not a shovel has gone in the ground yet. I am sure that is a concern to the Armstrong Creek community, and I am sure this is going on in other council areas around Victoria, particularly in growth areas — I do not think the City of Greater Geelong is peculiar in that regard. It is of concern to me as a member representing a growth area that we are not seeing this money spent appropriately.

Then you see the other aspect of development in that area. The road network is starting to collapse under the weight of development. In particular Reserve Road, Horseshoe Bend Road and Boundary Road in parts are starting to almost fall apart because no money is being spent on upgrading those roads. The levy contributions are being taken from developers, and as the member for Ivanhoe quite rightly pointed out, councils do have a choice as to where they spend those levy moneys — they do not have to spend them specifically in one area. These roads are falling apart. It is much like the Andrews government, which has not been maintaining state roads. Recently Reserve Road's speed limit was dropped from 80 kilometres an hour to 60 kilometres an hour. It is a complete mess.

Hopefully the three incoming councillors for Kardinia ward will look at that. We should have a mayor soon in Geelong. We are not far off seeing who will be

mayor of Geelong; that will be decided tonight. It is incumbent on the City of Greater Geelong to look at the road network there. As I said, the actual construction of this infrastructure by local government is a real concern to me.

Also it is incumbent on the state to build infrastructure in growth areas. Recently — actually with the shadow Minister for Education, who is in the chamber — I visited another site in Armstrong Creek West where the government had made a commitment to have a brand-new school operational by now. The commitment was given 18 months ago by Ms Tierney in the other place, and not even the land has been purchased yet for that site let alone —

Ms Couzens interjected.

Mr KATOS — The member for Geelong is unaware — I will take up her interjection — this is Armstrong Creek West, in the Villawood development, and it was a commitment made by the now government to build a primary school there. The land is sitting there and has not even been purchased yet by the government, despite it being funded in last year's state budget. Ms Tierney gave a commitment in the local paper, the *Surf Coast Times*. When asked when the school would be operational, she said it would be in 18 months. That was in May last year, so 18 months is approximately now. It is incumbent on this government to keep its promises, because it was a promise it made to the local community to actually build this school.

I spoke earlier about the amendments that we are seeking to make. One of the things that this government did promise, and the Premier as opposition leader did promise, was that there would be no new taxes. It is not so much that we are opposing the fact that the levy has gone from \$900 to \$1150, but that it is going to be indexed, which essentially is a new tax. Look at the other new taxes that this government has brought in: the increase in stamp duty on cars; the new stamp duty on off-the-plan purchases; the new stamp duty on property transfers between spouses; the new annual property valuation to increase land tax; a new vacant home tax; the energy tax on brown coal, which shut Hazelwood; the introduction of a tax on taxi and Uber fares; the land tax surcharge for absentee owners; the stamp duty surcharge for foreign purchasers; and the fire services levy has also been increased. We have got a litany of taxes that have been increased, and the reason we are opposing the indexation is that essentially this is another new tax.

As an opposition, we want to hold the government to account for its promises. It was the then opposition

leader, now Premier, who looked down the Channel 7 camera and told Peter Mitchell there would be no new taxes. We are simply holding him to account for that. Apart from that, I think the contribution model for property is sensible in lieu of cash, particularly in growth areas. I think that is a sensible outcome. As I said, we are not opposed to the fact that the levy, the infrastructure charge, has gone up, but we are opposed to the fact that it is indexed. I might leave my contribution there. I commend the bill to the house, except for the increase in tax.

Ms GREEN (Yan Yean) (18:25) — I am delighted to join the debate on the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. I find it a bit curious that the member for South Barwon could not even make 10 minutes on his speech. He talked about the issues his electorate of South Barwon has in dealing with growth pressures. He is so passionate in standing up for them that he could not even make the 10 minutes required. I have not been in the chamber for all of the debate, but I know that the speaker who led off the contribution from the opposition and proposed a series of amendments was also another growth MP — the member for Gembrook. I simply do not see how these two gentlemen can look their communities in the face and say, 'I'm not going to support developers actually making a contribution to local council to ensure that new communities get the infrastructure that they need'. It is nonsense, what we have heard about this being a new tax. It is not a new tax; it is simply indexation.

The Leader of the Opposition, when he was the Minister for Planning, did absolutely nothing for growth communities, and certainly not in the north, which I represent. He collected a whole lot of growth areas infrastructure contribution (GAIC) funds. He introduced in-kind contributions that could only be overseen by himself with no input from councils, and then the money that was collected was not used. Only \$4 million was actually set aside for it, and we have now committed \$144 million. This includes \$30 million for new schools, \$27 million for a new railway station in Melton and \$7.4 million — this is one of my favourites — for an extra station at Hawkstowe on the Mernda rail line that we are extending. And isn't that project going well; it is going like the clappers. There is \$8.5 million from the growth areas infrastructure charge to purchase land for six new ambulance stations, including at Mernda.

Mernda is getting a great benefit from the growth areas infrastructure charge, while the previous Minister for Planning, who actually represented the north — he was a member for Northern Metropolitan Region in the

Council — sat on that GAIC money and did nothing. The population of Mernda and Doreen — that same postcode — between 2011 and 2014 actually doubled. He did nothing on schools, on new ambulance stations, on police stations or on public transport — actually only cuts to public transport — and certainly spent not one dollar on roads.

