The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade) took the chair at 4.48 p.m. and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MELBOURNE STATE COLLEGE

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Doutta Galla Province)—In view of the widespread community concern at the future of the Melbourne State College, what steps has the Minister of Education taken to ensure the provision of sufficient funds and student enrolments to the college for the coming three years in order to maintain its existing courses, which, incidentally, are held in high regard by our community?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—The Commonwealth Government has reduced funding for teacher education in this State by 2000 effective full-time students over the forthcoming triennium. This is because there has been an oversupply in the number of graduates in teaching in recent years and there is at present a continuing decline in pupil enrolments in primary schools, likely to continue until at least 1985, with a further decline in the number of student enrolments occurring in secondary schools in the latter half of the decade.

The Commonwealth Government took the view that the decline in enrolments represented a cruel dashing of the expectations of many young people who undertook training in those circumstances when they found there were no jobs available, as well as a wasteful use of public resources. It has reduced enrolments accordingly. It has also directed, as a condition of funding, that teacher training institutions amalgamate with broader based institutions. The reasons given for that decision were set out in my Ministerial statement of 5 May last.

However, it was a Commonwealth Government decision and the Commonwealth Government has repeatedly made it clear that it insists upon that requirement. The Melbourne State College is now at least fully aware, as it ought to have been at all times, that the Commonwealth Government intends to insist upon compliance with that requirement. The Melbourne State College has been conducting discussions with several institutions. The Commonwealth Government is now satisfied that those discussions are serious and designed to produce an amalgamation.

I do not intend to say anything about the state of the negotiations at this stage. It would be furthest from the desire of the Leader of the Opposition and myself to prejudice the somewhat delicate negotiations by discussing their present state publicly. The Commonwealth Government is satisfied that serious discussions are continuing and it has therefore agreed to postpone the closure deadline of the Melbourne State College after considerable pressure from me. It has agreed to keep the position of the Melbourne State College under continuous review in the light of the progress it is making in its discussions.

I understand that, if by the end of this year, the Melbourne State college has been unable to complete satisfactory arrangements, the funds for Melbourne State College for the ensuing year will not be allocated directly to it, but will be placed in a trust fund. However, provided that the negotiations are proceeding to the satisfaction of the Commonwealth Government, those funds will be paid out to the college to maintain its authorized student load.

I want to make it clear that, if the Leader of the Opposition, in talking about maintaining programmes, means maintaining programmes with the same number of students and the same number of teachers, that, of course, cannot be guaranteed. Rationalization and the reduction of funds for effective student numbers does not enable that to occur.

There will be an authorized student load and I see no danger of the Melbourne State College being deprived of the funds for the authorized student
load for 1982, provided that it proceeds earnestly, as it is at present, with its endeavours to meet the Commonwealth Government’s funding requirements.

VIOLENCE IN FILMS

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Has the meeting that was proposed by the South Australian Attorney-General to discuss the level of violence in films taken place, and, if so, who participated in that conference? Did it lead to any measures being considered by other State Governments, which will lead to a reduction of the content of violence in films and what action does the Victorian Government propose to take on this important question?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General)—I indicated almost immediately after receiving the request from the South Australian Attorney-General that Victoria would be very pleased to take part in a conference to discuss the level of violence in films. However, that conference has not yet been held and I am not aware of what replies the South Australian Attorney-General has received from other States.

However, there will be a meeting within the next few weeks of the Ministers who have responsibility in this area and that matter will certainly be raised then. I undertake that the matter will be raised at that meeting and I will be able to report to the House the results of that meeting some time towards the end of next month.

DEMARcation disputes in Latrobe Valley

The Hon. N. F. STACEY (Chelsea Province)—I direct my question to the Minister for Minerals and Energy. My attention has been drawn to disturbing reports that demarcation disputes in the Latrobe Valley are currently costing the State Electricity Commission customers and, therefore, the people of Victoria an amount equal to approximately $4 million a week.

Can the Minister comment on the accuracy of those reports and will he inform the House what action the Government is taking to ensure that employees of contractors in the Latrobe Valley are guaranteed the right to work?

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER (Minister for Minerals and Energy)—The report that demarcation disputes are costing about $4 million a week is unfortunately correct. This is another illustration of the high cost of this most futile form of industrial action, which is one of the most costly, because such disputes are often beyond the powers of either the employer or the court to resolve successfully.

Mr Stacey asked what action the Government is taking. The Government is using its best endeavours to persuade the parties to this most damaging dispute to resolve their differences. I am not sanguine as to the outcome of these negotiations and I impress upon the House that, if this dispute is not resolved, the Government and the State Electricity Commission will be forced to consider other options.

HAZELWOOD POWER STATION

The Hon. E. H. WALKER (Melbourne Province)—I preface my question to the Minister for Conservation by indicating that, in a letter dated 27 March 1981 to Mr Derek Amos, then the honourable member for Morwell, Mr Jack Fraser, Chairman of the Environment Protection Authority, indicated that the State Electricity Commission had been allowed to increase its emissions of particulate matter from the Hazelwood power station, as an interim measure, until June 1981. He then assured the honourable member that any further extensions of the relaxation beyond June 1981 “would have to be the subject of an amendment of the licence and therefore open to public review and objection if granted”.

Can the Minister explain to the House why that waiver has now been extended until 30 September 1981 without a revision of the licence, without any public review, without any capacity for the public to make submissions or objections and, indeed, without any public notification at all?
The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Conservation)—The question contains four “withouts” and the last three depend on the first “without”, that is, without the extended licence. I am grateful to have had the opportunity of studying the question in more detail than is usually the case.

To start at the last “without”, the question relates to action having been taken without any public notification, without any capacity for the public to make submissions and without any public review. All of those matters depend upon the extension of the licence, and that automatically opens the procedures to public review.

I do not know why the Environment Protection Authority has extended the licence of Hazelwood power station to operate until now, but I shall be delighted to take up the question and provide the honourable member with an answer.

SPEED LIMITS FOR PROBATIONARY DRIVERS

The Hon. D. M. EVANS (North Eastern Province)—I refer the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to an article which appeared in the September issue of Royalauto, the magazine of the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria, stating that the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria is seeking a removal of speed restrictions on first-year probationary drivers. It draws attention to the fact that:

The accident risk for first-year drivers is considered to be 24 times higher than if they were travelling at the average traffic speed flow.

In view of those interesting statistics and the alarming additional danger faced by probationary drivers who are forced to travel at speeds below the normal speed of traffic flow, will the Minister consider amending the regulations with regard to probationary drivers and, if so, when?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister for Police and Emergency Services)—I am aware of the report and I have asked for comments on it from the Road Safety and Traffic Authority regarding the facts. I do not dispute the facts, but I should like to make some comments on them.

It is interesting to note that P-plate drivers are required to maintain a speed limit of 80 kilometres an hour on the open road. That speed limit does not apply in a restricted area, where, of course, all motorists are required to observe the speed limit of 60 kilometres an hour. The formative period of a driver’s life is the first twelve months, when many bad habits can occur. I am concerned at the number of young probationary drivers who are killed on the roads. As honourable members are aware, fatalities in Victoria now are 70 more than had occurred at this time last year; last year, fatalities were at an all time low, probably because of good driving conditions, whereas this year the weather has been wet and inclement.

I am reluctant to change the rules yet; however, I have sought a report on the issue and I shall seek statistics from the Road Safety and Traffic Authority on the number of fatalities of persons under the age of 21 years for the information of the honourable member.

RETAIL TRADING HOURS

The Hon. D. N. SALTMARSH (Waverley Province)—Will the Attorney-General, who is the representative in this place of the Minister of Labour and Industry, indicate to the House the Government’s policy on shop-trading hours and the current campaign seeking an extension of those hours?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General) — Last year, the Minister of Labour and Industry indicated that the Government had no intention of instituting any general extension of Victorian shopping hours to either Saturday afternoons or Sundays, and that position remains. The Government has no proposal before it for any general extension and, if there were such a proposal, the Government would not accept it.

Particularly at the request of the Victorian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, which is adamantly opposed to any extension of shopping hours, a committee was appointed to examine
anomalies that have been highlighted in shopping hours and requirements for those hours.

I repeat that the Government has no intention of any general extension of shopping hours.

**MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY**

The Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Geelong Province)—I direct a question to the Minister of Education in his capacity as Leader of the Government in this House. I remind the Minister of debate during the last session on the motor vehicle industry and of the opinion then that the acceptance of the Industries Assistance Commission report and recommendations would have a disastrous effect on the motor vehicle and component industry in Victoria. I remind the Minister also especially of what the effect would be in Geelong where, if these recommendations were accepted, it would be at a cost of 9000 jobs in an area where there is already an unemployment rate of 9 per cent.

Will the Minister detail to the House what actions the Government has taken in this matter already and what future action it intends to take? It is extremely urgent that something be done.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—The views expressed by the Government on that occasion remain its firm views today and have been conveyed by the former Premier to the Prime Minister. Whether the new Premier has also conveyed the same views, I am unable to say, but I shall certainly obtain the information for the honourable member.

**PUMP CHARGES**

The Hon. K. I. M. WRIGHT (North Western Province)—I refer the Minister for Minerals and Energy to service charges that are made on board outlets and in particular to the effects of those charges on orchards and vineyards. One property has three drainage pumps and two irrigation pumps and the charge has increased from $14.85 to $18 each. With modern technology, is it absolutely necessary for a meter reader to go to each of five or more outlets on one property? Would it not be possible for a property to have one meter on the one board so that one reading only takes place, with resultant saving to the consumer?

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER (Minister for Minerals and Energy)—While that clearly is an attractive option, I am advised by the Water Commission that it is not normally a practical one. I am prepared to discuss with Mr Wright any particular situation that could suggest that special consideration should be given to summation of supply. It should be pointed out that the fixed supply charge of $18.18 covers not only the cost of meter reading, but also the cost of installation and maintenance.

**HEAVY ROAD TRANSPORT**

The Hon. R. J. LONG (Gippsland Province)—I direct a question to the Minister of Water Supply, who is the representative in this place of the Minister of Transport. An accident occurred at Warragul yesterday when three semi-trailers were carrying large concrete beams that are used in project construction. The rear bogey of the third semi-trailer struck the railway bridge, causing the beam to fall on to the roadway. The State Electricity Commission has constructed a road to the east of Warragul to enable heavy road transport to avoid the railway bridge.

Is it true that transporters with over-length and over-weight loads are required to obtain a permit from the Country Roads Board and, if so, will the Minister of Transport instruct the board to direct that such over-length and over-weight loads are to be transported on the road constructed by the State Electricity Commission in order to avoid the railway bridge at Warragul?

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply)—I am aware that special heavy-duty bypass roads have been constructed as well as some heavy duty bridges adjacent to the Princes Highway in order to allow the passage of heavy or over-length loads to power stations in the Latrobe Valley. Transporters of these special loads are required to obtain a permit. I shall draw
the matter to the attention of the Minister of Transport and provide Mr Long with a more specific answer. The use of bypass roads and heavy-duty bridges should be maximized not only for safety reasons but also to ensure that damage to the normal roadway is kept to a minimum.

POLICE HELICOPTER

The Hon. JOAN COXEDGE (Melbourne West Province) — I preface my question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services by saying that I have had numerous complaints from people in the west about the police helicopter when it flies at its normal level of 700 feet, as it creates severe noise disturbance and intrudes into their privacy. Due to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, the Police Force has obtained a two-month dispensation to allow the helicopter to fly at lower levels, thus intensifying the problem. Will the Minister assure the House that when the two-month dispensation expires, the police helicopter will revert to being just offensively, and not excessively offensively, intrusive and noisy?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) — The honourable member wrote to me on this matter and I am in the course of providing her with a reply. The facts she has stated are true. I will approach the Chief Commissioner of Police with a request to restrict the force’s activities wherever possible. There have been not a large number of complaints, but some complaints on the noise of the helicopter, which I am pleased is performing very well now and proving invaluable in crime detection. The people of Melbourne will gain great benefit from the helicopter. I shall discuss the question of noise with the Police Force. I add that before the helicopter can fly at below 700 feet, after the expiration of the permit, the Police Force will need permission from the Department of Transport.

COMMONWEALTH COPYRIGHT LEGISLATION

The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN (Western Province) — I direct a question to the Minister of Education in view of the confusion, particularly in school circles, at the practical effect of the Commonwealth copyright legislation in relation to copying of sound and especially of videotaping. I understand the Minister recently produced a directive or a letter of advice to schools about videotaping of school programmes.

Can the honourable gentleman give an assurance to teachers and other staff members of the Education Department that those who are acting in accordance with that letter of advice will receive the backing of the Victorian Government in the event of legal action being forthcoming for alleged breach of copyright?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education) — The short answer to the question is “Yes”, but I think the House will probably like to be informed in slightly greater detail on this question.

Amendments to the Copyright Act which came into operation on 1 July drew the attention of schools to many provisions of the Act that previously existed. Some of these provisions will, if strictly applied, cause great hardships to schools and to educators generally. The Victorian Government and, indeed, other State Governments have sought to ameliorate the situation and to obtain from the Commonwealth Government common arrangements with respect to both the print media and the electronic media.

The circular which I prepared was considered by the interstate committee and subsequently, in consultation with the Attorney-General’s office, was amended. The directive which I sent out to schools was sent out in similar terms by every other State education department and with the approval of the Commonwealth Attorney-General’s Department. The effect of the directive is that the recording and replaying of videotaped broadcasts to schools or other broadcasts prepared for educational purposes is acceptable provided
the replay is done only within schools and for school purposes and not for any other purposes.

I may say that there are many other issues yet to be resolved with respect to reasonable videocopying or print media matter. There is far from sufficient certainty as yet.

We are pursuing the matter, and it will be listed again for discussion at the conference of education Ministers next month. I hope we can make some arrangements which will be much more suitable to schools and educators.

**ABSENCE OF MR EDDY: RETURN OF MR DUNN**

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—Before I proceed to answer the first question on notice, I notice it was asked by Mr Eddy, who is absent from the House today because of illness. We extend to him our best wishes and hopes for his speedy recovery and return.

Having mentioned Mr Eddy's absence, I should also say how pleased all honourable members of the House are to see Mr Bernie Dunn back with us after his illness.

**PETITION**

**Victorian Government Travel Authority**

The Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Geelong Province) presented a petition from certain citizens of Geelong praying that the Government rescind its decision to close the Geelong branch of the Victorian Government Travel Authority. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 235 signatures.

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

**PRINTERS AND NEWSPAPERS (AMENDMENT) BILL**

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Printers and Newspapers Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read for a first time.

**STANDING ORDERS**

**Report of committee**

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL (East Yarra Province), on behalf of the Honourable the President, presented a report from the Standing Orders Committee upon its proposed resolution to suspend Standing Order No. 325.

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

**PAPERS**

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

- **Railways Board—Report for the quarter ended 31 March 1981.**
- **Taxation—Analysis of operations of land tax for the assessment year 1979, and probate duty and gift duty for the year 1979–80.**
- **Town and Country Planning Act 1961—Bendigo—City of Bendigo Planning Scheme 1962—Amendment No. 34.**
- **Bulla—Shire of Bulla Planning Scheme 1959—Amendments Nos. 83 and 84, 1980.**
- **Cranbourne Planning Scheme 1960—Amendment No. 39.**
- **Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 137, Part 2 (with map).**
- **Shepparton—City of Shepparton Planning Scheme 1953—Amendments No. 49, 1978; and Nos. 51, 52 and 54, 1980.**
- **Woorayl—Shire of Woorayl Planning Scheme—Amendment No. 49, 1980.**
- **Yallourn—Shire of Narracan, Yallourn North Planning Scheme 1951—Amendments Nos. 4 and 5.**
- **Upper Yarra Valley and Dandenong Ranges Authority—Reports for the period ended 30 September 1977, and for the year ended 30 September 1978 (two maps).**
- **Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1978—Summary of returns—June, 1981.**
- **Upper Yarra Valley and Dandenong Ranges Authority—Reports for the period ended 30 September 1977, and for the year ended 30 September 1978 (two maps).**
- **Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1978—Summary of returns—June, 1981.**

On the motion of the Hon. E. H. WALKER (Melbourne Province), it was ordered that the reports, taxation analysis and summary of returns under the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act be taken into consideration on the next day of meeting.

**CANAAN COLLEGE, THOONA**

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—I move:

That there be laid before this House, in relation to Canaan College, Thoona:

(a) the decision of 7 September 1981 in an application under section 42 (3) of the Education Act 1958 for a direction by the Minister to register the school as a primary school; and
CHELSEA LANDS BILL

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister of Lands) — I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to remedy a situation which has arisen due to a change in the adopted position of the high water mark of the waters of Port Phillip Bay and resultant variations in titles from the original Crown grants from which the titles have derived. The lands in question are in the City of Chelsea fronting the Nepean Highway between the Mordialloc Creek and Keast Park.

These Crown grants issued in 1865 and 1866. There were nine grants for a total of twelve allotments. In each case the easterly boundary of the grant was the present highway and the westerly boundary was a reserve of 100 feet width between the land alienated and the high water mark adopted at the time.

In the following years the alienated land was subdivided and resubdivided and the surveyors carrying out these subdivisions left a reserve of 100 feet. However, as the high water mark was regarded by them as having receded the reserve was, wrongly, also deemed to have moved, with the result that the subdivisions and the resulting titles encroached onto the Crown reserve. It is pertinent to note that the doctrine of accretion would apply only to widen the reserve and not to have any effect on the alienated land, which does not abut the water.

The proprietors of the subdivided allotments have, of course, occupied their lands in reliance upon the dimensions shown in the certificates of title. It is only proper that in view of the issue of these certificates the Crown take action to remove any doubt as to the validity of those titles.

In general there would today be at least 100 feet of reserve between the Crown grant boundaries as adopted in the Bill and the high water mark.

I now turn to the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is the usual citation and commencement provision. Clause 2 provides that the land shown on the plans in the schedules to the Bill shall be deemed to have been the Crown allotments granted by the Crown grants referred to in the clause.

Clause 3 authorizes the Registrar of Titles to make such amendments as are necessary to the Crown grants and certificates of title. Clause 4 provides that no compensation shall be payable by the Crown.

There are nine schedules to the Bill and the plans they contain either—

(a) agree with the depth measurements of certificates of title where these measurements are shown; or alternatively

(b) where such measurements are not shown, adopt metes and bounds to accord with measurements shown on abutting titles.

A large-scale set of the plans shown in the schedules has been lodged in the Library. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

FISHERIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is mainly to raise fees in line with Treasury direction to lift departmental fees and charges sufficiently
to offset their erosion by inflation. Commercial fishing licence fees were last increased as from 1 April 1981, and this Bill would allow for the proposed increase to take effect one year after that date.

Despite an increase in the Consumer Price Index of about 170 per cent from 1967–68 to 1979–80, fees were not increased until 1979 and 1980, and even then the increases averaged only about 50 per cent. It was therefore necessary to make very substantial increases effective from 1 April 1981, to restore the income of the fund in real terms to something approaching that of 1968. The Government now intends to avoid the need for such massive increases at one time by reviewing and adjusting fees regularly.

Honourable members will recall from the previous Bill last year that revenue from licences is paid into the Fisheries Research Fund and is used for scientific, economic or other research on Victorian commercial fisheries as well as providing money for enforcement, extension and educational services.

Accordingly, it is essential that if the industry is to be adequately serviced by the Fisheries and Wildlife Division the income of the fund has to be sustained in line with the demands on it. The Bill will achieve this by adding an estimated $50,000 in a full year to the division’s revenue from commercial licences.

I should point out that the Bill also includes a provision to raise the fee for an amateur netting licence. Opportunity has also been taken to further amend the principal Act in terms of the earlier amendment made by the Fisheries (Commonwealth–State Arrangements) Act 1981 with a minor attention to wording, necessary to ensure the intention of that section. It is the intention of the Fisheries and Wildlife Division to phase out gradually the amateur fishing licence.

For the benefit of members I will now go through each of the three clauses in turn. Clause 1 is the usual citation clause. It provides for the Act to come into operation on a day or days to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council published in the Government Gazette.

Clause 2 raises departmental fees and charges in line with Treasury direction by amendments to the principal Act, commencing with commercial fishing activities in . . . .

(a) Section 15 (1)—In seven subsections the fee for a range of commercial fishing licences. Honourable members should note that the concession rate to pensioners for a master fisherman’s licence is extended by exempting the $10 fee from the provisions of this Bill.

(b) Section 26 (3)—Fish culture permits, and

(c) Section 81 (c)—The boat registration fee.

(d) Amends Section 22 (1a) of the principal Act to raise the fee for an amateur netting licence.

Clause 3 is a minor amendment to section 9N of the principal Act with respect to wording in the regulation-making power set out in the Fisheries (Commonwealth–State Arrangements) Act 1981 regarding a joint authority managing a State fishery. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. E. H. WALKER (Melbourne Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

STANDING ORDERS

The debate (adjourned from September 8) was resumed on the motion of the Hon. A. J. Hunt (Minister of Education)—

That until the end of the Session:

(a) so much of Standing Order No. 325 as requires private Bill fees to be paid before any such Bill is read a first time be suspended; and

(b) a private Bill, other than a private Bill ordered to be dealt with as a public Bill, shall not be read a second time until a receipt for the payment of fees is produced by the member having charge of the Bill.
The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU
(Doutta Galla Province)—At my request, the Leader of the Government agreed that the motion should go to the relevant committee. That committee has met and its report has been tabled in the House. The report recommends the adoption of the motion moved by the Government. In those circumstances, the Opposition does not oppose the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (FALSE REPORTS TO POLICE) BILL

The debate (adjourned from September 9) on the motion of the Hon. Haddon Storey (Attorney-General) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. JOAN COXSEDGE (Melbourne West Province)—Basically, the Bill is an attempt to clamp down on those people who make false reports to the police, thereby causing a public mischief. The principal Act apparently has a legal loophole in it, which fails to penalize the person who manufactures a set of circumstances thereby inducing someone else to make the report that he or she wanted made. This measure will make liable the originator of the situation.

The proposed legislation results from a number of specific incidents in which blood-spattered taxis were found and people were staging their own bloody disappearances. It culminated in a nasty situation in which a Victorian man was playing around with a CB radio. He sent out a hoax call about a boat in trouble at Waratah Bay. The message was picked up by someone in Queensland, who rang the police in Victoria, who then diverted the police helicopter from attending a genuine alarm where three people were washed off the rocks at San Remo, and a woman was subsequently drowned.

Initially and quite justifiably, concern was expressed by members of the Opposition about what appeared to be the dragnet nature of proposed section 53 (2) (b), which could have led to possible abuse by police. Members of the Opposition have, however, been reassured that the situation is adequately covered by section 53 (1) of the principal Act. Clause 3 of the Bill will confer on the court a discretionary power to impose on a person who is convicted an additional financial penalty. The Opposition does not oppose the Bill.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—The National Party supports the Bill, which has been adequately explained by the Attorney-General and Mrs Coxsedge. Members of the National Party support the measure because it is alarming that people should make hoax calls or actually stage mock crimes so that people will report them to police, thus causing police investigations. The people who have done these things have so far been able to escape prosecution, and that is not good enough. If the Bill can close the loophole and deal with the people responsible, it will certainly have the support of the citizens of Victoria.

It is reasonable to expect people who cause considerable public expense through mischievous reports and the staging of crimes to contribute towards the cost of the investigations of the police or the assistance of emergency services. The emergency services and the police have enough to do in the ordinary course of events, without being impeded by these sorts of mischievous activities. I reiterate that the National Party supports the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

SUPREME COURT (FUNDS IN COURT) BILL

The debate (adjourned from September 9) on the motion of the Hon. Haddon Storey (Attorney-General) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU
(Doutta Galla Province)—The Attorney-General has explained the Bill in a most satisfactory manner, and the Opposition does not oppose it.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—The National Party believes the proposed legislation is reasonable and supports the Bill.
The motion was agreed to.

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

GOVERNOR’S SPEECH
Address-in-Reply

The debate (adjourned from September 9) on the motion of the Hon. D. N. Saltmarsh (Waverley Province) for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor’s Speech was resumed.

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Doutta Galla Province)—It is clear that the Government has failed in its duty by not initiating a Parliamentary inquiry into the Board of Works building. The case for an inquiry is overwhelming. The Board of Works entered into a building agreement on 5 August 1970 with E. A. Watts Pty Ltd, the builder, for the sum of $12 million, subject to rise and fall.

When the building was occupied in September 1973 it had cost $16 million. The building has not yet been completed. When it is finally completed the repairs will cost more than the original cost of the building. The repairs will cost at least $19 million. The scaffolding has cost an additional $1 million and the statement in the Age today was conservative. It is clear from the statement made by the Board of Works today that as at 30 June 1981 $8,519,000 has been spent on the building with the probability that an additional $12.2 million in further costs to complete the building will be involved which means the repairs will be at least $20 million.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply)—I raise a point of order about procedure in the matter that has been raised by Mr White. I have no wish at all to prevent him from continuing with his speech, which he is entitled to do. With your indulgence, Mr President, I desire to raise important questions which can arise if certain information is made available during the debate which may prejudice the hearing of an action between the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the defendants and the third and fourth parties.

You have previously ruled, correctly, Mr President, that in a case where a writ has been taken out, the matter is not sub judice so far as the Parliament of Victoria is concerned, until a date has been set down for hearing of the action. That is consistent with the practice laid down in May.

In this case the writs were taken out in the Supreme Court by the Board of Works and were No. 3000 of 1975 and No. 1882 of 1976. On 28 August 1981 the matter came before the Supreme Court to fix a date for the hearing, but the judge indicated that he had acted at one stage for one of the parties. The matter is now listed for 29 September 1981 to fix a date for the hearing.

Whilst I intend to answer, in as frank a manner as I can, all matters raised during the debate by Mr White, there may well be documents and opinions in my possession which I am not able to make public if I am to protect the interests of the Board of Works and its ratepayers.

The defendants and other parties to the action are in the favoured position where they cannot be called upon to make public information, documents or opinions in their possession. I make that point because it is important that these actions are proceeding. They are not actions that have been taken out just to disrupt the debate in this House. I point out that matters may be raised during this debate that could prejudice the hearing of the two actions in question.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! The honourable gentleman is correct when he says that matters awaiting adjudication in a civil court should not be a matter of debate in this Chamber. That is laid down clearly in May. Certainly from the time the case is set down for hearing—which has not been determined in this case—it is not proper for this House to debate the matter. However, I caution all honourable members to use discretion so in due course there is no prejudice to all concerned.

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Doutta Galla Province)—In the public interest I shall continue to mount the case for a public
inquiry. The second point in favour of a public inquiry is that the building was built between August 1970 and September 1973. The bluestone slabs then began to fall out. Eight years later the repairs are continuing. The situation is a disgrace to Victoria, but it is typical of the Government's projects and financial management that the Board of Works building will not be completed before December 1983.

The third point in support of a public inquiry is that in September 1973 the bluestone slabs began to fall out. The original proposal to have bluestone slabs in the building was extravagant beyond belief, especially when it is realized that these slabs cannot be identified from more than twenty paces. The ratepayers of Victoria are entitled to know why bluestone slabs were installed and why they fell out.

The fourth point in favour of a public inquiry is that when the bluestone slabs were removed and the building was inspected it was found that the concrete walls in a number of cases were beyond the accepted or prescribed tolerance rates with respect to vertical alignment. It is clear the building was poorly built the first time and was not within normal building tolerances. The building obviously did not conform to the Uniform Building Regulations. It is also clear that when the building was first constructed the builder believed that the shoddy workmanship would be hidden by the bluestone slabs which would provide the finish. Unfortunately for the builder, the slabs fell out. Now the builder, the Board of Works and the Government have been exposed.

The fifth point in favour of a public inquiry is that it is an irony—not one enjoyed by the ratepayers of Melbourne—that the original builders E. A. Watts Pty Ltd are being paid to complete the works which they are simultaneously being sued for. The repairs are being done on a cost plus basis.

The sixth point in support of a public inquiry is that the board purchased scaffolding for $1 million which will remain unused for months due to delays in repair work arising from a dispute over the quality of welding of aluminium panels.

The seventh point is that in August 1977 a contract was entered into with Dowell Australia Ltd to replace the bluestone slabs with aluminium cladding. Although Dowell Australia Ltd is experienced in this work, the Board of Works took exception to the quality of welding. The question that arises is: Why did the Board of Works fail to satisfy itself as to the quality of the work of Dowell Australia Ltd before awarding the contract? The contract is valued at $3.9 million. Is it not correct that the change in policy by the Board of Works has delayed the repair work by a number of years? Is it not correct that the Board of Works has had to negotiate a supplementary agreement with Dowell Australia Ltd and the board has taken responsibility for the welding?

The eighth point in favour of a public inquiry is that the Board of Works has entered into litigation against the original builder, the architect and other sub-contractors and it is clear that if the board is successful it will not actually recover the whole of the amount of the judgment. The reasons are simple; some of the original companies have been taken over and their assets stripped; some of the original companies were not properly insured; and the original architects have been incorporated.

The ninth reason for a public inquiry is that the original company responsible for installing the bluestone slabs, Standard Quarries (Masonry) Pty Ltd, which has been taken over by Pioneer Concrete (Vic) Pty Ltd, was not insured at the time it was awarded the contract by the Board of Works. That means it had no insurance cover against any action for negligence. There is no excuse for the Board of Works not checking to ensure that Standard Quarries (Masonry) Pty Ltd had insurance cover.

The tenth reason is that the terms of the proposed settlement, which were publicly disclosed to the Labor Party on Tuesday 14 July 1981 indicated that the building will cost at least $36 million and that the board will recover no
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more than $6.9 million in terms of its proposed settlement. The building has already cost $24 million including the cost of scaffolding and $8 million in repairs on top of the original cost of $16 million. It will cost at least an additional $12 million to complete the building and the bill for work to be completed is a maximum of $6.9 million.

The eleventh reason for a public inquiry is that the ratepayers of the Board of Works will pay at least $19 million for repairs. This partly explains the escalating rate burden suffered by ratepayers of Melbourne. The House should be reminded that on 28 April 1976, the Chairman of the Board of Works, Mr Croxford, who I understand is currently holidaying in Fiji, said that the ratepayers would not pay one dollar in repairs. On 28 April 1976 the Age stated:

"The board's chairman Mr Croxford said yesterday the size of the overdraft had not been decided. But board officials estimated it would be at least $1 million".

"I emphasize", Mr Croxford said, "that no rate money or loan money will be utilized for the work".

The twelfth point in favour of a public inquiry is that, if litigation proceeds between the board and the original builders, it is likely that the claims of the board and of the sub-contractors, Dowell Aluminium Architectural (Vic.), which arise out of delays in the performance of the aluminium cladding subcontract work, will be the subject of proceedings, either in the court or before arbitrators. If Dowell Australia Ltd succeeds—and it has a persuasive case—the ratepayers of Melbourne will be in for another slug.

Whom will they have to thank for the startling, abysmal mismanagement? None other than the Minister, the board, and the Thompson Government.

Point thirteen in favour of a case for a public inquiry is that, in the present climate, the firm of E. A. Watts Pty Ltd, now known as the Fletcher Watts Group, is in a position to create industrial dissension on the site, as that firm is operating on a cost plus contract, if it does not get a favourable settlement or if the matter goes to arbitration.

Point fourteen in favour of a public inquiry is that on 27 February 1981 Mr A. C. Chernov, QC, claimed in court, on behalf of the American Home Assurance Co., that that company denied liability as insurer for the architects on the ground that the architects had not complied with the terms of the contract. In other words, there is a distinct possibility that another party to the original contract was not adequately insured.

Point fifteen is that the insurance fund which Mr Croxford claims will be used to complete the repairs was set up for another purpose. Mr Croxford must realize that the revenue for the insurance fund came from the ratepayers and, if it is used, it will have to be replaced by the ratepayers of Melbourne.

Point sixteen is that on or about 25 June 1981, at 5 p.m. Mr Graham J. Clare, Chief Executive of the Fletcher Watts Group, visited Parliament, and in the office of the Leader of the Opposition and my presence and the presence of another witness made two claims to which I shall refer. He claimed that, if the board proceeded with litigation, there would be industrial disruption on the site. There was also a clear implication that, if the Labor Party did not raise the matter during the spring session—and specifically if Mr David White did not raise the issue—there would be something in it for the party.

Erskine May in the nineteenth edition of Parliamentary Practice at page 149 indicates that that type of conduct may constitute breach of privilege. I indicate to the House that this matter could be treated in that way.

The Hon. R. J. Long—Why did you not refer it to the Parliament?

The Hon. D. R. WHITE—I will later refer to Standing Orders on how to deal with such matters.

Point seventeen is that there is compelling evidence that the same individual, Graham J. Clare, to whom I have previously referred, approached the Premier via an intermediary. The intermediary was Sir John Anderson. I have in my possession notes prepared by
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Graham J. Clare for Sir John Anderson regarding the Board of Works building. I know who drove Graham J. Clare to Sir John Anderson’s office and delivered the notes to him. The fact is that Sir John Anderson is well known as a bag man for the Liberal Party—I refer honourable members to the 1980 edition of Who’s Who in Australia which indicates that Sir John Anderson was Treasurer of the Liberal Party in Victoria in 1978 and 1979. The people of Victoria and the ratepayers of Melbourne want to know why Graham J. Clare did not approach the Premier via the normal course, namely, the principal private secretary to the Premier, but instead chose the indirect path of going via Sir John Anderson.

In the notes, the following statements appear:

The Defendant Standard Quarries (Masonry) Pty Ltd has been stripped of all assets and in the event of an award of damages being made against it there would be no funds available to satisfy the judgment.

This material was provided in the notes, with the following preface:

It would appear that certain facts were unavailable to the Crown Law Department when it advised the Premier in relation to the proposed settlement of this litigation.

Sir John Anderson was also asked to make the following point to the Premier:

It can probably be assumed that, in the event of judgment being obtained against them, the architects would not have assets available for the purposes of execution.

On page two, the document states:

There is no conceivable way in which the builder could be held liable for the cost of re-cladding the building in aluminium or any other alternative material.

The document also states:

The combined costs of the action could exceed $3 000 000.

It is also true that the ultimate cost of the completion will not be $12 million according to this document prepared by Graham J. Clare of the Fletcher Watts Group, which is responsible for repairing the building on a cost plus basis. In the notes for Sir John Anderson, Graham J. Clare states that the full cost of repairs will be $20 million, not $12 million. To quote further from the notes prepared for Sir John Anderson:

... the combination of those factors will generate a demand for an enquiry and will provide ammunition to critics of both the Board and the Government in addition to casting aspersions upon officers of the Board ... This is the case he is mounting for a settlement in the near future. It is also clear from the document that he called for the appointment of a Cabinet sub-committee to resolve the problem.

It is clear that Sir John Anderson received the notes, and it is clear from the equivocal answers given by the Premier in another place that there is every reason to believe that Sir John did see the Premier on behalf of one of the parties to the litigation and that the Premier did see this document. The question is: Did Graham J. Clare offer funds to Sir John Anderson for the Liberal Party for that service and, if so, what funds?

Point eighteen in favour of a public inquiry is that the Government has had plenty of warnings on this issue. It has been raised many times in Parliament and the press over the past five years. In particular, it has been the subject of two major debates—in November 1980 and in April 1981.

There is no doubt that Croxford should be sacked. Graham J. Clare acted in clear concert with Croxford and it was Graham J. Clare who said to Croxford that the Australian Labor Party should be invited to see the board. It is also clear that the acting secretary of the board produced the following minute:

Re: M.M.B.W. Head Office Building

The Board having received without prejudice offers of settlement in respect of the re-cladding and completion of its Head Office building and all claims relating thereto, is of the view that it is in the best interests of the metropolitan ratepayer for these offers to be accepted, provided that the Government confirms its support for these offers to be accepted, provided that the Government confirms its support for such a settlement and also confirms that the Board will not be subject to further costs by way of continuing litigation, arbitration, public enquiry or other proceedings in respect of the completion of its Head Office building.

This was part of an approach in which Graham J. Clare, operating in concert with Croxford, was endeavouring to produce an earlier settlement.
And what of the Government’s part? It is clear that the Government could not, in the present political climate, allow the matter to be settled, so what happened? The Government sought to have the matter set down on the basis that it was in favour of the litigation proceeding, but it is clear that all they really wanted was the appearance that it would be set down. They were hoping it would be set down by Mr Justice Murphy on 28 August 1981 so that it would not come on in the Supreme Court until May 1982 or some time after the next State election. Then it would not be a matter of litigation until after the election. If the Liberal Party still had the front bench—and everyone in the community seriously doubts that—the Government would have settled the action there and then. They were seeking the clear knowledge that the press could not report this matter or the terms of the settlement, because that would be contempt of court.

The Government also knows that, if the matter had been set down by Mr Justice Murphy on 28 August, it would not be possible to raise the matter before the next election and that would have been the case if it had succeeded in appearing before Mr Justice Murphy on 28 August.

The Hon. N. F. STACEY (Chelsea Province)—On a point of order, Mr President, Mr White has just quoted a letter from the acting secretary, Mr G. M. Wight. The honourable member has not indicated the date of the letter, and certainly did not say to whom it was directed.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—I invite Mr White to give those details.

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Doutta Galla Province)—I am quoting from what I have available. It is a partial photocopy and it does not have a date on it. It is just signed G. M. Wight, acting secretary of the board, and it states in full:

I refer to the without prejudice offer communicated by you to the Chairman of the Board proposing a compromise of the actions extant in respect of the Board’s head office building and associated matters.

I am directed to inform you that it is considered inappropriate to settle the outstanding actions and claims by negotiation and that the said offer is not accepted.

G. M. Wight, Acting Secretary.

The Government did not want the matter to be raised before the next election and that would have been the case if it had succeeded in appearing before Mr Justice Murphy on 28 August.

The Hon. N. F. STACEY (Chelsea Province)—Mr President, might I point out that honourable members still do not know to whom the letter was written. It could have been to anybody—it could have been written in reply to a request from a ratepayer that the matter be settled.

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

The Hon. D. R. WHITE (Doutta Galla Province)—To sum up, it is clear that the cost of the repairs to the building will be in excess of $20 million and that the most that the board will recover is $6.9 million. It is also clear that many of the parties to the action have not to hide these matters as best it could. The acting secretary stated, and I quote the last paragraph:

I am directed to inform you that it is considered inappropriate to settle the outstanding actions and claims by negotiation and that the said offer is not accepted.

G. M. Wight, Acting Secretary.
been properly insured, particularly Standard Quarries Pty Ltd, which did not have any insurance cover, and also the original architect, whose insurance cover is now being contested by the insurer.

As well as that, one of the parties to the litigation who are personally liable, is Mr Leslie Marsh Perrott—honourable members know about Perrott, who is one of the commissioners of VicRail, and one of the supporters of the Liberal Party. He is one of the parties to this litigation and it is clear that during the course of his activities he has divested himself of many of his private involvements, including his interest in his marital home which has passed, since 8 February 1979, exclusively to his wife, in an attempt to evade his responsibility and his full obligations, under the terms and conditions of the contract, to the ratepayers of Melbourne.

It is also clear that Mr Graham J. Clare, as I indicated earlier, of the Fletcher Watts Corporation clearly attempted to bribe the Labor Party.

The Hon. N. F. Stacey—How much?

The Hon. D. R. White—There was a clear indication, as I stated previously, that if the Labor Party did not raise the matter in the spring session, which I am doing now, and specifically Mr David White did not raise the issue, there would be something in it for the party.

The Hon. Glyn Jenkins—Who was there?

The Hon. D. R. White—The same person and another individual, another member of Parliament whose name will be made available at the appropriate time. It is also clear that there is compelling evidence, as I have previously referred to, of Mr Graham J. Clare approaching the Premier through an intermediary, Sir John Anderson, to obtain a settlement. There is every reason to believe that because he did not go via the principal private secretary to the Premier, a normal course that any individual would undertake, that he made a similar offer to the Liberal Party. The question being asked by the people of Victoria, who want to know, is what was the nature of the offer that he made to Sir John Anderson. How much passed through Sir John Anderson to be passed on to the Liberal Party in return for Sir John Anderson going to the Premier. What the people of Victoria want to know is what happened at that meeting between Sir John Anderson and the Premier, and the response of the Premier, Mr Lindsay Thompson, to the points that were presented to him.

The question has been put to the Premier three times and each time the Premier has given the same answer. The Premier has stated that he did not see any of the litigants directly but the Premier has not answered the question whether he saw anybody on behalf of the litigants, and that was Sir John Anderson, who made an offer to him. The Labor Party has put the question but the Premier continues not to answer.

What the people want to know is what did Sir John Anderson do when he received the information. What did he say to the Premier? What conversation took place? What agreement was entered into by the Government?

It is clear to the ratepayers, who are currently paying their Board of Works notices, what they will have to face up to. The Government knew if it attempted to settle on those conditions that it was an outrageous offer that had been entered into by Croxford and Clare; that the board would receive only $6.9 million for repairs which cost in excess of $20 million. That is what the board was to receive.

It is submitted that the Government would not be able to sell that to the people of Victoria during this election year and so what it decided to do was to give the appearance, and the appearance only, that it would settle by litigation.

What the Government attempted to do was to stifle public debate and Parliamentary debate on this important issue. It has failed because it was hoping that the matter would be set down on 28 August before Mr Justice Murphy, but as is happening with every major political event in the State today, the breaks are not going in favour of the
Government and the case was not set down on that date. It was not set down because it was heard before Mr Justice Beach, who would not handle the issue and the matter will not be resumed until 29 September, but on 29 September it will be a closed shop and the matter will be set down for hearing and every attempt will be made by the Government to stifle public debate on the issue, as has been the case since September 1973. There have been calls for a public inquiry, in the interests of the ratepayers, as recently as April 1981, and before that in November 1980, but there has been no change by the Government and as a result of that we are in a situation today where this is the one and only opportunity where the public can be given the full facts.

The Hon. Glyn Jenkins—What about in the Supreme Court?

The Hon. D. R. WHITE—What will happen is as I have clearly indicated; the Government does not intend to go to the Supreme Court. It intends to wait until after the next State election and if it happens to regain the Treasury bench, one or two months after everything has settled down, the matter will be settled and the Government will cop the political reaction, but the Government does not want these matters to come out before the next State election.

The Opposition has this one opportunity to raise the matter. It is clear that we are not just dealing with gross financial mismanagement but the performance of the former Minister of Water Supply who has been euphemistically promoted to Minister for Police and Emergency Services for his eight years of negligence on the front bench of this Upper House.

The House is also not dealing only with the actions of the present Minister of Water Supply, who has finally scrambled into the Cabinet. What it is dealing with is corruption. Honourable members are dealing with an extension of what was found in relation to the land deals at Sunbury, Melton and Pakenham. What honourable members are dealing with is not only a decade of land deals scandals at Sunbury, Melton and Pakenham but also the financial mismanagement and performance of Government, mismanagement which has extended through every aspect of its performance. In every area and major public body, there has been some grotesque example of project mismanagement, if not corruption. The Government has failed, despite numerous calls over ten years, to have the Chairman of the Board of Works—currently in Fiji—removed from his position. The Labor Party has got him now; he will not get out of this one; he has gone for good.

This issue, among others, will put the Labor Party on the front benches, and the citizens and ratepayers of Melbourne can be sure of one thing, they will not have to face up to Mr Croxford as Chairman of the Board of Works. It is also clear that not once has the Government attempted to come clean with the facts of this issue. As recently as tonight, the Minister of Water Supply had an opportunity to put the cards on the table. The new Minister has scrambled into the Cabinet, a position which he sought at the last moment and will hold for not more than a year. That will be the extent of his Cabinet experience, because before twelve months are up he will be on the street looking for a job. It is clear that there is a compelling and overwhelming need for a public inquiry, and it is also clear that this issue will not go away. The facts and the cards are now on the table, and I call on the Government to conduct a public inquiry.

For these reasons I propose to move the following amendment to the Address-in-Reply:

That the following words be added to the proposed Address: "but deplore that the lack of control of the Minister of Water Supply over the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works in connection with the construction of its head office buildings has resulted in an inexcusable frittering of ratepayers' funds".

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—The Minister of Water Supply on the motion and the amendment.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply)—At the outset of this debate, I make it absolutely clear that the consistent view of the Government, of the former Minister of Water Supply, the Minister for Police and Emergency
Services, and myself, is that the action currently in the Supreme Court between the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the other parties should be set down and heard as soon as practicable by the Supreme Court. There will be no benefit or advantage to the community in setting up a Royal Commission, a committee of inquiry or a Parliamentary committee, and I will indicate shortly why that is so.

I contend that the Supreme Court is the proper place where the action should be heard; the court will determine where the responsibility lies and will assess the damages as between the parties. No other form of inquiry is capable of doing that.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Why not?

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—You are a former architect.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—I still am.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—Mr Walker is familiar with building projects, with contracts between owners, builders, architects and engineers. This is a dispute between the owner, in this case the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the architects, the engineers, the builders and various sub-contractors. The basis of their claim deals entirely with the building. It should not be overlooked that, although the building was commenced in 1973 and occupied in 1976, it was not until almost two years later that the board began to have real trouble with the cladding. It cannot be disputed that the board got the best architects that it could at the time, Mr Walker is inferring that they are not well respected architects.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—I did not say that.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—The board obtained the services of one of Melbourne's leading engineers, and the contracts were let to one of Melbourne's leading builders, E. A. Watts Pty Ltd. There was a combination of very good firms of architects, engineers and a well-known builder who had successfully constructed many buildings in this city over the years. I repeat again: The building was completed and it was occupied by the board. I will go through later the problems that then arose.

Mr White would have the House believe it was a shonky deal that was entered into from the start, that it was a cover up, but he failed to tell the House that up until two years after the board had occupied the building it could be regarded as satisfactory.

Mr White again today has shown two things; firstly, that he has a paranoid preoccupation with the Chairman of the Board of Works, Mr Croxford. Mr Croxford is a bigger man than Mr White and always will be. Secondly, Mr White has shown that he has a wild and productive imagination and, as he has done on so many occasions before, he gets a few facts, puts them together and draws some conclusions with the aid of his vivid imagination.

I shall put to the House that the Government has been consistent in asking the board to proceed with the action as soon as possible, and I will read to the House a series of letters exchanged between the chairman of the board and me. Earlier today, Mr White quoted from part of my letter to the board and appears to be trying to indicate that it was some other kind of letter.

Roughly, the sequence of events is that some two or three weeks after I was appointed Minister of Water Supply on 5 June, I had an informal discussion with the chairman of the board at a social function at which the question of settling was raised by the chairman. I repeat again: I have always been of the view, and I still am absolutely convinced, that the only way this matter can be properly settled and determined is in the Supreme Court of Victoria. There is no other alternative.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Why did you not tell the board that when you went down there?

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—I did.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—You did not tell the board at all.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—There is no other alternative that will give a satisfactory result, and when the matter is before the court, evidence from all
parties can be brought forward and tested, and I am certain that it will. It is true that the case could last at least 50 days and will cost a great deal of money. In my view, it will be one of the most complicated matters to come before the Supreme Court of Victoria in a long time. I reaffirm that I believe the Supreme Court is the proper place in which it should be heard and determined.

I was invited by the Chairman of the Board of Works to attend a meeting of the board.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—You raced straight out to your doctor afterwards, we know!

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—Mr White has had a great career. All I know is that he has done two things; he was a junior audit clerk at Price Waterhouse and Co., and his next famous appointment was as bhum boy to the then Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Doutta Galla Province)—Mr President, I believe the words that were used were offensive, and I believe the Minister should be directed by you to withdraw them.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Standing Order No. 131 reads:

No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any other Member. I call on the Minister to withdraw the offensive words.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply)—I will withdraw the words. The facts are that on 25 June I attended a meeting of the board at the invitation of the chairman. I understood I was going to the board meeting to hear a proposition for the settlement of this action. When I got there the board began to discuss the general terms of settlement and, after I had been there for ten minutes, quarter of an hour or so, and after hearing the discussion I indicated to the chairman of the board that I believed my attendance there was premature and that I would give consideration to the matter when the board came to a formal resolution on its attitude to a settlement. I then left the meeting and went back to Geelong. Any inference from the Leader of the Opposition—such as he made a few moments ago—that I went off and concluded a private deal with Mr Croxford is incorrect. I attended the meeting for a short time. I indicated that the board should come to a formal view on settlement and when it had come to that view I would consider the matter.

The next matter to which I refer is a letter from the Chairman of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, Mr Croxford, addressed to me and dated 24 July 1981, which reads:

Dear Mr Jenkins,

HEAD OFFICE BUILDING—ACTION

I refer to our previous conversations and our telephone conversation yesterday.

I confirm that the Board has discussed the without prejudice offers for the settlement of its claim against the various Defendants in respect of the recladding of its Head Office Building and it is of the view that settlement would be in the best interests of metropolitan ratepayers.

I also confirm the Board has not formally made a decision in the matter.

I further confirm your advice that before you could convey the Government's attitude in respect of a settlement, you would require the Board to formally determine its attitude to the without prejudice proposals.

For this purpose I have called a special meeting of the Board's Committee on Tuesday next to discuss the matter.

Yours faithfully, Alan H. Croxford, Chairman.

That confirms the facts that I have presented to the House. Next is a letter from the chairman of the board, Mr Croxford, addressed to me and dated 29 July 1981 which reads:

Dear Mr Minister,

HEAD OFFICE BUILDING

Further to my previous letter of the 24 July, I desire to inform you of the resolution made by the Board this day.

“The Board having received without prejudice offers of settlement in respect of the recladding and completion of its Head Office building and all claims relating thereto, is of the view that it is in the best interests of the metropolitan ratepayer for these offers to be accepted, provided that the Government confirms its support for such a settlement and also confirms that the Board will not be subject to further costs by way of continuing litigation, arbitration, public enquiry or other proceedings in respect of the completion of its Head Office building.”
Accordingly, this resolution is conveyed to you and it is requested that the matter receive your urgent attention.

Yours faithfully, Alan H. Croxford, Chairman.

On 7 August I wrote to the chairman of the board. I will read that letter in full:

Dear Mr Croxford,
Re: HEAD OFFICE BUILDING

I refer to your letter of 29th July in which you advised me that the Board resolved on that day as follows:

"The Board having received without prejudice offers of settlement in respect of the re-cladding and completion of its Head Office building and all claims relating thereto, is of the view that it is in the best interests of the metropolitan ratepayer for these offers to be accepted, provided that the Government confirms its support for such a settlement and also confirms that the Board will not be subject to further costs by way of continuing litigation, arbitration, public enquiry or other proceedings in respect of the completion of its Head Office building."

I was just repeating the terms of the board’s resolution. The important part is my reply which states:

The Government has carefully considered your Board’s resolution and believe it would be inappropriate to settle the outstanding actions and claims by negotiation.

I understand that a Supreme Court Hearing will be held later this month at which a date may be set to hear the principal action between the parties.

I would request the Board to proceed with the Supreme Court action in order that this outstanding matter can be resolved as quickly as practicable.

Yours sincerely,

GLYN JENKINS,
Minister of Water Supply

That gives the lie to some of the allegations made in this House by Mr White. It also indicates my view that the board should proceed to settlement. I have been consistent in that view. It has also been the consistent view of the Government. No deals have been done with any party. I can say that. Mr Mackenzie—by interjection—challenges what I say. I am telling this House that no deals have been done with any party. So far as I am concerned this action will be set down for hearing and will proceed as early as practicable.

Another matter adverted to by Mr White was that there were discussions between the Chairman of the Board of Works and the Executive of the State Parliamentary Labor Party. I make it clear from the outset that those discussions took place or were initiated without my knowledge or concurrence. Mr Croxford took that action on his own behalf. I did not concur with it. If he had asked me before he undertook that action, I would have expressed the view that he should not have done it.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Another cover-up.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. M. Campbell)—Order! The Minister should be allowed to present his case.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—Today members of the Opposition have no regard for the integrity of honourable members on this side of the House. I have made it clear in this House that I value my integrity very much. If anyone can prove that the statements I may make in this debate are incorrect, I will resign as Minister of Water Supply. I value my integrity.

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. M. Campbell)—Order!

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—I value my integrity and I do not take lightly allegations made by Mr Landeryou, Mr White or any member of the Opposition that I may make statements to this House that are incorrect. I will stand by them and continue to stand by them.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Why should not Mr Croxford talk to the Labor Party? I am waiting for you to tell me.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—I will tell the honourable member. This is a matter between the board, the engineers and architects concerned with the erection of the building. The settlement of this action is not a political matter.

The Hon. D. R. White—Tell that to the ratepayers.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—Mr White can have his view. My view is that settlement is not a political matter. It is a business matter between the Board of Works, its builders, engineers and architects. The board is entitled to have a building completed to specifications so that it can be secure in the know-
lodge that the building is a good building. That is a reasonable attitude for the board to adopt. It is entitled to take legal action to ensure that occurs.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Why do you think Mr Croxford spoke to the Labor Party?

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—I have no idea. He did it without my concurrence. I have no idea why Mr Croxford talked to the Labor Party.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—You were talking about integrity.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—I have no idea—

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Why don't you make all the documents available?

The sitting was suspended at 6.28 p.m. until 8.4 p.m.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—Prior to the suspension of the sitting I was going to advert to two letters: One from the Chairman of the Board of Works and my reply to that letter. I shall indirectly refer to two other letters, which I will make available to the House, but I will not take up the time of the House and read those other two letters. I want to read these letters to the House because I want to give the lie to the allegations made by Mr White that a giant fraud or cover-up has been perpetrated by the Board of Works and the builders in which the Government is directly involved. I will read from a letter dated 27 July 1981, from the Chairman of the Board of Works, Mr Croxford. That letter states:

Dear Mr Jenkins,

HEAD OFFICE BUILDING

I refer to my prior advice that the Board had conferred with the Sub-Committee of the Executive of the State Parliamentary Labor Party and now enclose copy of a letter dated the 24th instant from the Leader of the Opposition in respect of the matter.

I am not sure what is meant by the phrase "regarding the terms and conditions of settlement until such time that a full Government disclosure of all the relevant facts are made known" means.

You will recall that I indicated to you that during the conference with the Sub-Committee, its members advised that they did not want any information which, to use their phrase, was "not on the record" and stated that they were not prepared to receive the terms of the offers on the same Without Prejudice basis as the offers were received by the Board.

In respect of the nature of the Without Prejudice offers made to the Board, I enclose copy of a self-explanatory letter which I have forwarded to Mr Wilkes.

I will make these letters available to the House.

My reply to that letter from Mr Croxford is dated 5 August 1981 and it states:

Dear Mr Croxford,

Re: HEAD OFFICE BUILDING

I refer to your letter of 27 July 1981, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from the Leader of the Opposition dated 24 July and your reply to him dated 27 July 1981.

It should be noted that the discussions between yourself as Chairman of the M.M.B.W. and the Members of the Executive of the State Parliamentary Labor Party were initiated by you without my knowledge or concurrence.

I made it clear from the outset that the Government did not wish to intervene in the negotiations by the Board concerning the satisfactory completion of its Head Office building, until the Board passed a formal resolution on the matter.

In his letter to you of 24 July the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Frank Wilkes, indicates that the Labor Party "is not in a position to make a judgment regarding the terms and conditions of settlement until such time that a full Government disclosure of all the relevant facts are made known". As I pointed out earlier, I have consistently maintained that a formal recommendation from your Board was to be made to me before the Government would make a decision on the matter.

As your Board has now recommended a course of action to me, I anticipate conveying a decision to you shortly.

Yours sincerely,

GLYN JENKINS,
Minister of Water Supply

I have read those letters into Hansard to indicate that I was unaware that the Chairman of the Board of Works had initiated those discussions with the Australian Labor Party. I was aware of those discussions after they occurred and the chairman and I discussed the matter on at least one or two occasions. However, the chairman initiated those discussions with the Australian Labor Party without my knowledge or concurrence.

Mr White has made seventeen points, which he believes form the basis for the appointment of a Parliamentary
committee. I am arguing that a Parliamentary committee is not an appropriate body to determine this matter.

Mr White's allegations should be tested in the Supreme Court and the blame, if any, should be properly allocated and the damages payable by the parties should be properly assessed by the Supreme Court. I repeat: No other committee of inquiry, board of inquiry or Parliamentary committee is capable of determining the matter.

I want to traverse the history of the Board of Works building, because a couple of the alleged facts that Mr White gave to the House appear to be incorrect. The matter dates back to 1964, when the Board of Works resolved to proceed with the erection on its site at the corner of Little Collins Street and Spencer Street of a multi-storey structure constituting its head office, which would contain the central core of its management and administration.

In November 1967—almost fourteen years ago—the Board of Works authorized architects of long standing—then known as Perrott Lyon Timlock and Kesa—to prepare detailed drawings, designs and specifications for the provision of such a head office building. Thereafter, on 14 October 1969, a particular proposal submitted by the architects was approved by the Board of Works and the authority was given to invite tenders for the erection of the building and for the provision of ancillary services. In October 1969, the Board of Works proceeded to authorize the architects to proceed with the design of the building that they had outlined.

On 4 August 1970 the board resolved, in terms of its Act, to accept the lowest and most advantageous tender received for the erection of the head office building. That was from E. A. Watts Pty Ltd for $11,684,664 plus $210,000 provision money. The works comprised in the building agreement were duly commenced and continued to the stage that a practical completion certificate in respect of the greater part of such works was issued by the architect on 24 August 1973. The contract was let on 4 August 1970 and the building was completed, to all intents and purposes, on 24 August 1973.

Immediately thereafter the board entered into occupation of the building. A final certificate has not been issued to the builder and it is still held by the board that the builder is responsible for the completion of the repair work under the original contract. On the matter of cladding, during December 1975, more than two years after the board had occupied the building, and again early in 1976, it became increasingly apparent that a number of basalt slabs constituting the cladding had not been properly erected. While the defects which were observed were made good, a more extensive system of observation by the consulting engineers, Irwin Johnston and Partners Pty Ltd, was introduced by the then architects, Perrott Lyon Timlock and Kesa, and to the extent then possible, measures were taken to secure slabs appearing on inspection to be defective. These defects became known more than two years after the board occupied the building.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—that is absolute nonsense.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. M. Campbell)—Order! If Mr Landeryou wants to participate, he can make an independent speech.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—the Minister should answer my interjections.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT—Order! The Minister does not need to answer any question; that is not covered in the Standing Orders.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—I make the point that when these defects became known, more than two years after the board has occupied the building, Irwin Johnston and Partners Pty Ltd were introduced to investigate and recommend the steps that ought to be taken. It became clear that there were serious defects in the provision and erection of the cladding, which seemed to be fairly general in occurrence and that it was the presence of such defects which affected the stability of the cladding. One of such defects was,
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in the view of the then architects, the failure to remove the spaces used to separate slabs pending the insertion of the appropriate material to allow for the expansion and contraction of the stone and of its support.

This defect led to the discovery of other defects which, although not as extensive and fundamental, were of a serious nature. In addition to works of a preventive, although not of a finally remedial nature which were carried out on the building, steps were taken both by the board and the relevant authorities to protect members of the public from possible injury. These included the provision of barricades, awnings and the like and the closing off to traffic of both Little Collins Street and Francis Street. The board consulted both an architect, Bates Smart and McCutcheon Pty Ltd and a consulting engineer, Hardcastle and Richards Pty Ltd, each an incorporated body of both standing and experience, on a number of matters which related to the behaviour of the building. The board brought in new consulting architects and consulting engineers to give it advice on the problems that had arisen. This is a perfectly proper course of action for a responsible authority to take.

At about that time, Perrott Lyon Timlock and Kesa resigned as architects under the building contract. That resignation was effective on 19 May 1976. In the light of the resignation of the architects, Bates Smart and McCutcheon Pty Ltd, and the consulting engineers, Hardcastle and Richards Pty Ltd, were then asked to consider and report on what work of a remedial nature should be undertaken in order that the board should have a building of the character and quality it believed it had commissioned. That was a reasonable request.

I interpolate that the board, having regard to what in the light of the advices given to it was the provision of a building not of the required quality or standard, then instituted legal proceedings designed to recover the costs of or associated with the making good of the building. These proceedings which are inevitably bound up with the carrying out of remedial works are still before the Supreme Court for hearing and determination. Calling in the experts and immediately instituting legal proceedings to recover any additional costs that might arise in making the work good, is, again, a responsible action by a public authority.

After extensive consideration, consultation and examination of the remedial measures needed and the existing and alternative types of cladding the architects, Bates Smart and McCutcheon Pty Ltd, who were appointed in July 1975, recommended that, subject to some additional investigations which had already been commenced, metallic cladding should be adopted and in February 1977 the architects confirmed their earlier recommendation.

Mr White asked on what basis the new form of cladding was undertaken or approved by the board. The answer is there. It was recommended by the new architects, Messrs Bates Smart and McCutcheon. It was done after consideration of the available alternatives to repair the existing bluestone cladding and other alternatives.

My understanding is that as to the costs there was not a wide variation between making good the building and completely re-cladding the building with a new metallic cladding. Among the criteria forming the bases of the architect's recommendation were the following: The solution must be long-term and must not downgrade the board's investment; secondly, the capital cost should be as low as possible, consistent with the other criteria.

In the meantime, as it was clear that scaffolding components would be required, the board's advisers considered the options and following their recommendation it was resolved that it would be more economical to purchase the scaffolding components rather than hire the same. Tenders were invited and following consideration a contract was entered into with S.G.B. Building Equipment Pty Ltd for the sum of $144 073 plus $21 610 provision money. This contract was subsequently varied.
at a further cost of $229,700 to enable works to proceed on two facades of the building simultaneously. In addition, specialized corner scaffolding for the columns has been supplied by G.F.C. through the builder Watts. After due consideration of the architect's submission, on 8 March 1977 the board resolved that aluminium cladding should replace the existing basalt cladding, that the architect should take such steps as were necessary to enable tenders to be called for the supply and erection of the aluminium cladding, and that the tenderer would be a sub-contractor of the building contractor, E. A. Watts.

Following the decision of the board that aluminium cladding should replace the basalt, further investigations took place and the requisite sub-contract papers were prepared. Tenders were then invited for the design, fabrication, supply and erection of aluminium cladding. On 6 December 1977 the board resolved to accept the tender for the approved sub-contract works which had been recommended by the architects, Bates Smart and McCutcheon. The contract accepted was that of Dowell Australia Ltd for $3,148,834, plus $845,000 special and general provision money and the estimated total cost was $3,993,834.

Basically, the approved sub-contractor—"approved" because the prior approval of the board to the builder entering into the sub-contract was required—was a performance contract in which the sub-contractor bore the responsibility for design and erection, having regard to the conditions to which the sub-contract works would be subject. The terms of the approved sub-contract required the preparation by the sub-contractor of prototype drawings and the submissions and subsequent examination of these by the architects or at their requirements, by the consulting engineer.

Following approval in principle of the submitted drawings, authority was given for the manufacture of the prototype, its installation and ultimate testing. This testing was in the approved sub-contract, scheduled to be completed by mid-July 1978 and no substantial delay occurred in this regard. These were the delays to which Mr White referred. The submitted prototype, having satisfied the required tests, attention was given to the welding procedures which were to be adopted by the sub-contractor. This was an important aspect because the board and its architects and engineers had to ensure that the affixing of the cladding to the building was 100 per cent.

In arriving at those procedures, two matters had to be taken into consideration—the welding of the aluminium panels, which were to comprise the cladding of the building was to be in conformity with Australian Standards for the Welding of Aluminium—AS 1665, sometimes referred to as "the Code", and the outward faces of panels to be erected should be free from distortion, disfiguration or other imperfections. That is a reasonable request.

From August, 1978, the sub-contractor devoted a good deal of attention to the establishment of a welding procedure which would satisfy the obligations imposed by the approved sub-contract. Some difficulties were experienced and while the sub-contractor continued its efforts there was in the opinion of the board's advisers no consistent welding of the required standard.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—This led to the delay.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—Responsible architects and engineers have given advice to the board and they are entitled to investigate procedures until they find one that is satisfactory in every respect.

Discussions took place between the board's architect and its consulting engineers on the one hand and the sub-contractor and its advisers on the other and subsequently between those parties and the builder. By April, 1979, it was apparent that quite substantial disagreement had arisen both as to the applicability of certain portions of AS 1665, "the Code", as to the effectiveness of the panels produced by the sub-contractor and as to the achievement of the general requirements of
the approved sub-contract. These differences were fundamental, and were matters of substantial concern to the respective parties.

The existence of the disagreement and the requirements which the board’s architect felt constrained to impose had the effect of halting the erection of panels. Some time was spent by the architect, the consulting engineers and officers of the board on the one hand and officers of the builder and sub-contractor and their respective advisers on the other in efforts to reach agreement as to the standards applicable and the requirements to be observed. On not less than three occasions—17 July, 4 September and 16 October 1979—possible solutions were submitted to the board for approval and, although approved in principle by the board, were found to be not generally acceptable to the other parties.

The board made its position abundantly clear. It was not prepared to embark upon remedial work unless it was satisfied that the works would comply with the standard which its advisers believed should be maintained. It was the general view of the board’s officers and advisers that the inability to reach a compromise between the board, the builder and the sub-contractor could adversely affect each of such parties and could further delay the execution of necessary works. Further losses would be inevitable. Following examination by officers of the board and discussions with and tests carried out by its advisers, it was generally considered that a solution might lie in the board—which had been concerned with welding over a long period— itself carrying out the actual welding. Further discussions between the parties led to the formulation of a change in the sub-contract works whereby the board executes the actual welding. Provision for this change was incorporated in a supplementary agreement executed by the board, the builder and the sub-contractor respectively on 18 December, 1979.

The point in making that information available to the House is that the board, with its architects, engineers and advisers, was constantly seeking a satisfactory solution to the methods by which the building would be re-cladded, having regard to the fact that the original basalt slabs and the methods of affixing and constructing had been deemed to be satisfactory. Within all those discussions and negotiations in an endeavour to achieve a satisfactory result, there is no basis for calling for the appointment of a Parliamentary committee, which is the general thrust of the submission by Mr White today.

I refer to the costs. Mr White correctly said that to 30 June 1981 the board had incurred costs of $8.5 million. I will outline to the House those costs: In 1975–76, $221,798; 1976–77, $585,413, 1977–78, $2,134,828; 1978–79, $1,766,112; 1979–80, $1,177,946; and last year $2,632,903.

The board has been working, firstly, to strip the building of the unsatisfactory basalt cladding and, subsequently, in devising ways and means by which the building could be re-cladded to an acceptable standard. The amount of $8.5 million has not been added to the rates of the board’s ratepayers. This amount is shown in the balance-sheet under deferred payments and will be published in the board’s statements for the year ended 30 June 1981 as expenditure on remedial works for the head office building. The costs of making this building good have not affected the level of rates charged by the board.

On the question of rating, it was interesting that earlier this year—in May—Mr White, in his usual style, made the wildest allegations about the probable level of rating in the current year. Those allegations were outrageous and similar to those Mr White normally makes and they were not found to be true. In effect, the board’s rates increased 9.2 per cent this year compared with last year and, if inflation is considered, that is less than the average rate of inflation. There again is another example where Mr
White, as he has on many occasions and on many issues, has made the wildest allegations that were subsequently determined to be untrue.

The two cases are currently before the Supreme Court. As I indicated earlier, the first action commenced in 1975 and the second in 1976 and they have now been combined. The matter is between the board, certain defendants, certain third parties and certain fourth parties. I reiterate, as I have maintained consistently in the debate, that is where the matter ought to be settled.

I shall deal with a number of allegations made by Mr White as the basis on which a Parliamentary committee should be established. I have made a note that he said the bluestone began to fall in December 1973. The summary I have given to the House shows that that is incorrect. The board was in occupation of the building for more than two years before these major faults became obvious. Mr White queried why the work was not properly supervised. As I indicated earlier, the board engaged well-known and competent architects, engineers and the building firm, E. A. Watts Pty Ltd was awarded the contract. When the building was completed there was nothing to indicate that those decisions were incorrect. Again, there is no basis on that flimsy excuse for the setting up of a Parliamentary committee.

Mr White said the building was out of vertical alignment. He did not indicate what he meant by that; it was almost a throwaway line. I do not know what he is referring to, but it does not appear in any of the notes I have been given in regard to this building. It is possible that in certain areas the building may be out of alignment, but I am not aware of the details.

Mr White said that the building does not conform to the Uniform Building Regulations. Again, that is a throwaway line to try to boost a weak case. Mr White gave no evidence to the House of the way in which the building did not conform with the Uniform Building Regulations. I should have thought that, if we were going to substantiate this argument, he would have given the House the reasons why the building did not conform with the Uniform Building Regulations.

Mr White said that the original builder who was responsible for the shoddy workmanship was given the opportunity of doing the repairs and was paid for so doing, and he put this up as a reason why a Parliamentary inquiry ought to be set up. The facts are that the board carefully assessed this matter, and Mr R. Brook- ing, Q.C., as he then was, advised the board that in principle the builder should be given the opportunity of carrying out the remedial work unless considered to be incapable of properly so doing. To change the builder might have added substantially to the time within which the remedial work could be executed and to the difficulty of securing a new builder at a contract price which did not contain a substantial loading by reason of the work to be done being largely that of making good defects in an existing building.

In my experience as a liquidator and trustee in bankruptcy I have been faced with that position. The question is whether one continues with the present builder or gets in a new builder. Mr Walker would know the problems which arise in that situation. The board considered the matter carefully. It got legal advice from Mr R. Brook- ing, Q.C., and on that basis it agreed that E. A. Watts Pty Ltd should proceed with the building. It was not a decision taken lightly; it was a considered and responsible decision by the board in the light of the advice it was given. Again, certainly no reason has been put forward for the setting up of the committee.

The next point is rather interesting. Mr White in his seventh point tried to convince the House that the Dowell firm was not a competent contractor, yet Mr White's twelfth point stated that arbitration with Dowells is also pending and that "they have a persuasive case; if Dowells win, the board will have to pay substantial sums".
In the seventh point Mr White alleged that Dowells was not competent in the field, yet in his twelfth point he tried to convince the House that that firm had a persuasive case. Either Dowells were or were not competent contractors, and in the view of the architects, engineers and advisers to the board, they were competent, so he cannot have it both ways.

The next basis on which Mr White argued for the setting up of a Parliamentary committee was that the individuals involved rearranged their assets and stripped their assets from the companies that undertook the work. Who is going to control that situation? No one can control it. No Parliamentary committee of inquiry can have any effect on those arguments. The facts are that those people undertook the work, but if they subsequently stripped the assets, no one could have stopped them from doing so. Mr White did not argue the merits or demerits of that proposition. He merely told the House that that was one of the bases on which it should investigate the matter.

He made a further point by saying that the board had not inquired whether Standard Quarries (Masonry) Pty Ltd, a sub-contractor, had adequate insurance against negligence. I do not know why, but I understand that at that time negligence insurance was difficult to get. It was not as common as it is today, and claims for negligence were not as popular as they are today. It is another case where Mr White, with the advantage of hindsight, is trying to apply the rules of today to many years ago; he is being wise after the event.

I have indicated before that the ratepayers have not footed the bill for the repairs to the Board of Works building. Mr White made the allegation under point No. 11 that this accounts for the escalating rate bill of the Board of Works; that is not a fact.

His next point was that Mr Croxford had said in a statement to the Age in 1976 that the ratepayers would not pay one cent of the cost of the repairs. Mr White did not bring the actual quotation to the attention of the House. There again, it was a throwaway line to try to bolster his case. I have not seen the report; I question its accuracy.

I understand that the chairman of the board said that he hoped to recover all the costs from the action, and if that were so there would not be any cost to the ratepayers. Mr White did not say that; he just made a bland statement that Mr Croxford had made a specific statement. He did not quote anything; he just gave another throwaway line.

I have already covered the next point on the question of Dowells and have referred to the inconsistency between an earlier point Mr White made and point No. 12.

Mr White then said as a basis for this proposed Parliamentary inquiry that the firm of E. A. Watts Pty Ltd could cause dissension on the site because it has a cost-plus contract and will not be prejudiced by delays. That is a strange allegation for Mr White to make.

The Hon. D. R. White—That is what Clare said to us that he would do—if it was not settled he would cause industrial disruption.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—If it can be proved that the builder was causing industrial disruption or inciting the workers to go on strike, he would not be entitled to payment. Mr White knows that.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—You do not understand contracts too well, do you?

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—I understand contracts well enough, but that was a broad statement that the builder was going to incite his workers to go on strike, and that was some form of threat.

I shall go briefly over the rest of the points. Mr White said that the American Home Assurance Co. on 27 February 1981 denied liability to indemnify the architects on their professional indemnity policy. As I understand it, the architects have two policies. There is some dispute on whether the architects were covered or not. Is this a basis on which the matter ought to go before the committee?
The Hon. D. R. White—It is the responsibility of the board to ensure that it is properly covered before it issues a big contract.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—Again, years later, with all the facts before him, with the benefit of hindsight, with Mr White’s paranoid ability to put the worst possible complexion on a matter, Mr White alleges that the board was negligent in this matter. Whether the architects succeed against the American Home Assurance Co. will be a matter ultimately for the courts when action is taken by the architects against the insurers. We do not know at this stage whether they will be successful or not.

Mr White then went on about the board’s insurance fund meeting some of the costs. The insurance fund may meet some of the costs; I do not know if it will do so. The board is a self-insurer and prudently has set aside substantial funds to meet insurance claims. From memory, the board has a substantial fund of about $15 million set aside. I will check the figure later. Nothing about that could give rise to an inquiry and, once again the board has made prudent provision for claims which may arise.

Earlier Mr White alleged that it was unnecessary. The Labor Party will be attempting to filch some of the funds of the ratepayers of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. That money will be put into the Victorian Development Bank which is known in Liberal circles as the “Jolly Bank” from its author Mr Rob Jolly. The Labor Party will amuse itself playing with the money of the Victorian ratepayers.

Mr White then made allegations about a Mr Graham Clare of Fletcher Watts, and alleged that he had discussions with the Labor Party. The Government had nothing to do with the discussions between Mr Clare and the Labor Party or any offers he may have made, inferred or sought. In his curious way Mr White has somehow chosen to associate the actions of Mr Clare directly with the Thompson Government and with me as Minister. No evidence has been brought forward to substantiate this, and once again it is a paranoid insinuation.

I have been a member of this Parliament for eleven years. Mr White has not been here quite that long but over the years he has repeatedly made insinuations. I do not know whether the reason is that the moon is in a certain position on those occasions. He has criticized the Board of Works, the Housing Commission, Ministers of this Government, the State Electricity Commission and the Forests Commission, whilst quietly on the side, Mr White, Mr Jolly, Mr Crabb and a few others have been plotting the downfall of their former Leader. Mr White has never denied that. He talks about plotting but honourable members know who was involved in the plot against his former Leader, in conjunction with the Socialist left and Mother Coxedge.

When dealing with the subject of plotters, honourable members realize that this Chamber must have the epitome of plotters in Mr David White who, while pretending in the party room to be the friend of his Leader, was insidiously working against him and undermining him. On the day when the former Leader of the Labor Party introduced the policy on which a future Labor Government might be laid, and a document was issued—“Preparing for Government: Financial Management and Economic Strategy” for the Australian Labor Party—with a picture of Mr Frank Wilkes on the front cover and, as the Leader of the party, a ceremony was held at the Wentworth Hotel at 2 p.m. However, the night before, or the night before that, the Socialist left had planned Mr Wilkes’s downfall and, by dinner time, Mr Wilkes was on the way out. This document is a first-day cover. It will become a collector’s item. I intend keeping it because it will have considerable historical value. In the morning Mr Wilkes was cock of the walk, and by dinner time he was shot down by the Socialist left.

The Labor Party proposes to set up the “Jolly Bank”, known officially as the Victorian Development Bank,
known also as “dealers in funny money”—the people’s money. It is stated that funds will be extracted from the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. Members of the Labor Party have their beady little eyes on the reserves of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works which, according to page 105 of their document, on 30 June 1980 amounted to $163.1 million. The Labor Party talks about prudent management, but it will force the Board of Works to get rid of the ratepayers’ money to the “Jolly Bank”.

I shall bring to the attention of the House the investments of the board. As at 30 June 1981 the total investments of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works were $164 million. Of that, $32.2 million were in long-term investments and $131.95 million were in short-term investments. Those are the funds that Mr Jolly wishes to get hold of. That money will be grabbed and invested in health, social welfare and education programmes. The Labor Party talks about getting the economy moving again. It will extract the money from the working section of the economy and invest it elsewhere. Mr Jolly will immediately take 50 per cent of that $131.95 million.

On 1 July 1981, the very day after those figures were announced, the board had to pay out more than $31 million of that money in interest and loan redemptions. Over the next six to eight weeks to the end of August, about $65 million of those reserves was required by the board to pay its expenses and to continue its works, until the current rates came in. Therefore, about $96 million was required.

Mr Jolly might be a good economist but I do not think he knows much about banking or accounting. As part of the policy of the Labor Party to get this State moving, as outlined in the Wilkes first-day cover document, the Labor Party will take money from all the authorities in Victoria. Worse still, it will force the authorities to sell their investments, which will mean a flood of semi-government investments on the market. Mr White might laugh, but I am stating the net effect of what will happen. The Labor Party will force authorities throughout Victoria to sell their marketable securities. It is believed that the total amount involved is the rate of $1500 million, which will be sold at about $300 million a year. There is no doubt that in the current economic climate and with the current interest rates, these investments will be sold at a loss. Commonwealth long-term bonds with a yield of 5.25 per cent are selling for 56 cents in the dollar.

The Labor Party claims it will force the Board of Works to sell its marketable securities, but who will make up the loss? Mr Landeryou sits there in his tubby little fashion and chortles away, but he has obviously not applied his mind to the problem. It seems that none of the members of the Labor Party have applied their minds to the practical financial effects of the policies they have put forward. Those policies would certainly have a substantial effect on the Board of Works, of which Mr White has been critical over the years. It would be forced to sell its investments at a loss, but who would repay the money to the board’s ratepayers; who would repay the money to the superannuation fund; who would repay the long service leave moneys that have been set aside for the benefit of the workers employed by the Board of Works? There is not a word about any of that in this airy fairy doctrine that has been set down by Mr Jolly and his cohorts.

Members of the Labor Party would have us believe that they have the solution to these problems. They have not. They would have the people of Victoria believe that they can do a better job of managing Victoria than the Liberal Government, but what would they do? Mr White would destroy the whole structure of statutory authorities and other Government bodies. He would sack Mr Trethowan and everybody else at the State Electricity Commission; he would sack the Chairman of the Gas and Fuel Corporation; he would sack everybody connected with the Housing Commission; and he has said today that he would
sack everybody connected with the Board of Works. What the Labor Party is doing is signalling to the Public Service that it has absolutely no confidence in the Public Service. In order to promote political argument, at every opportunity members of the Labor Party denigrate not only the senior public servants of Victoria but also the Public Service itself. It is a trait of members of the Labor Party to act in that manner, and it is certainly typified by Mr White.

Mr Mackenzie is yelling out, but I can produce a copy of the Geelong Advertiser in which there is a report of his attacking members of the Public Service. He denigrated the Public Works Department. It was not a specific attack, he simply attacked the entire staff of the Public Works Department as a pack of inefficient no-hopers. He was forced to withdraw those comments to some extent when the Public Works Department did a marvellous job following a fire at a school in the province represented by Mr Mackenzie and myself.

Mr White has sheeted home all the blame for the whole exercise to the Chairman of the Board of Works, Mr Croxford. He carefully refrained from mentioning that the board includes other members. For the benefit of honourable members, I shall enumerate them. The Government nominees are the Chairman, Mr Croxford, Mr J. W. Keck and Mr J. B. King. There are also area chairmen, who are elected by area commissioners.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—It is a typical Liberal gerrymander.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS—That is not so. I went to the Board of Works this afternoon to conduct the election of two chairmen for the central and western region and the southern region. The election was successful. Other members of the board must also take responsibility. If they are prepared to accept the salary, they must also be prepared to accept the responsibility that goes with being a member of the board.

I am aware that Mr Croxford can be autocratic and difficult to deal with, but it cannot be said that he has sole responsibility for the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. Mr A. A. McCutcheon is an area commissioner and he is a well-known member of the Labor Party. He is to be the Labor Party candidate for St Kilda at the next election. Is Mr White saying that Commissioner McCutcheon has not undertaken his duties properly? Mr McCutcheon was first appointed on 17 June 1976, so he has been a party to most of the decisions made by the board about which Mr White has been so critical. His present term expires on the 30th of this month and today he was re-elected and reappointed for a further term of four years. His salary is $7329 a year. He, together with the other board members, Mr K. E. Miller, Mr A. R. Paterson and Mr F. G. Cox, as well as the chairman and the two Government nominees, share joint responsibility for the board. It is quite wrong for Mr White to suggest that Mr Croxford has sole responsibility for everything done by the board. The commissioners accept their appointments and accept their salaries, and they must also accept responsibility for running the board.

Mr White moved an amendment in the following terms:

That the following words be added to the address:

but deplore that the lack of control of the Minister of Water Supply over the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works in connection with the construction of its head office building which has resulted in an inexcusable frittering of ratepayers' funds.

I have explained the way in which the matter arose and have indicated the interest I have taken as Minister, and I will continue to take that interest. There is absolutely no justification for the sort of committee for which Mr White has called. It might be a great political exercise for the Labor Party but, as I said at the outset of my remarks, this is a building dispute between the Board of Works, as the owner and proprietor of the building, the expert engineers, architects and advisers it engaged, and the reputable firm of builders, E. A. Watts Pty Ltd.
Mr White has not suggested that there was anything wrong with the arrangements made at the outset. The fact that the cladding of the building has proved to be unsatisfactory has given rise to the dispute between the board and the other parties, and action has been taken to obtain a judgment or settlement in the Supreme Court. There is no other way in which the matter can be handled satisfactorily. I completely reject the call for a Parliamentary committee to examine the matter.