I cannot believe that these people come into this chamber and think that they are going to lecture us. They propose amendments that will mean that councils continue to have inadequate funding from developers to provide the necessary community infrastructure, like sporting fields and open space that keep our kids fit, the intersections and non-state roads that are provided. On kindergartens, I know that the member for Mill Park, the Minister for Suburban Development, in her contribution talked about growing up as a little girl in Fawkner and how her brother got to go to kindergarten and she did not. We are not going to see that sort of thing happen. We are going to make sure, whether it is with this bill or whether it is with other measures, that those communities have got facilities, services and infrastructure in place as the communities are growing.

I was with the Minister for Planning only last week — and with my great friend, my next-door neighbour, the member for Yuroke — when he released precinct structure plans for Donnybrook and Woodstock. These are old locality names that have existed for a very long time, but they are now going to be new suburbs. They are actually completely planned. The schedules show the community what is going to be delivered there and that there is some certainty, unlike when those opposite were in government. The community already has a train station at Donnybrook. It is a bit old and dilapidated, so in this year's state budget we said that we would upgrade that. There is going to be a bit of GAIC money going into that as well.

We are looking to the future with new train stations at Lockerbie and Beveridge, in between Donnybrook and Wallan. There will be schools delivered in a timely manner, and there is funding for roads. I am sure that we will see buses travelling along those roads, getting kids to school and to the train station, to work and to study. That is in complete contrast to what the member for Bulleen, the then Minister for Planning, did when Mernda and Doreen's population was going troppo.

Those opposite have made mention of taxes, saying there are new taxes. I am actually proud that we have had a redistribution of taxes. We have got an issue with an overheated market, with investors and overseas investors buying off the plan and not paying stamp duty, and then our first home owners have been

struggling with housing affordability. We make no excuse when we say we think that those who should benefit from a stamp duty exemption are our first home buyers so they can get into their first home for their family. Those who try and say that they never raise taxes, that they are the good guys, cannot kid anyone that they ever built infrastructure and services, because we can all see the emperor has got no clothes with that.

When the member for Malvern was the Treasurer — a pretty ordinary Treasurer — in 2013–14 state taxation revenue grew by 8.8 per cent. In 2014–15 this grew again by 8.5 per cent. In 2014 alone the member for Malvern also hiked motor vehicle taxes by over \$580 million. At a time when the local car industry was on its knees, he did something like that. We are now getting on with the job, and we are not wasting a day getting infrastructure and services, and catching up on the deficit that those opposite left us with.

Trust those opposite to trash our communities, to try to prevent a levy for services that had not been updated since 2004. The figure of \$1150 had not been raised from the \$900 that it had been set at in 2004. So I actually think that is quite a reasonable increase, given it has not been increased for some 13 years, and that it should be indexed. I think people in growing communities want to see that. The member for Ivanhoe, speaking before me, talked about his community, so it is not just in the growing suburbs. People in established suburbs need some of this contribution for open space and other things when development is occurring.

I recall this when the member for Warrandyte was opposing the growth areas infrastructure charge that we introduced in 2009–10. He and I were at a Warrandyte Community Association political debate, and I made the point then why did he think that the infrastructure that was required in new communities — like the one I represent in the Plenty and Hume growth corridors — should be solely footed by other taxpayers, including his own residents in Warrandyte. He had no answer for that. I think the answer to that is that he did not care whether people in new communities had infrastructure or not.

The community does see that there is a role for developer contributions, and these should be clear and up-front. It is good for councils to be able to plan what they need to do in delivering infrastructure, so this allows councils to do their jobs in a cooperative way with developers. With our work with GAIC, and now the introduction — I see the Minister for Suburban Development is in the chamber, who is also working with GAIC, and the Minister for Local Government with the infrastructure growth fund — I commend the bill to the house, and I am against the amendments.

Mr GIDLEY (Mount Waverley) (18:35) — I rise to make a contribution on this bill before the house, and in particular in relation to the amendment. It is another sad day in the Victorian Parliament for not only the residents of Mount Waverley district — that is, the residents of Glen Waverley and Mount Waverley — but also the state of Victoria. Unfortunately even though you may think that after nearly three years in office — of raising taxes and charges on households and families, and on small and medium-sized businesses, and doing their darnedest to increase the cost of living for Victorians — that this government, the Andrews Labor government, might have just thought to catch their breath. They might have just thought for one moment to not bring in a piece of legislation that is going to make it harder, not easier, for households and families not only in my district, but across Victoria, that would make it easier for small and medium-sized businesses to be able to employ people to be able to achieve their aims, their goals and their aspirations, not harder.

True to form, before the house today we have a bill in relation to indexation — another new tax, another new charge that this government is going to foist on the people of Victoria. Context is very important because I go back to before the last state election — and I am a great believer that before state elections leaders, particularly leaders of the opposition, need to tell the truth to the people of Victoria — and I go back to the commitment that the member for Mulgrave, the now Premier, made to the people of Victoria. An unequivocal commitment, not a commitment that was a maybe, not a commitment that was, ‘We’ll look at the books and we’ll tell people then’ — an unequivocal commitment to the people of Victoria. At that particular time the now Premier was asked a question by Peter Mitchell, Channel 7 reporter:

... all the polls say you will be Victoria’s next Premier. If you are do you promise Victorians here tonight that you will not increase taxes or introduce any new taxes?

The Leader of the Opposition at the time, the now Premier, said:

I make that promise, Peter, to every single Victorian.

You always know when the Victorian branch of the Labor Party is in trouble: the louder they shout down people, the louder they seek to prevent people having a say, the more you know — and they know — that they are wrong. That is exactly what is happening in this chamber.

I go further. On 19 November, when interviewed at the Sky News election forum, David Speers asked:

So any higher taxes, levies?

The member for Mulgrave said:

Absolutely not ...

So it was not a maybe, it was not a could be, it was not, ‘We’ll look at it depending on the state of the budget’, it was absolutely not. Then I go back to 6 November 2014, as reported in the *Herald Sun*:

Opposition leader Daniel Andrews said yesterday Labor would reveal its full costings before the election, and said he had ‘no plans’ to increase fees and fines.

Well, what do we find? The bill before the house does clearly, today, increase the level of state government taxes and charges through, at the very least, the indexation. Anybody who is indicating that when you index a tax or charge you are not clearly increasing the tax burden on households, families, and small and medium-sized businesses has just got their head in the sand. They have just read the government bill book, they have been given their lines by the minister of the day and they have come into the Parliament and put their head in the sand. I just find it incredibly disappointing that before the house we not only have a bill that is a complete breach of an election commitment, but we also have members of the government continuing to try to hoodwink the people of Victoria that when you index and you increase taxes and charges you are not doing that.

But I guess whilst I am incredibly disappointed, I should not be surprised. This is a government that has seen a substantial increase in revenue flows on land tax — the sort of taxes that people in my electorate pay who may have purchased property before the property boom, who are not multimillionaires but have tried to do the right thing, have tried to take care of themselves and their families, have tried to not be a burden on the state, whether or not through the aged pension or other things, or maybe they are part pension funded and they have tried to do the right thing. Week after week they are coming to me and saying that this government just does not understand the impost that the massive increases in land tax is having on them, in many cases forcing them to sell a property earlier than they otherwise would, therefore taking away their work and their effort to be more self-sustaining.

That is incredibly disappointing, and it is even more disappointing when the Treasurer of the day just dismisses that and says, ‘Well, these are just market fluctuations’. No, these are real people, and while the members of the government will not stand up for the people of Glen Waverley and Mount Waverley, rest assured that I will. I will continue to stand against this

government that continues to increase the taxes and the charges on households, residents and small and medium-sized businesses.

We know the government is addicted to revenue, taxing and charging people massive increases in stamp duty. I was listening to the Treasurer today in the Parliament, and he was telling homebuyers in my district in Glen Waverley and Mount Waverley that they have never had it so good, that they should be on their knees thanking the Treasurer and thanking this government for what they have done on stamp duty. Well, sorry, Treasurer; they are not, because they know. They will not be hoodwinked. This government, one of the highest taxing and charging governments in history, is not making it easy for them. It is making it harder. Those people will not be hoodwinked. But, once again, I will stand up against the incredibly regressive and record levels of stamp duty that this government is putting on the people of my district. In addition to that, those people will not be hoodwinked on the ineffective rate capping system or the record increases in the fire services property levy.

The best thing and the biggest thing I would highlight in relation to this debate is for those residents who might be able to put all of that aside but then go and buy a new car — not a car that might attract the luxury motor vehicle tax, but a modest car. They might be buying a first car for their children. They might be buying or upgrading their car because their family has expanded. Or, unfortunately, they might be buying a car with additional safety features from the point of view that they have had a tragedy. What have they got from this government? They have not got support. What this government has done is increase the tax on buying a new car for them, so again it has made life harder for residents in Glen Waverley and Mount Waverley and harder for my district — and on a modest car, on buying the family car.

Let us go back to the election. Before the election it was no new taxes and no new increases in taxes, and what did they do? It is not bad enough that they increased the revenue of land tax and payroll tax; they now want to put indexation on this. They are also making it harder for families to buy a new car and harder for people to upgrade to a new car. We get shouts from the government that the residents of Glen Waverley and Mount Waverley should be on their knees thanking them for the job they are doing. I say to the Andrews Labor government that we do not thank you for increasing taxes on and charges to buy a new car. We do not thank you for forcing people to have to sell property — property that they may have worked very hard for to be self-sufficient — because of your land tax

system; we do not thank you for the outrageous levels of stamp duty and payroll tax increases that you are inflicting on the people of Victoria; and we certainly do not thank you — in fact we consistently argue against you — for the other tax grab of the introduction of annual valuations that you are putting forward.

Not only does this government have these issues on the taxing and charging of households and families and small and medium-sized businesses but it does not deserve the money, because it does not know how to spend the money effectively. I have so many residents come up to me in my district and say, ‘Michael, you might have a different view on the east–west link, but I have never heard of a government spending \$1 billion to not build a road’. We would not trust this government to spend \$100, let alone buy a contract not to build a road for \$1 billion when we are standing and waiting for overcrowded train services or we cannot get onto the Monash Freeway because this government spent money to cancel a contract, money that otherwise could have been spent on improving transport services.

In addition to that, the government clearly does not know how to spend money in my district. It has cut frontline police in my district with its plan to close and sell police stations in my district. While it is addicted to taxing and spending and making life harder for the residents of Glen Waverley and Mount Waverley in Victoria, one thing you can be certain of about this government is that it will waste money. It is ineffective at spending money, and it does not deserve the taxes and charges that the good people of Victoria are contributing to it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms HALFPENNY (Thomastown).

Debate adjourned until later this day.