The Hon. R. J. LONG (Gippsland Province)—By way of anti-climax, I shall return to the motion. Mr White completely ignored the motion calling for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. This debate gives members an opportunity of putting forward constructive matters for consideration by the Government.

Before I deal with specific matters, I desire to reaffirm my allegiance and the allegiance of the great majority of the electors of Gippsland Province to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. I am sure we all look forward to meeting Her Majesty, if possible, when she is in Melbourne for the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. I also thank His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Winneke, and Lady Winneke. Through dedication and service they have endeared themselves to the people of Victoria.

It was with some sadness that I realized that the Governor’s Speech probably represents the last he will make in this place because of his impending retirement. In his Speech, His Excellency pointed out that the State Electricity Commission of Victoria is continuing to plan for the orderly development of power stations to meet the future needs of the State. Of course he was referring to the Latrobe Valley or the area which my colleague, Mr Taylor, and I represent in this House.

The Hon. D. M. Evans—And Mr Gallagher’s house as well.

The Hon. R. J. LONG—Yes, Mr Gallagher’s house as well! I have lived in Gippsland all my life and I well remember playing golf 25 years ago on the Traralgon golf course and being hit in the face with soot from the Yallourn power station chimney. That form of pollution ceased many years ago because of the millions of dollars spent by the State Electricity Commission on precipitators for all the chimneys. For as long as I can remember it was common for all the power stations in the Latrobe Valley to emit inversions which spread a layer of low cloud and other emissions across a wide area.

Today, from time to time, many people including academics—and, I have even heard, Mr Walker—on visiting the Latrobe Valley for the first time, notice the inversions. These people immediately complain about pollution. I can assure such people that the Latrobe Valley is a much cleaner place to live in than it was 25 years ago. Many people visiting the Latrobe Valley for the first time are amazed at its beauty and immediately point out that all the publicity has led them to believe that the valley is full of smog and other pollution which one associates with other industrial areas around the world.

In April 1980 the Latrobe Valley Ministerial Council sought a strategic plan by the State Electricity Commission to use the brown coal in the Latrobe Valley designated under the interim development order as reserved for State Electricity Commission purposes. One month later, in May 1980, the State Electricity Commission presented a task force report entitled “Latrobe Valley Power Station Siting”. The terms of reference required the task force to determine the location and extent of sites for power stations needed for orderly development within the State Electricity Commission designated coal areas, which should not prejudice access to economically recoverable coal in the long term. Despite warnings from the State Electricity Commission, the conceptual plan was taken by most people to mean that the State Electricity Commission would build 21 future power stations in the Latrobe Valley whereas the report referred only to sites for possible future power stations.
The second point that caused problems was that a number of the power stations were sited outside what we term the "State Electricity Commission area" created by the interim development orders. In fairness I should point out that the State Electricity Commission has never been in favour of building power stations on coal because it causes considerable foundation problems. Some time before the report, the Government, after investigations, proclaimed the "State Electricity Commission area" under an interim development order which imposed restrictions on future development and practically ensured that this area would be used for coal-winning purposes for the next 50 years.

Those people outside the designated areas breathed a sigh of relief and believed their properties were safe for the future. As I said, the conceptual plan identified 21 future possible power station sites and a number of sites were outside the State Electricity Commission area. With good cause, the landowners immediately complained. Since then the State Electricity Commission has endeavoured to finalize the sites of the possible power stations. For example, the State Electricity Commission put a site near Maryvale and the State Electricity Commission has been endeavouring to find another site in the nearby Tyers area. It is intended to place further restrictions on land use in relation to the future possible power sites.

One can imagine the problems faced by an estate and I shall cite an actual case. The land in question is located in the Tyers area. The executors desired to wind up the estate and advertised an auction. Some two or three days before the auction the State Electricity Commission announced that the possible site for a future power station would be on the estate property. Naturally the auction was affected and the property was not sold. The executors are faced with expenses of approximately $2000 for advertising the auction. That sort of conduct creates an injustice.

In my view the people of the Latrobe Valley would not tolerate the building of 21 power stations. One must remember that, apart from social considerations, a need would exist for vast water resources and the construction of a large number of transmission lines from the Latrobe Valley to Melbourne. Already within approximately 8 miles of both north and south of the town of Warragul seven transmission lines will be constructed with provision for two more. That area already supports an oil pipeline and two gas pipelines.

The Loy Yang power station is under construction and the Government, as we all know, is considering the construction of a further power station at Driffield. If another future site or perhaps two were designated at this time or in the near future that should take Victoria through to the year 2020. I leave aside the possibility of other forms of power generation. That would free nineteen possible sites and give those affected landowners some peace of mind. It is time the Ministerial Council carried out a review of the areas designated by the existing interim development order and future power station sites so that some certainty can be engendered for landowners in the Latrobe Valley.

His Excellency also mentioned the progress being made on the construction of the Tanjil dam, which is mainly required to provide cooling water for the Loy Yang and the Driffield power stations. I have been involved with the land acquisitions at Loy Yang and am now involved in land acquisitions for the Tanjil dam, commonly called the Blue Rock dam, Driffield, the State Electricity Commission designated areas and the acquisition of easements for a transmission line from Hazelwood near Morwell to Cranbourne.

I believe I can speak with some authority on the question of compensation payable to landowners whose land is acquired. I have always believed that if the State wants my property for any community purpose I should be fully and adequately compensated. Of course, no amount of money would adequately compensate any persons
who are forced to uproot themselves and move to other areas because the State requires their properties. However, at least we should try to make the transition as comfortable as possible and compensation is the main tool available to us.

I will give the House an example. Imagine a man and his wife who have laboured all their lives on a farm. They have a nice house, garden and so on, and everything on the farm is laid out as required. The farm is free of debt, and they have reached the age of, say, 60 years. An acquiring authority says, "We want your property for community purposes". I have seen the traumatic effect of a notice to treat upon people like that. They have to uproot themselves and move to another farm. The compensation they receive will not buy an equivalent property. They may have to borrow money to buy another property and incur a debt which they do not want at that stage of their lives—all of this at a time when they want to slow down. I can understand the mental effect of a notice to treat upon any landowner.

In fairness, I say of the people who have land over coal that I have never heard one of them complain about the fact that the State Electricity Commission may want to mine the coal under their land, but they expect reasonable and sensible compensation. Landowners who receive a notice to treat cannot carry out proper negotiations. They feel unequal; they feel that a gun is being held at their head, and the State can pull the trigger, if necessary. I believe an acquiring authority should not have to start by serving a notice to treat, as a first step. The legislation should provide that an acquiring authority can negotiate the purchase, as a first step. If the landowner is unreasonable or proper progress is not being made, then a notice to treat could be served to take effect from the time the first approach to the landowner was made. Currently, an acquiring authority is obliged to serve a notice to treat in order to fix the date of valuation of a property. When an offer of settlement has not even been made more than eighteen months after service of the notice to treat, it creates difficulties. There are numerous cases in the Blue Rock area, in the Cranbourne-Hazelwood power line area, in the State Electricity Commission's area and in the Driffield area where a period of more than eighteen months has elapsed and still no compensation has been paid. To be fair, I know that not all the fault lies with the State Electricity Commission but the stage has been reached where ways and means of speeding up the payment of compensation must be devised.

Again, the Lands Compensation Act provides that an additional amount not exceeding 10 per cent of the market value of the land, as the Minister thinks just to offer by way of solatium because of the compulsory nature of the acquisition, shall be paid. Solatium does not cover any amount awarded in consideration of disturbance; it is assessed in respect of imponderable factors arising from the compulsory nature of the acquisition. In the words of Mr Justice Barber of the Victorian Supreme Court, solatium means a sum of money or other compensation given to a person to make up for loss or inconvenience. It is awarded to cover inconvenience and, in the proper case, distress caused by the compulsory taking or for the nuisance and annoyance resulting from the disruption of a person's business and trouble caused to him by the acquisition. It represents only the imponderables which are not specifically proveable.

A few years ago, it was common for 10 per cent to be awarded by way of solatium. As a result of the interpretation of this provision by the Department of Property and Services, an interpretation with which I am forced to agree, the department says in effect that 10 per cent should be awarded only in extreme cases, and the usual figure would be something like 5 to 6 per cent. In my view, an amount of 5 to 6 per cent is unreal, especially in relation to the acquisition of a complete farm, and should be increased considerably.

Again, the Lands Compensation Act provided for payment of an amount equal to any direct pecuniary loss
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caused by the acquisition. To take advantage of this provision, it is neces-
sary to keep a diary recording every conceivable detail, and most farmers
are not good bookkeepers.

At Loy Yang, 15 per cent of the value of the land only up to $800 an acre by way of resettlement allowance was added to the compensation in addition to the solatium. This was intended to cover such things as the depreciation of the property caused by the planning blight and the loss of profit caused by the compulsory move to another property, but 15 per cent is not large enough by today's standards. This principle should be confirmed by legislation and the amount increased.

I could go on criticizing the compensation provisions. For instance, I have not mentioned realistic interest payments on compensation moneys that are agreed to. The whole process should be speeded up instead of allowing it to drag on for years.

As I have already said, compulsory acquisition of land has a traumatic effect on landowners. The landowner has probably played his part in establishing the community in which he lives. He might have joined in community projects, such as the construction of tennis courts, the local hall or improvements to the local school grounds, and no compensation is payable for his work. He must leave those benefits behind and start anew in a fresh environment.

I make a plea to the Government to lay down principles for the payment of an amount to the Latrobe Valley municipalities in compensation for loss of rate revenue. The State Electricity Commission is a large organization in the Latrobe Valley, owning large tracts of land, and yet the municipalities are paid only an ex gratia amount to cover loss of rate revenue. The burden on private landowners is increasing. A formula must be devised to ensure that the State Electricity Commission pays fair and reasonable amounts to cover this loss of rate revenue.

In conclusion, I urge a review of the boundaries of land over coal and a statement of which lands will be required for coal winning purposes in the next 50 years. Too much land is under a planning blight at the moment. I also urge a review of the provisions relating to compensation payable for the compulsory acquisition of land, with a view to updating them. Finally, I urge the establishment of a formula so that the State Electricity Commission pays its proper portion of the rate revenue.

I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply and opposing the amendment moved by Mr White.

On the motion of the Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Geelong Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

JOINT SITTING OF PARLIAMENT
Deakin University Council; Monash University Council

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—I have received the following communication from the Minister of Education:

Dear Mr President,

The statutes relating to the universities listed below provide for the appointment by the Governor in Council of three Members of the Parliament to each of their governing council:—

- the Members to be recommended for appointment by a joint sitting of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly conducted in accordance with rules adopted for the purpose by the members present at the sitting. I should be grateful if you could arrange for such a joint sitting to recommend Members for appointment to the following vacancies:

Deakin University Council—(Deakin University Act 1974 Section 7 (1) (a))

Members vice the Honourable David Mylor Evans, MLC. Aurel Vernon Smith, Esquire MP, and Neil Benjamin Trezise, Esquire MP, for the term ending on 31 December 1985.

Monash University Council—(Monash University Act 1958 Section 7 (a) (1))

Member vice Neil Malcolm McInnes, Esquire MP (who has resigned from the Council) for the term ending on 11 December 1983.

I have addressed a similar request to the Speaker, Legislative Assembly.

Yours sincerely,
A. J. HUNT
Minister of Education
I have also received the following message from the Assembly:

Mr President,

The Legislative Assembly acquaint the Legislative Council that they have agreed to the following resolution:—
That this House meet the Legislative Council for the purpose of sitting and voting together to choose three Members of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the Council of Deakin University and one Member of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the Council of Monash University, and proposes that the place and time of such meeting be the Legislative Assembly Chamber on Tuesday next at six o'clock, with which they desire the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

S. J. PLOWMAN,
Speaker

The Hon. HADDON STOREY
(Attorney-General)—By leave, I move:

That this House meet the Legislative Assembly for the purpose of sitting and voting together to choose three Members of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the Council of Deakin University and to choose one Member of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the Council of the Monash University and, as proposed by the Legislative Assembly, the place and time of such meeting be the Legislative Assembly Chamber on Tuesday next at Six o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

It was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Assembly acquainting them with the foregoing resolution.

WILDLIFE (FEES) BILL

The debate (adjourned from September 9) on the motion of the Honourable W. V. Houghton (Minister for Conservation) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE
(Geelong Province)—The main purpose of the Bill is to raise fees in line with the Treasury direction to lift departmental fees and charges sufficiently to offset their erosion by inflation. It is a simple Bill and the Government has taken the opportunity of establishing greater relativity between the classes of licences which have a similarity. It is purely a machinery Bill.

I indicate at the outset that the Labor Party does not oppose the Bill in any way, but it is disappointed that the Government did not take the opportunity, having the Wildlife Act before the Parliament, to give some consideration to other aspects of wildlife, especially the protection of wildlife.

In discussing the relationship that the Government has to wildlife protection and the introduction of fee increases, I point out that the Labor Party expresses concern over recent events with regard to the management of wildlife in the State. I refer mainly to the recent decision by the Government to allow the commercial shooting of kangaroos in this State. This is the first time that this has occurred in Victoria and the community has learnt from press reports that in actual fact, in round figures, there are now something like 30 commercial shooters operating in Victoria and they are being paid a bounty to cull something like 30,000 kangaroos from Victoria.

Not only that, but commercial operations are being established so those carcases will be fed into the food processing area—we will see the establishment of a wildlife food processing system in Victoria. The tragedy is that the decision, which has been made by the Government, involves the destruction of what has been a normally protected species of animal in this State. The decision has been made without a proper survey being undertaken or knowledge of the existing number of kangaroos in Victoria being obtained.

From checking with the Fisheries and Wildlife Division, I can explain to honourable members exactly what has happened. The shooting of kangaroos is controlled by the Fisheries and Wildlife Division and this is by means of a wildlife destruction permit. Farmers or agents operating on their behalf are permitted to kill but not to sell the carcases of a specified number of kangaroos. By means of Part XV of the Wildlife General Regulations made under the Wildlife Act of 1975, and gazetted on 16 April 1980, the kangaroo carcases shot by an agent can be sold by him if he is the holder of a wildlife control licence.

This means that the agent can shoot kangaroos under the authority of a farmer's wildlife destruction permit.
and can sell the carcases under the authority of a wildlife control licence. However, there is not a commercial industry as such as in other States.

The wildlife control licences, applicable to other animals as well as kangaroos, were first issued about September 1980 and control is exercised over the number issued. Up to date there have been 24 such licences issued.

A meeting of conservation Ministers decided on the quota of kangaroos to be destroyed in Victoria. For the first time Victoria was included in the quota and the Minister picked out the figure of 30,000 kangaroos.

I emphasize the point that this was done without any knowledge of the number of kangaroos in this State. In answer to a question asked the other day, the Minister for Conservation verified the fact that commercial operations were under way. In my question I also asked the Minister what studies had been undertaken, and it was apparent from his answer that no study had been undertaken.

In actual fact, there appeared in the Melbourne Sun News-Pictorial on 8 July 1981, an article under the heading "Roo-kill industry is on Way", and an officer from the Fisheries and Wildlife Division explained what was going on and what was allowed to be done.

The information was made available by a Mr Dempster, who was the chief wildlife conservation officer of the Fisheries and Wildlife Division. In the course of the article Mr Dempster indicated that in shooting the kangaroos it was inevitable that pain would be caused and that it was in the best interests of the farmer to ensure that this was done as quickly as possible. Mr Dempster went on, *inter alia*:

The number of kangaroos in Victoria was unknown because no satisfactory survey had been done. Here is an admission by the chief wildlife conservation officer that the Fisheries and Wildlife Division had granted permits for the extermination of something like 30,000 kangaroos and that no satisfactory survey had been done to ascertain the number of kangaroos in the State. That is a disgraceful state of affairs. The Minister should not allow that to happen in this State and should not allow the destruction of protected animals. One could rest a little easier if one knew that it was being done by professional shooters and under the strict supervision of the Fisheries and Wildlife Division, but it is not.

Honourable members have seen on television, the cruelty that is being perpetrated on these animals by amateur shooters, and by farmers in an effort to save their crops. One can understand the farmers' point of view and the Opposition does not argue that no licences should be issued, but says it is a disgrace when this shooting is being done haphazardly, and when cruelty is being perpetrated on the animals without surveys being done. It could lead to a similar situation that occurred in Queensland, where the koala population was wiped out in six weeks in the 1930s simply because the people did not know their numbers and did not understand anything about their biology. There is now a quota system in Australia that allows for the total destruction of almost 3 million kangaroos a year. When one adds to that the numbers killed indiscriminately by farmers, and the ones unknown to the authorities, a million or so can be added to that figure.

I understand that only South Australia and Queensland have carried out surveys. There is a need for a tagging system whereby the animals that are professionally shot are tagged, and the tag remains with the carcass until it is taken to the factory. There is no tagging in Victoria. It is uncontrolled slaughter, not based on scientific evidence but is done purely at a whim, following complaints from farmers. The Government should examine this problem in the proper manner before introducing legislation.

The Labor Party would like to put forward to the Government certain ideas that it believes the Government should use in the culling and controlling of kangaroos. The slaughter of kangaroos in Victoria should not be permitted until
reliable population monitoring for each species is in operation as a part of the national population management programme. There should be no slaughter of kangaroos unless—(i) viable populations of each species are maintained; (ii) evidence of economic damage, or other damage, is established to justify the destruction of specified numbers; (iii) every carcase, skin or other product used or sold in Victoria is accounted for by a permit issued within Australia; (iv) harvesting is limited by permit to kangaroos causing economic or other damage, or facing malnutrition through over-population; (v) slaughtering for use of the carcase is carried out under hygienic conditions within the powers of meat inspection legislation, and (vi) slaughtering is carried out humanely.

The Labor Party understands that from time to time there will be a need to cull the kangaroo population, regardless of how that goes against our nature. The Labor Party understands that the numbers of kangaroos do increase, with farm lands providing extra pasture and there being a more adequate water supply than in the animal’s natural habitat. But cannot the Government base its decision on something more substantial than an odd complaint from a farmer?

The Labor Party does not oppose the Bill, but takes this opportunity of pointing out to the Government that there is a proper and correct method of slaughtering or culling the kangaroo population in this State.

The Labor Party understands that from time to time there will be a need to cull the kangaroo population, regardless of how that goes against our nature. The Labor Party understands that the numbers of kangaroos do increase, with farm lands providing extra pasture and there being a more adequate water supply than in the animal’s natural habitat. But cannot the Government base its decision on something more substantial than an odd complaint from a farmer?

The Hon. D. M. EVANS (North Eastern Province)—The National Party supports the Bill. I know that its intention is to increase fees and to obtain a greater relativity than was obtained under this Act between the various classifications and operations for which the Act sets fees.

One must be certain of the intention of the Government in setting fees; whether it is to obtain revenue to maintain an inspectorial system and to see that the proper provisions of the Act prevail or whether it is just a fund-raising exercise. I hope it is the former and not the latter, because in areas such as this the level of fees is not of sufficient volume to ensure a large amount of input to the State exchequer. Nevertheless, it can be significant in providing the necessary policing and controls that are needed from time to time.

I do not think anyone in Australia believes the various classifications for the fees set in the Bill should not be controlled in some form or another. Mr Mackenzie made the point that the destruction of kangaroos from time to time is necessary. He is correct in that, and it is a fact. I also agree that the provision of water and the farming of land in Australia has provided better food for kangaroos. A kangaroo has the facility of withholding the development of the foetus prior to its birth. It has a natural mechanism to withhold that development until feed conditions are adequate. Under the conditions that the white man has created, that is unlikely to occur. Conditions are better, and the birth rate will increase, thus providing a greater number of kangaroos.

If I see a wild animal, whether kangaroo, rabbit or whatever, in unusual places, where one does not normally expect to see them, it is a clear indication that there are a fair number of them about. I recently saw on the Hume Highway, about 25 miles from Melbourne, a dead kangaroo; that is an indication that kangaroos are coming more and more into the open. They are very shy animals, but because of over-development and their large numbers in the more remote and quieter rural areas, they are coming onto one of the busiest highways in Australia. That dead animal was still there this morning. That is a clear indication that the numbers are increasing. That takes simple observation.

The point made by interjection a moment ago that it is difficult to count kangaroos is also correct. I wish Mr Mackenzie had suggested some way in which a population count could be set down. Perhaps it could cover certain areas of the State with a count being taken at a certain time of day and season to check the number and ascertain whether there is a set standard.
The Hon. R. A. Mackenzie—They do a bird count around Australia.

The Hon. D. M. Evans—It is difficult to do a count of kangaroos. I have tried it. I find difficulty in hearing interjections.

The President (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! I suggest Mr Evans should ignore interjections; not only are they out of order but they also have nothing to do with the Bill.

The Hon. D. M. Evans—Nevertheless it is necessary to control some of the wildlife in Australia. It is easy to point to kangaroos as a fair example. I suggest there is an increasing number of kangaroos in Victoria. I cannot say kangaroos are an endangered species so it is not unreasonable that a culling programme should be carried out. May I say, with some degree of levity, that if kangaroo permits are not given to farmers they will not shoot them but a lot will have heart attacks at night.

The Hon. Joan Coxsedge—The kangaroos or the farmers?

The Hon. D. M. Evans—The kangaroos. There will be a reduction in the number of kangaroos, one way or another, until the numbers come down to a reasonable balance. It is, therefore, sensible to ensure that the culling is carried out in an orderly fashion and it is hoped that some economic return can be given for them, otherwise the kangaroo meat is wasted.

If one takes it a little further, I assume it is reasonable to say that we kill domestic animals for human consumption but at one stage they were wild. We still have wild pigs and wild sheep. Perhaps one day we will have domesticated kangaroos. It might lead to better hamburgers. I do not want to treat the Bill with too much levity. I think I have made the point that it is necessary to shoot wildlife from time to time.

The major portion of the Bill is involved with the keeping of wildlife, in many cases, by people who have a genuine affection and wish to conserve and preserve wildlife. The next point of interest is natural wildlife park licences. I notice the fee is being increased. I assume the Minister believed an equitable fee was not being charged. I believe an increasing number of people are interested in setting up wildlife parks. I know the motives of those people are generally honest and sincere but I am sometimes concerned about the standard of maintenance, of knowledge and the conditions under which animals are kept, and I would be concerned to think in terms that people should declare their property as a sanctuary in which wildlife of a particular species are not to be shot rather than to set up wildlife parks as such. That would be a more reasonable way to do it. I do not see any mention of that type of proclamation in this measure. Perhaps that is an omission.

Perhaps a small fee should be charged to register a property as a sanctuary so that it is noted and can be protected by some degree of law. I am not suggesting a high fee should be charged for what should be a privilege. Generally it is believed that the Government has the right to increase fees. None of the fees included in this Bill seem unreasonable but this is an emotional issue in which some degree of balance and common sense needs to be adopted. I was pleased to hear Mr Mackenzie moving in that direction.

The Hon. J. W. S. Radford (Bendigo Province)—As Mr Mackenzie devoted so much time to addressing the Bill, I wish to refer to the matter of kangaroos. As stated by Mr Evans, there has been an increase in the number of kangaroos in this State. Mr Mackenzie wonders whether a survey should be carried out but that would be difficult because kangaroos are moving out from more secluded areas where they are hard to count and are proving to be dangerous to themselves and road users.

As Mr Evans said, there are an increasing number of kangaroo carcasses along the roadside. I dare say a lot of damage is done to vehicles and perhaps the occupants of cars involved in collisions with kangaroos are injured as well. When one looks around many
areas, one sees damage done to crops by kangaroos. I was pleased to hear Mr Mackenzie acknowledge the effect this is having on grain growing producers because in many areas their crops are being affected by an increasing number of kangaroos.

For the first ten years I was farming I did not see any kangaroos, but thereafter I saw approximately one a year and suddenly there were dozens of kangaroos not only crossing the property but also on the property. I have received complaints from neighbours whose crops are being badly beaten down by kangaroos. Not only do they damage crops by eating them, but, also because of their physical structure, the movement of the kangaroo's tail breaks down the crop.

I know that the Minister will be using common sense when assessing the numbers that are to be culled as a result of permits issued under this measure.

Reference was made to kangaroo meat finding its way into other items of food. That matter is under a cloud at present and I think one will find that the restriction on the use of carcasses in future will be much stricter than in the past. As far as human consumption is concerned, that should be the case.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Increase in fees for licences)

The Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister for Conservation)—Mr Mackenzie's contribution to this debate indicates his concern about the destruction of kangaroos. He echoes the concern of some people in the community, many of whom do not know much about kangaroos but want them protected. That is a worthy aim. The honourable member's words criticize Victoria for the way it is handling the kangaroo problem, but his figures indicate that each year in Australia 4 million kangaroos are destroyed and his figure for Victoria was 30,000.

If one were to compare the population of kangaroos with the population of people and consider the importance of the primary industries to Victoria and the other States of Australia and if one were to compare Victoria's population of 4 million people with the population of 30,000 kangaroos, one could do nothing but praise the way in which the kangaroo problem is handled in Victoria. There is no State Government in Australia that affords more protection to kangaroos than does the Victorian Government. It would be a waste of time to conduct a survey of kangaroos in Victoria.

Anybody who lives outside the Melbourne metropolitan area would know something about the number of kangaroos in Victoria. This information would be available to any honourable member of the National Party and those honourable members on this side of the House who represent country Victoria. Those honourable members would be well aware of the large number of kangaroos that exist in Victoria and the large number of kangaroos that exist in Australia.

The Hon. K. I. M. Wright—I quoted a figure of 7000 kangaroos on one property.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—While Mr Wright was absent for part of the debate on the matter, it was indicated that in Hattah-Kulkyne National Park there are more kangaroos present than the number of kangaroos slaughtered in Victoria.

Mr Evans raised the matter of registering properties as sanctuaries and providing fees for that purpose. I take the point. Private property wildlife sanctuaries have not always been a success. Very often such sanctuaries have been used for the benefit of those people who own the properties and not for the benefit of the animals, which those sanctuaries were established to conserve. Therefore, the Fisheries and Wildlife Division is moving to a different solution to that adopted in the past of preserving areas of private property for the conservation of wild
animals. Nevertheless, what Mr Evans has said in the debate has been noted and will certainly be considered.

The Hon. D. M. EVANS (North Eastern Province)—I attempted to define the difference between a wildlife park, in which the animals may be kept under more artificial conditions.

The CHAIRMAN (the Hon. W. M. Campbell)—Is Mr Evans talking about the fees in clause 2 of the Bill? If not, I ask him to resume his seat.

The clause was agreed to.

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

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND UTILIZATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

The debate (adjourned from September 9) on the motion of the Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister for Conservation) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. E. H. WALKER (Melbourne Province)—This is a Bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Land Utilization Act 1958. It is a Bill that provides for a number of machinery changes associated with updating the Act in terms of money values and reference to public bodies and various other procedures. The Opposition welcomes the strengthening of the provisions that protect water supply and, at the same time, provide for the more flexible management of proclaimed water supply catchments and group area conservation schemes. In that regard, the Bill is timely.

The Opposition welcomes the provisions in clause 3, which formally recognize the role of the Soil Conservation Authority in salinity problems. The importance of the authority's role in the management of salinity problems cannot be too highly stressed.

The authority has been especially involved in the investigation of dryland salting. That problem has been recognized since the days of early settlement. I quote from a document entitled "Dryland Salting in Victoria" by J. J. Jenkin. It is a publication of the Soil Conservation Authority. Page 3 of that publication states:

The first record of salting was in 1853, in a letter from J. G. Robertson to Governor Latrobe, in which it was stated that saline springs were appearing in the watercourses, and that salt was killing the native grasses in the Dundas area. This was only nineteen years after settlement. The occurrence of dryland salting was also noted by Holmes, et al in 1939, but it was not until 1949 that it was formally recognised as a problem, particularly in its relationship to erosion (Downes, 1949). Following this, the Soil Conservation Authority undertook an investigation into what was then called "catchment salting" in Victoria.

I found the entire publication interesting. The notion that dryland salting has been a problem for more than 100 years has interested me. I repeat that the Opposition is pleased that the Bill will reinforce the authority's role in regard to salinity. The extent of land in Victoria affected by dryland salting has been recently estimated at approximately 100,000 hectares, which is a vast area of land.

There are various estimates of dryland salting. However, a publication of the Victorian Irrigation Research and Promotion Organization indicates at page 10 that there are two types of salting: Secondary salting of 100,000 hectares and primary salting of 120,000 hectares. The publication contains an alarming map, which indicates that non-irrigation salting—dryland salting—is extraordinarily extensive.

The map indicates that much dryland salting occurs in the north western and central areas of Victoria. The problem of dryland salting cannot be overstated. I pay tribute to the authority's work in that area.

There was some concern in the early days about whether the authority was the proper authority to undertake this work. It has proven by its work in recent times that it is the proper authority to deal with dryland salting. The authority's powers should be reinforced to deal with the problem. On page 5 of the 1980 report of the Soil Conservation Authority, it states that the area of Victoria severely affected by dryland salting is now estimated at 90,000 hectares.
That is a comparable estimate. If it is good grazing land or grazing and cropping country, one would have to value that land at between $20 million and $30 million. That is a rough estimate, but a high value of land is affected. It appears that the problem is increasing by up to 15 per cent per annum. The Opposition therefore welcomes the fact that the Soil Conservation Authority has the experience and scientific knowledge to deal with the problems and is formally given that recognition in the amending Bill.

I foreshadow that in the Committee stage I will move an amendment to clause 11. Clause 11 has been inserted in the Bill to change a situation in a way that does not please the Opposition. The changes are in regard to delegated powers. Clause 11 provides for the insertion of proposed new section 39A(1) which states:

The Minister may by writing under his hand delegate to any person any of his powers under this Act (except this power of delegation) so that the delegated powers may be exercised by the delegate with respect to the matters specified in the instrument of delegation.

That is saying that the course of administration in the Soil Conservation Authority must be altered. The delegation that usually exists is with the Minister and power is delegated to the chairman of the authority and then, normally, to his nominees. That is a proper constructual situation as it now exists. The Opposition is seriously concerned about clause 11. It is difficult to understand why the Minister should at this stage make the sort of change that would allow him directly to delegate those works. They are works that are clearly directly within the confines of the normal authority. Section 14(3)(b) states that the authority may:

employ such workmen and other persons as may be required from time to time for the carrying out of such works or the conduct of such experiments and demonstrations;

Why would the Minister want to have the direct capacity to employ such workmen? Section 14(3)(c) states:

make grants or loans of moneys on such terms as to interest and repayment as it thinks fit to any Government department public authority or person for the carrying out of specific projects in furtherance of the objects of this Act;

Those three powers are most likely to be the ones to which the Minister is referring in the transferral of the delegation of power. I consider that is an attack on the normal structuring within the authority as to who has what power.

I shall quote other powers that are included in the principal Act. Clause 17 includes a power in relation to district advisory committees. At present, the authority has the power, on the recommendation of the appropriate district advisory committee and with the approval of the Minister, to give directions in writing to any owner or occupier of land, including Crown land, for or in relation to land for the purposes of preventing soil erosion. This is an important power and a power that has been used in the past. The structure of the district advisory committee is a good structure. The original Act is correct in terms of the power offered to
the authority. Therefore, why should the Minister want to have those powers for direct delegation? It is difficult to answer. Section 23(4)(a) provides another power which could be one in which the Minister wants increased direct control. It states:

The Authority after consultation with the appropriate district advisory committee and with the approval of the Minister may from time to time by notice in writing to the owner or occupier of any land and to every Government department and public authority concerned impose in accordance with any such determination conditions on the use of such land.

That is an important power and I will not give any more examples. I wanted to point out that there is a serious erosion—I do not mean that as a pun—of the chairman’s powers in the Soil Conservation Authority. Perhaps the Minister can explain why this is so.

The Opposition cannot accept this and it is suspicious of why the Minister has the power to delegate to any person directly. The Minister should be able to delegate, but surely to persons most likely to have the interests of the Soil Conservation Authority and its clients at heart. It should be those who know the Soil Conservation and Land Utilization Act and the persons most suited to that are the chairman and his staff. Should not the delegate be the chairman himself? That is the view of the Opposition and I foreshadow that I shall move an amendment in the Committee stage relating to that power. The amendment shall suggest that the power be given back to the chairman so that the delegation of the Minister is more normally placed.

My final comment refers to the 1980 report of the Soil Conservation Authority in regard to funding. On page 35 the report contains a disturbing bar chart which charts the works and services expenditure over the past five years in such a way that the over-all bar length indicates the actual dollar value of moneys in works and services that the Soil Conservation Authority has expended in those years. It does not look bad. In 1975–76 the amount was $1·11 million in actual expenditure and the actual expenditure in 1976–77 was $1·09 million, which is not very different from the figure of the previous year. In 1977–78, the actual expenditure was $1·14 million and in 1978–79 it was $1·18 million. The last year included in the report was 1979–80 in which the expenditure was $980,000. The bars in the chart are all about the same length and within the bars in a shaded portion is the actual value of that money, taking consumer price index changes into account. In other words, it indicates the expenditure in real terms, taking account of consumer price index increases. That provides a dismal story because the real value of those moneys from 1975 had decreased from $970,000 in 1975–76 to $31,000 in 1979–80, less than one-third of the actual expenditure.

The funding situation for the authority has become critical. The authority is to be commended for such a clear demonstration of difficulties without making a big fuss about them. I make the point that the Bill does provide the reinforcement of amending powers. However, it is not being funded by this Government in a way that it can do its job well. I would like a comment from the Minister in that regard. The Opposition does not oppose the Bill, but I foreshadow an amendment to be moved to clause 11 in the Committee stage.

The Hon. D. M. EVANS (North Eastern Province)—The National Party regards the Soil Conservation Authority as an extremely important utility in Victoria. One will notice that it had its genesis in the 1940s at the time of a Country Party Government. The National Party regards the Soil Conservation Authority as an important authority. Honourable members may recall that about three years ago I moved a substantive motion dealing with soil erosion, water quality and salinity problems and suggested that the problem was developing major proportions. I pointed out many of the statistics to which Mr Walker referred to illustrate the concern of the National Party and the need for urgent remedial measures. I stated that it was a community responsibility and one that was far beyond the capacity of individual landowners. It was
then suggested, as a form of debating the matter in the House, that a Select Committee was needed to deal specifically with it and to monitor the effects of those problems.

Having expressed that opinion three years ago and having seen nothing in the interim to believe the facts placed before the National Party, and which formed the basis of concern, have altered in any way but that they have developed and increased in the manner predicted, members of the National Party still have that great concern, although they are pleased with the small moves in a general direction to improve the position.

I refer, as Mr Walker has, to the inclusion of dryland salinity works in the responsibilities of the Soil Conservation Authority. Mr Walker referred to statistics in a broad, sweeping fashion. Those statistics are alarming enough. What is even more alarming, and which does not show in the statistics, is that dryland salinity is appearing in places in which it has not appeared before. These are small areas and will not show up in the broad statistics.

The problem is not going away; it is increasing. It is appearing in areas in north-eastern Victoria and even in the Goulburn Valley adjacent to irrigation areas. Perhaps a part of the problem is that it has not been noticed before because farmers did not at first understand it, but it is there and the effects are devastating. More research is being done on the causes and ways in which it can be dealt with. It is appropriate that the Soil Conservation Authority has the power to deal with it.

At present, the National Party is reviewing its policies on conservation and land use. It is the considered view of members of the National Party that there is a real need for an increase in powers, not only for controlling the problems that are occurring but also in providing the mechanism under which assistance both financial and advisory, can be given. Also, it will provide the basis of advice under which early warning can be given to landowners so that the first remedial steps may be taken at the earliest time. Perhaps recognition is very much a problem in the beginning of dryland salinity. If that recognition were early enough, the necessary and appropriate steps could be taken to arrest the problem and contain it in the smallest possible area. Members of the National Party applaud that provision.

Clause 5 is interesting in that the occasional sub-committees that can be set up under the principal Act have hitherto consisted of three persons. The clause removes the restriction on numbers and provides that those occasional sub-committees shall hold office for no more than twelve months. That point has not been sufficiently explained, although there may well be a good reason for it.

The majority of the other provisions of the Bill appear to be fairly machinery and the National Party accepts the explanations given in the second-reading speech of the Minister that minor anomalies need to be corrected, such as those where a landholding in a particular declared area passes from one owner to another, when it is reasonable to expect that the responsibilities taken on by the original ownership are carried through exactly as if the original owner still had control. It is silly to expect a scheme operating for the benefit of the community to suddenly lose force because of a change in ownership.

I shall be interested to follow further debate on clause 11, to which Mr Walker referred. I can understand the point Mr Walker is making that the subsidiary powers that would normally have been carried out and accepted by the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority would now appear to be given to a wider group of people. It appears that if the Minister has powers that are assumed in clause 11 surely he should also have the power to delegate that responsibility if he so desires. I am not as concerned as Mr Walker because I believe the Minister reasonably can have that facility given to him.

Clause 10 provides that the amount where the authority can enter into a contract without Ministerial approval be increased from $1000 to $10,000, and that it is reasonable. It is a matter of limitations and does not commit anyone to anything. I certainly assure the House
that not much work could be done for $1000 these days, in soil conservation, earth moving or similar work. In fact, one would be hard put to get a shovel out of the shed for that money.

The Bill is a forward step. The National Party will be issuing a policy document later calling for even stronger action to be taken on soil conservation and salinity. The Bill is moving in a reasonable direction. It gives the authority greater powers and responsibilities and, I hope, some greater influence. All of these are matters that need to be done provided that they are carried out with discretion and that there is accountability. As the Minister is the responsible person, there is that Ministerial accountability.

The Hon. N. F. STACEY (Chelsea Province)—The Bill is a further development of the powers and functions of the Soil Conservation Authority. Many honourable members will recall newspaper reports in the 1940s and 1950s of the concern that existed in the area of Victoria that is now in the province of Mr Dunn and which was in danger of becoming a desert. It is due in part to the work of the Soil Conservation Authority that the land, because of improved farming practices, is not now likely to become a desert, and that it is now an important productive area of Victoria. It is always good when upon examination we look back over 30 years to see what progress has been made. In this Bill particularly one sees the improvements that farmers throughout Victoria have adopted, often as a result of the developments pioneered by the Soil Conservation Authority, and it is proper to pay tribute to the authority.

As has been mentioned by previous speakers, this amendment to the Act centres on dryland salting. I am indebted to Mr Walker for bringing up the report of 1853 in the Dundas area where dryland salting was noted. That is probably one of the first written accounts of it in Victoria, but one does not need to be clever to find examples of saline springs that have existed probably since time immemorial. If one thinks of saline springs as the worst extremity of dryland salting, one sees that it is a serious problem that has existed in miniature for centuries.

However, what is being talked about in this amendment is the power for the Soil Conservation Authority to be involved in dryland salting. As the Minister said in his second-reading speech, the authority has been involved in providing advice, making recommendations and providing treatment for some time in this area because it recognizes dryland salting as a prelude to soil erosion and quite properly and patently it has looked upon dryland salting as an indication of serious problems that could occur in simple soil erosion.

It is alleged that some 90 000 acres of land in Victoria are affected by dryland salting. Mr Walker quantified the cost at probably $300 per hectare, but that does not necessarily mean a reduced total production from those areas, so I hesitate about his quantum leap into maths. Often large areas of those 90 000 hectares are identified as areas with dryland salting potential because they have the characteristic red leaf type of growth which indicates that salt is leaching into the soil and affecting the plants in the area. That type of trouble occurs frequently in the Western District of Victoria, so one should not quantify in terms of the figures that Mr Walker raised.

Clause 4 provides that payment may be made to the Soil Conservation Authority for information which it provides to people who are often in the business of selling information—namely, consultants or even developers, and that is a proper power that the authority should have.

Clause 7 amends section 23 of the principal Act. Basically the amendments provide more flexibility in the management of declared areas under the Soil Conservation Act. The clause allows for part of the catchment area to be proclaimed, and that is important. A technical defect existed for some time because often the areas which we are talking about where soil conservation is needed are flat. To determine a catchment area is sometimes difficult, and this applies particularly to areas
of dryland salinity as distinct from headworks erosion. It is important to be able to deal with that part of a catchment area. The soil type may be different; it may have a potentiality for salting, and the flexibility is important. Provision is also made for a variation in the proclamation and for efficient management to continue even if there is a change of ownership of the property.

Another area in which I welcome the amendment is in clause 12, which increases penalties. I am particularly pleased to see the provision of penalties for the practice of gravel stripping without consent. There are a number of rivers, river flats and plains in Victoria which, because of the fashion for pebble gardens, have recently become deposits from which unscrupulous people have harvested the pebbles along the river frontages. It is important that penalties be imposed for that practice, because if it continues in certain areas, it will considerably change the character not only of the river or stream but also of the plains of that river, and controls must be imposed in that area.

Having looked at some of the items in the Bill and commented on them to the best of my ability, I inform the House that I shall be happy to support the Bill.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—I am deeply concerned about soil conservation in Victoria. It can be clearly shown that the Victorian Government pays lip service only to the Soil Conservation Authority. It is a shameful record—Mr Walker took us through the figures so I do not intend to do so again. On the one hand the Minister in charge of one department talks about 25 per cent increases in agricultural production in Victoria, and on the other hand, an authority like the Soil Conservation Authority, on which we must pin many of our hopes, is starved of funds by the same Government. That is what I mean by lip service—a complete neglect of the importance of this authority. The Minister can pass the buck on this matter, if he wishes, and I know he would like to do that.

I cannot understand how Liberal Party Ministers and members representing country areas are prepared to buy this sort of thing. How can Mr Radford sit up there and support the Victorian Government, which is literally starving the Soil Conservation Authority? How can the agriculturally orientated Minister for Conservation, who is responsible for this department, sit there? What do we get? There are not as many country members of the Liberal Party present as I had initially thought. Mr Chamberlain is another one. What does he think about the inadequate amount of funds that the Soil Conservation Authority receives?

The Government must back some of these State departments with adequate funding. The Soil Conservation Authority has been going around Victoria and holding meetings in regional centres to bring home to people like Mr Radford and other honourable members the need for the State Government to provide more assistance to enable the authority to meet its needs.

The National Party will ensure that this important authority obtains funds and has the capacity to deal with its responsibilities. Together with Mr Ken Wright, I represent the electors of the Mallee and the north west area of Victoria, an area which Mr Stacey said was very much in the balance 40 or 50 years ago.

The Hon. K. I. M. Wright—Not politically, Mr Dunn!

The Hon. B. P. DUNN—Not politically, but as far as the management of the land is concerned the people of the Mallee have many problems. They have learned to deal with the land and to farm it, yet amongst the Mallee farmers today are probably some of the best conservationists one could find. Certainly they are orientated towards soil conservation. They realize that their livelihood depends on the management of that land which is extremely light and which, if incorrectly managed, can be ruined for generations through erosion. The Minister has seen the effects of that erosion around the area near Yarto and Patchewollock. Dunes have been
created through cultivation and poor management. One can see the work that has been undertaken by the Soil Conservation Authority with that cooperation of farmers in tying down the sand dunes and establishing varieties of grass which stop the dunes from drifting and allow them to return to some form of limited production. That is the sort of work that is being undertaken but it is limited, and every dollar from the department is hard-earned. I hope much more work of this kind will be undertaken.

The main point that I raise is that of dryland salting referred to in clause 3 of the Bill which stipulates that one of the functions of the authority will be to carry out investigations into the prevention, mitigation, and reclamation of soil affected by salinization and associated soil erosion outside of proclaimed irrigation districts and to advise and assist landholders thereon.

Many people believe the salinity question is limited to irrigation areas but in the Mallee and through central Victoria, as Mr Radford is aware, massive areas of land are salt affected. Many figures have been quoted and Mr Walker mentioned 100,000 hectares. I know that the area is extensive and that it is increasing in size. The other day I saw some slides which amazed me. They showed Lake Tyrrell which is considered to be a salt lake at a time when trees were growing on its banks. That was in the early 1900s.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—It was ruined by cheap irrigation water.

The Hon. B. P. Dunn—It will be further ruined, and I will come to that later. It is clear that the water tables in the area have been rising and the areas of salting on the lower lying lands are increasing in size. Thousands of hectares of that land are absolutely useless salt pans. In duneys, light country the water comes out of the hills, seeps into the valleys and salts many of them out. Those are major problems to which the farming community must address itself. In the near future, I intend visiting the Manangatang, Chinkapook and Annuello area which is about 30 miles south of Robinvale. The farms there are large and have been salt affected.

A special committee of the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association has been set up, and I intend looking at the salt-affected properties and entering discussions on ways in which the problem can be tackled. At present the Government is considering a plan to take water from the irrigation areas into the Mallee. If the mineral reserves basin scheme and the proposed extension to Lake Tyrrell are adopted, water from salt-affected irrigation areas will be dumped into salt-affected dryland areas, which will push up the water table around Lake Tyrrell and that part of the Mallee and will add further to the salting problems.

On many occasions in this House I have made it clear that as a member representing that area I cannot and will not accept that as a method of disposal of saline water. It is transferring the problem from one person's backyard to another's. The hour is late but I make a plea to the Minister. He has taken the first step towards recognizing that this is a problem and has given the Soil Conservation Authority a charter to deal with it. I ask him to back up the authority with the necessary funds, resources and staff and to do something more about the problem than just talk.

The Hon. B. A. Chamberlain (Western Province)—I am pleased to note that Mr Dunn supports my previous pleas on behalf of the Soil Conservation Authority. Honourable members will recall that last year I took the House through a detailed exercise of the description of the work of the authority and the devastation being caused to this State by the denuding of the landscape of trees. I even produced some pictures which represented the withdrawal of trees from the Victorian landscape since the area has been subject to intensive farming.

There is no doubt that Victoria is facing the same situation that was faced in the United States of America. It is exporting soil quality in the form of various grains and other foods.
Unless remedial action is taken in the affected areas there will be a diminished soil resource with which to provide the crops of the future. For many years I have supported the work of the Soil Conservation Authority. It is a relatively small unit of Government but most effective. The many officers whom I know are hard working. They work closely with the farming community and are keen to educate the public, whether school children, farmers, or people in small country towns on the need for a sensible attitude to growth and regrowth, trees, river management and so forth. The funds that have been allocated to those areas are miserably low. Members of Parliament and the Minister constantly make submissions to the Treasurer that priority should be given to the problems, but at the same time they make submissions about other areas, such as education, hospitals, road funding and so forth. The funds that have been allocated to those areas are miserably low. Members of Parliament and the Minister constantly make submissions to the Treasurer that priority should be given to the problems, but at the same time they make submissions about other areas, such as education, hospitals, road funding and so forth.

I believe the Soil Conservation Authority is an efficient body. It is small and lean. The provisions of the Bill which allow for delegation do not in any way detract from the authority of the chairman who is universally respected.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—Has Mr Chamberlain looked at the clause carefully?

The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN—I have. The Soil Conservation Authority is basically self-operating.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—that is not the point.

The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN—It is the point. The authority has its charter. It knows its job, and each year it is a question of what funds the authority can get together to do the work.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—that clause bypasses the chairman.

The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN—There is no way in which the authority can work by bypassing the chairman. The chairman has my complete confidence and the confidence of the farming community, and I believe, of the Minister. That is not in doubt. The only doubt exists in Mr Walker’s mind, and it is unfounded.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—I will remind you in a year’s time.

The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN—Mr Walker should remind me at that time, when this Government will still be in office, and if he has a problem, legislation will be introduced to rectify it. The authority is important. This Bill will assist the authority in its work. It will not derogate its work in any way, and I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD (Bendigo Province)—I am pleased to support the views expressed by my colleague, Mr Chamberlain. As most honourable members know, I have had a long association with the Soil Conservation Authority. For some eighteen years I was a member of the district advisory committee of the Avoca River district. I pay tribute to the work done by this organization, not only by the present chairman, Alec Mitchell, who I know is held in the highest respect all over the State for the work that he and other members of the authority have done, but also to Denis Cahill and Jim Allison who has been standing in for him while he was away and Mr Jack Gilmour.

These and other members of the authority have done a magnificent job, and they have done it with limited facilities and money. It is unfortunate that their work has been curtailed by a lack of funds, but I am always amazed that, no matter what restrictions are placed on their funds, through their versatility and enthusiasm they seem to be able to use those limited resources to great purpose. If all Government authorities extracted as much value from the dollar as does the Soil Conservation Authority, this State would be in a much better position than it is at present.

Mr Walker spoke about dryland salinity. He may not be aware that many Victorian soils inherently have a high proportion of salinity. A classic example occurs in the Shire of Lexton, at the top of the Divide, where there...
has been very little clearing but areas of land are extremely saline. It has not been cropped to death or grazed to death, which shows that, irrespective of where one is in Victoria, there are outcrops of extremely saline soil. They are no respecters of the manner in which the soil is cared for.

I was rather disappointed that Mr Dunn, in his contribution to the debate, seemed to be placing the onus for all the damage that has been done to the soil on the Government and the Soil Conservation Authority. You, Mr President, in your role as the honourable member for Central Highlands Province, would be well aware of the problems that are created by farmers in the use of their land. I am sure Mr Dunn would agree that dryland salinity problems can be caused by long periods of fallowing, when the land is left uncovered for too long, and when farmers, for a variety of reasons, go into closer and closer rotation, rather than having greater periods between fallowing and cropping.

All honourable members would be aware of the situation that Mr Dunn mentioned on the surrounds of Lake Tyrrell, where there is insufficient timber. The timber may have been cut down for use as fence posts or something like that, and the trouble is that many landholders believe they can continue to remove timber from their properties without replacing it. The work carried out by Dr Jenkins of the Soil Conservation Authority reveals that there is a direct relationship between timber cover, moisture retention and soil salinity. Experiments have also been carried out in Western Australia, where there is great concern about the threat of increased salinity in the Perth water supply. That research has shown that if 10 per cent of the land is returned to timber there is quite a drastic effect on the salinity in the water.

I can only express the hope that action will be taken jointly by landowners and Government bodies, including the Soil Conservation Authority, to ensure that more timber is replaced on Victorian lands. The tree planting scheme proposed by the then Minister of Forests, Mr Granter, was absolutely overwhelmed with applicants. The Government provided $100,000 for tree planting and there was an enormous response from landowners interested in participating. When the Budget is announced, I hope the sum of $100,000 will have been multiplied many times, so that farmers will be able to help themselves in this important battle against salinity.

My colleague, Mr Stacey, made reference to changes in the ownership of land and the importance of continuing soil conservation works that have been commenced. It is a great pity that in some cases the new owners of land do not appear to share the enthusiasm for soil conservation works shown by previous owners.

Mr Stacey also referred to gravel stripping along riverbeds, which causes many problems, as those familiar with riverside reserves would be well aware. I hope the work that was initiated by Sir Henry Bolte when the Soil Conservation Authority was established, and that great man, Mr Harold Hanslow, after whom the Hanslow Cut is named, will be carried on and that more funds will be provided for the purpose.

I conclude my remarks by pointing out that there has been concern in rural areas about the provisions of clause 11, which refers to the delegation of powers by the Minister. I am sure that when the Minister deals with this matter during the Committee stage, he will be able to set at rest the fears of those who perceive some danger to the present status of the Soil Conservation Authority.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Public authorities)

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Conservation)—I thank those honourable members who have contributed to the debate on this Bill. It is a testimony to the efficiency of the Soil
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Conservation Authority that so many honourable members have joined in the debate and it is a credit to the authority's public relations.

I would be the last to criticize the enthusiasm of the Soil Conservation Authority— it has done tremendous work and the chairman of the authority has gone about his duties most diligently—but it disturbs me that in a debate of this nature there should be a lack of critical analysis of the duties of the authority. One might well imagine that the only body that could possibly carry out the vital duties now performed by the Soil Conservation Authority is the authority itself. It is a pity that it is left to a committee like the Public Bodies Review Committee to make a critical examination of the responsibilities of Government authorities in Victoria. I do not mean by that that the Soil Conservation Authority is not the best authority to carry out this important responsibility. I certainly would not want to have anyone but those people who are now engaged in that job which has to be done. That is not what I am talking about. The people who are performing the job are the right people because they have the experience and a record of authority behind them.

Let it not be said that the Government does not support the Soil Conservation Authority—it does. One honourable member said that the Soil Conservation Authority is starved of funds. What a ridiculous statement! One could say the same thing about the Education Department, the Law Department or any other department or authority in Victoria. The Soil Conservation Authority is led by three men on high salaries.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—That is all you can afford now.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I did not hear any criticism of that from Mr Walker and Mr Dunn.

The Hon. B. P. Dunn—Your members agree that they do not get enough money.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—Who does? The plain answer is that every department and authority is obtaining the amount of money that the taxpayers of Victoria believe it ought to get. The responsibility for determining that amount of money rests with the representatives of the people. The representatives are the Parliament and this Parliament is making decisions about how the money raised as revenue is distributed. I think a perfectly adequate amount is distributed to the Soil Conservation Authority.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—That will read well in the Weekly Times.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I do not care whether it reads well. I am glad the country press will take up my point that the Soil Conservation Authority is adequately funded and performing a good job. I am sure Mr Dunn does not disagree with that.

The Hon. B. P. Dunn—It is doing a good job with limited funds.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—It could not do so if it was not funded properly. I am sure the honourable member will agree with that contention. Much has been said about soil salinity. Mr Dunn was treading on pretty delicate ground when he began to talk about the destruction of vegetation around Lake Tyrrell because of soil salinity. I suppose there is no group that benefits more in Victoria than these irrigators. We provide them with cheap water and they use it with careless abandon. I suppose that would be the best expression to use. We use water with such prolificacy that it is no wonder that areas like Lake Tyrrell are destroyed by salinity.

Farmers ought to learn lessons in the economic use of irrigation water. Probably the reason why water is used with careless abandon is because there is a lot of it. Victoria is not short of water. Vast headworks have been built at considerable expense and the water is provided to irrigation farmers at the cost of distribution only. I am sure Mr Dunn would not want to criticize that aspect!
Mr Evans questioned the clause which provides that sub-committees of district advisory councils hold office for twelve months. The clause also provides that the number of representatives should be increased to five instead of three. The reason behind the clause is that district advisory councils should be able to do the majority of the work in advising on soil conservation needs within regions. However, if it is found necessary to form sub-committees, which have special interests in more limited areas, those sub-committees should be expected to get on with the job. The deliberations of the district advisory committees should not go on endlessly. That is the rationale behind the limitation in the period of operation of the committee. I hope that the honourable member will accept that explanation because it seems to be a measure which will encourage such committees to get on with the job.

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

Clause 5 (Local committees).

The Hon. D. M. Evans (North Eastern Province)—I thank the Minister for his comments. The matter interests me because people in the area that I represent were concerned at a current Land Conservation Council inquiry into softwood planting in the Ovens area. One of the specific issues has been the possible effect on stream flows of acquiring land for the planting of pines and the prospect of sudden increases in water flow, along with the fear of land owners, particularly in the higher reaches, that such increases in stream flow in sudden flood conditions could cause major damage.

I raised with the Minister of Forests the possibility of the small local advisory committee being formed. I suggested that perhaps a local resident, landowner, member of the Country Fire Authority or municipality could deal with the specific flood problems or any other problems on a local or watershed basis. One of the suggestions made to me by the Soil Conservation Authority was that the very section within the Soil Conservation Act, which this particular clause amends, used to provide for such a committee. In other words, an occasional committee under the Soil Conservation Act, appointed by the local advisory committee could fulfil that function. The type of committee I foresee—and which is needed—would be a continuing committee which would run for more than twelve months.

The provisions in clause 5 block off that possibility and that should not be the case. I ask the Minister to consider amending the time span of twelve months. I have no quarrel at all with the increase in the number of personnel to a figure which is adequate for a particular job. I do not think it should be tied to three people; it could be 4 or 5. However, by tying the operation of the committee to twelve months flexibility is lost, and I have given a fair indication of what I mean by that flexibility.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 6 to 10.

Clause 11 (Delegation of powers).

The Hon. E. H. Walker (Melbourne Province)—I move:

Clause 11, lines 33-39, omit all words and expressions on these lines and insert “to the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority any of his powers under this Act (except this power of delegation).”

The proposed new section 39A would then read:

The Minister may by writing under his hand delegate to the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority any of his powers under this Act (except this power of delegation).

I made some comments about this during the second reading debate. Comments made since by honourable members lead me to suggest that the situation is more serious than I had thought. I want to put two bits of information before Mr Stacey to suggest that the authority is clearly being destabilized. Some restructuring has been going on within the Ministry for Conservation, as Mr Stacey is aware. In fact, the Fisheries and Wildlife Division has been the subject of significant restructuring in recent times, and the Minister has taken a hand in that.
Looking at the Bill and hearing comments from around the Chamber, I now believe two pieces of information indicate that a major restructuring is under way within the Ministry of Soil Conservation. I shall deal with the two pieces of information in question, and in relation to the first, I invite honourable members to consider the money being spent. In five years, an effective $1 million has become an effective $300,000. That is a reduction to less than one-third of the actual buying power of the real funds for this authority in five years.

The second piece of information is that the delegated powers which this authority normally has—and the Act is built around those powers—have been taken away; they have been altered. One must ask why that is so.

A reading of the Act reveals that, by section 14, the authority is charged with certain roles, and then the Act sets out what the authority shall do. By and large, the language is in the form that the authority may make surveys and so on with the approval of the Minister. Now, that is to be altered. The reality is that, with one fell swoop, the Minister has taken over. He is giving himself power to delegate, not necessarily to anybody with authority, but to any person, the powers that he holds. I should like to hear Dr Kevin Foley on this matter because it is a matter of administrative structure.

Clause 11 is designed to pull the blocks from under the authority. The Minister will not necessarily begin to use the power immediately, but one must ask why it is to be put there. The Act has worked well in the past. The Minister has powers and the Act sets out those powers and how they should be used by the authority. The words now to be included in the Act are:

The Minister may by writing under his hand delegate to any person any of his powers under this Act...

In other words, it states that any powers that he has can be given to any person. What does the Minister intend to do? Why has he written in this provision? The reality is that the Minister wants to give some power to somebody else. One is forced to that conclusion. It is no small matter. I indicated in my second-reading speech the sorts of powers that may be involved. It may be power to take on part-time workers for specific purposes or a number of other things, but it may well be that the reality is that the actual job is to be given to someone else.

The Hon. N. F. Stacey—What does sub-section (2) of the proposed new section say?

The Hon. E. H. Walker—I will answer Mr Stacey's question in a moment. Within the powers of the authority—and the authority must be seen as a constituent part of the Ministry for Conservation—certain works have been undertaken. One must ask who within the Ministry is likely to be given the powers that the chairman or the authority itself used to have. I am not by nature a suspicious person but on looking at the facts that have emerged I have to ask why this section is being inserted. It will take powers away from the chairman and the authority in its normal sense. Administratively, that is a catastrophe for the authority. I can only assume that it is step one, or perhaps step two, on the way towards fragmenting this authority in some fashion or perhaps restructuring it in some other fashion. I suppose Mr Brookes and the Minister got together and determined that something needs to be done. If they do not have confidence in the chairman, they should say so. It would be more honest to say that Mr Alec Mitchell no longer holds the confidence of the Minister and the permanent head of the Ministry. If that is the case, they should be honest and make a new appointment. If that is not so, this clause should not be in the Bill because the way it reads indicates a total lack of confidence in the chairman. It cannot be read in any other way. It gives to the Minister a simple power to delegate powers outside the authority. If that power is not to be used, it should not be in the Bill. It is poor administration to include it. The clause should not be necessary.

The Hon. E. H. Walker
It would have been better for me to move an amendment simply to delete the clause. However, I have written the amendment in this form so that I could say that it is clearly the Labor Party’s view that the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority should be given back the powers he had under the original Act. I could have dealt with the matter by moving an amendment to delete the clause, but I have not got the numbers on this side of the House to win this argument. If there were some honest people on the Government benches, they would not support this clause.

Money has been taken away from the authority. Mr Radford cannot make heart-bleeding speeches about how much it is possible to squeeze out of the dollar and say that the authority is doing a splendid job in about one-third of the amount it used to receive. I understand that other projects receive other funds, but I am saying that the authority itself has had its funds reduced to less than one-third in five years.

The evidence is written all over the 1980 reports. Honourable members should read them and see the evidence. On page 5, dealing with financial grants, it talks about the authority’s achievements during 1979–80. One of those achievements was that it made 129 grants totalling $92,800 to assist landholders and municipalities, as compared with 261 grants totalling $196,000 in previous years. Taking into account the Consumer Price Index devaluation of money, that $92,800 is not even $92,800. In one year alone, this authority had its funds cut to less than half for its projects. The report is not complaining but if one reads it carefully one sees in other parts statements that it is terribly strapped for space and that it cannot work efficiently in its space. It makes comments of that sort. I commend to honourable members a reading of that document.

The reality is that something is being done to the authority. Mr Dunn understands that. He has sensed the fact that there is an attack on the authority, an authority which the National Party believes to be important. What is going on? I say to the House that if this clause is passed, it will become obvious in a few months what the Minister has in mind. He works efficiently in that regard! Major changes will occur within the authority because of the change in that delegation of power clause. Honourable members must make their choice: They can compliment the Soil Conservation Authority and let the Minister take this step or they can compliment the authority and reinforce it; that is to say, leave the delegated powers as they are, put confidence in the chairman and the authority and fund it properly.

I cannot make it more clear than that. That is exactly the case that is before the House and honourable members should see it that way. Hence, I commend the amendment to the House.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Conservation)—I have been trying to think what is wrong with the Minister thinking about how he should reconstruct the authority to make it more efficient, and I have found it difficult to come up with any answer.

The Hon. E. H. Walker—You are admitting that is what you have to do.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—Mr. Walker said that that is what I had to do and that is what set my train of thought in motion. I answer the question in four ways.

I believe the Minister should have total power to do whatever is necessary with any authority under his control. Therefore, I propose that he have the power to delegate to any person, and Mr Walker reinforces this when he argues, to use his words, that the Soil Conservation Authority is a constituent part of the Ministry for Conservation. If it is a constituent part of the Ministry, as he says it is, the Minister ought to have power to delegate power to any part of the Ministry for Conservation. I should have thought Mr Walker had reinforced my argument in that respect.
Thirdly, he argued that, if the Government has no confidence in the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority, it should say so. I place on record that I have the utmost confidence in the ability and authority of the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority.

Fourthly, Mr Walker asked for an indication of my intention. It is not to change the authority of the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority and it is not to change the responsibility of the Soil Conservation Authority. The Soil Conservation Authority is controlling soil conservation in a better way than any other organization and I indicate quite firmly that my intention is not to delegate any powers away from the Chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority or from any person who is acting in the place of the chairman.

It is popular in Government administration currently throughout Australia and indeed throughout the rest of the world to be moving away from the directions of the 1960s and 1970s and even going back to the 1950s under which Government authorities or groups which are called semi-government authorities should be exercising independent control. It was suggested that the powers of government should not be exercised over groups which were not too closely associated with government and hopefully the blame for any misfeasance would not rest squarely on the Government. It has been proved that that does not happen and nowadays when something is done wrong by the semi-government authority not only is the semi-government authority castigated but also the Government.

Honourable members have witnessed an example of that in the Chamber this evening and there are examples of it almost every week the Parliament sits. There has been a tendency for Government administration to move back to Ministerial responsibility and the clause under discussion is a reinforcement of Ministerial responsibility.

The Hon. D. M. EVANS (North Eastern Province)—I have listened to the arguments from both sides. When Mr Walker first spoke I formed the view and accepted the fact that the Minister should have an opportunity to accept Ministerial responsibility and that he had powers to delegate it. The argument advanced by Mr Walker was a very sensible one and I am concerned, as is the National Party, that the measure does not mean that a major change in direction is to be given to the Soil Conservation Authority. The words of the Minister for Conservation certainly heightened that concern, because quite frankly I see it as more important to enhance the strength of the Soil Conservation Authority than to pass it over to the Ministry for Conservation, and the points made by Mr Walker to facilitate that argument are very important.

During the second-reading debate I did not refer to the allocation of funds as I regarded that matter more appropriate to be raised during the Budget debate, but the matter has been raised and I agree with the points which have been made, which I am sure enhance the comments I had made.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—It may be the last time available for Mr Evans to criticize the financial aspects.

The Hon. D. M. EVANS—It may be; we never know as we are all mortal. The case made by Mr Walker is a good one and it provides considerable food for thought. I am wondering whether under those circumstances, and in order to provide honourable members with further time to consider the excellent points that have been brought out this evening, the Minister for Conservation might consider reporting progress because there are people who are concerned over the way in which the debate has gone. The clause is undoubtedly providing a far wider direction than its simple terms would indicate. If honourable members take into account the recent words of the Minister for Conservation in relation to his delegation of power to other areas of the Ministry for Conservation, then surely that delegation would be destroying the Soil Conservation Authority and at this stage the Minister for Conservation should report progress so Parliament has a further chance to look at it.
The Committee divided on the question that the words and expressions proposed by Mr Walker to be omitted stand part of the clause (the Hon. W. M. Campbell in the chair).

Ayes .. 21
Noes .. 11

Majority against the amendment .. 10

AYES
Mrs Baylor Mr Houghton
Mr Block Dr Howard
Mr Bubb Mr Hunt
Mr Chamberlain Mr Jenkins
Mr Crozier Mr Lawson
Dr Foley Mr Radford
Mr Granter Mr Saltmarsh
Mr Guest Mr Storey
Mr Hamilton Tellers:
Mr Hauser Mr Stacey
Mr Hayward Mr Ward

NOES
Mrs Coxsedge Mr Sgro
Mr Dunn Mr Walker
Mr Kennedy Mr Wright
Mr Kent Tellers:
Mr Landeryou Mr Evans
Mr Mackenzie Mr White

PAIRS
Mr Knowles Mr Baxter
Mr Long Mr Butler
Mr Reid Mr Walton
Mr Taylor Mr Eddy

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Geelong tourist authority office—Desalination project on Barr Creek—Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting—Gordon House—Motorized three-wheel conveyance — Lower Goulburn River flood plain—VFL grand final tickets

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—I move:

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until tomorrow at four o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Geelong Province)—I raise with the Minister for Minerals and Energy, representing the Minister for Tourism, the proposed closure of the Geelong office of the Victorian Government Travel Authority, which has been operating in Geelong as a tourist bureau for 37 years. In that time it has built up tremendous support amongst a large section of the Geelong people.

Between July 1980 and May 1981 it had 75,000 inquiries, and over this 263 day period that averaged 284 inquiries a day. It seems strange that an authority that is used by so many people in Geelong is to be closed by the Government. I have been presenting petitions to the House. Already, more than 300 people in Geelong have signed a petition indicating that they oppose the closure of this office.

I ask the Minister to pass on to the Minister for Tourism the fact that the staff employed at the authority are very concerned, inasmuch as their future has not been spelt out. They do not know to this day whether they will continue to be employed. They have been given their fourth closure date. They were told in June that the centre would be closed in September, and after several dates they were told last week that the office was to be closed in November, but there is still no indication from the Government of what is to happen to them and what their future is.

I ask the Minister to take up this matter and see whether the Government could reconsider its decision. The authority has been used for many years by pensioner groups throughout Geelong. It is one of the few travel agencies that provide this service and expertise. The football clubs in Geelong also have written to me and to the Government stating that this office organizes a great deal of their travel arrangements.

I ask the Minister to see whether this office can be retained in Geelong as a valuable service, whether something can be done to allay the fears of
the staff in regard to their future, and whether the Government will give some indication of what that future will be.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—I raise with the Minister of Water Supply a question I asked earlier this year about a feasibility study into a pilot desalination programme on the Barr Creek in the Kerang area. The then Minister of Water Supply, the current Minister for Police and Emergency Services, told me that a firm called Austep, would undertake a feasibility study; that it would commence in April this year and that it would be investigating desalination processes. He said that one of its references would be to examine the feasibility of a pilot plant.

The Minister said in his answer to me at that time that a performance specification for a pilot plant is a minor part of the study, and that it will be necessary to examine the recommendations of the report before decisions are made as to the location and timing of construction of any pilot project. This is important, in view of the imminent continuation of the mineral reserve basin scheme in that area, which has been temporarily delayed by the Government while the Public Works Committee examines additional evidence.

The National Party wants that inquiry to be reopened, but I have strongly sought the investigation of desalination as a possible alternative to pumping salt water into evaporative basins because of the effects that has on surrounding properties and water tables.

I ask the Minister of Water Supply whether the firm of consultants, or Austep, has undertaken the study? Have they completed that study and, if so, have they made a report to him and will details of that report be made available to honourable members. I think most honourable members have a limited knowledge only of desalination plants, which is an alternative that should be seriously examined. When that report is available I hope Parliament will have an opportunity to view it and to debate it.

The Hon. D. N. SALTMARSH (Waverley Province)—I raise with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services a matter concerning the forthcoming Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Melbourne and the tie-up of certain streets at particular times during the day. Is the Minister aware that a number of important facilities, such as St Andrew’s Hospital, the Mercy Hospital, and other public instrumentalties, will have restricted access as a result of the traffic control plans for this conference?

Will the Minister indicate what plans will relate to emergency situations, such as a woman about to deliver a baby and booked into St Andrew’s Hospital? What special arrangements will be made for emergency situations at that time?

The Hon. JOAN COXSEDGE (Melbourne West Province)—I raise with the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government a matter that was reported in the Age of 14 September this year. It stated that a Mr Ian Sturzaker, the merchant banker entrepreneur who has developed Gordon House—which incidentally used to be a haven for homeless men—has been granted relaxed fire regulations because Gordon House is an historic building.

A case could be made for providing a financial incentive for the purpose of preserving an historic building, but I find it incomprehensible that concessions involved with the health and safety of people should be put at risk. I ask the Minister to please find out why such an incredibly dangerous and insensitive dispensation was given in this case.

The Hon. K. I. M. WRIGHT (North Western Province)—I direct an important matter to the attention of the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. It concerns a constituent of mine who is a victim of red tape and officialdom with regard to the registration and licensing of a motorized three-wheel conveyance. The matter concerns Mrs Irene O’Bierne of Red Cliffs. She has rheumatoid arthritis and steel plates in her hip joints. That being so, she is unable to walk except with great difficulty. She lives
alone in a specially constructed and adapted caravan at the Red Cliffs Caravan Park. She has a ramp to enable her to gain access to the caravan. Her independence is assured by the fact that she has this battery operated three-wheel motorized vehicle. She uses it for shopping, banking, social and cultural activities. She is completely unable to use public transport. She drives this motorized vehicle on the roads between Red Cliffs, Irymple and Mildura, a distance of ten or twelve miles and on the footpaths where available. She has travelled 9800 miles, over ten years, without accident and her doctor says she is capable of driving this vehicle.

Some time ago the local police expressed concern at the fact that as this vehicle travels at 30 kilometres an hour it ought to be registered. Eventually the vehicle was registered because it travels at more than 7 kilometres an hour. It is not possible to govern the particular vehicle to travel at less than 7 kilometres an hour because a qualified mechanic has said the Honda 50 cc. motor would burn out.

In January 1980 I made representations to the Minister’s predecessor, the Hon. Lindsay Thompson. Following his helpful intervention, the vehicle was registered, I believe, at no fee, as per section 7 (3) of the Motor Car Act. However, a further major problem arose when the police at Red Cliffs were concerned about the fact that as this vehicle travels up to 30 kilometres on the road, traffic is inclined to bank up behind it, as it does with the dear old lady driving a small sedan at 60 kilometres an hour—they achieve the same thing.

Mrs O’Bierne was advised that she requires a driving licence. The difficulty is that because it is a small three-wheel conveyance it is not possible for her to drive as an “L” plate driver because there is no room for anybody to sit with her. Having successfully answered the 30 questions it is not possible for her to pass the driving test because a burly policeman cannot sit beside her on this conveyance.

I was informed last week that the Police Department is about to turn down this admirable lady’s request for a driving licence. This would drive her off the road and, in our area, there are no bicycle paths or footpaths for her to ride on—such as there are in the metropolitan area. I ask the Minister to intervene in this case to grant some kind of dispensation. This woman has exhibited outstanding bravery, initiative and determination. Only late last week she said to me, “Mr Wright, you might just as well amputate my legs as take my ability to drive this vehicle away”.

I conclude by saying, this is the International Year of Disabled Persons—the Government is telling us a lot about it and what we should be doing. Surely this is the time when we should provide opportunity and encouragement for the disabled. We should grant them independence and the opportunity to fulfill their lives. I believe the residents of Mildura and district, to a man and woman, would agree that it would be a cruel and heartless action to take away this ability. Finally, I ask the Minister to intervene in this matter and ensure that this woman is not hampered in any way in the continued use of her motorised vehicle.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Chelsea Province)—I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Conservation. He will be aware that the whole of the Lower Goulburn River flood plain between Shepparton and Echuca is at present subject to a Government flood investigation study. Nevertheless, unauthorized levy banking has been undertaken by some large landholders in the area which has caused serious problems in the recent wet period. Some work was one on Crown land and closed roads in which trees were bulldozed and large holes dug to provide material for a levy bank which broke.

I ask the Minister to fully acquaint himself with the situation and take steps to ensure that no further work of this kind is undertaken until the flood study is completed and proper control is undertaken of that sort of flood protection work.
The Hon. C. J. KENNEDY (Waverley Province)—I direct a matter to the attention of the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the Minister aware that Mr Jack Hamilton, General Manager of the VFL, has alleged that the Victorian Government has twice refused to positively respond to VFL requests to make it illegal for scalpers to sell grand final tickets at above face value? If so, what does he now say is the Government’s intention in that grand final tickets are currently selling for at least $200 on the black market?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Minister of Consumer Affairs)—The Government is concerned that people should be asked to pay these enormous prices for grand final tickets and wonders how it is that these scalpers have tickets available to sell. The Government has said to the VFL on each occasion this matter has been raised over the past three years that the VFL should very carefully examine the system under which it distributes tickets to avoid the situation where apparently some people have large blocks of tickets which they are able to sell to people coming from interstate and generally to advertise regularly in the newspapers.

It is not practicable to have legislation to deal just with the resale of football tickets, which is what would be involved. The remedy is in the hands of the VFL and the public. As a Melbourne supporter I would not pay $200 to see Collingwood play in the preliminary final, much less the grand final, so the answer is for people to refuse to pay these prices and scalpers would not then make a killing.

The Hon. D. G. CROZIER (Minister for Minerals and Energy)—I have noted Mr Mackenzie’s representation on behalf of the Geelong office of the Victorian Government Travel Authority. I agree that the staff of this office have carried out their function over the years in a most diligent and effective fashion. I can assure the honourable member that the decision the Government has made has not been taken lightly. Nevertheless, I note the points he has raised which will be passed on to my colleague, the Minister for Tourism.

Likewise, I have noted the observations made by Mrs Coxedge relating to a matter of public safety in Gordon House and her observations will be passed on to the Minister for Local Government.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister for Police and Emergency Services)—The matter raised by Mr Saltmarsh related to an emergency situation which may arise regarding CHOGM. Last Friday the police had a conference with retailers, medical people and a number of others who could be affected by the CHOGM exercise that will take place in Melbourne very shortly. Emergency telephone services will be established to supply information on public access to transport and medical facilities.

Mr Saltmarsh mentioned the problems that people could encounter in wanting to gain access to St Andrew’s Presbyterian Hospital. However, access to the Freemasons and Mercy hospitals will be affected due to the closure of Clarendon Street. People wishing to gain entrance to those hospitals will be able to enter from either the side doors or the back entrances. Any person who encounters difficulty in gaining access to those hospitals will be able to telephone the emergency telephone centres and arrangements will be made for those persons to gain access to the hospitals.

In respect to Mr Wright’s query on behalf of Mrs Irene O’Bierne, I can assure him that I will take the matter up with the Chief Commissioner of Police. It sounds a worthy case and one that deserves sympathetic consideration, which I trust will be forthcoming.

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply)—Mr Dunn indicated to me that he would ask me a question and I have obtained the relevant information on the investigation by Austep, a firm with experience covering a wide range of desalination processes.

The study of the disposal of saline water undertaken by Austep commenced in April of this year. The study is two-thirds complete, and will finish
in November. There is no final report yet available. Copies of the final report will be available to members of Parliament and interested members of the public.

Mr Dunn queried the costs of desalination and referred to the matter that is currently being investigated by the Public Works Committee. Evidence has been given to the committee. Honourable members may be interested in a comparison of costs.

In the mineral reserve evaporation basins scheme, the estimated capital cost as at August 1981 was $5.54 million. The estimated annual cost is $38 000 a year. The life of the scheme is estimated to be 150 years and the benefit cost ratio is 0.61.

The equivalent reverse osmosis scheme has an estimated capital cost of $5.54 million. The estimated annual cost is $1.18 million a year. The life of the scheme before replacement will be required is 20 years and the benefit cost ratio, taking into account the value of reclaimed water, is 0.13.

A real problem arises because the desalination plant would require 1.9 megawatts of electricity. In addition, this plant does not actually destroy the salt. It separates the salt and leaves the problem of the disposal of the reject brine.

The consultant is continuing with his work. I have noted from a press report that the Deputy Leader of the National Party in another place has made some claims following his recent overseas tour to study desalination. I understand that the honourable member will be reporting to the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission on that matter. When the honourable member does report to the commission, that matter will be referred to Austep for evaluation.

Mr Kent directed a question to the Minister for Conservation on the construction of private levee banks. That matter comes broadly under my jurisdiction because it arises from the operation of the Drainage of Land Act. I have already commented in the House on the construction of private levee banks and the flood plains in the Goulburn-Murray irrigation area.

Mr Kent referred to the lower Goulburn area between Shepparton and Echuca. As I have indicated, I have seen the effects that the construction of private levee banks has had due to the selfish action of a few people. Those citizens who live in flood-prone areas must learn to live together. The current flooding has highlighted the problem that has occurred with the construction of private levee banks. I propose to examine the matter carefully and the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission is already on the job. I shall seek amendments to the Drainage of Land Act, which will create more effective control of levees.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.46 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PUPIL ABSENTEEISM

(Question No. 37)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Thomastown Province) asked the Minister of Education:

(a) With regard to the statement of the Minister for Community Welfare Services in the Herald of 14 April 1981, that 7000 Victorian children were absent from school each day without reasonable excuse, what are the relevant figures for each region of the State?

(b) How many attendance officers are employed, and how often do they visit schools to inspect attendance rolls?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—The answer is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 2 June 1981 that the information my office obtained from the Department of Community Welfare Services indicated that—

(a) It is not practical to compile accurate figures for absences on a regional basis as many children are enrolled at schools which are in different municipalities from residences. However, there is no reliable evidence to suggest that any one region has a greater or lesser proportional incidence of non-attendance for children between six and fifteen.
There are sixteen School Attendance Officers for the eight metropolitan regions, there is an Attendance Officer allocated to each of the ten country regions, a total of twenty-six attendance officers working in the eighteen regions. The senior attendance officer and one other attendance officer are attached to the Protective Service Unit of the Department of Community Welfare Services to coordinate and implement the School Attendance programme.

Schools are contacted whenever a case of unsatisfactory attendance is reported, to ascertain if intervention by the attendance officer is necessary. Attendance officers attempt to routinely visit every Victorian school at least once each term as part of their working contact with schools and in co-operation with school staff use the rolls to identify attendance problems.

WHITTLESEA TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

(Question No. 39)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Thomastown Province) asked the Minister of Education:

When will the next stage of the new school building at Whittlesea Technical High School be commenced and the remaining new buildings completed?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—The answer is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 16 June 1981 that priorities for projects are determined by the regional priority review committees and, at this stage, building extensions for the Whittlesea Technical High School are unlikely to proceed during the 1981-82 financial year.

ADOPTION APPLICATIONS

(Question No. 40)

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Thomastown Province) asked the Minister for Conservation for the Minister for Community Welfare Services:

(a) When applications are re-opened for adoption of children by childless couples, will priority be given to people who were long-standing applicants before the books were closed?

(b) Will age limitations be waived for long-standing applicants who, through no fault of their own, may now be outside the usual age requirements?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Conservation)—The answer supplied by the Minister for Community Welfare Services is:

(a) Those people who applied for adoption of children before the waiting list closed in 1975 have been given priority over more recent applicants. Assessment of all applications are in progress.

(b) The welfare of the child is given paramount consideration in adoption matters. Therefore with respect to the current waiting list of applicants for babies the age limitations cannot be waived. However, for those people who applied for the adoption of babies and were on the 1975 list, the maximum age gap between prospective adoptive parents and the child is 40 years. This is less restrictive than the maximum age of 35 years permitted for applicants on the current waiting list.

There is a separate list of applicants for adoption of children aged 4 to 15 years or of any age with significant handicaps. The maximum age gap required between prospective adoptive parents and these children is 40 years.

PAYMENTS OF ROYALTIES FOR SALT MINING

(Question No. 73)

The Hon. K. I. M. WRIGHT (North Western Province) asked the Minister of Lands:

(a) What total amount of royalties was paid for salt mined in Victoria in each of the past 6 years?

(b) What amounts were paid in respect of areas in the North Western Province, giving separate figures for Sea Lake (Lake Tyrell) and Pink Lake near Linja?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister of Lands)—The answer is lengthy and statistical, and I seek leave to have it incorporated in Hansard.