CAULFIELD RACECOURSE RESERVE BILL 2017

Council’s amendments

Message from Council relating to following amendments considered:

1. Clause 3, page 3, line 8, omit “33” and insert “34”.
2. Clause 3, page 3, line 14, omit “32” and insert “33”.
3. Clause 3, page 3, line 25, omit “34(2)” and insert “35(2)”.
4. Clause 31, line 24, omit “prepare” and insert “table”.
5. Clause 31, after line 26 insert—

“() The Trust must include in its annual report details regarding the use of the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve for the purposes of recreation and for public park purposes during the preceding financial year.”.

6. Insert the following New Clause to follow clause 31—

“A Annual report of the Department

The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning must include in its annual report of operations for each financial year, details regarding the use of the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve for the purposes of recreation and for public park purposes during that year.”.

7. Clause 33, page 20, line 14, omit “38” and insert “39”.
8. Clause 45, page 30, line 8, omit “44” and insert “45”.
9. Clause 48, page 32, line 26, omit “45(b)” and insert “46(b)”.
10. Clause 49, page 33, line 33, omit “46(1)” and insert “47(1)”.
11. Clause 50, page 34, line 23, omit “45(b)” and insert “46(b)”.
12. Clause 50, page 35, line 12, omit “45(f)” and insert “46(f)”.

Ms D’AMBROSIO (Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change) (18:46) — I move:

That the amendments be agreed to.

May I add a few words in speaking in support of these amendments. The other place has agreed to amend clause 31 of the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve Bill 2017. I thank all members of the other place for their support of what is a very important bill which has been in the making for quite some time now. There was a bipartisan working group commissioned by my colleague the former Minister for Environment, Climate Change and Water, the member for Bellarine, and led by the members for Caulfield and Oakleigh. The bipartisan nature of this bill has extended to the Parliament. Everyone in this place and the other place of course agrees that establishing a new independent trust with the necessary powers to manage the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve for the purposes it was reserved — and they include of course racing, recreation and a public park — are extremely important.

The substantive amendment to clause 31, moved as a house amendment by the government in the other place, will require the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve Trust to include in its annual report of operations for each financial year details regarding the use of the Caulfield

Racecourse Reserve for the purposes of recreation and for public park purposes during that year.

A new clause following clause 31 moved by the opposition will be inserted, which will require the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning to include in its annual report of operations for each financial year details regarding the use of the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve for the purposes of recreation and for public park purposes during that year. I do want to say that this amendment in particular is superfluous in that it does create a little bit of extra red tape: the newly established trust will be required to report annually in any case. However, we have been prepared to accept the new clause to actually see that this bill is passed.

There are several related technical consequential amendments to other clauses in the bill resulting from the insertion of the new clause. A minor amendment in clause 31 has also been made by omitting the word ‘prepare’ in line 24 and inserting the word ‘table’. In all these are not major amendments to the bill, but they do underline the government’s intention to ensure that the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve is available for public use. With those few words I commend the amendments to the house.

Mr WAKELING (Ferntree Gully) (18:49) — It gives me pleasure to rise to contribute to the debate on the Council’s amendments to the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve Bill 2017. I thank the minister and the government for their acceptance of the amendments that were moved in the Legislative Council. Can I firstly place on record my congratulations to the member for Caulfield for the work that he has done on behalf of his community in a bipartisan way with the member for Oakleigh in achieving this outcome, which is going to be an incredible boon for residents within the Caulfield community. This has been a vexed issue and ongoing problem for many years in terms of the operation of the racecourse. We know the racecourse provides enormous benefit for the local community, but the community also wants to have an asset that they can access, and this is going to provide that opportunity.

In terms of the amendments before the house, firstly, the government moved their amendments relating to the reporting of the trust. The opposition moved their amendments in regard to the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP), including the operations of the racecourse for the purposes of recreation and public park purposes to be reported in the DELWP annual report. This is a very important outcome because what it does is it ensures that the secretary of the department is fully cognisant of what is happening at the Caulfield Racecourse. It

ensures that the community is made well aware, through the DELWP annual report, of the operations of the racecourse, particularly with respect to recreation and the public park, which is the primary issue that the community was looking to resolve, and it was a driver of the working party to achieve that outcome.

We are pleased to see that the amendment moved by the opposition has been accepted by the government, we look forward to it being implemented and we await the bill's short passage through the house. With those words I will allow the member for Caulfield to speak as well.

Mr SOUTHWICK (Caulfield) (18:51) — I rise to speak on the amendments that are present before us today in regard to the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve Bill 2017. Can I say at the outset that as a member of the opposition I support these amendments. I want to place on record again my support for the work that has been done here. I know in the other place there was a lot of work done on this bill. I want to particularly thank Mr Davis in the upper house for working through this and also the shadow minister for environment in this chamber, the member for Ferntree Gully.

These amendments are very important because they are specifically around ensuring that there is recreation and there is community benefit from the racecourse itself. A working party was established, and it included me and the member for Oakleigh working in a bipartisan way to ensure that we delivered this outcome for the community. I want to place on record the importance of that and the fact that it has been a long process and an important process but also ultimately something that we had to get right. I will say that it has taken a little bit longer than I would have liked. I would certainly like to see that we get use of open space, particularly when it comes to sporting activities in my area, as soon as is practically possible.