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows:

(a) The total amounts of royalties paid in respect of salt removed from areas administered by the Lands Department were—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Lake Tyrell</th>
<th>Pink Lakes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$24,034</td>
<td>19,376</td>
<td>15,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$19,276</td>
<td>18,996</td>
<td>9,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$10,809</td>
<td>10,746</td>
<td>5,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>$25,315</td>
<td>21,633</td>
<td>16,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>$22,663</td>
<td>21,995</td>
<td>13,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>$9,387</td>
<td>8,808</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) The figures in respect of the North-Western Province are:
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The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman) took the chair at 4.5 p.m. and read the prayer.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER
The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—I have been notified that the Minister for Planning will be late for question time but will be here shortly.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING
Mr CAIN (Leader of the Opposition)—I direct the attention of the Premier to disturbing reports concerning the rapidly escalating costs of the repairs to the Board of Works building in Spencer Street, now expected to exceed $19 million. Will the Premier give an assurance that the ratepayers of Melbourne will in no way be required to bear the costs arising from what appears to be mismanagement by the board; if he can give that assurance, will he indicate where the money will come from to cover the cost of the repairs?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—This matter is likely to be the subject of court action, as is well known by the Leader of the Opposition, and the most suitable place for it to be settled is in the Supreme Court of Victoria. The size of any shortfall in money would be apparent only after a decision by the court and the Government will therefore await that decision before making any statement.

LOAN FUNDS FOR STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION
Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—I refer the Premier to the problems being faced by the State Electricity Commission in gaining capital loan funds and I ask: Will he give consideration to some statutory reserves being made available to the State Electricity Commission to cover its shortfall? Having regard to the fact that the State Electricity Commission is a trustee security investment and that its loans are guaranteed by the Government of Victoria, it seems that such a scheme would maintain sound financing and would help the commission out of a difficult situation.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—The honourable member is now debating the issue.

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I thank the Leader of the National Party for his suggestion. The Government’s policy on this general issue of use of reserves, will be made clear during my Budget speech tomorrow.

PAGING SYSTEM FOR PARLIAMENT HOUSE
Mr McCLURE (Bendigo)—Is the Premier aware of recommendations from the House Committee that a paging system be installed in Parliament House to facilitate communication between members and the locating of members in this old building? I ask the Premier: Will the efficiency of the operation of Parliament be enhanced by the installation of such a system? Secondly, if its efficiency will be enhanced, will the Premier ensure that the available funds are forthcoming for the House Committee to instal the equipment, given that the equipment is available on about three to four weeks’ notice?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! The heart of the honourable member’s question is acceptable, but the rest of the question is seeking an opinion. However, the question is allowed.

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—Communication is undoubtedly a problem at all levels of life. I understand that this proposal was put forward in order to have improved communications installed within Parliament. It may have been axed during the economies drive. I am happy to re-examine the proposal in the light of the constructive suggestion made by the honourable member for Bendigo.
BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray)—Will the Premier confirm that he recently met Sir John Anderson, a well-known Melbourne business and political identity, regarding the infamous Board of Works building? If so, will the Premier indicate on whose behalf Sir John Anderson was acting and what the outcome of those important discussions were?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—As I indicated last week, I decline to discuss the Board of Works dispute with any parties directly involved, and I stand by that statement.

COMMUNITY YOUTH SUPPORT SCHEME

Mr WHITING (Mildura)—In view of the importance of the Community Youth Support Scheme programme to youth in Victoria and following the establishment of the co-operative development programme in March of this year, can the Minister for Employment and Training indicate whether the total sum of $650,000 allocated to the scheme has been fully committed and whether any of the groups set up under the new scheme are yet self supporting?

Mr DIXON (Minister for Employment and Training)—The funds that were devoted to the scheme last financial year, some of which are still to be allocated this financial year, have certainly not been exhausted. With the possible exception of the Maryborough Bootstrap Co-operative Ltd, I do not consider that any of the cooperatives are economically viable. The period in which they have been operating has been too short to enable them to become economically viable. As anyone will appreciate, when one enters a new business enterprise, it takes time to reach the stage at which one can proclaim oneself economically viable.

However, I add that the Victorian Government has been concerned about the action of the Commonwealth Government to terminate prematurely the Community Youth Support Scheme. The Victorian Government considers the service should continue, at least until the end of this financial year, and that a new scheme, which I will present to a conference of responsible Ministers on Friday, called Youth Enterprise Support Scheme, ought to be supported by the Federal Government and by the other States. The scheme contains the best features of the Community Youth Support Scheme and includes other features such as co-operation from State Governments, local government and voluntary organizations in a way that should supply employment training or support opportunities to every young Australian.

SUNDAY FOOTBALL

Mr McARTHUR (Ringwood)—Can the Minister for Community Welfare Services advise the House whether the time for submissions to the study team established by his department to examine all aspects of Sunday football has closed and whether the Leader of the Opposition has conveyed a recent submission to the study team that he received by way of petition in opposition to Sunday football and on which he sought considerable publicity last week?

Mr JONA (Minister for Community Welfare Services)—The closing date for submissions for the Sunday football study team established in my department by the Victorian Government was 5 p.m. yesterday. The closing date was widely publicized many weeks prior to that date.

In answer to the second part of the question, no submission has been received from the Leader of the Opposition conveying any of the views expressed by the 23,000 petitioners who petitioned him last Thursday. It is regrettable that the submission made to the Leader of the Opposition, or at least the contents of the submission, were not passed on to the study team prior to the closing date so that consideration of the submission could have been given by the body appointed by the Victorian Government to carry out the sort of investigation that the Leader of the Opposition has said is Labor Party policy.
Approximately 530 submissions have been made on the question of Sunday football matches and these include submissions from both the Victorian Football League and the Victorian Football Association. It is regrettable that the Leader of the Opposition did not submit these petitions to ensure that the study team had the opportunity of considering the matter discussed with him on the front steps of Parliament House last Thursday.

BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr Ginifer (Keilor)—I ask the Premier whether the Government was informed of the terms and conditions for the settlement of the Board of Works building dispute and, if so, whether the Government instructed the board not to settle but to take the dispute to court.

Mr Thompson (Premier and Treasurer)—I have nothing further to add to the answers I have already given. This matter is complex and controversial and it is the Government’s view that it should be settled in the proper place, the Supreme Court of Victoria.

COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING

Mr Richardson (forest Hill)—Is the Premier aware of a statement in the Age of 14 September by Michelle Grattan in which she commented on the growing criticism of the disruption and inconvenience that will be caused—

The Speaker (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! The honourable member may not read statements in questions without notice.

Mr Richardson—Is the Premier aware of remarks made by Michelle Grattan in the Age in which she referred to the inconvenience caused by security precautions planned for the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Melbourne later this month? If so, will the honourable gentleman inform the House whether he has received representations from concerned people objecting to the security precautions and, specifically, whether the Government and the Chief Commissioner of Police have been consulted on security arrangements for this important meeting? Further, does the Government support the Federal Government in hosting this historic meeting and does the Premier welcome the choice of Melbourne for this important event?

The Speaker—Order! The question is in three parts and I ask the Premier to answer the question on security matters. The other questions relate to that but are additional questions and honourable members must ask only one question during questions without notice.

Mr Thompson (Premier and Treasurer)—I have had discussions both with the Prime Minister and Chief Commissioner of Police on the desirability of interfering as little as possible with the normal flow of traffic in the City of Melbourne during the whole of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. However, unfortunately, in this day and age there are extremists and people who rely on the use of force to achieve their own ends and it is necessary to go to far greater trouble than would have been necessary 10, 15 or 20 years ago to ensure the safety of distinguished heads of Government and international visitors.

Melbourne will receive approximately 1500 visitors. There will be 40 heads of Government, a number of whom have had attacks made on their lives either in their own countries or in countries they have been visiting and, therefore, the Victoria Police Force has made a special feature of preparing adequately for the safety of these persons while they are resident in Melbourne.

I stress, once again, that the precautions taken will not be extreme although they will slightly interfere with the normal flow of traffic in Melbourne. Naturally, the final judgment of what security precautions need to be taken will be left to the Chief Commissioner of Police and the head of the Federal Police.
BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr ROPER (Brunswick)—I ask the Premier: In view of widespread community concern over the rapidly escalating cost of repairs to the ill-fated Board of Works building, the protracted delay in settling the issue and the possibility of an additional financial burden on the ratepayers of Melbourne, will the Premier arrange to appoint an all-party Parliamentary committee of inquiry to inquire into and report on all matters relating to this issue as a matter of priority?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I have nothing to add to my previous answers.

PETROL RETAILING

Mr JASPER (Murray Valley)—I ask the Premier: Because of the continuing problems within the petrol retailing industry and the representations that have been made by the Victorian Automobile Chamber of Commerce and other organizations to the Government and to members of Parliament, what action is the Government prepared to take to protect the interests of service station operators, particularly those operating on company-owned sites? Also, what action, if any, does the Government intend to take to legislate to set a wholesale price for fuel; to stabilize the industry in Victoria and to achieve a uniform price between the States?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—A meeting has been held with representatives of the retail industry and the oil industry itself. There will be another meeting when discussions between those two groups have been completed.

SALES TAX

Mrs PATRICK (Brighton)—I ask the Premier whether he has made personal representations to the Prime Minister to have sales tax removed from seat belts and other safety equipment used in motor vehicles.

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I thank the honourable member for Brighton for her constructive suggestion. I have already made such an appeal through the press and will follow that up with a detailed letter indicating the benefits, from a safety point of view, which would flow from the abolition of sales tax increases on seat belts in particular.

STATE BANK HOME LOANS

Mr CATHIE (Carrum)—Will the Treasurer indicate whether there is any agreement between the Government and the State Bank for refugees and migrants to obtain home loans after four months of their arrival in Victoria and, if so, and in view of the call by the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet to halt the scheme, whether there is any intention to amend the programme and, if so, in what way?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—There has been no formal agreement between the Government and the State Bank. Following strong representations from the honourable member for Noble Park that this scheme may be working adversely against the interests of people who live here permanently, the matter will be discussed with the board of commissioners of the State Bank to ascertain whether some modification is justified.

MANAGEMENT OF GRAMPIANS AREA

Mr McGRATH (Lowan)—My question to the Minister of Forests relates to comments made earlier this year by four members of the Liberal Party representing western Victoria, who suggested that the management of the Grampians area should remain with the Forests Commission. Following the proposed recommendations from the Land Conservation Council released at the week-end suggesting that half of the Grampians area should be placed under the control of the National Parks Service, can the Minister give an assurance that he will do everything within his power to ensure that the management of the Grampians area is retained by the Forests Commission, or will he bow to the pressure of city Liberal Party members?
Mr AUSTIN (Minister of Forests)—
The Government will not bow to any pressure as such from anybody. It will be looking at the matter on its merits. The recommendations of the Land Conservation Council have just been brought down and I have not had a chance to study them at this stage. However, one assurance I can give to the honourable member for Lowan is that although my role has changed somewhat from the time the statement appeared in the Wimmera Mail-Times to now, in that I am currently Minister of Forests, my attitude to the management of the Grampians area has not altered. I still believe the management of the Grampians ought to be left in the hands of the Forests Commission.

TOURIST INDUSTRY

Mr I. W. SMITH (Warrnambool)—
Can the Minister for Tourism indicate what actions he has been able to take to improve the effectiveness of Government involvement in the tourist industry in this State?

Mr WEIDEMAN (Minister for Tourism)—I thank the honourable member for Warrnambool for his question. I suggest to the House that Victoria is just becoming familiar with the business of tourism. Its economic value to the State is in the order of $750 million, and by the end of the decade I believe it will increase to $1000 million.

In specific terms, as honourable members have said, the Government has streamlined tourism in Victoria. It has closed down Victour offices in four of the sites, but has strengthened the role of the twelve regions in the State, and they will take over the responsibility. In closing down those offices, the Government will be establishing offices in Canberra, Perth and Hobart to complement those in Brisbane, Sydney and Adelaide.

In terms of conventions, one must recognize that in twelve months Victoria's convention business has increased to a total value of $46 million and the number of conventions has more than doubled, from 150 to 357. With a multiplier effect, the value of this would be in the order of $140 million.

The value of the skiing industry this year was $180 million, and I expect that that will increase to $1000 million by the end of the decade.

The future of tourism in this State, now that we have discovered tourism, is very bright, and the Government will take all steps to encourage an industry that we would expect in Victoria.

ALCOA SMELTER AT PORTLAND

Mr JOLLY (Dandenong)—I ask the Premier whether, during his period as Treasurer, the State Treasury prepared a report or reports about the proposed aluminium smelter at Portland warning against the proposal and outlining that the subsidy for the transmission line alone was $12,200 per job created by the smelter on the assumption that a higher cost than the proposed charge would be charged. If so, why did the Treasurer not accept this advice, and will the Premier and Treasurer now make available all the documents associated with the proposed aluminium smelter?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—As was indicated to the House last week, Treasury made a report at that time and naturally recommended the most economical scheme. The Treasury is obliged to look at the proposal basically from a financial point of view.

The Government was interested in decentralizing industry. It was also interested in conservation issues and had to consider those issues in making a balanced judgment.

After considering Treasury advice and advice relating to decentralization, balanced development and conservation, the Government made the decision to encourage Alcoa to establish a smelter at Portland, an area where a harbour has been in course of construction and has been improved regularly since the 1950s, originally with the full support of the former Premier of those days, 1952 to 1955—the father
of the present Leader of the Opposition—who emphasized continually, as I mentioned last week, the importance of the Government taking positive action to make full use of the port of Portland.

We hear from time to time of the need to foster the decentralization of industry. We are spending more than $30 million a year in encouraging industry to stay in the country and in ensuring that when it goes to the country, it prospers there. There has never been any criticism of that policy.

When we take positive action to establish a large smelter at Alcoa, it is rather strange that the same sort of praise that goes to the New South Wales and Queensland Governments for developing smelters interstate does not go to us.

RETAIL TRADING HOURS

Mr Cox (Mitcham)—Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of a campaign being waged for extended trading hours? Will the Minister tell the House whether he will be considering that submission or whether he will support the plea by small traders to keep the status quo?

Mr Ramsay (Minister of Labour and Industry)—The Government is not proposing or considering, nor would it agree, to any proposal for a general extension in shop-trading hours. That situation was announced by me as long ago as last November when I indicated that the Government had considered the various sides of the argument very closely, and reached the conclusion that any general extension of shop-trading hours would cause hardship to countless thousands of small businessmen and their families which would more than outweigh any advantage that the community might obtain from longer shopping hours being made available. Nothing between last November and now has given the Government any cause to change its mind on that particular question.

Following a request from the Victorian Chambers of Commerce and Industry that was made at the time of the introduction of the tourist precinct concept for limited trading at weekends—the Government established a committee of inquiry to examine various anomalies that may exist in section 80 of the Labour and Industry Act. I remind the House that that section is an attempt to establish a balance between the conflicting interests in the community of those who would want to have some shopping facilities available at week-ends and those traders who are looking to preserve their week-ends as a time for leisure, which is the common practice for the majority of citizens in this community.

It is inevitable, in trying to strike a balance in these areas, that certain anomalies will arise. The committee is comprised of the various interests concerned to see if some consensus can be reached amongst those interests on the best arrangements for week-end trading. The Government recognizes that the present provisions of the Act may not be entirely adequate. If a consensus can be reached, I would expect the committee to report accordingly, but there is not a proposal for a general extension of shop-trading hours before the Government.

ALCOA OF AUSTRALIA LTD

Mr Rowe (Essendon)—I ask the Premier: Did the State Electricity Commission advise the Government that it would not be able to guarantee power to Alcoa's smelter at Portland in 1983? If so, why did the Government enter into the agreement with Alcoa at Portland, and was that at the expense of other businesses and consumers in Victoria?

Mr Thompson (Premier and Treasurer)—The question relates to negotiations that took place at that particular time between the Government, the State Electricity Commission and Alcoa. This Government has gone immeasurably further than either the Queensland or the New South Wales Government in making available information. For example, the New South Wales Government did not introduce any legislation into the New South Wales Parliament. The Victorian Government declared its intention clearly in bringing this pro-
posed legislation into the House for full debate in 1980. A final decision was made about the Alcoa project. The agreement that was reached was debated in detail in this House. The Government makes no apology for encouraging Alcoa to go to Portland. It is a major industry which contributes $400 million to our balance of payments annually, $566 million in the payment of salaries, wages and the cost of services and $100 million in taxes. Half of Alcoa’s profits of $46 million stays in Australia. The company was founded by Australians and has a greater content of Australian ownership than other companies which have been established to farm alumina in either New South Wales or Queensland.

TELECOM CHARGES

Mr B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East)—I refer the Premier and Treasurer to approaches which were made on a number of occasions by his predecessor, Mr Hamer, to the Commonwealth Government in regard to Telecom charges and their effect on decentralization. Will the Premier consider connecting all State public offices to the “inward wide area telephone service”, thus enabling all Victorians, wherever they live, the democratic right to contact State public offices at the price of a local telephone call, a privilege presently enjoyed only by residents of the metropolitan area and those who live within a radius of approximately 50 miles from the General Post Office?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I should be pleased to assess the cost of such a proposal. Firstly, I will take up again the plea made in recent times by the former Premier, Mr Hamer, to the Commonwealth Government to apply the same principle to telephone charges as the Victorian State Government applies to State Electricity Commission charges throughout the State.

PENSIONER REBATE SCHEME

Mr SKEGGS (Ivanhoe)—Has the attention of the Minister for Community Welfare Services been drawn to a report in the Heidelberger newspaper of a claim by an Australian Labor Party candidate that the Government plans to abandon the pensioner rebate scheme? Can the Minister give an assurance that this scheme will continue?

Mr JONA (Minister for Community Welfare Services)—My attention has been drawn to the statement made by the Australian Labor Party candidate for Ivanhoe, Mr Tony Sheehan. This is a most irresponsible statement by Mr Sheehan. I suppose the most generous description that I could give of Mr Sheehan is that he is grossly unreliable. He claims that he has some information from a confidential document that was leaked to him. I do not know to what confidential document he is referring or whether any grounds exist on which he could have based such a statement. As the honourable member for Ivanhoe will be aware, this matter forms an important part of Budget consideration and the position will be clarified when the Budget is brought in tomorrow.

I remind the honourable member that in the year just concluded, the Victorian Government paid, by way of subsidies to pensioners in this State, an amount in excess of $46 million, covering Board of Works and council rate rebates, motor car registration and third-party insurance premium rebates, fare concessions and other discounts. That amount is far greater than the amount allowed in other States in the Commonwealth and represents a most generous contribution towards the living costs of pensioners in Victoria. I assure the honourable member that the interests of the pensioners in respect of these rebates and assistance with income maintenance requirements will always remain a high priority of this Government.

ALCOA OF AUSTRALIA LTD

Mr EDMUNDS (Ascot Vale)—I remind the Premier and Treasurer that in 1979 his predecessor, Mr Hamer, and at the last moment in respect of the negotiations with Alcoa, discovered that there was a necessity
for much harsher terms and, in a belated recognition of this fact, stated that the terms and conditions of the settlement were far too generous. In view of the Premier’s absolute recall on many subjects, I submit that he will recall all of that. If so, can he advise the House what were the new terms and why action has not been taken to implement them?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—My reply to the honourable member for Ascot Vale is along similar lines to other questions that I have answered, that this was part and parcel of negotiations. It has not been the practice of other State Governments to give any information. We came into this House and introduced this Bill—and honourable members can go to any office of the State Electricity Commission and find out what the MS tariff is on any day of the week. No details were given in New South Wales in relation to Alcan.

The Government stands by the agreement that was made and believes it was in the interests of Victoria, in the interests of balanced development and particularly in the interests of developing an area where we have spent $18 million on harbor development over the past twenty years.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

Mr BIRRELL (Geelong West)—Can the Minister of Labour and Industry inform the House regarding the appointment of commissioners to the Industrial Relations Commission, about which legislation was passed, and when this commission will start operating?

Mr RAMSAY (Minister of Labour and Industry)—The President of the State Industrial Relations Commission was appointed some months ago. He has been working steadily since in preparing the ground work for the establishment of the commission and the appointment of two commissioners has been announced today.

Mr L. J. Eddington, the Secretary of the Plumbing Industry Employers Secretariat, and Mr R. J. Garlick, Secretary of the Victorian Teachers Union, have been appointed as commissioners to take up appointment as from 1 November at which time the Act will be proclaimed and the commission will be under way.

COAL TO OIL LIQUEFACTION PLANTS

Mr MILLER (Prahran)—Will the Premier agree to make available the details of agreements negotiated between the Government and companies proposing to establish coal to oil liquefaction plants in this State? If not, why not?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—In reply to the honourable member for Prahran, I repeat the offer made by my predecessor that details will be made available on a confidential basis to Leaders of the other parties. It is an extraordinary thing that members of the Opposition are always talking about the need to create additional employment opportunities and provide more jobs because every large-scale move by this Government to introduce large industrial undertakings which would have the effect of producing a large number of additional jobs is consistently opposed in a most negative manner by the Opposition.

MUNICIPAL FLOOD FUNDS

Mr HANN (Rodney)—Can the Premier advise the House whether a formula has now been drawn up for the reimbursement of municipal councils for funds expended for the purpose of assisting private people to protect dwellings during recent flooding?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—The details of the method of finance were sent out, I thought, to all honourable members in flood-affected areas. Any changes were to be made through the Minister for Local Government. I will discuss that matter with him and give the honourable member any further information that is available.

TOURISM

Mr TANNER (Caulfield)—In view of the fact that the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting to be held in
Melbourne would appear to be an excellent opportunity to promote tourism in Victoria, what action has the Minister for Tourism taken to promote tourism in our State to coincide with the meeting?

Mr WEIDEMAN (Minister for Tourism)—The Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting will be an excellent opportunity for us to promote tourism in Victoria, as there will be 40 heads of Government, their delegations and approximately 1000 media representatives and foreign journalists as well as representatives of many non-Commonwealth countries in Melbourne at that time.

The Victorian Ministry will be preparing literature and, with the Australian Tourist Commission, will be providing a great deal of information about this country, particularly Victoria. A task force will be putting together an information kit brochure to illustrate the beauties of this State and will be manning the Exhibition Buildings in an effort to ensure that we provide the appropriate information to visiting dignitaries. No doubt the many journalists and media representatives will be providing the rest of the world with a picture of Melbourne, as they will be taking up much of the time available on television throughout the world. The Ministry for Tourism will not be neglecting this great opportunity to promote Victoria.

AIR-CONDITIONED TRAINS

Mr CRABB (Knox)—Can the Minister of Transport advise the House whether it is a fact that the Victorian Railways new air-conditioned suburban trains are 3 inches too wide to operate on most suburban railway lines; can he inform the House on which lines they will be operating once they commence operations; and what action is the Minister taking to ensure that all of Melbourne’s rail commuters will have the opportunity of riding in the new air-conditioned trains instead of the 65-year-old red rattlers to which they are at present condemned?

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—The honourable member for Knox refers to the new suburban trains, the first of which, honourable members will be delighted to know, will be handed over officially on 25 September—the question allows me a brief commercial on that. The new trains, like many other systems that are being upgraded, call for higher standards than are available historically. The situation is similar to that in New South Wales, where the Minister has said the New South Wales Government will be spending $200 million on upgrading railway tracks to enable advantage to be taken of the new, high-speed country trains. In Victoria, through a programme that has been going on for many years, we are upgrading and relaying tracks.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr MACLELLAN—The usual negative howls! It would have escaped the notice of all members of the Opposition except perhaps the honourable member representing part of Geelong, that we have just duplicated the line to Geelong. That honourable member is now whingeing about the fact that it has taken so long. He apparently does not have time to say a friendly word about the fact that it has been done.

The new suburban carriages represent an investment of about $120 million or $130 million and, as I said, the first is to be delivered shortly. There have been trials around the system and some points will have to be upgraded. The trains will be put into operation on the lines for which they are suitable and lines throughout the system will be improved progressively until all of the new trains can be used, leading to the elimination of most, if not all, of the wooden-bodied carriages, which will enable us to have a system that will suit the needs of Melbourne.

The honourable member for Knox rather tactfully confined his question to the new suburban air-conditioned trains, but he nonetheless referred to air-conditioned trains. He perhaps did not want any reference to the fact that the unions will not allow the new air-conditioned country trains to operate.
MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr WILLIAMS (Doncaster)—No doubt the Minister of Agriculture is aware that the Australian meat scandal occurred at an extremely fortunate time for the American meat industry, which was in a depressed state. Can the Minister give the House an assurance that in future officers of his department will keep an eagle eye on the activities of west-coast Americans interested in the Australian meat industry?

Mr AUSTIN (Minister of Agriculture)—The question refers to the meat industry trade between Australia and the United States of America. When fraud was perpetuated most people thought it would lead to a disastrous and serious downturn in the trade. However, we saw a hiccup or stutter. The American authorities sent out a leading policeman to negotiate with Australian police and his comments were that the matter should be straightened out as quickly as possible because America needed the meat trade with Australia.

Of course, another matter of particular significance is that in the market-place—either new markets or wherever sales have taken place—very little fluctuation in meat prices in Victoria has occurred since 15 August.

MEAT INDUSTRY REGULATIONS

Mr FOGARTY (Sunshine)—Can the Minister of Agriculture explain why the Government has refused to act after repeated requests from Government and semi-Government authorities that stricter controls should be applied on horse and kangaroo meat and other knackery products? I refer particularly to the former Meat Industry Committee which made definite recommendations applying to the pet food industry. Can the Minister explain why the Government did not act because if it had done so it may have had some effect on the scandal now confronting the Victorian meat industry?

Mr AUSTIN (Minister of Agriculture)—The first point that needs to be made is that the fraud took place in the export arena.

Mr Fogarty—No!

Mr AUSTIN—The fraud occurred in the export arena and is the responsibility of the Federal Government. No changes in inspection services introduced during any period could have avoided the situation. If people want to cheat or rob a bank they will find ways and means of doing so. If Victorians desired some sort of controls imposed on every activity in which they are involved, they would have those controls. However, somebody has to pay for them. Because companies operating within the meat industry have not been able to behave themselves much stricter controls will have to be imposed in many areas.

I have already explained what is to take place. The sale of kangaroo and horse meat for human consumption will be banned and all pet meat is to be branded with an edible dye known as denaturing rather than the present bandaging system. However, these controls will require more meat inspectors, more staff and more expense, and it is a pity that such restrictions have to be imposed.

PETITIONS

Sunday football—Abortion

Mr CAIN (Leader of the Opposition) presented two petitions from certain citizens: 1. Praying that the House will take such action as it may to prevent the introduction of Sunday Victorian Football League football; and 2. praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petitions were respectfully worded, in order, and bore 23,453 and 16,969 signatures respectively.

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

Amusement machine industry—Abortion

Mr SPYKER (Heatherton) presented two petitions from certain citizens: 1. Praying that the Victorian Government undertake an urgent review of all planning, health and other statutory controls
relating to the amusement machine industry and of alternative recreation facilities and programmes for our community; and 2. praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petitions were respectfully worded, in order, and bore 441 and 408 signatures respectively.

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

Housing Commission rental homes

Mr TEMPLETON (Mentone) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that the Victorian Government allocate substantial new funds to Housing Commission rental homes in the 1981-82 Budget. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 2933 signatures.

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

Retail trading hours—Abortion

Mr BIRRELL (Geelong West) presented two petitions from certain citizens: 1. Praying that the House take action to ensure that there be no further extension of trading regulations already provided for week-end trading; and 2. praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petitions were respectfully worded, in order, and bore 2310 and 580 signatures respectively.

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

Abortion

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 298 signatures.

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

Mr TREWIN (Benalla) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 544 signatures.

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

Mr CATHIE (Carrum) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 422 signatures.

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

Mr TANNER (Caulfield) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 661 signatures.

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

Mr ERNST (Geelong East) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 458 signatures.

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

Mr TREZISE (Geelong North) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is
a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 815 signatures.

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

Mr REYNOLDS (Gisborne) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 521 signatures.

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

Mrs TONER (Greensborough) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. She stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 647 signatures.

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

Mr COX (Mitcham) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 1228 signatures.

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

Mr McARTHUR (Ringwood) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 396 signatures.

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

Mr CRELLIN (Sandringham) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 374 signatures.

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

Mr AUREL SMITH (South Barwon) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 401 signatures.

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

Mr KING (Springvale) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 1238 signatures.

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

Mr COLEMAN (Syndal) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 2482 signatures.

It was ordered that the petition be laid on the table.
Mr BROWN (Westernport) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 412 signatures.

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

Mr STIRLING (Williamstown) presented a petition from certain citizens of Victoria praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 228 signatures.

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

PAPERS

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


Town and Country Planning Act 1961:
- Bendigo—City of Bendigo Planning Scheme 1962, Amendment No. 34.
- Cranbourne Planning Scheme 1960, Amendment No. 39.
- Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 137, Part 2.
- Narracan—Shire of Narracan, Yallourn North Planning Scheme 1951, Amendment Nos. 4 and 5 (two papers).
- Shepparton—City of Shepparton Planning Scheme 1953, Amendment Nos. 49 (1979), 51, 52 and 54 (1980) (four papers).
- Woorayl—Shire of Woorayl Planning Scheme, Amendment No. 49 (1980).

Upper Yarra Valley and Dandenong Ranges Authority:
Reports for the period ended 30 September 1977 and for the period ended 30 September 1978 (two papers).

APPROPRIATION MESSAGE

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman) announced that he had received messages from His Excellency the Governor recommending that appropriations be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the following Bills:

- Education (Amendment) Bill
- Town and Country Planning (Western Port) Bill

JOINT SITTING OF PARLIAMENT

Deakin University Council:

- Monash University Council

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—I have received the following communication from the Minister of Education:

Dear Mr Speaker,

The statutes relating to the universities listed below provide for the appointment by the Governor in Council of three Members of the Parliament to each of their governing councils—the Members to be recommended for appointment by a joint sitting of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly conducted in accordance with rules adopted for the purpose by the members present at the sitting. I should be grateful if you could arrange for such a joint sitting to recommend Members for appointment to the following vacancies:


I have addressed a similar request to the President, Legislative Council.

Yours sincerely,

A. J. HUNT, Minister of Education

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this House meet the Legislative Council for the purpose of sitting and voting together to choose three members of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the Council of Deakin University, and one member of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the
Council of Monash University, and propose that the place and time of such meeting shall be the Legislative Assembly Chamber on Tuesday next at six o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

COUNCIL OF ADULT EDUCATION BILL

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As a public education authority, the Council of Adult Education is highly regarded throughout Victoria, and is the envy of adult education agencies in other States. The council was written into the Education Act as a statutory body in its own right and proclaimed on 21 March 1947. The legislation enacted at that time has enabled the council to contribute widely and usefully to the growth of adult education in Victoria for the past 34 years.

The Bill removes the council from the Education Act 1958 and is introduced as part of the logic of the White Paper and as part of the restructure of post-secondary education in Victoria—a restructure which has clearly identified the Council of Adult Education as a major technical and further education provider.

The White Paper recommends rational and simple structures for primary and post-primary education. Consequently, the amendments to the Education Act that flow from the paper should not be required to encompass organizational structures for adult education. To require them to do so would complicate a process that the Government wishes to simplify. Legislation for adult education must be shaped by a different set of procedures and principles from those which apply to primary and secondary education. The purpose of this Bill is to establish a body corporate under the name of the Council of Adult Education, and to further increase its effectiveness.

The legislation proposes no change of significance to the operation of the council, because the council has been widely recognized in the community and by the Government as an autonomous statutory authority, although in fact this autonomy is currently limited by its existence within the Education Act. The time is now opportune, therefore, for the council to operate under its own Act with the autonomy and independence that the community expects of it, in fact as well as in substance.

Responsibility for adult education in Victoria was transferred by the Education Act 1946 from the Extension Department of the University of Melbourne and the Workers Education Association and placed in the hands of a council of eighteen members. The move was prompted partly by the need for a properly planned and co-ordinated system of adult education, which the existing organizations had neither the constitutions nor the resources to handle, and partly by the success of the services education scheme.

The scheme had gathered the largest collection of educational books then assembled in Australia and provided service to people at home and abroad with discussion notes, music, drama, hobby and craft opportunities, remedial education and assistance with rehabilitation. The scheme has demonstrated that adult education really works for the ordinary man and woman provided it has the backing of trained staff, premises and materials.

When the Council of Adult Education was set up, the Government of the day acknowledged education as a lifelong process and asserted that means would have to be found to enable as many people as possible to further their own schooling. The means found in fact amounted to an annual grant of $50,000. It was sufficient to encourage the new Director, Mr Colin Badger, previously the Director of the Extension Department of the University of Melbourne, to launch into the provision of a wide range of self-funding programmes.

Mr Badger appreciated that legislation made the council a statutory authority, not a department. It gave the council a wider charter that included advising, administering and planning adult education as well as providing courses. By conscious design it had given to the council a large measure of autonomy, with policy in the hands of...
the eighteen member council. The council met its responsibility to Government by keeping within the four corners of its Act, accounting for the public money it received and reporting annually to Parliament.

Under the legislation the council over the years has provided an excellent working model of a statutory authority. It has consistently raised about 40 per cent of its operating costs. It has developed a staffing structure with a sound career path for a full-time staff of more than 90. It has engaged part-time staff for teaching, while the full-time staff has concentrated on the development, organization and administration of programmes. As a consequence, some of the best known figures in literature, the arts, the professions and government have worked for the council at one time or another. It has never attempted to be a cure-all for social ill-health but has tried to cater for non-formal, non-credit learning needs in the belief that the process of meeting these needs can assist adults to enjoy their leisure more and be more effective at work. It has not attempted to extinguish other forms of adult learning but has tried to foster and extend them as its charter requires.

This is the record which that legislation is seeking to consolidate and extend into the future. In doing, so it is appropriate to thank and congratulate all who have served on the council during the past 34 years. The present council has assisted greatly in the preparation of the Bill now before the House. It consists of not more than 32 members, most of whom come from groups, specified in the Education Act 1958, associated with or involved in adult education. There has been such an explosion in adult education in recent years, however, that the number of agencies and groups involved has considerably expanded. It would be unworkable to extend the composition of the new board to include members from all the relevant fields of adult education. The Government has therefore decided to return to a pattern similar to that of the first council, which included thirteen appointed members.

The board of the new council will consist of the Director of Adult Education, an officer of the council, a tutor, a local advisory committee member, a member of the Adult Education Association, not more than twelve appointed members and not more than ten members co-opted by the board itself. A board of this kind, consisting of not more than 27 members, is large enough to ensure that every viewpoint on adult education can be heard and small enough to ensure effective interaction between members.

The council is a direct provider of adult education, chiefly through its headquarters building in Flinders Street, Melbourne. It has enrolled in excess of 40,000 students in 1981, in over 1500 courses, taught by 900 tutors. During peak times up to 14,000 students a week use the city building. Many more are enrolled in courses conducted in 70 or more locations in suburban Melbourne and elsewhere throughout country Victoria. Almost 8000 are enrolled in the book discussion groups which are spread around the State, and several thousand more take part in camps, educational tours, seminars and other day and night activities. On almost every day of the year, including Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, there is some activity of the council in progress.

The council also has established a special relationship with country continuing education centres. This is not surprising in view of the fact that its second director, the late Mr Colin Cave, who died in 1979, founded the first such centre in Wangaratta in 1962.

For a time after Mr Cave's death it seemed that the future of the council might be in doubt, but the strong support which emerged at that time led to the Government's affirmation of the value of its work and to the appointment of the third director, Mr A. R. Delves.

Perhaps the most significant recent initiative of the council has been the renewal and strengthening of the relationship with continuing education centres and similar adult education agencies in country Victoria. Early in
1980 it made available to country centres the opportunity to forge more direct and positive links with the council by becoming local advisory committees under section 75 of the Education Act 1958. In return the council has agreed to preserve the autonomy and independence of local advisory committees and to act as a more direct funding authority on their behalf. At present 22 centres have interim status as local advisory committees and currently several others are seeking such status—a provision retained in the present Act.

The council is now recognized as a major TAFE provider with a State-wide responsibility for adult education. In this aspect of its charter the council complements the work of local and regional groups including those in metropolitan Melbourne, mainly through its field officers and the experience and expertise built up through the life of the council.

At present, the council operates on a budget consisting of a direct grant of $50,000, a supplementary grant from Treasury of $2,472,183 in 1980-81, and courses fees of $1,498,850 in 1980-81. Included in the supplementary grant is an allowance for its work in access programmes in the TAFE area for which no course fees are charged. The council will continue to operate on a budget of these proportions, eventually as part of the total TAFE budget. It will do this as a body corporate, managing its own funds in accordance with Treasury regulations and the provisions of this Act.

Ownership of some land at Bunyip, the Ola Cohn Centre at East Melbourne and the Russell Street Theatre, at present held in trust for the Council by the Minister, will be transferred to the council by this Bill. The former Mutual Store Building at 256 Flinders Street has recently been leased for the council for a period of ten years with two further options of five years each. The building has been internally reconstructed by the owner to the specifications of the council and will be officially opened and named by His Excellency, the Governor-General, Sir Zelman Cowen, who was a tutor with the council for some fifteen years or so.

The council is optimistic about its future. The decision to advertise courses more extensively through daily newspapers has resulted in an unprecedented rush of applications for programmes. It has justified the council’s confidence in developing access to education programmes for those who wish to return to study and in offering a wide range of community programmes while continuing to offer its traditional programmes in the creative arts, liberal studies, language studies and for those aged 60 and over. The demand for its services in the areas of general assistance, advice, staff training and community liaison and support continues to expand. The freedom of movement that will be available to the council as a body corporate will enable it to continue expansion in those programme areas for which there is an assured public response and for which there is a requirement within the TAFE system. This in turn increases the capacity of the council to provide services elsewhere.

In summary, this Bill, by establishing a body corporate under the name of the Council of Adult Education, continues the logic of the White Paper, takes a further step in the restructure of post-secondary education in Victoria, and equips an organization with a remarkable history to continue and further develop a valued service to the community. It provides the council with the autonomy of operation that one associates with a body corporate while retaining the exceptional quality of the legislation which established the council in 1946. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr FORDHAM (Footscray), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

FILMS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill has two purposes—firstly, to reduce the minimum age of children able to attend screenings of films classified for “restricted exhibition” from six
Films (Amendment) Bill

years to two years and, secondly, to increase certain fees payable under the Act.

In 1973, a meeting of State and Commonwealth Ministers responsible for censorship agreed that the minimum age limit on children attending screenings of films classified for "restricted exhibition" should be reduced from six years to two years. Subsequently, all States with the exception of Victoria legislated to reduce the age limit. In Victoria, a Bill to reduce the age limit was introduced in 1974 but after further consideration the Government decided not to proceed with the Bill.

Recently, the Government has looked at the matter again and has decided, in the light of available evidence, that the minimum age should be reduced in line with the other States. In this regard, submissions have been received from medical experts that some children aged between two and six years might suffer psychological harm if they were repeatedly exposed to the violence and matters of a sexual nature often present in such films.

Clause 2 of the Bill contains the amendments which reduce the minimum age of two years. The effect of the amendment will be that a child who has attained the age of two years and has not attained the age of eighteen years will not be permitted to attend the screening of a film classified for "restricted exhibition". In addition, clause 2 contains provisions which will enable the age restrictions to be enforced and which will ensure that children are protected from the irresponsible acts of adults. Where a person attends a "restricted exhibition" film with a child, that person may be asked for details of the child's age and may be asked to sign a statement. There are penalties provided for causing or assisting a child between the ages of two and eighteen years to attend the screening of a "restricted exhibition" film and for supplying false information.

Clause 3 of the Bill provides for increases in certain fees payable. Firstly, sub-clause (1) contains amendments to section 34 (g) of the Act. That section allows annual fees for exhibitors, producers and persons who sell or lease films to be prescribed up to a fixed limit. In fact, fees were prescribed up to the current fixed limit in 1971 and no increases have been possible since then, although the consumer price index has risen by approximately 150 per cent. The amendments to section 34 (g) increase the upper limits by 200 per cent which will allow an immediate increase of 150 per cent in line with inflation to be prescribed in the regulations. Further increases up to the new limit will be able to be prescribed in the regulations without a further amendment to the Act.

Clause 3 (2) amends the schedule to the Act, which contains the fees payable on appeals to the Chief Censor. In 1976, a meeting of State and Commonwealth officers responsible for censorship agreed that each State officer would recommend to his Minister that fees applicable to the registration of films for censorship purposes be levied on a uniform basis for all of the States. The amendments to the schedule are in line with the uniform fees which are now imposed in all of the other States with the exception of Queensland. These fees, which involve no work on the part of the States, are collected by the Commonwealth Censor and are returned in full to each State. It is estimated that this amendment will result in an increase of more than $20 000 per annum in the amount received by Victoria from the Commonwealth. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr CATHIE (Carrum), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

PORT OF GEELONG AUTHORITY BILL

Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works) —I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

From its inception the port of Geelong has worked hand in hand with industry to meet the needs and aspirations of a growing nation.

Over the past years, major industrial development has taken place around the port, and most of the industries have
been dependent upon efficient bulk transport facilities. The port of Geelong is widely recognized for its excellent back-up facilities and direct uncongested access to the State’s road and rail arteries. A commendable industrial record has been firmly established and Geelong provides versatile services and facilities that are not readily available in some other ports. The port caters for users who have special requirements not easily accommodated elsewhere.

The port of Geelong provides roll-on-roll-off facilities, dry bulk handling and container facilities, modern berths of world class and safe approach channels.

To meet the ever-growing and changing needs of industry dependent upon sea transport, the commissioners have formulated both medium and long-term development plans, which incorporate a review of administrative aspects and, in turn, consequential review of the provisions of the Act.

The Bill proposes several amendments to the Geelong Harbor Trust Act 1958. The first amendment in the Bill, which is relatively minor in nature, concerns the extension of the interpretation of "owner".

The present interpretation of "owner" defines owner when used in relation to goods only. Throughout the Act reference is made to the owner, master or agent of a vessel and so the amendment sought will extend the present interpretation to include the owner of a vessel or anyone purporting to act on his behalf such as an agent or charterer.

Of a more significant nature is the next amendment, which will change the name of the body responsible for the management of the Port of Geelong from The Geelong Harbor Trust Commissioners to the Port of Geelong Authority.

There is a general lack of understanding overseas of the word "trust" in connection with port administration and the modern practice is for Governments in Australia and overseas to include the words "port authority" in the title of the organizations responsible for the operation of their ports.

Mr Wood

Australian examples of this are the Fremantle Port Authority and the Port of Brisbane Authority, and honourable members will recall that in 1978 the Melbourne Harbor Trust was, in like manner, re-named the Port of Melbourne Authority. The Bill also changes the title of the Act by which the port authority is constituted and functions.

The next amendment concerns the present power of the authority to lease vested land, which in all cases requires the consent of the Governor in Council. The Bill will give the authority power to lease lands vested in the authority with the consent of the Minister where the term of the lease does not exceed 20 years, and with the consent of the Governor in Council where the term of the lease is in excess of 20 years.

The new provision will speed up the mechanism of negotiations and improve the authority’s efficiency in these negotiations with prospective lessees, without lessening the accountability to the Minister.

The Bill provides for a new section 41 to be inserted into the Act giving the authority a general power, subject to the approval of the Minister, to carry out any function and business associated with operation development or expansion within the Port of Geelong.

Such power will allow the commissioners to enter into joint ventures with private enterprise in the formation of companies for the purpose of improving and expanding port services and facilities, for example, slipways, ships repairs, container repairs, towage and marinas. In other words, this will allow the authority to take an equity participation role in all port development and associated services.

Furthermore, the new section 41 will give the commissioners flexibility by allowing them to licence others to conduct or operate a business or facility within the port.

The principal Act provides the commissioners with power to make available plant or equipment outside the port where in their opinion a state of emergency exists.
However, the commissioners deemed it appropriate that a new provision be inserted in the Act to allow them to hire or lease excess or unused plant, equipment, materials or labour outside the port area thus allowing a greater degree of flexibility in the utilization of resources. The Bill provides for this amendment.

The Bill further provides for amendment to the provisions of the principal Act relating to the commissioners' borrowing powers by way of loan and overdraft accommodation.

The Geelong Harbor Trust (Finance) Act 1952 set the present borrowing limit of $9 million. Carefully preserved internal resources have enabled the new container facilities to be constructed without resorting toborrowings. However, future capital projects will involve loan funds. The expansion of the bulk grain berths has already commenced and this, together with other proposed developments, will necessitate borrowings in excess of the existing limit.

The Bill amends the principal Act by raising the limit on borrowing powers in section 87 from $9 million to $25 million.

The present bank overdraft limit of $400,000 in section 94 was also set in 1952. The Bill will increase this limit of advances by way of overdraft to $2 million, subject to the approval of the Treasurer of Victoria. This increase in bank overdraft limit will enable the funding of the authority's trading activities, which are increasing year by year. It is expected that overdraft accommodation would also be used for bridging purposes between loans for major projects.

As I have indicated, at present the principal Act provides for the commissioners to obtain financial accommodation by borrowing pursuant to section 87 or by way of bank overdraft as set by section 94, but not otherwise. The Bill inserts a new section 94A into the principal Act to enable the authority to obtain further financial accommodation to these two sources subject to the approval of the Treasurer in Victoria.

Provision has been made for payment of interest and repayment of principal and overdraft accommodation to be guaranteed by the Government of Victoria.

The provision is essentially the same as that which already exists in the Port of Melbourne Authority Act, the Melbourne Underground Rail Loop Authority Act and the State Electricity Commission Act in order to assist in the funding arrangements for the capital works programmes being carried out by these bodies.

Section 76 of the principal Act empowers the authority to levy charges on goods landed from or loaded into vessels within the Port of Geelong. Section 76 also sets the maximum charge per tonne, per cubic metre or kilolitre.

The present maximum wharfage charge is $2, this figure being set in 1971. The actual scale of charges is prescribed by regulation and the highest charge currently levied is $1.12 per tonne.

To enable regular review of charges to keep pace with inflation and to bring these charges into line with those of other Victorian port authorities, the Bill provides for the statutory limit to be raised from $2 to $3.

A number of redundant provisions and related references in the principal Act have been identified and accordingly this Bill repeals these provisions and references.

Finally, in consequence of the change of name proposed in clause 2 of the Bill, a number of Acts will require amendment and these are listed in the schedule to the Bill.

Explanatory notes on the various clauses are contained in the papers supplied to honourable members. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr ERNST (Geelong East), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.
PUBLIC TRUSTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.
The purpose of clause 2 is to provide that the offices of Public Trustee and Deputy Public Trustee are brought under the provisions of the Public Service Act and that the Senior Deputy Public Trustee automatically becomes the Acting Public Trustee in the absence of the Public Trustee through illness or other cause or during a vacancy in the office of Public Trustee.

In the course of a management review by the Public Service Board of central administration of the Law Department in September 1978, attention was drawn to the fact that the Public Trustee, and, consequently, the Deputy Public Trustee, were not subject to the Public Service Act 1974. The first Public Trustee Act in Victoria was passed in 1939 and it provided for both these officers to be appointed by the Governor in Council.

While there is no clear evidence available as to why the statutory appointment of the office of Public Trustee was selected, it was most likely intended to facilitate the appointment of the first holder of the office. In contrast, the staff of the Public Trustee's Office are appointed under the Public Service Act and, although in recent years the Public Trustee being outside the Public Service has not created any problems, it is considered that control of the administration of the Public Trust Office could be improved if all persons employed in that office were subject to the Public Service Act.

It is considered that a change in the manner of appointment of the Public Trustee should not create legal or practical problems and it is pertinent to note that all Victorian Public Trustees other than the first appointed have come from the Public Service.

Obtaining a formal grant of probate is an expensive exercise. The purpose of clause 3 is to make this unnecessary in relation to estates administered by the Public Trustee and on estates not exceeding $1000 in net value. The procedure provided by sub-clause (1) is that the Public Trustee may give such notice by advertisement or otherwise as he deems appropriate and then deal with the estate as though probate or administration had been granted to him.

Under sub-clause (3), the rights of any person to recover any sum paid under the section from a person who has received it from the Public Trustee are not prejudiced. The amendment will save small estates considerable expense and relieve the Public Trust Office of a cumbersome administrative burden.

At present, by virtue of section 17 of the principal Act, the Public Trustee may, instead of applying for a grant of probate or letters of administration, employ the cheap alternative provided for therein of filing an election with the Registrar of Probates where the estate does not exceed $10,000 gross value.

This section was amended to its present form in 1971 and was apparently designed to meet cases where the only real asset of value in the estate is a residence. Because of the large increase in property values over the past ten years, it is sensible to increase the sum referred to in the section to $50,000 which nowadays would purchase an average house. Clause 4 (A) is designed to achieve this measure.

Section 17 (8) presently provides that where, after the filing of an election, the gross value of the estate is found to exceed $12,000, the Public Trustee shall apply for a grant of probate or letters of administration in the ordinary manner. Clause 4 (B) increases this amount to $60,000 which bears the same proportion to $50,000 as the present sum of $12,000 bears to $10,000.

Clause 5 relates to the application of the Probate Duty Act 1962 to estates administered by the Public Trustee. At present these estates are at a great disadvantage in that the Public Trustee has no statutory power to recover duty from the recipients of notional estates, and the beneficiaries have no power to refer cases to the Hardship Relief Board or to lodge an objection to assessment with
the Victorian Taxation Board of Review. This function is normally carried out by the administrator of an estate, but in the case of estates administered by the Public Trustee, the Public Trustee is both administrator and the assessor of probate duty. The proposed amendments seek to rectify this disadvantageous situation.

Clause 5 (1) replaces the present section 20 which sets out the procedure for assessment by the Public Trustee of probate duty on estates administered by the Public Trustee and, with a minor exception, excludes the application of the Probate Duty Act to such estates.

The proposed section 20 (1) provides that estates administered by the Public Trustee should be liable to the same duty as is payable by other estates under the provisions of the Probate Duty Act 1962. It will be further provided by the proposed section 20 (2) that the Public Trustee will make his assessment within twelve months of the grant of probate or administration.

As noted above, the Public Trustee combines the roles of administrator of an estate and assessor of duty in respect of estates administered by him. Thus, the proposed section 20 (3) places an obligation on the Public Trustee in his role as assessor to treat an estate in the same manner as the Commissioner of Probates if the estate has been one on which duty is assessed by the Commissioner of Probates. Similarly, when in his role as administrator, an election has to be made under section 24 (8) of the Probate Duty Act as to the date on which certain shares are to be valued, the Public Trustee is obliged by the proposed section 20 (4) to make an election which in his opinion will result in the least amount of duty being paid by the estate.

Proposed section 20 (5) and (6) provide for a notice of assessment to be given to beneficiaries and other affected persons and for particulars of the manner of such assessments to be given on demand. Prepayments of probate duty as provided under section 39 of the Probate Duty Act are related to Public Trustee estates by the proposed section 20 (7).

The proposed sub-sections (8) to (11) inclusive provide in essence that all the provisions of the Probate Duty Act as set out in the first column of the Sixth Schedule should apply to estates administered by the Public Trustee with the modifications set out in the second column.

The proposed sub-section (12) gives probate duty on estates administered by the Public Trustee priority over all other debts after payment of testamentary and funeral expenses. The proposed sub-section (13) is the same as the existing section 20 (3). Clause 5 (2) of the Bill provides for the retrospection of those provisions of the Probate Duty Act which are set out in the schedule. The purpose of this clause is to provide that the estates of people who have died before the passing of the Bill but whose estates have not been finalized by the Public Trustee may take advantage of the provisions of the Bill.

Section 28 (2) of the Public Trustee Act deals with the certification of persons as infirm and allows the Public Trustee to certify a person infirm not more than fourteen clear days from the date of examination by the first of two medical practitioners who examined the person. When medical certificates have to be amended, fourteen days has proved in many cases to be too short. The purpose of clause 6 is to increase this period to a more realistic 21 days.

Currently section 39 empowers the Supreme Court to make an order for the appointment of a committee for the protection, care and management of the person of an involuntary patient in an institution under the Mental Health Act 1959. However, no similar power exists for the appointment of a guardian of an infirm person who is not a "patient".

There was a recent case in the Supreme Court of an elderly infirm person whose welfare and treatment was the centre of considerable family disagreement. In order to give the court power to determine who should be the guardian of the infirm person, it was necessary for the infirm person to be made a "patient" by being admitted to an institution and then boarded out.
on trial leave or parole from that institution. This procedure is cumbersome and can cause unnecessary distress to infirm persons and to their families. Clause 7 will amend section 39 by providing that a court may make an order appointing a guardian for the protection, care and management of the person of an infirm person.

Authority is currently provided by section 42 of the Act for an officer charged by the laws of any British possession, other than Victoria, with the administration of the property of a lunatic patient residing in a British possession, other than Victoria, to authorize the Public Trustee to administer any property which the patient possesses and which is situated in Victoria.

Clause 8 provides for a new section 42 which now enables the Public Trustee to request and authorize the proper officer in any State, other than Victoria, or territory of the Commonwealth or in New Zealand or the United Kingdom who is charged under the laws of that region with the management of the affairs of persons, however described, who are incapable of managing their affairs by reason of senility, disease, illness, or physical or mental infirmity, to sell or administer the property in that region of any protected person resident in Victoria.

The clause also introduces a new section 43 which gives reciprocal powers to the Victorian Public Trustee upon the request and authorization of such a proper officer. The new sections do away with outdated terms such as "lunatic patient" and "British Possession" which, in the past, have limited the application of the old section 42 and have caused the use of other more cumbersome provisions in its place, such as the use of section 25 of the Public Trustee Act relating to uncared for property and applying for receivership orders under section 39 of the Act.

In addition, the new sections will enable the Public Trustee to deal in any of the named regions with the proper officer who acts under similar reciprocal legislation.

Mr Maclellan

At present, section 48 (5) provides that there shall be payable to Her Majesty a percentage of 1 per cent per annum on the corpus of every estate administered by a committee other than the Public Trustee and 2.5 per cent per annum on the income of every such estate.

As a consequence, these estates must pay a commission on all capital and income annually whereas under the predecessor of this section, namely, section 137 of the Mental Hygiene Act 1958, commission was charged on capital and income as it was collected. The latter situation appears to have been the real intention of the section. Clause 9 (1) amends section 48 (5) to ensure that commission is payable only on the corpus and income collected in any particular year.

There are at present only two estates administered by receivers, which by virtue of section 39 (a) are subject to the same provisions as private committees, and it is estimated that if the section be amended there would be a potential loss of revenue of about $6500 a year. It is submitted however, that it was not intended to collect this money in any event and this fact should be balanced against the great benefits to the individual estates which have already have to bear the additional expenses of administration.

Clause 9 (2) gives the section a retrospective effect to the time section 137 of the Mental Health Act referred to above was repealed in 1959 and will apply the amended section to the two estates presently being administered by receivers.

Section 48A provides that a person who is a voluntary patient in an institution may authorize the Public Trustee to manage his estate until such time as the patient revokes such authority. This section had led to abuse. In one case a person had himself admitted to an institution for a matter of only days and made himself a protected person under the section. The Public Trustee then discovered that the protected person had contracted hire-purchase debts for motor cars which he had illegally sold and that the only income received by
him was in the form of an invalid pension. He could thereby use the protection afforded by the Act to attempt to evade his creditors and the law and would remain so protected until he voluntarily revoked his election. This would appear to be a highly undesirable mis-use of the protective provisions of the Act.

Clause 10 is designed to amend this situation by providing that the Public Trustee may, with the consent of a judge of the Supreme Court, decline an authority referred to above or accept it upon conditions.

Clause 10(1)(b) will provide that such an authority will continue until revoked by the patient or until he is discharged from an institution whichever first occurs. This should put an end to the present open-ended situation whereby protection could continue long after the need for it has disappeared. Sub-clause (2) ensures that the provision has a retrospective effect.

Section 52 allows the Public Trustee to exercise powers vested in a protected person as a trustee. In situations where the Public Trustee has purported to exercise the powers of protected persons to appoint new trustees and in fact has appointed new trustees, there is some doubt as to whether the trust property thereby automatically vests in the new trustees, pursuant to section 45 of the Trustee Act 1958. The reason for this doubt is that the former section 39 of the Public Trustee Act 1958 specifically gave the appointment of new trustees by the Public Trustee the same effect as such an appointment pursuant to section 45 of the Trustee Act 1958. The reason for this doubt is that the former section 39 of the Public Trustee Act 1958 specifically gave the appointment of new trustees by the Public Trustee the same effect as such an appointment pursuant to section 45 of the Trustee Act 1958. The question remains whether the repeal of section 39 by the Mental Health Act 1959 prevented the application of section 45 to appointments made by the Public Trustee. There are no reasons available as to why the former section 39 was repealed.

Clause 11 provides that in the event of the exercise by the Public Trustee on behalf of a protected person of a power of appointing new trustees, either before or after this amendment, the provisions of section 45 of the Trustee Act 1958 shall apply to such an appointment.

Section 53 provides that the Public Trustee may not sell any freehold or leasehold lands exceeding $4000 in value without the order of the court. In 1977, there were 67 sales, only one of which was under $4000, and in 1978 there were 57 sales, only three of which were under $4000. This means that during this two year period, it was necessary to take out 120 chamber applications.

In 1939, when the Public Trustee Act was first enacted, the sum involved was £1000 which would then have purchased the average house and land. Such a house and land would now cost in the vicinity of $50 000 to $60 000. Obviously the section has not been updated sufficiently to take into account rising land prices.

Clause 12 will have the effect of increasing the figure to $60 000. This will dispense with numerous and costly court applications while maintaining the spirit of the original enactment.

Section 54(2) contains a drafting inconsistency in that the expression "shall leave" in paragraph (c) thereof is inconsistent with the word "may" in the first line of the section. Clause 13 rectifies this.

Sections 54H and 54I provide that a protected person is incapable of dealing with his property and that any such dealings will be void and of no effect unless made for adequate consideration with any other person who proves he has acted in good faith and was unaware that such person was a protected person.

Senior counsel has expressed an opinion that the expression "dealing" would not necessarily include the receipt by a protected person of moneys owed. Thus a person could repay such moneys directly to a protected person who may then dissipate them. Naturally, all moneys owed to a protected person should be paid to the Public Trustee who would then apply them as required.
Clause 14 provides that for the purposes of sections 54H and 54I, the acceptance of a debt shall be deemed a dealing with property.

Presently, section 56A provides that the Public Trustee may with the consent of the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister, invest part of the common fund towards the acquisition of land and buildings to be used in connection with his duties, powers or functions. Under sub-section (4) a fair monthly rental for any buildings so acquired is assessed and paid from the Consolidated Fund.

It is desirable that provision be made for the acquisition of furniture, fittings and equipment as well as land and buildings. Clause 15 will amend section 56A to achieve this. The conditions as to acquisition leasing and disposal which presently exist under the section in relation to land and buildings will apply to furniture, fittings and equipment.

By virtue of section 57(4) and (5) of the Act there exists an account named the Estates Guarantee and Reserve Account. This account is partly made up of what could be called "excess items" such as amounts left to the credit of the interest suspense account after payment of all interest payable and the capital profits made upon the realization of investments from the common fund.

Clause 16 is designed to ensure that where a payment has been made from the common fund on behalf of a particular estate or trust property and there are insufficient funds in such estate or trust property to repay these amounts the common fund may be repaid from the estates guarantee and reserve account. A limit of $1000 on such payment in the aggregate for all estates in any financial year has been incorporated into the clause. Thus, small debit balances which cannot be recovered may be cleared from the estate ledger accounts and the common fund be repaid.

Sub-clause (2) ensures that, where after such payment from the Estates Guarantee and Reserve Account, the amount or part thereof is recovered in relation to a particular estate or trust property involved, this amount shall be repaid to the Estates Guarantee and Reserve Account.

Clause 17 is designed to ensure that for small amounts not exceeding $50 in the aggregate a person of sixteen years and over may give a valid receipt. A sixteen-year old should be able to manage such a small amount and there is little point in this amount being kept by the Public Trustee until the person in question turns eighteen years of age.

The view has been expressed that the Supreme Court, which pursuant to section 66 of the Act has the power to supervise actions taken by the Public Trustee, may have no authority to approve, order or advise on the commencement of proceedings where the Public Trustee acting in one capacity is against the Public Trustee acting in another capacity.

Clause 18 is designed to ensure that there can be no doubt that the court possesses this necessary power.

It is extremely cumbersome administratively for the Public Trustee to produce the probate or letters of administration for such purposes as notation of the grant of probate or letters of administration at a number of share and other registries at about the same time, particularly where an estate contains numerous and varied assets. Clause 19 is designed to incorporate into the Act a section which is present in corresponding Acts in all other States, namely that the Public Trustee may issue a certificate under his hand and seal to the effect that he is authorized to administer the estate of a deceased person.

The proposals embodied in the Bill will greatly add to the efficient and economical administration of the Public Trust Office and will ensure that estates administered by the Public Trustee will no longer be disadvantaged by being denied the benefits and rights which presently attach to other estates. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr Maclellan
On the motion of Mr ROWE (Essendon), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

RAILWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL
Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Victorian Railways Board has recently been in negotiation with Steam Age Australia Pty Ltd, a company incorporated in Victoria, in relation to a modern steam hauled convention and excursion train concept called the "Melbourne Limited", with destination points being major regional cities and towns with tourist and convention facilities. The parties have reached general agreement on the matter.

Basically the concept is that certain rolling-stock would be owned by the company and operated by VicRail's operational staff on VicRail's tracks. Schedules for the operation would be agreed between VicRail and the company, the company being responsible for organizing and arranging the balance of the convention or excursion details.

The board's legal advice is that the Railways Act does not authorize the board to allow such an operation. Section 11 of the Railways Act makes provision in relation to rolling-stock other than VicRail's. However, this is limited in operation and only relates to contracts with a "company being the owner or lessee in possession of any other railway" and is accordingly ineffective for a "Melbourne Limited" type of operation.

The Government considers the "Melbourne Limited" concept to be innovative and imaginative and agrees that VicRail should be empowered to operate such a project on its system.

Accordingly, the Bill before the House is to amend the Railways Act 1958 by substituting a new section 11 to enable VicRail to have reasonable flexibility in relation to such schemes. The redrafted section also clarifies VicRail's ability to operate its rolling-stock on other lines of railway and for rolling-stock from other States to operate on VicRail's tracks. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr WALSH (Albert Park), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

ROYAL VISIT RACE-MEETING BILL
Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Victorian Amateur Turf Club invited Her Majesty the Queen to attend the race meeting scheduled for Caulfield Racecourse on Wednesday, 30 September, 1981 and open the Victorian Racing Museum during the meeting.

However, the main purpose of the Royal Visit is to enable Her Majesty to attend the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Melbourne. The programme which has been drawn up for Her Majesty makes it impossible for the Queen to visit Caulfield on 30 September, but she has graciously consented to attend a race meeting and open the museum on Tuesday, 29 September.

The Racing Act 1958 makes provision for the Minister to authorize the transfer of a race meeting to a later date in certain circumstances. However, there is no power for a meeting to be held prior to date allotted a club by the Victoria Racing Club. The circumstances of this case are so unusual and important that it is appropriate to legislate for the transfer of the meeting to enable Her Majesty to attend.

The Victoria Racing Club and the Kilmore Racing Club, which was to have raced on 29 August, have both agreed to the transfer of the Victoria Amateur Turf Club meeting. The Kilmore meeting has been transferred to Wednesday, 30 September, which coincides with the date of a Sydney meeting and will be to Kilmore's advantage. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Dr VAUGHAN (Glenhuntly), the debate was adjourned.
It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

FRENCH ISLAND (LAND EXCHANGE) BILL

Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to authorize an exchange of Crown land for freehold land on French Island.

A State park was created on the island in 1979, as a result of an approved recommendation of the Land Conservation Council. The park, managed by the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife, comprises most of the Crown land on the island but it is not one compact unit, being fragmented to some degree by freehold land.

The owners of some of this freehold land, E. M. Bourke and family and associated companies, have put forward the proposal that 158.5 hectares of their freehold land might be more advantageously used if it became part of the park. They suggested an exchange of that land with some of the park which adjoined another portion of their freehold property and of a similar size. The proposal was examined by the Fisheries and Wildlife Division of the Ministry for Conservation, which fully supported the scheme, as did the Land Conservation Council.

It is agreed that the freehold land offered in exchange would help to consolidate the State park and form a corridor of vegetated land between its northern and southern sectors. At the same time the exchange would consolidate the land holdings of the Bourke family.

The island is not within a municipality but is subject to a planning scheme administered by the Department of Planning. That department has agreed to the necessary rezonings.

The Valuer-General has valued both parcels of land. The freehold land is valued at $62,125 and the Crown land at $58,500. The Bill provides that the Crown will pay to the parties an amount of $1825, being the difference of $3625 between the valuations less $1800 being the cost of the necessary surveys effected by the Lands Department.

Schedule One of the Bill shows the lands to be surrendered to the Crown. Schedule Two shows the Crown land to be granted in exchange. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr HOCKLEY (Bentleigh)—I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works)—I suggest that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray)—On the question of time, I take it that the Minister will make available the resources of the relevant departments to the honourable member handling the Bill so that any queries he may have can be handled expeditiously?

Mr Wood—I will do so.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

CALLING OF MINISTERS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr A. T. Evans)—On recent occasions prior to the reading of the second-reading speech, Ministers and some honourable members on the other bench have been urging the Speaker to call the Minister.

It is a courtesy of this House that has been long established that the Minister is not called until a copy of the Bill is in the hands of all honourable members.

FOOTSCRAY (WESTERN OVAL RESERVE) LANDS BILL

Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Footscray (Recreation Ground) Lands Act of 1968 appointed the Corporation of the City of Footscray as the committee of management of the Western Oval Reserve, the home ground of the Footscray Football Club. It also provided that the corporation could grant a lease of part of the reserve, specified in the Act, for the purposes of sport or recreation or
social activities or purposes connected therewith, including the erection of buildings for those purposes. Subsequently a lease was given to the football club for a specified area which included the club-rooms under the grandstand, the lease to expire in 1991.

The city council and the football club desire that they be able to enter into a 40-year lease for the whole reserve in order that the responsibility for ground management be transferred from the corporation to the club. Such an arrangement is in line with current practice in respect of Crown reserves used by the Victorian Football League, as is instanced by the legislative provisions made in 1975 for the Carlton ground and in 1977 for the Geelong ground. This is the purpose of the Bill.

It will be a covenant of any new lease that the arrangement will continue for only so long as the ground remains the venue of the Footscray club first eighteen for its home matches in the Victorian Football League competition. It will also be provided that the rights of all other sporting bodies using the reserve are protected. These other users, including the Footscray Cricket Club, have no objections to the proposal.

The Bill also repeals section 5 of the 1968 Act. This provision is no longer required as the authority for loans is now contained in the Local Government Act. It also amends the provision for a lease to be granted for 21 years by extending the term to 40 years which is in line with other league grounds. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr FORDHAM (Footscray), the debate was adjourned.

Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works)—I move:

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray)—Like the Government, I hope debate can be expedited in the interests of all concerned. I will endeavour to have the replies from the bodies involved by next Tuesday and I hope that is the case. I hope the Minister will be indulgent if an extra day or so is required.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

The sitting was suspended at 6.15 p.m. until 8 p.m.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (FALSE REPORTS TO POLICE) BILL

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport), was read a first time.

SUPREME COURT (FUNDS IN COURT) BILL

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport), was read a first time.

MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr HANN (Rodney)—I move:

That, in view of the importance of the meat industry to Victoria, this House expresses alarm at the present crisis caused by the substitution of horse and kangaroo meat and calls on the Victorian Government to take appropriate action to prevent such practices in the future.

This is a matter of grave concern for both the State of Victoria and Australia as a whole. The recent announcement that meat exported to America was found to have been substituted, will have disastrous long-term consequences for the meat industry in this country, and those consequences could last until the end of the century. That highlights the fact that this is a drastic situation that will affect the economy of Victoria and the economy of the country, because the meat industry is an important primary industry in Australia.

In 1979-80, Victoria produced approximately 553 000 tons of meat, while the production for Australia as a whole was 2 330 700 tons. During that year Victoria exported almost 150 000 tons and Australia exported approximately 833 000 tons. Those figures make it obvious that the recent disclosures of actions by a minority in the industry—I stress that it is a minority—will have disastrous consequences
for Victorian meat producers, processors, stock agencies and employees in the meat industry, many of whom are already out of work because of the present crisis.

Before dealing with the crisis, I shall explain the state of the industry. Between 1974 and 1977, the meat industry suffered one of the worst recessions ever known in this country. Thousands of cattle were slaughtered and dumped in pits. The industry was at rock bottom. The animals had to be slaughtered because the processors did not want to buy them in the marketplace. Some producers who tried to sell stock were unable to find buyers. The first cattle shoot took place at Tongala and it was followed by many others. Thousands of cattle, including breeding stock, were slaughtered.

The industry came out of the recession in late 1977-78, and for a short time meat producers started to recover financially from the predicament they had faced. Unfortunately, that recovery was shortlived because the reduction in the number of animals had an impact on the processing side of the industry, and that impact was aggravated by a serious drought right across Australia—it affected New South Wales, Victoria, parts of Queensland, and extended across South Australia and Western Australia. That reduced the stock available for slaughter, with the consequent closure of many abattoirs. Some twenty major abattoirs have closed in Australia in the past two years. In New South Wales alone 4000 workers have lost their jobs, while the figure over-all is much higher.

The meat industry was already facing a serious crisis. On top of that on 11 August this year—according to that statement issued by the Minister for Primary Industry—the United States of America advised the Australian Bureau of Animal Health that horsemeat was suspected in a carton of boneless beef in San Diego bearing the markings of Australian Meat Export Establishment 140C, ProFreeze, Richmond, Melbourne.

On 12 August the movement of all export meat from ProFreeze was terminated and seven other boning-rooms in the same complex were placed under strict surveillance with thorough checks made of their product before its release for export. Subsequently, the United States Department of Agriculture advised on 13 August 1981 that the laboratory tests on the establishment 140C meat in San Diego proved positive for horse-meat. As soon as the Federal Government received that advise the boning-room was deregistered and could no longer export meat. The Federal Police were asked to investigate. An amount of 1809 cartons of meat bearing the 140C mark with an approximate value of $100 000 was immediately seized and impounded for testing.

As a result substantial publicity has occurred in the media both in Australia and the United States. I am led to believe that the publicity is on a world-wide basis drawing attention to the fact that horse-meat had been substituted for Australian meat on the export market. After receiving kangaroo serum for testing, the Americans have subsequently reported that kangaroo meat has also been substituted for what was supposed to have been genuine Australian beef.

This has had a disastrous effect of the morale of the beef industry in Australia and, in particular, on beef prices. The Minister ultimately had to close and suspend the licences of 27 boning-rooms. At least two major meat-processing companies have been forced to close operations during the period that this matter is under review by the Government authorities. Subsequently the Federal Government, joined by the Victorian Government and other State Governments, has announced a Royal Commission. Delay was experienced in the setting up of the Royal Commission for the simple reason that, although a Royal Commission is required to investigate the details, the implications of the matter are also rather serious for the long-term future of the beef industry.

The honourable member for Sydalan will have an opportunity of contributing later in the debate. His inane interjections make a poor contribution. I shall refer to the history of the efforts by the National Party in this Parliament to bring about some control in the meat industry. The history goes back to the
meat crisis of 1975-76 when the National Party moved a motion of want of confidence in the Government for the lack of control over the meat industry and that lack of recognition of the problem of meat procedures. An earlier motion was moved in 1975 and the want-of-confidence motion was moved in 1977 when the National Party argued that greater controls should be exerted.

At that time the National Party advised the House that the Government was holding reports from its own experts in the Department of Agriculture which suggested that improvements should be made in the current marketing system. As one of its strategies tonight, the National Party will argue that if the Victorian Government had been prepared to heed the advice of the National Party at that time and had implemented a proper marketing scheme and a State authority with greater controls, the present disastrous situation could have been avoided.

The policy of the Government of free enterprise in the meat industry, as expounded by both the Minister and people like the honourable member for Syndal, has not helped the situation. The honourable member for Syndal has a vested interest in the matter—I am not talking about meat substitution—because of his close involvement in the Victorian meat industry.

That free enterprise policy allows processors to do what they like and allows anybody who wishes to become involved in the meat industry, particularly the export side, to operate often in fairly sub-standard conditions. That policy has brought about the current crisis. The lack of action by the Government in instituting control has resulted in many "fly-by-nighters" exploiting the meat industry. Many of these operators have voluntarily gone bankrupt and removed themselves smartly from the situation. One or two such operators—possibly more—are now involved in the present meat substitution racket.

One wonders why the Government has been so reluctant to involve itself more seriously in the control of the meat industry. In the early days when the Victorian Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority was set up and issued a report, at least two abattoirs that I am aware of were threatened with closure. It was really action by the Government at the time that delayed the closure which was to be brought about because the operators worked in sub-standard conditions.

For many years criticism has been made of conditions at the Melbourne City Abattoirs. The honourable member for Doncaster has expressed concern on a number of occasions and now interjects to say that that abattoir should be bulldozed. However, his Government has done nothing over the years to implement that sort of action. When one considers criticisms of particular meat operators by the honourable member for Doncaster, one wonders why the Government did not take more notice of him. It is interesting to note that the people involved in the present crisis are in close proximity to the electorate of Doncaster. One wonders why the Government did not heed the honourable member's advice and investigate the claims that had been made.

The Government did not heed advice and the former Minister of Agriculture, who held the portfolio for a number of years, allowed the meat industry a free run. The former Minister of Agriculture had a free enterprise policy for the meat industry. The meat operators were allowed to do as they wished. The absence of action by the Government has brought about the current crisis which will have disastrous long-term consequences.

It is interesting to examine the activities of operators who are interested in setting up abattoirs in the meat industry. These operators have actually said to senior personnel in local government, who passed the information on to me, that a particular operator said to one municipality that many of the people involved in the meat industry are rogues. How right that comment has proven. There are rogues in the meat industry!

An Honourable Member—Do you have any names?

Mr HANN—There is no need to name the particular person concerned. However, I can trace it back to the personnel concerned.
It is interesting that even a Minister of the Crown in this Government—and I shall not name him either because it may cause him personal embarrassment—indicated to me that he had been aware, going back even to the war years, of meat operators in this State having their own stamps, and they would walk down the line in their abattoirs and stamp one carcass "Primary Industry" and another carcass "Health Department". I was a little incredulous and thought that perhaps that sort of thing happened during the war years when there was a total lack of control, but there is a similar sort of situation here where it is reported that a series of brand changes brought about this substitution and caused the present crisis in the meat industry. A multi million dollar industry of vital importance to Victoria has been placed in jeopardy because of the Government's lack of action to bring about adequate control over the industry, to the extent where at least two major processors have been closed down during the present crisis, throwing more meat industry workers out of employment.

Contrary to the statements made in the House today by the Minister of Agriculture, prices are falling dramatically at the present time. Both beef and lamb prices in Victoria have fallen. I do not know where the Minister got his information. The fall in prices is not entirely seasonal, although there is certainly a normal seasonal drop, but this is a much more defined fall in prices at a time when both beef and lamb prices are well below their 1978 level.

I pointed out earlier that meat producers in Victoria were already facing difficult financial circumstances because of falling returns. During the past twelve months returns have been at least 25 per cent below what they were the year before. In money terms, it represents something like $100 a head sold to the beef producer and it represents approximately $10 a head on fat lambs. At a time of inflation and rising costs, that is an impossible position for a meat producer to find himself in. Some of the young men who were just starting to come out of the depression in the meat industry in this State, during which they lost thousands of dollars, are now looking for alternative jobs. One example of this is a young man whose wife has recently returned to nursing because of the current crisis and he is now looking for a part-time job to try to carry on his beef farming.

Mr Hayes—When were you told about these operators branding their own carcasses?

Mr Hann—I will tell the honourable member privately and I will give him the name of the person who told me. However, I did understand it was something that related back to the war years. Subsequent to that, it was the personnel who were involved with the particular person who indicated to me that there were many rogues in the meat industry. These rogues have now been caught up with, but one wonders just how widespread the practice is when one sees that, as a result of the current publicity, at least two boning rooms have had their licences cancelled by the Federal Government and when one also sees that examples can be given of situations in Victoria where meat for local consumption has been found to be contaminated. Such incidents have highlighted the total inadequacy of controls, especially in regard to pet meat, both as to its distribution in Victoria from other States and also in regard to the controls placed on pet meat in Victoria.

This situation goes back to the difficulties in regard to substandard meat from knackeries getting into the fresh meat market and the lack of control there. This highlights the fact that the regulations are extremely poor in this State. The former Minister must take much of the blame because he was in control of the meat industry in this State for many years. I sympathize with the present Minister because he has been landed with the embarrassments of past years. The present crisis has highlighted both the lack of control over that pet meat industry in this State and the inadequacies of the penalties.
The Herald of 4 September 1981 reported that brands were taken off meat. I will quote to the House from the newspaper item:

A Melbourne meat company charged with having removed state brand markings from meat was fined $100 in Oakleigh Magistrates' Court today.

Astralane Investments Pty. Ltd. pleaded not guilty to the charge before Mr H. F. King, SM. Mr Kevin Conron, meat inspector, told the court that other inspectors visited Oakleigh abattoirs about 3.30 a.m. on February 10 this year.

Mr Conron said they found 20 forequarters of beef which were being loaded on to a truck with the state brand removed.

He said 80 other forequarters of beef, which were also being loaded on to the truck, still had the brands on them.

Mr Conron said the company's works manager, Tom Dienoff, had told him the brand may have been removed because of contamination.

Mr Conron said Deinoff told him the night foreman may have seen some contamination and trimmed the meat.

Tim Morris, for Astralane, said it was unfortunate that the case had come up at the same time as other allegations against the meat industry were being made.

"It is a procedural charge and has nothing to do with the quality of the meat," he said.

Mr King said the company had failed to show a reason for the removal of the brands and fined it $100.

The penalties are obviously inadequate. If the Government intends to take strong and positive action to stamp out these rackets in the industry, one of the first things it must do is reassess the strength of the regulations and the penalties. The Federal Government is acting quickly by substantially increasing the penalties at Federal level, but there has been no indication from the State Minister of Agriculture as to what the Government in Victoria intends to do. A penalty of $100 is a negligible amount when one considers the hundreds of thousands of dollars that this industry is worth to the meat processing companies in Victoria.

Over the years, the National Party has pressed the Government for a combined approach by the Commonwealth and the States, the Meat and Livestock Corporation and the meat marketing authorities from the States, including Victoria. In the present situation, the Meat and Livestock Corporation, particularly its chairman, has been found wanting. The chairman was overseas at the time the present situation was revealed and saw no reason to return to Australia but, even moreso has he been found wanting because of his lack of control over the processing side of the industry in Australia. I have been critical of the corporation for some time and it must bear some of the brunt of the criticism for failing to exercise stronger control over this vital Australian industry. The corporation has not sought the powers, and that is part of the problem. Further, the Government has had the opportunity of acting, having been urged on a number of occasions in this Parliament by the National Party to do so, but it has failed to take action. One would hope that it will act now.

About three years ago a private member's Bill was first introduced into Parliament for the establishment of a meat marketing authority, but so far the Government has refused to debate the Bill. Had the Government been prepared to debate that Bill and to establish such an authority, the present crisis might have been avoided because it would have been possible to keep out the racketeers who have exploited the weaknesses in the industry. It has taken something like five years to sort out the fact that there is a dual meat inspection system; in fact, it is still not sorted out. However, the State Government has finally agreed that there ought to be a single inspection authority, but we still have not reached the point where we have a single inspection authority.

There have been examples of Victorian meat inspectors not being allowed to intercept meat trucks because the operators have stated that the meat was for export and, vice versa, the Commonwealth meat inspectors could not interfere with meat which the operators had claimed was for local consumption. Therefore, we have this ridiculous situation. It is important to recognize that from time to time there have been reports from meat inspectors and in the past complaints have been made of malpractices which in turn
have not been thoroughly or sufficiently investigated as they should have been by the Government. I come back to the system, the lack of control under the system and the belief of the Government, with its free enterprise philosophy, that nothing should be done to interfere with the operations of meat processors because they are “good guys” who provide a maximum return to meat producers and therefore their operations should not be interfered with. A former Minister of Agriculture has stated that on a number of occasions, and that has been the whole basis of this argument, that these people have the skill and expertise in running the processing side of the industry and the Government should not interfere.

We have a situation where the Government has got out of the processing side of the industry. It now has no close knowledge of that side of the industry or any real effective knowledge of how the industry is going. The Government possessed that knowledge when the Victorian Inland Meat Authority works were operating and for some time the National Party has been urging the Government to have some involvement with the meat industry through the Cooperative Farmers and Graziers Direct Meat Supply Ltd works. As I understand it, and it has not been denied by the Premier, the Government now owns those works because it has paid out the Barclay’s Bank loan, and one hopes the Government might reconsider the situation. If there is one thing that is known it is that the independent operators, especially those involved in the export processing companies, have been seen to be exploiting the producers in this State and, at the same time, ultimately they have been exploiting the whole industry.

It has been proved that at present there has been only a fairly small number of operators who have done so much damage in this industry, but that is the most serious aspect of the whole matter. A multi-million dollar industry has been damaged by one or two small operators who have exploited the system. It is the responsibility of the Government to take action to prevent these practices from happening. If one looks at the quantities involved, one finds that substantial volumes of meat have been delivered by these operators.

I refer again to the statement made by the Minister for Primary Industry to the Federal Parliament. He stated, *inter alia*:

On 1 September, the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation suspended the export licence of Samsons Meat Co. (Vic.) Pty. Ltd., and is continuing investigations into other companies.

On 4 September 1981, the USDA advised that horsemeat had been confirmed in a consignment of meat from Establishment 622—Jason Meats Pty. Ltd. Abbotsford, Melbourne.

That establishment was immediately deregistered, and the Australian Federal Police advised. All cartons labelled 622 are being seized and tested. So far, 2,533 cartons have been impounded.

Fairly substantial quantities of meat are involved through those companies. Certainly it is difficult to say whether horse meat or kangaroo meat has been substituted for beef, but there have been sufficient quantities of those types of meat which have been substituted to cause the present crisis in the industry.

It is important for the Parliament to debate this matter. I recognize that the Government has responded to the Federal Government’s call for a Royal Commission. The Government has joined with the Federal Government in holding that Royal Commission, but I hope the Royal Commission will not extend for an indefinite period because for the whole of the period that the Royal Commission is under way, there will be a continuing blight over the meat industry both in this State and in Australia, and therefore it is important that the matter be resolved very quickly.

If additional controls are to be imposed upon the industry, it is important for the Government to take action to place greater controls over the processing sector of the industry in Victoria. The Government should strengthen its regulations, particularly in regard to pet meat and in regard to the slaughter of horses—I would hope there is no kangaroo meat slaughtered in Victoria, but if that is the case it would be most unwise.
I re-emphasize that the Government should look at the penalties under the respective Acts, particularly with respect to the change of brands and the deleting of brands from carcases, because the only way in which one can prevent those operations is by imposing stiff penalties.

The National Party hopes the Government will support the motion. It recognizes that the Government has taken some action on the matter, but hopes it will be resolved very quickly.

Mr FOGLARTY (Sunshine)—The Opposition welcomes the fact the debate has been brought forward a few days because this issue is most important. As has been stressed, it is of State and national importance, especially as it affects our meat export industry. I look upon the matter differently as the industry Australia-wide employs some 60 000 people, of which there are about 14 000 in Victoria. Added to that number there are many thousands of farmers and people working in complementary industries such as meat pie manufacturing, dim sim manufacturing and the hamburger industry. The crisis is having a dramatic effect upon all those industries, and if there are no consumers there will be no industry.

Although it has been stressed that our export industries are at stake at this stage, we as Australians are not second-class citizens. The standards applying to our export industries should also apply to our local meat industries. What has been applying in our export industries is bad enough, but I suggest that there is more opportunity for these practices to occur at the local level than at the export level. There have been interjections on the side talking about hopscotch kangaroo meat in America, but the same situation applies in Australia.

Rather than taking any tactical advantage during this debate, at this early stage I inform honourable members that it is the intention of the Opposition to move an amendment to the motion moved by the honourable member for Rodney. The motion moved by the honourable member for Rodney is full of merit, but members of the Opposition believe it does not go far enough. It is our belief that there should be censure of the Governments, both State and Federal, and it is about time the Minister took action. When I say the “Minister” it must be accepted that there is more than one portfolio involved. Not only the Minister of Agriculture but also the Minister of Health is involved, and the proposition put by the honourable member for Rodney definitely does not go far enough.

As an amendment to the motion moved by the honourable member for Rodney, I move:

That all the words after “House” be omitted with the view of inserting in place thereof “condemns the Victorian Government for its failure to adequately control the meat industry within the State with disastrous effects on Australia’s international reputation and trade and Victoria’s public health and economy and calls on the Government to act immediately to—(a) prevent corrupt practices which may compromise the control of meat; (b) apply effective controls over meat inspection brands and documents; (c) require all meat other than for human consumption imported into or processed in Victoria to be subject to thorough control through methods of ready identification, such as injected edible dyes, and notifications of intention to import, imports and movements; (d) establish adequate resources to rapidly investigate, identify and remedy threats to public health from contaminated or other impure meat; and (e) introduce rigorous penalties against meat substitution and other practices which may threaten public health and the meat industry”.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Is the amendment seconded?

Dr COGHILL (Werribee)—I second the amendment.

Mr FOGLARTY (Sunshine)—Over the past four days, the Opposition has attempted, by a number of means, to extract from the Minister of Agriculture, a statement on the attitude of the Government to this scandalous affair; that there is a crisis in the meat industry in Victoria. The Opposition has attempted to extract from the Minister of Agriculture an indication of what the Government intends to do. The people of Victoria must know what the Government intends to do about the scandalous situation confronting the meat industry in Victoria and in Australia. The Minister has indicated that there will be a Royal Commission, and
he has also indicated that it is the intention of the Victorian Government to take part in that Royal Commission. A Royal Commission can take three or four years but in this instance it has been stated that investigations are to be completed in one year. Can the people of Victoria wait twelve months for the Minister to make recommendations to the Parliament based on the findings of a Royal Commission? They cannot afford that luxury. The Opposition believes a Royal Commission will do immense good for the meat industry in Australia, but steps must be taken now by the Government to ensure that the consumer knows whether he or she is eating kangaroo meat, wombat, or whatever.

The consumer is the guiding light in this exercise. The Chinese community will not eat dim sims; the Italian community will not eat spaghetti and meat sauce, and certain allegations have been made by the Islamic community. When the Labor Party is in Government, it will take part in the hearings before the commission, but the Minister must inform the people of Victoria immediately what he intends to do and he must assure them that the meat that they buy as from today will be good wholesome food.

I have received many complaints in the past few weeks. Allegations have been made that goat meat is being sold. Goat meat has been sold on the market since the year dot. It can be bought at the Victorian market, as can pet food. The issue concerns whether buffalo meat, kangaroo meat or goat meat is being slaughtered and processed under strict hygienic conditions, and whether it is being done under the control of the appropriate department.

The Labor Party believes the Government should be censured. The Government has known for some time that something is wrong with the meat industry in Victoria and it has not acted upon the information it has received. The meat industry was raised on six occasions in this House last week, and I do not want to bore the House with tedious repetition, but this is a different debate. In the Weekly Times of 13 July 1977, Mr Wally Curran, the Secretary of the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union is quoted:

Mr Curran said that his information was that lids of meat packs, which had been passed only for the local trade, were being replaced, with lids stamped as passed for export by DPI.

He alleged that two Eastern European nations—Rumania and Bulgaria—had complained to the Australian Government that the description on the packs did not fit the contents.

There is no doubt that the Minister of the day knew of those charges. I now refer to Federal Hansard and I will be brief because repetition will not enhance the debate—on 7 March 1978, when Senator Primmer is quoted as saying:

I turn now to some specifics relating to this illegal meat export operation. As I understand it, in June-July 1977 the Romanian Government issued a diplomatic complaint to the Australian Government alleging that meat it had received did not meet required specifications. Further, I believe that two other eastern European governments complained to the then Australian Meat Board concerning meat which failed to reach required standards.

The senator further on mentioned a number of Victorian companies. These serious allegations must have been relayed to the Victorian State Government, but there has been no report from any authority on the results of any investigations. The Victorian State Government has been very lax.

The Labor Party stated two years ago that the meat industry was over-capitalized. I asked the then Minister of Agriculture to consider not issuing any more licences through the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority for increased slaughter. That motion was defeated. In 1974–75, when the meat industry was in dire straits, there were 338 licensed meat establishments in Victoria, and in 1979–80 there were 516 of such establishments. The area of concern has extended beyond all bounds. By the meat industry being over-capitalized, it becomes inefficient and employees working in the industry are not receiving a fair reward for their labour; they are working a short week, and this has led to industrial unrest.

Today, the industry is in a different situation. The stock being slaughtered in the meat industry in Victoria has
been reduced, and, as a result, there have been large-scale closures of works in Victoria and this has had an adverse effect on the industry. It is little wonder that the workers in the industry, and those working in allied industries, in particular the farmers, are concerned. This scandal has eventuated at a time when there is a recession in the industry. The Minister has a responsibility to set his own house in order.

On ten occasions in the past four years, the Opposition has informed the Government that many meat processing establishments in Victoria do not meet the required standards. The Minister of Agriculture, in answer to a question said that it would require a funding of $11 million to update the Melbourne City Abattoirs. The abattoir is built on Crown land, under the control of the Melbourne City Council and is tenanted by Protean (Holdings) Ltd.

The honourable member for Rodney made the statement that the honourable member for Doncaster has carried on a one-man war at Government level within his own caucus against Protean (Holdings) Ltd and the condition of the Melbourne city abattoirs. On at least two occasions I have taken the honourable member to task because I strongly object to certain statements made about the meat inspection system in Victoria. By the same token, I believe the Melbourne city abattoirs do not meet the required standards. One must also remember that if one bulldozes the works one is also bulldozing a number of jobs. In fairness to the people who have given a lifetime of service, the Opposition suggests that the operations at the Melbourne city abattoirs should be phased out over a given period.

The honourable member for Doncaster has suggested that the Melbourne city abattoirs be included in an inquiry into the meat industry. If an inquiry is to be conducted into Protean (Holdings) Ltd, the Geelong works should be included. During the 1979 election campaign the Premier said he would have 800 people working at the Geelong abattoirs within a couple of weeks but I doubt whether anyone is working at the Protean (Holdings) Ltd works at Geelong now.

To be fair to Protean Enterprises (Newmarket) Pty Ltd, I doubt whether anyone could get away with any shifty move at a large export abattoirs because they must meet the high standard set by the Wholesale Meat Act of America 1967. Victoria's meat inspectors are competent and have to pass a strict examination. Export abattoirs have to be hygienic and inspection is first class. However, I agree with the Minister that no matter how good the regulations are some unscrupulous scoundrel will defeat the system. That is what is happening.

Meat imported in large lots from interstate and under the control of unscrupulous operators in Victoria has brought the meat industry to a low level overseas. Mr Bjelke-Petersen says he does not want a bar of the Royal Commission. Another State says the same. Most of the meat that is in an unhygienic condition comes from interstate and is being processed by scoundrels who should have their licences taken away. The Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act and other legislation should provide that the fines be increased.

The Opposition believes the Government has been very lax and remiss and does not have its house in order. The 1980 Report of the Victorian Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority makes the point that sixteen local abattoirs and seventeen slaughterhouses had their licences renewed in 1977 with conditions and orders issued under section 29 specifying certain works, repairs or installations to be carried out.

The legislation had been in force for three years prior to that time. As a realistic person, I believe when a new Act is brought in there should be some relaxation in certain areas, so long as it does not apply to hygiene. There are some meatworks that should be closed down. The Government should know which ones and should act on information provided. The Minister did know of certain shortcomings
within the meat industry in Victoria but did not act on those shortcomings. By the same token, I believe the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry—whether it be Ian Sinclair or Mr Nixon—knew about those shortcomings. Other areas of Government administration are also involved.

I now refer to an address to the Australian Institute of Health Surveyors Conference delivered by Mr Doug Hawkins, M.A.I.H.S., Chief Health Surveyor, City of Doncaster and Templestowe. He presented a substantial report to a conference of learned men and women. Present at that conference was Mr Ken Gainger, Professor Lance Townsend, Mr Greg Andrews, Mr Brian Robinson and Mr Keith Whitney. They are all important people directly or indirectly associated with the Health Commission.

There is no doubt that serious allegations were made by Mr Hawkins and those allegations would have been referred to the Minister of Health because they have been freely published. I know they were published twelve months ago because I repeated some of them. I will now quote from page 85 of the Australian Institute of Health Surveyors (Victorian Division) 49th Annual Conference Papers.

On the subject of imported meat products, it is of the gravest concern to this Institute that the Government has seen fit to remove Sections 328 to 332, thus permitting the sale of horse flesh for human consumption in Victoria.

As the law now stands, there is no restriction whatsoever on the type of meat which can be included in food products. This means that horse, dog, cat, or whatever can be legally used in food products.

Besides the threat of these meats being included in imported foods from countries where they may be considered delicacies, there is an immediate threat that local manufacturers are including them in domestic products.

That is a statement of fact.

Recent analytical evidence proves that a sample of one of Australia's favourite products contained kangaroo meat.

It would be most naive of us to believe that horse meat has not or will not be included in meat products whilst its presence there is quite legal.

Many would argue that as horse, dog and cat is normally used as food by many of the ethnic groups in our Society, particularly the more recent arrivals, the Government is in order by not legislating against their use.

Mr Fogarty

Regardless of the Health consideration, it is my opinion the majority of the Australian population would be revolted at the thought of eating these animals, but they can be included in meat products without disclosure.

If the Government is happy with the use of these meats, then the very least they can do is make all products containing horsemeat, etc., be so labelled as the English Regulations require them to be.

One objection to the present use of kangaroo meat is that as killing of kangaroos in Victoria is illegal, it appears that the source of supply is the pet food industry in New South Wales.

That important report on a conference of the Australian Institute of Health Surveyors must have been brought to the attention of the Minister of Health and the recommendations of that report should have been acted upon through consultation and co-operation between the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture.

The Opposition cannot complain about what has happened in the meat industry unless it makes some positive suggestions. The first suggestion the Opposition makes is that the loophole of dual inspection of meat be closed. Although there is a conflict of views on this matter between various State Governments, one inspection system should operate. Although it was recently reported in the media that a member of the Opposition stated that the Minister of Agriculture has offered to place the matter in the hands of the Commonwealth Government, if that is going to be the case, it is to be hoped that a better Commonwealth meat inspection system operates than what has been apparent in the horsemeat scandal in Victoria up to date.

There should be one meat inspection system that should be under the control of the Commonwealth Government. Each State Government should be delegated certain authorities to enable those Governments to trace diseases and other matters that apply to the quarantine regulations. State Governments should be responsible for the matter but they should be answerable to the Commonwealth Government. There should be a uniformity of laws between each State, allowing for certain matters such as geography and climate.
Another matter of concern is that the meat inspection system is completely fragmented. The bureaucratic empires of primary industry, agriculture and health each want to maintain control of their empires. Such a situation can no longer be tolerated because recent events have demonstrated that the present safeguards at the meat wholesale level are a failure. There must be co-ordination and co-operation between the relevant State and Commonwealth Government departments. The Department of Agriculture must have overriding authority with regard to meat products, especially at the meat wholesale level and the boning-room areas away from the export market level.

The entire pet food industry should be brought under the control of the Department of Agriculture. Control over meat that leaves knackeries is lost once the meat leaves the point of processing.

An interim report from the Meat Industry Committee on the pet food industry was published in April 1971 and the summary of recommendations were specific, especially recommendation No. 14.1, which stated that the entire industry should be placed under the umbrella of the Department of Agriculture. Recommendation 14.5 has not been acted upon or carried out. That recommendation stated that all pet food meat packs should be adequately packaged and clearly labelled. That recommendation has not been adopted. The retail meat market is alarming to the customer when he or she is confronted with mincemeat specials of topside in one basin and pet food in another basin and, human nature does prevail through suspicion, especially when there is a handfull of meat missing from either basin.

The Opposition accepts that the Minister of Agriculture will take action and authorize the injection of dyes into certain pet foods. That will be a step in the right direction. The other matter of concern is meat brokerage. I recently read a Senate report on diced lamb being sold as diced beef. The company concerned was a brokerage company located in Sydney. Meat situated in cool stores can change hands three or four times without leaving the cool stores. That is wrong. There must be a complete and thorough investigation into all aspects of meat brokerage because malpractice is involved.

There have been investigations into the poultry and pet food industries in Victoria. In New South Wales there was a report published of a committee of inquiry into malpractice in the cattle industry. The report does not mention those matters that affect the stamping of carcasses, but the report deals mainly with sale-yards.

The Prices Justification Tribunal conducted a complete and comprehensive investigation into the Australian meat industry. That investigation covered marketing margins; livestock selling; the auction system; transportation aspects and the slaughtering capacity of the Australian meat industry. However, that inquiry did not cover the vital factors that have been highlighted by the recent meat scandal.

The Opposition accepts the need for a comprehensive Royal Commission into the Australian meat industry. However, the Minister of Agriculture, as a responsible person, should not be the one to initiate moves in Victoria that can only act as an interim measure for curing the problems that face the meat industry. The Minister should state clearly to the public of Victoria, that "I, as Minister, have carried out the investigations into the allegations as contained in certain reports and, following my investigations, I have plugged all the loopholes and I can assure the people of Victoria that in the future they will eat good wholesome meat". That is all the Opposition asks the Minister to do.

The Opposition has castigated the Minister for his inactivity because this matter first came to light on 9 July. A lot of water has flowed under the bridge since then. The Minister has not made any definite statement on what he intends to do about the matter in the immediate future.
Mr AUSTIN (Minister of Agriculture)—The honourable member for Rodney has moved a motion that talks about the importance of the meat industry and expresses alarm at the present crisis and refers to the substitution of horse and kangaroo meat and asks the Government to take appropriate action to prevent that kind of thing happening in the future. I do not take issue with any of the statements contained in the motion. I claim at this stage that the Government has shown concern and taken steps to ensure that the Government has better control over the industry in future so that what has happened does not recur. The honourable member for Sunshine has asked specifically what those steps are. I will answer his queries in a moment.

The honourable member for Rodney also outlined the disastrous situation that faced the meat industry throughout the 1970s. Honourable members are very much aware of that and of the action which the Government purported to take at that stage in encouraging people to destroy stock. It is remarkable to recall, in subsequent years, that the offer of $10 a head subsidy to destroy stock was taken up as a remedy for so many owners of beasts. That reduced the numbers of cattle and immediately had an effect on the market-place. From that time, the beef industry has substantially recovered.

Mr Wilkes—When will you deal with horse and kangaroo meat?

Mr AUSTIN—I still have some time in which to speak. The honourable member for Rodney referred to stamps that had been misused. It always amazes me when people make statements about what they know has happened in the past. He went on further to say that he knew of other misdemeanours in the industry. I wonder why these occurrences were not brought out and directed to the attention of people responsible for these matters so that action could have been taken at the time.

Mr Remington—The honourable member for Doncaster has been doing it for years and you ignored him.

Mr AUSTIN—A great deal has been said about claims of malpractice over the years. In 1976 in Victoria there were 39 complainants, 5 prosecutions were recommended and 5 convictions were recorded. In 1977, there were 38 complainants. 4 prosecutions were recommended and 3 convictions were recorded. In 1978, there were 41 complainants, 2 prosecutions were recommended and 1 conviction was recorded. In 1979, there were 72 complainants, 11 prosecutions were recommended and 4 convictions were recorded. In 1980, there were 123 complainants, 16 prosecutions were recommended and 8 convictions were recorded. In 1981, to date, there have been 72 complainants, 7 prosecutions have been recommended and 4 convictions have been recorded.

In answer to the honourable member for Keilor who is interjecting, I indicate that I am answering the claim that has repeatedly been made, namely, that nothing is ever done when allegations are made. I am pointing out that action has been taken and convictions have followed.

The honourable member for Rodney discussed wide and general matters and covered much of the meat industry. He referred to the establishment of a meat authority. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how a meat authority could have any effect on what has occurred in the past few weeks. I know that this has been a favourite topic of the National Party for some time, but until it is able to indicate to the Government how much a meat authority in this State will mean in actual dollars in the pocket of producers of meat the Government will not be interested in moving in that direction. The honourable member also referred to the popular word that is used of a “dual” meat inspection. The Government realizes that many attempts have been made to change the system of meat inspection, but it is not correct to use the term “dual” meat inspection, because it is misleading to the people of Victoria. What happens is that meat
in export abattoirs is inspected by inspectors of the Department of Primary Industry and the meat that does not go for export but returns to the domestic market, is inspected by State inspectors.

Mr Remington—That is dual.

Mr Austin—It is a re-inspection of the meat that does not go for export and sometimes it can be a single carcass, an individual carcass or even part of a carcass.

Mr Wilkes—So, State inspectors do not inspect export meat.

Mr Austin—That is correct. I shall trace the history of what has happened during the current meat disaster. At this stage, I indicate that the State Government fully recognizes the extent of the disaster and the fraud that has been perpetuated and does not underestimate in any way the effect that it might have had and could have on the meat industry, particularly the beef industry.

The honourable member for Sunshine, in his opening remarks, referred specifically to the employees. A number of people have suffered because of the fraud perpetrated by a small number of people in the industry, the people the industry supplies, the masses of people involved in the production of beef and meat generally, and also the employees in those works where Government action has been forced to occur and the boning rooms have been closed for a period of time. On 13 August—the honourable member for Rodney mentioned a slightly earlier date that I will check later—a meat inspector in the United States of America noticed that a particular carton of meat was a little darker than he thought it ought to be. It was tested and found positively to be horsemeat. The authorities were not able to test for kangaroo meat because there are no kangaroos in the United States of America.

On 17 August the Department of Primary Industry advised the Department of Agriculture what had occurred and on that same day the establishment 140C had its licence cancelled. At that time the Federal Minister brought in the police and a police inquiry began, under the command of Chief Inspector Elkington. One may ask what action the State Government took at that time. The State Government immediately applauded the action of the Federal Government in setting up a police inquiry and insisted that the Victoria Police join in the inquiry.

Mr Wilkes—Big stuff!

Mr Austin—It is big because the Victoria Police had had experience in investigating the meat industry in this State. The Government realized that the police had the necessary abilities and skills and that the police would know the full extent of what was happening if they were involved in the Federal inquiry, and after it was completed, the State Government might need a knowledge of what had happened in the inquiry and could refer to the police.

At the same time, Chief Inspector Elkington was made a meat inspector under the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act. Opposition members may laugh, but they do not know what that means because they do not have the faintest idea of what it is about. The appointment gave Chief Inspector Elkington certain powers that he otherwise would not have had. The power it specifically gave him was to be able to move as an inspector in any of the domestic meat-works and if he made inquiries and asked where meat had come from or where it was destined for, his queries had to be answered in his capacity as a meat inspector.

On 4 September, an examination of 900 frosted cartons outside the Protean works showed that many contained either horse or kangaroo meat and revealed also the presence of dye, indicating that some of the meat probably emanated from a knackery. The sampling of cartons of meat from the Protean stores revealed no signs of either horse or kangaroo meat. On that day, 27 independent boning rooms were deregistered and some time later, another six were deregistered. As has been pointed out during questions without notice and in the inquiries from the
honourable member for Sunshine into these matters, that was most unfortu­
unate for those boning room operators and the workforce. However, it was a
necessary action taken by the Depart­
ment of Primary Industry. The Opposi­
tion would have taken the same action.

The boning rooms were deregistered until they could ensure adequate secu­
ri ty of their product and could transfer their products only to approved cold
stores with adequate security of transfer and with a satisfactory species testing
programme.

On the following day, 5 September,
24 000 tonnes of meat then in the
United States of America was released
onto the market. However, meat from
Victoria was not included in that re-
lease. The Minister for Primary
Industry, Mr Nixon, called for a meet­
ing in Melbourne at which all State
Ministers were present.

Considerable pressure had been
exerted to establish a Royal Comis­sion and many people were critical that
no such action had been taken. I agreed
with Mr Nixon's attitude then of not setting up a Royal Commission until the
Police Force had made further inquiries
and had obtained sufficient evidence to
be able to prosecute. If a Royal Comis­sion had been set up then, two
things could have happened: Firstly,
the evidence people were giving volun­tarily might well have ceased; and,
secondly, the United States of America
could well have decided that as Aus­
tralia was setting up a Royal Commis­sion it would not continue the meat
trade with Australia until the findings
of the Royal Commission were made.

During that period, a very senior
American police officer was sent to
Australia and he made it clear in my
office to a meeting of those who were
closely involved in discussing the total
situation, that the United States of America was keen to resume trading
with Australia as quickly as possible
because it needed the Australian meat
export trade. That is an important point in view of the long-term relationship
between the two countries. Victoria has

a $600 million meat industry and the
United States of America is the main
export market; 41 per cent of all beef
produced in Victoria is exported.

The honourable member for Sunshine
has quite rightly asked what the Vic­
torian Government is doing and has
done. I have outlined what has hap­
pened in the police inquiry which, to a
degree, has been successful; some
twenty charges have been laid against
one person. A Royal Commission has
now been set up by the Federal Gov­
ernment. The Government had on-going
discussions on what role the State of
Victoria would play. From the start, I
insisted that Victoria be part of a Royal
Commission. The Federal Government
drew up its terms of reference and they
were telexed to me. I immediately de­
manded that Victoria, if not included in the Federal Government's terms of
reference, must have its own. Agree­
ment was reached that Victoria would
introduce its terms of reference to the inquiry and that the Royal Commission,
under Mr Justice Woodward, would run
with those terms of reference in parallel.

Last Thursday I telexed those terms of
reference to the Minister for Primary
Industry. I wasted no time, as it was
necessary to have Governor in Council
approval and the telexed terms of re­
ference were subject to that. In a tele­
phone conversation from Cairns, the
Minister indicated that those terms of
reference mirrored his own but related
to the State of Victoria, which was the
intention, and widened the inquiry into
every aspect of the meat industry, in­
cluding the domestic market in Victoria.

That was the intention and the Gov­
ernment has taken every step to ensure
that the terms of reference, which were
approved by the Governor in Council
today and verbally accepted by the
Minister for Primary Industry, will al­
low the inquiry to investigate every
aspect of the meat industry from
knackeries to boning works and all the
various establishments and also it will
allow for the calling of papers and
documents as required.
An interesting situation arises on the attitude of the other States, all of which were invited by the Minister for Primary Industry to take part in the Royal Commission. Honourable members have probably heard the remarks of the Premier of Queensland when he said that if there is a dog fight in another paddock, one does not join it, that if one is white, one stays white and that if one is clean, one stays clean, and he has indicated that there is absolutely no problem in Queensland.

If there is no problem in the other States and if the other States are in no way involved, if kangaroos from New South Wales, Northern Territory, Queensland and anywhere else have not been brought into Victoria and those States are absolutely clean in every way, it is fair enough for those States to stay out of the inquiry. I have suggested that all States should be included; they have been invited to do so. I hope the situation does not arise of the commission investigating a certain line and suddenly getting itself to a State boundary and not being able to cross that boundary because of the lack of co-operation from other States.

Mr Wilkes—When will it be safe to buy beef in Victoria?

Mr Austin—Absolutely, and they will be completed as soon as the Parliamentary Counsel can handle the bookwork. There is nothing else stopping it. The Government knows exactly where it is going.

The Speaker (the Hon S. J. Plowman)—Order! I suggest the Minister make his own speech without having simply an extension of question time from the front bench of the Opposition side of the House.

Mr Austin—Thank you, Mr Speaker. The main thing that the amendment to the legislation will do is to ban the sale of horse meat and kangaroo meat on the domestic market. It can be sold only for pet food. The other thing it will do to a large extent—and this was mentioned by both the honourable member for Rodney and the honourable member for Sunshine—is to increase the penalties. This was foreshadowed by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, and all penalties relating to lawbreaking will be greatly increased.

Under regulation we will be denaturing pet food.

Mr Wilkes—What does that mean?

Mr Austin—that refers to the use of an edible dye, which will not affect pet food, but will protect the industry.

Mr Wilkes—Can you get protection for it?

Mr Austin—Yes, it is possible to do so. In the past a strip or band was used around the animal. This will be a dye which covers the whole of the animal and cannot be removed.

The Victorian Meat Inspection Service is the most comprehensive of any service in any State in Australia. It is the only State which has an inspection service which covers all abattoirs and slaughter-houses. The service covers 104 abattoirs, 28 slaughter-houses, 172 boning rooms and cold stores, 166 meat inspection depots, 2500 transport vehicles, 35 knackeries and 17 pet food establishments. To run that service it has 6 veterinary officers, 10 administration officers, 28 branders and 250 inspectors, and the cost of the service is some $6 million.
The honourable member for Rodney referred to meat inspection brands. The system we have run in Victoria has been more tightly controlled than that in the Commonwealth, and there has been no evidence of any malpractice in relation to State brands. The only people in the State system who are allowed to use those brands are the meat inspectors and the branders. Meat workers are not allowed access to them. If a brand is lost or disappears, all brands with that number are withdrawn and a new licence is issued.

Mr Fogarty—Issued by whom?

Mr Austin—I will check that for the honourable member.

We can say without fear of contradiction that meat sold on the domestic market in Victoria is of the highest quality. It is always popular to knock the whole system whenever anything fails or somebody takes advantage of a system and a fraud like the recent one occurs, but I do not believe the people fully realize the damage that such action could have caused to the whole industry. We ought to realize the effect it has had on both producers and employees; and that it could have been much worse. I repeat that we fully recognize the extent of the disaster, but believe that by conducting a Royal Commission as well as a police inquiry, we will ensure that a total clean-up will take place in Victoria and the meat industry will be placed on a better basis for a long time to come.

Finally, for the benefit of those who believe that prices in the market-place have suffered considerably because of the fraud that occurred through the substitution of meat, I should like to establish some figures for sales at Newmarket sale-yards.

For the week ending 14 August the price for vealers was 188 cents a kilogram; on 21 August, a week later, it was 181 cents; the following week, 28 August, it was 184 cents; on 4 September it was 178 cents and on 11 September, 182 cents, so the prices moved through a tight range over those five weeks with little change in the market. For the same period from 14 August to 11 September the prices for cows were 125 cents, 131 cents, 132 cents, 134 cents and 131 cents—they increased by 6 cents from the start to the finish of the period. During the same five weeks the price for steers was 161 cents, 160 cents, 158 cents, 155 cents and 151 cents—a drop of 10 cents, but a fairly consistent range. During the same period the prices for bullocks were 140 cents, 138 cents, 138 cents, 139 cents and 141 cents—they were up 1 cent over that five-week period.

The yardings of cattle during this time are important if one is looking at prices over a period, because that can often show where the confidence was or what the market or producer reaction was. During the period from 14 August to 11 September the yardings were 2870, 3090, 2574, 3356 and 2788. They were consistent yardings through that period, so we have been fairly fortunate because the market price has not suffered to a greater extent.

The Government accepts the wording of the motion moved by the National Party and opposes the amendment.

Mr Trewin (Benalla)—Members of the National Party are not pleased to bring this motion before the House, because there is a reason for what happened. We hate to think that the cause of this motion is something that reflects not only on Victoria and Australia but also internationally, and it has had a strong impact on our cattle and meat industry.

Over the past two or three years I have been disappointed that following the last State election the Meat Industry Committee was not reappointed. That committee had been in operation for about twelve years. Under the chairmanship of the Honourable Stan Gleson, who was qualified to be chairman in all ways, the committee made several reports, some of which were extremely useful to the livestock and meat industries. Some worth-while inspections were carried out and some information was obtained by members of that committee which, I am sure,
Meat Industry was put to good stead by them as members of the committee and as individuals.

The situation that has developed could have developed in other industries but, because of its nature, the cattle and meat industry is open to manipulation. At one stage the wheat industry was in this position, as was the wool industry, but it is now well controlled and stabilized. Meat is very perishable and must be handled carefully and preserved well. There are various types of meat, including cattle, sheep, horse, goat, donkey, kangaroo, rabbit, chicken and so forth, but basically there is red meat and white meat. In this case the red meat is affected. When red meat is put into coolers, taken out and put back again, it can change its colour and it would be difficult merely by visual inspection to determine whether the meat was horse or cattle meat. One can understand how this deception has occurred.

I have been receiving reports and releases from the Department of Primary Industry in Canberra, which have been revealing and realistic. It is now known that a Royal Commission has been set up. The Victorian Minister of Agriculture has done well to support that Royal Commission, and I believe the revelations that will come from the Royal Commission eventually will serve the industry in good stead, not only in bringing to account those who have been involved in the scandal, but in bringing forward new ideas to be presented to Governments which must tighten up some areas and even create stronger penalties for those who intrude into the industry for no other purpose than to make a quick dollar.

I was extremely disappointed when the Horse Breeding Act was repealed some years ago. Following that repeal there was an upsurge in the number of horses in Victoria. In about three years, paddocks of horses appeared within approximately 50 to 60 miles of the metropolitan area. Every child wanted a horse, and at first the horses were cheap. More horses were bred, until the pyramid reached its peak. The children grew up and did not want the horses which were too expensive to keep in small paddocks. As a result, they were turned out, and then somebody wanted a dollar in return. Any person who is interested in the livestock industry will have noticed the large number of horses for sale around the State, at places like Ballarat, Bendigo and Dandenong. Where does all that horsemeat go?

Years ago when a horse had outlived its usefulness, it went to the lions at the zoo. We can remember seeing the lions in the cages with large bones in front of them. That cannot happen now. I realize that in many countries horsemeat is a delicacy. The great Clydesdales and Shire teams in England went to France and the Continent to be consumed by humans. Some Australians who were born overseas find beef to be a luxury but eat horsemeat as a delicacy. They have not been backward in asking for horsemeat. However, it has not been possible to protect these people with the existing regulations in Victoria. One cannot kill a horse in an abattoir with an export licence except in two specially licensed abattoirs, a horse must be killed in a slaughterhouse or a knackery.

In the past, horsemeat and kangaroo meat have been used in meat pies. There is no secret about that, and if one has not been aware of it, one has not been about. At the Royal Agricultural Show which starts tomorrow there will be a shortage of both meat pies and beer. The same will occur at the football next Saturday. In recent times, more horses have been slaughtered in Victoria than have been killed over the past 25 years, because of the large number of existing horses that are not required in this State. The other day at Kilmore a trotting pacer ran a good race. Its owner bought it when it was about to be killed at a knackery. He liked the look of it and it seems to have a good future.

Hundreds of horses are slaughtered weekly and that meat is going somewhere. On a radio show the other morning an Australian was speaking from New York about the scandal and corruption in the meat industry. He said that some people in America were
involved in that racket. It appears that some people in America knew the horse-meat was coming. That is one reason why the Americans have not refused to take any more Australian meat.

Honourable members will realize that Victoria has done a tremendous job in cleaning up brucellosis. The campaign has not been completely successful, but it is well on the way. The Department of Agriculture has done a tremendous job. The former Minister of Agriculture deserves commendation for his efforts, and I shall give it to him, because under his guidance an excellent job was done on the eradication of brucellosis. If that job had not been done, Victoria could well have been banned from the American market and from all other world markets by 1984. That would have been a far greater catastrophe than this small mistake; we will simply have to tidy up this mistake.

Why have these things happened? I have been going to cattle markets for years and there are many characters—the honourable member for Syndal objected when the honourable member for Rodney used an expression similar to "characters", but I shall use that term—in the cattle industry. If these people were not around, many cattle would not be sold and would be left in the yards or just passed by. These characters buy old boner cattle which, after cooking and processing, are used in pet food and so on.

There are characters in the meat trade, too. The honourable member for Doncaster has been telling us about them for—I was going to say "donkey's years", but that may be inappropriate—a long time. It is a fact of life that perishable goods have to be kept moving. I was told recently by a fellow—he is way out in the bush and I do not know his name and could not find him—who worked in the industry in Melbourne that at 4 p.m. the boning rooms in which he worked would shut down and the phantom operators—of which he was not one—went out into other boning rooms at night time.

Mr Fogarty—Did you inform the Minister?

Mr TREWIN—I did not.

Mr Fogarty—You should have.

Mr TREWIN—That may be right. This is where I believe that sort of trade has been flourishing. The honourable member for Sunshine accompanied me and other honourable members on a visit to Donald, when we saw the stock going to the Donald meat works. The meat came to Melbourne to be boned. We appreciated that the operator was sincere—

Mr Fogarty—He wasn’t, he touched the till!

Mr TREWIN—I was not told that story.

Mr Fogarty—He even touched the Department of Agriculture.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr A. T. Evans)—Order! The honourable member for Sunshine is out of order. His remarks are not relevant to the debate.

Mr TREWIN—I am not about to belittle anyone if I am not sure of the facts. All of the stock was sent to Melbourne to be boned, and only two days ago I saw a truck from the Donald meat works that was still operating in Melbourne. That is how the meat trade operates. We have great international companies like Borthwicks, Coopers, Smorgons and so on, who trade all around the world. When I was in London eleven years ago I was taken by a representative of the Australian Meat Board to the Smithfield meat market. I was not proud of all the samples of Australian meat I saw there. The meat industry in Australia is not as sophisticated as its counterparts in certain other countries. I refer particularly to New Zealand, which has a highly sophisticated industry. I do not believe the events that took place in Victoria could occur in New Zealand.

We will have to ensure that the recommendations of the Royal Commission can be put into effect properly so that the situation is remedied. We must ensure that this cannot happen again. To do that, this Parliament will have to make sure that the recommendations of the Royal Commission are researched in a practical fashion by people who are efficient in and knowledgeable about the meat industry.
About ten years ago the Americans placed severe restrictions on the Australian meat industry, and Australian operators had to obey their orders. They stipulated that our abattoirs had to meet certain requirements and standards before meat coming from them would be acceptable to America. At that time Australian visitors to America reported back that the American abattoirs did not meet the standards America was setting for Australian abattoirs, but I understand that that situation has now been corrected.

If it is necessary to dispose of some of the older abattoirs in Victoria—and I do understand that we have some good abattoirs that are idle—to improve the industry, there will have to be compensation for the people who are affected financially, and that compensation will have to come from the Federal level. That is where the lead should be given. The meat trade operates nationally and internationally. It has been said that the problem has arisen only in Victoria, but no one knows where it may next occur. The situation in Queensland, for example, is quite different, because Queensland does not have the prime beef Victoria has.

Before concluding my remarks I again refer, as I did last week, to the fact that live horses are being sent out of this country, as are live sheep and cattle. Some countries prefer to receive livestock rather than meat. Methods of travel today are so good that the horses that left the airport at Tullamarine last week were in Japan within 10 hours. That was a quicker journey than the journey my Clydesdales made from Devenish to the Royal Melbourne Show. It took them 14 hours to travel 140 miles by train. The horses that were exported to Japan would not have been under great stress, because the journey was so quick.

I am not an advocate of the export of live horses, and I believe the Japanese should obtain the meat they require, rather than livestock. They are purchasing our grain to fatten the animals. In fact, they are purchasing seed grain, so that in future they will be able to grow their own.

I commend the motion moved by the honourable member for Rodney. The National Party does not want the catch cry “Right—we will deal with this for ever” adopted. I am satisfied that although action was a little slow and reluctantly taken it has now been decided to hold a Royal Commission and the Minister and the Government have given their support. After the deliberations of the Royal Commission have concluded, the National Party would like the Government to ensure that it takes the necessary action in line with the Royal Commission’s findings to stamp out such illegal operations and ensure that Victorians in particular receive the quality and type of meat they seek.

Dr COGHILL (Werribee)—I support the amendment moved by the honourable member for Sunshine and, in doing so, I shall refer particularly to the actions of the Victorian Government. Before doing so I shall make one reference to the Federal legislation. Many of the problems with the export market could have been avoided if the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation had been given total control over export contracts and other export areas other than meat inspection services.

However, one must ask why it is that Victoria is the only State which has been implicated in meat substitution on the export market and why it has also been allowed to occur on the Victorian domestic market with serious implications not only for the trade but also for public health.

As you would understand, Mr Speaker, meat which is substituted for properly inspected and processed meat must be suspect from the public health point of view. The Victorian Government must accept responsibility for this because it is its Constitutional responsibility—a responsibility which it has accepted. If one examines the record of the current Minister of Agriculture one can only be appalled at the approach of the Government to this serious responsibility. One has only to refer to the answer given by the Minister to a number of questions on notice in the last two weeks in which the House has sat. The best that could be said of his answers is that they have
been extremely unconfident and unsure. The answers of the Minister are a sign of a Minister who does not have a grasp of the running of the Ministry and who does not understand the particular problem despite his having had virtually three weeks' notice of it before the Parliament resumed.

The same can be said to the response of the Minister, in the debate last week on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting, to a number of matters raised by the honourable member for Sunshine. Anyone who listened to the speech of the Minister this evening would have to be disillusioned about his competence. The honourable gentleman could not even understand that two inspections of certain categories of meat were the same as dual inspections. Somehow or other the Minister does not understand that re-inspection is dual inspection.

So far as his reference to brands is concerned—as I shall illustrate later—the Minister does not understand the way in which brands are controlled and applied under the Victorian meat inspection system. We could also consider his reference to the terms of reference agreed to by the Governor in Council this morning. The Minister has not been prepared to trust this Parliament with the terms of reference. It would have been a simple matter for the Minister to ask for them to be incorporated in Hansard so that they would be available to all honourable members for this debate.

However, we have the ludicrous situation in which honourable members are debating this crucial issue today without having the terms of reference which are highly relevant. Honourable members will not know the terms of reference until they read them in tomorrow morning's newspapers.

It is absurd and an insult to members of Parliament and the very institution of Parliament. Parliament ought to be the institution first, not the last to be taken into the confidence of the Minister. Honourable members are debating the terms of reference of the Royal Commission, hoping against hope that the terms of reference adopted by the Governor in Council this morning are adequate for a proper examination of the meat industry in Victoria. However, honourable members do not really know whether or not that is so.

Indeed one wonders whether we should be considering voting on a motion relating to the confidence of the Parliament in the Government and, in particular, the Minister of Agriculture. Of course, that applies not only to the incumbent Minister. The former Minister of Agriculture, the honourable member for Warrnambool, must also bear a heavy responsibility for the mess that exists in Victoria. The Deputy Premier, the Minister of Health, as a responsible Minister, must also accept his share of responsibility. However, one wonders whether he will.

It is obvious that this sorry episode, which has extended over the years, has been brought about because the Victorian Government has been manipulated by the unscrupulous elements in the meat industry. Plenty of evidence exists to back up that statement.

Mr I. W. Smith—Where is the evidence?

Dr COGHILL—For example, one could examine the regulations applying in this area and the role of the former Minister of Agriculture as well as that of the current Deputy Premier. Regulation No. 78 of 1975 required that carcasses passing from knackeries should be sprayed all over their surfaces. Yet, we find that in 1978 Statutory Rule No. 40 amended the regulation. This was approved by His Excellency the Governor of Victoria in the company of Mr Rafferty, the then Chief Secretary, the current Minister for Police and Emergency Services, the Deputy Premier and the former Minister of Agriculture. The new regulation repealed the provision requiring that the entire carcass be sprayed.

The regulation was changed so that the carcass would be merely required to carry a continuous strip at least 5 centimetres wide. Under the actions of the former Minister of Agriculture that is the only requirement now. These former and current Ministers must bear direct responsibility for what has happened in the area and the implications.
that flow from it. As they would know, it is a fairly simple operation for a skilled butcher to trim off such a narrow strip with a knife. Undoubtedly that has occurred in some institutions which are relevant to the subject before us tonight.

It was up to the former Minister of Agriculture, as the then responsible Minister, to require that pet meat imported into Victoria be subject to the same requirements as pet food processors in Victoria. However, the Government, acting through the former Minister of Agriculture, took the decision not to make those requirements necessary despite the recommendations of the Public Service to that effect.

Another matter to be examined is the exemptions from these sections of the Act. Again, in response to pressure from the most unscrupulous sections of the industry, the former Minister of Agriculture had a large number of premises exempted from the provisions of the Act. If one examines the Victoria Government Gazette No. 26 of 5 April 1978, one discovers 103 premises which are exempted from the provisions of the Act. These provisions would have enabled control of this problem and, quite likely, would have avoided many aspects of the particular problem Victoria now faces.

Further exemptions followed, for example, on 3 May 1978. When some of the processors realized the implications of the Minister's actions they sought repeal of the exemptions and action under the provisions of the Act. That occurred on 17 May 1978 and, in further cases on 9 August 1978, 17 September 1980, two further premises were exempted. It is worth while to point out some of the circumstances in which meat enters Victoria from other States which were exempted by the decision of this Government not to impose controls over such meat.

I refer, for example, to a pet food operator in the Alice Springs area who has a business. If a station owner asks him to shoot wild horses on his property, the pet food operator visits that property, shoots the horses, cuts off the hindquarters, throws them, skin and all onto his truck, rumbles into Alice Springs—however far that may be—and some time later he skims and bones the hindquarters in an open shed and puts them into cartons, some of which arrive in Victoria. They could well be among those cartons which have been implicated in the current substitution racket.

Mr Coleman—Has he got a name?

Dr COGHILL—Of course he has a name. Exactly the same sort of thing has happened in other instances. The conditions under which kangaroos are slaughtered in other States are well known and they could not be considered hygienic. The kangaroos are shot at night, picked up the next morning and brought into places which may or may not be clean for processing. How could anyone reasonably expect that kangaroos left in the open for some hours could be pure meat by the time they were processed?

I should like to quote to the House from the record of the Queensland Parliament dated 26 August 1981 of what has been going on there. I shall quote from the remarks of Mr Tom Burns, the honourable member for Lytton, at page 1821 of Hansard, who said:

This morning I visited the Watson cold stores in my electorate, where I saw 2 580 plastic bags of undyed roo meat. It is there now. It is there for every honourable member to see. There is no dye in it at all. There are 172 cartons of branded roo meat and 2 580 bags of undyed roo meat in that cold store now.

The evidence he presented to the Queensland Parliament was that that and similar meat was being exported to Victoria, obviously under very poor control. It is also well known that there is every opportunity under the system operating in Victoria for lids of cartons to be switched. There is evidence in Victoria that the number of lids printed vastly exceeds the number of cartons actually exported, and the implication is that substantial switching is occurring. That would facilitate the sort of substitution racket which has been well reported.

The Government has protected the crooks in the meat industry in other ways. I refer honourable members to
the answer to question No. 2052 which was given on 17 April 1980. I had asked the then Minister of Agriculture for details of premises which had been prosecuted for not properly branding meat. In his reply, the then Minister said, *inter alia*:

I am not prepared to make publicly known the names of the persons concerned. In some cases they have already been dealt with by the courts and in other cases, the courts have yet to reach a decision regarding their guilt or otherwise.

In those cases where a decision has been reached, it is obvious that the then Minister and the Government were protecting people who had been convicted of offences under the Act. One wonders at their motives in protecting those people unless, as I have suggested, the Government is manipulated by unscrupulous elements in the meat industry in Victoria.

I could add that I have evidence that the Health Commission of Victoria was advised of 30 tonnes of kangaroo meat which was detected during a raid on premises in the northern suburbs, and yet, so far as can be determined, no prosecution has been launched, despite strong evidence that the kangaroo meat was being substituted for other meats in dim sims.

These are not the actions merely of a Government committed to free enterprise but, rather the actions of a Government which is subject to manipulation by unscrupulous elements, and that has obviously been occurring here. If the Government were serious in tackling the problem, it would have seen that, not only were those people prosecuted, but that they were never able to work again in the meat industry in Victoria.

Other aspects of the Government’s performance in this area are appalling, and I refer to the administration of the meat industry in this State through the Victorian Public Service. One of the most elementary things which one would expect the Government to know would be the number of meat premises in the State and yet, in answer to question No. 1850, the then Minister of Agriculture advised me that:

Dr Coghill

The total number of meat premises in Victoria is unknown to officers of my department.

That is an incredible situation.

If the Minister of Agriculture had taken the trouble to thoroughly understand the industry, he would know that meat inspection brands are not adequately controlled in Victoria, although certainly, the situation with Victorian brands is better than that with Department of Primary Industry brands. To give just one example of the slaughter house at the Robinvale butchery, the State brand is there kept in a locker in the manager’s office, together with property of the slaughter house, not in a single locker used solely for the brands, as one would have expected if there were proper controls. Other problems exist in other instances. The standard practice is for the brands to be handed over to a labourer by the inspector at the beginning of the day’s shift and retrieved at the end of the day’s inspection. That works on the killing chain but it does not work satisfactorily at the loading-out rooms or the boning rooms. Under those circumstances, it is impossible for an inspector to have total supervision and to ensure that the brands are used only on meat which has been properly processed and properly inspected. It leads to a situation where all sorts of shenanigans could be going on under the nose of the Government through the Victorian Department of Agriculture.

The standard practice even extends to the point where there are no Department of Agriculture inspectors at loadings-out. It is quite possible for all sorts of movements to occur between a loading-out room and a truck without the knowledge of the Department of Agriculture. That situation is totally unacceptable. It is also unacceptable that there is no control for meat brokers. The honourable member for Sunshine has pointed out the dangers which are implicit in the rapid turnover of meat which can occur between meat brokers in Victoria under the present system.

There are other practices in the industry of which the Minister ought to be aware if he were doing his job, practices which also compromise the inspection system. Some inspectors—I
hope it is only a small number—accept
meat allowances from the employing
meatworks. There is no suggestion of
evidence that those meat inspectors
have been guilty of malpractice in their
meat inspection, but it leaves them open
to pressure and in a compromising posi-
tion, and it ought to be stopped. I have
evidence from a person who is pre-
pared to testify before the Royal Com-
mission that one quite senior officer
who has been employed by the Depart-
ment of Agriculture every Friday
visited a major Melbourne meatworks
and accepted a meat allowance from
that premises in plastic specimen bags.
That sort of thing should not be allowed
to occur, yet it has been going on.

At another abattoir a senior inspector
each week obtains $30 worth of meat
for $1.50—not a bad going rate! In
addition he received meat for his lunch
and his breakfast at the premises. This
was known to the Department of Agri-
culture and the Minister ought to know
about it—if the honourable gentleman
does not then he is derelict in his duty.

Mr I. W. Smith—How long have you
known about that?

Dr COGHILL—I have known about
it since shortly before this debate com-
enced. I am raising it in the Parlia-
ment now and as I indicated the
evidence in support of the allegations
will be given to the Royal Commission.

There is another practice which
involves some, but I hope not many,
State inspectors. The practice also
leaves the system open to abuse. There
is what is known as an “early days”
roster which operates at some abattoirs
whereby the inspectors agree among
themselves that one or other will leave
early on certain days during the week.
Of course, that means that the par-
ticular premises are not staffed during
that period when the particular in-
spector has his turn of what is known
as an “early day”.

The Victorian Government has shown
itself not only to be incompetent but
also corrupt—corrupt in that it has
been manoeuvred by the worst of the
most malevolent and unscrupulous
elements in the meat industry in the
State. It is a shame, but I have already
referred to the evidence and if that is
the Liberal Party Government’s idea of
free enterprise, then it can be assured
that is not the view of any other
citizen in Victoria on how the State
ought to be run.

The people of Victoria are demanding
strong, decisive action in this area.
They are demanding action now. The
Royal Commission will have some
effect, but it will not have an immediate
effect. It will run at least twelve
months and it will probably be longer
before the Royal Commission reports
if it is to do a thorough job. In the
meantime our meat exports need to be
protected, together with the domestic
trade, and we also need Victoria’s
health to be properly protected.

On 8 September the Minister of Agri-
culture, in answer to a question, stated
that nothing would be left to chance.
Yet, on his speech tonight and on his
failure to make the terms of reference
available to honourable members,
things are being left to chance. There
is simply not a fair dinkum approach to
the problem. Steps ought to be taken to
put an end to the malpractices which
have been permitted in Victoria, in both
the export and domestic trades.

The amendment moved by the hon-
ourable member for Sunshine puts
forward constructive steps which ought
to be taken immediately by the Vic-
torian Government so the people of
Victoria, the meat industry and the
meat producers can be confident that
their interests are being properly pro-
tected.

We need a tightening up of admin-
istration so malpractice and possible
corruption is cleaned out. We need a
single meat inspection system nego-
tiated now rather than spread over
several years, as has occurred to date,
so that there is proper control over
meat in Victoria, and in Australia for
that matter, from the paddock to the
plate and people can be confident
about the quality of the meat they are
eating and our export markets can
likewise be confident of what they are
buying.
We need proper control over our brands and over the documentation which is used, not only in the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry meat inspection service but also in the Victorian meat inspection service—that is not the current position.

We need to have some form of evidence that the type of dye that will be instituted by the Government will be a real solution to the problem. The Minister of Agriculture did not inform the Parliament what type of dye would be used, but I hope that it is more satisfactory than the one which was previously provided for in the 1975 and 1978 regulations.

The Minister of Agriculture made no reference to the control of interstate movements of pet foods. Yet, on all the evidence that is available, State control is essential to overcome the substitution rackets, both export and domestic. We need notification of imports into Victoria so the Department of Agriculture knows at least 24 hours ahead what meat is being imported to the State and its destination. Without that control it is impossible to have proper control over movements of pet food into and through Victoria. Likewise there needs to be added control over imports, in addition to notification of movements, once meat is within Victoria, whether pet meat or meat for human consumption.

With regard to the human health side there needs to be proper facilities and resources provided for the Health Commission so that the Health Commission can carry out adequate meat investigations. Evidence available to me suggests that the Health Commission simply did not have or use epidemiological skills when investigating the Tibaldi case. The people at Tibaldi can be upset by the way in which they have been treated by the Health Commission, and the people of Victoria ought to be very concerned about the failure of the Victorian Government to quickly and properly act to overcome that problem which has dealt such a devastating blow to that firm, apart from its effect on the people who were ill as a result.

I am making no reference to the quality of the Tibaldi product. What I am stating is that when the problem occurred the Minister of Health should have had at his disposal or at least should have used proper epidemiological practices which could have quickly and accurately defined the problem, what had got into the meat and what was necessary to overcome it, yet on the evidence available that did not occur.

The important thing which is essential in all these instances is the provision of proper penalties. This evening the Minister of Agriculture made some vague reference to increased penalties, but he did not have the trust in Parliament or in members of Parliament to inform the House what is proposed. That is the very least he could have done because honourable members need to be convinced that the penalties are adequate so that at least those people who are consistent offenders can be disqualified and prohibited from operating premises in Victoria.

On the evidence available to honourable members, the Victorian Government stands condemned on its record in this area and I strongly urge honourable members to support the amendment moved by the honourable member for Sunshine.

Mr I. W. SMITH (Warrnambool)—This has been a very wide ranging and interesting debate. It has been interesting that the Leader of the Opposition, who obviously saw the debate originally as a grand standing mechanism for him to gain headlines as the meat scandal was generating tremendous publicity a week or so ago, has found that there are other issues which are far more important to him in that he has handed over the whole debate not only to his shadow Minister of Agriculture but also he has been prepared to incorporate his very lengthy motion into the motion moved by the National Party, by having the honourable member for Sunshine move his amendment.

The National Party really begged the question whether appropriate action has been taken by the State Government. In the discussion which has ensued tonight, what has not been emphasized
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is that the problem exists in export meat in the substitution of export beef with other types of meat, but that area of responsibility is absolutely and totally under the control of the Commonwealth Government.

They are following sets of guidelines and procedures very rigorously viewed by the American authorities.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! The time appointed under Sessional Orders for me to interrupt the business of the House has now arrived.

On the motion of Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health), the sitting was continued.

Mr I. W. SMITH (Warrnambool)—The American authorities not only rigorously try to ensure that the tasks set by the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation are undertaken, but they have laid down the conditions under which these inspectorial tasks will be undertaken by the Australian authorities. For honourable members to come into this Parliament and try to put the State Government into this meat scandal is simply trying to, if you like, divert attention from the real issue, just as the Queensland Premier has tried to divert attention from his State.

How many people picked up the plea from the kangaroo meat industry in Queensland, rated as a $25 million industry in Queensland? The minute this scandal hit the papers, that industry practically went to the wall. In fact, it appealed for Federal and State Government support. Yet the potent State of the pumpkin-scone republic has said everything is lilywhite in Queensland and that Queensland should not have been part of an inquiry. There is absolutely no mechanism available to Queensland, or policed by Queensland, that would indicate that kangaroo meat—or any other meat for that matter—going out of Queensland is unable to re-enter Queensland in some other substituted form. It is open and possible for that to occur. Fortunately the Queensland Premier has now realized that, but he has crawled out of it by passing it over to Mr Ahern, his Minister for Agriculture, who has recently returned to Queensland from Japan. When he was in Japan he was talking to the Japanese authorities, and he is reported by Michael Byrnes in the National Times of September 13-19 1981, and I will read some relevant points:

Mike Ahern held a Tokyo press conference where he announced, among other things, that the Japanese Government was now allowing the import of kangaroo meat for human consumption.

Until the new decision by the Japanese authorities, Australian exports of kangaroo meat to Japan had to be labelled "game" or other pseudonyms. Ahern's explanation occurred before the uproar over meat exports to the U.S.

Ahern told the assembled press in Tokyo that the export of kangaroo meat for human consumption to Japan would mean "substantial export business" for Queensland.

It is obvious that not only is Queensland exporting kangaroo meat for consumption, but it is doing it on a very large scale. While there may be nothing wrong with that—so long as it is masqueraded under its correct title and processed and supervised under proper hygienic standards—in fact it has been called "game". If they are prepared to call it "game" in Japan, what else are they prepared to call it elsewhere?

The Queensland authorities have encouraged this $25 million industry to grow, yet the minute a substitution allegation is made, the industry falls to its knees and calls for support. It is heartening and sensible that the Queensland Premier has at last seen the wisdom of a full-scale inquiry.

I remind honourable members that this scandal started by a new inspector in America suspecting flesh that he was examining was too dark to be beef. He had a species test run on it and found that it was horsemeat. He then traced that shipment back to the port of Melbourne, and that blew the whistle on the trade and brought Victorian meat establishments under suspicion.

It is not legally possible to slaughter kangaroos, and very few horses are slaughtered in Victoria. By far the majority of this trade goes on in New South Wales and in Queensland. Both of those States have meat marketing
authorities, which is what the National Party was advocating would be the mechanism of overcoming the current problem. Both are producer dominated and both are totally ineffective, producing not one additional cent to the grazier; they simply lumber the industry with a great additional cost. There would be no benefit in having a Victorian meat industry authority. It certainly would not have prevented the current meat scandal.

I want to separate the issues discussed, which basically are the local issues, from the scandal itself, which is substitution on the export market. Queensland has various definitions of meat in its Act, and “carcass” includes any meat or offal pertaining to a carcass of stock, or in the case of poultry, any poultry meat or offal pertaining to a carcass of poultry. The Queensland meat inspection authority caters for the full range of meat slaughtered by any mechanism under any sort of banner in Queensland. It ought to have been possible, if the Queensland authorities were doing as they say they have been doing, for all their meat—not for human consumption but destined for the local market—to be dyed with an indelible dye. Obviously the Queensland authorities are not as lily-white as they have painted themselves to be.

The New South Wales Meat Industry Act 1978 defines “abattoir animal” as bull, ox, steer, cow, heifer, calf, ram, ewe, wether, lamb, goat, kid and swine, and includes any other animal that the Minister, by order published in the Government Gazette, declares to be an abattoir animal for the purposes of the Act. Kangaroo is not included. All of this begs the question whether there should be a single meat inspection authority with a uniform code of practices over the whole nation.

Ironically, it was this Government, while I was Minister of Agriculture, that offered to the Federal Government, all the rights of meat inspection that Victoria had under its Act. That offer has not been matched by any other State Government. It has been reiterated by my successor, the current Minister of Agriculture, and the offer still remains. If the Federal Government thinks it can provide a better service, that it can control the industry to the satisfaction of the producer right through to the consumer in a better way than the State is able to do, it is welcome to try, but it has failed. It has failed totally in Victoria, the place where honourable members of this House are alleging that the State Government has neglected its duty. It has not neglected its duty.

The honourable member for Werribee suggested that the Government did not even know the number of meat premises in this State. That is ridiculous. The Minister of Agriculture quoted them earlier in the debate. The honourable member obviously was not listening to the Minister; he must have been out somewhere, as he usually is, preening himself for his well-known smile during debate. The number of meat premises in Victoria is 165; the number of meat inspection depots is 167; the number of slaughter houses is 29; export licensed abattoirs 19, and the number of local licensed abattoirs is 85. Those figures were quoted by the Minister of Agriculture, but again I quote them for the benefit of the honourable member for Werribee.

Members of the National Party and the Labor Party who have spoken in the debate have made extraordinarily serious allegations against unnamed organizations and individuals within the meat industry.

I hold no brief for any individual in the meat industry, or any other industry for that matter, except the industry of politics, but to stand up in a place and be a responsible member one must surely follow the innuendo or allegation by some snippet of fact. The closest we got to that was the honourable member for Werribee recently saying that he had drawn to his attention information which would be available to the Royal Commission. At least there is some semblance of credibility on his part. It is a dereliction of duty for the honourable member for Benalla to say these things have been going on for years and
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add credibility to that statement by his association as a member of the Meat Industry Committee, not to have drawn those allegations to the attention of someone earlier. The same applies to the honourable member for Sunshine.

The policy of this Government, while I was Minister and during the time the current Minister has been in office, has been that an allegation made by anyone—and the honourable member for Doncaster has made some—has been fully investigated. Where allegations involve State administration and where they go beyond State administration to inter-state administration, the relevant responsible person has been notified and given whatever facts are available to us or, alternatively, in the case of the Federal Government the appropriate officer has been notified, together with documentation of whatever the allegations and facts are in our possession. Wherever assistance has been necessary full co-operation has been assured.

The House heard the Minister quote the figures of allegations made, inquiries undertaken, prosecutions launched and those successfully brought to court. I do not dispute the issue of the paucity or extent of the fines. In this day and age they are much too low. They should have been reviewed upwards long ago. But the small number of convictions would probably indicate that that is a fairly fruitless task. By far the most beneficial way to control the meat industry is by the vigilance of the meat inspectors on the chain, in the inspection process wherever it may take place, through the boning room and ultimately through health inspectors to the retail outlets. If those people are known to be vigilant in enforcing the regulations few fines are necessary. In spite of that people have been prepared to run risks to go to great lengths to substitute meat which is not beef in export containers and in spite of the vigilance of the Commonwealth—and I underline “Commonwealth”—officers these people have not until now been brought to justice. Thank goodness the Commonwealth is now in the process of bringing them to justice.

However, we should not discredit the State meat inspecting service, which is a costly undertaking at $6 million but less costly than the equivalent would cost if Commonwealth inspectors performed this task because their awards and conditions are more costly to the industry and would ultimately be reflected to the producer and consumer. The State meat inspection service, State administration and State Government should not be criticized for something they have not done. The fault does not lie in that area. It lies in the administration, or lack of it, by the Commonwealth and lack of control by other States.

If those are not the facts the forum will ultimately be available for those people who want to make allegations, because right from day one the State Government has said it supports a full inquiry. I have said that ultimately Mr Nixon and the Federal Government cannot avoid a full-scale inquiry because, although one may stop the problem now by being more vigilant, it is clear that certain people may have made heaps of money and done irreparable damage to our export chances in some countries. Those people ought to be brought to justice as a matter of justice and prevention.

The allegations made by Senator Primmer in the Federal Parliament which have been widely reported and which used the term “illegal slaughtering” relate to two instances, one at Timboon and one at Dimboola, where small abattoir operators were taken to court and prosecuted for illegally slaughtering—not horses, donkeys or anything else—but, would honourable members believe, sheep and beef. At that stage their works were not under the supervision of meat inspectors. Why? Because they were working long hours and off hours but they were not, at least in my view, working under sub-standard conditions. The illegal slaughtering simply refers to the lack of inspection supervision. On the day they were caught they were supervised and the meat discovered on the premises was certainly that of sheep and cattle and nothing else and so the illegal
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slaughtering there cannot in any way—it was of such a small scale to be insignificant in the total argument—be linked to meat substitution for the export market. That is quite different.

The origin of this meat is clearly from an interstate source because there are not sufficient quantities of horses slaughtered in Victoria and it is illegal to slaughter kangaroos in Victoria. There are not many donkeys in Victoria outside of this place. I believe in the circumstances the State Government has behaved in an exemplary manner and that it has taken the appropriate action called for by the National Party. In fact it has led off the appropriate action called for by the National Party and the requirements of the motion moved by the Opposition simply add humbug to a service which is performed well. It does not get to the nub of the problem, namely, a lack of performance by Commonwealth inspectors.

The House divided on the question that the words proposed by Mr Fogarty to be omitted stand part of the motion (the Hon. S. J. Plowman in the chair).

Ayes . . . . . . 47
Noes . . . . . 31

Majority against the amendment . . . . 16

AYES
Mr Austin
Mr Ballour
Mr Birrell
Mr Borthwick
Mr Brown
Mr Burgin
Mrs Chambers
Mr Coleman
Mr Collins
Mr Crellin
Mr Dixon
Mr Dunstan
Mr Ebery
Mr Evans (Ballarat North)
Mr Evans (Gippsland Fast)
Mr Hann
Mr Hayes
Mr Jasper
Mr Jona
Mr Lacy
Mr Lieberman
Mr McArthur
Mr McCaffrey
Mr McClure
Mr I. W. Smith

Mr McGrath
Mr McInnes
Mr McKellar
Mr Mackinnon
Mr Maciellian
Mrs Patrick
Mr Ramsay
Mr Reynolds
Mr Richardson
Mr Ross-Edwards
Mrs Sibree
Mr Skeggs
Mr Smith
Mr Smith (South Barwon)
Mr Smith (Warrambool)
Mr Templeton
Mr Thompson
Mr Trewin
Mr Weideman
Mr Whiting
Mr Williams
Mr Wood
Tellers:
Mr Cox
Mr Tanner

NOES
Mr Cain
Miss Callister
Mr Cathie
Dr Coghill
Mr Crabb
Mr Culpin
Mr Edmunds
Mr Fogarty
Mr Fordham
Mr Gavin
Mr Giffen
Mr Hockley
Mr Jolly
Mr King
Mr Kirkwood
Mr Mathews
Mr Miller
Mr Rowi
Mr Sidiropoulos
Mr Simmonds
Mr Simpson
Mr Spyker
Mr Stirling
Mrs Toner
Mr Trezise
Dr Vaughan
Mr Walsh
Mr Wilkes
Mr Wilton

The motion was agreed to.

WILDLIFE (FEES) BILL

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

JOINT SITTING OF PARLIAMENT
Deakin University: Monash University

A message was received from the Council acquainting the Assembly that the Council had agreed to meet the Assembly for the purpose of sitting and voting together to choose three members of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the Council of the Deakin University, and one member of the Parliament of Victoria to be recommended for appointment to the Council of Monash University, and, as proposed by the Legislative Assembly, the place and time of such meeting being the Legislative Assembly Chamber on Tuesday next at six o'clock.

HOSPITALS SUPERANNUATION (GENERAL AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will recall that, during the autumn sessional period last year, legislation was enacted to make two important and urgent amendments to the hospitals superannuation scheme.

They were, firstly, to correct an anomaly in the scheme which had the effect of disregarding up to two years'
service by a contributor for the purpose of calculating eligibility for pension and other entitlements and, secondly, to provide a framework for a new lump sum benefit of three times final average salary calculated on the three years immediately preceding retirement in respect of 30 or more years' service.

In introducing the Bill, it was mentioned to the House that a review of the Hospitals Superannuation Act was being undertaken by the Hospitals Superannuation Board and further amendments to the Act were foreshadowed to maintain the benefits payable to contributors and to ensure that the scheme operated as effectively as possible.

The Bill before the House represents stage II of the review of the Hospitals Superannuation Fund legislation. The amendments proposed in the Bill are mainly unrelated and, accordingly, are best discussed in my comments on the clauses contained in the legislation. However, the general philosophy behind the legislation is to bring the hospitals superannuation scheme more into line with the State employees retirement benefit scheme. Because of their different histories, there will, of course, continue to be differences between the two schemes. Nevertheless, the amendments proposed in this Bill will give the Hospitals Superannuation Board a greater flexibility in administering the hospitals superannuation scheme and maintain the benefits payable to its contributors.

There are nineteen clauses in the Bill and these are as follows: Clause 1 is the usual citation clause and provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 2 amends section 4(3) of the principal Act to increase the membership of the Hospitals Superannuation Board from five to six. The sixth member is to be appointed from a panel of not less than three names of directors of the Victorian Hospitals Association submitted to the Minister by the association. The original Hospitals Superannuation Board included a representative of the association although provision for such representation was not included in the restructuring of the board by the Hospitals Superannuation (Amendment) Act 1976. However, the incumbent at the time, Mr R. D. Birdsey, retained office in accordance with section 2(2) of that Act until his death late in 1979.

As a result of discussions between the association and the Minister of Health, it has been agreed that representation on the board from the association should be restored in view of the fact that it represents the boards of management of all public hospitals, institutions and the majority of community health centres in Victoria. This clause restores such representation on the board.

Clause 3 inserts a new sub-section in section 4 to give the Governor in Council a capacity to appoint a person to represent the Victorian Hospitals Association if a panel of names is not received from the association within one month of being so requested.

Clause 4 substitutes a new section for the present section 5 of the principal Act. The present section, among other things, empowers the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council to invest moneys, "in the purchase of land or land and buildings or in the erection of a building for use as the office of the board". The new section, which reflects section 16 of the State Employees Retirement Benefits Act (the S.E.R.B. Act) widens the power to give the board a capacity to buy, sell and lease land for investment purposes.

Clause 5 inserts three new sections in the principal Act. Proposed section 19A is designed to give the board a right to examine employment records of contributors to or beneficiaries of the superannuation fund.

Experience has shown that, from time to time, information provided to the board by a participating institution has been incorrect and this has affected the contributions or the benefits payable by or to a contributor. The powers
proposed in the Bill will enable a mem-
ber or an authorized officer of the
board to verify information regarding
the service and salary of a contributor.

The new section 19a will set out the
factors to be observed by the board in
classifying contributors to ensure the
solvency of the fund and that the
average value of benefits paid out of
the fund are the same for each classi-
 fica tion. The new section, in fact, will
reflect the actuarial principles which
have been adopted by the board, al-
though not actually spelled out in the
legislation. It is essentially the same
as section 12 of the Superannuation
Act and the comparable provision in
section 29 of the S.E.R.B. Act.

Proposed section 19c will give a con-
tributor a right of appeal if he or she
is dissatisfied with the classifica tion
determined by the board. The new
section is based on section 67 of the
S.E.R.B. Act and provides that where
a contributor is dissatisfied with his or
her classification an appeal may be
made to a review panel consisting of a
member of the board, an independent
actuary and an independent legally
qualified medical practitioner. If the
review panel varies the determina tion
of the board, the appeal fee of $25
is to be refunded to the contributor.
Provision is made in the new section
and in the complementary amendment
proposed to section 49 by clause 18
for the payment of fees to members
of the review panel.

Clause 6 amends section 35A(2) of
the principal Act which requires the
Governor in Council to declare by
Order published in the Government
Gazette within 31 days of 30 June each
year the amount by which in his
opinion the minimum wage has in-
creased between 1 January 1976 and
30 June last past. This declaration is
the prerequisite to the adjustment of
contributions payable by pension con-
tributors which are calculated on the
basis of .05 per cent for each complete
1 per cent an employee is receiving in
excess of the minimum wage up to a
maximum of 2.5 per cent of salary.
It has been found very difficult to com-
ply with the requirement that the de-
claration must be made within 31 days
of 30 June and, accordingly, the
amendment sought to this section
will require the making of such a
declaration as soon as practicable after
this date.

Clause 7 substitutes the words “a
pension contributor” for “a contribu-
tor” in sub-section (2) and sub-section
(5) of section 35f of the principal Act.
Similar amendments to other provisions
are proposed in clauses 9, 11 and 19 of
the Bill. These amendments are being
made on the advice of the board’s
legal advisers. Under the Hospitals
Superannuation Act, a “contributor”
and a “pension contributor” are defined
differently. In effect, a “pension con-
tributor” is either a person who joined
the hospitals superannuation scheme
subsequent to the 1976 amendment or
a contributor prior to the 1976 Act
who elected to participate in the new
pension scheme introduced by that Act.

Section 35f of the principal Act
states, in part, that a pension contribu-
tor shall be entitled to a retirement
pension if he retires having attained
the age of 65 years. It goes on to
provide that the amount of the retire-
ment pension payable “shall be an
amount calculated at the rate of 1.120th
part of the adjusted final fund salary
of the pension contributor for each
complete year, not exceeding 30, during
which he continued to be a contributor
before attaining the age of 65 years”. 
Expressed more simply, the section
provides that retirement pension of a
“pension contributor” is to be calcu-
lated at the appropriate rate of salary
during each complete year he was a
“contributor”.

The use of the word “contributor”
in this, and in subsequent sections, was
no doubt intended by the legislature to
mean “pension contributor” but counsel
has pointed out that the Act draws a
distinction between a “contributor” and
a “pension contributor”.

It has been suggested that a possible
construction of section 35f is that
“pension contributors” shall be entitled
to take into account for the purposes
of calculating their retirement pension,
the time that they were ordinary contributors to the Hospitals Superannuation Fund as it existed prior to the amending legislation. The advice of counsel is:

The result of this would be that persons who were not contributors before the commencement of the amending legislation or persons who wished to bring into account past services when their retirement pension is calculated. This would be on the basis that they were not "contributors" whilst such past services were being undertaken.

The purpose of the amendment to this and to subsequent sections of the principal Act is to make clear that the term "contributor" when used in these sections is intended to comprehend all past services which are picked up by employees pursuant to section 35ZF.

Clause 8 inserts a new section 35FA into the principal Act. The new section closely follows section 42 of the State Employees Retirement Benefit Act and will give a pension contributor receiving a pension a right at 70 years of age to apply to the board to have part of his pension converted to a lump sum payment. Only one such application may be made and, needless to say, the pension payable is reduced by the amount of the pension entitlement converted to a lump sum.

Clause 9 substitutes a "pension contributor" for "a contributor" in section 35G(2) of the principal Act for the reasons outlined on clause 7. This section deals with the determination of the amount payable as an early retirement pension.

Clause 10 inserts a new section 35HA into the principal Act. It is modelled on section 38 of the State Employees Retirement Benefit Act. At the present time, section 35H of the principal Act entitles a person who resigns from a participating institution to accept employment in a non-participating hospital or institution to opt for a deferred retirement pension.

The new section extends this principle. It will entitle a pension contributor who ceases to be employed by a participating institution for reasons other than to accept such employment or on the grounds of retirement, disability or death, to opt for a deferred pension as though he or she had resigned to become a public servant. At present, such a pension contributor is only refunded his contributions.

Deferred retirement benefits will not be payable prior to the contributor reaching 65 except in the case of his death. In such instances, the spouse will be entitled to two-thirds of the deferred pension plus any deferred lump sum and interest and children will be entitled to a pension calculated on the basis that the deceased was a pension contributor at the date of his death.

Clause 11 substitutes a "pension contribution" for "a contributor" in section 35I(2) of the principal Act which deals with the calculation of disability retirement pensions.

Clause 12 amends section 35K(1) of the principal Act to increase from $442 to $650 the pension payable to the child of a deceased pensioner. Clause 13 makes a similar amendment to section 35L of the principal Act to update from $884 to $1300 the pension payable to a double orphan. The new scales provided for in both clause 12 and this clause will bring payments in respect of children under the pension scheme of the Hospitals Superannuation Fund into line with those payable under the State Employees Retirement Benefit Act.

Clause 14 amends section 35M of the principal Act which provides for the refund of contributions on the resignation of a contributor from a participating institution. The effect of the amendment will be that contributions will be refunded with interest, determined on the basis of the results of the investment of contributors' funds, less the cost assessed by an actuary of the death and disability cover. Section 37 of the State Employees Retirement Benefit Act contains a similar provision.

Clause 15 makes two amendments to section 35N of the principal Act. The first inserts the words "or whose husband is alive but not wholly or substantially dependent on the pension..."
contributor" in this section. The section deals with the refund of contributions following the death of an unmarried, divorced or widowed pension contributor prior to his or her retirement and the effect of the first will be to enable contributions to be also refunded where the contributor was married but whose spouse was not dependent upon the contributor. The second amendment to the section will have the effect of providing for the payment of interest in addition to the refund of contributions under this section.

Clause 16 makes a similar amendment to section 35P of the principal Act to provide for the payment of interest in addition to the payment of the difference to a pension contributor where the benefits payable to him are less than the amount he has contributed.

Clause 17 re-enacts section 35u of the principal Act with amendments. The present section provides for an annual adjustment of pensions each December to take account of changes which have occurred in the consumer price index during the preceding twelve months. The substituted section will require adjustments to be made half yearly—in June and December. This is similar to the procedure provided for in section 43 of the State Employees Retirement Benefit Act.

Clause 18 amends Section 49(b) of the principal Act to provide a head of power for regulations prescribing fees payable to members of review panels as mentioned under clause 5.

Clause 19 substitutes the words "a pension contributor" for "a contributor" in section 6 of the Hospitals Superannuation (Amendment) Act 1980 which deems that a pension contributor employed between 1 January 1977 to 30 June 1977 to be a contributor while he was so employed. The provision was enacted to correct an anomaly in the recognition of past service for the purpose of calculating benefits under the Hospitals Superannuation scheme.

As I indicated in my introductory remarks, the purpose of the Bill is to maintain the benefits payable to contributors to the Hospitals Superannuation Fund and, in particular, to bring them more into line with the State Employees Retirement Benefits scheme. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr Edmunds, for Mr ROPER (Brunswick), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

LOTTERIES, GAMING AND BETTING (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to clarify and bring up to date some existing provisions of the Lotteries Gaming and Betting Act and to make special provision for small raffles, lucky envelope vending machines and trade promotion lotteries. I propose to deal briefly with each of the proposed amendments.

At present, raffles of a private nature among persons engaged in common employment where the value of the prize does not exceed $10 are exempted from the provisions of the Act. The limit of $10 has remained unchanged since 1966 and clause 2(2)(a) of the Bill raises the limit to a more realistic amount of $100.

Apart from raffles of the type that I have just mentioned, a person wishing to conduct a raffle under the existing provisions of the Act must apply to the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board in the prescribed pay, pay the appropriate fee and receive a permit. The Government is of the view that persons who wish to conduct small raffles for a recognized community purpose should not have to obtain a permit each time a raffle is conducted.

Clause 5(c) of the Bill inserts a new sub-section (6c) in section 6, which, in general terms exempts people conducting small raffles from the necessity to obtain a permit each time a raffle is conducted.

As I indicated in my introductory remarks, the purpose of the Bill is to maintain the benefits payable to contributors to the Hospitals Superannuation Fund and, in particular, to bring the benefits more into line with the State Employees Retirement Benefits scheme. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr Edmunds, for Mr ROPER (Brunswick), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

LOTTERIES, GAMING AND BETTING (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to clarify and bring up to date some existing provisions of the Lotteries Gaming and Betting Act and to make special provision for small raffles, lucky envelope vending machines and trade promotion lotteries. I propose to deal briefly with each of the proposed amendments.

At present, raffles of a private nature among persons engaged in common employment where the value of the prize does not exceed $10 are exempted from the provisions of the Act. The limit of $10 has remained unchanged since 1966 and clause 2(2)(a) of the Bill raises the limit to a more realistic amount of $100.

Apart from raffles of the type that I have just mentioned, a person wishing to conduct a raffle under the existing provisions of the Act must apply to the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board in the prescribed pay, pay the appropriate fee and receive a permit. The Government is of the view that persons who wish to conduct small raffles for a recognized community purpose should not have to obtain a permit each time a raffle is conducted.

Clause 5(c) of the Bill inserts a new sub-section (6c) in section 6, which, in general terms exempts people conducting small raffles from the necessity to obtain a permit each time a raffle is conducted.

As I indicated in my introductory remarks, the purpose of the Bill is to maintain the benefits payable to contributors to the Hospitals Superannuation Fund and, in particular, to bring
between $200 and $500 proposed sub-section (6e) requires the person conducting the raffle to be registered with the Raffles and Bingo Permit Board.

Proposed sub-section (6f) provides that raffle tickets issued by a registered person should contain the registration number of that person and proposed sub-section (6g) provides that registration lasts for a period of twelve months. Accordingly, once registration is achieved, there is no need for any further application to the board for raffles with prizes under $500 during the twelve month period. Proposed sub-section (6h) gives the board the power to require an audited statement of receipts and expenditure.

Clause (5d) makes a minor amendment to section 6(7) to ensure that there is a power to prescribe general conditions under which these raffles can be conducted. These provisions should make it easier for small raffles to be conducted without the necessity for complying with all of the procedural and technical requirements of the Act and regulations.

Honourable members may be aware that there is a certain type of raffle conducted by means of "lucky envelopes". In essence, these are raffles where the sealed ticket contains a printed number and the person conducting the raffle has a list of numbers which entitle the holder of a ticket with a corresponding number to receive a prize.

These raffles are conducted on the basis that a person who purchases a ticket selects one at random from a container. At present, lucky envelope competitions come within the general raffles provisions of the Act. There are now dispensing machines available whereby a person inserts a coin and receives a ticket. These machines were not in existence when the Act was drafted and the Government considers that it is necessary to have special provisions covering them, in particular to control the operation of the machines.

Provisions covering lucky envelope machines are contained in clause 7 of the Bill and proposed section 6AB(1) enables the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board to grant a permit to sell tickets through a vending machine. It should be noted that lucky envelopes are a form of raffle and as such, no cash prizes will be permitted. Proposed section 6AB(4) provides that machines may only be installed in prescribed types of premises. The Government intends, at this stage, that the type of premises prescribed for the purposes of the section will be limited to premises licensed under the Liquor Control Act and premises occupied by the organization benefiting from the sale of tickets, and will not include retail premises. Proposed section 6AB(4) also provides that the name of the fund to benefit shall be displayed on the vending machine and sets out minimum levels of prize payments and payments to the organization conducting the raffle. Proposed section 6AD requires printers of tickets sold through machines to be resident in Victoria and to obtain the approval of the board. Proposed section 6AC(1) provides that the Government is to receive a surcharge of 5 per cent of the gross receipts where the raffle is conducted for philanthropic and benevolent purposes and 8 per cent of the gross receipts where the raffle is conducted for sporting or recreational purposes. This will be consistent with the proposed increased surcharges paid on games of bingo to which I shall refer later. Proceeds from these machines should provide a welcome boost to the funds of many charitable and sporting organizations.