The amendments that we have in front of us today are important because they bring in a reporting feature. The government has brought that reporting feature in so the trust gets to report on it, but the amendment that the opposition put forward, which is also being supported by the government, allows the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning to report on it, and this is very, very important. I know the minister said that it could be seen as doubling up, but when we have had a situation of a lack of transparency when it comes to the use of this particular racecourse, the fact that we have had an Auditor-General's report looking at that transparency and looking at the fact that we have not had the public benefit of this racecourse up to now, then I think it is certainly incumbent on the government and this place to ensure that we provide every single opportunity for that

transparency, and the community are looking for that; the community expect that.

The situation at the moment is that we still do not have a trust; we still do not have the new entity formed. This bill goes some way towards that, but there is a lot of work that still needs to be done, and we want to make sure that there is a reporting feature each and every period. I wanted to point out specifically that the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning must include in its annual report of operations for each financial year details regarding the use of the Caulfield Racecourse Reserve for the purposes of recreation and for public purposes during that year. It is very important for that to be reported each and every year.

As we have said on many occasions, racing is a very important part of what we provide in this state, and we are very proud in terms of what the Caulfield Racecourse does to contribute to that. It is a great racecourse and is highly regarded and respected internationally, but we have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to take the middle of that racecourse and turn it into something and give it back to the community. We have an opportunity to have racing living together with sport and public open space. This will provide an absolutely perfect opportunity for this to happen — a great opportunity.

I have talked to a number of clubs in my area that are absolutely desperate for open space. I actually had meetings with some of the clubs only yesterday and also in previous weeks about them absolutely wanting to see the utilisation of the racecourse as part of that.

One of the things we know in our area, as we do throughout Victoria, is that we want to get more women participating in sport, particularly when it comes to sports like soccer and football where you need big playing surfaces. We have more women's teams in Caulfield through the City of Glen Eira. We have three clubs — the Ormond Football Club, the Caulfield Bears and the Ajax Football Club — that now have women's teams as a result of more women participating in those sports. This is brilliant, this is fantastic, this is what we should be seeing. But in order for that to happen, we need the open space, and when Glen Eira has the lowest amount of open space in Victoria, then we have a situation where we have got to try to make that space available and we need to look at every opportunity to do that.

This is something that was started by the previous Minister for Environment and Climate Change and current Minister for Police, who is here as well, as is the current Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate

Change. It is important in terms of that collaboration to work together. There are quite often times when we do not get that chance. Here is an opportunity to do that, and I thank the government for giving us that opportunity and for giving me the opportunity to be part of driving that change.

As I said, there is a lot of work to be done. We need the trust to be established, we need to ensure that we get the board going and we need to see sport in there as soon as practically possible, and these amendments will ensure that we deliver those outcomes. That is what we are seeking.

I will say that it will be important for the government to get on with it. I know there is a fair bit of work to be done in negotiating the lease between the Melbourne Racing Club and the parties, whether it be the trust or the government, but we need to get that done. We need to understand what the future of training will be once the lease is signed to ultimately ensure that we can get more participation in sport. These are all very, very important decisions that need to be made. I would hope those decisions will be made well and truly in time for us to see sport being played at the racecourse within the next 12 months. It would be great to see some form of sport played there within the next 12 months. That would be a really good step forward, not that we would see the whole centre turn into sporting activity, but even if we got one ground going — something to show that we have made a step forward — it would be a really positive move.

The community are desperate for it; my constituents in Caulfield are desperate for it. I think certainly in terms of increased participation in sport throughout Victoria, whether it be women, whether it be young people, whether it be us encouraging more people to get involved and get active, this is a great step forward. The Caulfield Racecourse Reserve could be that key facility at which we could have an internationally recognised racecourse proudly sitting right alongside the kinds of sports that are played, whether it be football, basketball, cricket or soccer, whatever we can possibly entertain and absorb into the fantastic facility that we have at that racecourse. With those remarks I support these amendments.

Motion agreed to.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT AMENDMENT (PUBLIC LAND CONTRIBUTIONS) BILL 2017

Second reading

Debate resumed from earlier this day; motion of Mr PAKULA (Attorney-General).

Business interrupted under sessional orders.

ADJOURNMENT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — The question is:

That the house now adjourns.

Forest Road, The Basin, pedestrian crossing

Ms VICTORIA (Bayswater) (19:00) — (13 559)
I rise to ask the Minister for Roads and Road Safety to have VicRoads install a pedestrian crossing on Forest Road in The Basin in the vicinity of the intersection with Wright Street. Forest Road in The Basin is quite scenic; it is in the low foothills of Mount Dandenong, running parallel to the mountain. On one side you have increasing slopes up to the forested mountain, and on the other it slopes down gradually into suburbia. Both sides have beautifully treed suburban housing. Amongst the trees and housing there is residential aged care, child care, schools, parks, shops and other places people like to walk to. Like many roads in Melbourne's outer suburbs, Forest Road is becoming increasingly busy. There was a school pedestrian crossing on the road, but that was decommissioned some time ago.

Knox council and VicRoads have discussed installing a crossing on Forest Road, but the location must be right. Community member Paige Kennett has led a campaign to have a pedestrian crossing installed near Wright Street; I tabled her petition with 225 signatures on 1 November. A further 99 constituents have written to me about the issue. Further to that, we have received letters of support from The Basin Primary School principal, The Basin Primary School teachers, Boronia K-12 College and Christadelphian Heritage College.

Graeme Russell, The Basin Primary School principal, writes:

There are currently no safe pedestrian pathways, walkways or crossing points along the full stretch of Forest Road, from Boronia Road all the way down to Mountain Highway (a distance of 2.2 kilometres).

The Basin Primary School staff write:

We encourage our students to participate in active play and exercise; however, limited safe walking pathways and crossings in this area restrict this type of activity.

Meagan Cook, principal of Boronia K–12 College, writes:

Safe pedestrian access is so limited along Forest Road that residents are either forced to dangerously cross the road or seek alternative modes of transport, primarily cars.

Jon Fry, principal of Christadelphian Heritage College, writes:

I support the development of a safe pedestrian access on Forest Road in The Basin and trust that with the development of a safe pedestrian crossing children and their families will benefit and we can continue to encourage the many benefits of walking and exercise.

The community needs a safe crossing in an appropriate location, so again I ask the Minister for Roads and Road Safety to have VicRoads install a pedestrian crossing on Forest Road in The Basin near the intersection with Wright Street.

Wine industry

Ms THOMAS (Macedon) (19:02) — (13 560) The matter I wish to raise this evening is for the attention of the Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Regional Development in the other place, and the action I seek is that the minister join me in my electorate to meet with winemakers and outline how the Andrews government's Wine Growth Fund is supporting investment and growth in our world-class wine industry.

Earlier this year I had the pleasure of opening a new cellar door at Lyons Will Estate in Lancefield. Lyons Will was supported through the Wine Growth Fund in 2016, and now owners Renata Morello and Oliver Rapson have a place to welcome visitors to their winery and make a personal connection with their customers. Also supported through the 2016 round of grants were Kyneton Ridge Estate, Mount Towrong Vineyard and Guildford Vineyard and Cellar Door. Each of these wineries is working to expand its reach into new markets as well as enrich its offering to customers.

Victoria's wine industry contributes \$7.6 billion to our state economy and directly employs nearly 13 000 people, and the wine that comes from the Macedon Ranges is some of the finest in the country. But selling a regional product on a global market is not always easy. That is why earlier this year we launched the *2017–2021 Victorian Wine Industry Development Strategy* to ensure that as a government we are making a considered and connected response to the challenges in an ever-changing industry. I launched the strategy at

another of our stunning local wineries, Granite Hill Wines, whose riesling was recently crowned top in the state and was awarded the coveted Victorian Trophy for White Wines of Provenance at the Royal Melbourne Wine Awards.

As part of the Labor government's \$1 million election commitment to boost the wine industry, the Wine Growth Fund provides welcome support for wineries in the Macedon Ranges and across the state that want to increase wine tourism and cellar door sales, foster export markets and deliver skills and training for business development. I look forward to discussing the opportunities that the Victorian government's Wine Growth Fund offers to wineries in my electorate with the minister at her convenience.

Gippsland rail services

Mr D. O'BRIEN (Gippsland South) (19:04) — (13 561) My adjournment matter is for the Minister for Public Transport, and the action I seek is that the government and the minister release a timetable for works on the Gippsland rail revival project. This project was announced on 30 April this year, and a few days later, on 1 May, the minister issued a press release headed 'Pressure mounts on Turnbull to back regional rail revival', which states that these projects are funded and ready to go. Yet here we are six and a half months down the track and no work has begun, there have been no further updates on what is happening and we are faced with constant delays, cancellations and problems on the Gippsland line.

That has occurred particularly within the last couple of weeks, including yesterday when trains were cancelled, while there were delays last week when all nine trains from Traralgon on Monday morning were delayed and there were a number of cancellations. A number of people took 3 to 4 hours to get from Traralgon to Melbourne. Likewise we had problems on the longer haul Bairnsdale to Melbourne line, which of course affects Sale in my electorate of Gippsland South.

This is becoming an issue of concern. People are getting angry that the train service is simply not reliable, and we have the other issue that the government has not addressed and has made no effort to address — a dedicated Gippsland line for Gippsland V/Line passengers. One of the issues we have is that our trains are generally rocking along pretty well until they get to Pakenham. Then they often get stuck behind a Metro train, and the government's sky rail project has almost certainly killed off any prospect of a dedicated Gippsland line through that corridor. Yet the government has showed no interest in it. Indeed when I

have raised this question and questions about the Gippsland rail revival package, the minister has simply refused to answer them, including on the cost of the Avon River bridge replacement and also as to why the government has not included train stabling at Sale in its package of rail revival.

I am interested to know also whether the government has sent a full business case to the commonwealth with respect to this project, given that it is sending almost the entire bill to the commonwealth for these important projects. I ask for the government to release a timetable and get on with the project works.

Upfield–Somerton rail upgrade

Ms SPENCE (Yuroke) (19:07) — (13 562) My adjournment matter is for the attention of the Minister for Public Transport, and the action I seek is that the minister provide an update on progress of the \$5 million Upfield to Somerton rail upgrade business case.

Public transport is an increasingly popular choice for commuters in Melbourne's outer north. I note Labor's investment in delivering extra peak services, station parking and the game-changing Metro Tunnel project, all of which will greatly benefit Yuroke residents.

The Andrews Labor government is also investigating the feasibility of running Seymour V/Line services via the Upfield line, which would in turn provide additional capacity on the Craigieburn line. This would be made possible by upgrading tracks between Roxburgh Park and Upfield stations that are currently not in use. I am sure that Yuroke residents would be interested to know more about progress on this business case and how the potential Upfield to Somerton rail upgrade could benefit their families. I look forward to receiving a response from the minister.