Clause 6 introduces a new concept of trade promotion lotteries into the Act. At present under the Act, raffles, which are defined as a type of lottery without cash prizes, are only able to be conducted for a "community purpose". However, the Act does allow lotteries for any purpose to be held where the participant is entitled "gratuitously to participate". The courts have interpreted this provision very narrowly and have said that a lottery is not "gratuitous" where a purchase or other expenditure is required in order to qualify for a chance to win a prize. At present, some competitions are conducted by traders but they may only be conducted on the basis that a purchase is not
necessary to enter the competition. Competitions such as those where the payment of an admission fee to a function entitles a person to participate in a drawing of prizes are not permitted under the Act at present because participation is not regarded as "gratuitous". From time to time, persons wishing to conduct competitions for the promotion of a trade or business and where participation is not strictly "gratuitous", even though the tickets are not sold as such, apply to the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board for permission to conduct such competitions. Under the Act as it stands, the board is unable to permit such competitions although competitions of this type are permitted in New South Wales and Queensland.

The Government cannot see any harm in competitions of this type provided that no specific fee is required from the public for the right to participate. Indeed, the Government sees advantages in supervising such competitions to ensure that they are conducted in a fair manner. The effect of these provisions is that competitions involving such things as tickets given by shopkeepers with a purchase, competitions where it is necessary to send in a packet top or label and competitions where the payment of an admission fee to a function entitles the person to participate in a drawing of prizes will be permitted.

I should point out that trading stamps will not be permitted under these provisions. Trading stamps are coupons which entitle the holder to demand money or goods and they differ from lotteries because every coupon holder is entitled to receive something. With trade promotion lotteries, however, a ticket would merely confer a right to participate in a drawing of prizes. Trading stamps are prohibited under section 10 of the Consumer Affairs Act 1972 and this will remain the case.

Clause 6 of the Bill contains the provisions covering trade promotion lotteries. Proposed section 6AAA(3) makes it clear that no fee in addition to the amount charged for goods or services shall be charged for the right to participate. Proposed section 6AAB(1) provides for a fee to be paid for the grant of a permit. The regulations will prescribe basic conditions to ensure that such lotteries are conducted in a fair manner and proposed section 6AAA(4) allows the board to impose any additional conditions which it thinks necessary. These conditions would relate to such matters as the period of time during which the promotion is to be conducted, public announcement of the winners' names, the exact description of prizes to be won and the method of determining winners.

Some time ago, the Crown Solicitor gave an opinion that the awarding of liquor as prizes in raffles did not amount to a breach of the Liquor Control Act 1968. This means that there is no restriction on the awarding of liquor as prizes, and in order to achieve uniformity, the Government considers that section 5(3)(b) of the Act should be repealed. Section 5(3) allows the Chief Commissioner of Police to issue permits for small lotteries and games of chance at fetes and the like where the value of the prize does not exceed $10 and subparagraph (b) prohibits the disposal of liquor at these games. Clause 2(1) of the Bill repeals this sub-paragraph.

Under section 6(6) of the Act the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board has the power to delegate in writing its authority to issue permits for raffles. This means that in many instances the secretary of the board is able to issue permits with the authority of the board. However, no such power of delegation exists in the bingo provisions and it is obviously inconvenient and time-consuming that the full board deal with each application for a bingo permit. The Government is of the view that the bingo provisions should contain a power of delegation along similar lines to section 6(6) and clause 8(c) of the Bill inserts a new sub-section in the Act which gives this power to the board.

Section 6(1) of the Act provides that the board may consent to raffles in certain circumstances. This was one of the original provisions of the Act and the Act has since been amended by the insertion of the bingo provisions in sections 6A to 6F. The board has recom-
mended that a number of minor amendments be made to section 6(1) so that, as far as possible, it is consistent with the provisions of sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 6A, which deal with the power of the board to consent to games of bingo. This recommendation is supported by the Government and is implemented in clause 5(a) of the Bill.

Section 6A(1) (k) and (l) of the Act provides that at least one half of the gross receipts for any bingo game or session of games shall be distributed as prizes. There is no upper limit on the prize pay-out and representations have been made to the Government on behalf of small clubs on the basis that they are disadvantaged by larger clubs that operate at a low profit and high turnover and offer prizes of more than 80 per cent of the gross receipts. Smaller clubs that have to pay expenses such as the cost of tickets, advertising and rental of a hall are unable to compete and the Government believes that an upper limit on the payment of prizes in bingo games should be prescribed. This will ensure that a reasonable proportion of the gross receipts will go towards the community purpose for which the game is conducted. Clause 9 of the Bill provides for an upper limit of 70 per cent of the gross receipts on prize payments in games of bingo but also provides that the board may allow a higher percentage in appropriate cases.

The present maximum period of a bingo permit as provided in section 6A(8) of the Act is three months. From time to time suggestions have been made that this period be increased. The Raffles and Bingo Permits Board has recommended that the period be increased to six months, which would offer advantages to permit holders without any diminution of control by the board. The Government supports this recommendation which is implemented in clause 8(a) and (b) of the Bill.

Clause 11 of the Bill increases the surcharges payable to the Government on games of bingo to 5 per cent of the gross receipts where the game is conducted for philanthropic or benevolent purposes and 8 per cent of the gross receipts where the game is conducted for sporting or recreational purposes. As I have just mentioned, these amounts are consistent with the surcharges to be levied on lucky envelopes sold through machines and they will result in increased revenue to the Government.

Section 6F(4) of the Act provides that where any under-age person is on premises where a bingo game is being conducted, the holder of the bingo permit authorizing the conduct of the game is guilty of an offence unless the under-age person is accompanied by an adult who is his parent, guardian or spouse. Section 6F(5) provides for a definition of the term “under-age” for the purposes of the bingo provisions. In relation to raffles, the Act leaves the question of under-age persons to the regulations. The Raffles and Bingo Permits Board has recommended that participation of under-age persons in bingo and raffles—whether by way of lucky envelopes, spinning wheels or otherwise—should be dealt with in a uniform manner in the regulations and that section 6F(5) be repealed. The Government supports this recommendation which is implemented in clause 12(b) and (c) and clause 13 of the Bill.

Sections 38(2), 42(2) and 66A(1) of the Act provide for Ministerial approval to be given for betting on sporting meetings, communication of betting odds and “Calcutta” sweeps. The Government considers it is more appropriate that approval in these circumstances be given by the permanent head of the Law Department. Clauses 14, 15 and 17 of the Bill replace a reference to “the Minister” with a reference to “the Secretary to the Law Department”.

Under the present wording of the Act, section 6d(1) requires holders of bingo permits to pay certain surcharges to the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board and section 6d(2) requires the board to pay these moneys into the Bingo Fund. However, section 6c(2) already requires all moneys lawfully received by the board to be paid into the Bingo Fund. The board therefore considers that section 6d(2) is unnecessary and has recommended
that it be repealed. The Government supports this recommendation which is implemented in clause 11(b) of the Bill.

Section 6r(2) of the Act provides for penalties where a bingo game is not played in accordance with the provisions of the Act, regulations or permit granted, but as presently worded, does not specify who is guilty of an offence. Clause 12(a) of the Bill rectifies this situation by relating the offence to persons who conduct or assist in conducting games of bingo. In addition, section 74 of the Act deals with breaches of the provisions of the Act and provides for general penalties where a penalty is not expressly provided elsewhere in the Act. Clause 18 of the Bill extends section 74 to cover breaches of the regulations made pursuant to the Act.

Finally, the Bill replaces all references to the "Chief Secretary" in the Act with a reference to "the Minister" following the transfer of responsibility for administering the Act to the Attorney-General. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr TREZISE (Geelong North), the debate was adjourned.

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

I have received a request that the debate be adjourned until 13 October. In the circumstances and owing to the complication of the Bill, I give a guarantee to extend the time if required.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

**URBAN LAND AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL**

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill to amend section 19 of the Urban Land Authority Act 1979, relates to a machinery matter which was brought to attention by the Auditor-General. The Urban Land Authority was established under the provisions of the Urban Land Act 1979 which came into operation on 12 March 1980. The functions of the authority are to provide allotments as directed by the Minister of Housing and to dispose of lands which the Governor in Council declares ought to be disposed of in the public interest.

Prior to March 1980, the Housing Commission held land on behalf of the Urban Land Council, a non-statutory body, and then vested it in the Urban Land Authority in accordance with the Act. The land had been purchased with moneys advanced to the Housing Commission on behalf of the Urban Land Council under the Commonwealth's Urban and Regional Development (Financial Assistance) Act 1974 and a subsequent Commonwealth-State Agreement made under the Act. The liability to repay the moneys lent became the responsibility of the Urban Land Authority pursuant to section 21 of its Act.

Section 19(5) of the Urban Land Authority Act states:

Where any property is vested in the Authority by the operation of this Section, the person or body to whom the property was formerly vested shall be entitled to proceeds of the sale of the property less any amounts incurred by the Authority in or in relation to the development and sale of the property.

This section, which was meant to apply to other cases, infers, in fact provides, that the Housing Commission would be entitled to the proceeds of the sale of the lands purchased on behalf of the Urban Land Council even though the repayment of the relevant loans now becomes the responsibility of the Urban Land Authority.

This amending Bill clarifies this matter so that the proceeds of the sale of those lands can remain with the Urban Land Authority for the repayment of the loans to the Commonwealth. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr CATHIE (Carrum), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.
MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS (BORROWING POWERS) BILL

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Act 1958 to increase the present limit of the board's borrowing powers from $100 million to $130 million.

At the beginning of the current financial year the board's outstanding capital debt was just over $87 million and it has been granted approval by the Treasurer to raise a total of $12 million during the 1981–82 financial year to finance its programme of improving public passenger transport.

Raising of this money will mean that by the end of the year the outstanding capital debt will be in excess of $99 000 000, a sum so close to the present authorized limit that it is considered prudent to increase the limit now to provide for the future.

As honourable members will be aware, the board has a continuing programme of improving its rolling stock and has at present 175 of the new orange trams in operation. A further 40 new trams are in course of completion under the current contract. In addition the board has almost completely renewed its bus fleet, the most recent addition being the 130 M.A.N. buses now operating in the metropolitan area. A further 30 of these buses will be put into service during the current year.

A major redevelopment of the Footscray bus depot is at present taking place and investigations are proceeding into an automatic vehicle monitoring system which will substantially improve the reliability of the service.

Improvements to public transport require continuing capital investment and the present statutory limit on borrowing must be increased to allow this to take place.

I turn now to the provisions of the Bill. Clause 1 relates to the title of the proposed Act and provides that it shall come into operation on the day on which it receives Royal assent. Clause 2 amends section 28 of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Act 1958 to raise the limit of the board’s borrowing powers to $130 million.

The provisions of the Bill will allow the board to continue its vital role in providing efficient street public transport in the metropolitan area. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr GAVIN (Coburg), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND UTILIZATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

PORT OF MELBOURNE AUTHORITY (INSCRIBED STOCK) BILL

Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works)—I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a relatively minor Bill, with the main purpose being to amend the Sixth Schedule of the Port of Melbourne Authority Act 1958, which relates to the authority’s issues of inscribed stock.

Established by the Melbourne Harbor Trust Act 1936, at the authority's office is a registry for the inscription of stock created and issued under the authority of the Port of Melbourne Authority and an officer of the authority is appointed as Registrar of Stock. The provisions of the Sixth Schedule have remained unaltered since 1936 and, consequently some of these provisions are out of keeping with modern practice.

Amendments included in the Bill will, therefore, update and simplify the administration of stock and associated procedures in the light of modern requirements. The Port of Melbourne Authority will be given some discretionary powers in the transmission of deceased stockholders' stock, and amendment to the principal Act will enable inscribed stock to be recorded in the Port of Melbourne Authority's
computer system. The first amendment relates to section 3(1) of the Sixth Schedule, which provides that the Port of Melbourne Authority shall keep "books" to be called stock ledgers, in which stock is to be inscribed. As the Port of Melbourne Authority intends to introduce a system of recording stock by means of computer records, it is necessary to insert an interpretation in section 3 of the principal Act to cover both books and computer records. The interpretation proposed satisfied both requirements and is in accordance with interpretations under the Companies Act 1961.

The second amendment, as detailed in sub-clauses 3(a), (b) and (c) of the Bill, is consequent upon the new interpretation of "Books" and substitutes words throughout the Sixth Schedule in accordance with that interpretation. In sub-clauses 3(b) and (e), the Bill provides for amendments to the monetary amounts in clauses 2 and 4(2) of the Sixth Schedule. As I have previously stated these amounts have remained unaltered since 1936.

The clauses of the schedule provide that inscribed stock shall be sold in parcels of $20 or some multiple of $20 and a person shall not transfer any fraction of $2 or any smaller sum than $20 unless that smaller sum is the total amount of the balance standing to the stockholder's credit in the stock ledgers. The Port of Melbourne Authority points out that, for some years now, it has been the practice to sell stock in public loans in minimum parcels of $100 with subsequent multiples of $100. The authority considers that a minimum amount of $200 for sale and transfer of inscribed stock is both realistic and desirable, with a minimum of $100 for subsequent parcels. Of course, a smaller amount will still be permitted if it is the total amount of the balance standing to the stockholder's credit in the stock ledgers.

Clause 5(2) of the Sixth Schedule provides that when a stockholder dies, probate of his will or letters of administration of his estate must be produced to the Registrar of Inscribed Stock. The only exception to this requirement is in the case of the death of a joint holder of stock where the surviving holder or holders apply for transmission. In that event, the registrar may accept the death certificate in lieu of probate or letters of administration. The provisions of this clause at times impose hardship upon an estate, both in terms of delay and expense in obtaining the relevant grant of probate or letters of administration. In the case of small estates, these associated costs are in many cases prohibitive.

The Bill provides for an amendment to allow the Port of Melbourne Authority to dispense with the requirement to produce a grant of probate or letters of administration in cases where the deceased's stockholding does not exceed $5000. The Bill will allow the Port of Melbourne Authority to accept some instrument other than a grant of probate or letters of administration as evidence of a person's authority to administer an estate in those cases where the authority considers it appropriate to do so.

Finally, although the Port of Melbourne Authority will take all reasonable precautions to ensure that stock is transmitted to the right person, errors may occur. It is reasonable for the authority to be safeguarded against possible claims, but at the same time ensuring that a person to whom stock is transmitted will account for the same at law. Accordingly, the Bill makes provision for the prevention of claims against the Port of Melbourne Authority for matters arising out of transmission proceedings, while ensuring that the person to whom the stock is transmitted remains accountable at law. Notes on the clauses are attached to the second-reading notes which have been distributed to honourable members. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr ROWE (Essendon), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 6.
ADJOURNMENT

Police helicopter—Alteration in road traffic laws—Sunday football inquiry—Review of youth needs—Facilities for handicapped persons—Leave for teachers on religious holidays—Board of Works rates—Curriculum services unit—Morwell Technical School

Mr WOOD (Minister of Public Works)—I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr EDMUNDS (Ascot Vale)—During August I wrote to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services regarding the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and the security arrangements for that conference. I suggested that, because there has been a great deal of doubt about the effectiveness of the Victorian police helicopter compared with the well-known effectiveness of the three New South Wales police helicopters, it would be a good opportunity for the Victorian Government to ask the New South Wales Government to loan one of its helicopters—

Mr Crellin—the Army is coming instead. They will do it better!

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! The honourable member for Sandringham is not only interjecting; he is also interjecting from out of his place.

Mr EDMUNDS—For a loan of one of their Bell helicopters, which, unlike the Army's Bell helicopters that the honourable member for Sandringham reminds us will be arriving, are specially equipped for police services.

Mr Crellin—They are fully equipped.

Mr EDMUNDS—These ones are specially equipped for police services. I suggested that one of them could come to Victoria during the eight-day conference that starts later this month to demonstrate their effectiveness.

The Minister replied, acknowledging my letter of 5 August and saying that my suggestion was being examined and that he would write to me again as soon as possible. That letter was dated 17 August. I suggest to the Government that it should now announce to the community whether it intends to accept my suggestion. Although the 161st Army Helicopter Squadron is to be based in Melbourne during the course of the conference, those helicopters are not equipped for police service.

Mr Crellin—They are well equipped.

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member for Sandringham will cease interjecting.

Mr EDMUNDS—The Army helicopters are not equipped for police services.

Mr Crellin—You do not know what you are talking about!

The SPEAKER—Order! I have several times asked the honourable member for Sandringham to cease interjecting. I ask him to observe the Chair's requirement. If the honourable member cannot contain himself, I suggest he might vacate the Chamber.

Mr EDMUNDS—I ask the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to take up the matter urgently because it is in the community interest to ascertain the effectiveness of the helicopter purchased by the New South Wales Government in the environment of a high security conference. The machine is available and the New South Wales Government is willing to lend it. The Government would only have to contribute a small amount towards expenses; the crew can travel to Victoria and the machine can bring itself.

Use of the helicopter during the conference would illustrate to the Government and the police in Victoria how effective it is in a high security operation. I ask the Minister to consider the matter with his counterpart in another place, as a matter of urgency.

Mr McARTHUR (Ringwood)—I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services concerning a matter which has been brought to my attention by certain constituents over a number of months. I am concerned about the matter also as a member of the Road Safety Committee because it is something about
which we have spoken individually in the committee and the honourable member for Gisborne has entered into discussions about it with me also.

The matter concerns the right hand turn in the State of Victoria. If the driver of a car travelling along the road intends to turn right and at the same intersection another motorist intends to turn left, in Victoria the law provides that the motorist turning left must give way to the motorist turning right. Victoria appears to be the only State where this is the case. I have checked out the situation in other States where the motorist turning left has the right of way. Perhaps it is a case of "when in Rome do as the Romans do". However, for Victorian motorists travelling interstate the situation can be quite alarming and frightening if they expect the right of way. The situation should be worked out uniformly and I hope the Minister and the relevant departments will examine the system interstate. I suppose one could argue: Are we in step in Victoria, or are the other States out of step with us?

This also applies in the reverse situation. An interstate motorist coming to Victoria, who is used to having the right of way when doing a left hand turn could find himself in some confusion. I do not know the statistics, but I imagine a number of fatal accidents involving interstate travellers are caused in this way. I do not know whether a solution to this anomaly can be found, but perhaps the law could be explained in literature and include a warning to Victorian motorists who are contemplating interstate travel. Some of the worst accidents today are caused by cars which turn in front of oncoming traffic. I believe the Minister for Police and Emergency Services and the relevant departments should examine the situation to ascertain whether Victoria should join the other States to achieve uniformity in this respect. If that is not to be the case, Victorian motorists should be warned of the situation that exists in other States.

Mr Jasper (Murray Valley)—I raise a matter for the attention of the Premier concerning an investigation into Sunday football. I have received representation from constituents in my electorate and from municipalities which are concerned that Sunday football is being sought by the Victorian Football League.

The Premier has indicated to me in correspondence that representations on behalf of the Shire of Tungamah have been noted and that the letter has been sent to the inquiry. The Premier also advised that he notes that the VFL is contributing towards the cost of the inquiry. In reply to a question this morning, the Minister for Community Welfare Services indicated in reply to an interjection, that funding was not being provided by the VFL.

I should like the Premier to clarify exactly who is paying for the investigation and why it is being handled by the Department of Community Welfare Services especially when the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation announced that two Sunday matches would be played. Also, I think honourable members need to be assured that the inquiry will be independent. When one discovers that the VFL is contributing funds towards the inquiry, one wonders exactly what input that organization will have into such an inquiry. Will the fact that the VFL is contributing funds mean that the result will be favourable for the VFL? Could the Premier clarify that the inquiry will be independent?

Mrs Toner (Greensborough)—I refer the Minister for Community Welfare Services to the review of youth needs in Victoria which he announced during his visit to the Turana Youth Training Centre on Friday. It is my understanding that the Minister made the decision on the run when he was confronted with the situation at the centre. The Minister thought that something needed to be done so he examined the situation and decided to call for a review. That review would take only six months and the Minister hopes that that will tide the situation over until after the elections.

Therefore, the people concerned with delivering welfare services to youth in Victoria are concerned that consultation did not occur with them despite
the fact that the Childrens Welfare Association of Victoria had called on the Minister and his department for a review. The point of that organization was that it is evaluated in terms of the services delivered, but no one evaluates the department and serious suggestions were made that the department is not doing well in this regard.

The Minister may ignore what I have to say, but he is also ignoring members of his department because they do not know what the inquiry is about. I understand that the Minister has not yet taken the question of a review to Cabinet. Perhaps the honourable gentleman is asking the Premier at the moment whether he has permission to proceed with the inquiry! I hope the Premier will reply to him because I understand conflict exists about which Minister is responsible in the youth needs area. Is it the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation or the Minister for Community Welfare Services?

Voluntary agencies dealing with the most difficult clients—the clients who have come out of the institutions—are extremely concerned about the situation in their hostels. They are concerned about resources because the commitment made by the former Premier has not been adhered to. It seems as though there is a likelihood that they will close down.

The Government may bob up with something in the Budget tomorrow. However, that is not good enough. In view of the necessity for practical funding, is the proposed review the same as that requested by the Childrens Welfare Association of Victoria? That association wrote recently to all members of Parliament calling for a review of the ad hoc services provided by the department. Furthermore, has the Minister thought about modifying his irresponsible comments about disturbed youth?

This is a matter of real concern to welfare workers who consider that because the Minister says that Victoria has disturbed and violent young people in its gaols and youth centres, young people may feel that they have to act out the Minister's prophecy. Therefore, there is a strong feeling amongst welfare workers, particularly in the welfare field, that it is irresponsible of the Minister to write off a whole section of the community and to make a prediction that somehow these young people are irredeemable and that Victoria needs tighter security. Consistently since he has fulfilled the role as Minister of his department, he has approached this matter with a total lack of compassion for and understanding of young people. Consequently, I would like some answers on the critical situation that has been reached with youth in Victoria.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mrs PATRICK (Brighton)—I shall briefly raise a matter for the attention of the Minister of Public Works. I understand that as this is the International Year of Disabled Persons, buildings that are owned by the State Government have been examined from the point of view of access for those who are physically disabled. I refer the Minister to Commonwealth-owned buildings because I noticed that my local post office in Church Street, Middle Brighton, has steep steps surrounding it and it would not be possible for anyone in a wheelchair or a person physically handicapped to get into the building. In fact, elderly people find it difficult to do so. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Public Works to examine Commonwealth-owned public buildings in Victoria to determine what can be done to make them more accessible for the physically handicapped.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! I find it hard to relate that question to the responsibility of the State Minister of Public Works. The honourable member has asked the Minister to take action on Commonwealth-owned buildings because I noticed that my local post office in Church Street, Middle Brighton, has steep steps surrounding it and it would not be possible for anyone in a wheelchair or a person physically handicapped to get into the building. In fact, elderly people find it difficult to do so. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Public Works to examine Commonwealth-owned public buildings in Victoria to determine what can be done to make them more accessible for the physically handicapped.

Dr VAUGHAN (Glenhuntly)—The matter I raise for the attention of the Minister of Educational Services concerns a decision made by the Teachers
Adjournment

Tribunal on 27 August to eliminate leave with pay for teachers on various religious holidays. I am not sure how many representations the Minister has received to date on this matter, but I have received several. From the reactions I have had, I accept that Ministers will receive many more representations on this matter. Leave with pay on religious holidays for members of the teaching profession has existed for 35 years. I understand the original decision was made in 1946. In the electorate that I represent, many people are asking what prompted this decision because it has been a surprise to many teachers who availed themselves of this facility in the past.

I ask the Minister whether the decision has been gazetted as a way of communicating it to members of the teaching profession. I am unable to get a clear answer on this matter. I understand that teacher unions were not notified and, as a result, have not been able to convey this decision as completely as they may have wished to members of the teaching profession who in the past week have applied for leave with pay for religious holidays that occur in the month ahead.

This is an example of poor industrial relations. The Minister, as a new direction by this Government, ought to be interested in good relations with the teaching profession of Victoria. Teachers in the schools in the area that I represent are concerned that the schools have not been notified of the tribunal's decision. I shall demonstrate to the House the situation of a teacher who is a member of the Jewish faith. Rosh Hashana occurs on Tuesday, 29 September. Yom Kippur occurs on Thursday, 8 October, and Socco occurs on Tuesday, 13 October. They are religious holidays for teachers who are members of the Jewish faith.

This decision is not a good example of a tolerant Australia and a multicultural society. It also affects members of the Greek Orthodox Church, the Russian Orthodox Church and a number of other significant religious minorities. How does this move marry with anti-discrimination, State and Federally? I should like the Minister's comments on this matter. Has the Minister discussed this matter with Mr Al Grassby? I am sure it is of interest to him. If the Minister has not raised this matter with him, perhaps I ought to do so.

On behalf of the many local residents in the Glenhuntly area and the City of Caulfield—this is of interest to the honourable member for Caulfield as well—I urge the Minister to take action to have this unfortunate decision of the Teachers Tribunal reversed as soon as possible.

Mr TANNER (Caulfield)—I direct the attention of the Minister representing the Minister of Water Supply to my concern at the basis of establishing Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works rates. As honourable members would known, every four years the values of properties within every municipality are valued. From this valuation of properties, a net annual value is derived, which is generally 5 per cent or one-twentieth of the marketable value of properties. The Board of Works then strikes a rate on the net annual value, which is calculated to meet its costs for the coming year. I am opposed to this system of rating because it is discriminatory and is similar to the wealth tax with which the Labor Party is so enamoured. It is discriminatory because it bears no relation to the usage of water and sewerage services. It is a wealth tax because it is based on a person's apparent wealth, namely his or her home.

I consider that a more sensible and fair system would be to have a standing rate charge for all householders in the Melbourne metropolitan area with an excess charge for those who use excessive amounts of water which is, after all, our most precious asset. If the Minister is unable to accept this proposal, I suggest that the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works should introduce a subsidization scheme for some of its ratepayers. I have a copy of a press release from the Minister of Water Supply dated 4 September in which the Minister said:

Dr Vaughan
In country Victoria the range of average household bills in 1980 for water varied from $40 to $169, and for sewerage from $30 to $160. This compares with Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works figures of $80 for water and $120 for sewerage for the average household.

In other words, the average Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works rate for households in Melbourne is $200 per annum but, in the electorate that I represent in the Caulfield area, many householders pay in excess of $700 per annum. The Minister also stated:

Under the new system financial support aimed at assisting existing country authorities with unavoidably high rates, would provide assistance which would phase in when household water and sewerage rates went 20 per cent above the State average. The objective is to ensure that average household water and sewerage bills did not exceed more than 50 per cent above the State average for sewerage and water services.

I suggest that if the Minister cannot accept my proposal, he should introduce a subsidization scheme for Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works rate-payers who have bills that are more than 50 per cent above the average. Virtually every household in the electorate I represent would benefit from such a scheme. I ask the Minister to bring my proposal to the attention of the Minister of Water Supply.

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray)—I raise a matter with the Minister of Educational Services concerning a decision which he made in July this year to redeploy 50 teachers working in the curriculum services unit of the Education Department, with effect from the end of 1981. The curriculum services unit is a unit of some 250 teachers who develop courses of study for children in primary, secondary and technical schools and assist and support school communities in developing a curriculum to meet their specific needs.

It can be seen that the redeployment of some 50 out of 250 teachers will severely affect 20 per cent of the work of an important unit and will place an impossible burden on the teachers remaining in the unit.

I ask the Minister to reconsider that decision on a number of grounds. Firstly, there is in progress a review of the work of a whole range of services being offered at the central level of the Education Department arising from the Government's White Paper on Education Structures in Victoria, and it is premature for a decision to be made on such a massive restructuring before the relevant reports have been received and considered by the Government and a determination made as to whether in fact it would not be more appropriate for this unit to be strengthened rather than diminished in its important support work for schools.

Secondly, I understand that the Minister made this decision without consultation with the teachers concerned or with the unions representing them in an industrial sense. I believe that this is a wrong principle. Any Minister should consult with those affected before making a decision of such magnitude and, in an industrial sense, the union representing those teachers has not only a right but a responsibility to argue on their behalf and to put a case to the Minister.

I take up the interjection of the honourable member for Ballarat South who asks: Who pays the bills? Of course, the Victorian public pays the bills, but who pays the price if our schools do not function at the level at which they should function? No one can doubt that the curriculum services unit has done an excellent job in the interests of the children of Victoria, and it is an investment that should be fostered and encouraged.

The third ground I raise with the Minister is that this redeployment will have a disastrous effect on the capacity of the unit to continue and to further develop important areas of activity. I think all honourable members have received representations from some of the individuals concerned and from the unit as a whole, and they have put an impressive case on the sorts of activities they have been undertaking and have planned for the future in this important area.

For those reasons, I hope the Minister will review the earlier decision and will consult with the teachers concerned and their unions with a view to
reviewing the adequacy of curriculum services support work. As a result of such a review, I believe the work of the unit would be strengthened rather than diminished.

Miss CALLISTER (Morwell)—I raise a matter of Government administration with the Minister representing the Minister of Education. It concerns the Morwell Technical School which has suffered since the start of the year from teacher shortages, having been promised an establishment number of 60 and having been supplied initially with 51.8 teachers. The number of teachers supplied to the school has never risen above 55.8.

A large number of letters have been written to the Minister and a deputation from the school council has spoken to Mr Ritchie, the Acting Director of Education. To that deputation, Mr Ritchie attacked the teachers saying that they had caused low morale in the school and, ipso facto, a low school image so that teachers were not being attracted to it.

To cut a long story short—because of time constraints, not because brevity does justice to the matter—the school council has put to that Minister several ideas for attracting teachers to the Latrobe Valley. The first of those suggestions is a zone allowance such as that offered in industry—by APM, for example. It was also suggested that the limited tenure mode of employment for teachers does not provide a sufficiently secure framework of employment to attract them to the Latrobe Valley for only a few months. It was also suggested that teacher housing is urgently required in the area.

I ask the Minister to investigate the situation and, as a matter of urgency, to provide teachers for that school.

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—The honourable member for Ascot Vale raises a matter in relation to which he has corresponded with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services about the possible use of a New South Wales helicopter in Victoria during the forthcoming Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. I will draw the matter to the attention of the Minister and see whether he can reply to the honourable member for Ascot Vale.

The honourable member for Ringwood also raised a matter for the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. I am not sure whether it has any political connotation, but the honourable member suggested that some priority be given to those turning left as opposed to those turning right, saying that that is proper in other States and that Victoria is somehow at odds with the general rule. I am not familiar with the rule to which he refers, as I do not drive in other States, and I am not aware of the problem. Nor am I aware of any accident rate arising from such a rule in Victoria. However, I will direct the matter to the attention of the Minister and seek a reply for the honourable member.

I do not know, Mr Speaker, whether you ruled out of order the matter raised by the honourable member for Brighton.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—I suggested that she take up the matter directly with the Federal Minister.

Mr MACLELLAN—With your leave, Mr Speaker, in respect of any streets or public area under the control of the State of Victoria, I will draw that matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, in addition to reiterating your suggestion that the honourable member take the matter up with the Federal Minister concerned.

Mr JONA (Minister for Community Welfare Services)—The honourable member for Greensborough seemed confused about all of the issues she raised on the adjournment. If I understood her correctly—and I listened intently to try to pick up what she was saying—I would answer her in this way. She is firstly apparently confused over the respective areas of responsibility of the Department of Community Welfare Services and the Ministry for Youth, Sport and Recreation in regard to youth.
I suggest that the honourable member refer to the youth policy, which has been clearly enunciated by the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation in recent times, which clearly sets out that Ministry's responsibility to youth. So far as my own department is concerned, its responsibility for welfare and for family and individual well-being is clearly spelled out under the terms of the Community Welfare Services Act. Rather than take up the time of the House in outlining all of those details, I refer the honourable member to those two documents.

As to the reviews which are currently being carried out, again if the honourable member had understood what I have previously said very clearly, she would appreciate that I have instructed the supervisor of classification and training in the Family and Adolescent Services Division of my department, Mr Bruce Anderson, to carry out a review of all programmes being undertaken in our youth training centres in Victoria and to advise me of the changes, if any, that should be undertaken to those programmes to cope with the changed composition of the youth now coming into our training centres since the original programmes were devised. I should like to know whether the honourable member for Greensborough would disagree with that approach. The second inquiry is into the cause of family breakdown and other factors contributing to the increasing complexity of problems of young people coming into the centres. That is being done in conjunction with my colleagues, the Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation and the Minister of Health, both of whose departments have already done an enormous amount of work in this area. This work is being collated and, as a result, the Government will be far better equipped to tackle the problem at its root sources.

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—The honourable member for Murray Valley raised the matter of who paid for the survey on Sunday football in connection with Victorian Football League activities and mentioned that correspondence had been sent from the Shire of Tungamah. I recall the submission and assure the honourable member that $15 000 was contributed by the Victorian Football League and that the Richmond Football Club paid more than its fair share of that. Further moneys were contributed by the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation and the Country Roads Board, which also made submissions to the Ministry. The major portion of the cost was provided by the Victorian Football League.

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The honourable member for Glenhuntly raised a matter that has been referred on numerous occasions by the honourable member for Caulfield to the Minister of Education and to me—paid leave for persons wishing to observe religious holidays. I shall take up with the Minister of Education the concern of both honourable members to determine whether the matter has been resolved and, if so, whether everyone can be appropriately notified so that there can be no misunderstanding of Government policy. If no decision has been made, I shall express the concerns of the honourable members for Caulfield and Glenhuntly to the Minister and will get back to them on the result of the review of the decision.

The honourable member for Morwell raised the question of staffing of one of the schools in the best-staffed teaching system in the world—the technical teaching system—and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition assures me on behalf of his colleague that the Morwell Technical School is being badly treated in the provision of staff. I have no information about the circumstances of the matter other than the information the honourable member has given me, but I shall take up the matter with the Minister of Education, whose responsibility is staffing, to ascertain whether staff can be obtained to bring the Morwell Technical School up to its staffing strength.

The least informed submission made was that made by the honourable member for Footscray. He raised the concern of three teacher unions about a
review of the staffing of the curriculum services unit and the reduction of the staffing of the unit from 50 positions from the beginning of 1982. In the course of his remarks the honourable member asserted that I had not consulted with the staff before taking that decision. I refer the honourable member to a letter date 29 May from the three teacher organizations of the curriculum services unit, signed by Tim Meyer of the Technical Teachers Association of Victoria, John Blair, of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association and Russell Pollard of the Victorian Teachers Union, which states:

Please find enclosed a copy of a paper which we have prepared outlining the aims and functions of the Curriculum Services Unit with information on the effect of staff cuts to the Unit, as requested at our meeting on May 14th.

Thank you for your consideration in this regard.

I received from the same gentlemen a report on the deputation to the Minister of Educational Services on 14 May. It runs to three pages and outlines what they believe to be the remarks made by them and by me on that occasion.

There was also another meeting with the teacher unions on the day before the announcement of the reduction in staff, made on 14 July. There were two meetings, one with the major union whose staff was affected and one with the staff from the shop floor, so to speak, at Queensberry Street, and a submission by the staff was considered. It cannot fairly be said by the Deputy Leader of Opposition that there was no consultation on this matter.

There are three important educational reasons for reducing the staff of the curriculum services unit. Incidentally, New Zealand has an education system similar in size to Victoria's and it employs fewer than 50 persons performing tasks for the central curriculum school system in comparison with Victoria, which employed 250 people for those tasks. The discovery that the New Zealand system operates perfectly with only 50 people providing guidelines for school-based curricula while Victoria had 250 doing the same job, was not an insignificant factor in deciding that that number should be reviewed from the beginning of 1982.

The curriculum services unit staffing was built up when there were few curriculum consultants out in the field. There are now curriculum consultants in each inspectorate and that is where they should be, close to the schools and not sitting in headquarters in Queensberry Street. It is important that people providing consulting services to schools are close to the job.

The White Paper on education spelt out the Government's approach on curricula. It took the line that the teacher unions were seeking—that the centre should determine core curriculum guidelines and that schools should be free to develop curricula within those guidelines. That was not new. It had been happening for some time. The Government gave formal agreement to it. In addition, it was intended that the central curriculum services unit should recognize the shift away from a move centrally-determined curricula towards a more school-determined curricula.

Some work was being undertaken for organizations other than the Education Department, such as teacher associations and various other organizations on the fringe of the department. It was my view that if teacher associations and other organizations wanted to have newsletters, they should provide them.

Those newsletters should not be paid for by staff employed in a unit which was not set up for that purpose. In May I instituted a complete review of the activities of the curriculum services unit. I obtained a report from my officers and I submitted that information to the scrutiny of the staff on the shop floor, so to speak, and discussed it with the Victorian Teachers Union, the major union covering the staff affected, and then made a decision and, furthermore, made it at that time so that those teachers affected had the maximum opportunity to apply for other positions.
Furthermore, I believe the means of choosing the people to be redeployed back into the schools was in accord with the soundest industrial relations principles and I should be happy, when more time may be available, to discuss that aspect with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition because the interests of those people were taken into account in determining who should go and their opportunity to apply for other positions was certainly relevant to the timing of the Government's decision.

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—The honourable member for Caulfield raised a matter for the attention for the Minister of Water Supply. I take it that the gist of his matter was he wished the townfolk of Caulfield to be treated as they might be if they lived outside the metropolitan area. It was his belief that the system under which high rates are not paid by people living in country areas for water and sewerage services should also apply to those people who live in those metropolitan areas to which he directed attention.

I will draw his remarks to the attention of the Minister of Water Supply and ask the Minister to take them into account in any future review of the rating system. The honourable gentleman should also take into account the fact that the responsibilities of the Board of Works are greater in their coverage of community activities than the combined functions of country waterworks trusts or sewerage trusts in that the responsibilities of the Board of Works go far beyond those of country authorities.

For instance, I point out to the honourable member that I, at Berwick, receive a Board of Works rates notice. The Board of Works does not supply sewerage services to me yet, and nor does it supply water services but I pay a Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works rate. On occasions I have sought clarification from the chairman of the Board of Works on why I am paying rates and the board has written to me, when I have been slow in paying, to indicate that the Board of Works intends to disconnect the water supply. On one occasion the Board of Works threatened to disconnect the sewerage services, but I indicated to the chairman that since the Board of Works provided neither, it was going to be difficult to use that disciplinary measure. I use that example for the benefit of the honourable member to indicate that he should not draw a comparison between country water supply and sewerage authorities and the Board of Works without taking into account the fact that the functions of the Board of Works go beyond that of country utilities.

However, I will draw his remarks to the attention of the Minister of Water Supply and seek a reply for the honourable member in due course.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.34 a.m. (Wednesday)

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated—

BOX HILL HOSPITAL

(Question No. 13)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of the Box Hill Hospital:

1. How many administrative officers are employed at the hospital?

2. How many medical registrars are employed at the hospital and how this compares with the number of accredited positions at the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital and the Western and General Hospital?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

1. The following officers are employed in an administrative capacity at Box Hill and District Hospital:

   Chief Executive Officer
   Medical Director
   Deputy Medical Director
Director of Administrative Services
Director of Nursing
Deputy Director of Nursing
Assistant Director General of Nursing
Chief Engineer
Catering Manager
Personnel Officer
Domestic Services Supervisor
Supply Officer
Finance Officer

In addition, the hospital employs the following clerical employees:

Finance and General Office 15.07 EFT*
Personnel/Payroll 3.00 EFT
Accident and Emergency 9.00 EFT*
Outpatients 7.20 EFT
Reception/Switchboard 7.72 EFT*
Supply 2.00 EFT
Catering 1.00 EFT
Para-Medical (not including Medical Records) 16.80 EFT*
Medical Records 9.51 EFT*
Nursing Administration 5.00 EFT

Departments marked thus * indicate that 24-hour and/or weekend coverage is involved.

2. Approved registrar posts for 1981 at the three hospitals are as follows:

Box Hill Hospital—Five hospital posts, plus two on rotation/secondment with other hospitals.

Western General Hospital—Eight hospital posts, plus three joint appointments with another hospital, four on rotation/secondment from another hospital.

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)

—The answer is:

1. The financial and accounting procedures presently in force in the commission provide budget costs and estimates for the Central Administration and Service divisions of the commission under the one heading of Health Administration. The number, classification and cost of staff for the year 1979–80 and estimated figures for 1980–81 can be provided only in the form set out in the Budget papers already provided to the Treasury and are as follows:

HEALTH

Years and numbers 1980–81 1979–80
79–70 80–81 Estimate Payments

HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
(Including Central Administration and Service Divisions)
(See Division No. 620)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Chairman, Health Commission—Salary ($50,904) and allowance ($2,000)</th>
<th>$52,904</th>
<th>$46,267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Full-time Commissioners</td>
<td>$133,836</td>
<td>$85,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Part-time Commissioners</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>First Division Officers</td>
<td>$208,240</td>
<td>$148,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Second Division Officers</td>
<td>$221,220</td>
<td>$138,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Third Division Officers</td>
<td>$3,427,936</td>
<td>$2,437,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Exempt from Provisions of Act No. 8656</td>
<td>$1,937,726</td>
<td>$1,373,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Temporary Assistance</td>
<td>$231,798</td>
<td>$260,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,448</td>
<td>$170,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Less Estimated savings consequent upon resignations, etc.</td>
<td>$784,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Total Health Administration</td>
<td>$5,263,000</td>
<td>$4,528,638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PUBLIC HEALTH

(See Division No. 625)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years and numbers</th>
<th>1980-81</th>
<th>1979-80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 806 001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>6 621 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>11 579 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3 480 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2 548 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>26 035 585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Less Amount to be provided from other funds | 16 195 600 | 10 786 785 |
| Estimated savings consequent upon resignations, etc. | 1 884 985 | ... |
|        |        | 18 080 585 | 10 786 785 |
| Total Public Health | 7 955 000 | 6 856 144 |

### HOSPITALS

(See Division No. 627)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years and numbers</th>
<th>1980-81</th>
<th>1979-80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>187 826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>288 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>866 442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 358 518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Less Estimated savings consequent upon resignations, etc. | 210 518 |
| Total Hospitals | 1 148 000 | 982 320 |

### MENTAL RETARDATION

(See Division No. 631)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years and numbers</th>
<th>1980-81</th>
<th>1979-80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43 638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3 300 080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>23 185 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1 807 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2 040 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 397 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Less Amount to be provided from other funds | 439 700 | 264 693 |
| Estimated savings consequent upon resignations, etc. | 2 777 300 |
| Total Mental Retardation | 27 180 000 | 23 860 351 |

*Includes the salaries of temporary employees engaged in permanent Third Division positions.
2. As at the 30th June, 1980, thirty-nine (39) persons, as set out in the classifications below and whose salaries were either totally Commonwealth funded or cost shared and were employed on the pay-roll of public hospitals, were located within the Health Commission engaged on or providing support services for projects and activities relating to health services in Victoria:

1 Co-ordinator of Interpreter Services
2 Medical Officer
1 Technical Officer
6 Research Officers
1 Librarian
1 Stenographer
8 Typists
1 Draughting Officer
4 Clerical Assistants
3 Medical Records Administrators
10 Administrative Officers

The annual salary payable to the above staff would be approximately $393,000. However, not all have been employed for a full year.

It is not possible to estimate the number of staff who may be seconded or engaged on special projects for the Commission during the year 80–81. Although the figure is expected to increase by a number of persons engaged to provide Interpreter and Ethnic Welfare Services in the current year.

3. The following Tables show the “recurrent non-salary costs” for each Division of the Commission as specified in the 1980–81 Budget Estimates.

In the answer the cost provided for the term “recurrent non-salary costs of the Commission” represent the “head Office” costs for each Division.

It should also be noted that the costs provided for Division 620 include the cost of each of the Service Divisions.

### MENTAL HEALTH

(See Division No. 634)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Division Officers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106 924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Division Officers</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>9 252 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Division Officers</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>74 246 940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt from Provisions of Act No. 8656</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>7 894 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2 742 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>141 783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less Amount to be provided from other funds

Estimated savings consequent upon resignations, etc.

Total Mental Health

*Includes the salaries of temporary employees engaged in permanent Third Division positions.*
Questions on Notice

Mental Retardation Division (Total of MRS Head Office and Clinical Services) Location 1740

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health Division Locations 4290 4231</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79–80</td>
<td>80–81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634–2–1</td>
<td>634–2–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 341</td>
<td>27 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 836</td>
<td>3 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 525</td>
<td>4 670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39 410</td>
<td>67 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 619</td>
<td>2 780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68 999</td>
<td>105 350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mental retardation figures include expenditure from Clinical Services. It is estimated that approximately 70 per cent of the cost is attributable to Clinical Services. This breakdown is based on the 1980–81 estimates submitted by the Division.

CHILD MALTREATMENT PILOT PROJECT

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of the evaluation of the Barwon Region Child Maltreatment Pilot Project:

1. What is the basic design of the evaluation and how it will be carried out?

2. Given the long gap between the commencement of research and the original commencement of the project, whether the research effort will be hindered and how it is intended to compensate for the delay?

3. Why the researcher is based in Melbourne when the project is in the Barwon region and whether this will hinder the research?

4. When it is expected that the first report will be available?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

1. The evaluation of the Barwon Region Child Maltreatment Project commenced with a description of the major services involved and a report of the interactions of these services in regard to child maltreatment. This report identifies in a preliminary way which issues are sufficiently significant for further research.

The interdepartmental Working Party on Child Maltreatment, Department of Community Welfare Services, is overseeing further research which will concern itself primarily with the process of co-ordination of services and information about child maltreatment. The research officer who completed the first report is expected to undertake the current project.

2. Research efforts with the Barwon Project have not been hindered by delay because it has not been feasible to establish a time baseline of programme commencement in Barwon. To compensate for the difficulties associated with lack of a time baseline, the current research effort will look at co-ordinating activities in one or more regions in addition to the Barwon region thereby providing for some comparison of co-ordinating activities between regions.

3. While the researcher is based in Melbourne, she is given an adequate travelling allowance which allows her to spend the required amount of time in the Barwon region. The time the research officer spent in the Barwon region completing the first report amounted to approximately three days a week. The current project requires that the research officer have access to persons and facilities in Melbourne for several days each week.

4. The first report is currently with the Director-General of the Department of Community Welfare Services who is reviewing the report prior to a decision regarding release.

SCHOOL DENTAL CLINICS

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of school dental clinics in the electoral district of Brunswick, whether on 13 March 1979, the then Minister of Health, Mr Hunt, together with the then Assistant Minister of Health, Mr Jona, issued a press statement, which promised pre-school dental clinics at the following primary schools: Brunswick, Brunswick North, Coburg West, Moreland, and facilities for mobile dental clinics at the following: Brunswick East, Brunswick South, Brunswick South West, Brunswick West, Merri, Princes Hill and Brunswick North West, as well as funds for the construction of mobile school dental clinics and vehicles and X-ray equipment for these and other clinics; if so, whether any of these clinics have been established, and in that event, where; if not, why they have not been established and what has happened to the funds?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

Yes—a press statement was issued regarding the provision of school dental clinics at Brunswick Primary School, Brunswick North Primary School, Coburg West Primary School and Moreland Primary School.
The statement indicated that mobile school dental clinics had been approved for the following primary schools—Brunswick East, Brunswick South, Brunswick South West, Brunswick West, Merri, Princes Hill and Brunswick North West.

Subsequent to that statement, the then Assistant Minister directed the commission to re-examine the cost structure of single fixed surgeries and staffing aspects of that form of service. As a result of that review, it was considered uneconomic to continue to construct fixed surgeries and since 1980, it has been the commission's policy to construct concrete platforms at schools and to purchase mobile dental units. This allows greater flexibility of service, more appropriate use of staff, and provides a more equitable spread of services than the previous model.

Commonwealth approval has been obtained to fund the construction of concrete platforms at Brunswick, Brunswick North and Coburg West. Work on all other sites is in progress except at Moreland Primary School and Princes Hill (where the proposal to construct the concrete platform is under consideration by the school council).

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES, COLAC
(Question No. 20)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of school dental services for primary school children in the Colac area:

1. What services are currently provided?
2. When it is expected that school dental clinic services will be available and in what form?
3. What discussions have occurred with the Minister of Health and the Health Commission as to the provision of facilities through the district hospital, and when adequate services will exist either through the hospital or through the school dental programme?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

1. A school dental service is provided at the following schools in the region:
   School No. 2740 Gellibrand.
   3497 Carlisle River.
   3894 Kawarren.
   1642 Deans Marsh.
   1204 Pennroyal.
   1114 Yeodene.
   2708 Forrest.
   2866 Barwon Downs.
   1243 Gerangamete.

2. There are no plans to provide a school dental service at any other locations in the Colac area.

3. A number of options are being examined and discussed within the Health Commission with a view to expanding dental services in the area. The implementation of new services will be dependent on the availability of funds and an assessment of needs elsewhere in the State.

BRUNSWICK NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL
(Question No. 22)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

In respect of the development of school grounds at the Brunswick North primary school, whether the Public Works Department compiled a report in the 1978–79 financial year on the need for the development of the grounds and estimated the work to cost $35,000; if so—(a) whether the work was placed on the northern regions work list and in what position, and if not, why; and (b) whether it is proposed that this development work, necessitated when the Education Department purchased and knocked down a series of houses adjacent to the school, will be undertaken?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 7 September 1981 that the Public Works Department prepared a report in the 1978–79 financial year for the ground development at Brunswick North Primary School at an estimated cost of $35,000.

This work was placed on the region's minor works priority list, however, it was decided later that it should be done as a school council contract in conjunction with the Brunswick City Council.

This work is now being completed at a cost of $20,000.

The site of the houses purchased for extension to school grounds is not the area being developed in this project.

HOSPITAL AND NURSING HOME BEDS
(Question No. 34)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

Since 31 August 1978, in respect of hospital and nursing home beds registered under the Private Hospital Regulations:

1. How many beds have been registered, specifying the number in each category and the name, address and owner of each hospital in respect of which new or additional beds have been registered?
Questions on Notice

2. How many beds have ceased to be registered, specifying the number in each category and the name, address and owner of each hospital so affected?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)

—The answer is:

The attached information is provided in response to the honourable member's question and covers the period August 1979 to June 1981.

Summary

Private Nursing Homes
August 1979 to June 1981

A. New beds registered 2344
B. Additional beds registered 488
C. Additional temporary beds registered 4
D. Registered beds deleted 104
E. Temporary registered beds deleted 88

PRIVATE NURSING HOMES—NEW BEDS REGISTERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allanvale</td>
<td>130-144 Aviation Road, Laverton</td>
<td>D.W.J. Allan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altona Meadows</td>
<td>297 Queen Street, Altona Meadows</td>
<td>Peter Speer Holdings Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaroo</td>
<td>294-296 Maroondah Highway, Ringwood</td>
<td>Ewscott Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmoral Lodge</td>
<td>5 Peter Street, Grovedale</td>
<td>R. C. Stephenson and J. W. Whitehead</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia Court</td>
<td>391-393 Maroondah Highway Croydon</td>
<td>Victorian Professional Group Management Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>207-215 Richards Street, Ballarat East</td>
<td>E. B. R. Holdings Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benlynne Park</td>
<td>2-6 Killara Street, West Sunshine</td>
<td>Evell Corium Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>33 Bendigo Street, Richmond</td>
<td>Zayen Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgwood Hill</td>
<td>14 Edward Street, Burgwood</td>
<td>Prystin and Prystin Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Park</td>
<td>55-57 Broadway, Chelsea</td>
<td>Muston Ridge Pty. Ltd. and Dienert Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>827-867 Sydney Road, Coburg</td>
<td>Zayen Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman Park</td>
<td>34A Balaka Street, Rosebud</td>
<td>Eleventh Vernob Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbourne</td>
<td>Craig Road, Cranbourne</td>
<td>Doctors Birman and Rosenbaum</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern District</td>
<td>124 Maroondah Highway, Croydon</td>
<td>Haksala Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon</td>
<td>10 Fletcher Street, Essendon</td>
<td>Zayen Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelia</td>
<td>45 Herbert Street, Parkdale</td>
<td>Hacy Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenfield House</td>
<td>Bellarine Highway, Leopold</td>
<td>Alverna Damien Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam</td>
<td>47-49 Hallam-Belgrave Road, Hallam</td>
<td>Hallam P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>27 Shierlaw Avenue, Canterbury</td>
<td>Eido Investments Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmwood</td>
<td>Lalors Road, Healesville</td>
<td>Holmwood Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innissfree</td>
<td>66 Jennings Street, Kyneton</td>
<td>P. Hackwell</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedasa House</td>
<td>218-224 Lower Plenty Road, Rosanna</td>
<td>Jedasa House P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilor Downs</td>
<td>Corner Copernicus Way and Sunshine Drive,</td>
<td>Dr. F. Bergman</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe</td>
<td>14 Como Street, Fairfield</td>
<td>Mr. K. Lollis</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>41 Thomas Street, Maidstone</td>
<td>K. M. and B. Matthies</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Martha</td>
<td>Corner Benton's Road and The Esplanade, Mt</td>
<td>Fraser Hospital Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>117 Helms Road, Newcombe</td>
<td>G. K. Mauderer and L. C. Martin</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western</td>
<td>14 South Circular Road, Tullamarine</td>
<td>Extaris Giselle Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakmoor</td>
<td>352 Warrigal Road, South Oakleigh</td>
<td>Oakmoor Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osburn Lodge</td>
<td>Corner Osburn-Howell Streets, Wodonga</td>
<td>M. S. Beck/B. A. Beck</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineville</td>
<td>2 Gertrude Street, Geelong West</td>
<td>C. W. Van Lieshout</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston and District</td>
<td>36 Benambra Street, Preston West</td>
<td>Dr. H. Perelberg</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenscliff</td>
<td>20-28 Hesse Street, Queenscliff</td>
<td>Queenscliff P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>87-93 Radford Road, Reservoir</td>
<td>Giotto Helena Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeview</td>
<td>Lot 4, Worland Road, Wangaratta</td>
<td>Seventh Gemiap Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent</td>
<td>44 Regent Street, Preston</td>
<td>R. M. Straw and J. B. Anderson</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Nursing</td>
<td>Lot 1, Gladenville Boulevard, Patter-</td>
<td>Riverside Nursing Care Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Lakes</td>
<td>son Lakes</td>
<td>St. Ives. P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ives (Ethnic)</td>
<td>118-124 Vale Street, Melbourne East</td>
<td>St. Ives. P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Raphaels</td>
<td>Cotham Road Kew</td>
<td>Genazzano Sisters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke</td>
<td>18 Tarana Avenue, Upper Ferntree Gully</td>
<td>Doereva Holdings Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorento House</td>
<td>304 Nepean Highway, Sorento</td>
<td>M. Oppy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>340-344 Springvale Road, Springvale</td>
<td>Solwood Holdings Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Private Nursing Homes (New Beds)—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunraysia</td>
<td>143 Tenth Street, Mildura</td>
<td>K. M. and B Matthies</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine</td>
<td>Lot 4 Devonshire Road, Sunshine</td>
<td>Canelt Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Barker</td>
<td>Glenmore Street, McLeod</td>
<td>Hibernian Society of Victoria</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>McLennon Street, Moorooloona</td>
<td>T. F. Hall</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomastown</td>
<td>Corner Anson Street, and Dalton Road, Thomastown</td>
<td>Kairuka Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>770 Canterbury Road, Vermont</td>
<td>Frazer Hospital Vermont Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warley Coves</td>
<td>B. N. Hospital N. H. Annexe, Coves</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>4 William Street, Newport</td>
<td>Doctor L. Janovic</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>46-50 Commercial Road, Footscray</td>
<td>Kaviena Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Suburbs</td>
<td>44 Stephen Street, Yarraville</td>
<td>Kaviena Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRIVATE NURSING HOMES—ADDITIONAL BEDS REGISTERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice Berry</td>
<td>King’s Road, Emerald</td>
<td>H. and K. Schmidt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna House</td>
<td>12 Athol Street, Moonee Ponds</td>
<td>Anna House P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashwood Annex</td>
<td>95 High Street, Road Ashwood</td>
<td>J. H. Emerson Investments Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balwyn</td>
<td>3 Belgrove Avenue, Balwyn</td>
<td>R. and P. Barnett</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambra House</td>
<td>5 Bambra Road, Caulfield</td>
<td>A. and J. Joyce</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkly</td>
<td>81 Barkly Street, Bendigo</td>
<td>J. M. Marshall</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belevedere</td>
<td>352-354 Princes Highway, Noble Park</td>
<td>Victorian Private Geriatrics</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth-Lea</td>
<td>62 Blyth Street, Brunswick</td>
<td>Jacril Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boronia</td>
<td>12 Stewart Street, Boronia</td>
<td>Estate of Brian Emery and Mrs. L.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>292 Latrobe Terrace, Geelong</td>
<td>L. W. and D. T. Edenborough</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>719 Athol Street, Brighton</td>
<td>S. P. A. O’Brien</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>2 Overton Road, Frankston</td>
<td>Brotherhood of St. Laurence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberlea</td>
<td>629 Riversdale Road, Camberwell</td>
<td>J. Fanning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>14 Balwyn Road, Canterbury</td>
<td>K. M. and B. J. Matthies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrisbrooke</td>
<td>31 Hopetoun Avenue, Canterbury</td>
<td>B. C. Gordon and W. A. Gordon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charman</td>
<td>200 Charman Road, Cheltenham</td>
<td>R. and P. Wigley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Park</td>
<td>18 Hyton Crescent, Croydon</td>
<td>Nottage Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culcairn</td>
<td>Corner Hastings Road and Culcair Drive, Frankston</td>
<td>Culairen P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culroy</td>
<td>59 Southernhay Street, Reservoir</td>
<td>Culroy Private Hospital Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claverley</td>
<td>67 Sydney Parade, Geelong</td>
<td>Iverna Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde</td>
<td>31 Skene Street, Geelong</td>
<td>B.C.R. Nominees</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromana</td>
<td>Nepean Highway, Dromana</td>
<td>Dromana P. H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaglemont</td>
<td>25 Thorsby Grove, Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Fabron Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>582 Upper Heidelberg Road, Heidelberg</td>
<td>Audencias Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findon</td>
<td>16 Findon Street, Hawthorn</td>
<td>Priston and Priston</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>10 Geelong Road, Footscray</td>
<td>P. Gugliemo</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glandore</td>
<td>194 Alma Road, St. Kilda East</td>
<td>Mrs. Iris Howard</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenroy</td>
<td>85 Chapman Avenue, Glenroy</td>
<td>Nena Stojanovic and Maria Perac</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanslope</td>
<td>12 Hanslope Avenue, Alphington</td>
<td>Hanslope P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>24 Shierlaw Avenue, Canterbury</td>
<td>Eldo Investments Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillview</td>
<td>754 Canterbury Road, Surrey Hills</td>
<td>P. and J. Bennett</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karinyah</td>
<td>69 Broadway, Camberwell</td>
<td>M. K. McDonnell</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>42 Mentone Parade, Mentone</td>
<td>Weta Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiverton Park</td>
<td>16 Wills Street, Glen Iris</td>
<td>Unmack Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross</td>
<td>9 Broughton Road, Surrey Hills</td>
<td>J. M. Enterprises Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>1 Templestowe Road, Bulleen</td>
<td>P. M. and M. Lazarus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandilo</td>
<td>4 Scott Street, Essendon</td>
<td>A. and H. Bergman</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda</td>
<td>4 Robe Street, St. Kilda</td>
<td>Applied Credits Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlynton</td>
<td>1050 Sydney Road, Coburg</td>
<td>Goxann and Ding Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinnon</td>
<td>97 Wheatley Road, McKinnon</td>
<td>W. and Y. Sawento</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>105 South Road, Brighton Beach</td>
<td>Fraser Hospital Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Martha</td>
<td>Corner Bentons’s Road, and The Esplanade, Mt. Martha</td>
<td>Fraser Hospital Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montifore</td>
<td>95 High Street Road, Ashwood</td>
<td>Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Private Nursing Homes (Additional Beds Registered)—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myola</td>
<td>59 Serrell Street, Malvern East</td>
<td>Sister Ruby (Moses) Whitefield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natimuk</td>
<td>Schuna Street, Natimuk</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Dene</td>
<td>Corner Roslyn and Valley Roads, Highton, Geelong</td>
<td>M. and D. M. Schimana</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineville</td>
<td>2 Gertrude Street, Geelong West</td>
<td>C. W. Van Lieshout</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reubenville</td>
<td>103 Holmes Road, Moonee Ponds</td>
<td>Saitta Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>65 Riversdale Road, Hawthorn</td>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis Society of Victoria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosehill</td>
<td>265 Centre Road, Bentleigh</td>
<td>Jackel Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowena</td>
<td>12 The Ridgeway, Ivanhoe</td>
<td>M. M. Blair</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Elizabeth</td>
<td>410 Wattletree Road, Malvern East</td>
<td>K. White Sheet Metals Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's Convent</td>
<td>Retreat Road, Newtown</td>
<td>Sisters of Mercy Property Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Mercy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark's</td>
<td>829 Alexander Road, Essendon</td>
<td>D. and A. O'Sullivan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Leigh</td>
<td>33 Bay Road Sandringham</td>
<td>Ernest W. and Sister Mary A Leach</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampford</td>
<td>508 Glen Eira Road, Caulfield</td>
<td>Sister Anita R. Cooke and Mr. Malcolm P. Hutchison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraton</td>
<td>374 Nepean Highway, Frankston</td>
<td>Paula James Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siesta</td>
<td>10 Sheppard Street, Moorabbin</td>
<td>A. Dunkley</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>398 Ryrie Street, Geelong East</td>
<td>Barwon Management Services Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toorak House</td>
<td>1011 Toorak Road, Camberwell</td>
<td>L. E. Provis and Red Rum Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeovil</td>
<td>15 The Explanade, Geelong</td>
<td>J. M. Brussell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private Nursing Homes—Additional Temporary Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>292 Latrobe Terrace, Geelong</td>
<td>L. W. and D. T. Edenborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfree</td>
<td>66 Jennings Street, Kyneton</td>
<td>P. Hackwell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private Nursing Homes—Deletions of Permanent Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>292 Latrobe Terrace, Geelong</td>
<td>L. W. and D. T. Edenborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberlea</td>
<td>629 Riversdale Road, Camberwell</td>
<td>J. Fanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewhurst</td>
<td>3 Victoria Avenue, Canterbury</td>
<td>Sister Michele J. Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>27 Shierlaw Avenue, Canterbury</td>
<td>Eido Investments Pty. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfree</td>
<td>66 Jennings Street, Kyneton</td>
<td>P. Hackwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamaria</td>
<td>33 Stanhope Grove, Camberwell</td>
<td>Sister J. C. Godfred-Spenning and E. McGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montefiore</td>
<td>95 High Street Road, Ashwood (Ashwood Annexe)</td>
<td>Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary</td>
<td>Sacred Heart Convent, 147 Victoria Street, Ballarat East</td>
<td>Sisters of Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Leor</td>
<td>31 Thanet Street, Malvern</td>
<td>Mr. Bertram Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Omer</td>
<td>44 Prospect Hill Road, Camberwell</td>
<td>Kergate Pty. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glen</td>
<td>1027 Glenhunty Road, Glenhunty</td>
<td>Sister R. and A. Hooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandella</td>
<td>97 Ormond Esplanade, Elwood</td>
<td>Sister Christine H. Bowtell-Harris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private Nursing Homes—Deletions of Temporary Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abalene</td>
<td>569 Glenhunty Road, Elsternwick</td>
<td>R. E. and L. E. Skibbeck and J. A. Stannard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna House</td>
<td>12 Athol Street, Moonee Ponds</td>
<td>Anna House P.N.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardossan</td>
<td>18 Hull Road, Croydon</td>
<td>Sister L. G. Neuparth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll</td>
<td>143 Finch Street, Glen Iris</td>
<td>Nancy Joan Bugg and Glenys Amy Canty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balwyn</td>
<td>3 Belgrove Avenue, Balwyn</td>
<td>R. and P. Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boronia</td>
<td>12 Stewart Street, Boronia</td>
<td>Estate of Brian Emery and Mrs. L. J. Emery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Private Nursing Homes (Deletions of Temporary Beds)—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>292 Latrobe Terrace, Geelong</td>
<td>L. W. and D. T. Edenborough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>2 Overton Road, Frankston</td>
<td>Brotherhood of St. Laurence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claverley</td>
<td>67 Sydney Parade, Geelong</td>
<td>Iverna Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Park</td>
<td>18 Hyton Crescent, Croydon</td>
<td>Nottage Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromana</td>
<td>Nepean Highway, Dromana</td>
<td>Dromana P.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Lenny</td>
<td>46 Victoria Street, Coburg</td>
<td>Charlewood Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glandore</td>
<td>194 Alma Road, St. Kilda East</td>
<td>Mrs. Iris Howard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenferrie</td>
<td>31 Chrystobel Crescent, Hawthorn</td>
<td>C. R. and J. N. Cochrane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenora</td>
<td>15 Shaftesbury Street, Coburg West</td>
<td>Desmond F. and Lynette M. Drum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenroy</td>
<td>85 Chapman Avenue, Glenroy</td>
<td>Nena Stojanovic and Maria Perac.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmaria</td>
<td>33 Stanhope Grove, Camberwell</td>
<td>Sr. J. C. Godfrey-Spenning and Sr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karinyah</td>
<td>69 Broadway, Camberwell</td>
<td>M. K. McDonnell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>42 Mentone Parade, Mentone</td>
<td>Weta Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinkora Court</td>
<td>33-37 Kinkora Road, Hawthorn</td>
<td>Lasia Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiverton Park</td>
<td>16 Wills Street, Glen Iris</td>
<td>Unmack Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>1 Templestowe Road, Bulleen</td>
<td>P. M. and M. Lazarus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandysil</td>
<td>4 Scott Street, Essendon</td>
<td>A. and H. Bergman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretto Abbey</td>
<td>Mary's Mount Convent, Sturt Street, Ballarat</td>
<td>Loretto Abbey Convent Institute of The Blessed Virgin Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda</td>
<td>4 Robe Street, St. Kilda</td>
<td>Applied Credits Ptd. Ltd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestonia</td>
<td>10 Hotham Street, Preston</td>
<td>Reginald John Bates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosehill</td>
<td>265 Centre Road, Bentleigh</td>
<td>Jackel Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowena</td>
<td>12 The Ridgeway, Ivanhoe</td>
<td>M. M. Blair</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Elizabeth</td>
<td>410 Wattletroe Road, Malvern East</td>
<td>K. White Sheet Metals Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Heliers</td>
<td>2 Canterbury Road, Camberwell</td>
<td>Edward J. and Sr. Brigid O'Donnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's Tower</td>
<td>84 Princess Street, Kew</td>
<td>Missionary Sisters of Sacred Heart of Jesus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampford</td>
<td>508 Glen Eira Road, Caulfield</td>
<td>Sr. Anita R. Cooke and Mr. Malcolm</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studley Park</td>
<td>26 Edgecombe Street, Kew</td>
<td>Sister June Mullen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>398 Ryrie Street, Geelong East</td>
<td>Barwon Management Services Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toorak House</td>
<td>1011 Toorak Road, Camberwell</td>
<td>L. E. Provis and Red Rum Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>12 Pretoria Street, DoroPene</td>
<td>Jackel Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynnstay</td>
<td>21 Wynnstay Road, Armadale</td>
<td>Hillvale Investments Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyuna</td>
<td>88 Cunningham Street, Northcote</td>
<td>Mr. Gregory T. Prouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY PRIVATE HOSPITALS
August 1979 to June 1981

A. New Beds Registered 184
B. Additional Beds Registered 304
C. Additional Temporary Beds Registered 6
D. Registered Beds Deleted 54
E. Temporary Registered Beds Deleted 25

PRIVATE HOSPITALS—NEW BEDS REGISTERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bundoora District</td>
<td>Greenhills Road, Bundoora</td>
<td>Northgate P.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>Spavin Drive, Sunbury</td>
<td>Lawsche Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbourne Clinic</td>
<td>Fitzgerald Street, Shepparton</td>
<td>Sherbourne Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Police Hospital</td>
<td>South Melbourne</td>
<td>Victoria Police</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questions on Notice

**PRIVATE HOSPITALS—ADDITIONAL BEDS REGISTERED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beleura Private</td>
<td>925 Nepean Highway, Mornington</td>
<td>Beleura P.H. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellbird Private</td>
<td>198 Canterbury Road, Blackburn South</td>
<td>E. and K. Trepton and C. and V. Orielja</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beulah Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bush</td>
<td>Station Street, Chelsea</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epworth Private</td>
<td>34 Erin Street, Richmond</td>
<td>Board of Management</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilydale Bush</td>
<td>Anderson Street, Lilydale</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linacre Private</td>
<td>12-16 Linacre Road, Hampton</td>
<td>Hospital Corporation of Aust. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitcham District</td>
<td>27 Doncaster East Road, Mitcham</td>
<td>Tellwood Nominees Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrayville Bush</td>
<td>Murrayville</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyah West Bush</td>
<td>Nyah West</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Bush</td>
<td>Rainbow</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir Private</td>
<td>73-75 Pine Street, Reservoir</td>
<td>Fison Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart</td>
<td>Moreland Road, Coburg</td>
<td>Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart Property Association</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Hospital</td>
<td>Dandenong Road, Carrum Downs.</td>
<td>Brotherhood of St. Laurence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmore</td>
<td>102 David Street, Preston</td>
<td>M. N. Bates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Private</td>
<td>Cnr. Wiltshire and Cumberland Streets, North Sunshine</td>
<td>Westpond Consultants Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaucouleurs Private</td>
<td>82 Moreland Road, Brunswick East</td>
<td>G. T. Prouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburton Health</td>
<td>Warburton</td>
<td>The Australasian Conference</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toora Bush Nursing</td>
<td>Toora</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern Bush</td>
<td>Chiltern</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIVATE HOSPITALS—ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY BEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>Menzies Street, Charlton</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epworth Private</td>
<td>34 Erin Street, Richmond</td>
<td>Board of Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIVATE HOSPITALS—DELETION OF PERMANENT BEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epworth Private</td>
<td>34 Erin Street, Richmond</td>
<td>Board of Management</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linacre Private</td>
<td>12-16 Linacre Road, Hampton</td>
<td>Hospital Corporation of Australia Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIVATE HOSPITALS—DELETION OF PERMANENT BEDS—continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moreland Hall</td>
<td>26 Jessie Street, Coburg</td>
<td>Central Methodist Mission</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natimuk</td>
<td>Schuna Street, Natimuk</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Avenue</td>
<td>40 The Avenue, Prahran</td>
<td>American Medical International Aust. Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waringal</td>
<td>216 Burgundy Street, Heidelberg</td>
<td>Hospital Corporation of Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIVATE HOSPITALS—DELETION OF TEMPORARY BEDS

Name Address Proprietor Number of beds
--- --- --- ---
Ballan and District Cowie Street, Ballan Trustees 2
Chalton Menzies Street, Chalton Trustees 3
Epworth Private 34 Erin Street, Richmond Board of Management 4
Lilydale Bush Anderson Street, Lilydale Trustees 4
Mena House 29 Simpson Street, Melbourne East Trustees 2
Murrayville Bush Murrayville Trustees 3
Toora Bush Nursing Toora Trustees 5
Vaucluse Private 82 Moreland Road, Brunswick East G. T. Prouse 2

SCHOOL AND PRE-SCHOOL MEDICAL SERVICE

(Question No. 39)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of the school and pre-school medical service during 1980, indicating the respective schools and pre-school numbers separately:

1. How many children were examined?
2. How many children—(a) received their routine initial medical examination; (b) did not receive such examination; and (c) received specialized examinations?
3. How many schools and pre-schools were not visited by—(a) medical officers; (b) nursing staff; (c) medical officers; and (d) nursing staff?
4. What is the establishment of the service and how many positions were filled in terms of full-time equivalents as at—(a) 1 January 1980; and (b) 1 January 1981?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)

The answer is:

1. 281,701 children. (242,719 school children and 38,982 pre-school children.)
2. (a) 37,494 school children, 37,192 pre-school children.
(b) 29,229 school children, 39,18 pre-school children.
(c) (i) Eye clinic
(ii) Special problems (learning difficulties)
(iii) Reading, treatment and research centre
(iv) Special education facilities
(v) Special medical assessments
(vi) Ear, nose and throat consultations
(vii) Government Medical Officer examinations

3. 318 schools were not seen in 1980 by medical officers working alone, nursing staff working alone, or medical officer/school nurse teams.

101 pre-schools.

Medical staff 1-1-80 1-1-81
--- --- --- ---
61 (45) 59 (42-5)

Nurses 138 (134) 138 (130)

Clerical staff 17 (17) 17 (17)

The numbers of positions filled in terms of full-time equivalents on the two dates are shown in brackets.

APPRENTICES FOR HEALTH DEPARTMENTS

(Question No. 42)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

1. In each of the years 1977 to 1980, in what trades apprentices have been employed by the Department of Health and Mental Health Authority and subsequently by the Health Commission?
2. What was the total number of—(a) apprentices employed; and (b) first year apprentices engaged by each of the branches?
3. How many apprentices it is estimated will be employed this year, specifying the number beginning their apprenticeships?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)

The answer is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Numbers employed</th>
<th>First years employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitter and Turner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Year</td>
<td>1977 to 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitter and Turner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Year</td>
<td>1978 to 1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitter and Turner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Mechanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Mechanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Year</td>
<td>1979 to 1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitter and Turner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Mechanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Mechanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. 1977 23 employed include six first years.
1977-1978 20 employed include three first years.
1978-1979 89 employed include 65 first years.
1979-1980 86 employed include 22 first years.

3. 1980-1981 approximately 70 apprentices employed of which eight were first year.

COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAMME STAFF POSITIONS
(Question No. 45)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:
In respect of staff positions in the Community Health Programme for each of the past three years, specifying separately in respect of—(i) the Hospitals Division; (ii) the Mental Health Division; (iii) Mental Retardation Services; (iv) Early Childhood Services; and (v) other services:

1. What were the number of positions agreed to?
2. How many of the approved positions have been filled?
3. What is the number of approved positions which have not been able to be filled because of financial constraints?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHOOL CHILDREN WITH HEAD LICE OR NITS
(Question No. 46)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether the recommendation by the National Health and Medical Research Council that children should be no longer excluded from school if suffering from head lice or nits will be adopted; if so, what arrangements will be made to supervise continuing treatment?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:
The honourable member was advised in a letter dated 2 June 1981 as follows:

"On matters of this nature the Education Department is guided by the recommendations and decisions of the Health Commission.

I notice that a full answer to an identical question was given on 14 April in the House by my colleague, the Minister of Health, as printed on page 7452 of Hansard, No. 20."

BALLARAT AND DISTRICT BASE HOSPITAL
(Question No. 52)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of the Ballarat and District Base Hospital and further to the answer in question No. 1242 given on 12 March 1980:

1. Whether the hospital has now been told that the replacement of the Queen Victoria block's medical wards is on the "5 year plan"; if so, what is its position on the plan?
2. Whether architects have yet been employed; if not, when the Hospital Board will be given approval to employ them?
3. When it is expected that documentation will be completed and approved?
4. When it is expected that building works will actually commence?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

1. The hospital has not been advised that replacement of the Queen Victoria block's medical ward is on a "five-year plan", as no provision has been made at this date, for inclusion of the project.
2. No. Architects cannot be appointed until funds are approved for the project.
3 and 4. It is not possible to answer the honourable member's questions until the project is approved and funds allocated.
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SOUTHERN PENINSULA HOSPITAL
(Question No. 53)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:
In respect of the Southern Peninsula Hospital at Rosebud:
1. What was the cost of planning fees paid to architects and quantity surveyors for the major extension, including the additional 30 nursing home beds and whether any of the drawings or work done will be used in respect of new plans for the hospital?
2. Whether plans have been agreed on for upgrading of the casualty department and other areas of the hospital; if so, when it is expected that work will be commenced and what contribution there will be from the State Government?
3. When the application was made to the Health Commission to construct a private hospital on land next door to the Southern Peninsula Hospital and when the details of the application were made known to the joint working party?
4. What effect the construction of the private hospital will have on the development of the Southern Peninsula Hospital, and on the Frankston Hospital?
5. What are the details of the agreed application for the private hospital?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:
1. Documents were prepared in 1977 based on the requirement as seen by the Hospitals and Charities Commission in 1976. These documents included a 30 bed wing together with alterations to the existing buildings to provide an increased area for casualty services. The documents were prepared at a total cost of $101,098.

In 1979 the committee of management decided that the documents as they had been prepared would not meet current demands by the community, and therefore the plans were abandoned.

2. Sketch plans have recently been submitted for approval, and it is anticipated that the Casualty Department will be upgraded by the 1981–82 holiday season.

The project will be financed from committee funds with no State Government contribution.

3. Application was first made on 22 August 1979. The joint working party became aware of the proposal midway through their deliberations.

4. Nil. Development of both the Southern Peninsula and Frankston Hospitals is proceeding in accordance with commission guidelines.

Approval for the construction of a private hospital took into account—
(a) The rapid increase in population which has occurred and is likely to continue.
(b) Seasonal influx of holiday visitors and the impact this has on existing hospital facilities.

5. The commission has granted approval for the construction of a 60 bed medical/surgical private hospital.

BRUNSWICK HIGH SCHOOL
(Question No. 54)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Educational Services:
Further to the answer to question No. 672 given on 10 March 1980 concerning cyclic maintenance at Brunswick High School, whether he will indicate in which financial year cyclic maintenance will be carried out?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:
The honourable member has been advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 along the following lines:
"At this stage it would appear unlikely that maintenance works at the Brunswick High School will be undertaken during the 1981–82 financial year."

KYNETON DISTRICT HOSPITAL
(Question No. 56)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:
1. In respect of district nursing services at the Kyneton District Hospital, what has been the increase in the last three years, and what is the expected requirement for this year?
2. How many nurses are employed, and what allowance is made for the size of the area to be covered?
3. What is the Kyneton Hospital’s priority rating for the appointment of an additional nurse or nurses, and when it is expected that such an appointment will be made?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:
1. There has been no increase in the district nursing service. However, the total number of visits made in the Kyneton area has increased as follows:
   1978—3275.
   1979—3865.
   1980—4383.

2. Two nurses are employed, one works within a twelve-mile radius of Trentham and the other within a twelve-mile radius from Kyneton.

3. District nurses for many hospitals are included on the priority list but the only way any of these could be employed, with the present zero growth policy, is by reclassification.
PUBLIC DENTAL SERVICES
(Question No. 59)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of public dental services:

1. What is the Health Commission's basis for allocating public dental services to non-metropolitan areas specifying the number of public dentists required for particular population groups?

2. What public dental services are available in the Geelong area, and what steps are proposed to increase the availability of such services to Geelong residents?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)
—The answer is:

1. The basis for allocating public dental services to non-metropolitan areas is determined by the local community need.

Once the need for a service has been established, the Regional Dental Services Advisory Committee, through the Royal Dental Hospital, assesses the priority to satisfy the need, taking into account alternative accessible services, the priority and the funds available. If warranted, the advisory committee recommends to the Health Commission the establishment of a service.

2. Two dental chairs have been established in Geelong.

The Regional Dental Services Advisory Committee is considering the establishment of more chairs in Geelong but funds for further expansion are not at present available.

HOSPITAL AND HEALTH CENTRE STAFF
(Question No. 62)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of personnel working at 555 Collins Street, what arrangements exist for people not directly on the Health Commission's payroll, namely hospital and community health centre staff, to work at the commission and how many such people are currently engaged in such exchange?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)
—The answer is:

Arrangements exist with some hospitals and community health centres to have staff engaged in work associated with the provision of health services in Victoria at the commission's head office, 555 Collins Street, Melbourne. These people are engaged in projects as and when the need arises.

The positions that they occupy have in the past been funded by the Commonwealth or have been cost-shared. At 30 April 1981 there were 46 persons located at the commission's head office who were employed on hospital or community health centre payrolls.

SENIOR CITIZENS' CLUB FOR MALDON
(Question No. 64)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

Whether the proposal for a senior citizens club at Maldon is on the current list; if so, how many clubs are ahead of it in priority and when it is expected that funds will be available?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)
—The answer is:

An application by the Shire of Maldon for a capital subsidy towards the cost of establishing senior citizen's clubrooms at Maldon is on the priority list of applications submitted to the Commonwealth.

There are 54 unapproved senior citizens' club projects ahead of the Maldon project.

If funding continues after the 1980–83 triennium and in the present method, it is unlikely that funds would be available before the 1985–86 financial year.

HOSPITAL SUPERANNUATION PENSIONS
(Question No. 65)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of proposals to amend the Hospitals Superannuation Act 1965 and in particular to allow eligible persons to take part of their pension or all of it by way of a lump sum, whether this proposal has been agreed to by the Hospitals Superannuation Board and sent to a Treasury sponsored committee; if so, when is it expected that a decision will be reached?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)
—The answer is:

A decision on the proposal will be made in the context of advice received from that committee.

SHEET-METAL FACILITY, BRUNSWICK
(Question No. 66)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

In respect of the decision to locate the sheet-metal facility at Brunswick Technical College:

1. Whether the school was informed that the facility was to be located on the Millers Rope Works site and whether meetings were held on site to commence planning?
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2. Whether a decision was then made to shift the location to Preston; if so, when that decision was made and by whom?

3. Whether all or some of the following interested parties had approved the construction of the facility at Brunswick—(a) the Brunswick Technical School Council; (b) the Principal of the Preston Technical College; (c) the planning committee of the North Regional Council of Technical Education and the committee itself; (d) the facilities planning committee of the State Council for Technical Education; and (e) the State Council for Technical Education; if so, why those approvals were ignored?

4. On what basis the decision to relocate the facility at Preston technical college was made?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 3 August 1981 as follows:

1. The Directorate of the Technical Schools Division advises me that the school was among those who attended a site meeting at Miller's Ropeworks to discuss the possible location of the Northern Regional Sheetmetal Apprentices Centre.

2. In light of the proposed usage of Miller's Ropeworks site and that Preston would be the permanent home for the Northern Regional Sheetmetal Apprentices Centre, it was decided that the move to Preston should be made now instead of in the future. The TAFE Board made the decisions.