Croydon Primary School

Mr HODGETT (Croydon) (19:08) — (13 563) I wish to raise a matter for the Minister for Education. The matter I wish to raise is for the minister to commit \$3 million to replace the administration building and finish final school building works at Croydon Primary School, completing the last part of the rebuild of Croydon Primary School.

I rise today to champion the spirit and fight the good fight on behalf of all the parents, friends, teachers and students of Croydon Primary School and request that the Minister for Education provide the necessary funding to kick off the final stage of the school's rebuild. The Croydon Primary School community has been in regular contact with my office and I have been

to the school on several occasions to inspect the final building that requires replacement.

We have had a state election, three budgets handed down and not a single dollar spent on or committed to Croydon Primary School by this government. As the local member I am committed to improving education in the Croydon area by ensuring students and families have access to the very best educational facilities and learning spaces available. Since being elected I have secured and delivered significant investment in Croydon schools including \$7.3 million for Eastwood Primary School, \$10 million for Yarra Hills Secondary College, \$2.34 million for Bayswater North Primary School, \$2.2 million for Pembroke Primary School, which the minister and I recently attended for the opening of that project, and \$10 million to commence Melba College's rebuild.

Last election I committed \$3 million to provide enough funding to allow Croydon Primary School to undertake a capital upgrade and complete the full rebuild of the school, and I am seeking the same funding from the minister so the school can get on with their rebuild and complete this final stage, in effect delivering the full rebuild of Croydon Primary School. Again I ask the Minister for Education to commit \$3 million to replace the administration building and finish the final school building works at Croydon Primary School, completing the last part of the rebuild of Croydon Primary School.

Sports funding

Ms BLANDTHORN (Pascoe Vale) (19:09) — (13 564) I appreciate the opportunity to raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Sport, and the action I seek is that the minister provide me with an update on the various state government grants that are available to assist sporting clubs in the Pascoe Vale electorate. Given the vitally important role sporting clubs play in our communities and the shoestring budget on which they often operate, it is particularly important that government provide funding programs that support local sporting clubs.

One of the great local success stories of the year to date is that of the West Coburg Football Club. In its inaugural season the under-12 girls team coached by Peta Price won the premierships. It was an incredible effort from all involved.

This success combined with the growth in participation rates in female AFL that the club is experiencing means that the club is now considering entering an additional four or five female teams next season. This story is just one of many sporting success stories to come out of the

Pascoe Vale electorate this year, and with access to government support, whether small or large, clubs such as the West Coburg Football Club will continue to go from strength to strength.

Fetal alcohol syndrome disorder

Ms SHEED (Shepparton) (19:10) — (13 565) My adjournment matter is for the Minister for Families and Children in the other place, and the action I seek is that she meet with me and representatives from health, education and early childhood service providers in my community who are very concerned about the lack of treatment interventions for young people suffering from fetal alcohol spectrum disorder, also known as FASD. The purpose of this meeting would be to establish a pilot treatment program for the children who have been diagnosed with this insidious disease.

Many children in my electorate have been diagnosed with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder, over a long period of time. Many of these children are clients of the Department of Health and Human Services and are often in out-of-home care. Many of these children grow to cause major disruption in the community as teenagers, and many of them, now adults, are in the prison system.

Four years ago the federal government held a parliamentary inquiry into the condition, acknowledging its increasing — and most likely underestimated — prevalence. Yet on the ground in my electorate we need treatment options and funding to provide therapeutic interventions, not offers for more diagnosis, assessments and research. The recently retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria raised this issue several years ago. She was keen to understand the role of fetal alcohol spectrum disorder in prison recidivist populations.

Research has shown that with appropriate interventions you can positively alter the trajectory of these young lives, and so it is time we saw a specialised treatment approach to what is one of the major non-genetic causes of long-term, irreversible brain injury. While there are currently prevention programs to improve the awareness of mothers about the dangers of alcohol to a foetus both before and during pregnancy, we cannot forget about the children who are already facing this challenge.

My community is already taking steps in this direction with key service providers working together to share their knowledge, but we need an action plan. There has been some investment in providing therapy for trauma-affected children at four of our most disadvantaged primary schools, but there are long

waiting lists and a number of the children on these waiting lists suffer from FASD. We need funding for targeted therapies to help them understand and manage their disorder. We need a referral network to ensure children who might otherwise be dismissed as ‘troublesome’ are engaged with appropriate services and do not fall through the gaps.

FASD has impacts across the whole of our community, but we know that there are particular issues in our Indigenous community. Shepparton has the highest Indigenous population outside of metropolitan Melbourne. While we have programs such as Cradle to Kindergarten in place to educate and support mothers, fathers and families, we also need a treatment program. If we are to break the cycle of disadvantage in our community, we need to provide these therapeutic interventions to help the children affected and we need to evaluate such interventions so that we can continue to find better solutions to the embedded challenges that young people in our community face on a day-to-day basis.

Frankston Dolphins

Mr EDBROOKE (Frankston) (19:13) — (13 566) My adjournment matter is for the Premier of Victoria, and the action I seek is that the Premier accompany me to the monumental first Frankston Dolphins home game for 2018. I know you will be excited to know, as I was to be there, that yesterday evening was the milestone first training and selection night for the Dolphins. I was pleased to see around 50 hopeful future Dolphins on the field, and many of them were from Frankston clubs.

Mr Wynne — Will you be playing?