3. Although those mentioned approved of the temporary location of the Northern Regional Sheetmetal Apprentices Centre at Brunswick it was felt by the TAFE Board that funds would be saved if the move to Preston was made now. Also the board was advised on the use of the Ropeworks site for the Brunswick Technical School in its secondary educational needs, and on the other sport and community facilities proposed for the area.

4. Saving of costs, as the facility at Preston will be the permanent position for the centre, and will not need further funds to be resited.

DENTAL SERVICES, BALLARAT (Question No. 68)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of dental services provided through the Ballarat Base Hospital, whether there are waiting lists for any categories of treatment; if so, what is the average waiting time for each such category?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

1. Yes.

2. Urgent cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Waiting Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fillings</td>
<td>two months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractions</td>
<td>one to five days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denture</td>
<td>three to four months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-urgent cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Waiting Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fillings</td>
<td>twelve months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractions</td>
<td>two months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denture</td>
<td>twelve to fifteen months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOME HELP SERVICES (Question No. 69)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of grants for travelling costs incurred by home help services, which municipalities receive reimbursement for travel, specifying the amount received last financial year and the estimated amount this financial year?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

Travelling costs (including private transport) are part of the overall expenditure for the home help service. This service cost the State and Commonwealth Governments $8 410 240 in 1979-80. The allocation for 1980-81 is $8 580 000.

The municipalities that have been granted approvals to claim private transport costs are listed in the attached schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Approved subsidy 1979-80</th>
<th>Approved subsidy 1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberton Shire</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Shire</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>2 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altona City</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapiles Shire</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoca Shire</td>
<td>1 400</td>
<td>1 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Shire</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchus Marsh Shire</td>
<td>1 600</td>
<td>1 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaconsfield Shire</td>
<td>2 200</td>
<td>2 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaconsfield Town</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballan Shire</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat Shire</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>3 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannockburn Shire</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>1 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrara Road Shire</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>3 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Shire</td>
<td>1 800</td>
<td>1 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarine Shire</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>3 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benalla City</td>
<td>2 200</td>
<td>2 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benalla Shire</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>3 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 September 1981]

Municipality

Bendigo City
Berwick City
Bet Bet Shire
Birchip Shire
Box Hill City
Bright Shire
Brighton City
Broadford Shire ..
Broadmeadows City
Brunswick City
Bulla Shire
..
Buln Buln Shire ..
Bungaree Shire ..
Buninyong Shire
Camberwell City
Camperdown Town
Castlemaine City ..
Caul field City
Charlton Shire
Chelsea City
Chiltern Shire
Cobram Shire
Coburg City
Cohuna Shire
..
Collingwood City
Colac City
Colac Shire
Corio Shire
..
Cranbourne Shire
Creswick Shire
Croydon City
Dandenong City . .
..
Daylesford and Glenlyon
Shire ..
Deakin Shire
..
Diamond Valley Shire
Dimboola Shire ..
..
Doneaster and Templestowe
City..
..
..
Dundas Shire
..
Dunmunkle Shire
East Loddon Shire
Echuea City
Eltham Shire
Essendon City
Euroa Shire
Fitzroy City
Flinders Shire
Footscray City
Frankston City
..
Geelong City
Geelong West City
Gisborne Shire
Glenelg Shire
Gordon Shire
Goulburn Shire
Grenville Shire
Hamilton City
Hampden Shire
Hastings Shire
Hawthorn City ..
Healesville Shire ..
Heidelberg City ..
Heytesbury Shire
Horsham City
Huntly Shire
Kaniva Shire
Karkarooc Shire
Keilor City
Kerang Borough
Kerang Shire
Kew City
Kilmore Shire
Knox City
..
Koroit Borough ..
Korong Shire
..
Korumburra Shire
Kowree Shire
Kyneton Shire
Leigh Shire
Lexton Shire
Lillydale Shire
Lowan Shire
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Approved
subsidy
1979-80

Approved
subsidy
1980-81 (to
13 May 1981)

$

$

200
2800
1400
800
600
1800
400
400
3000
800
1600
1000
2200
1800
3000
200
1200
800
400
3000
600
3000
1000
800
1000
1000
600
3000
3000
2000
3000
3000

200
2800
1400
800
600
1800
400
400
3 SOO
800
1600
1000
2800
1800
3 SOO
200
1200
800
400
3 SOO
600
3 SOO
1000
1800
1000
1000
600
3 SOO
3500
2000
3 SOO
3 SOO

1000
800
1000
200

1000
800
1000
200

1600
3000
800
3000
1000
3000
1000
400
800
3000
3000
800
2000
2000
2400
800
400
3000
1200
2000
3000
2400
1600
1000
1000
800
1600
1200
1200
1000
1000
800
1000
600
2600
3000
800
1200
2200
3000
600
1000
1000
3000
400

1600
3 SOO
800
3 SOO
1400

3 SOO
1000
400
800
3 SOO
3S00
800
2000
2000
2400
800
400
3 SOO
1200
2000
3 SOO
2400
1600
1000
1000
800
1600
1200
1200
1000
1000
800
1000
600
3 SOO
3 SOO
800
3 SOO
2400
3 SOO
600
1000
1000
3 SOO
400

Municipality

Mclvor Shire
Malfra Shire
Maldon Shire
Malvern City
Morong Shire
Maryborough City
Melbourne City ..
Melton Shire
..
Metealfe Shire ..
Mildura City
Mildura Shire ..
Minhamite Shire ..
Mac City
..
Moorabbin City ..
Mordialloc City ..
Mornington Shire
Mortlake Shire ..
Morwell Shire
Mt. Rouse Shire
Myrtleford Shire ..
Nathalia Shire ..
Narracan Shire ..
..
Newham and Woodend Shire
Newstead Shire ..
Newtown and Chilwell city
Northeote City ..
Numurkah Shire ..
Nunawading City
Oakleigh City
Omeo Shire
Orbost Shire
Oxley Shire
Otway Shire
Pakenham Shire ..
Phillip Island Shire
Port Fairy Borough
Portland Shire ..
Portland Town ..
Port Melbourne City
Prahran City
Preston City
Pyalong Shire
Queensclilfe Borough
Richmond City
Ringwood City
Ripon Shire
Rochester Shire
Rodney Shire
Romsey Shire
Rosedale Shire
Rutherglen Shire
..
Sale City
Sandringham City
Sebastopol Borough
Seymour Shire ..
Shepparton City
Shepparton Shire
Sherbrooke Shire
South Barwon City
South Gippsland Shire
South Melbourne City
Springvale City ..
St. Amaud Town
Stawell Town
Stawell Shire
..
Strathfieldsaye Shire
Sunshine City ..
Swan Hill City
Swan Hill Shire ..
Talbot and Clunes Shire ..
T ambo Shire
..
Tallangatta Shire
Traralgon City ..
Tullaroop Shire
Tungamah Shire
Upper Murray Shire
Upper Varra Shire
Voilet Town Shire
Walpeup Shire ..
Wangaratta Shire
Wangaratta City
Wan non Shire ..
Waranga Shire ..
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Approved
subsidy
1979-80

Approved
subsidy
1980-81 to
13 May 1981

$
1000
800
1000
600
2600
2000
600
1600
1400
3000
3000
1400
600
800
800
3000
1000
600
1800
400
400
2000
1000
400
400
800
800
3000
800
800
200
2000
1400
3000
3000
600
3000
200
1000
2200
1800
200
3000
200
2400
2400
3000
1600
1000
3000
600
200
3000
1400
3000
400
1200
3000
600
3000
400
3000
400
400
600
800
3000
800
3000
600
3000
400
400
600
18D
1800
3000
400
2400
400
600
800
2400

$
1000
800
1600
1800
2600
2000
600
3 SOO
1400
3 SOO
3500
1400
600
800
800
3 SOO
1000
600
2000
3 SOO
400
2600
1600
400
400
800
800
3 SOO
800
800
200
2800
1600
3500
3500
600
3 SOO
3500
1000
2200
1800
200
3 SOO
200
2400
2400
3 SOO
1600
1000
3 SOO
600
200
3 SOO
1400
3 SOO
400
1200
3 SOO
3 SOO
3500
400
3 SOO
400
400
600
800
3 SOO
1200
J SOO
600
3 SOO
400
1200
J 200
1800
3 SOO
3 SOO
400
2400
400
600
1200
2400
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Municipality
Warralul Shire
Warracknabeal Shire
Warrnambool City
Warrnambool Shire
Waverley City
Warribee Shire
Whittlesea Shire
Winnacalla Shire
Wappa Shire
Warrnambool Shire
Werribee Shire
Whittlesea Shire
Wodonga City
Woorayl Shire
Wonthaggi Borough
Wyndham Shire
Yackandandah Shire
Yarraview Shire
Yea Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Approved subsidy 1979-80</th>
<th>Approved subsidy 1980-81</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warralul Shire</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warracknabeal Shire</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool Shire</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley City</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warribee Shire</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittlesea Shire</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnacalla Shire</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woorayl Shire</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonthaggi Borough</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham Shire</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah Shire</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarraview Shire</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yea Shire</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFANT WELFARE CENTRES
(Question No. 70)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of decisions taken to commence infant welfare centres, or increase the number of sessions at an existing centre, what criteria are used by the Health Commission in making that decision, and specifically what weight is placed on increases in birth notices and increases in new enrolments?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

Subject to the availability of funding for additional sessions the major factors are the numbers of birth notifications and new enrolments, but these factors are considered in conjunction with the following criteria:

- The proportion of non-English speaking families in the population served;
- the geographical area served by each infant welfare nurse and the mobility of the population;
- whether the same nurse must provide a service at more than one centre;
- whether the areas served have limited or no referral sources, thus imposing additional demands on the infant welfare nurses; and
- whether the community being served imposes increased demands on a nurse, such as parent and group activities.

DELACOMBE INFANT WELFARE CENTRE
(Question No. 72)

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) asked the Minister of Health:

In respect of the Delacombe Infant Welfare Centre, whether he or the Health Commission received a submission from the Shire of Grenville pointing out the increased demand for sessions at the centre; if so, whether a decision will be speedily made to provide the additional sessions required; if not, why?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—The answer is:

Yes.

No further funding is available for 1980-81 and the position for 1981-82 is dependent on the outcome of Budget submissions.

MIGRANT ENGLISH TEACHERS, OAKLEIGH
(Question No. 74)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

What is the migrant English teacher entitlement of each school in the electoral district of Oakleigh, indicating the number of migrant English teachers actually provided in each case?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 20 July 1981 that schools are allocated a “special needs” component in their staffing entitlement and determine their own particular areas of need. This area could include the field of migrant English teaching.

The following table shows the number of migrant English teachers at schools in the electoral district of Oakleigh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of migrant English teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Chadstone</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4669 Chadstone Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4176 Hughesdale</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Huntingdale</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4716 Huntingdale</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S. Huntingdale</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4678 Jordanville South</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3449 Murrumbeena</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601 Oakleigh</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4823 Oakleigh South</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S. Oakleigh</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Waverley</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REGIONAL FUNDING
(Question No. 118)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on funding for each Education Department region given in answer to question No. 103 on 2 December 1980 (Hansard page 4026)?
Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

Since answering the question, nothing has changed.

Similar information for the ensuing year will not be available until December 1981.

DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, OAKLEY

(Question No. 119)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on disadvantaged schools in the electoral district of Oakleigh, given in answer to question No. 102 on 29 October 1980 (Hansard page 1946)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 that in respect of Supplementary Grants programme funds received in 1981 the position is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Community Programme</th>
<th>Community Programme Aide (·4)</th>
<th>Photography</th>
<th>Photography Aide (·5)</th>
<th>Excursions</th>
<th>Excursions Aide (·3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordanville South Primary School</td>
<td>14 053</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh Primary School</td>
<td>33 715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement Aide (F/T)</td>
<td>8289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development Programme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Camps</td>
<td>7914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Excursions</td>
<td>4414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Photography</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Photography Aide</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Language Extension</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERIODS OF SERVICE AT SCHOOLS

(Question No. 120)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on periods of service at schools, given in answer to question No. 918 on 16 April 1980 (Hansard page 8146)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 that in respect of

Jordanville South Primary School—$14 053
Community Programme
Community Programme Aide (·4) 3600
Photography 546
Photography Aide (·5) 4500
Excursions 1767
Excursions Aide (·3) 2700

Oakleigh Primary School—$33 715
Community Involvement 960
Community Involvement Aide (F/T) 8289
Language Development Programme:
1. Camps 7914
2. Excursions 4414
3. Photography 1200
4. Photography Aide 9000
4. Language Extension 1998

COSTS IN GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

(Question No. 121)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on education costs in Government and non-Government schools given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 917 on 11 March 1980 (Hansard page 6758)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 as follows:

Net recurring expenditure per pupil in Victoria (Government schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>$1123</td>
<td>$2062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government recurrent expenditure on non-Government schools per pupil: 1978-79 $327.36.


I expect the Annual Report for 1979-80 to be presented during the spring sessional period.

VIETNAMESE STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

(Question No. 123)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on students of Vietnamese origin and Vietnamese-speaking teachers given by the then Assistant
Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 3 September 1981 as follows:

1. Before listing schools with significant Vietnamese refugee populations a number of points should be noted:

(a) The Victorian Education Department, through Ethnic Education Services, monitors the numbers of children going into any individual school. It is policy to disperse children as widely as possible across a range of schools to avoid placing undue strain on the teaching and material resources of the school.

(b) The initial six months of the educational provision is given in Reception Language Centres which provide intensive English language instruction, orientation to the Victorian school system and local community and allows time for these children to overcome the trauma associated with resettlement. Reception Language Centres are located on independent sites and in school grounds. Those on independent sites are Noble Park, Wiltona and Midway. Those in school grounds are Parkmore, Eastbridge, Maribyrnong High School and Victoria Park.

(c) Placement from language centres is done in close consultation with feeder schools and children are placed in schools according to the school's ability to cope as perceived by the principal and staff.

(d) The classification "refugee" does not only apply to Vietnamese but also Laotians and Kampucheans. Educational backgrounds and needs differ markedly between these groups.

(e) When parents move from the hostel (or nearby area) into private accommodation children may enrol in the local school for which they are zoned. It is then up to schools to notify the Education Department should they enrol sufficient numbers to warrant additional assistance over and above that offered in the normal school programme.

The information requested in 1(a) is not held in the form required. However, the following are schools which have significant numbers of refugee children. Those marked with an asterisk have heavier populations.

Primary
*Maribyrnong
*Debney Meadows
*Springvale
*Richmond Girls
*Ascot Vale
*Flemington
*Westall
*Moonee Ponds West
*Kensington
*Altona Gate
*Nunawading South

Secondary
*Maribyrnong
*Altona North
*Nunawading
*Richmond Girls
*Noble Park
*Flemington
*Debney Park
*Mitcham
*Westall
*Preston East
*Paisley
*Brunswick
*University
*Blackburn South
*Richmond
*Collingwood Education Centre

Technical
*Footscray
*Whitehorse TAFE
*Altona North
*Preston East
*Mitcham

2. There are nine Vietnamese speaking teachers employed by the Education Department through Ethnic Education Services. All of them are working closely with students (both adult and child) of Vietnamese origin. Four of the teachers are fully involved in teaching English as a second language.

3. The pre-service training of teachers is the task of the various teacher education institutions. Any teacher applying for employment is interviewed and where qualified, registered and assessed as suitable for employment as a migrant education teacher is recommended for employment by Child Migrant Education Services. Appointment is only possible where a recognized vacancy exists.

EDUCATION ACT 1958

(Question No. 124)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on notifications pursuant to section 64K (1) of the Education Act 1958, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 930 on 11 December 1979 (Hansard page 6153)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answers is:

The honourable member has been advised by letter dated 16 June, that since 11 December 1979 the department has made provision for children who are under or over school age in the following manner:

A parent guidance and parent education service is provided by the staff from Counselling, Guidance and Clinical Services and the Special Education Branch at Monnington, Kew.
As at 29 May 1981 this service was provided to:

Forty-nine families with a pre-school aged hearing-impaired child; and eleven families with a pre-school aged intellectually handicapped child. An additional nineteen pre-school hearing-impaired children have been ascertained by the Central Ascertainment Committee for Hearing-Impaired. (Previously, these children were ascertained at Monnington.)

The visiting teacher service is providing support for seven hearing-impaired children under the age of four years and six months.

From 1980-81, 182 students over the age of sixteen years have been approved to remain at day special schools so that they can continue their education.

On 29 May 1981, 66 students over the age of 21 were attending special developmental schools and 82 children aged four years and six months and under were participating in early intervention programmes at these schools.

In Institutional Special Schools there were three children under four and half years of age, 326 over the age of 16 years and a further 328 over the age of 21 years attending sessions. Fifty-six persons over the age of sixteen years were attending work education centres at Bendigo and Montague.

SPEECH THERAPY SERVICES, OAKLEY

(Question No. 125)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on speech therapy services in the electoral district of Oakleigh, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 920 on 27 November 1979 (Hansard page 5090)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services) - The answer is:

The honourable member has been advised by letter dated 16 June, 1981 along the following lines:

1. (a) and (b). There are 27 children receiving speech therapy at present and there are 78 children on the waiting list for treatment.
2. Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-eastern metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benalla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gippsland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAILING CENTRES AND DEVELOPMENTAL SCHOOLS

(Question No. 126)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services—The answer is:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on admission to training centres and special developmental schools, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 931 on 21 November 1979 (Hansard page 4879)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answers is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 11 August 1981 that as day training centres come under the jurisdiction of the Health Commission it is suggested that the honourable member should refer section (i) of the question to my colleague, the Minister of Health.

Prior to the 1976 school year no day training centre had transferred to the Education Department to become a special developmental school.

| 1. (a) (ii) 1976 | 15 |
| 1977 | 15 |
| 1978 | 15 |
| 1979 | Nil |
| 1980 | Nil |
| 1981 | 15 |

2. (b) (ii) 1976 | 12 |
| 1977 | 14 |
| 1978 | 16 |
| 1979 | 16 |
| 1980 | Nil |
| 1981 | Nil |
**EDUCATION ACT 1958**

(Question No. 127)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in *Hansard* the information on special services pursuant to section 64B of the Education Act 1958, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 928 on 21 November 1979 (*Hansard* page 4877)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 11 August 1981 that, since the response 21-11-79 to question No. 928, the Teachers Tribunal has provided new staffing schedules which became effective February 1980.

**Services for Intellectually Handicapped**

(i) Day Special Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-eastern metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benalla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gippsland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates no day training centres had converted to special developmental schools at this time.

(ii) Institutional Schools—

(a) Kingsbury + 2
(b) St Nicholas + 4
(c) Sunbury + 4

Now established schools. Previously annexes of special schools.

(b) Maintained—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kew Education Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Formerly called Community Centre Children's Cottages Kew).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Extended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janefield</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Discontinued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Work Education Centres—

(a) Established

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Maintained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Extended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo and Northern District Work Education Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Discontinued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services for Physically and Sensorily Handicapped

(b) Maintained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Children's Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Waverley Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yooralla, Balwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yooralla, Glenroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monnington Parent Education Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carronbank School for Deaf/Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Elizabeth Junior School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian School for Deaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Extended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Teacher Services—Physically Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Teacher Services—Visually Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Teacher Services—Visually Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendonald</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on special schools, given by the then-Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 926 on 21 November 1979 (Hansard page 4876)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—I advised the honourable member by letter dated 3 August 1981 as follows:

Schools for the Physically and Sensorily Handicapped

(a) Established
Glen Waverley Special School
St Albans School for Deaf Children
Carronbank School for Deaf/Blind Children
Princess Elizabeth Junior School
Monnington
Ewing House
Glenonald
Nepean
Austin Hospital
Royal Children's Hospital
Yooralla Balwyn
Yooralla Glenroy
Shannon Park
Janefield Deaf Unit
Kew Cottages Deaf Unit

(b) Maintained
Glen Waverley Special—240
Carronbank School for Deaf/Blind—18

(c) Nil

(d) Marathon
Places added—
Glen Waverley Special—240
Carronbank School for Deaf/Blind—18

Places lost—
Marathon—80 (Closed school).

Special Developmental Schools—

(a) Established
Box Hill
Preston
Shepparton
Traralgon
Wangaratta
Wodonga
Djerriwarrh (Melton)
Heidelberg and District
Milparinka (Parkville) 8
Milparinka (South Melbourne)
Nadrasca (Nunawading)
Oakleigh
Urimbirra (Noble Park)
Wyndham (Werribee)
Woorinyan (Frankston)
Yarrabah (Glen Waverley)
Cobram
Kallemondah (Seymour)
Kyndalyn (Maffra)
Mirridong (Yarram)
Numurkah

(b) Maintained
Djerriwarrh 3
Heidelberg and District 1
Milparinka (Parkville) 8
Mirridong 3
Numurkah 3
Oakleigh 10
Preston 50
Shepparton 2
Traralgon 5
Urimbirra 12
Yarrabah 11

(c) Urimbirra
Yarrabah

(d) Nil
Places added: 108

Djerriwarrh 3
Heidelberg and District 1
Milparinka (Parkville) 8
Mirridong 3
Numurkah 3
Oakleigh 10
Preston 50
Shepparton 2
Traralgon 5
Urimbirra 12
Yarrabah 11
Questions on Notice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places lost: 54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyndalyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadresca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools for the Intellectually Handicapped

(a) Ascot Vale (to replace Fitzroy)
   - Kingsbury
   - St Nicholas Hospital
   - Sunbury

(b) Ashwood
   - Ballarat
   - Broadmeadows
   - Bulleen
   - Croxton
   - Dandenong
   - Geelong
   - Janefield
   - Kalianna
   - Kew
   - Mitcham
   - Moe
   - Montague Continuing Education
   - Moorabbin West
   - Naranga
   - Ormond
   - Stawell
   - Rosamond
   - St Albans
   - Shepparton
   - Vermont South
   - Watsonia
   - Bendigo and Northern District
     Work Education Centre.

(c) Ormond

(d) Fitzroy (replaced by Ascot Vale)
   (i) places added:
       - Ascot Vale 120
       - Kingsbury 28
       - St Nicholas Hospital 28
       - Sunbury 33
       - Ormond 10
   (ii) places lost: Fitzroy 50

Schools for the Socially and Emotionally Handicapped

(a) Established: Nil

(b) Maintained:
   - Bayswater Youth Training Education Centre
   - Castlemaine Prison Education Centre
   - Travancore Special School
   - Allambie Special School
   - Baltara Special School
   - Hillside Special School
   - Tally Ho Special School
   - Langi Kal Kal Youth Training Education Centre
   - Melmsbury Youth Training Education Centre
   - Turana Youth Training Education Centre
   - Winlaton Youth Training Education Centre
   - Ararat Prison Education Centre
   - Beechworth Training Prison Education Centre
   - Bendigo Training Prison Education Centre
   - Pentridge Prison Education Centre
   - Fairlea Female Prison Education Centre
   - Geelong Training Prison Education Centre
   - South-Eastern Child and Family Centre.

(c) Extended:
   - Bayswater Y.T.E.C.
   - Baltara Special School
   - Turana Y.T.E.C.
   - Winlaton Y.T.E.C.
   - Ararat Prison Education Centre
   - Pentridge
   - Fairlea Female Prison Education Centre

(d) Discontinued: Basin Boys Special School

Places added: Services provided within Social Welfare Institutions are subject daily to sweeping fluctuations in enrolment.

Places lost: It is not possible or practical to provide this information.

EDUCATION ACT 1958

(Question No. 129)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on notifications pursuant to section 64E of the Education Act 1958, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 929 on 17 October 1979 (Hansard page 3462)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The honourable member has been advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 as follows:

Children referred to Counselling, Guidance and Clinical Services are grouped for statistical purposes into the broad categories given
below. The number of referrals in each category for the year ending 30 June 1980 is also given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Retardation</td>
<td>2351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem behaviour</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Handicap</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory Handicap</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sources of the above referrals were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Department</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>4647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education Department Sources</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Agencies</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Authority</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare Agencies</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health—Health Commission</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.I.S.C.C.A.—Yooralla Society</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Sources</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE COUNCIL FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION MEETINGS

(Question No. 130)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information about special educational authorities, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 925 on 1 November 1979 (Hansard page 4166)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—I advised the honourable member by letter dated 1 June 1981 as follows:

1. The Special Education Authority (Work Education) which was established on 21 July 1978, no longer exists. Its functions have been merged in the Standing Committee for Work Education which is under the State Council for Special Education.

2 and 3. At the first formal meeting of the Special Education Authority (Work Education) held on 17 August 1978, the authority appointed an assessments sub-committee and agreed that all individual assessments should be made by officers of the Counselling, Guidance and Clinical Services Branch of the Special Services Division of the Education Department, Individual assessments continue to be made by this branch.

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENTAL SCHOOLS

(Question No. 132)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information about special developmental schools, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 927 on 1 March 1979 (Hansard page 4166)?
Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:
I advised the honourable member by letter dated 3 August 1981 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special developmental schools</th>
<th>Former day training centres</th>
<th>Gain in places since entry to Education Department</th>
<th>Loss in places since entry to Education Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balwyn</td>
<td>Araluen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvoir</td>
<td>Mulleena</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Hill</td>
<td>Alkaira</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobram</td>
<td>Cobram</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djerriwarrh</td>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston</td>
<td>Frankston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>Ivanhoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallemondh</td>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyndalyn</td>
<td>Mafra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milparaika</td>
<td>Parkville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Melbourne</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirridong</td>
<td>Yarram</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadasca</td>
<td>Nunawading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numurkah</td>
<td>Numurkah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh</td>
<td>Oakleigh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>Bundoora</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepparton</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traralgon</td>
<td>Traralgon</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urimbirra</td>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta</td>
<td>Killara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham</td>
<td>Werribee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrabah</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overall gain of 42 places since entry to Education Department.

EXCLUSIONS FROM SPECIAL SCHOOLS

(Question No. 133)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information about exclusions from special schools, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 932 on 1 March 1979 (Hansard page 4167)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 as follows:

Schools for the Physically and Sensorily Handicapped

Before October 1978—Nil.

November—December 1978—Nil.

1979—Nil.


Schools for the Intellectually Handicapped

1974—Two—danger to other pupils and staff, physical aggression.

1975—Nil.

1976—Nil.

1977—One—danger to other pupils.

1978—One—for striking a teacher.

1979—One—physical assault on work experience student.


Schools for Socially and Emotionally Handicapped

1975—Six—behavioural disturbance.

1976—Nil.

1977—Nil.

1978—Nil.

1979—Nil.

1980—Nil.

1981—Nil.

1980—May—

EDUCATION ACT 1958

(Question No. 134)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information about enforcement of sections 64E and 64J of the Education Act 1958, given by the then Assistant Minister of Education in answer to question No. 933 on 1 November 1979 (Hansard page 4167)?
Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 1 June 1981 as follows:

1. No regulations have been made regarding sections 64E and 64J of the Education Act 1958.

2. No failures to report a handicapped child in terms of section 64E of the Act have been noted. The Minister is not aware of the existence of a handicapped child until notified by parents or school principal.

2. No offences under section 64J of the Act have as yet been reported. Hence, no prosecutions have taken place.

MIGRANT CHILDREN AT SPECIAL SCHOOLS

(Question No. 135)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on migrant children attending special schools, given in answer to question No. 921 on 22 April 1980 (Hansard page 8319)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The honourable member has been advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrolment Number of migrant children</th>
<th>Percentage of migrant children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(August 1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectually Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5109 Ascot Vale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5097 Ashwood</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4762 Ballarat</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4930 Broadmeadows</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5099 Bulleen</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4679 Croxton</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4918 Dandenong</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4768 Geelong</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4728 Kaliana</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4871 Mitcham</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5097 Moe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4928 Moorabbin West</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5080 Naranga</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846 Ormond</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4792 Rosamond</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5167 Shepparton</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4979 St Albans</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5025 Vermont South</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5027 Watsonia</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4563 Janefield</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4431 Kew</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5216 Kingsbury</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4549 Pleasant Creek</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5217 St Nicholas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5218 Sunbury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2784 Montague</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3356</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Developmental School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrolment Number of migrant children</th>
<th>Percentage of migrant children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(August 1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5146 Balwyn</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5222 Belvoir</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5225 Box Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>New in 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5147 Cobram</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5162 Djerriwarrh</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5143 Frankston</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5161 Heidelberg</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5149 Kallermoundah</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5175 Kyndalyn</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5144 Milparinka</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5166 Mirridong</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5163 Nadasca</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5148 Numurkah</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5151 Oakleigh</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5219 Preston</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5220 Shepparton</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5145 South Melbourne</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5221 Traralgon</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5164 Urnibra</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5226 Wanganaratta</td>
<td></td>
<td>New in 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5165 Wyndham</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5142 Yarrabah</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL RETENTION RATES

(Question No. 156)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on school retention rates, given in answer to question No. 916 on 16 April 1980 (Hansard page 8145)?

Mr LACY—(Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 5 June 1981 as follows:

Following the tabulations as set out in the answer to question No. 916 the requested information is as follows:

#### Retention Rates—
Victorian schools 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Based upon February enrolments</th>
<th>Based upon August enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>13 114—36 per cent.</td>
<td>11 873—32·8 per cent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Catholic schools</th>
<th>Other non-government schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5 526—46·3 per cent.</td>
<td>4 864—90·2 per cent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparable information from other States and Territories

Percentage of secondary school entrants apparently remaining to Year 12 in Government schools, 1979.
Questions on Notice

Year 1979

New South Wales 30.9
Victoria 23.1
Queensland 31.1
South Australia 30.8
Western Australia 28.4
Tasmania 24.8
Northern Territory 22.7
Australian Capital Territory 70.5

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

STUDENT-TEACHER RATIOS

(Question No. 157)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on student-teacher ratios and class sizes, given in answer to question No. 914 on 16 April 1980 (Hansard page 8145)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 5 June 1981 as follows:

"Following the tabulations as set out in the answer to question No. 914 the requested information is as follows:

Ratio of students to all teaching staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary (1)</th>
<th>Secondary-High (2)</th>
<th>Secondary-Technical (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. "Primary" includes special schools teachers and students.
2. "Secondary Technical" relates to July whereas the primary and secondary relate to February. The secondary technical does not include teachers on leave, therefore it is not comparable with secondary high figures.

Pupil-teacher ratio for other States and Territories—1979

TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Primary schools</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.C.T.</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Average Class-size

(i) Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average class size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Secondary—Average size of English classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High schools</th>
<th>Technical schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NIGHT CLASSES—OAKLEIGH ELECTORATE

(Question No. 158)

Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on night classes at schools in the electoral district of Oakleigh, given in answer to question No. 912 on 16 April 1980 (Hansard page 8144)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The honourable member was advised by letter dated 15 June 1981 as follows:

HUNTINGDALE TECHNICAL SCHOOL

No. of evening students 1980

1. Recreational Programmes (Stream 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Students 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery and Sculpture</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinning and Weaving</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasswork</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copperwork and Enamelling</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwork</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Maintenance</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture Gardening</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmaking</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookery</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cake Decoration and Making</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Community</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Foreign</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Basic English</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film and Theatre Appreciation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, Philosophy and Religion</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Games (Holiday Programs and Surfing (16))</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evening Programmes

Technical and Further Education Academic Evening Classes (Stream 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Students 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English for Handicapped Adults</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OAKLEIGH TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Evening Programs

No. of evening students 1980

1. Recreational Programmes (Stream 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Students 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Plants</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Gardening (short courses)</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocational Programmes (Stream 3)

* Adult Trade Certificate—Gardening
* Adult Trade Certificate—Landscape Gardening
* Adult Trade Certificate—Turf Management
* Adult Trade Certificate—Nurseryman
* Adult Trade Certificate—Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Students 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Design (Stream 4)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool Contractors (Supervision) (Stream 4)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students attend two nights per week for three weeks of the month then one day per month.
FIRE PROTECTION IN SCHOOLS
(Question No. 159)
Mr MATHEWS (Oakleigh) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he will bring up to date and consolidate in Hansard the information on fire protection measures at schools in the electoral district of Oakleigh, given in answer to question No. 168 on 15 April 1980 (Hansard page 8143)?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 1 July 1981, that there has been no change to the fire protection measures at the school in the electoral district of Oakleigh with the exception of an upgrade of building facilities at the Chadstone Park Primary School. This upgrade included some updating of the fire protection at the school in that a new fire service has been provided.

SCHOOLS CLOSED
(Question No. 162)
Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

1. What schools have been closed in each of the past ten years?
2. What is the estimated value of each of the properties involved?
3. Which of these properties have been disposed of, indicating at what price and to whom?
4. What use is being made of each of the remaining properties?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 1 July 1981, as follows:

1. 3 and 4. The list of schools closed in years 1968-1978 and their disposal or their present use are indicated in tabulations below (7 pages).

2. Only freehold properties can be sold by the Department direct. In cases of Crown Lands the disposal can only be arranged by the Lands Department and the Education Department is credited with the value of the improvements.

Valuation of properties are obtained prior to disposal. An estimate of values on unsold properties therefore cannot be stated to any reasonable degree of accuracy at this stage.

SCHOOLS CLOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>Woodstock West</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Grant, restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2951</td>
<td>Marnoo East</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3547</td>
<td>Toora North</td>
<td>No site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4898</td>
<td>Eppalock Reservoir</td>
<td>No site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3953</td>
<td>Youanmite South</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2929</td>
<td>Portez</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4179</td>
<td>Drung North</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3980</td>
<td>Wilgul</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4629</td>
<td>Mologa North</td>
<td>3 acre site donated in 1947. To be returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4126</td>
<td>Pambornieit East</td>
<td>24 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2288</td>
<td>Wilby</td>
<td>Crown Land 1 March 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2169</td>
<td>Barjarg</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1118</td>
<td>Ballangeich</td>
<td>No site (Old Crown Reserve revoked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>Nalinga</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>Mannum</td>
<td>2 acres, ½ Crown Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/035</td>
<td>Kooroobangka</td>
<td>½ of an acre, ½ Crown Land, ½ freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Ashbourne</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Campbell's Forest</td>
<td>22 acres Crown Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>22 acre freehold (gift 1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Salisbury West</td>
<td>Old second site 1 acre Crown Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2749</td>
<td>Lah</td>
<td>Vacant site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4358</td>
<td>Ercildoune</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Daisy Hill</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3405</td>
<td>Trida</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2846</td>
<td>The Brothers</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvements removed to other school. Site surrendered
With improvements sold auction E. M. Inkerlingill and B. R. Austin in 1973—$480.00
Leased building
Temporary site and building only while Reservoir was constructed
Improvements removed. Site used for SEP (4896 Invergordon)
Site and building used as Camp site. Frankston Teachers College
Sale requested. Not sold as yet. Leased at $5 a year (beehives) during 1980
Sold to E. F. Vaughan—$270
Sold to Frank Stares—$620
Building sold for removal to F. C. Bowland, $120.00 in 1969. Site returned to donor for $1
With improvements sold auction E. M. Inkerlingill and B. R. Austin in 1973—$480.00
Sold to R. H. and J. Weidl of Benalla in 1972—$400
Sold to R. H. and J. Weidl of Benalla in 1972—$400
Sold to J. D. and C. A. Nealy—$850
Sold to L. J. Cannon in 1977—$150
Whole site sold to R. J. Greenway by Lands Department (Auction) 1971—$200
Used as camp site by Avondale Heights Primary School. Site extended by the school—$7 500 (1978) paid by school
Used as camp site by Avondale Heights Primary School. Site extended by the school—$7 500 (1978) paid by school
Improvement sold to Boy Scouts by Lands Department for $700 in 1978
Sold to R. H. and J. Weidl of Benalla in 1972—$400
Freehold sold to L. J. Cannon in 1977—$150
Whole site sold to R. J. Greenway by Lands Department (Auction) 1971—$200
Sold to P. F. Gardy—$87
No action on disposal
No action on disposal
All sold at auction (1971) J. D. and C. A. Nealy—$850
Improvements removed to other school—shelter and out offices sold $40 and $10
Sold to H. C. Williams of Burrumbeet (1971) for $115.00
Improvements removed; land revoked 1970
Improvements destroyed by fire. Used SEP by 2636 Seaview Primary School
Used for SEP (Benambra)
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SCHOOLS CLOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title &amp; background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854 Lyonville</td>
<td>23 acres. Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Used for SEP (Oak Park Primary School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4623 Leedbeart</td>
<td>31 acre freehold (Gift)</td>
<td>Sold (auction) F. G. and E. F. Giff—$475 (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856 Glastonbury</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3815 Gama East</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land Revoked 1971</td>
<td>Improvements removed (Culgoa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027 Jeeralang</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Used for 2090 Whitlees (Old building still on site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2666 Nearim</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Carutharne</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings removed for re-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587 Yuleena</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land Old buildings removed from site</td>
<td>Site used for (Arboretum) 2035 Hamilton North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311 Flynn’s Creek Upper</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Buildings burnt down. Site is under consideration for SEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873 Diper’s Creek</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676 Porcupine Flat</td>
<td>22 acres freehold</td>
<td>Buildings burnt down. Site granted for SEP Sunshine High School 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708 Monument Creek</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings removed to Sunshine Technical School for camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109 Mt Lonarch</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Improvements still on site. Advertisied for School Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4133 Hunter</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings sold to F. S. King—$570 (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155 Bungarrie</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Sold for Public Reserve—$100 (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4632 Framlingham Settle</td>
<td>Site was a permissive occupancy only</td>
<td>Building handed over at no cost to Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs. M.O. 23.0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 Fryerstown</td>
<td>Old site 2 acres revoked 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636 Blackwood North</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>New site 4 acres Crown Land with improvements used as Camp Site. 3897 Gardenvale (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977 Murmungee</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building moved to Beechworth. Site sold to R. J. Witheroo—$250 (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3972 Fairholm</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings sold to A. Brien—$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3580 Johnstone’s Hill</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land Revoked 1970</td>
<td>Lands Department was requested to dispose of improvements on our behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Kanumbra</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Buildings still on site. Granted for Arboretum—1331 Yarrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690 Illowa</td>
<td>1 acre freehold (old law)</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3706 Coonooer West</td>
<td>(a) 3 acres Crown Land revoked 1971</td>
<td>Sold at auction to W. J. C. and M. M. Dunstan—$310 (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 Humevale</td>
<td>(b) 3 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3839 Tye</td>
<td>(c) 1 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Used for SEP 2090 Whitlees (Old building still on site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2391 Wangaratta North</td>
<td>(d) 1 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4454 Mount Eccles South</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Buildings burnt down. Site granted for SEP Sunshine High School 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017 Libna</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land Revoked 1975</td>
<td>Site and buildings sold to H. and V. Burrows—$1,700 (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536 Hurdle Creek West</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building granted to Sunshine Technical School for Camp 3897 Gardenvale 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2531 Flagg Creek</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3886 Barraport</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land Revoked 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3498 Cannie</td>
<td>1 acres Crown Land Revoked 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4913 Murtoa North</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4977 Sandhill Lake</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3604 Lucynella</td>
<td>1 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3818 Wallinduc</td>
<td>3 acres freehold (old law)—$400 paid in 1963</td>
<td>Building removed 1971. Disposal under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3358 Goulburn Weir</td>
<td>1 acres Crown Land Revoked 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3781 Vite Vite North</td>
<td>1 acre freehold (gift)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3786 Barasminuga</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904 Weering</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2359 Wilkin</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2089 Boxwood</td>
<td>1 acre freehold (gift)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 Carnham</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827 Lake Marmal</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land Revoked 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3480 Kelvin View</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land Revoked 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2471 Bungil</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 Illarrubuck</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756 Lake Mundi</td>
<td>½ acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3172 Dumbalk East</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192 Truganina</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395 Mockinya</td>
<td>1 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4095 Minxina East</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2619 Woiwiagorm</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4796 Sheldof West</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Questions on Notice

### SCHOOLS CLOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3413 Yulongah</td>
<td>1 acre Crown Land Revoked 1972</td>
<td>Part of buildings removed to other school. Others left on site which is reserved for Public Recreation (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633 Jackson's Creek</td>
<td>1½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Improvements to be sold in situ by Lands Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Emu</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site with improvements thereon sold by Lands Department to J. D. Smethurst for $910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357 Cundare North</td>
<td>4½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and improvements sold to C. J. and I. D. McClelland for $160 in 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2351 Appin</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and improvements removed to a Camp site. Building still on site. Use of property for SEP under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109 Bundalong</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>New site improvements sold in 1977 at auction to P. F. and R. S. Stevens for $3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352 Wahring</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Later reserved for public hall. Value improvements $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4432 Glenloth East</td>
<td>½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483 Durham Ox</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4619 Mirimbah</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748 Dereel</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2875 Woodbourne</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3871 Torrita</td>
<td>3½ acres Crown Land reserved.</td>
<td>Building removed to Walpeup. Auction sale being arranged by Lands Department (Some improvements remain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840 Bolwarrah</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>School building and T.H.A. residence still on site. No longer used as camp. Disposal at auction currently under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3190 Rosebery</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319 Lake Tyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518 Strangways</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2272 Goldie North</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774 Belley</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2347 Oxley Flats</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3536 Strathkellar</td>
<td>New site (vacant) 2½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Use of building is granted to a local group. T.H.A. residence still on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4151 Box Hill Salvation</td>
<td>No site (institutional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615 Benjeroop East</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2616 Murrabbi West</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4566 Gonn Crossing</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4828 Archer’s Estate</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4088 Bayvindien</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082 Coromby</td>
<td>7 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4235 Tooradin North</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2907 Berringa</td>
<td>Portable removed. Site used for SEP Corryong Consolidated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2889 Lima East</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2767 Bambra</td>
<td>Original site ½ acres Crown Land Revoked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3073 Noorongong</td>
<td>4½ acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4766 Upper Lurg</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 Foxhow</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>School building transferred to another school. Shelter sold for $30 to Football Club. T.H.A. residence still on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Russell’s Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2658 Lima South</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3105 Peechabba</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Residence sold by T.H.A. for removal. Department intends to retain site for possible future use. Temporary lease under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818 Taminick</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2826 Diapour</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land Revoked</td>
<td>Building and site used as Camp (Gould League)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2561 Lima</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3239 Butcher’s Ridge</td>
<td>2½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4536 Whitlands</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4749 Morjiana</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3524 Mirboo East</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4793 Warrambeen</td>
<td>5½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOLS CLOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallup East</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Formerly part of State Forest. In situ sale declined by Lands Department. Improvement removed from site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventnor</td>
<td>No 1 site; 3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Used for SEP since 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2 site; 3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Allocated for Morwell High School for camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailsa</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Main building removed to Laan Shelter removed to Tarranyurk, Out offices sold for $10 by Lands Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beynton East</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Hampton High School intends to use the building as camp. Buildings retained for possible future use (D.I.'s report 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatyoon</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building transferred to Wooragge Primary School; intended to use site for camping (High School Marsden) but Shire of Mansfield objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delatite</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building transferred to Wooragge Primary School; intended to use site for camping (High School Marsden) but Shire of Mansfield objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dung Dung</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Old improvements sold to Scouts Association for $10. Site may be revoked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar South</td>
<td>3½ acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site. After various proposals for SEP use the disposal of property (site and school building) is again under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumbuk</td>
<td>1½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site used as SEP by 4970 Churchill. Site and buildings allocated as school for Seaholm Primary School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale</td>
<td>3½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Site used as SEP by 4970 Churchill. Site and buildings allocated as school for Seaholm Primary School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysia</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Small area with residence retained for T.H.A. Balance with brick school building removed. Site reserved and reserved for Public Purposes under consideration. (War memorial plaque in walls.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drik Drik</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site granted for SEP (Dartmoor Primary School). Building is used by National Parks Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building sold, St Peter and Paul Primary School (Doncaster) for $2200 (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wychiella</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Used as camp by Black Rock Primary School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunding</td>
<td>Site 2. 1½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Used as SEP since 1948. Sold at Auction to G. Connroy for $560 (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boorolite</td>
<td>Site 3. 6 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Used as SEP Ballan Primary School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minhah</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Granted to Frankston Technical School as a Camp site. Enquiries as to its continued use are at present being made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheilbourne</td>
<td>3-75 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Old building is brick. T.H.A. residence still on site. No action on disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambo Crossing</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay North</td>
<td>1½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Shelter transferred to Essay Group School. Site used by National Parks Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedy Flat</td>
<td>2½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Shelter transferred to Essay Group School. Site used by National Parks Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathbogie North East</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building allocated to St Albana High School as a school camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathbogie West</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Some minor improvement removed to Homewood Primary School. Property is granted for SEP. (St Albana High School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathbogie South</td>
<td>1½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Buildings removed from site (Consolidation) Site sold to Shire of Eurob for $2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naringal East</td>
<td>2½ acres freehold Restricted</td>
<td>Improvements removed to other centres. Site is granted to the Victorian Conservation Trust (used as camp). Site and buildings used as School Camp (Karingal High School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahaihak</td>
<td>7½ acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Old building is brick. T.H.A. residence still on site. No action on disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darriman</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardigan</td>
<td>1½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>1½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boongilla Migrant Centre</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Brae</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Building transferred to Mt Blowhard Primary School. Site used by National Parks Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham East</td>
<td>5 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Bridge</td>
<td>1½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katundra</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and building remitted for SEP purposes (Ensay Group School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giffard West</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Site used by National Parks Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corack East</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site used by National Parks Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigator</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site used by National Parks Service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 September 1981] Questions on Notice 445
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4538 Shelley</td>
<td>3-5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>School building removed to Primary School Koetong. Site used as SEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169 Ardonachie</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings granted as Camp for Hamilton Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3292 Dellicknora</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>All improvements except the old timber school building were removed to various other schools in 1973. Reservation is revoked and the sale of site with old building thereon is in the hands of Lands Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715 Lance Creek</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building removed to Wonthaggi North (1953). Shelter and outbuildings still on site. Advertised as Camp: still under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3270 Elam</td>
<td>2 acres freehold Restricted</td>
<td>Site and improvements sold at auction to J. F. and O. M. Kingwill $2000 (1975).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3250 Cooncroc</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2839 Beavil</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Residence sold for removal $1500 A. S. Pinnoch. School building sold for removal M. Y. Newsham. ($100) Land sold by Lands Department to J. D. Bourke ($15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3558 Glen Valley</td>
<td>½ acre Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Building is still on site. Report on future use or disposal was recently requested from D.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3192 Grass Flats</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building removed to Nairnuk. Land and remaining improvements sold to L. D. Webb—$120 (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3298 Mount Eccles</td>
<td>½ an acre Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Timber building and shed still on site. Lands Department to arrange sale of improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764 Molligal</td>
<td>1½ acres Partly Crown Land partly freehold</td>
<td>Old brick building still on site. Transfer to Lands Department for use by Land Conservation Council is under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3946 Turriff West</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Building removed to Ouyen Primary School. Site reverted to Lands Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4668 Wando Heights</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2378 Kilara</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land Revoked in 1967</td>
<td>The school was conducted in a leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2426 Bungite West</td>
<td>Site No. 1; 2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Old school building still on site. May be required for SEP purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3295 Fernbank</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2905 Purnim West</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site. School building and part of site is leased to Shire of Warrnambool (Kindergarten)—$100 a year for 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340 Willung South</td>
<td>½ acre freehold</td>
<td>Site and old building allocated to 4669 Traralgon as Camp Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2218 Warncoort</td>
<td>2½ acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site. Disposal by auction will be considered when the residence is no longer occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758 Rupanyup North</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Value in 1974 was $225.00. Could be available for auction sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4181 Leongatha North</td>
<td>½ of an acre freehold</td>
<td>Buildings still on site. Use for plantation is still under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3712 Stockdale</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Buildings were resited at Munro Primary School. Valued at $2500 in 1977. Disposal still under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4413 Rubicon Junction</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence on site. Site and school building transferred to the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs for nominal ($2) consideration. T.H.A. residence sold to the Ministry at rate $40 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931 Leonard’s Hill</td>
<td>1 acre Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Vale of the site is held as a gift to T.H.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2145 Fenton’s Creek</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site. No action on disposal. Considered as camp site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664 Arnold</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Shelter demolished. Use of site is still under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2783 Buckrabanyule</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site. No action on disposal. Considered as camp site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4637 Hillside</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence on site. School building transferred to Lindenow South. Use of site for SEP is still under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2970 Arawata</td>
<td>4 acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence on site. Site and school building granted as Camp. Building removed to other school. Use as camp site is under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4403 Chesney Vale</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site. Granted to Elwood High School as Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4545 Goongerah</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>No State building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2868 Fifteen Mile Creek</td>
<td>1½ acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Site and buildings used as Camp Site. (Wangaratta Inspectorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 Franklinford</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Old building is brick construction. Site is being considered for SEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719 Broomfield</td>
<td>2½ acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Site and buildings granted as school camp for Braybrook High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 Broadwater</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence on site. Shelter removed 1975. Site and building is to be made available for public purposes (Shire of Minnamurra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4672 Red Rock</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Property granted as camp site for Broadmeadows Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536 Wurti Boluc</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Old building still on site. Use for camp or disposal is still under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2670 Wombelano</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>School building and shelter removed to Willenabrina Primary School. Toilet block sold for $50 to local Committee of Management by Lands Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3991 Fairley</td>
<td>3 acres freehold (gift)</td>
<td>School building removed to Tresco Primary School. Shelter re-sited at Mt. Macedon South Primary School. Land sold to adjoining owner at $1000 (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2691 Dunmunkle East</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Improvements sold (Windmill to P. J. Walsh for $20. Building and shelter valued at $240 sold by Horsham Region). Reservation revoked in 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOLS CLOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3414 Lawler</td>
<td>2 acres freehold (gift)</td>
<td>Building and tank stands transferred to Minyip Primary School. Land transferred to original donor (A. W. and I. V. Milgate) for nominal ($1) consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2453 Tamleugh North</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Old buildings exist on site. The future use of this property (SEP) is still under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3820 Yin Barrun</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Shelter shed and horizontal bar removed to other schools. Site allocated for SEP (High School Benalla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3099 Cravensville</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Buildings on this land were destroyed by fire in 1937. The school when re-opened in 1951 was conducted in a leased building. The 5 acre site is now used as a camp site by Wodonga High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647 Slaughton Vale</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building granted as camp for Corio Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4452 Nullawil South-west</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Property allocated to Nullawil Primary School as arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2645 Neurapurr</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence attached to school. Lands Department has been requested (September 1979) to arrange a sale on our behalf. Sold on 2 June 1980 to J. and R. Maclehouse (Improvement value $500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>801 Evansford</td>
<td>2½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and building are being retained for possible future use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696 Delvine</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3509 Wonjip</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
<td>School building used on a temporary basis by St Mathias Church of England. Sale by auction is under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113 Ravenswood</td>
<td>½ acres freehold</td>
<td>All improvements burnt to ground in 1977. Reservation will be revoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3608 Werneth</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Buildings still on site. Property granted as school camp to 3146 Clifton Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4008 Glen Forbes</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and improvements granted as School Camp for Collingwood High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4363 Havel Park</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2648 Locksley</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>School building removed to Avenel Primary School, Site and shelter (storage) granted to Flemington High School for SEP purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3135 Archie’s Creek</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and improvements granted as School Camp for Collingwood High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025 Back Creek</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and buildings are used for SEP purposes by Shepparton Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2466 Cosgrove</td>
<td>5 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings allocated as camp site to Yooralla Special (in conjunction with Mountbatten and Nepean Special Schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3849 Garfield North</td>
<td>2½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings retained for possible camp site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055 Karramomus North</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>School building removed to Yarragon Primary School. Site granted as school camp for Irwin Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2435 Buin Buln East</td>
<td>5 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings retained for possible camp site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2862 Springdale</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794 Bulimba</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>School building removed to Primary School Stratford. Site may be used as School Camp (under consideration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3217 Wallacedale</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Main building was destroyed by fire December 1973. The property was sold by Lands Department to Mrs A. M. Ryan for $1425. This Department was credited with the value of remaining improvements at $70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1382 Chatsworth</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and building are still on site. The property is used temporarily by &quot;Clarence&quot; Pre-School Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4831 Kangaroo Lake</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>School was conducted in a leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2238 Kelisac</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land Reserved</td>
<td>Improvements still on site. Disposal under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1039 Irrewillipe</td>
<td>Site 1; 5 acres Crown Land Site 2; 3 acres Freehold</td>
<td>Buildings removed to other centres. Both sites are retained for SEP purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951 Tabilk</td>
<td>1 acre Crown Land—½ acre Freehold</td>
<td>Improvements and site are used by Seymour In-Service Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3353 Wood Wood</td>
<td>½ acre Crown Land</td>
<td>T.H.A. residence still on site. Land and building used as school camp (Swan Hill Primary School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4162 Pambie</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Buildings removed to Wood Wood Camp Site by Swan Hill Primary School (1978) Land returned to Lands Department. Site is used for SEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2439 Morwell West</td>
<td>5 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building temporarily used as Community Education Centre. Review every 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3995 Allambie Estate</td>
<td>½ acres freehold (Crown Grant, Restricted)</td>
<td>Site and building are used as School Camp by Orbost High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3739 Wairewa</td>
<td>5 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and building are used as School camp by Ballam Park Technical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4528 Melwood</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and building are used as school camp by Foster High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3450 Grassy Spur</td>
<td>3 acres freehold</td>
<td>Improvements still on site. Could be listed for public auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867 Cannum</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings let for camping purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4430 Wyn Wyn</td>
<td>½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4463 Miga Lake</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>No action on disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3952 Island Road</td>
<td>½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings allocated to Ballarat District Primary Schools Outdoor Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247 Blakeville</td>
<td>3½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>All improvements sold to East Framlingham Golf Club $430. Land may be reserved by Lands Department for public purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860 Framlingham East</td>
<td>2½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Leased building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2373 Glenaladale</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Site and buildings allocated to Ballarat District Primary Schools Outdoor Education Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHOOLS CLOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title background</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culla</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooram</td>
<td>No site; 2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Site and buildings used as School Camp by Norwood High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal Wal</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land; vacant site</td>
<td>Site set aside for SEP purposes (Euroa High School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamarooka</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>School buildings on site. Disposal is still under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Prison Farm Education Centre</td>
<td>Institutional No site</td>
<td>Bluestone school building built by local effort in 1869. The reservation was revoked and site and building made available for community use (Shire of Maldon) by the Lands Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baringhup West</td>
<td>1 acre Crown Land</td>
<td>Building and improvements still on site. Auction sale is intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannawarra North</td>
<td>1½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Land and improvements sold to H. C. and B. L. Richards (of Cohuna) for $8 200 (1960).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrawee</td>
<td>5 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building and other improvements still on site. The property is granted to Primary School 4743 Swan Hill North for sanctuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>6 acres (2 acres Crown Land; 4 acres freehold)</td>
<td>Bluestone building classified by National Trust. The site and building has been allocated to Castlemaine Primary Inspectorate for camping purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myola East</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Building and improvements still on site. Auction sale is intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meatin West</td>
<td>2 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Shelter and building removed to other centre. We have requested Lands Department to dispose of remaining improvements on our behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neerim North</td>
<td>1½ acre freehold</td>
<td>Main building removed to other school. We agree to sell land and remaining improvements for $6 000 to the Shire of Buln Buln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagshot</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Building (brick) still on site. Land leased temporarily for grazing. Disposal will be given consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitchie</td>
<td>3 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Improvements valued at $3000. Lands Department has been requested to arrange sale at auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfold</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Main building removed to 343 Kyneton. Some improvements still on site. Lands Department has been requested to arrange a sale at auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland East</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>School was conducted in a leased building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchupga</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>School was conducted in a leased building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>2 acre freehold</td>
<td>Sold to L. H. and M. E. Ruddell $6 000 (May 1980).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longsta</td>
<td></td>
<td>This school was re-opened in 1977.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroop</td>
<td>2½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Minor improvements still on site. Future use or disposal will be given consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooralla</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Buildings re-sited at Narrawong East Primary School. Use of site as a school camp is under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carapook</td>
<td>3½ acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Main building removed to other Centre. Lands Department has been requested to arrange an in situ sale of remaining improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurack</td>
<td>2 acres part freehold, part Crown Land</td>
<td>Buildings still on site. Arrangements are in hand for disposal of this holding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillinglough</td>
<td>2½ acres freehold</td>
<td>Main building removed to Nyah Primary School. Outbuildings re-sited at Wood Wood (Camp). Sale of land could be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sisters</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building removed to another centre. Surrendering to Crown to allow reservation for public purposes is under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathallan</td>
<td>5 acres freehold (restricted)</td>
<td>Improvements sold for removal to R. F. Tredgett—$100. Site retained for SEP purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litchfield</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Buildings still on site. Lands Department was requested to arrange disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwald</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>Leased building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungadoo</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Lands Department was requested to dispose of it by public auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonang</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Building is still on site. Use of site as a School Camp is still under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jey Creek</td>
<td>4 acres Crown Land</td>
<td>Building re-sited at Athlone Primary School. Use of property as camp site is still under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunbower Island</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>Building is still on site. Property used as a regional school camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edi</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Building and out-offices are still on site. Use for SEP or School Camp is still under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boho South</td>
<td>1 acre freehold</td>
<td>Improvements are still on site. Possible future use is still under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Alfred</td>
<td>2 acres freehold</td>
<td>School building (brick) and other improvements still on site. Environmental use or disposal is still under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Thomson</td>
<td>No site</td>
<td>School was conducted in a building provided by M.M.B.W. (construction site).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEONGATHA HIGH SCHOOL
(Question No. 164)

Mr Fordham (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

With regard to the staffing position at Leongatha High School:

1. Why there has been a reduction for 1980 of the special needs component within the school's establishment from 1.5 to 1.2 teachers, thus forcing the school to eliminate or seriously curtail programmes designed to assist disadvantaged students?

2. Why finance to provide a part-time teacher aide at the school has been withdrawn for 1980?

3. Why a library assistant has not been provided for the school, despite the school's entitlement on the Education Department's own personnel schedule?

Mr Lacy (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 26 June 1981 as follows:

1. The change was so small that it could readily have been compensated for by minimal changes in time-tableting. It could not reasonably have in any way resulted in the elimination of essential programmes. The relative needs of schools are re-examined annually and independently by trained and impartial staffing officers, in accordance with objective criteria. The determinations are not made in any sense on a political basis, nor will they be. Application of the criteria necessarily results in change each year in the relativities as between individual schools. The special needs component at a Leongatha High School was marginally reduced from 1.5 to 1.2 because that school's position had progressed relative to other schools, which were considered currently to suffer greater need.

2. After consideration of the Revised School Priority Index teacher aide positions were allocated for 1980 on a basis of need at that time. On the basis of that criteria Leongatha High School's standing was such that retention of a part-time (0.5) teacher aide was not warranted in 1980 and could not be granted without depriving another school, whose entitlement according to the formula was greater.

3. In respect to the employment of library assistants the Education Department is still obliged to use the Public Service Board formula by which Leongatha High School has an entitlement of one part-time library assistant, and this position has been filled since 1975.

WENDOUREE HIGH-TECHNICAL SCHOOL
(Question No. 165)

Mr Fordham (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

In relation to the Wendouree High-Technical School:

1. What was the enrolment in 1980 and 1981?

2. What is the expected enrolment in 1982 and 1983?

3. How many classrooms are at the school and of these how many are temporary?

4. When it is expected that the already long overdue Stage 2 of the school's building programme will be undertaken?

5. What additional ancillary staff was provided in 1980 to cope with increased enrolments?

6. What grounds development was undertaken in 1980 and will be undertaken in 1981?

Mr Lacy (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 1 June 1981 as follows:

1. 1980—503.


3. The position as at 30 March 1981 was as follows:

53 classrooms. Permanent facilities comprise: 25 learning areas, canteen, toilet block and locker room. In addition there are 28 temporary learning spaces, two administration units and two toilet units.

4. Stage 2 expected to be occupied shortly.

5. Wendouree High-Technical School had a part-time technical assistant to the end of 1980. This position has been reclassified for 1981 to a full-time position.

6. Tennis/basketball courts, road entering and parking, oval development (joint project with the local council), access paving around the class-rooms and landscaping along the school frontage and around permanent and relocatable buildings.

TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
(Question No. 166)

Mr Fordham (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

1. How many individuals who taught English as a second language in the classroom in the primary, secondary and the technical divisions, respectively, were employed by the Education Department at the—(a) beginning of the
1979 school year; (b) end of the 1979 school year; and (c) beginning of the 1980 school year?

2. What are the figures of effective full-time people employed by the Education Department who taught English as a second language in the classroom in the primary, secondary and technical divisions, respectively, at the—(a) beginning of the 1979 school year; (b) end of the 1979 school year; and (c) beginning of the 1980 school year?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 7 June 1981 as follows:

1 and 2. It is not possible to provide a full answer to the questions in the terms as expressed.

Many schools which indicated a desire for fewer E.S.L. teachers in 1980 did so because of a number of factors including:

(a) the integration of E.S.L. students and staff into the total school programme;
(b) fluctuations within such schools of the migrant component of the enrolment;
(c) the increased level of support given to such schools by language centres to service the needs of newly arrived migrants and refugee students.

Because of the introduction of school controlled determination of needs, the complete comparative statistics of the E.S.L. teacher allocations between the years 1979 and 1980 when the changed staffing policies were put into effect are not held.

(Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 7 June 1981 as follows:

1, 2, 3 and 4. It is not possible to provide a full answer to the questions in the terms as expressed. The terms "lost teachers" and "gained teachers" imply a high specification of role for teachers of English as a second language.

Many schools which indicated a desire for fewer E.S.L. teachers in 1980 did so because of a number of factors including:

(a) The integration of E.S.L. students and staff into the total school programme;
(b) Fluctuations within such schools of the migrant component of the enrolment;
(c) The increased level of support given to such schools by language centres to service the needs of newly arrived migrants and refugee students.

Because of the introduction of school controlled determination of needs, the complete comparative statistics of the E.S.L. teacher allocations between the years 1979 and 1980 when the changed staffing policies were put into effect are not held.

(Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 7 June 1981 as follows:

1 and 2. It is not possible to provide a full answer to the questions in the terms as expressed.

Many schools which indicated a desire for fewer E.S.L. teachers in 1980 did so because of a number of factors including:

(a) the integration of E.S.L. students and staff into the total school programme;
(b) fluctuations within such schools of the migrant component of the enrolment;
(c) the increased level of support given to such schools by language centres to service the needs of newly arrived migrants and refugee students.

Because of the introduction of school controlled determination of needs, the complete comparative statistics of the E.S.L. teacher allocations between the years 1979 and 1980 when the changed staffing policies were put into effect are not held.

MELBOURNE COLLEGE OF PRINTING AND GRAPHIC ARTS

(Question No. 170)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

In respect of the Melbourne College of Printing and Graphic Arts:

1. What progress has been made by the task force established to advise the State Council for Technical Education on the needs of the college?
2. What action is to be taken in response to this investigation?
3. What is the current enrolment at the college?
4. How many applications for apprenticeship were refused due to inadequate facilities at the college?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 20 July 1981 as follows:

1. The task force has completed a report on the needs for training in the printing trades.
2. The report has been forwarded to the Commonwealth Minister of Industry and Commerce.
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3. The apprentice enrolment at the college as at 27 August 1980 was 1239.

4. The number of apprentices not directed to school as at 8 August 1980 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compositors</th>
<th>Printing Machining</th>
<th>Graphic Reproduction</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Printing and finishing</th>
<th>Screen Printing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Industrial Training Commission has advised me that as at 17 December 1980, 70 metropolitan and 21 country applicants were awaiting placement at the Melbourne College of Printing and Graphic Arts. These were accommodated in 1981.

TEAC FUNDS
(Question No. 173)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Whether he has requested the Commonwealth Minister of Education to allow funds earlier allocated for the Transition Education Advisory Committee programme for 1980 to be in fact spent on approved programmes in 1981, without affecting funds already planned to be spent in 1981; if so, what is the result of such a request; if not, whether he will make such a request?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 11 August 1981 as follows:

Commonwealth Funding—Schools Commission
1978–79 $38,795 million
1979–80 $33,440 million
1980–81 $30,054 million

The Schools Commission gave broad recommendations on expenditure patterns to be applied to funding provided by them for capital works.

Specific components must be spent on the following:
Disadvantaged Schools—7 per cent (approximately).
Special Education—6 per cent (approximately).
Library Resources—8 per cent (approximately).

Details on actual expenditure as provided in the Schools Commission reports which are prepared annually and relate to the over-all provision under each States Grants (Schools Assistance) Act. Each Act relates to one calendar year.

Commonwealth TAFE
1978–79 $18,519 million
1979–80 $18,174 million
1980–81 $26,962 million

Funds provided in this area are provided for specific projects as detailed in the relevant States Grants (Tertiary Education Assistance) Act. All funds were expended as required.

TEACHERS
(Question No. 177)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

1. What was the actual staff ceiling in each of the primary, technical and secondary teaching divisions at 1 March 1981, excluding teachers on leave?

2. What was the staff establishment in each of the primary, technical and secondary teaching divisions at 1 March 1981, excluding teachers on leave?

3. When the Government plans to bring about equality between the staff ceiling and the staff establishment in each of the primary, technical and secondary teaching divisions?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 2 June 1981 as follows:

The terms “staff ceiling” and “staff establishment” are synonymous. Both are used to describe the number of teachers the Education
Department is entitled to have on duty at any stage of the year. The term “on duty establishment” is also used to describe the department’s teaching service entitlement.

In order that the on-duty establishment is maintained through the school year it is necessary, because of the numbers of teachers on leave, to actually employ several thousand teachers over and above the “establishment”. As at 1 March 1981 the on-duty establishments allocated to each teaching division were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Division</th>
<th>Establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>14,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>10,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEMBLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL**

(Question No. 178)

**Mr FORDHAM** (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

When it is expected that a full-time clerical assistant will be made available at Wembley Primary School, particularly bearing in mind the additional clerical work associated with the school’s involvement in the Supplementary Grants Programme, special assistance programmes and school-based policy development?

**Mr LACY** (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 13 August 1981 that ancillary staff are provided for primary schools in accordance with a Public Service Board formula which requires 500 or more students to be enrolled for a full-time appointment to be made. Wembley Primary School does not qualify as the current enrolment is 235.

The department recognizes the need for additional clerical and typing assistance and has submitted requests to Treasury for additional funds to enable the implementation of an improved staffing formula for primary schools. An improvement to the formula was made last year which was of benefit to smaller schools but, unfortunately, it has not been possible to further improve the situation on a general basis.

From discussions that have been held at this stage, I am optimistic that we will obtain an improvement in the teacher formula for next year, but that we are unlikely to obtain improvements both in teacher provision and in ancillary staff in the one year.

**EMERGENCY TEACHERS**

(Question No. 179)

**Mr FORDHAM** (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

In view of the concern expressed by school councils across Victoria at the negative impact on educational programmes of the decision of the Minister to restrict the employment of emergency teachers, whether the Minister will now agree to lift this restriction and to consult with relevant bodies on a more appropriate means of administering the use of emergency teachers?

**Mr LACY** (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 22 July 1981 that a number of school councils have written to the Education Department, or to him, raising questions or expressing concern about one aspect or another of the emergency teacher scheme. They were strongly encouraged to do so by the Victorian Teachers Union, which in a letter to school councils misrepresented both the intention and the actual effect of the revised scheme.

Some of the individual points raised by particular school councils in their letters to the department need to be considered in the light of further experience and this will be done when the operation of the 1981 scheme is fully reviewed towards the end of the year. However, the major point which emerged from this correspondence was the apparent reluctance of school councils to accept any financial or other restrictions on their ability to develop curriculum programmes that they see as ideally desirable.

There can never be a charter for unlimited expenditure in any field of public activity—including education. Resources available for any activity must be governed by the need demonstrated for it, the relative priority allotted in the light of all competing claims, and the willingness of the public and the capacity of Government to pay.

Furthermore, equity demands that in a public education system each school financed out of public funds shall receive its fair share of the total resources available. The corollary is that no school can have access to a greater share of staff or resources simply on demand, or because of a belief that it could do better with more. Staffing policies have been based upon the principle of equity and the same principle must apply to provision for emergency teachers. To advocate or adopt any other approach would be plainly unrealistic.

The basic objective of the emergency teacher scheme is to provide an ad hoc replacement in the unavoidable short-term absence of the normal class-room teacher. The current scheme provides a satisfactory mechanism for achieving this objective subject only to the availability of teachers of the required category in the particular area at the time of the absence of the usual teachers.

Provision for emergency teachers has never been intended to enable unlimited expansion of a school’s curriculum regardless of the resources allocated for it. The liberal staffing establishments already provided in Victorian schools are specifically designed for this purpose, with access within clear rules to emer-
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Emergency teachers to maintain the permanent programme organized within the staffing establishment. Emergency teachers are not intended to provide for additional curriculum initiatives which cannot be serviced from the school's normal authorized staffing establishment.

Unfortunately our experience shows that a small minority of schools has failed to appreciate this fundamental principle. For example, regular camps and excursions are properly regarded in most schools as part of normal curriculum offerings designed to provide for the proper educational development of pupils. It is also generally accepted that normal curriculum offerings are intended to be catered for from the authorized teaching establishment. It is axiomatic that this is what should in fact occur unless the most compelling reason is demonstrated.

Over many years schools provided for camps and excursions either by supplementing teacher resources with voluntary parent participation or by re-organizing classes for those remaining at the school (with larger class sizes on a temporary basis during the currency of the camp or excursion) or by a combination of both. More recently, however, some schools have sought to take the easy way out by simply employing emergency teachers without constraint at the cost of the taxpayer. This undesirable trend cannot continue, and a return to the situation where the school organizes its programme within its resources is essential.

Your suggestion that the scheme is "negative" can readily be answered for it has a number of positive results:

- Under Category "A" it maintains the full right of schools to obtain emergency replacements in the case of sudden and unavoidable absences; there is no qualification or cut-back whatever;
- Schools are for the first time provided (under Category "B") with their own emergency teacher budgets to enable them, as of right and at their own election, to provide for planned teacher absences, or for special activities which would not otherwise be possible;
- The scheme thus, in line with the White Paper, devolves decision making on this issue to schools, enforces accountability and spreads the sharing of limited emergency teacher resources across all schools. It seeks to achieve a degree of equity which was certainly not apparent last year.
- It will contain the runaway increase in demand, which involved a 40 per cent increase in expenditure over the last two years alone. The incidence of that upsurge in demand meant that some schools used the limited resources inordinately, and on virtually a regular basis, whilst others in the same areas, and with genuine emergencies were left with no available teachers to call upon.

Despite the deliberate intention of the Government to check the unconstrained increase which has occurred, it is not true that there has been any cut-back in funds for emergency teachers. On the contrary, funds for the 1981 school year on this item will exceed those for the previous year, just as funds for the financial year just concluded have exceeded those for the preceding fiscal year.

As indicated the operation of the scheme is being closely monitored. The views of interested groups and individuals have been collated for consideration in the light of this process, and will undoubtedly assist in the evaluation of variations which might be considered for the future.

Following is a further copy of the current guidelines, which will of course remain in force pending the review which has been fore-shadowed.

"Emergency Teacher Scheme: 1981"

In response to letters from school councils and other interested groups, the facts related to the provision of emergency teachers in schools are set out below:

1. Any school's curriculum choices and priorities must be contained within budgetary limits. No school dependent on public funding for its operation can ever expect to have unlimited use of those funds.

2. The Education Department has consistently developed a staffing policy which has allowed schools to develop their own curriculum programmes within the total number of teachers provided. Authorizations for the use of emergency teachers have always directly related to the need to provide immediate, ad hoc replacement for absent establishment teachers so that the planned curriculum programme developed within the establishment staffing provided could be maintained. Emergency teachers were never intended to be supplied to schools to extend the curriculum programme beyond what could be encompassed within the permanent staffing members provided and consistent and regular instructions to the above effect have been given to schools through the Education Gazette.

3. The introduction in 1981 of a separate schools fund into emergency teacher provision is a quite definite further step in allowing local schools to decide their own curriculum choices and employment priorities.

4. Regional directors, out of separate and open ended funding, will continue to be approving emergency teacher replacements for all shortfalls within declared establishments, all cases of teacher illness, all short-term teacher leave, for designated in-service courses of value to schools and teachers, and for many other specially approved reasons. The Government remains fully committed to providing emergency teacher replacements in the above circumstances because it accepts that school children are entitled to continuous instruction in the unavoidable absence of their normal class teachers. In addition to the above approvals, the 1981 emergency teacher scheme now allows for schools to be provided with an annual quota of emergency teacher day (set for 1981 at 1.5 per establishment teacher) to use as they prefer, be it for the development
of more extensive camps and excursions programmes, additional in-service release for teachers, or whatever.

5. Budgetary considerations too, cannot be ignored. The emergency teacher bill has risen by almost 40 per cent per annum for each of the last two years with salaries for emergency teachers in 1980 totalling in excess of $1.2 million. With respect to the over-all allocation to the schools fund, the general formula has been worked out on the basis of known expenditure in these areas in 1980 and it has been provisionally estimated that the current formula provision should allow for marginally higher expenditure overall in the areas of camps and excursions, in-service education and associated activities. What formula allocation has really done is to provide for a more equitable distribution of the emergency teacher resource than formerly. Some schools will now have less access to the use of emergency teachers but other schools will benefit from this redistribution.

6. Budgetary considerations aside, the Education Department believes that there are sound educational reasons for containing the use of emergency teachers within reasonable limits. An emergency teacher, employed on an ad hoc basis, can never represent an adequate substitute for the regular class teacher.

7. The revised procedures for 1981 should be seen as the first step in providing greater flexibility to schools in the short-term employment of teaching staff. The scheme will operate in its present form throughout 1981, but is being closely monitored to establish whether further differentiation within the formula provision for different types of schools is warranted. In this general monitoring process inputs from principals, teachers, teacher unions, parent organizations and school councils will be welcomed.

A. J. HUNT, Minister of Education.”

WENDOUREE PRIMARY SCHOOL

(Question No. 180)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

When it is expected that a full-time clerical assistant will be provided at Wendouree Primary School?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answers supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 13 August 1981 that ancillary staff are provided for primary schools in accordance with a Public Service Board formula which requires 500 or more students to be enrolled for a full-time appointment to be made. Wendouree Primary School does not qualify as the current enrolment is 396.

The department recognises the need for additional clerical and typing assistance and has submitted requests to the Treasury for additional funds to enable the implementation of an improved staffing formula for primary schools. An improvement to the formula was made last year which was of benefit to smaller schools but, unfortunately, it has not been possible to further improve the situation on a general basis.

From discussions that have been held at this stage, I am optimistic that we will obtain an improvement in the teacher formula for next year, but that we are unlikely to obtain improvements both in teacher provision and in ancillary staff in the one year.

STRATFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL

(Question No. 181)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Why the services of a part-time special assistance teacher were withdrawn from Stratford Primary School?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 16 June 1981 that primary schools are staffed on the basis of the net enrolment, with additional staff being allocated where warranted to meet special needs. Currently there are approximately 1400 “special needs” teachers allocated to 700 schools. The “special needs” allocations to individual schools are determined in accordance with an agreed formula, on the basis of statistical information provided by the principals. These allocations are not finalised until the circumstances of each school receive scrutiny by the staffing officer and the district inspector.

The criteria contained in the formula by which “special needs” teachers are allocated to schools were determined to ensure complete equity as between all schools, after consultation with parent and teacher organizations and persons involved with migrant education and the supplementary grants programme for disadvantaged schools. The formula was accepted by all parties as providing the fairest possible basis for allocation of staff on the basis of objective criteria.

On the basis of the approved criteria, Stratford Primary School’s standing with respect to all other primary schools was such that the retention of a 0.5 “special needs” teacher was not warranted in 1981, and could not be granted without depriving another school, whose entitlement according to the formula was greater.
SCHOOLS COMPUTER CENTRE
(Question No. 184)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

In relation to the Schools Computer Centre located at Ardoch Education Village:

1. When the centre was established?

2. What equipment was provided and at what cost?

3. How many teachers and other staff were based at the centre?

4. Why the centre was closed and what alternative services have been provided to meet the needs of schools?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 22 June 1981 as follows:

1. The Ardoch Education Village Computer Centre was established as an operating unit as from the commencement of Term 2, 1980.

2. The following equipment was provided at the time of commencement of operations:

   1 x Webster Spectrum 11 Computer with—
      2 VDU’s
      1 hard-copy terminal
      1 cardreader
      1 printer
      Cost $25000

   1 x Apple 11 Microprocessor with—
      Dual Disc drives
      Printer
      Monitor
      Cost $5500

3. Staff based at the centre at the time of establishment:

   One teacher seconded full-time.

4. Centre was unstaffed from 1 January 1981 to 27 April 1981.

   Alternative services provided were:

   (a) During the period when the centre was unstaffed a consultant in computer education was appointed to the central metropolitan region on the basis of a 0.4 time fraction secondment.

   (b) Since 27 April 1981 the secondment of the teacher referred to in (a) above was increased to 0.8 time fraction, and teacher’s duties became those of a manager of the centre. In addition a full-time teacher secondment was made to establish a software clearing house which also operates from the Ardoch Education Village Computer Centre.

HIGHER SCHOOL CERTIFICATE BY CORRESPONDENCE
(Question No. 185)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

Which metropolitan high schools over each of the past five years have had higher school certificate students undertaking their studies by correspondence, indicating in each case the subject involved?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The required information was sent by the Minister of Education to the honourable member in a letter dated 16 June 1981 as shown in the following tabulation:

Metropolitan High Schools—With H.S.C. Students enrolled at the Correspondence School from 1975–81 with subjects involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Park High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polish (2); French (1)</td>
<td>Pure Maths (1); Applied Maths (1)</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Music (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altona High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Italian (2)</td>
<td>English Literature (6); Italian (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>Economics (1); Eighteenth Century History (1); Italian (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altona North High School</td>
<td>German (3); French (1); European History (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>General Maths (3); Art (3); German (2); European History (1)</td>
<td>Art (2)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Art (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashwood Heights High School</td>
<td>Art (5); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); German (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale Heights High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The required information was sent by the Minister of Education to the honourable member in a letter dated 16 June 1981 as shown in the following tabulation:

Metropolitan High Schools—With H.S.C. Students enrolled at the Correspondence School from 1975–81 with subjects involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Park High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polish (2); French (1)</td>
<td>Pure Maths (1); Applied Maths (1)</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Music (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altona High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Italian (2)</td>
<td>English Literature (6); Italian (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>Economics (1); Eighteenth Century History (1); Italian (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altona North High School</td>
<td>German (3); French (1); European History (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>General Maths (3); Art (3); German (2); European History (1)</td>
<td>Art (2)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Art (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashwood Heights High School</td>
<td>Art (5); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); German (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale Heights High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Ardoch High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Ardoch High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Ardoch High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Ardoch High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Ardoch High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Ardoch High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Ardoch High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Balwyn High School</td>
<td>French (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Balwyn High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Balwyn High School</td>
<td>German (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Balwyn High School</td>
<td>German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Balwyn High School</td>
<td>German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Balwyn High School</td>
<td>French (3); Art (3); Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Balwyn High School</td>
<td>Home Economics (4); Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Banyule High School</td>
<td>German (3); General Maths (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Banyule High School</td>
<td>English (2); English Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Banyule High School</td>
<td>Economics (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Banyule High School</td>
<td>English Literature (1); French  (3); German (2); Economics (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Banyule High School</td>
<td>French (1); German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Banyule High School</td>
<td>French (3); Italian (1); Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Banyule High School</td>
<td>Economics (2); Music (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Bayswater High School</td>
<td>German (1); General Maths (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Bayswater High School</td>
<td>French (2); Politics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Bayswater High School</td>
<td>German (2); General Maths (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Bayswater High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Bayswater High School</td>
<td>German (2); Commercial and Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Bayswater High School</td>
<td>Studies (1); Australian History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Bayswater High School</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Beaumaris High School</td>
<td>Geography (2); French (2);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Beaumaris High School</td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Beaumaris High School</td>
<td>German (4); General Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Beaumaris High School</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Beaumaris High School</td>
<td>German (3); Indonesian (2);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Beaumaris High School</td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Beaumaris High School</td>
<td>Indonesian (1); Commercial and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Bentleigh High School</td>
<td>German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Bentleigh High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Bentleigh High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Bentleigh High School</td>
<td>Politics (3); French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Bentleigh High School</td>
<td>Music (4); Art (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Bentleigh High School</td>
<td>German (3); Politics (5);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Bentleigh High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Blackburn High School</td>
<td>French (1); German (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Blackburn High School</td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Blackburn High School</td>
<td>English Literature (2);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Blackburn High School</td>
<td>Accounting (1); French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Blackburn High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Blackburn High School</td>
<td>Geography (1); French (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Blackburn High School</td>
<td>Australian History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Blackburn South High School</td>
<td>Home Economics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Blackburn South High School</td>
<td>Geography (1); French (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Bonbeach High School</td>
<td>French (5); German (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Bonbeach High School</td>
<td>Music (1); German (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Bonbeach High School</td>
<td>French (2); Australian History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Bonbeach High School</td>
<td>(1); General Maths (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Bonbeach High School</td>
<td>German (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Bonbeach High School</td>
<td>Art (2); French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Bonbeach High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Box Hill High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Box Hill High School</td>
<td>German (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Box Hill High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Box Hill High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Box Hill High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Box Hill High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Box Hill High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Braybrook High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Braybrook High School</td>
<td>Chemistry (1); French (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Braybrook High School</td>
<td>General Maths (1); Physics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Braybrook High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Braybrook High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Braybrook High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Braybrook High School</td>
<td>Home Economics (1); Art (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Brentwood High School</td>
<td>French (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Brentwood High School</td>
<td>Indonesian (2); German (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>European History (1); Australian History (1); Eighteenth Century History (1); German (3); English Literature (2)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>German (3); English Literature (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Art (6)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>German (1); English Literature (1)</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Politics (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Art (1); Economics (1); German (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Music (1)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>English Literature (1); Australian History (1); German (3)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>English Literature (1); Australian History (1); German (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Economics (3); Geography (2)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Applied Maths (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Applied Maths (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Politics (2); French (3); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>French (1); Art (1)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Italian (1); Art (4); English Literature (1); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (4);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>German (1);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); French (1); Geography (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleeland High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting (4); French (4); Chemistry (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburg High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music (3); French (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carwatha High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood Education Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coomoora High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music (4); Australian History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandenong High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doveton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ASSEMBLY]
Questions on Notice

Doncaster East High School

1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Nil
1980 Nil
1981 German (3); French (2); Indonesian (3)

Eltham High School

1975 German (1)
1976 Music (2)
1977 Music (1)
1978 German (1); General Maths (3)
1979 Nil
1980 German (1)
1981 Nil

Elwood High School

1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 German (6); French (3)
1978 German (3)
1979 German (4); French (3); Indonesian (2)
1980 German (3); Art (2); Accounting (1); Italian (1); Indonesian (3)
1981 Indonesian (2); German (3); French (1)

Essendon High School

1975 Geography (1); German (4); French (3)
1976 German (5); French (1); Geography (1); Australian History (1)
1977 French (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)
1978 Italian (3); German (1); Music (5)
1979 Art (1)
1980 French (1); Italian (1)
1981 French (1); Italian (1)

Exhibition High School

1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Geography (1); English Literature (2); Economics (1); Greek (3); Art (3)
1980 Italian (1)
1981 Politics (1); General Maths (1)

Fawkner High School

1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 French (2); German (3)
1980 Italian (4)
1981 Art (1); German (1)

Ferntree Gully High School

1975 German (3); Economics (1); Geography (2); Art (1); Politics (2)
1976 Pure Mathematics (4); Applied Mathematics (4); Accounting (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (2); Economics (2); European History (2)
1977 French (2); Economics (2); German (1); European History (1)
1978 Accounting (2); Economics (3); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); General Maths (7)
1979 Economics (3); Eighteenth Century History (1); Politics (2); Commercial and Legal Studies (5); Pure Maths (1); Applied Maths (1)
1980 Nil
1981 Music (3); German (1)

Fitzroy High School

1975 Eighteenth Century History (4); Accounting (2); French (4); Geography (1); English Literature (1)
1976 French (2); Art (5)
1977 French (2)
1978 Art (3); Economics (1); French (2)
1979 Nil
1980 Italian (1); Greek (2)
1981 Greek (3); Italian (1)

Flemington High School

1975 French (1); European History (1)
1976 Politics (2); French (1)
1977 Indonesian (1); European History (1)
1978 General Maths (2)
1979 Commercial and Legal Studies (3); Australian History (2)
1980 Politics (2)
1981 Politics (3); Home Economics (3)

Fairhills High School

1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 German (1); European History (1); Art (1); Music (1); General Maths (1)
1979 German (2); Art (1)
1980 Nil
1981 English Literature (1); Indonesian (2); Politics (1)

Footscray High School

1975 French (2)
1976 German (2)
1977 General Maths (1); European History (1)
1978 Art (3); French (1)
1979 Accounting (1); Greek (1)
1980 French (2); Greek (3)
1981 Italian (4); English Literature (4)

Footscray Girls' High School

1975 Geography (1); Accounting (3)
1976 General Maths (4)
1977 Nil
1978 Accounting (1)
1979 French (1); Italian (1); Economics (1); Accounting (3)
1980 Art (5); French (4); Applied Maths (2)
1981 Italian (2); Art (3)

Frankston High School

1975 Nil
1976 German (1)
1977 Indonesian (3); German (1); French (3)
1978 Music (1); German (3); French (4); Italian (1)
1979 French (2); German (1); Indonesian (3); Music (1); Greek (1)
1980 German (2); French (2); Indonesian (1)
1981 Art (4); French (2); Politics (1)
Questions on Notice

Glenroy High School
1975 Eighteenth Century History (1)
1976 Art (4); European History (3); Economics (1)
1977 Art (2)
1978 Italian (2)
1979 Art (3)
1980 Nil
1981 French (1)

Glen Waverley High School
1975 Art (5); German (3); Pure Maths (1)
1976 German (2); Indonesian (2)
1977 German (4); Music (3)
1978 English Literature (1); German (1); French (2)
1980 Politics (3)
1981 English (1); German (2)

Greenwood High School
1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Economics (1)
1978 Italian (1)
1979 Eighteenth Century History (1); Politics (4); Art (1)
1980 French (1); Italian (1); Economics (1); Greek (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (2)
1981 Geography (2); Politics (1)

Gladstone Park High School
1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Commercial and Legal Studies (1)
1980 French (3); Art (6)
1981 Nil

Greythorn High School
1975 Eighteenth Century History (1); French (7); German (1); Art (1)
1976 Nil
1977 Accounting (4); European History (2); Politics (1); Economics (1); Pure Maths (1)
1978 French (2); Accounting (3)
1979 German (1); Australian History (1); Italian (1)
1980 Art (3); European History (3); French (3); Italian (1); Geography (1); German (1); Politics (1)
1981 Politics (4)

Hadfield High School
1975 French (1)
1976 Art (2); French (1)
1977 Nil
1978 Italian (1); Australian History (5)
1979 Italian (1); French (1)
1980 Nil
1981 Pure Maths (1); Applied Maths (1)

Hampton High School
1975 Australian History (1); Eighteenth Century History (1); French (1)
1976 Australian History (3); European History (2); Politics (2); German (1)
1977 Politics (1); Chemistry (1); Accounting (2); French (4); Geography (1)
1978 French (1); German (1); Politics (1); Art (2); Australian History (2); Commercial and Legal Studies (2)
1979 Commercial and Legal Studies (6); Australian History (2); Economics (1); Geography (3); Accounting (1); Politics (5); French (1); Music (1)
1980 Music (1); English Literature (1); Art (3); Commercial and Legal Studies (1)
1981 Italian (1); European History (1)

Heatherhill High School
1975 German (2)
1976 Nil
1977 Indonesian (3); French (3); German (2)
1978 French (4); German (3); Indonesian (1)
1979 French (4); Art (3); Indonesian (1)
1980 German (1)
1981 European History (1); Indonesian (1); Geography (1)

Heidelberg High School
1975 French (1); Accounting (1)
1976 French (1); Music (1)
1977 Nil
1978 Accounting (2)
1979 Nil
1980 Nil
1981 Home Economics (3)

Highett High School
1975 Economics (1); Politics (1)
1976 French (1); German (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Accounting (1)
1977 Commercial and Legal Studies (3); Australian History (1); French (2)
1978 Commercial and Legal Studies (3); Accounting (3); Indonesian (1); General Maths (1)
1979 French (2); Music (1)
1980 Geography (1); Economics (4); French (1)
1981 Nil

Huntingdale High School
1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 French (1)
1979 French (4)
1980 General Maths (2)
1981 French (1)

Hurstbridge High School
1975 French (1)
1976 Nil
1977 Music (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1)
1978 Accounting (1); French (1); German (1)
1979 Music (1); Accounting (3)
1980 Nil
1981 Accounting (4); Music (1)

John Gardiner High School
1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Art (1)
1980 Music (1)
1981 French (1); English Literature (2); Indonesian (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karingal High School</td>
<td>French (2)</td>
<td>Indonesian (1); French (1); Biology (1)</td>
<td>European History (1); French (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>Geography (4); German (1); Politics (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>Music (1); Indonesian (2)</td>
<td>Biology (1); Accounting (2); English Literature (3); Geography (1); Indonesian (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kealba High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>German (2); French (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (2); Economics (1)</td>
<td>Accounting (4); French (2); Art (5); Music (1)</td>
<td>German (1); Eighteenth Century History (3)</td>
<td>German (2); French (1)</td>
<td>German (1); Greek (1); French (1); Geography (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (3)</td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilor Heights High School</td>
<td>German (2); French (6); Biology (1); European History (1)</td>
<td>Geography (5); Biology (1); German (2); European History (1); General Maths (2)</td>
<td>Geography (4)</td>
<td>German (4); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Italian (1); Geography (1)</td>
<td>German (1); Italian (1); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>Home Economics (1); Economics (2)</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew High School</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1); European History (1)</td>
<td>German (2); Indonesian (5); Economics (3)</td>
<td>French (2); German (1); General Maths (1); English Literature (1)</td>
<td>German (1); Greek (1); Geography (1)</td>
<td>Accounting (1)</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koonung High School</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndale High School</td>
<td>Geography (1); German (1); Economics (1); Art (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside High School</td>
<td>French (4)</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>German (1); Italian 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavarot High School</td>
<td>Accounting (4); Economics (3); Politics (1); Chemistry (2); European History (1); Art (1); Geography (9)</td>
<td>Accounting (5); Art (1); Pure Maths (1); General Maths (1); European History (1)</td>
<td>European History (1); Accounting (1); Politics (1)</td>
<td>Art (4)</td>
<td>Art (2); English Literature (1)</td>
<td>Australian History (1); Music (1); Applied Maths (1)</td>
<td>General Maths (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilydale High School</td>
<td>General Maths (6); Geography (2); Accounting (2); French (2)</td>
<td>French (3); European History (2); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndale High School</td>
<td>Geography (1); German (1); Economics (1); Art (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinnon High School</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lalor High School**

| 1975 | Art (1) |
| 1976 | Nil |
| 1977 | German (1); French (4) |
| 1978 | French (1) |
| 1979 | English (1); Greek (1) |
| 1980 | Nil |
| 1981 | Art (1) |

**La Trobe High School**

| 1975 | Geography (1) |
| 1976 | Art (1); Eighteenth Century History (1) |
| 1977 | Physics (3); Accounting (1) |
| 1978 | Geography (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Accounting (2); General Maths (2) |
| 1979 | Nil |
| 1980 | Nil |
| 1981 | Nil |

**Laverton High School**

| 1975 | Accounting (4); Economics (3); Politics (1); Chemistry (2); European History (1); Art (1); Geography (9) |
| 1976 | Accounting (5); Art (1); Pure Maths (1); General Maths (1); European History (1) |
| 1977 | European History (1); Accounting (1); Politics (1) |
| 1978 | Art (4) |
| 1979 | Art (2); English Literature (1) |
| 1980 | Australian History (1); Music (1); Applied Maths (1) |
| 1981 | General Maths (1) |

**Lilydale High School**

| 1975 | General Maths (6); Geography (2); Accounting (2); French (2) |
| 1976 | French (3); European History (2); General Maths (1) |
| 1977 | Art (4); French (3); European History (4); German (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); General Maths (2) |
| 1978 | German (2); Politics (1); Italian (1) |
| 1979 | Literature (2); Australian History (1) |
| 1980 | Music (1); Economics (1); Italian (1) |
| 1981 | Commercial and Legal Studies (1); English Literature (1); Accounting (1); Italian (1); Home Economics (1); Eighteenth Century History (1) |

**Lynsdale High School**

| 1975 | Geography (1); German (1); Economics (1); Art (1); Eighteenth Century History (1) |
| 1976 | German (3) |
| 1977 | Accounting (1) |
| 1978 | English Literature (1); Italian (1) |
| 1979 | Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Politics (1) |
| 1980 | Geography (2) |
| 1981 | Indonesian (2); French (1) |

**McKinnon High School**

| 1975 | French (4) |
| 1976 | French (4); German (2); Indonesian (1) |
| 1977 | Indonesian (1) |
| 1978 | Nil |
| 1979 | Nil |
| 1980 | Nil |
| 1981 | Nil |
Questions on Notice

Macleod High School
1975 Australian History (4); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); English Literature (1); Politics (1); French (3); German (5)
1976 French (2); Biology (1)
1977 German (1)
1978 English Literature (2)
1979 Nil
1980 Nil
1981 French (3); German (1)

MacRobertson Girls' High School
1975 Nil
1976 German (1)
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Nil
1980 Nil
1981 Nil

Malvern Girls' High School
1975 Geography (2); Accounting (2)
1976 Art (1); Accounting (1); Eighteenth Century History (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); General Maths (1)
1977 Economics (1)
1978 General Maths (1); German (1)
1979 Nil
1980 French (1); German (1)
1981 French (1); German (1); Italian (1)

Maribyrnong High School
1975 French (1)
1976 French (3); Art (4); German (2)
1977 French (3)
1978 Art (2); French (1); Australian History (1)
1979 Art (2)
1980 Geography (1); German (2); French (1)
1981 Nil

Maroondah High School
1975 Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Economics (2); Accounting (1); General Maths (1)
1976 Nil
1977 English Literature (1); German (1)
1978 Art (1)
1979 Indonesian (1); French (1)
1980 Nil
1981 Greek (1); German (2)

Melbourne High School
1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 German (5); Art (1); Indonesian (1)
1978 Nil
1979 Music (1)
1980 Nil
1981 German (4); Music (4)

Mentone Girls' High School
1975 Accounting (2); Applied Maths (1); Australian History (1); German (1)
1976 Accounting (3)
1977 Accounting (1); German (1); General Maths (1)
1978 European History (1); English Literature (1); Politics (1)
1979 German (3); Commercial and Legal Studies (1)

Monash High School
1975 French (5)
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 French (1); Music (1); German (1); Italian (2)
1979 German (4); French (1)
1980 Nil
1981 Politics (5); Music (1)

Monbulk High School
1975 French (2); German (2)
1976 General Maths (1)
1977 Accounting (1)
1978 Accounting (6); Italian (1); English Literature (1)
1979 Economics (2); Politics (1); Music (1)
1980 Accounting (3); Economics (2); Australian History (2); Geography (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)
1981 German (3); Economics (2); Geography (4); Politics (2); Indonesian (1)

Monterey High School
1975 Australian History (2); Commercial and Legal Studies (2)
1976 Nil
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montmorency High School</td>
<td>1975 French (2); Politics (2); Accounting (3); German (5); General Maths (5)</td>
<td>1976 European History (1); French (2); German (4); Accounting (3)</td>
<td>1977 Politics (1); German (1); Music (2)</td>
<td>1978 Music (1)</td>
<td>1979 Music (1); French (2); Italian (1)</td>
<td>1980 French (1); Home Economics (2); Music (1); Biology (1)</td>
<td>1981 French (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin High School</td>
<td>1975 Eighteenth Century History (9)</td>
<td>1976 German (2)</td>
<td>1977 French (4)</td>
<td>1978 German (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>1979 Accounting (4); Greek (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); German (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>1980 Nil</td>
<td>1981 French (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorleigh High School</td>
<td>1975 European History (2); French (1)</td>
<td>1976 French (1); European History (2); Art (1); Politics (1); Accounting (1)</td>
<td>1977 Geography (2)</td>
<td>1978 German (1)</td>
<td>1979 Nil</td>
<td>1980 French (3); European History (1)</td>
<td>1981 General Maths (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordialloc-Chelsea High School</td>
<td>1975 Accounting (1); European History (1); German (1); Economics (2)</td>
<td>1976 French (2); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>1977 Nil</td>
<td>1978 Nil</td>
<td>1979 Nil</td>
<td>1980 Nil</td>
<td>1981 French (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland High School</td>
<td>1975 Nil</td>
<td>1976 Accounting (2); French (1)</td>
<td>1977 General Maths (1); French (2)</td>
<td>1978 Nil</td>
<td>1979 Politics (4)</td>
<td>1980 Nil</td>
<td>1981 Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington High School</td>
<td>1975 General Maths (1); European History (1)</td>
<td>1976 Nil</td>
<td>1977 Music (2); Economics (2)</td>
<td>1978 Nil</td>
<td>1979 Nil</td>
<td>1980 Music (1); German (1)</td>
<td>1981 French (1); Music 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Waverley High School</td>
<td>1975 Politics (2); Commercial and Legal Studies (2); French (1)</td>
<td>1976 European History (1); Geography (2)</td>
<td>1977 Nil</td>
<td>1978 Art (4); German (1); French (3)</td>
<td>1979 German (1); French (1)</td>
<td>1980 Art (5); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); German (2); French (1)</td>
<td>1981 French (3); German (3); English Literature (1); Art (5); Australian History (1); Indonesian (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrumbeena High School</td>
<td>1975 Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Accounting (1); French (4); Eighteenth Century History (4)</td>
<td>1976 Politics (1); Geography (1); Indonesian (1)</td>
<td>1977 French (1)</td>
<td>1978 French (3); Applied Maths (1); Music (1)</td>
<td>1979 Music (1); French (1)</td>
<td>1980 Geography (2); Accounting (1); French (3)</td>
<td>1981 Greek (1); French (3); European History (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlands High School</td>
<td>1975 French (2)</td>
<td>1976 Chemistry (1)</td>
<td>1977 French (1)</td>
<td>1978 Nil</td>
<td>1979 Nil</td>
<td>1980 Italian (2)</td>
<td>1981 Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niddrie High School</td>
<td>1975 Nil</td>
<td>1976 Nil</td>
<td>1977 Nil</td>
<td>1978 English Literature (1)</td>
<td>1979 French (2)</td>
<td>1980 Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Australian History (3); Economics (1); French (1); General Maths (2)</td>
<td>1981 Politics (3); French (1); General Maths (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble Park High School</td>
<td>1975 French (3)</td>
<td>1976 French (2)</td>
<td>1977 French (2)</td>
<td>1978 French (1); Italian (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Northcote High School</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>German (4); Greek (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>German (2); French (1); Music (1); Greek (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>German (2); French (1); Music (1); Greek (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northcote High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (12); Biology (3); General Maths (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Norwood High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography (1); Politics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>English Literature (3); Politics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian (2); German (1); Politics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Nunawading High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Oakleigh High School</td>
<td>Politics (1); French (5); General Maths (3); European History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Politics (2); French (1); Geography (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (1); German (1); Art (2); European History (1); Economics (1); Geography (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting (2); Art (1); General Maths (1); French (1); German (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting (1); French (2); Australian History (1); Geography (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (2); Geography (4); German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian History (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Italian (1); Art (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Oak Park High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (1); Accounting (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting (1); German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian (2); German (1); French (1); European History (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (2); Italian (1); Art (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian (5); German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Paisley High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>German (1); Italian (2); French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (2); Greek (1); German (1); Eighteenth Century History (1); General Maths (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Pakenham High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Parkdale High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (3); Italian (1); Geography (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics (2); Art (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Pascoe Vale Girls' High School</td>
<td>Accounting (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>German (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Pembroke High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (4); Geography (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (3); Economics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (2); Art (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (3); German (1); Accounting (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>German (4); Accounting (4); Economics (1); French (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian (2); French (4); Pure Maths (2); Applied Maths (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Prahran High School</td>
<td>Art (7); German (2); Geography (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (4); Art (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Preston East High School</td>
<td>Art (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>English Literature (2); Art (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Maths (2); Applied Maths (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting (2); European History (2); Applied Maths (1); Pure Maths (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (4); Italian (1); Greek (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (4); Economics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Preston Girls' High School</td>
<td>Art (2); Accounting (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics (2); Politics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>French (3); Geography (3); Accounting (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (2); French (4); Geography (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>Politics (1); Art (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (3); Music (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art (4); Italian (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions on Notice

Princes Hill High School
1975 Biology (2); Economics (2); Australian History (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)
1976 Politics (2)
1977 Accounting (2); Commercial and Legal Studies (2); Politics (1); European History (2); Australian History (2)
1978 English Literature (2); Music (1); European History (1); Accounting (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Australian History (2)
1979 Australian History (1)
1980 English Literature (1); French (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)
1981 Accounting (1); Home Economics (4)

Reservoir High School
1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Nil
1980 French (2); German (2); Italian (1)
1981 Italian (1)

Richmond High School
1975 Nil
1976 French (3); German (1)
1977 French (3); European History (3); German (2)
1978 Italian (2); French (1)
1979 French (1); Italian (3)
1980 Music (1); Italian (1); French (1); Economics (2)
1981 French (2); Greek (2); Accounting (3); Economics (2)

Ringwood High School
1975 Commercial and Legal Studies (2); Politics (1)
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Italian (1); General Maths (1)
1980 Nil
1981 French (1); German (1)

Rosanna East High School
1975 Nil
1976 German (1)
1977 German (3); Geography (1); Economics (4)
1978 Art (4); Geography (1); French (1); Australian History (1)
1979 Art (2); French (2); Greek (1); German (2); General Maths (1); Geography (1)
1980 German (3); Art (3); French (2); Accounting (1)
1981 Art (1); German (1); French (1)

Roseland High School
1975 Politics (3); Australian History (1); German (2)
1976 Chemistry (1); Politics (3); French (1)
1977 Politics (3); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); French (1); Art (1)
1978 English Literature (1); French (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)
1979 Art (1)
1980 Australian History (3); Art (1); Music (1); French (6)
1981 French (1); Art (1)

St. Albans High School
1975 French (2)
1976 French (1)
1977 Nil
1978 French (1)
1979 Nil
1980 Greek (1); German (2)
1981 Accounting (6); German (7); French (3); Italian (2)

Scoresby High School
1975 Nil
1976 Nil
1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 Nil
1980 Politics (1); German (2)
1981 English Literature (5); Accounting (1); German (3)

Seaford-Carrum High School
1975 Geography (2); Art (1)
1976 Geography (1); General Maths (3)
1977 German (2); French (2); Applied Maths (1); Pure Maths (1)
1978 German (1); English Literature (1); Economics (1)
1979 Accounting (1)
1980 Nil
1981 Home Economics (3); French (3); German (1); Accounting (2); General Maths (1)

Springvale High School
1975 French (1)
1976 French (5)
1977 Music (1)
1978 Nil
1979 European History (1)
1980 Nil
1981 French (2)

Strathmore High School
1975 French (1); Australian History (1); General Maths (1)
1976 Art (2); German (1)
1977 Music (1)
1978 French (4)
1979 French (4)
1980 French (1); Music (1)
1981 Nil

Sunbury High School
1975 Commercial and Legal Studies (6); Applied Maths (1); Chemistry (2); French (2); German (1); Australian History (1)
1976 French (1); German (1)
1977 Accounting (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1)
1978 French (4); Accounting (1); Politics (2); Pure Maths (1); Applied Maths (1)
1979 Geography (1); German (2)
1980 Art (4)
1981 French (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine High School</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>French (2)</td>
<td>Art (1);</td>
<td>English Literature (1); Geography (1); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>Politics (2); Economics (1); Biology (1)</td>
<td>Economics (2); Politics (2); Art (1); Italian (2); Greek (1); French (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine West High School</td>
<td>French (3); German (5)</td>
<td>French (1); German (1); Art (5)</td>
<td>Art (3); German (1)</td>
<td>Indonesian (5); German (3); French (2)</td>
<td>German (2); Indonesian (1); French (1); English Literature (3); Music (1)</td>
<td>French (3); Music (2)</td>
<td>French (5); Indonesian (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndal High School</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (1); German (1)</td>
<td>French (1); Music (3); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>French (3)</td>
<td>Indonesian (5); German (3); French (2)</td>
<td>German (2); Indonesian (1); French (1); English Literature (2)</td>
<td>French (3); Music (2)</td>
<td>French (5); Indonesian (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templestowe High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>French (3)</td>
<td>German (3); French (3); Italian (2)</td>
<td>German (2); French (3)</td>
<td>German (4); French (3)</td>
<td>German (3); French (1); Italian (3); Home Economics (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomastown High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>French (1); Accounting (1); Eighteenth Century History (1)</td>
<td>French (2); Accounting (2); Politics (2)</td>
<td>Italian (1); Politics (1); Accounting (1); French (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Geography (1); General Maths (2); European History (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century History (2); Greek (1); French (1); Italian (2); General Maths (1)</td>
<td>Italian (2); Commercial and Legal Studies (1); Art (1)</td>
<td>German (1); Italian (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornbury High School</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td>French (2)</td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (1)</td>
<td>French (2); Geography (4)</td>
<td>French (1); Geography (1)</td>
<td>European History (4)</td>
<td>Accounting (1); Italian (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University High School</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>German (3)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upfield High School</td>
<td>Accounting (4); German (1)</td>
<td>French (2); Politics (1)</td>
<td>General Maths (4)</td>
<td>Accounting (4); Art (2); Music (1)</td>
<td>Biology (1); Italian (1); Geography (1); Politics (1)</td>
<td>Art (3)</td>
<td>Greek (1); Art (3); French (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upwey High School</td>
<td>European History (1)</td>
<td>Politics (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>German (3)</td>
<td>French (1); Accounting (5); European History (2)</td>
<td>German (2); European History (2); Accounting (5)</td>
<td>Accounting (6); German (3); French (2)</td>
<td>English Literature (2); French (2); Italian (1); German (1); Geography (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont High School</td>
<td>German (1); Geography (1); English Literature (1); Art (1); Economics (1)</td>
<td>German (2); Music (4); Economics (1)</td>
<td>Economics (1)</td>
<td>Music (2); French (2)</td>
<td>Music (2); German (2); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>French (2); German (1)</td>
<td>German (1); English Literature (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonia High School</td>
<td>Accounting (3); German (3); French (8)</td>
<td>European History (1); German (1)</td>
<td>Art (1)</td>
<td>German (1); Australian History (1)</td>
<td>Accounting (1)</td>
<td>French (1)</td>
<td>German (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattle Park High School</td>
<td>Accounting (1)</td>
<td>French (2); Commercial and Legal Studies (3); Music (1)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Art (4)</td>
<td>Music (1); Accounting (2); French (3); German (1)</td>
<td>Commercial and Legal Studies (5); English Literature (2)</td>
<td>English Literature (2); Accounting (2); Art (2); French (4); Music (1); Commercial and Legal Studies (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley High School</td>
<td>Australian History (1); Politics (3); European History (6); Eighteenth Century History (2); French (1); Geography (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW PHYSICAL EDUCATION POLICY

(Question No. 187)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

What progress has been made in the implementation of the new physical education policy announced by the then Assistant Minister of Education on 20 January 1981?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

On 22 June 1981 the Hon. A. J. Hunt, the then Acting Minister of Educational Services, advised the honourable member by letter as follows:

"In February 1981 the Minister of Educational Services established a departmental implementation committee. This committee meets regularly and is using the various resources of the department in order to establish the most feasible processes and programmes of implementation. Substantial progress has been made in respect to all aspects of the policy. It is the intention of the Minister of Educational Services to present a statement of progress in the near future."

HAMILTON HIGH SCHOOL

(Question No. 189)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

In relation to Hamilton High School:

1. When it is expected that the long overdue renovations will be undertaken on the original 1921 building?

2. When it is expected that the eight bristol units provided to the school in 1946 as temporary accommodation will be replaced with permanent buildings?

3. What is the reason for the delay in undertaking these essential works?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 1 September 1981 as follows:

1. Cyclic maintenance to the main building is to be considered in the light of the 1981-82 Works and Services Budget. No commitments can be made at present.
2. No commitment can be made on replacement of the Bristol units. However as an interim measure a contract has been let for re-roofing the units.

3. No regional priorities have been set for this work.

**MONBULK HIGH SCHOOL**

(Question No. 190)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

In relation to Monbulk High School:

1. Why there has been a reduction of special needs staff from 2·6 in 1980 to 1·7 in 1981?

2. Why has there been a reduction in instrumental music teaching staff from 0·6 in 1980 to 0·4 in 1981?

3. When it is expected that long overdue building conversion works will be undertaken in respect of staff, literary and home economics facilities?

4. When it is expected that the requested new music upgrade will be undertaken and an art relocatable classroom provided?

5. Why despite an increasing enrolment, there has been a reduction in the school's equipment and furniture budget from $74,800 in 1979 to $53,300 in 1981?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 4 August 1981 as follows:

1. The number of special needs staff for any one school is not fixed and permanent regardless of changing circumstances: It is subject to revision according to the relativities revealed on the schools priorities index and the survey of migrant English needs. The allocation of special needs staff to Monbulk High School for 1981 has been correctly set in relation to the relative needs of schools across the State, and reflects small changes in those relativities.

2. In an instrumental music survey of December 1980 there was a reduction in the number of pupils undertaking instrumental music. This led to a time reduction in the instrumental music teaching staff from 0·6 in 1980 to 0·4 in 1981.

3 and 4. Building conversion works for staff, library, home economics, and music have been given a priority by the Eastern Metropolitan Regional Building Priority Committee. The ability to carry out the works in the near future is dependent on the availability of capital funds under Loan Council authorization and budget allocations within it.

5. Because of Loan Council constraints imposed over the protests of the Victorian Government capital funds available for public works in Victoria have been reduced in real terms. Heavy priority has necessarily been given to the provision of new pupil places where these are required. These factors have reduced funds available for capital expenditure in other areas such as equipment and furniture. The school has received its fair share of the funds in fact available.

**SYNDAL PRIMARY SCHOOL**

(Question No. 191)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

What was the basis of the decision to withdraw the services of a clerical assistant from Syndal Primary School and in view of the obvious need for continuing clerical assistance at the school, whether the Minister is prepared to reconsider his decision?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 4 August 1981 that the enrolment at Syndal Primary School fell to below 200. The Treasury funds are provided only for schools with enrolments of 200 or more. The position cannot therefore be restored unless the enrolment rises to 200 or more.

The department recognizes the need for additional clerical and typing assistance and has submitted requests to the Treasury for additional funds to enable the implementation of an improved staffing formula for primary schools. An improvement to the formula was made last year which was of benefit to smaller schools but, unfortunately, it has not been possible to further improve the situation on a general basis.

From discussions that have been held at this stage, I am optimistic that we will obtain an improvement to the teacher formula for next year, but believe that we are unlikely to obtain improvements both in teacher provision and in ancillary staff in the one year.

**TRADE TEACHERS**

(Question No. 192)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

What was the basis of the decision requiring trade teachers in technical schools and colleges to undertake academic, rather than trade studies, for the upgrading of their qualifications for promotion purposes?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 22 June 1981 that trade teachers who are on a 5-12 salary range and who wish to proceed to subdivision 14 or to senior teacher class must
complete approved post-apprentice qualifications. In order to give the greatest assistance to trade teachers who are in this position and especially those in remote country areas, the Teachers Tribunal has provided several options, viz.:

(a) Further study in the teacher's original trade (that is, more depth and specialization);
(b) study in a trade associated with the teacher's original trade (that is, broadening the teacher's trade expertise);
(c) post graduate courses in a new direction—for example, Educational Technology, Careers. Although such courses are different from the teacher's original trade, they are most useful and relevant to trade teachers;
(d) technician and middle level courses relevant to the teacher's original trade;
(e) academic studies in an entirely new area—for example, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Commerce. Trade teachers who commence these courses invariably complete them and do very well. Some choose to move entirely into the new area, others continue to teach their trade. Trade teachers who pursue such courses gain valuable insights into another teaching area and are broader enriched people as a result.

Trade teachers are not required to follow option (e) only. Some choose that option—most choose one of the others. Academic study is but one of the several options open to trade teachers.

MORWELL HIGH SCHOOL
(Question No. 193)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

In relation to Morwell High School:
1. What are the current unfilled vacancies for staff in specified teaching areas and when it is expected that these needs will be met?
2. What is the reason for the protracted delays in filling these vacancies?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 17 June 1981 as follows:

"I am informed that there are no current vacancies at this school, and there have not been any vacancies in the past two months."

ECACENTRE, BRIGHT
(Question No. 195)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

When it is expected that an Ecacentre will be provided at Bright Higher Elementary School?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

I advised the honourable member by letter dated 11 August 1981 that at a deputation on 2 July, the School Council of Bright Elementary School was advised that the Education and Community Activity Centre programme was directed to post-primary schools only and higher elementary schools were not included. Due to the large number of post-primary schools still to receive these facilities it is not envisaged that higher elementary schools would ever be considered eligible.

The school council indicated it would need to reconsider the needs of the school including the provision of a change room/shower block and may make a further submission at a later date.

HAMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL
(Question No. 197)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services, for the Minister of Education:

What was the basis of the decision earlier this term to withdraw a teacher from Hampton Primary School?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer supplied by the Minister of Education is:

The Minister of Education has advised the honourable member by letter dated 16 June 1981 that Hampton Primary School reported an enrolment of 423 in its 16 February staffing return on which staffing is allocated for the year. On the basis of this return, the school's staffing entitlement was 21 teachers including one "special needs" teacher. A discrepancy was revealed in a subsequent check by the district inspector which showed the actual enrolment on 16 February to be, in fact, 421 children. This entitled the school to only twenty teachers including one "special needs" teacher.

A move was made to transfer one teacher from the school but because another teacher took sick leave and then resigned, the proposed transfer was not proceeded with. The school is currently correctly staffed.

ALLOCATION OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FUNDS
(Question No. 200)

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

What was the basis of the decision to provide additional funds for toilet block upgrading to the Gippsland region of the Educa-
Questions on Notice

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The Minister of Education advised the honourable member by letter dated 3 September 1981 that the Minister of Educational Services is considering a list of toilet projects in the Gippsland region for funding in the 1981–82 financial year. As yet no decision has been made. It is unlikely that any final decision will be made until the Budget is known.

OIL-FIRED HEATERS IN SCHOOLS
(Question No. 248)

Mr GAVIN (Coburg) asked the Minister of Educational Services:

How many schools were converted from oil-fired heaters during 1979 and 1980, indicating such schools within the electoral district of Coburg?

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services)—The answer is:

The honourable member has been advised by letter dated 16 June 1981 that of the schools within the electoral district of Coburg the Batman Automotive College has been converted from oil-fired to gas heating.
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The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade) took the chair at 4.17 p.m. and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

TEACHER SHORTAGES

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Doutta Galla Province)—I ask the Minister of Education: What steps does the Government intend to take to overcome the present significant shortage of post-primary teachers in a number of disciplines in Victorian high and technical schools, particularly in mathematics and science and a number of trade areas? In addition, what action is being taken to ensure that sufficient places for students are available to Victorian colleges of advanced education to meet expected future demands for such teachers?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—For some years there has been a shortage of mathematics and science teachers which, despite the training of teachers, has continued because of the increased emphasis on mathematics and science subjects in the school curricula. In view of this shortfall, this year the Education Department is visiting teacher-training institutions at a much earlier stage than usual, offering ongoing employment to students in their final year, subject to passing their courses and final exams.

It is hoped that in this way the percentage of students enrolled for State colleges will increase. In addition, the State College at Hawthorn has put forward a proposal for a quick conversion course for tertiary-trained mathematicians and scientists who are willing to turn to teaching. That scheme is under consideration by my department. Several detailed seminars on meeting the future needs in the maths and science field have recently been held, including one at the State College of Victoria at Melbourne. The draft report of that seminar has been given to me, but the final report is not yet at hand. However, this matter is certainly being studied and action will be taken to increase the numbers available in that area in the future.

One of the difficulties in relation to the shortage of trade teachers is that a number of tradesmen are not being attracted to teaching because of the comparatively higher salaries available from private employers in industry.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—They are not being paid enough.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—One must have regard to the level of salary paid to teachers. With the Premier’s concurrence, a working party was established on that issue and has recently reported that in the case of technical and further education teachers, the separation of TAFE colleges from the Education Department will enable the Post-Secondary Education Remuneration Tribunal to consider that matter. It will also consider advice received in the course of industrial experience, as it is needed for teaching experience. All of these issues have been under active consideration in recent weeks.

CONTROL OF THE GRAMPIANS

The Hon. K. I. M. WRIGHT (North Western Province)—In view of the recommendations of the Land Conservation Council to create a large national park in the Grampians and the strong expressions of support for Forests Commission control by western Victorian members of Parliament, what steps is the Minister for Conservation taking to retain the Grampians under Forests Commission control?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Conservation)—The Land Conservation Council recommendations, which have recently been issued, are not final recommendations, but proposed recommendations. I do not intend to take any action to ensure that the proposed Grampians park is retained under Forests Commission control. I expect the public will respond, as it always has, and oppose the recommendations.
of the Land Conservation Council. Once the Government has received public feedback, it will make appropriate final and subsequent recommendations to the Government.

ADVANCED EDUCATION AT FRANKSTON

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Chelsea Province)—My question is directed to the Minister of Education. In view of the decision by the council of the Caulfield Institute of Technology to withdraw support for the proposed merger with the State College of Victoria at Frankston, what steps has the Government taken to ensure the maintenance and development of advanced education at the Frankston campus for the coming triennium?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—The honourable member is out of date with his information and has relied on press headlines that conveyed this information to the public. The Caulfield Institute of Technology decision did not, in itself, put an end to the proposal for a merger. At my request, the Caulfield Institute of Technology council sent representatives to meet me on Monday evening. A lengthy and amicable meeting ensued at which all issues were considered. The Caulfield Institute of Technology has agreed to proceed with the negotiations for the amalgamation of the two institutions, as had been planned at an earlier stage. I should like publicly to thank the president and the council of the institute for the very favourable way in which they treated the issue and for their clear interest in ensuring provision for their own institute, staff and students and ensuring the provision of tertiary education in the south eastern suburbs.

OFFERING OF BRIBES

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON (Higinbotham Province)—I direct my question to the Attorney-General. Is the making or offering of a bribe a felony or an offence? What is the duty of any person on becoming aware of the commission of a felony or an offence? Is the Attorney-General aware of allegations made in the House last night concerning the offer of a bribe to members of the Labor Party and has any report been made to the appropriate authorities of such a bribe being offered?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General)—Certainly, the offering of a bribe to someone does constitute a serious criminal offence and it would be the plain duty of anybody to whom such a bribe was offered to report that immediately to the responsible authority so it can take action. I am aware of the allegations which were made in the House last night. They suggested that Mr White was aware of the offer of a bribe to the Labor Party as long ago as 25 June, and I would have thought that it was his duty to have immediately indicated that to the appropriate authority so it could have taken action. Nothing has been brought to my attention to suggest that any such action has been taken by Mr White or by the other unnamed member of the Labor Party to whom Mr White referred.

STATE RIVERS AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province)—My question is directed to the Minister of Water Supply. When will the major review of urban stock and domestic water supplies in the Wimmera-Mallee system by the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission be completed? Have any decisions been made to alter the services which are at present being provided in the Wimmera-Mallee area by the Water Commission? Can the honourable gentleman give an assurance that the service which is being provided at present in the district centres, including Horsham, Murtoa, Birchip, Ouyen, Swan Hill and Red Cliffs, will be retained and not centralized in larger regional centres?
The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply)—The State Rivers and Water Supply Commission is currently undertaking an assessment of its organization and in particular its services to country Victoria through regional and district offices. That report is not yet completed. The report will ensure that the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission will continue to service the people in their particular districts whilst at the same time affecting a reorganization which will give economies to the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission. When that report is completed, I shall make it available to Mr Dunn.

VICTORIAN SECONDARY TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

The Hon. ROBERT LAWSON (Higinbotham Province)—My question is directed to the Minister of Education and arises from a letter sent to all members of Parliament and signed by Mr Peter Vaughan, President of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association. In the letter Mr Vaughan stated that the Minister has refused to meet him to discuss teachers' working conditions in secondary schools. Mr Vaughan also claimed that the Minister has refused to bring down new agreed legislation which would change working conditions for secondary teachers. Is this claim correct? If so what were the Minister’s reasons for these actions? Could the Minister inform the House whether this is so, and, if it is so, the reasons for his decision not to meet Mr Vaughan?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister of Education)—Last term negotiations proceeded between representatives of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association and the Education Department on the question of teachers' conditions, and something very close to agreement was reached.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—But you couldn’t get it through the Cabinet, could you, so you had to think up a pretext?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—It was not necessary for the matter to go to Cabinet.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—What about the Bill?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—if I am asked a question, I would appreciate the opportunity of answering it without continual interjection raising other issues.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—The truth hurts!

The Hon. A. J. HUNT—Negotiations took place and almost resulted in agreement. They did not result in agreement because of a number of factors; firstly, the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association proposal involved a maximum of half an hour a week for teachers engaged in general supervisory duties such as yard duties. It ought to be obvious that a school cannot be run on such a small amount of supervisory time.

Furthermore, the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association did not agree with the prescription of up to 3 hours of non-scheduled duties in any one week and with certain other requirements which appeared to departmental negotiators to be essential to the running of the school.

Negotiations at that stage were broken off by mutual consent because agreement had not been reached. There was thus nothing for me to either affirm or refuse, as agreement was not reached. No agreement was reached by me.

Shortly thereafter, at its annual general meeting, the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association resolved upon a series of rolling strikes last term and a further strike this term on the subject of conditions. I regarded that as intolerable, because conditions in Victorian secondary schools are the best in the world. The face-to-face teaching hours of teachers in Victorian secondary schools are the shortest in the world. They are about 16 hours a week compared with 22 hours a week in the United States of America and 24 hours a week in Great Britain.

I regarded a threat of industrial action on the conditions as intolerable and unjustified, and I advised the three organizations at the meeting the following week that if those strikes proceeded,
they would prejudice the proposal for new industrial machinery which depended on mutual good faith.

That week I saw Mr Vaughan and we agreed to resume negotiations. We talked further on the following Sunday, and the negotiations commenced on Tuesday. To my surprise, the strikes went ahead on the Wednesday. I advised him on that day that I would not continue negotiations under the threat of the strikes.

That remains the position. The rolling strikes have proceeded, and another strike is proposed for this term. If that strike is called off, I will reconsider the position.

WATER SUPPLY AT WHEELERS HILL

The Hon. C. J. KENNEDY (Waverley Province)—What action will the Minister of Water Supply take to clean up the dirty water in households at the Woodland estate in Wheelers Hill? People who live in homes in this select residential estate, particularly at No. 23, have complained consistently of the bad water there. I have written to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works but have not received a response. The residents complain that the water is of a dirty brown colour and contains dead insects and other unsavoury organisms. Will the Minister spare a few minutes to see whether he can do something to assist my constituents in that area?

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply)—I will be happy to take up the matter on behalf of Mr Kennedy’s constituents. I cannot recall having received any correspondence from him on this matter. Mr Kennedy did not indicate when he took the matter up with the board, but if he lets me have the details, I will be pleased to give him an answer and pass it on to him as quickly as practicable.

POLICE STATION FOR SCORESBY

The Hon. D. N. SALTMARSH (Waverley Province)—Is the Minister for Police and Emergency Services aware of concern in the Scoresby community about the lack of a police station in that district? Will the Minister indicate whether any forward planning action has taken place with a view to making provision in Scoresby for a police station in the future?

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Minister for Police and Emergency Services)—The Police Department has plans to locate a district police station and headquarters in Burwood Highway, Knoxfield. The police have negotiated for an area of approximately 2 acres of land which is currently held by the Department of Agriculture for a police station.

I cannot give any indication of what priority this proposed district police station and headquarters will have, bearing in mind that major stations are to be built in the Broadmeadows, Glen Waverley and Bendigo areas and that the Police Academy at Glen Waverley needs improvements, but I assure Mr Saltmarsh that his representations will be borne in mind.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

The Hon. G. A. SGRO (Melbourne North Province)—I ask the Attorney-General why the amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act were declared urgent in the Legislative Assembly during the autumn sessional period of Parliament but as yet have not been proclaimed?

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General)—In the Legislative Assembly this legislation was dealt with in a number of hours after several weeks of remaining on the Notice Paper. It came to the Legislative Council, where I believe the longest debate which has ever taken place in this Chamber on any legislation since the second reading of the Health Commission Bill occurred.

Indeed, it was necessary for this Act to be passed during that session of Parliament so that the many arrangements which have to be made can be made as expeditiously as possible to enable the Act to come into operation. Arrangements have to be made for new staff to be appointed, for the appointment of referees of the tribunals and for the
establishment of approved financial institutions into which the bond moneys can be paid; regulations and documents have to be prepared, and so on.

All these matters are being pursued vigorously, and I look forward to being able to announce soon the date of commencement of that legislation. I will ensure that it is given substantial publicity so that all people in the community who are affected by the legislation, who number in the area of hundreds of thousands, will be fully aware of the effects that will flow from it.

COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING

The Hon. W. R. Baxter (North Eastern Province)—I direct a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Will the Minister ensure that publicity put out by the Police Department concerning security arrangements for the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting dwells upon the positive aspects of the conference in Melbourne and does not dwell too much on the minimal inconvenience caused to the citizens of Melbourne; points out also that the conference is being held in Melbourne rather than in Canberra because Canberra does not have adequate facilities for a conference of this nature; and that the conference has a considerable potential benefit for Melbourne and that it might well focus world spotlight on Victoria in a favourable manner in much the same way as happened at Lusaka at the last conference in 1979?

The Hon. F. J. Grant (Minister for Police and Emergency Services)—I do not believe the Police Department will put out publicity regarding the positive side of the conference. I have been endeavouring to deal with the inconvenience that might affect people as a result of the movement of heads of Government to their destinations and to the Exhibition Buildings. That has been a real problem for the Police Force, and I will mention it to the Premier and the Prime Minister who would naturally be the ones to make mention of the positive side of the conference and the importance of the conference to Victoria and to Australia.

LUCKY ENVELOPES

The Hon. N. F. Stacey (Chelsea Province)—Immediately before the House met today, I handed the Attorney-General an envelope which seems to have originated from a service organization which seeks to sell lucky envelopes in bundles and supply a vending machine to dispense them. I ask the Attorney-General whether the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board would give approval for sale of such lucky envelopes.

The Hon. Haddon Storey (Attorney-General)—At present the Lotteries Gaming and Betting Act provides for lucky envelopes to be sold to serve the purpose approved by the Raffles and Bingo Permits Board. That board does not and will not grant permits for the sale or disposal of lucky envelopes through vending machines at this time. A Bill is being introduced in another place which will set out a method of regulation under which these machines will be able to be used.

BUSSES FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

The Hon. Joan Coxedge (Melbourne West Province)—Will the Minister of Education tell the House who will pick up the tab for ensuring that refugee children from the Wiltona Migrant Hostel arrive safely at school as they are currently exposed to great risk from hazardous roads on which there are trucks and heavy transport? Will the State and Federal Governments indulge in a fruitless debate over who is responsible for the cost which pales into insignificance when compared with the lavish expenditure on safe transport for the participants in the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting? If the State and Federal Governments can happily co-operate on the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, why not on the provision of a bus for refugee children?

The Hon. A. J. Hunt (Minister of Education)—I fail to understand how the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting is relevant to the rules
and policies which govern the provision of transport and free bus services for children in Victorian Government schools. The rules in Victorian Government schools apply across the board to all children, regardless of race and religion. It would be quite wrong for those rules to discriminate against any racial or religious group and, equally, it would be wrong to deny Australian children any privilege granted to another racial group. This means that there must be consistent rules. That is the case, and they are being applied. The rules do not enable the provision of buses to children at a hostel, which would not be available to other children. There clearly is a case for making some special provision to new arrivals as new migrants. That is a matter for the Commonwealth Government which recognizes this situation and makes appropriate provisions for a period of six months. If it is believed that the period should be extended, the proper place to direct requests is to the Commonwealth Government.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND EXPENDITURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. N. F. STACEY (Chelsea Province)—I move:

That Standing Order No. 207 be suspended in respect of the Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee insofar as is necessary to allow—

(a) publication of fair and accurate reports of evidence given by witnesses examined at public hearings; and

(b) the release of evidence, discussion notes and other documents and the publication thereof at the discretion of the Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. N. F. STACEY (Chelsea Province) presented a Treasury minute from the Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee upon the Auditor-General’s reports for 1976–77.

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

PAPERS

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


Police Service Board—Determinations Nos. 349 and 350.

The Hon. E. H. WALKER (Melbourne Province)—I move:

That the report of the Anti-Cancer Council be taken into consideration on the next day of meeting.

I am delighted to note, in relation to the Police Service Board determinations, that policemen who use their own push-bikes will now receive 3·1 cents a kilometre. I commend the board in that regard.

The motion was agreed to.

MEAT INDUSTRY ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. W. R. BAXTER (North Eastern Province) —With the leave of the House, I propose to move Notice of Motion No. 2 standing on the Notice Paper in my name in an amended form in order to take account of events which have transpired subsequent to my giving notice last week. Accordingly, I now move:

That, in view of the importance of the export meat industry to Victoria, this House expresses alarm at the present crisis caused by the substitution of horse and kangaroo meat and urges maximum co-operation by the Victorian Government and all sections of the meat trade with a view to assisting the Royal Commissioner to conclude his deliberations at an early date in order that Australia’s reputation as a reliable trading nation is restored and enhanced.

I move this motion not in any way as a political exercise, but as a genuine response to an appalling situation that has arisen in one of Australia’s most important and significant industries. In moving the motion, I believe I am representing thousands of genuine farmers throughout Victoria and throughout Australia, particularly beef producers and producers of other forms of meat, such as lamb and mutton. They are the people who are contending with the elements, whether it be drought or flood; they are the people who may operate in alpine areas, where they have no opportunity for any other sort of farming but the production of beef; or they may be in outback Queensland, helping to populate the vast empty
tracts of Australia; but, wherever they are, they are the people who have been striving for more than 100 years to produce a top-class product. They are the people who pay the promotion charges for the public relations exercises at home and abroad to sell Australia's meat to the world. They are the people who have been defrauded in a most despicable manner by one or two unscrupulous operators in the meat trade.

It is a dastardly act for anyone in any trade to perpetrate a fraud like the fraud that was carried out in the meat industry and to bring into disrepute an industry that has long held the reputation of a consistent supplier of high quality goods that are true to label, and the Australian meat industry has had that reputation for many years. I can fully understand and appreciate why those producers are calling for blood and why they want the perpetrators of this fraud to be tracked down and run to earth as soon as possible and to have the full weight of the law applied to their misdeeds.

I make it clear to honourable members, who might not appreciate the implications of the scandal in the meat industry, that it does not affect only the beef trade. All meat trading is interrelated and the price of beef has a direct relationship to the prices of other meats, like lamb and mutton. One only has to look at last week's issue of *Stock and Land* to see the impact the scandal has had already on prices. Some of the headlines are, "Prices Fluctuate for Bullocks", "Fat Sheep Average $3 to $4 Lower", "Weaker Demand for Fat Lambs", and so on. The story on the front page is headed "Scandal Rubs Off on Prices". The article says that at Bendigo there was a $2 fall and prices at all north-eastern markets dropped by $4. The article continues:

Cows at this week's sales in both Victoria and southern NSW were $10 to $20 cheaper, but the biggest fall occurred at Monday's Hamilton cattle market when bull prices crashed by $50 to $70.

Lack of confidence and uncertainty about the beef-substitution crisis has been blamed for the sudden saleyard price falls.

It will be clear to all honourable members that price reductions of that magnitude seriously jeopardize the profit-ability of all farmers in Victoria and throughout the country. There is a snowballing effect throughout the economy. The businesses in the towns are affected, the trades who supply the farmers are affected, it goes through to the merchants in the cities and to the transport operators, as well as to many other sectors of the economy. The standard of living of every Australian could well be affected quite seriously and could be severely eroded if this degradation of Australia's reputation as a reliable trader is not corrected and overcome very quickly indeed.

The Commonwealth Government has moved to set up a Royal Commission. Members of the National Party applaud that action, but with this reservation: We hope the Royal Commissioner will be given the incentive, the wherewithal and the ability to carry out and conclude his investigations well before the suggested finishing date of 1 September 1982. It is for that reason that the motion refers to co-operation with the Royal Commissioner by this Government and by all sections of the meat trade.

In answer to the earlier interjection about the Queensland Government, I agree. I hope the Queensland Government co-operates with the Royal Commissioner in every respect, and I have no hesitation in saying that, but the matter that concerns my colleagues and me is that Royal Commissions have a habit of going on at length. The Victorian Royal Commission into the Housing Commission has now been in progress for more than two years. It has had several extensions of time. The Royal Commission into the Federated Ship Painters and Dockers Union of Australia seems to be a little like Blue Hills. I appreciate the ramifications of a Royal Commission and I understand that lines of evidence have to be followed up and that sometimes they become quite tortuous and time-consuming, but the point I make as strongly as possible is that what is at stake in the Royal Commission into the
meat industry will simply not permit that sort of time-scale. The matter must be investigated thoroughly and it must be investigated promptly, which requires the co-operation of everybody involved—it does not matter whether that involvement is at the Government level or at the meat trade level, through boning rooms, the agents or anyone else. I appeal now to everyone concerned to offer the Royal Commissioner that sort of co-operation, because it is in the interests of the nation, in the interests of every Australian, that this cancer should be rooted out and the causes of its existence overcome so that this sort of disaster cannot beset us in the future.

I referred earlier to the desire of the Victorian Minister of Agriculture for the Victorian Government to be involved jointly with the Commonwealth Government in the Royal Commission. I commend the Minister for that move. It is highly desirable. However, I am concerned that this Parliament has not yet been officially advised of that participation—at least honourable members in this Chamber have not been advised, and so far as I can discover honourable members in another place have not been advised. The terms of reference have not been spelt out. Funnily enough, when I telephoned the Minister's office this morning and asked for the terms of reference, I was told that they did not have a copy but they did have a press release that they would send over to me. I hope the Minister for Conservation will, in responding to this debate, advise the House of the precise terms of reference, if they are available, because it would be valuable to have them recorded in Hansard.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—Did you read the press release?

The Hon. W. R. BAXTER—It has not reached me yet. It was to be sent over post-haste, but it is still somewhere in the system.

Since 1973, members of the National Party in this Parliament have introduced a number of initiatives in the meat industry in seeking the formation of a meat authority. That has not met with the approval of the Government and, as a result, the legislation envisaged by the honourable member for Rodney in another place has not been introduced.

It is fair to say that if the proposed legislation, promoted by Mr Hann on a number of occasions—which reached the second-reading stage in a couple of sessions of Parliament since I have been a member of this place—had been adopted the current disaster that has befallen this country might not have occurred. An authority of the nature envisaged by the measure would have been operating by now and could have used techniques involving such stringency that it would have been able to forsee the activities undertaken by one or two bad operators. Such an authority could have strengthened the rules, regulations and inspection procedures and such a disaster might never have happened.

If the Government had taken notice of warnings given on a number of occasions in this House by the former honourable member representing the Northern Province, the Honourable Stuart McDonald particularly concerning the activities of one particular knackery in that province, we might not have had the allegations that were made last week or allegations about peculiar substances in meat pies or dim sims.

Attempts have been made to paint Mr Nixon, the Federal Minister of Primary Industry, as the bogey man in the whole episode. The Minister for Primary Industry has been accused of closing down boning-rooms willy nilly and causing ill will in the trade. I make it perfectly clear that the Federal Government is involved in the export section of boning-rooms only. Only the exporting sections were suspended for a short time until they were able to prove that their security arrangements were adequate. The domestic sections of the boning-rooms were able to continue; that is a State responsibility.

The current disaster must be used once and for all to overcome the farcical situation in meat inspection. I know genuine attempts have been made to reach a compromise and come to a better arrangement. Mr Keith Campbell of the Industries Assistance Commis-
sion made recommendations and Mr C. R. Kelly, and another, at the request of the Prime Minister, prepared a report making recommendations for a single meat inspection authority.

I know the Victorian Government has been reasonably co-operative in that line and it would appear that the New South Wales Government is the nigger in the woodpile. For some reason or another the New South Wales Government is insisting that it maintain a State inspection service alongside the Commonwealth service. The current crisis must demonstrate clearly and firmly that whilst we have a dual system not only is it extraordinarily expensive, but also creates the opportunity for smart operators to avoid the rules and concoct the inspections. If a single meat inspection authority were operating the opportunities for that sort of activity would be severely reduced. That can only be for the good of the meat industry. If one good factor emerges from the crisis it will be a single meat inspection authority.

I should deal with another matter, which was not strictly related to the export trade but deals with the closure of abattoirs. This has been a fairly frequent occurrence in the past twelve to eighteen months because of the difficulties in the meat trade. A number of farmers have been caught as unsecured creditors of abattoirs to which suddenly receivers and managers were appointed. I put on record that with the help of the Attorney-General and those involved in legal reform the procedures laid down for the winding up of companies and the recovery of debts may be improved from their current less than satisfactory situation.

I refer to the case of AWOL abattoirs in Wodonga, which is operated by J.R. Meats Pty Ltd, a Sydney-based company not registered in Victoria. On 4 August 1981 the Bank of New Zealand appointed the Sydney accountants Ernst and Whinney as receivers and managers of J.R. Meats Pty Ltd because the company owed the Bank of New Zealand over $8 million. An amount of approximately $1 million was also owed on another secured loan.

On 5 August the receiver and manager so appointed wrote to the creditors including farmers and stated, *inter alia*:

One effect of my appointment is to put property of the company under my custody and control as Agent of the company. The powers of management of the Directors have therefore been suspended pending our retirement.

My primary function is to effect payment of the indebtedness due to my Appointor as expeditiously as practically possible. As Manager I am empowered to carry on the business of the company.

The significant part of the letter referring to unsecured creditors stated:

I shall not discharge ordinary unsecured debts of the company incurred prior to my appointment and no set-off will be allowed of such debts against debts incurred to the company after my appointment.

In other words, a number of farmers who supplied cattle in good faith to the company the day before it went into receivership are now owed large sums of money. One farmer is owed approximately $35,000, which honourable members will agree represents a large sum of money to a farmer and comprises a substantial proportion of yearly turnover. Six farmers, who approached me last week, are owed between them a total of $85,000. However, the receiver and manager is empowered to obtain the $8 million for the Bank of New Zealand and the debts of the farmers will not be considered until the business of the bank has been concluded.

The Hon. R. J. Long—That is normal.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—Indeed it is and it seems somewhat unfair to me. Even if those farmers petition for the winding up of the company its liquidation cannot proceed until the receiver and manager of the bank has recovered the $8 million. It could take years for that to happen. I am not sure what the answer is or whether any answer is available, but I ask the Attorney-General to examine the issue of debts, credit and liquidation to ascertain whether a fairer system can be devised.

The Hon. R. J. Long—They are put on the same basis as secured creditors.
The Hon. W. R. Baxter—That may be so. Perhaps, in their own interest farmers need to take up that activity. However, it is the action of a rogue to accept cattle on a Monday and go into receivership on Tuesday. There must have been some prior warning. No bank moves in on a company unannounced and appoints a receiver and a manager. Obviously the bank had been pressing the company for some time to reduce its debts. It seems to be bordering on roguery to accept cattle from farmers in good faith and then involve them in large debts involving a large proportion of their yearly income.

I conclude on the lines on which I commenced—that I am not attempting to attribute blame to anyone and I am not attempting to score points. I am simply putting on the record that the Royal Commissioner must get on with the job and conclude his deliberations as soon as possible. In doing that, he would be materially assisted by co-operation from all Governments involved and by all sections of the meat trade.

Over the years, Australia's reputation as a reliable trader has been good but it has now been severely tarnished. However, if we, as a nation, are seen to be doing something about the matter and taking steps to overcome the situation which we did not foresee but which we perhaps should have foreseen, and if we are good enough to convince the Americans that we are taking preventative measures, we can recover our reputation, but it will not be recovered if this matter is allowed to drag on ad nauseam like some other Royal Commissions that have been conducted in Australia.

The Hon. D. E. Kent (Chelsea Province)—I move the following amendment as an addition to the motion proposed by Mr Baxter:

That the following words be added to the motion—"and condemns the Victorian Government for its failure to adequately control the meat industry within the State with disastrous effects on Australia's international reputation and trade and Victoria's public health and economy and calls on the Government to act immediately to—(a) prevent corrupt practices which may compromise the control of meat; (b) apply effective controls over meat inspection brands and documents; (c) require all meat other than for human consumption imported into or processed in Victoria to be subject to thorough control through methods of ready identification, such as injected edible dyes, and notifications of intention to import, imports and movements; (d) establish adequate resources to rapidly investigate, identify and remedy threats to public health from contaminated or other impure meat; and (e) introduce rigorous penalties against meat substitution and other practices which may threaten public health and the meat industry".

The Hon. R. J. Long—You know that is kite flying; we have no control over exported meat.

The Hon. D. E. Kent—As Mr Long would agree, Mr Baxter has dealt with problems in the meat industry, problems which are widespread and at various levels of the industry, commencing at production on the farm. As honourable members know, much attention has been paid in Australia to developing the meat industry, not only the beef industry and not only an export industry, but an industry which would be a stable and continuing one, providing regular incomes and industrial security for Australia's producers, as well as a guaranteed export market. Strict conditions have been laid down by our principal export market to the United States of America, which have resulted in the upgrading of export licensed abattoirs.

As Mr Baxter mentioned, the problem has existed of joint inspection. Although it is not insurmountable, it seems to have been unreasonably protracted because of prejudice and we still have dual inspection as between Commonwealth and State authorities in some instances.

All of these matters have added to the complexities of the industry and have perhaps made it more difficult to ensure complete inspection of all processes at every stage of the operation of the industry. It must be conceded that people engaged in the meat industry, from production through to export and the selling of meat, tend to be unfavourably disposed to control and restriction. In the worst sense of the words, they tend to believe in free enterprise, but they do realize that they
themselves need to be protected and that they need to be organized. Degrees of organization have been reached over recent years at both the production and marketing levels, and that gives some hope for the future.

Nevertheless, the situation has arisen where the numbers of beef cattle and sheep in Australia, particularly beef cattle, have declined considerably. As a consequence, a surplus of abattoirs has developed and the State Government must accept responsibility for having allowed new abattoirs to be licensed, despite the fact that many abattoirs have closed down, many have gone out of business and many have been operated as short-term operations, closing when stock numbers have declined temporarily. Frequently, they have been owned by parties who have leased them temporarily to other operators.

Another aspect which adds to confusion and instability in the industry is the number of companies, many of them phantom companies, which operate under various names. All of these matters tend to render control of the product to the consumer, whether on the home market or on the export market, more difficult to follow through.

The situation which has recently been publicized has undoubtedly existed to some degree for a long time. It is a matter of concern to the people of Australia, and particularly those of Victoria, that the situation has been publicized world-wide in recent times. It has always been a matter of importance that there ought to be more rigid control over all aspects of the meat production and handling industry, but the urgency has become much more apparent because of the recent world-wide publicity and because of the loss of confidence in our markets, not only our export markets to the United States of America and other countries, but also a loss of confidence by the local market. People fear—although I believe their fears are largely unfounded—that they may not be obtaining meat of the standard they should obtain and from the source from which they believe it should come.

A few of the facts should be put straight. So far as I am aware, I have never eaten horsemeat or kangaroo meat.

An Honourable Member—How would you know?

The Hon. D. E. KENT—I said, "So far as I am aware".

The Hon. H. R. Ward—You look the lean and hungry type to me!

The Hon. D. E. KENT—It is thoroughbred breeding rather than eating thoroughbreds that has put me in this condition. It is well known that many people like kangaroo meat—and not for the hops, either! I understand that people in Europe have long regarded horsemeat as acceptable. However, the consumer should know that the meat he or she is buying and eating is what it is purported to be and that the meat has been killed and prepared under the hygienic conditions laid down for meat marketed for human consumption. That is the issue. Whether kangaroo, goat or horse meat should be available for human consumption can be discussed, but it is important that there should be no mis-representation of the type of meat reaching the market.

The loss of confidence this has caused has had serious repercussions overseas and it has had a considerable emotional impact on Victorians. Some persons who do not know anything about meat—mostly young children—have jumped quickly to the idea that they will not eat meat because it might contain donkey meat. The little asses might not know any differently but that lack of confidence can be promoted easily.

The scandal is a major setback to the meat industry. Butchers probably are experiencing difficulties with the buying public because of the emotional repercussions of the discovery of improper practices in the meat industry and the publicity given to it. Consumers have been made aware that the practice has been occurring over many years and that has caused a lack of confidence in the meat industry.
There have been times when producers of beef cattle have not been able to get high prices. The general public may have imagined that the market for meat was buoyant but that has not been so over the past two years. Anything that depresses that market has a detrimental effect on the economy not only of rural industries but also of every sector in the State and would seriously hamper the efforts of the Victorian Government to develop confidence in primary production.

I shall not repeat many of the remarks that have been made by many persons over the past few weeks and rehash what has been said by those persons who now are able to say, "I told you so"—my life has been full of that and I am not trying to take advantage of this situation. Over the years, the attention of those in authority has been drawn to the improper practices in the meat industry. For that reason, the Government is to be condemned for not having taken those warnings more seriously. The meat industry has a tendency to attract persons who would not be particularly concerned about obeying the law provided that they could get away with it, so it does require strict control.

The other issue concerns effective identification of meat for human consumption and meat to be used as pet food. A tremendous amount of meat killed under conditions that do not meet the standards for meat killed for human consumption most likely has entered the market for human consumption illegally. One cannot prevent a person from buying meat that is known to be marketed for pet food only and using it for human consumption; undoubtedly, that happens. However, meat killed in knackeries for the pet food market should have proper identification to indicate that it is unfit for human consumption so that there is no misrepresentation of meat on the market, and this has happened.

The motion makes several points. It is important not merely that the Royal Commission should be conducted expeditiously to prevent a protracted state of limbo in the industry resulting from innuendo, suggestion and supposition, and fresh evidence and implications being made because that inevitably will continue to sap confidence in all levels of the community, from producer to consumer. It will, as Mr Baxter suggests, take a long while for any restoration of confidence. I assume that; even after a substantial period, it will be very difficult to again reach the consumption rate the market has had recently.

I am not prone to imposing penalties as an answer to problems; adequate control to prevent the offences and to minimize the offences is more important. However, it is obvious that if persons are prepared to break the law blatantly, particularly those who have been able to get away with actions that are substantially detrimental to the industry, certainly there should be heavy penalties because of the tremendous economic cost that they are imposing on the industry and because of the danger to public health.

Some of the actions taken recently have been strange. The export operations of 27 independent boning rooms were suspended—a broad, sweeping action that tended to destroy confidence in the industry immediately. That action is not taken normally. If one milk bar offends, all milk bars are not closed. If one milk bar is offending and it cannot be identified, such drastic steps are not taken to destroy utterly the confidence of the industry.

The meat industry has had to bear the slur cast on it by the actions of a small—I hope—number of people. There have been other reactions and I can understand the reluctance of the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Nixon, to hold a Royal Commission. Knowing the industry as he does, he would have had real fears that people close to him and to his party will most likely be involved closely in it.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—What sort of evidence have you got for that?

The Hon. D. E. Kent—I have not got evidence. I have a fair knowledge of the attitudes that are prevalent and the
reasons for such action. One can only assume that helped Mr Nixon very reluctantly to take an attitude, if there is evidence, which some people claim already exists, steps could be taken and should be taken at this stage to bring the people to justice and to allay the fears of the public.

In the Adelaide Advertiser of 29 August this year the following article appeared:

I know meat scandal culprit, says detective.

The man heading the police investigation in Victoria into the meat scandal said yesterday he knew who exported the suspect beef to the U.S.

But Detective Chief Inspector N. Elkington, of the Federal Police, said he did not know when charges would be laid.

I am suggesting that if it is possible to identify the culprit in these matters, it should certainly be possible to lay charges.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—Often the police know who a murderer is but are unable to lay a charge because of lack of evidence.

The Hon. D. E. KENT—That is true. I suppose there is a slight difficulty. There is a different attitude on the part of the Victorian Government; it does not hesitate to make charges against certain people and organizations in this community without having evidence. The Government names the people, then sets up an inquiry into a particular council, a union or some individual. In the meat industry scandal, people will not be named until there is evidence.

The Royal Commission will take a tremendous amount of evidence. Undoubtedly it will delve into events that have occurred over a period of years. It will have to respond to allegations and suggestions that have been made in Federal Parliament, as early as 1978 by Senator Primmer, and by various members in the Victorian Parliament. It is on that basis there was a belief—I will not use the word general knowledge—that improper practices were being carried out in the meat industry. It does lead to one being justifiably critical of the lack of action by the Government to this stage.

It is disappointing that the situation was allowed to deteriorate to a stage where the industry has been brought into disrepute, when steps, which have been generally advocated fairly widely to clean up the industry, to rationalize the industry from the abattoirs through the inspection system and the distribution system, have largely been ignored. They have been ignored probably on the grounds of allowing free competition and minimizing control; on the ground of cost saving by the Government, and now the situation has been reached where the cost to the Government in revenue, to the community as a whole, is far in excess of any costs of restructuring, rationalizing or probably controlling the industry.

For that reason, on behalf of the Labor Party, I support Mr Baxter's motion, with the addition of the words I have moved as an amendment, and I urge the House to support the motion, as amended.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister for Conservation)—It would not be difficult for all parties to support the motion that Mr Baxter has moved because the problem is one of national and international significance in Australia. It deeply affects one of the most important industries in this nation. However, I intend to move an amendment to the motion later to alter the wording slightly and I hope the National Party will accept the amendment that I propose to move. Before doing so I should like to speak to the motion. I indicate at the outset that the Government does not support the amendment that Mr Kent proposed to the House.

It is important to put the events into perspective and to examine precisely the time span over which the problem has existed and the actions that have been taken to meet what could only be described as a crisis. It goes back to the week ending 15 August when a health inspector in the Department of Agriculture on the west coast of the United States of America detected what he thought to be horsemeat in some of the cartons of the Australian beef exported to the west coast of America.
At that time there was no certainty that the meat had come from Australia. There was some conjecture that it would have been possible to have substituted the meat when it arrived in America. The Department of Agriculture was not sure about it, and neither was the Government.

However, it did not take long to establish that these cartons had come from Australia and the substitution was more than likely carried out in this country. "Substitution" is the word because that is the core of the problem—substitution of meat that had been branded in a certain way, but which did not accurately describe the contents of the carton.

On 17 August the Department of Agriculture in Victoria was advised by the Department of Primary Industry that export registration for establishment 140C should be cancelled. It became obvious that the cartons of meat bearing this serial number were suspect and that led the Department of Agriculture to the freezers of Protean (Holdings) Ltd. I hasten to add that the fact it was in Protean's freezers did not indicate necessarily that this company, which is well known in Victoria, was involved in the problem. It would be more accurate to say that the meat inspection branch of the Department of Agriculture in Victoria was requested by the Department of Primary Industry to assume control of the meat that had been branded in this way, and 805 cartons were located in the freezers of Protean (Holdings) Ltd in Richmond, and a further 698 cartons in five other local and export cold stores.

It eventuated that the cartons contained substitute meat that was not only horsemeat but also kangaroo meat. It must be borne in mind that the United States of America had no way of discovering whether any of the meat was kangaroo meat because it does not have kangaroos, and it had no way of comparing the meat in the cartons with kangaroo meat. The United States did know about horse meat. Many of the cartons were from other freezing companies, apart from Protean (Holdings) Ltd, and again, these companies were not necessarily implicated. They provided a refrigeration service, and anyone who wished to use those services were able to use them, so the freezing companies did not know, and were not obliged to know, what the cartons contained.

At this time the sampling for species identification by the Department of Agriculture commenced. 100 samples were forwarded to the Department of Agriculture Veterinary Research Institute for identification.

All cartons in the Protean cold store have the legend "Hammonds Meats and Australia Approved stamp-140C" which identifies each of the cartons picked up on the west coast of America and all cartons in the other establishments have, in addition to that, the local crown brand of Richmond Abattoir, "DA X17" and the words "Domestic Use Only" stencilled on the carton.

Bearing in mind that we are moving along rapidly—we have identification during the week ended 15 August and I think I an article appeared in the press of 14 August—then an identification of the brand numbers and location of where the cartons actually were, followed by a rapid sampling of the suspect cartons.

Three days later on 18 August, 50 samples were collected for species identification, and a number of cartons set aside for thawing to enable a visual examination of the contents on Monday, 24 August. It was apparent that many cartons contained meat in off-condition. Not only did we have the problem of substituted meat but also meat that was contaminated in one way or another. That was detected on 18 August and further inquiries were made at cold stores Statewide to ascertain if further 140C cartons were in circulation.

On Thursday, 20 August Mr Ham mond and his solicitor were interviewed by officers of the Meat Inspection Branch. Mr Hammond was acquainted with the known facts and advised of the legal requirements of the Abattoir and...
Meat Inspection Act. On his solicitor's advice he declined to comment which, I suppose, in the event was good advice.

On Friday, 21 August—we are getting towards the week after the first discovery—laboratory results indicated the presence of horsemeat in 48 samples, kangaroo meat in 21 samples and beef was detected in 68 samples. During this week Detective Chief Inspector Elkington, a policeman from the Commonwealth Police Force, was appointed to take charge of Investigations. He was immediately offered the full cooperation of the Victoria Police. There were about fifteen Federal policemen and six Victorian policemen working cooperatively. Detective Chief Inspector Elkington was appointed as a meat inspector under the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act so that he was able to exercise the powers of a meat inspector, go into abattoirs, ask the appropriate questions and make the appropriate inspections as a meat inspector.

On Monday, 24 August—we now progress to about ten days after the event was first brought to our attention—a further 200 cartons of Hammond meats of the 140C brand were discovered and retained. Visual examination of defrosted cartons confirmed that some meats were contaminated and in off-condition.

On Tuesday, 25 August, 50 further samples were collected for species identification. From Wednesday, 26 to Monday, 31 August and Tuesday, 1 September, further samples were taken and further tests conducted. Further visual examinations were made on defrosted cartons of meat.

On Wednesday, 2 September a further 50 samples were taken at the Protean store. At this stage a total of 290 samples had been taken from 805 cartons in the Protean store. As I indicated earlier in the sequence of events, no horsemeat or kangaroo meat was discovered in any of the cartons in the Protean store. The substituted meat was all found in other freezing establishments.

On Friday, 4 September an examination of defrosted cartons revealed that a high percentage of the 900 cartons held outside Protean were found to contain horse and kangaroo meat and other contaminants such as grass, stones, dirt, leaves, and the sort of things that might result from improper handling. I assure Mrs Coxsedge, who is interjecting, that if meat is passed by the inspectors it is suitable to eat. If it is not and is substituted for the sort of things that happened in this case, then Mrs Coxsedge would be wise to be a vegetarian. However, I would not recommend that because meat is full of protein and energy and is a useful food.

On Friday, 4 September the Meat Inspection Branch of the Department of Agriculture was advised that all meats in storage originating from Establishment 622 Jason Meats Pty Ltd, were to be retained. Here was an indication of another batch of meat from another group of operators that was found to be possibly substituted. Mr Nixon issued a statement informing that further horsemeat had been found in a consignment in the United States of America.

On Friday, 4 September the export operation of all independent boning rooms in Victoria—totalling 27—was suspended. Subsequently, approximately another six establishments were suspended so that in all 33 establishments boning for export and local trade had their licences suspended.

Subsequently, about fifteen of those regained their licences because they were boning rooms which were established in abattoirs where the whole operation from the womb to the tomb, so to speak, was undertaken and there was no possibility of substitution. The cattle were killed, dressed, transferred to the boning room, packed, frozen and stored in the one establishment so there was no point in doing anything but release those fifteen establishments immediately and replace their licences.

On 5 September—we have now progressed about twenty days—Mr Nixon announced the release of 24 000 tons of Australian beef from retention in the United States of America. The United States had frozen the distribution of
Australian meat held there. Meat from Victoria was still being withheld from release in the United States of America.

I shall give some of the figures which indicate the sort of responsibilities employed by the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act. There are 104 abattoirs, 29 slaughterhouses, 165 meat premises, 168 meat inspection depots, 17 pet food establishments and 36 knackeries. A wide range of processors, abattoirs, killing works and so on in Victoria are under the control of the Victorian Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority. There are approximately 255 staff employed at all levels of meat inspection.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Do you think that is enough?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—If that staff is properly managed, that number would be sufficient. However, if Mr Landeryou's interjection implies any criticism of the way in which meat is inspected, I would join with him in that criticism. For example, between 1967 and 1970 a Parliamentary committee which inquired into meat inspection was of the view that dual meat inspection was an inefficient and wasteful method. Although recommendations were made by that committee that dual meat inspection should be abolished, no action has been taken to resolve the recommendation.

Dual meat inspection means that meat, which is meant for local consumption, but which is derived from export abattoirs is inspected by inspectors from the Department of Primary Industry, but if any of that meat is destined for the local market, an inspection by local meat inspectors is carried out.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—Absurd!

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I agree with the interjection. There is a valid objection to the elimination of dual meat inspection because of the efficiency of Victorian meat inspectors. The Victorian meat inspectors gather a large quantity of statistics on the types of diseases and problems that occur in Victorian cattle. Therefore, the Victorian health authorities are able to obtain a much better picture of the over-all cattle health scene.

There is no reason why the meat inspectors of the Department of Primary Industry could not be given the same responsibility to report upon defects and diseases that occur in cattle that are killed to provide meat for export. I do not know why this issue has not been resolved. However, the Minister of Agriculture at the most recent meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council, tried to resolve this matter. If Victorian meat inspectors are to inspect only Victorian cattle that are killed in local abattoirs to provide meat for local consumption, it is incumbent upon the Victorian Government to ensure the inspection of that meat. It is to be hoped that Victoria will move to a system where there is only one inspector for each batch of meat and that the dual inspection system is eliminated because it is a wasteful practice.

Further events that occur will depend upon the action that is taken by the Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Nixon, and the Victorian Minister of Agriculture. Mr Baxter and Mr Kent criticized the establishment of boards of inquiry and Royal Commissions on the ground that these inquiries take a long time to report, and so they do. However, these inquiries do not represent the only action that can be taken. Short-term solutions can be provided and action has already been taken at both the Federal and the State levels. For example, security at meatworks has been strengthened. Victoria is often the major exporter of meat from Australia. There are occasions when Victoria exports more meat than does Queensland. The port of Melbourne has always been the source of exports of the largest quantities of refrigerated cargoes of meat. The meat industry is of enormous importance to Victoria. The Minister for Primary Industry has established extra meat security surveillance at independent boning rooms and cool stores. The ship loading of meat is closely scrutinized to prevent its substitution after it has passed a final inspection and before it has left the port of Melbourne. The meat substitution has occurred at that interim stage.
A new system has been devised for security seals to be placed on meat carcases. The cost of that system will be $1 million in 1981-82. Meat inspection security has been strengthened not only through increased Government efforts but also through the provision of more money.

Mr Baxter voiced his concern about the terms of reference of the Royal Commission into the Australian Meat Industry and he suggested that those terms of reference ought to be on the record. The terms of reference established by the Commonwealth Government are:

(a) whether administrative arrangements and procedures for the supervision of the handling of meat for export are adequate to ensure that all meat exported from Australia meets the requirements prescribed by law;

(b) whether malpractices are occurring, or have occurred, in the handling of meat for export or the exportation of meat;

(c) allegations made, whether in public or to a Minister, department or authority of the Commonwealth, of malpractices alleged to have occurred during the past 10 years, in the handling of meat for export or in the exportation of meat;

Those terms of reference are designed to trace to their source and conclusion the large number of allegations that have been made concerning the notification of the meat industry scandal to members of the Police Force and members of Parliament. The terms of reference are designed to determine whether such allegations were acted upon and what the source of those allegations was. The terms of reference continue:

(d) whether such allegations were dealt with in a manner that was adequate and effective;

(e) whether in response to such allegations, any illegality or corruption occurred.

After discussions between the Victorian Minister of Agriculture, the Minister for Primary Industry and the Victorian Attorney-General, additional terms of reference have been given to the Royal Commission. The Victorian Government has decided that it should be involved in the inquiry and it has offered its co-operation, which has been accepted.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—If it had not been for the State of Victoria, there would not have been any need for an inquiry.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I will have more to say on that matter in a moment. For the information of all honourable members, the additional terms of reference are:

Whether administrative arrangements and procedures for the supervision of the handling of meat for human consumption in Victoria are adequate to ensure that all such meat meets the requirement prescribed by law;

Whether malpractices are occurring, or have occurred in the handling of meat for human consumption in Victoria;

Allegations whether in public or to a Minister, Department or Authority of the State of malpractices alleged to have occurred since the coming into operation of the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973 in the handling of meat for human consumption in Victoria;

Whether such allegations were dealt with in a manner that was adequate and effective; and

Whether in response to such allegations any illegality or corruption occurred.

Mr Baxter made some point about the effect on prices at stock markets, and I take issue with his comments on this matter. He read some statements from a stock journal, which I hope was Stock and Land.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—it was.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—Those statements indicated that the meat market had taken a dive as a result of these problems. You, Mr President, would know almost as well as I that this is a time when stock markets traditionally begin to slump. I always measure my stock selling by Melbourne show time. The records that I have been studying over the past 37 years—and I regard Stock and Land as my Bible; it is my regular Thursday night reading from cover to cover—reveal many examples of such headlines as Mr Baxter has read tonight when there has been no hint of anything amiss in the meat industry, except for the vagaries of supply and demand, drought and flood. It is not fair, and may even be harmful, to the meat industry to suggest that the fluctuations in prices are due to the sort of problems that currently exist.
The Hon. W. R. Baxter—It must surely have had some effect. It is surely significant that it occurred at the sale immediately following this publicity.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—Let us look at the facts of the matter, as Mr Landeryou would say. The reality is that, for the week ended 14 August the price of vealers was 188 cents a kilogram. That was at the very beginning of the history of this problem which I read to the House. For the week ended 14 August the price of vealers was 188 cents a kilogram; a week later, on 21 August, it was 181 cents, a drop of 7 cents; the following week, it was 184 cents, up 3 cents; on 4 September, 178 cents, down 6 cents; on 11 September, 182 cents, up 4 cents. So the market was fluctuating, as it always does at this time of year, and exactly in line with market fluctuations over many years.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—Quote the bullock prices.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I will come to that. During the same five weeks the price for steers was 161 cents, 160 cents, 158 cents, 155 cents and 151 cents, a drop of 10 cents, but a fairly consistent range. Mr Baxter knows as well as I do that, in Victoria at this time of year, we are busy keeping up with our own domestic trade and the export trade has very little effect on the Melbourne market in winter months and up to Melbourne show time at any rate.