Mr EDBROOKE — No, I will not be playing.

I know it was a proud moment for me and many of the people that have helped the club get back on board. The name Frankston Dolphins certainly is not unheard of in this house. It was not long ago that we heard that they had lost their VFL licence and then regained it. Many of us said, ‘No, we are not going to let this happen’. In fact with a strong club-led campaign we went from 100 members to around 1250 members, and we had around 3500 signatures of people in support of bringing back the Dolphins, which was fantastic. Even the federal opposition leader joined in the club in their time of need. Our community just was not willing to accept —

An honourable member interjected.

Mr EDBROOKE — Yes, hear, hear, Bill! Our community were just not willing to accept that we lose our premier football team, which is a conduit for many of our youth to go on to bigger and better things. We have got some unfinished business on the field and in our community as well.

It was magnificent news when the state government was able to chip in and help the club with their debt up to the tune of almost \$500 000. We have got a new, fantastic general manager, and now we are building up a head of steam. We have actually got a new coach, Adam Skrobalak, as the senior coach for 2018.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr EDBROOKE — He played for St Kilda, I think, or was one of the coaches of St Kilda. It is fair to say it has been a tough fight and we have a long way to go, but the first bounce is going to be great. If the level of passion and commitment is anything to go by, we are certainly going to be a formidable force in the next season. This is what I love about the Frankston community. It is that sense of resilience, the determination, not backing down in a fight and actually winning. That is the thing. It is an amazing attribute of Frankston.

As a proud sponsor of the club, I look forward to introducing the Premier to the team behind the resurrection of the Dolphins, because this is a history-making moment. It is epic, it is unforgettable and it will be glorious. Bring on season 2018!

Mornington Peninsula Freeway

Mr DIXON (Nepean) (19:16) — (13 567) I wish to raise a matter for the Minister for Roads and Road Safety. The action I seek is for him to listen to my constituents and also to listen to Mornington Peninsula Shire Council regarding congestion, safety and noise issues on the Mornington Peninsula Freeway and then to act on the actions that are being called for by my constituents and the shire. The mayor recently wrote to me regarding these issues, and without going into the detail, I know the minister, his office and VicRoads all know about the issues that have been raised by the mayor. To quote some of the paragraphs from the mayor:

Mornington Peninsula shire and its community have been voicing concerns to VicRoads for a number of years about the road safety and congestion issues at the Jetty Road and Mornington Peninsula Freeway intersection in Rosebud.

VicRoads acknowledged the intersection in the 2013 VicRoads Point Nepean road study, which identified the need for a proposal to be developed to address its existing safety

and congestion issues. To the best of our knowledge, this has not yet occurred.

And in the other letter:

Mornington Peninsula shire and its community have been voicing concerns for a number of years about the adverse impacts of Mornington Peninsula Freeway traffic noise on nearby residents between Safety Beach and Rosebud.

We have had hundreds of freeway noise-related concerns from residents —

this is to the shire —

in the townships of Safety Beach, McCrae, Arthurs Seat, Dromana and Rosebud that reside within approximately 250 metres of the Mornington Peninsula Freeway.

In both letters the mayor said:

As our state member of Parliament, I would appreciate your assistance in this matter.

I have raised it in this place before and we have had petitions, but I am raising it now because I have had direct contact from the mayor on behalf of the Mornington Peninsula shire and all the councillors. Just in terms of the traffic congestion on the Mornington Peninsula Freeway:

During peak times, drivers are becoming frustrated with the long queue lengths along Jetty Road as well as on the freeway. The jointly run VicRoads/shire travel time demonstration that was conducted last summer revealed that queuing on the Mornington Peninsula Freeway heading towards the southern peninsula reached lengths of over 4 kilometres during peak times.

You do not even get queues like that on the Monash. Regarding the freeway noise:

Whilst council is generally supportive of the \$12.7 million road safety upgrade of the freeway, which has recently started construction, the proposed removal of over 12 hectares of vegetation as part of the project will no doubt exacerbate the existing noise issues. This removal includes vegetation that currently acts as noise and light buffering between the freeway and residential areas.

There are real issues there. They are not just my issues. They are constituents' issues. They are Mornington Peninsula shire councillors' issues. We are all working together. I ask the minister to listen to these concerns and to act on them.

Atkinson Street–Dandenong Road, Oakleigh

Mr DIMOPOULOS (Oakleigh) (19:19) — (13 568) I wish to raise a matter for the Minister for Roads and Road Safety, and the action I seek is for an investigation to be undertaken into the intersection of Atkinson Street and Dandenong Road in Oakleigh with

specific regard to the safety of the intersection due to the road's surface. Whilst it may not be immediately apparent, this section of Dandenong Road is actually on a hill, where the outbound section of Dandenong Road is much slower than the inbound section and separated by a wide median strip. The real problem occurs around the middle of the intersection as Atkinson Street crosses Dandenong Road. The surface is quite uneven and I believe presents a possible safety issue for vehicles crossing over Dandenong Road and for those turning right from both sides of Dandenong Road and from both sides of Atkinson Street. I put on record my thanks for the minister's hands-on efforts in making Victoria's roads safer. I would appreciate his assistance to provide an investigation into this intersection.

Responses

Ms NEVILLE (Minister for Police) (19:19) — A number of members have raised a range of issues with ministers, and I will pass those issues on to those ministers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER — Order! The house now stands adjourned until tomorrow.

House adjourned 7.20 p.m.