During the same period, the price of bullocks was 140 cents, 138 cents, 138 cents, 139 cents and 141 cents, up 1 cent over the five-week period.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—Have you got the Queensland prices for export type cattle where prices fell 17 cents a kilogram?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I think the rundown of the prices I gave shows, in fact, that prices did not fall. They fell for some commodities in the market but increased for other commodities, so there was really no effect on the price in Victoria as a result of this matter.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Mr Minister, you are not seriously arguing that this scandal will not have a long-term effect on the price of beef?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I would seriously argue that this problem will not have a long-term effect on the Australian export meat trade. The American market depends on our meat as much as we depend on their market. During the course of this problem, some concern was felt in America. The 24 000 tonnes of meat awaiting distribution in America was frozen and the price of hamburger meat in America rose so much in that week that the American authorities became somewhat alarmed at the price of the meat to the consumer. It took a big jump. So much for that argument. I do not believe it is a valid argument that there was any great effect, if any, on the Australian market and the Victorian market in particular for meat.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—Your Bible, Stock and Land, seemed to think there was. You will have to downgrade your Bible for last week.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—Other actions taken subsequent to the discovery of the problem included an announcement by the Victorian Minister that he would introduce a Bill to prohibit the sale of kangaroo and horsemeat for human consumption. Believe it or not, up to now the sale of those meats had not been prohibited. It is not really necessary that it should be because it is perfectly wholesome meat. It is just that Australians have something of an antipathy towards eating an animal they like so much.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—What about the 1978 regulations?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—in fact, there was no prohibition on the sale of those meat products and the Minister of Agriculture announced that he would introduce a Bill to ensure that all meat for pet food was denatured or dyed with vegetable dye for easy identification. The Federal Minister announced a considerable increase in penalties under various Acts.
The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Why will you not meet the question?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—Because I am making a speech, not answering questions.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—But you are evading the facts.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—I did not hear the question very well.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—What about the 1978 regulations?

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)—Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to cease interjecting.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON—The Federal Minister announced that maximum penalties under the Customs Act and the Commerce (Trade Descriptions) Act for illegal export are to be lifted from the present $1000 to $100,000 or five years' imprisonment, or both, on indictment under each Act. Also both Acts will provide for a maximum penalty of $5000 or one year's imprisonment, or both, on summary conviction.

There will be a separate, new Bill—the Meat Export (Penalties) Act. This will also provide for maximum penalties of $100,000 or five years' imprisonment or both, on indictment, for offences relating to the misuse of inspection stamps, alteration or interference with descriptions and tags, and making false or misleading statements. Similarly, it will provide for a maximum penalty of $5000 or one year's imprisonment, or both, on summary conviction.

So, in general, all of the legislation that has anything to do with the regulation of the meat industry has been amended. Admittedly, the penalties were far too low. They were something like $100 and, in general terms, they have been increased to $100,000 with a five-year term of imprisonment. That is a fairly solid penalty for a serious offence.

I move the following amendment to Mr Baxter's motion:

Omit the words "the Victorian Government" with the view of inserting in place thereof the words "all Governments in Australia."

I trust my amendment will be accepted by all parties. As I pointed out at the outset, this is a matter which concerns not only an important sphere of State activity but also a very important sphere of national and international activity. It is important to get every State in the Commonwealth to co-operate with the Federal Government. All States have indicated their intention of co-operating with the Federal Government with respect to the inquiry into the export industry, but it is also essential that they should co-operate as did the State of Victoria, in extending the terms of reference if necessary, or at least in some way facilitating an inquiry into the local meat trade as well because it is a very important domestic industry.

It has been argued by some States that they should not become involved but when one reads of the large volumes of meat imports into the State, for instance, of kangaroo meat which is imported from Queensland and New South Wales, then these are matters which should be investigated. Large volumes of pet food are also imported and somehow that meat has found its way into the export meat trade. It has been alleged in another State that donkey meat from the Northern Territory is being used so there are interstate implications involved in all the issues and the Victorian Government urges all other State Governments to be involved to the maximum extent, not only with respect to the export meat trade but also to the maximum extent in the conduct of the Royal Commission. I commend my amendment to the House.

The Hon. G. A. SGRO (Melbourne North Province)—I indicate my support for the amendment moved by my colleague, Mr Kent. It is disgraceful that a modern State like Victoria has been damaged so much in its export trade of beef, on which it relies for income, because a thing like this has happened. The National Party had a chance to overcome this difficulty when the House was debating the Wildlife (Fees) Bill which was really designed to eliminate control over the shooting of kangaroos. The reason I state this is because I have
many overseas friends from whom I receive communications and only the other day I received a letter from a friend who lives in Switzerland. The letter indicated that no one in Switzerland or Italy will eat any more Australian meat or beef because of the headlines in the newspaper, on television and so on, headlines that are saying that it is kangaroo meat, donkey meat, and so on. Therefore, this State is facing a tremendous problem.

Despite what the Minister for Conservation has stated, prices do fluctuate up and down and in a few months time, just wait and see what will happen. The Minister for Conservation knows this better than I because he is a farmer, but in a few months time when the meat which has been frozen for many months and which the overseas butchers use at the moment, when it runs out, then beef will not be purchased—no more beef will be purchased from Australia and I ask what will then be the consequences for this State?

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—Mr Sgro is speaking of people who are actually buying beef at the moment.

The Hon. G. A. SGRO—The Minister for Minerals and Energy can laugh, but it is not just Switzerland and not just how much meat the people in Switzerland use but in the whole of Europe. This man wrote to me from Switzerland.

The Hon. D. G. Crozier—Does Mr Sgro know how much beef we supply to Switzerland at the present time?

The Hon. G. A. SGRO—I do not know, but I do know that the Minister for Trade and Resources, Mr Anthony, a few months ago went around the European Economic Community and urged them to buy beef and in some ways he did persuade them to open their doors, but after all that has happened we can rest assured they will not open their doors; they will shut the doors and not buy our beef.

There should be one control over meat in this State whereas at the moment there are two. There is control over overseas meat and control over local meat and honourable members can rest assured that the more controls there are, the easier it is for people to manipulate those controls. Therefore, the Government should take immediate steps to have one meat inspection control in this State and not two.

Further, a delegation comprising members of all political parties in this State should be sent overseas to convince the people that the beef which is sold in overseas countries is not kangaroo or donkey meat, that it is pure beef from this country. That has to be done. Until the Royal Commission and the meat scandal is over, the Government should pass legislation to stop the slaughter of kangaroos and other animals in this country and therefore convince the people overseas that all meat is fair dinkum meat.

A few months ago I spent two or three days in the electorate represented by Mr Baxter.

The Hon. W. R. Baxter—I bet Mr Sgro saw a lot of kangaroos!

The Hon. G. A. SGRO—Yes, I saw a lot of kangaroos, and also I saw two or three farmers go out every night and shoot 200 or 300 kangaroos. I also saw trucks follow them and load the dead kangaroos. I do not know where they took the meat, but honourable members can rest assured that some of that meat appeared in some abattoir. If the National Party is concerned for the farmers, which it claims to represent, then it should try to stop the slaughter of kangaroos. Until it does that, then it is a shame on the National Party and on the Government for allowing meat markets to be lost because that is what will happen. People overseas will not want to buy our beef and they have good reasons for doing that.

Therefore, I fully support the amendment moved by Mr Kent, that the Government of Victoria should be condemned for its lack of involvement and understanding of the problem.

A few months ago whenever headlines appeared in newspapers about migrants or other people from overseas, there were calls for an immediate inquiry. I recall the headlines calling for
an inquiry into the Mafia, but on this occasion it is known that the Federal Government was warned five years ago about what was occurring but took no action. It is also known that Mr Nixon was warned many months ago but took no action and nothing has been done because as Mr Kent stated, he was frightened that some of his friends might become involved.

Therefore, I urge the Government, for the good of the industry, to take steps immediately and not to wait until the Royal Commission completes its inquiry in a few months time.

The Hon. W. R. BAXTER (North Eastern Province)—In speaking to the amendments, and in the spirit in which I originally moved the motion calling for co-operation, I am perfectly happy to accept the amendment proposed by the Minister for Conservation, that words be substituted to urge all Governments in Australia to co-operate with the Royal Commission. I point out, of course, that the difficulty has occurred in this State and the rest of the nation will obviously be looking for some action from this Government.

Having stated that, I have no objection to accepting the amendment moved by the Minister for Conservation, but as I stated at the outset it is an expression by this Chamber of a desire for co-operation and an expeditious hearing of the Royal Commission.

By the same token, I am therefore unable to accept the additions proposed by Mr Kent. He is seeking to attribute blame directly to the Victorian Government, and I made it clear today that that was not my intention. Although I may be able to support the direction of many of Mr Kent’s remarks, I do not believe his proposed amendment is in the spirit in which honourable members are discussing this issue today.

I shall dwell for a moment on the comments made by Mr Sgro. The point he made about his pen friend from Switzerland is a valid one. Although Australia may not sell much beef in Europe, the point made by the writer that our reputation has been damaged by these sorts of headlines may well also apply in the United States of America and in our other good markets.

Mr Sgro answered his own question about the control of kangaroo numbers in his reference to the province that I represent. I know very well that Mr Sgro has been in the Tallangatta valley region, and it is one of the areas of the North Eastern Province that is most severely afflicted by a surplus of kangaroos. If the farmers in that area were not taking the action to which Mr Sgro referred, they would be overrun by kangaroos in a short time and it would become a completely uneconomic proposition for them to remain in that farming area, albeit that it is one of the most fertile parts of Victoria.

Any honourable members who suggest that there is a danger of the kangaroo becoming extinct should on a moonlit night visit the area to which Mr Sgro referred and they will be convinced that there will be kangaroos in this nation for the next millennium, regardless of how many are shot and loaded onto the trucks. Therefore, I believe the solution proposed by Mr Sgro is not a practical one. I can understand his sentiments in saying that we ought to convey to the world the message, “You will not get kangaroo meat because we have stopped the slaughter”, but to me that is not a practical solution to the problem.

The Hon. R. I. KNOWLES (Ballarat Province)—I support the motion moved by Mr Baxter and the amendment moved by the Minister for Conservation and oppose the amendment moved by Mr Kent. The basic objection to the amendment moved by Mr Kent is that it tends to confuse the issue. Certainly the views that he and Mr Sgro expressed, although I certainly understand and support the basis for them, tend to confuse the issue of whether it concerned State inspection problems relating to meat for the domestic market or the Commonwealth inspection service for the supervision and inspection of meat for export. It is critical for honourable members and for the community to understand that the basic
issue is fairly and squarely in the Commonwealth Government's sphere of activity. The Victorian Government has responded, and on a number of occasions has encouraged the Federal Government to institute a Royal Commission. The Victorian Government is very keen for that inquiry to be a broad brush inquiry which will look at the meat industry in total, both export and domestic.

The point covered by the Minister's proposed amendment is that the problem is not confined to Victoria. There is a need for all State Governments to adopt terms of reference similar to those adopted by the Victorian Government, which will allow for a thorough inquiry to be conducted into all aspects of the meat industry.

The matter that concerns me is that, although other State Governments have indicated willingness to co-operate with the inquiry, it may mean that they will only do so in terms of the world export trade. It may well be that when leads are being pursued by the Royal Commission on abattoirs servicing the domestic market, once those leads reach the border the inquiry will be stifled.

It is appropriate to encourage and call upon all State Governments to co-operate with the inquiry and, as I said, in my view it is necessary for them to adopt similar terms of reference in regard to their own States.

I should like to make some comments about State meat inspection services. The Victorian inspection service is recognized as being the most comprehensive of any State in the Commonwealth. Victoria is the only State with a full-time inspection service for all abattoirs and slaughter-houses. That means that the inspection services cover something like 820 facilities, and approximately 250 meat inspectors provide that inspection.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Do you know how many meat premises there are in Victoria?

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—You want to look at your Minister's answers more correctly next time.

The Hon. R. I. KNOWLES—They are the figures I have, and I have no reason to believe they are incorrect.

The Hon. R. I. KNOWLES—Mr Kent indicated that he believed there was a lack of dedication at the State level to examining complaints that have been made. I should like to record the number of complaints over various years that the service has received and the results of those investigations.

In 1976 there were 39 complaints, 5 recommended prosecutions and as a result of those prosecutions 5 convictions were sustained. In 1977 there were 38 complaints, 4 recommended prosecutions and 3 convictions; in 1978 there were 41 complaints, 2 recommended prosecutions and 1 conviction; in 1979, 72 complaints, 11 recommended prosecutions and 4 convictions; in 1980, 123 complaints, 16 recommended prosecutions and 8 convictions, and in 1981, 72 complaints, 7 recommended prosecutions and 4 convictions.

In a number of cases the complaints related to aspects of the abattoirs inspected by the Commonwealth service. Those complaints were passed on to the relevant Commonwealth authorities with all the information that the State service had or was aware of.

It is important to maintain public support and confidence in the State meat inspection service so that when people purchase meat, they know they are getting what they believe they are paying for. This is absolutely crucial, and that is why we must be careful not to be deflected from the main thrust of the Royal Commission. It is fairly clear that there are some problems in the Commonwealth meat inspection service, and attention must be directed to that service to ensure that the problems that have been experienced do not occur again in the future. As all speakers have
said, that is the only way in which we are going to restore overseas confidence in the Australian meat industry.

A number of comments have been made about the dual control of inspection services. Three years ago, the then Victorian Minister of Agriculture invited the Commonwealth to take over the Victorian meat inspection services and to incorporate them in the Commonwealth inspection services for export meat. As the Minister indicated, that was only on the condition that the Commonwealth was prepared to provide advice to the Victorian Government on any findings it had on disease, so that the Victorian Department of Agriculture could continue to provide a service to the farming community to eliminate whatever disease might be found. Mr Radford indicates that this allows a trace back service to continue which is an important aspect of the present meat inspection services.

I reiterate that it is crucial to focus attention on the export area and the need for improving meat inspection services. One should not be sidetracked on the matter of the State inspection services, although they should be examined, and if areas need to be tightened, it is essential that that should occur. As the Minister indicated, during this session the Government will introduce a Bill to strengthen further a number of the requirements. However, if the Royal Commission finds that additional aspects need to be covered, the matters should be instituted as quickly as possible.

The other aspect that I reiterate is the need for all States to co-operate and allow for a thorough investigation of the meat industry nationally, both meat that is exported and that which is for local consumption. I oppose the amendment by Mr Kent and support the motion by Mr Baxter and the amendment by the Minister.

The sitting was suspended at 6.33 p.m. until 8.4 p.m.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU (Doutta Galla Province)—Prior to the suspension, honourable members were debating a proposition put forward originally by Mr Baxter, an amendment by the Minister and a well-reasoned amendment by Mr Kent. The three propositions are fairly easily tackled. One calls for co-operation with the Royal Commission from the Victorian Government and the community. The Minister's amendment goes to the question of all Governments in Australia, and I should have thought that was fairly logical, if not the only alteration one would have liked to make to Mr Baxter's motion. The Labor Party acknowledges that a need exists for co-operation right across Australia from all Governments and authorities and the community generally on this question. The motion moved by Mr Baxter is typical of the National Party which is making a last-ditch effort to attain coalition by trying to spell out what is required. One would have thought that those representing that large slice of Victoria in area would have been aware of their responsibilities to the whole of Victoria in terms of the export trade and the home consumption of meat.

The Hon. B. P. Dunn—Why did not the Labor Party put the motion on the Notice Paper?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—The reason is that this is the International Year of Disabled Persons, and the Labor Party tries to encourage those who are slow and rarely make contributions to this House, and Mr Dunn is one of those.

The proposition put forward by the Labor Party merely acknowledges what is a fact, that an inquiry will be held, that there should be co-operation from the Victorian Government, which the Minister assures us is forthcoming, and that there should be co-operation from the rest of the community. The Labor Party obviously endorses the sentiments behind that.

What has led to the need for a Royal Commission is of concern. I do not pretend to know a great deal about the meat industry and I am sure that Mr Baxter, the Minister, or even Mr Kent would not do so, but I know enough of the problems associated with the creation of doubt about a product to know that such a matter should not be han-
The present mess could have been avoided if the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation had been given total control over export contracts and other export areas other than meat inspection services. An honourable member suggests that I am wrong, and I will provide statistics shortly. Some absurd statements have been made by Ministers in another place and by a Minister in this House in respect of the Government's attitude to the problem. As Mr Sgro has said, the problem is not new. When I asked a question in this House about the consumption of horsemeat, the Minister, who goes out killing 80 snakes in a week-end, said that there was nothing wrong with horse. There is nothing wrong with horse, but the Minister is arrogant in the way in which he treats these sorts of complaints. Earlier there was great hysteria from members on the Government side of the House when a Dorothy Dix question was asked of the Attorney-General about the actions of one of my colleagues, but nothing has been said about the complaints lodged by employers, consumers and the Labor Party representatives in respect of the handling of meat in this State.

It is clear that any inquiry that examines only the question of export control and does not go to the question of intrastate and interstate transportation and control of meat will be merely a whitewash. Victoria is the only State implicated in both the electronic media evidence in interviews and statements and in newspaper reports.

The Hon. J. W. S. Radford—That is not correct, Mr Landeryou. You want to check your facts.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—Mr Radford would not recognize a fact if he tripped over it. To illustrate my point I refer to some statements made in the Queensland Parliament on 22 April by Mr Tom Burns, the honourable member for Lytton. Mr Burns made some fairly startling allegations. The document to which I am referring is a Hansard draft of Mr Burns' remarks, which states:

This morning I visited the Watson cold stores in my electorate, where I saw 2580 plastic bags of undyed roo meat. It is there now. It is there for every honourable member to see. There is no dye in it at all. There are 172 cartons of branded roo meat and 2580 bags of undyed roo meat in that cold store now. The bags have been recycled. Some bags previously contained a substance called notrophil, which is associated with ammonium nitrate.

The next page illustrates even more vividly the vagaries of the system and gives the lie to the assertions made by the Minister in response to an interjection by me that he is satisfied that the department manages its affairs with considerable skill.

Mr Burns tells the story of a carton that was clearly branded on the outside as beef. The carton was sent around Australia from capital city to capital city to test the dual inspection system. When the carton arrived back at its point of origin, it bore on its outside so many stamps indicating inspection approvals that the name of the consignee was almost impossible to read. The carton was covered with approval stamps and bore inspection stamps from all the capitals of Australia, yet it contained nothing more than ice.

I asked the question about horsemeat because I was a little horrified about it all. As I indicated, I do not know very much about meat. I have seen lamb and goat on a spit and have had great difficulty in trying to decide which was which. My Greek friends assured me for years that I could not tell the difference, before I was actually game to try the goat meat. I can understand the problems that might occur with visual inspections, although I should have thought that a kangaroo carcass would be readily identifiable, even by a layman like myself. I am sure that even the Minister for Conservation, in his weakest moments, would not have any difficulty in telling the difference.

The Minister was put on notice by the questions that were asked and the Government was put on notice by the complaints lodged with it by the Stawell council about the detection of kangaroo
meat in dim sims. Despite being put on notice, neither the Ministers involved nor the Government did anything. The proper inspection of meat is vital to ensure that substitution does not take place. From a public health point of view, the consumption of substituted meats in Victoria must be of concern to everyone. I have been told by the man who is known as the rabbit king of Melbourne—he is a personal friend of mine—that approximately 15 tonnes of kangaroo meat finds its way into the domestic human consumption market in Victoria each week. He did not make that assertion lightly. Obviously, the meat goes into pies, Chiko rolls, dim sims and other products of that nature.

The Minister has not only glibly dismissed the problems of the export market, despite the Argentinian experience, but has also ignored the fact that it was known in the department—and I have spoken to many members of the Government party about this—that kangaroo meat was being consumed by humans in Victoria. Despite having had all this information, the Government chose to do nothing about it. I suppose it is part of the arrogance born of the 25 years of stifling rule of this Government, but it appears that whenever something of such great public importance occurs the Government covers it up. The Government does what it has always done, it says, “Don’t let the Parliament know, don’t let the people know.”

That is exemplified by the fact that when the Minister was asked, by a question on notice, about the number of prosecutions, the years in which prosecutions took place and the names of those prosecuted, typically of the Government, he was decidedly evasive.

My colleague in another place suggested to the Government that the original regulation should be implemented. That would require the type of dyeing to which I referred to. That is why I earlier questioned Mr Knowles’ assertion, by way of interjection, about the number of establishments. The Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973 defines “meat establishment” or “establishment” as including abattoirs, meat inspection depots and other meat premises. It goes on to state:

“Meat premises” means any place other than abattoirs where meat intended for sale for human consumption is stored, packed, packaged, processed, canned, treated, boned out or manufactured into small goods.

They are the relevant definitions. The Minister and the Executive have the power to exempt both meat establishments and meat premises from sections of the Act dealing with licensing. In other words, although Parliament has, by law, imposed certain conditions and restrictions on licensing, the Government, through its Executive powers, has the authority to exempt certain people from the provisions of the Act.

Section 46 of the Act reverses the traditional British justice notion of the onus of proof and provides that a person having meat for sale on his premises bears the onus of proof, as occupier of those premises, to prove that it is not intended for human consumption.

Therefore, that was quite a Draconian approach to what was no doubt recognized by the Parliament in 1973 as a serious question.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—It is conceivable that one would want to prove it is for human consumption, but why would one want to prove it was not for human consumption?

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—I was not a member of Parliament in 1973. However, in 1973 the Parliament passed the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act. Section 46 (2) stated:

Where any meat or meat product is found on premises used by any person for the sale of meat or for the storage of meat intended for sale it shall, be deemed to be in the possession of that person for sale for human consumption unless and until the contrary is proved.

That can only mean one thing—if a person is found to have meat on the premises he or she is obliged to prove that it is for human consumption. This applies whether the meat is for sale or whether it is in storage.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—It is deemed that the meat on the premises is for human consumption.
The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—Precisely. The onus is on the person to prove that it is not.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—That is appropriate.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—That is exactly the sort of response I was hoping the honourable gentleman would make. I refer to question on notice, No. 1850 of 25 March 1980, asked by the honourable member for Werribee in another place of the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr I. W. Smith. Honourable members should bear in mind the regulations and requirements in the meat industry against the background of this question as well as the definition of meat premises which I have just read. The question was:

In respect of meat premises located in Victoria: 1. What is the total number? . . . . .

The reply by the former Minister of Agriculture was:

The answer is: The total number of meat premises in Victoria is unknown to officers of my department.

On 15 March 1978 those regulations were amended by removing the requirement that horse carcasses and so on be sprayed all over with violet dye. Honourable members may be interested to know that with the Governor in Council at that time were the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr I. W. Smith, the former Chief Secretary, Mr Rafferty, the current Minister of Health and the current Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

More importantly, a company which has a fine tradition and a long-standing history in this State has suffered because of the action of the Government. I was chastised by members of the back bench—certainly by one honourable member who will be sent to political oblivion shortly—for drawing the attention of the public to the fact that a dance company was masquerading as a dancing school and ripping off thousands of dollars from the poor and lonely, and even in one instance a handicapped person. I was chastised for making that matter public.

The Hon. B. A. Chamberlain—Have they sued you yet?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—No, neither has the honourable member. However, in the case of Tibaldi Smallgoods (Australia) Pty Ltd not one honourable member felt obliged to speak up. That company was sent to the wall through incompetence of the Government without any proof. The provisions of the Act would have guaranteed inspection and yet, according to page 863 of the Victoria Government Gazette of 5 April 1978 certain companies were exempted. I shall read the preamble where, under the heading Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1963, it states:

In pursuance of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act 1973, I hereby exempt the premises situated at the addresses set out hereunder and owned or occupied by the firm set out adjacent thereto from those parts of sections 21 and 24 of the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act which require the said premises to be licensed as meat premises.

The long list that follows that information contains 103 companies which were exempted. Those exemptions were approved by a Government which did not even know how many premises were operating in Victoria. What was the delightful phraseology of the former Minister of Agriculture? The Minister answered:

The total number of meat premises in Victoria is unknown to officers of my department.

The Minister replied to that question knowing that a long list of companies, including Tibaldi Smallgoods (Australia) Pty Ltd had been exempted.

I am not a great fancier of salami, but it seems to me that this company was hung out to dry by the Government. At least three other companies were suspected, but not named. People associated with Tibaldi Smallgoods (Australia) Pty Ltd wanted to recall the product but the Health Commission and its officers told them not to do so.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—That was salmonella.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU—I understand that. If one understands the concern of this House about the flippant response to my question last year about horse meat, one will understand that concern has been expressed because the Government allows kangaroo meat and
other products to be killed in the most inhumane way in the worst possible conditions and taken to market.

The Minister knows that these products are being used for pies and dim sims. Court evidence exists to prove that this is the case with dim sims and other small goods. The Government knows that and has tried to cover it up.

I shall outline my criticism of the inspection services because the Minister stated that the only thing wrong with dual inspection was the duplication involved. In the absence of the Minister for Conservation earlier in the debate, I told honourable members about a packet of ice that went around Australia and came back again. When the package arrived at its destination one could not recognize the original name of the consignee because it was stamped with so many approval stamps from the various health inspections throughout the State and Commonwealth. When the package arrived back at Brisbane—the original despatch centre—and was opened it contained the ice that was originally sent. That is the sort of inspection that the Minister for Conservation seems to think is adequate.

The Hon. H. M. Hamilton—Did it go by train or camel train?

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—Of all the blocks I could describe the honourable member would not be one of them. It seems that the amendment to the regulations was the result of pressure from knackeries and so on in the pet food industry. The Victorian Government has never had any great plans for Victoria other than the greedy, personal, political power of its members to hang on at all costs. The Victorian Government has never had any vision or understanding of where it was taking the Victorian people. The Government has never understood the basic problem. As always, the Government reacts like a lump of jelly and after it receives a whack it changes its direction.

Therefore, the Government felt pressure from a small group of people and changed the regulations. Until now, the Government has refused to control interstate imports of horse and kangaroo meat and knackery products as recommended repeatedly by senior public servants within departments. Such a measure could have effectively prevented, the meat substitution racket. Despite the controls to which the Minister for Conservation referred prior to the suspension of the sitting, that fact is acknowledged on the air waves, on television, in the newspapers and by the municipal councillors to whom I have spoken around Victoria.

They complained to the back-benchers and the Ministers about this racket, knowing full well what was going on.

My colleague in another place referred to the meat racket in Alice Springs. Mr Tom Roper raised the matter of kangaroo meat in pies and was laughed at by Government Ministers. Time and again honourable members on this side of the House and Opposition members in another place have tried to raise matters of public concern. My friend made the allegation that 15 tonnes of kangaroo meat went into human consumption products each week in this capital. He is a reputable man and a traditional supporter of the Liberal Party in this State. He would have no reason to come to me with that information for any reason other than his concern for the average consumer in this State.

If the Government had been honest with the people of this State it would have been prepared to share the facts that were discovered and what it knew because of allegations being made and findings by the court, which named the companies involved. It was not prepared to do that and is still not prepared to do it. When one considers the answers to questions that have been asked of the current Minister of Agriculture in another place, it is clear that either his department is not providing the answers for him, or alternatively, someone in his department is determined to bring him down. Fancy a Minister of the Crown who is responsible for those sections of the Act defending the Government and saying that he will give these exemptions and then watch Tibaldi Smallgoods (Aust.) Pty Ltd go to the financial wall because
of his own incompetence and ineptness, together with his departmental colleagues!

The same can be said of more recent responses of the present Minister. Anyone who has read or listened to what the Minister has said on this subject would be aware that he is out of his depth. I am not an expert on this matter and do not pretend to be. I do not understand the nuances associated with this aspect of the law. I consider the Minister and those who have spoken on the motion so far do not understand that reinspection is dual inspection. However, I have demonstrated with a brief example that that area needs to be tightened up completely. That is quite clear in the open-carcass operation; it is difficult in an open-air situation, in the full light of scrutiny, but that does not apply in boning areas, packing areas and so on.

The Minister knows that the numbers of lids and packages that are printed and made in this State far exceed the numbers of packages that go to the market. Honourable members all understand what that means. We all understand the rackets that have been going on. The motion surely acknowledges the step that has been taken; it is a good step and it should have been taken earlier. The Opposition acknowledges the Government’s amendment in ensuring that it has the co-operation of all Governments. I am not political points-scoring in mentioning Mr Bjelke-Petersen’s reaction to the Royal Commission. I hope he realizes the sense of it for Australia.

It is essential that all Governments co-operate because it is not only a problem for exporters, but it is also a damaging, dangerous and criminal activity. It concerns how hygienically the meat is being stored. The problem is not only related to how hygienically the smallgoods and pies are prepared, but also the reality is that people have paid for products that are not the products nominated.

The Government has not understood the way in which brands are controlled and applied under the Victorian inspection system. It is clear from the Minister’s speech tonight that he does not understand either. One should consider the practicalities of what occurs. The ludicrous position has been reached in which this critical issue is being debated at a time when the community generally and the press are preoccupied with the State Budget. The community does not understand the way in which the Government has handled the matter and the full implications of the activities of certain criminals in our society.

I wonder whether any honourable members will alter the party Whip line in the Liberal Party when a vote is taken on this matter. It is a matter of record that regulation No. 78 of 1975 required that surfaces of carcasses passing from knackeries should be sprayed. However, under pressure three years later the Government backed down yet again and statutory rule No. 40 was amended. That was approved by the Governor in Council and it is clear that the whole purpose of the new regulation is to repeal the provisions requiring that the entire carcass be sprayed.

I have not heard the Minister, or those who pretend to have some knowledge of this industry and who have spoken in this debate, acknowledge that it is a mere requirement to have the 5 centimetre-wide strip along the carcass. I understand that it is a comparatively easy exercise for a butcher or someone skilled in handling meat with a knife to remove that strip.

The Hon. N. F. Stacey—It would be a bit obvious.

The Hon. W. A. Landeryou—If it were obvious to Mr Stacey, it would be obvious to any child in a kindergarten, but I will put that comment aside. The action taken by the former Minister of Agriculture now form the requirements. The intention of the Government in 1973 was clear. If the 1973 regulation had been carried out the current problem would not now be faced.

Undoubtedly, if the skills that have been required in trimming off that narrow strip, which would be obvious according to Mr Stacey, were not possible, the problem would not now confront Victoria. It was up to the former Minister of Agriculture to require that pet meat imported in Victoria be subject to
the same requirements processed in Victoria. However, the Minister continues to back away from that commitment.

The Government exempted Tibaldi Small Goods (Aust.) Pty Ltd and 103 other companies on that list from the provisions of the Act on 5 April 1978. As a result of the Government's ineptness, Tibaldi was sent to the financial wall in an absolutely irresponsible way. A further exemption followed the exemption of 103 companies in May 1978 when some of the processors realized the implications of the Minister's action and sought a repeal of the exemption and action under the provisions of the Act. That occurred on 17 May 1978. A further case occurred on 9 August 1978 and 17 September 1980 when further premises were also exempted.

The Government has decided to exempt from its decision meat entering Victoria from other States; in other words, the Government has not placed any controls on meat coming from interstate. Sufficient evidence for the inquiry has come from public discussions in another place and from the knowledge of several back-benchers on both sides of the House and Ministers. The House should insist that the Government takes the steps outlined by Mr Kent.

I reiterate the difference in the Minister pretending in country newspapers that he is in Melbourne doing his job and that he is concerned about the beef industry and his actions in moving an amendment to the motion moved by Mr Baxter in an effort to protect not only the Victorian Government but also other State Governments. If the House is serious about the problem, it should call on the Government to do precisely what Mr Kent has argued, namely, the Government should take action to prevent corrupt practices which may compromise the control of meat; apply effective controls over meat inspection brands and documents; require all meat other than for human consumption imported into or processed in Victoria to be subject to thorough control through methods of ready identification, such as injected edible dyes and notifications of intention to import, imports and movements; establish adequate resources to rapidly investigate, identify and remedy threats to public health from contaminated or other impure meat, and introduce rigorous penalties against meat substitution and other practices which may threaten public health and the meat industry.

Mr Baxter began the debate in the Utopian attitude that it was not his role to try to play party politics. Tonight, the House has the opportunity of putting together a composite of the motion moved by Mr Baxter and the amendments moved by both Mr Kent and the Minister for Conservation. Such a composition would call for immediate action to prevent recurrence of malpractices in the meat industry prior to the outcome of the Royal Commission. The Royal Commission may well determine who is at fault and I hope it will; I hope it will recommend stringent control measures. However, in the absence of any material debate and proposition, the steps proposed to be taken are the least Parliament can take to protect consumers, producers and the interests of Australia abroad. Anything short of that would be political point scoring and sheer humbug.

Mr Kent has argued the case succinctly. The debate should not be used as a means of attracting attention in the rural press. Honourable members have an opportunity of acting apolitically in carrying a motion calling for the co-operation of the Government and the community with the Royal Commission and between all State Governments and the community and to adopt the expert advice public servants have been giving the Government over the years to protect the short and long-term interests of meat producers and consumers.

The Hon. D. M. EVANS (North Eastern Province)—The National Party has moved the motion because of the seriousness of the problems facing the meat industry. It is reasonable that Parliament should express an opinion and back up the action being taken by both the Federal and State Governments, to determine the truth of the matters that
have occurred in the past few weeks and to define a proper way in which to ensure that it does not occur again.

Mr Landeryou's proposition of a composite motion by amending the motion through the suggestions contained in the amendments of the Minister for Conservation and the points contained in the amendment of Mr Kent that makes specific requirements and suggestions, many of which appear to have a good deal of common sense, is an interesting point. The first four lines of the amendment of Mr Kent would be unacceptable, I am sure. However, it does call on the Government to act immediately and the further contents of the amendment contain suggestions to which the House could possibly agree. If such a composite motion were put and agreed to by the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, the National Party may well agree to it also.

The House should express an opinion on the matter. There should be some balance of understanding of what has occurred. Some horsemeat and kangaroo meat has been discovered in imports of meat into America. According to the facts known at present, the amount of meat contaminated in this way is a small proportion of the quantity of meat that has gone from Australia to America. How long this has been going on is not known and perhaps that point will be determined by the inquiry. It would be wrong for me to speculate on that. Nevertheless, the amount of meat containing either kangaroo or horsemeat being imported into America is less than 1 per cent of the total exports of Australian meat to that country.

The Hon. W. V. Houghton—I do not think that is quite right; it is much less.

The Hon. D. M. EVANS—It may well be a quarter of 1 per cent, I am not certain; it is a small amount. The majority of firms which export meat to America are proud of their reputation and deliver according to specifications of quality and description. Those firms are acting properly by the American market, by the Australian meat trade and by the Australian nation. It is fair and reasonable that proper controls should be exercised to ensure that their reputations are not tarnished by actions of crooks and illegal operators. Indeed, I wonder whether an organization such as the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association may at some time be able to sue for damages those persons who engage in such criminal activities.

The Hon. G. A. Sgro—What about the consumers?

The Hon. D. M. EVANS—Indeed, the consumers are the customers and it is necessary to deliver the product they want, of the proper description and proper quality. The customers are the arbiters. Responsible persons in the trade wish to do that and the trade wishes to ensure the continued confidence of consumers. The American market is a consumer. If meat going to any market, Australian, American or elsewhere is up to description and quality, consumers can be satisfied in making a confident judgment. That is the whole point. The system can be beaten in a number of ways by dishonest persons.

The Hon. N. F. Stacey—Dishonest people can beat anything.

The Hon. D. M. EVANS—I agree. The majority of persons in the meat trade are honest. The meat trade should be kept clean and seen to be clean by the consumers.

If adulterated meat is found, a decent traceback system must be carried out very quickly into the operation to find those who are responsible for the action.

Reference has been made tonight about dual inspection. That, to me, is an embarrassing issue but a somewhat separate one to the matter under debate. It is a cost-wasting exercise. If the inspection is done properly the first time, I see no reason for a second inspection. The cost is great and unnecessary. To ensure that everybody in the meat industry plays the game, an even more costly meat inspection system may be necessary. There has to be some balance in picking up those people who are not prepared to live within the system, and the Government must ensure that the type of meat inspection, and the controls exercised, are not such as to unduly load
the cost to the consumer or unnecessarily load the cost to the producer. Therefore, there must be a documentation system that is sufficiently monitored. That is where the problem lies at present.

A number of things should have been done following the discovery of substitute meat in America. I believe the senior person from the Australian authorities, perhaps Mr Jones, the Chairman of the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation, should have been despatched immediately to America. I am aware that he was overseas. If he had not been prepared to return to Australia and go to America, someone with his degree of authority should have been sent to America to liaise immediately and publicly with the American authorities so that the consumers could see that the best possible means were being used to track down the problem, and that co-operation was being sought with the American authorities to find the scope of the problem and the best remedial efforts.

I believe also that the Americans were lax in this matter. What concerns me more than anything else is a rumour that has gained strength in producer circles that the Americans have known for some considerable time about this substitute meat but have waited to bring it out at a time that was embarrassing for the Australian meat industry. I hope the Royal Commission obtains evidence from the American authorities to see if that is the case. If it is, then the American authorities are as much to blame as the Australian authorities in this matter.

Comment was made about the suspension of the licences of boning rooms and the unfairness of that action. When the licences were suspended, no one was certain what was happening. They were suspended only until they conformed to regulations that were regarded as interim measures to protect the meat trade to America. Rightly or wrongly, I understand from press reports that, following the action that was taken, the suspension of the meat trade to America was lifted. It can be assumed from that, despite the rumours and so on, the American authorities are satisfied that the Australian people are doing the right thing.

The damage that has been done in the market from the consumer point of view will remain until this stigma is lived down.

Members of the Australian Labor Party tonight blamed the Australian Government for laxness. This has created a situation in the minds of the consumer and the Americans that the trouble was wider than it proved to be, and I believe they have done a disservice to the Australian people. I particularly refer to Mr Hayden, the Federal Leader of the Opposition, who did not handle this matter well, and I want to put that on public record.

The A.M. programme proudly stated that it brought this matter into the open, but it was not a matter of pride that it was brought out. Mr Sgro referred to the publicity in Europe. The publicity in Australia has damaged the meat trade. A minute proportion of the total trade was involved in this meat substitution and people must be careful that they do not get carried away in an endeavour to get their names in lights, and in headlines, because they are doing a vast and irreparable damage to an important Australian trade.

I agree with the Minister for Conservation that, if America wants Australia's meat, it will take it; if it does not, it will not take it. Provided the American authorities are given an assurance that what is being done in Australia will prevent or make extremely difficult a repetition of this most embarrassing episode, if the American market requires our meat, it will take it.

I support the motion moved by Mr Baxter. The House should support it because members for all parties have expressed their concern, and I believe genuinely, that the situation has arisen.

The amendment moved by Mr Kent has considerable merit in it. It spells out in great detail many of the things that are inherent and can be covered
in the motion moved by Mr Baxter. It has some value. I hope the suggestion I have made is taken up and that members support the motion so ably moved by Mr Baxter.

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD (Bendigo Province)—I support the amendment moved by the Minister for Conservation, representing the Minister of Agriculture. The two previous speakers, Mr Kent and Mr Landeryou, who said a few words to get their names in Hansard, have left the House. That is how honest their gesture was in this debate.

On 3 August 1981 there was a meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council at Darwin. At that conference, the Minister of Agriculture offered, in the interests of a single meat inspection system for Australia, to hand over the whole of the responsibility for meat inspection to the Commonwealth, but that offer was not accepted. Mr Austin also said that he hoped the States and the Commonwealth would be able to reach agreement on a relatively simple and understandable system for the whole of Australia, based on a single meat inspection charge and the greatest efficiency of staffing. Mr Austin was suggesting something that the growers of this State and the Commonwealth were wanting for a long time—a common fee and a common inspection staff.

I do not have to point out to the House the problems associated with the meat industry. It is a widespread industry and affects many country towns. Unfortunately, the Federal Government was reluctant to have its staff go into areas where there was a small throughput; good business for the Commonwealth Government, but not good business for the meat industry of Australia, especially in Victoria.

A great deal has been made of the meat that has been used in other consumer items. Mr Landeryou mentioned dim sims. I will get around to the meat pie situation a little later. All honourable members must recall that Mr Austin made this agreement before this “Slaughtergate”, as some people call it, blew up.

Reports did not appear in the media from America until 13 August. Indeed the Herald reported, “Horsemeat threat to U.S. trade.” The meat industry certainly does not want that sort of publicity. Fortunately it has revealed the shortcomings that have existed for some short time only. We should remember that it is a threat not only to industry but also to consumers in this and other countries who are buying our products in good faith. Meat has been produced to export standard and reputedly sold at export standard, but then we find it has been adulterated in the most abominable manner with substitute meats. It is disappointing that an unscrupulous few would endanger the livelihood of 50,000 cattle producers in this country. When one looks at the problems facing the industry this was the last thing it wanted.

There has been a lot of opposition in United States producer circles to the importation of Australian beef. Let us face it, the very high standards that have existed in export meat works has been paid for by the Australian consumer and producer in bringing export meat works up to an exceptionally high level of hygiene. The criterion for hygiene for the export beef trade is the American market. Australia exports $500 million worth of beef to the United States, let alone the export trade to Japan and other countries. All of this trade has been put at risk.

An American hamburger company—Foodmaker Incorporated—which provides hamburger patties to 879 outlets in the United States, mainly to a chain of fast food restaurants, has refused to handle Australian beef. That is not the only fastfood outlet that has refused to handle Australian beef. There are reports of Jack Carson referring to “Rooburgers” and “Kangaburgers” on a very popular United States television programme. Indeed, the television media in America has carried the problem of the Australian beef producer into every house. One can certainly understand the reluctance of American consumers to buy beef or even think of going into shops where Australian beef is used if they believe their health and
that of their families is threatened. The effect is being violently felt in Australia.

Two members of this House have commented on how they see the effect on prices in the Australian market. There is some difference in view but I am sure everyone would have to admit there is definitely some effect, not only in Victoria but also in other areas of the Commonwealth. There are even reports of the Northern Territory Meatworks being in financial difficulties because of the disruption this has caused to the export trade. It is a pity this ever occurred. Who is to blame?—these unscrupulous people. As Mr Stacey said recently, there is always a cheat who will find a loophole in the regulations.

I comment on the action taken by the Victorian Government and point out the good work done by the Minister of Agriculture. Indeed his cooperation and I suspect his prompting of the Federal Government into action on this matter is something we can be very proud of. When the Federal Government appointed Detective Chief Inspector Elkington of the Federal Police to investigate the matter in Victoria the Minister took the unprecedented action of appointing him to the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Authority so that he had power to go into any killing facility in Victoria.

The Premier and the Minister of Agriculture held extensive discussions with the Chief Commissioner of Police. Five members of the Victoria Police, supported by the Victoria Stock Squad, were sent to back up the squad who were working with the Commonwealth Police Force in investigating the situation. Mr Austin said that it is important that the State Police be involved not only to speed up the investigation but also to be better equipped to handle any ongoing investigation.

Mr Austin went on to say that he was anxious that charges should be laid as soon as possible and any guilty people properly dealt with in order to clean up the industry. He said it was a tragedy that the $2000 million meat industry should be destroyed by people who wished to cheat the system to earn an easy dollar.

On 1 September Mr Austin said the department intended to provide adequate staining of pet foods with an edible dye to minimize the illegal use of pet food. He said the Government would move to prohibit the processing and sale of horse and kangaroo meat other than for pet food. He also said it was important from a public health point of view and to prevent substitution that meat for human consumption should be limited to those species subject to inspection in registered premises, both before and after death. Then the Federal Government, which had already banned one meat works, moved in and banned another 27 such plants. That had quite an effect on the Victorian stock market because without those meat buyers competing there was not sufficient competition in the market. On 9 September—this month—a man appeared in the City Court and was charged on 21 counts relating to the export of horse and kangaroo meat as beef.

Indeed, the Minister of Agriculture must be congratulated for influencing the Commonwealth Government, which has widened the terms of reference of the Royal Commission. It has been decided that the terms of reference of the Federal Royal Commission would refer only to that meat which is exported. However, the Minister of Agriculture said that the Victorian Government would have to examine the possibility of going it alone if the Commonwealth Government rejected the request for wider terms of reference to include the domestic meat market.

Earlier in the debate, the Minister for Conservation referred to the new and wider terms of reference for the Royal Commission. The Minister of Agriculture has said that the new, wider terms of reference will give the Royal Commission wider powers to investigate all aspects of the meat industry.

Much has been said about what has occurred in the Victorian meat industry. However, it was significant to note
that Queensland's kangaroo shooters found themselves in financial difficulty when the bubble burst in the meat industry. One would imagine that the consumption of petfood in Australia has remained stable.

The Hon. D. E. Kent—Stables are for horses.

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD—I welcome Mr Kent back to the Chamber. However, it is yet to be proved that kangaroo meat has been dumped on the Victorian meat market. If such an allegation was found to have any foundation, such action would endanger Australia's export meat markets.

It was pleasing to note that, after much huffing and puffing, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, the Queensland Premier, on 15 September changed his mind and indicated that the Queensland Government would co-operate with the Royal Commission. Although the Premier said he knew of no reason why the terms of reference of the Royal Commission should be extended, it is obvious that, owing to the pressure applied by various organizations in Queensland, the Premier changed his mind.

The Hon. K. I. M. Wright—the reason is, they have nothing to fear in Queensland.

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD—Where does Mr Wright think some of the kangaroos come from? The National Party has finally come to life. I was rather surprised to note that, when the meat scandal broke, on 14 August, the alleged champions of the meat industry, the honourable member for Rodney in another place and some of his colleagues did not become very vocal. On this matter the silence of the National Party has been deafening. The effects of the meat scandal have been felt not only in the metropolitan area but also in country areas. Honourable members will be aware of the fame of Gillies pies of Bendigo, and I draw your attention to the comments of Mr Les Gillies. I quote from an article that appeared in the Bendigo Advertiser on Wednesday, 12 September. The article states:

The Federal Government had badly handled investigations into the meat substitution racket, a Bendigo pie manufacturer said yesterday.

Because of this, a lot of innocent people had lost their jobs, Mr Les Gillies said.

Mr Gillies said the sale of Gillies' meat pies had dropped "by a shade under 10 per cent" since reports surfaced of horse, buffalo and kangaroo meat being put in pies.

In Melbourne the reaction to the meat substitution racket has been much more dramatic. Some pie manufacturers have reported their sales have dropped as much as 50 per cent.

The Hon. C. J. Kennedy—How do you make bacon out of horses?

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD—The only thing Mr Kennedy would have going for him would be Gillies pies.

It would be wrong for anybody to form the impression that Gillies Bros were a party to using adulterated meat in their pies. They placed an advertisement in the Bendigo Advertiser stating that they used only local meat purchased through local sale-yards and slaughtered locally.

The meat industry scandal struck close to home when the headline "Castlemaine firm destroys unfit meat", appeared in the Bendigo Advertiser.

The article under that headline states:

Castlemaine firm Castle Bacon yesterday destroyed five tonnes of contaminated meat from the Profreeze boning room in Richmond.

Department of Agriculture meat inspectors and a Commonwealth Police officer supervised the destruction of the Profreeze consignment, believed to have contained horse meat.

Castle Bacon had not used any of the contaminated meat, factory manager Mr Peter Harris said yesterday.

I refer to the headline, "Inspectors out if States not in". Perhaps similar headlines in other newspapers have influenced other State Governments to fall into line with Victoria. I refer to the comments made by my colleague Mr Knowles, who listed instances of where meat has been inspected and found wanting. As a result, charges have been laid and people have been fined. Of course, the Government will support any move to increase the penalties for those who set out to adulterate meat and other products.

Reference has been made to the Australian Cattlemen's Union and the Cattle Council of Australia. Mr Gerry Collins, President of the Cattle Council of Australia, said that the council
had sought a full judicial inquiry into the meat industry, at the Federal level, three years ago. A news release on 8 September 1981 from the Cattle Council of Australia stated:

It would not be fair for producers who were the innocent parties to the recent meat scandal to bear the cost of Commonwealth initiatives.

“Species testing and proposals for carton sealing are national health and export security measures and should be borne by the Commonwealth,” Mr Collins said.

Mr Collins said another reason for the Commonwealth to “Pick up the Tab” for tighter security measures in meat exports was that the Federal Government was responsible for export meat inspection to which the industry had been seeking changes for many years.

“The Government has failed to act on industry recommendations to improve meat inspection,” he said.

Mr Collins said a single meat inspection system would feature high on the agenda at a full council meeting of the Cattle Council of Australia in Melbourne next week.

That meeting is being held in Melbourne today and I am sure the views of the Cattle Council of Australia will be in the media tomorrow. The State President of the Pastoral Group, Mr Des Crow, in a newsletter dated 16 September stated:

I have urged the Primary Industry Minister, Mr Nixon, to direct the AMLC to review its legislation, and to ensure that effective regulations are established which enable a strong control of the meat export industry. The AMLC, which issues meat export licences needs the power to control, and if necessary, immediately suspend licences of exporters, meat packers or brokers who do not supply to specification. The complex meat transfer arrangements within the industry should not be an excuse for a fragmentation of control. Cattle producers pay for the AMLC to look after their industry and product. Producers also contribute to the funding of meat inspection by the Department of Primary Industry to ensure export meat standards. Producers are now demanding to see value for their money. The US requirement for species testing of imported beef from Australia is understandable from their point of view under existing circumstances. However, I should add, that cattle producers have no doubt what species they produce. It will not be acceptable to producers to have to pay for further testing to ensure that the rest of the industry is maintaining its standards.

Mr Crow has every right to make that comment.

The Hon. K. I. M. Wright—What do you think about it?

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD—I think he is perfectly correct in making that statement. I shall now refer to live sheep exports.

The Hon. D. E. Kent—You are really getting into it now!

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD—I can see that Mr Kent might start quivering now. He will be interested to hear that the endorsed Labor Party candidate for the Legislative Assembly seat of Polwarth has urged the Australian Labor Party to repudiate the Australian Council of Trade Unions on live sheep exports. The candidate, Mr Angus McIvor, a Western District sheep farmer, said the Australian Labor Party should reject a resolution passed at the Australian Council of Trade Unions congress in Sydney last week which called for a quota of one carcass to be sold for every live sheep exported.

The comments made by Mr Kevin Shiell, Executive Officer of the Pastoral Group of the Victorian Farmers and Graziers Association, in the August edition of the Victorian Farmer set out figures which give lie to the contention that it is due to live sheep exports that so many abattoirs have closed down. Mr Shiell states:

In the 12 months to the end of March 1981, sheep numbers in Victoria increased by 37 per cent. Over the same period sheep slaughterings increased 25 per cent while lamb slaughterings increased by 74 per cent. We saw also, a significant increase in the export of mutton and lamb over that period.

Therefore, on these figures alone it is quite evident that the comments by some meat unions, the Australian Council of Trade Unions and by some of the exporting companies are incorrect.

Whilst examining contamination and so on let us dwell on the threats that were made by the Victorian leader of one of the meat unions at Portland. The leader of this union considered that he was demonstrating his position on the live export of sheep to Moslem countries by splattering the sheep with pig blood and other items of pig offal. If that is not contamination, what is? Mr Kent should not treat the subject
as a laughing matter. This is upsetting not only from the point of view of the meat exporting industry but also from a religious point of view.

I am quite sure the sheep producers of Australia do not like a union leader and Mr Kent, who supposedly is the shadow spokesman on agriculture, making a mockery of the situation. It is a sad situation when a union leader is prepared to debase himself and take that action.

The Hon. D. E. Kent— I am not laughing at Mr Curran, I am laughing at you.

The Hon. J. W. S. RADFORD—I did not mention the name of Mr Curran; I thank Mr Kent for putting his name on the record. The situation illustrates the lengths that some members of the Australian Labor Party and the trade union movement will go to contaminate meat on the hoof. Unscrupulous traders substitute meat and endanger the consumers of this country. Untold damage is being caused to the meat export industry which is one of the mainstays of export revenue in Australia. I have great pleasure in supporting the amended motion.

The Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Geelong Province)— I do not propose to make a long speech. As honourable members are aware, I am not familiar with the beef industry, which was considered to be a rather stable industry. As Mr Kent said, this is a "horses for courses" debate.

I would like to support my colleagues on this side of the House and, considering what is at stake, to emphasize the importance of their remarks. I do not propose to mince matters or to be in any way abrasive but, to purloin a phrase from the Government, there seems to be more in this affair than meets the eye. The Government has the knack of extricating itself from what deserves to be called a regrettable affair. Without dobbing any person in, one considers that it is, in actual fact, a clever ruse on the part of the Government.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade)— Mr Baxter has moved a motion to which two amendments have been proposed, one by the Minister for Conservation, the other by Mr Kent. According to Standing Orders, I will first put to the House the amendment which by its place in the motion first affects that motion.

Mr Houghton's amendment was agreed to.

The House divided on the question that the words proposed by Mr Kent to be added be so added (the Hon. F. S. Grimwade in the chair).

Ayes . . . 8
Noes . . . 26

Majority against the amendment 18

AYES
Mrs Coxsedge Mr White
Mr Kennedy Mr Kent
Mr Landeryou Tellers:
Mr MacKenzie Mr Sgro
Mr Walker

NOES
Mr Baxter Mr Houghton
Mrs Baylor Mr Hunt
Mr Bubb Mr Jenkins
Mr Campbell Mr Lawson
Mr Chamberlain Mr Long
Mr Crozier Mr Saltmarsh
Mr Dunn Mr Stacey
Mr Evans Mr Storey
Dr Foley Mr Ward
Mr Granter Mr Wright
Mr Guest
Mr Hamilton Tellers:
Mr Hauser Mr Knowles
Mr Hayward Mr Radford

PAIRS
Mr Butler Mr Block
Mr Eddy Mr Howard
Mr Trayling Mr Reid
Mr Walton Mr Taylor

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

WILDLIFE (LICENCES) BILL

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

PORT FAIRY LAND BILL

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister of Lands), was read a first time.
CONSTITUTION BILL
This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister of Water Supply), was read a first time.

THE CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT (CONJOINT ELECTIONS) BILL
This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General), was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS ADVISORY COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL
This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General), was read a first time.

PRINTERS AND NEWSPAPERS (AMENDMENT) BILL
The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General)—I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.
This Bill makes substantial amendments to the Printers and Newspapers Act 1958, an Act which may be traced back to a series of English Acts passed between 1799 and 1827. In 1864, these Acts were consolidated and the current 1958 Act is almost identical with the English 1864 Consolidated Act. It will therefore come as no surprise that many of the provisions of the Act are in great need of updating.

The basic purpose of the Act is to provide for the registration of printing presses, newspapers, publishers and printers. Originally this was seen as a means of checking the dissemination of sedition by means of the printed word. However, the only real importance now of the registration provisions is to provide a means of identifying persons for the purposes of libel proceedings. This Bill is designed to ensure that the Act achieves this purpose thoroughly and efficiently.

Some of the amendments are concerned with the updating of antiquated expressions. However, there are amendments of a substantial nature and it is to these that I will now refer.

Part I. of the Act deals with the registration of printing presses. Any person who owns or uses a printing press is required to file a notice to this effect with the Registrar-General and there is a further provision that a justice may issue a warrant for the seizure of all unregistered printing presses. These provisions go back to the Napoleonic wars when the English authorities were concerned about the French spreading sedition by means of the printed word. It was believed that if a press were registered, the premises on which it was situated could be watched and any seditious practices controlled. If a press were unregistered, an excuse would be provided to bring into operation the rather Draconian seizure provisions. The idea behind the provisions is antiquated and no useful purpose can be seen in retaining them. In fact, they were repealed in England as long ago as 1869.

Clause 3 substantially amends Part 1. of the Act by repealing all sections dealing with the registration of printing presses and the seizure of unregistered printing presses. However, the requirement that a printer print on every paper or book printed for publication or distribution his name or business name and the address of his place of business is retained. There is no provision, however, for the private abode of the printer to be published. Many printers have expressed concern at their families being subjected to “crank calls”.

Section 11 of the Act defines the word “newspaper” for the purposes of registration provisions which follow. Presently, the registration provisions relate to newspapers only if they are published “for sale”. Clause 4 is designed to extend this to newspapers published for gratuitous distribution, thus ensuring that those newspapers which derive funds from advertising or from other sources are also required to register. This, of course, casts the net very widely. Consequently, there is a provision that any document containing only matter relating to the business or activities of a particular social club, sporting club, sporting association,
church group, local church or educational institution need not be registered. It is also provided that the Minister may exempt certain documents from the registration provisions by notice published in the Government Gazette.

Section 13 provides that where a person desires to publish a newspaper, he must file an affidavit setting out the names of the intended printer and publisher and the intended place of printing. Clause 6 is designed to ensure that where a person is registered as the intended printer or publisher or where a place is registered as the intended place of printing and it happens that the actual persons or place of printing are different from these, a new affidavit setting out the actual situation will have to be sworn and registered. The related form in the Fourth Schedule will be amended accordingly.

Clause 9 repeals section 21 which requires printers and publishers of newspapers to enter into a recognizance of $600 conditional on payment of any penalties inflicted for printing or publishing any blasphemous or seditious libel. This provision was first passed in England in 1819 during a turbulent time in British history and was designed to suppress sedition and treason. The sum of 300 pounds was then quite substantial and it is interesting to note that this sum has not been increased since 1819. The section was abolished in England in 1869 as it was found to be dated and oppressive. An action for blasphemous or seditious libel is nowadays a very rare occurrence, so there is no real need to require publishers to enter into this recognizance. Sections 22, 23 and 24 are all totally related to the question of the recognizance and their repeal is consequential to the repeal of section 21.

Clause 11 repeals section 29 which presently requires advertisements published in a foreign language to be accompanied by an English translation. Originally this section was designed to protect migrants from prospective employers who might not be scrupulously mindful of the provisions of the Labour and Industry Act relating to rates of pay and conditions of employment. This section is dated, never complied with and unworkable now that we have so many newspapers published in foreign languages.

The purpose of clause 12 is to simplify the present cumbersome procedures for the recovery of penalties under the Act provided for by sections 30 and 31. Presently, all penalties in excess of $40 may be recovered only by an action in the Supreme Court and only in the name of a law officer. It will now be provided that penalties be recovered in a summary manner in a Magistrates Court and the consent of the Attorney-General will not have to be obtained.

Section 32(1) prescribes a limit of $20 on fees payable under the Act. This figure was set in 1958 and is now unrealistic.

Clause 14 increases the upper limit to the figure of $200. I should point out that the Penalties and Sentences Act 1981 substantially increased the penalties for non-compliance with the provisions of the Printers and Newspapers Act. Thus, the omission of the name of a printer or employer of a printer from a newspaper will carry a penalty of between $500 and $1000 as opposed to the old penalty of $10 to $40. Publishing a newspaper without filing the necessary affidavits will carry a fine of between $500 and $1500 as opposed to the old fine of $50 to $200.

The Bill modernizes and simplifies the law in relation to the registration of printers and publishers. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. JOAN COXSEdge (Melbourne West Province), the debate was adjourned. It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

THE CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT (CONJOINT ELECTIONS) BILL

The Hon. HADDON STOREY (Attorney-General)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Although this Bill is brief, it is most important for it deals with the holding of the next Victorian Parliamentary elections. As honourable members are
aware, elections for both Houses of the Parliament are due to be held next year and this Bill makes provision for the next Legislative Assembly general election and the 1982 Legislative Council triennial election to be held together as a conjoint election.

Perhaps some explanation of the background of this Bill should be given in order that its effect may be clearly understood. In the case of the Legislative Council, the six-year period of membership of the 22 legislative councillors elected in 1976 will expire on 26 June 1982, and the consequent election to elect 22 members to represent the electoral provinces would, without the passing of this legislation, be held immediately thereafter.

Section 38 of the Constitution Act 1975 provides that each Assembly shall exist and continue for three years from the day of the first meeting after a general election unless sooner dissolved by the Governor. The first meeting of the current Assembly was held on 29 May 1979, and, if the present Assembly runs its full course, it will expire on 28 May 1982.

By allowing maximum election periods, the next general election for the Assembly could be held as late as Saturday, 17 July 1982.

The situation next year is similar to previous occasions, when both the Council and Assembly elections were due to be held at almost the same time, and it would again seem to be convenient to all concerned if both elections could be held together as a conjoint election.

The holding of a conjoint election instead of two separate elections would save a considerable amount of money and require voters to attend the polling booths only once rather than on two occasions within the space of only a few weeks, and I am sure that this Bill will have the support of the voting public. The holding of a conjoint election would also save Parliament being disrupted on two occasions by being adjourned while two separate elections are being conducted.

To enable a general election for the Legislative Assembly to be held conjointly on the same day, and using the same staff and buildings at a triennial election for the Legislative Council, the Government of the day, in 1961, introduced certain sections into the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1958. Although these sections were put permanently into the principal Act, they were, by a special provision, limited in their application to a conjoint election held before 1 August 1961. This provision has been amended just prior to the holding of subsequent elections to revive the dormant sections and, in consequence, Legislative Council triennial elections and the Legislative Assembly general elections since 1961 have been held conjointly.

The first aspect of this Bill is contained in clause 2. This clause revives the dormant sections of the principal Act relating to the holding of a conjoint election and applies them to a conjoint election held not later than 17 July 1982, being the last day on which the 1982 Legislative Council triennial election can be held.

I shall now deal with the second aspect of the Bill. As honourable members are aware, although the date for the holding of an Assembly election is variable and may be held at any time that Parliament or the Government of the day decides, the time of holding the Legislative Council triennial elections, by precedent anyway, is regarded as comparatively stable—such elections were, until the advent of conjoint elections, held on, or as soon as possible after, the anniversary of the day of election of the members concerned.

Just prior to the holding of the 1967 election, and each subsequent election, Parliament amended the Constitution Act Amendment Act 1958 so that the ensuing Legislative Council triennial election could be held conjointly with a Legislative Assembly general election, and also be held in advance of the normally accepted polling day. The triennial elections since then have been held from one month to four months in advance of the respective anniversary date.
The 1966 Act also introduced a permanent provision, now re-enacted as section 28 (3) of the Constitution Act 1975, protecting the rights of members elected at a prematurely held Legislative Council triennial election, while another clause, now re-enacted in the Parliamentary Salaries and Superannuation Act 1968, dealt with the salaries and pension rights, and so on, of such members.

Clause 3 of the present Bill is similar to Acts passed previously in that, for the purposes of enabling a conjoint election to be held, it will permit the 1982 Legislative Council triennial election to be held before the 22 members concerned are due to retire. This Bill, however, will permit the election to be held up to nine months in advance of its normal due date.

I want to make it quite clear to honourable members that this Bill does not interfere with any existing rights of the President who may, if he is of the opinion that it is desirable that a conjoint election be held, consent to the Governor issuing the writs for the Legislative Council periodical election. It will be seen, therefore, that not only does the Bill preserve the existing rights of the President of the Legislative Council, but also those of the members retiring in June, 1982.

Although the Legislative Council elections may be held up to nine months before the members retire, members elected thereat will begin their term of office as on and from 27 June 1982, and pensions, allowances, and so on, will operate similarly. I commend the Bill to the House.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

CONSTITUTION BILL

The Hon. Glyn Jenkins (Minister of Water Sunnly) — I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a short Bill to amend the Constitution Act 1975 and its purpose is twofold. Firstly, it seeks to upgrade the pensions payable to former Governors of Victoria and their widows. In 1978, legislation was passed to provide that, subject to certain conditions, the pension payable to a former Governor was to be equal to 50 per cent of the salary of the Chief Justice of Victoria, and that widows of former Governors were to receive pensions equal to five sixteenths of that salary.

In 1980, legislation was passed which increased pensions payable to Judges and, inter alia, increased the pension entitlement of the Chief Justice of Victoria to 60 per cent of salary, and the pension entitlement of the widows of a former Chief Justice was increased to three eighths of the salary of the Chief Justice.

This Bill seeks to provide a corresponding increase in the level of pension benefits payable to former Victorian Governors and their widows, to bring them into line with those envisaged by the 1978 legislation.

Secondly, the Bill will provide Ministers of the Crown with a general power to enable them to delegate specified duties and responsibilities to other Ministers. The Government presently has two Ministers who, as part of their portfolios, are required to assist more senior Ministers. This provision will enable them to be given some of the powers and responsibilities of the Ministers they are required to assist. The three clauses of the Bill are, thus, self-explanatory, and I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Honourable R. A. Mackenzie, for the Honourable W. A. Landeryou (Doutta Galla Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS ADVISORY COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Hon. Haddon Storey (Attorney-General) I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes several amendments to the Government Buildings Advisory Council Act, which was passed by the Victorian Parliament in the autumn session of 1972.
That Act was an historic piece of legislation, in that it was, I believe, the first such Act in Australia proclaimed in regard to the preservation of historic buildings. Prior to the proclamation of the Government Buildings Advisory Council Act in 1972, no formal controls existed to preserve buildings. An ad hoc preservation process existed largely because of the actions of preservation groups in the community.

Being the first piece of legislation of its kind, the Act was limited in its scope. Several unclear categories in relation to procedures and responsibilities have emerged. These insufficiently defined categories are now to be rectified by the incorporation of control of historic buildings of public authorities into this Bill and by the Bill to amend the Historic Buildings Act already introduced into Parliament by my colleague, the Minister for Planning.

Victoria's stock of historic buildings is divided into two categories: those in private ownership and those in public ownership. Privately owned properties are subject to control by the Historic Buildings Act. Government owned properties are likewise controlled by the Government Buildings Advisory Council Act.

The present Government Buildings Advisory Council Act does not cover buildings owned by public authorities and one of the aims of the Bill is to extend the jurisdiction of the Government Buildings Advisory Council to cover this category where there has been some inadequacy. These buildings fit more readily into the government building category when one thinks of such buildings as the State Library, the Exhibition Buildings and the many railway buildings.

In addition to encompassing public authorities, the Bill corrects inadequacies in the present Act. It empowers the Minister to cause a register of Government buildings to be compiled and requires approval of significant alterations before they may be undertaken. The work involved in preparing a register and looking at proposed alterations to designated buildings is very extensive and both the Government Buildings Advisory Council and the Historic Buildings Council will provide a more effective means of both identifying buildings of significance and dealing with alterations to those buildings. The criteria that need to be applied in Government buildings differ from those that are applied in the private sector.

The private sector, in order to assist in the preservation of buildings, looks to financial incentives such as reductions in rates and taxes, which is not a factor within the Government area. There are many examples of significant buildings that have been purchased by the Government in order to ensure their preservation. It is considered desirable that the Government buildings be subject to a similar degree of control to that applicable to the private buildings, and this Bill will provide the mechanism for those controls.

The Public Works Department is very conscious of the sensitivities in the preservation and restoration of buildings. It is a leader in this field in Victoria and has received many compliments for works carried out. Immediate examples which spring to mind, apart from this place, include the Werribee Park complex, the State Library, the Windsor and Shamrock hotels, the law courts and many others.

The first building referred to the Government Buildings Advisory Council for attention was Tasma Terrace. The recommendation to the Minister of Public Works was implemented, and this magnificent terrace has been fully restored. The headquarters of the National Trust are situated within Tasma Terrace, which is a most suitable location.

Subsequent work involving the council has included some of the examples I mentioned earlier. The involvement and input from the council has been very effective and of great benefit when considering the need for alteration in those buildings.

The present Bill will rationalize the procedures in not only identifying buildings of historic interest, but also in advice to the Minister of Public Works
in regard to alterations of buildings so designated and bring within the ambit of this scrutiny those buildings which have, in the past, fallen between the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister for Planning, namely, those of statutory authorities.

The Bill allows for the Government Buildings Advisory Council, of its own volition or at the request of the Minister, or at the request of any Government department or statutory authority, to investigate buildings to see whether they are of architectural and/or historic interest such as to warrant their preservation and recommend to the Minister their inclusion in the register. It covers buildings or parts of buildings. It provides for scrutiny by the council of alterations carried out in buildings on the register.

The provisions of the Government Buildings Advisory Council Act are similar to those in the Historic Buildings Act and these two legislative provisions will jointly ensure that Victoria’s heritage in regard to historic buildings is adequately preserved for posterity. The passage of the Bill will considerably strengthen the Government Buildings Advisory Council Act. I inform honourable members that notes on the clauses have been circulated. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Honourable R. A. Mackenzie (Geelong Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

WILDLIFE (LICENCES) BILL

For the Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister for Conservation), the Honourable Glyn Jenkins (Minister of Water Supply)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Following experience with the legislation, a problem has evidenced itself with respect to keeping of endangered species. At present persons who keep other than listed common birds are requested to be licenced under section 22 of the Wildlife Act. This section provides for three levels of licences—a Fanciers (General) Licence, for a limited range of species; a Fanciers (Special) Licence, for a long list of birds which are kept by many aviculturists; and a Fanciers (Special) Endorsed Licence for the keeping of species proclaimed as notable or endangered under sections 41 and 42 of the Act.

Problems are arising out of the lists of notable and endangered species, which were originally intended to reflect only the status of species in the wild. But, due to the construction of the Wildlife Act, are also automatically applying to persons keeping them in captivity. The lists of species that are proclaimed as notable and endangered under the Wildlife Act in Victoria have been determined on the following basis:

Endangered Species—The current Australian list recognized by the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers—CONCOM—is proclaimed for the purpose of the Victorian Act.

Notable—These species are the subject of some concern regarding their conservation in Victoria, although they are not endangered on a national basis.

It is therefore essential that a clearer distinction be provided between the keeping of a species in captivity and the conservation of that same species in the wild and the Bill before the House achieves this by way of addition to the Wildlife Act to provide for a special list of species proclaimed for the Fanciers (Special) Endorsed Licence. The amendment ensures the notable and endangered species lists do not automatically apply to that licence.

The result of the amendment is that those species which are listed as notable or endangered but which are commonly bred in aviaries are deleted from the lists for the Fanciers (Special) Endorsed Licence. This is a reasonable and fair alternative approach to the keeping of these particular species. The Wildlife Act currently compels persons keeping these birds to take out the third level of licence, which has a fee of $90 per annum.
This amendment will allow aviculturists keeping birds commonly bred in aviaries to be subject to the second level of licensing—$15 per annum—rather than the third level. Penalties, however, remain the same as at present. Any prosecutions regarding notable or endangered species which might be listed for the second rather than the third level of licence will remain at the much higher level as set out in clauses 41 and 42 of the Act.

Accordingly there will be no relaxation of the protection afforded by the Act, although obviously persons keeping these birds will be subject to, and benefit from, a lower fee level than previously applied.

For the assistance of members I shall now make reference to the three brief clauses of the Bill.

Clause 1 is the usual citation clause. Clause 2 makes amendment to the principal Act in three parts:

(a) By aligning section 22 (2) (b) (ii) with parts to follow, viz. in

(b) An additional sub-paragraph (iii)—in section 22 (2) (b)—allowing for Governor in Council gazettal to provide for endorsed protected Wildlife Fanciers (Special) Licence holders to be exempt from the need to pay an additional fee to keep certain declared species of endangered or notable wildlife, then in

(c) By addition of a further sub-paragraph (iv) in section 22 (2) (b), allowing that subject to the provisions of sub-paragraph (iii) where an additional fee is applicable it shall be $75.

Clause 3 repeals section 24 (b) the reference to declared wildlife under section 41, consequent of the amendments made in clause 2. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Geelong Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

PORT FAIRY LAND BILL

For the Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Minister of Lands), the Hon. Glyn Jenkins (Minister of Water Supply)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to ensure that adequate boat-building and repair facilities continue to be available to the fishing industry and the public of Port Fairy and nearby coastal districts.

The existing facility is run by Mr G. Stewart as an approved decentralized secondary industry. It is the only professional boat building business in Port Fairy and services both the private boating and fishing interests. The boat building yard is located on freehold land situated in Gipps Street some distance back from the west bank of the Moyne River. However, this site is no longer adequate for today's boat building and storage requirements and has no direct access to the river for launching and slipping boats.

The only effective way of overcoming these inadequacies is to provide for the re-establishment of the business on another site.

Field inspections made by officers of the Public Works Department, the Lands Department and the Port Fairy Borough Council disclose that the only suitable alternative site available for the purpose is an area of Crown land reclaimed by the Public Works Department. The land is part of the permanent reserve to the Moyne River between its east bank and Griffith Street lying immediately south of the foot-bridge over the river.

As it is vital to Port Fairy that this decentralized industry be retained and be capable of supplying an efficient service particularly in the interests of the fishing industry, the Bill empowers the granting of a lease of the new site for the appropriate purpose. The schedule contains a plan showing the proposed new site. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. R. A. MACKENZIE (Geelong Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.
CROWN RESERVATIONS
(REVOCATION AND EXCISION)
BILL

The debate (adjourned from September 9) on the motion of the Hon. W. V. Houghton (Minister of Lands) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Chelsea Province)—The Bill, which makes excisions to Crown land, has the support of the Labor Party. I point out that the measure does not detract from the total area of Crown land available to the public in any way. It provides for the revocation of a roadway which already exists between the Ovens Valley Highway and the Buckland Gap Road. This road goes through the reservation in the Parish of Murmungee.

The purpose of the Bill is to give this road legal status. Therefore it will in no way alter the current situation. The Bill also deals with road deviations for the improvement of the safety and speed of traffic. One area is in the Parish of Lockwood in the Shire of Strathfieldsaye and the other area affects the Yarra Boulevard-Chandler Highway intersection and the land involved forms the Yarra Bend Park. As I have indicated, the Labor Party has no objection to the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday, September 22, at half-past four o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.18 p.m. until Tuesday, September 22.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

GRAMPIANS' WATER STORAGES
(Question No. 94)

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North Western Province) asked the Minister for Water Supply:

Has he investigated the need for additional water storages in the Grampians catchment area; if so, what are the results of those investigations; if not, will a full study be made of the need for additional storage to supplement that at present available to the Wimmera-Mallee stock and domestic system?

The Hon. GLYN JENKINS (Minister Water Supply)—The answer is:

The Water Commission did initiate a study in the mid 1970s to re-assess the supply available from the existing Wimmera-Mallee Headworks. This study could not be completed at this time due to lack of data and the advent of higher priority work. With regard to the second part of the question the study will be taken up again when staff resources become available. More recently the Commission has undertaken an investigation to determine the feasibility and cost of replacing channels in the system with pipelines to reduce water losses and thereby increase water availability. Losses during transmission of that water are considerable. The results of this investigation will be made available shortly.
The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman) took the chair at 2.6 p.m. and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr CAIN (Leader of the Opposition)—In view of the understandable concern of the people of Victoria, and, in particular, of the ratepayers of Melbourne over the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works building fiasco, will the Premier agree to make a Ministerial statement explaining the actions and attitude of the Government on this important issue rather than continuing to avoid Parliamentary scrutiny by hiding behind the Supreme Court action which will in no way be affected by such a statement?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—This matter is already in the hands of the Supreme Court in Victoria. In spite of various representations that it should not go to the Supreme Court of Victoria, it will go there and the matter will be decided there.

Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—Further to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, I refer the Premier to the serious accusation of alleged graft made by a front-bench member of the Opposition in another place. Can the Premier advise the House whether this matter has been referred to the Victoria Police, and, if not, will he give an undertaking that it will be referred to them?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I thank the Leader of the National Party for that question. I was most disturbed, as everybody else in this House would be, to read those allegations this morning. I have already discussed this matter with the Commissioner of Police.

Mr ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the National Party)—I refer the Premier to the serious accusation of alleged graft made by a front-bench member of the Opposition in another place. Can the Premier advise the House whether this matter has been referred to the Victoria Police, and, if not, will he give an undertaking that it will be referred to them?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I have already arranged that if the Leader of the Opposition or Mr White from another place is prepared to produce any evidence on this matter, it will be immediately investigated by the Victoria Police, as it should have been on 25 June.

OFFER OF BRIBES TO PUBLIC SERVANTS OR PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr COLLINS (Noble Park)—I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Can the Minister advise the House whether the offering of a bribe to a public servant or a member of Parliament would be construed as a crime in Victoria? In the event that a bribe so offered was considered a crime, what steps should any individual take in Victoria to get due protection of the law and to bring to justice those who offer such bribes?

Mr THOMPSON—I have already arranged that if the Leader of the Opposition or Mr White from another place is prepared to produce any evidence on this matter, it will be immediately investigated by the Victoria Police, as it should have been on 25 June.

OFFER OF BRIBES TO PUBLIC SERVANTS OR PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr COLLINS (Noble Park)—I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Can the Minister advise the House whether the offering of a bribe to a public servant or a member of Parliament would be construed as a crime in Victoria? In the event that a bribe so offered was considered a crime, what steps should any individual take in Victoria to get due protection of the law and to bring to justice those who offer such bribes?

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I can understand the disappointment that the Opposition has in the fact that the Government has decided that this matter should go to the Supreme Court, whereas I suppose their expectations would be pinned on the fact that it might be settled outside the court.

If anyone is offered a bribe, they have, as citizens of this State, a duty, firstly, to report the matter to the police; and, secondly, to give such
evidence as they can which will assist the police in prosecuting the matter. To suppress the matter is to become party to it, and none of us can expect to assist in maintaining the law, and the rule of law in our community, if we pick and choose the times when we assist the police in those matters. This does not mean that it is a heartless, brutal and systematic thing, but if a person in a public position is offered a bribe, then they have a duty to take it to the police for the police to prosecute after investigating the matter.

The police are independent in prosecuting matters of this kind and are not subject to any Ministerial direction or control. Therefore, as citizens, we all can rely on the police being an independent force that exercises its own discretion, such as it is, as to whether the matter goes to court, that discretion being exercised only on whether there is evidence that will be acceptable in the court.

BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr FORDHAM (Footscray)—I ask the Premier a question that in no way impinges on proceedings in the Supreme Court. I simply ask the Premier to give an unequivocal assurance that ratepayers' funds will not be used to pay for the cost of repairs being undertaken on the Board of Works building.

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is assuming that the Supreme Court judgment will go one particular way, and apparently wants it to go one particular way, whereby an increased burden would be placed on the ratepayers. It is assuming a particular type of judgment that would cost the Board of Works money. The Government is prepared to await the judgment of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY

Mr B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East)—Has the attention of the Premier been drawn to comments made this morning by the retiring President of the United Nations Assembly calling for a reduction in the tremendous number of receptions held in that institution, and also for a reduction in the huge number of reports, to reduce the tremendous wastage of paper and the like? In view of the proclaimed interest in conservation by the State Government, will the Premier give an undertaking that he will examine measures that could be taken by the State of Victoria that, in some small way, will do something to reduce this tremendous wastage?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—Yes, I shall be pleased to examine the proposal that the honourable member has put forward.

COCHRANE INQUIRY

Mr REYNOLDS (Gisborne)—Can the Minister for Economic Development inform the House whether the Ministry for Economic Development has compiled a report on Alcoa of Australia Ltd for the Cochrane inquiry and, if so, can he advise the House of the thrust of that report?

Mr RAMSAY (Minister for Economic Development)—Yes; as soon as the Cochrane inquiry was announced, the Ministry for Economic Development commenced work on the preparation of such a report which was forwarded to Professor Cochrane last week. It goes into some detail on the economic basis of the development at Portland, of the tremendous economic development that has taken place within the Portland township and in other parts of Victoria in addition to the particular work that is already taking place in terms of the $70 million that has so far been invested at Portland and the amount in excess of $100 million that is already committed there.

It has been made perfectly clear to Professor Cochrane that the smelter is of considerable importance to the future of Victoria, and a number of possible alternatives have been suggested for the resolution of this problem for Professor Cochrane's consideration.

BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr EDMUNDS (Ascot Vale)—Is the Premier and Treasurer aware that on the Derryn Hinch radio show this
morning Sir John Anderson stated that he had discussed with the Premier the Board of Works building dispute, and will the Premier now agree to advise Parliament on the nature of those discussions and indicate on whose behalf Sir John Anderson was acting and, in particular, as this will not impinge on any action before court, will the Premier agree to answer the question?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I happened to hear Sir John Anderson speak on that show this morning. What he said was correct. On one occasion he rang me to say that he had been contacted by the head of the firm responsible for building the World Trade Centre. He pointed out that the Board of Works had recommended a settlement out of court and he asked whether I would check the correctness of this course of action. I said that I would. I referred the matter to the Crown Law Department and discussed it with the Attorney-General and the Minister of Water Supply, and we still decided that the Supreme Court action was the proper course to take.

At no stage and on no occasion was any mention made of any gift, emolument, bribe or money going to any political party or any person and, if there had been, I would have been on the telephone to the Chief Commissioner of Police within half an hour to have the matter investigated.

RENTAL ACCOMMODATION FOR YOUTH SUPPORT GROUPS

Mrs SIBREE (Kew)—Will the Minister of Housing advise the House of the basis on which he is able to allocate rental accommodation to youth support groups which are in need of this accommodation?

An Honourable Member—This question was teed up.

Mr KENNETT (Minister of Housing)—It was not teed up. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who prostituted his legal training for political advantage, the Government has been consistent in recognizing that there is a need within the community to provide accommodation for young people who need a reasonable standard of accommodation. Some months ago, the Government announced, as part of its new directions policy, that it would be providing more than 25 houses, or renovated boarding houses or "pubs" to community groups to run on behalf of the Ministry, on the condition that these groups offered additional facilities and advice to the young people to ensure that as soon as possible they would become viable units in the community and get back into society.

As the honourable member for Carrum knows, this type of accommodation will be staffed by the youth organizations and charitable organizations which have answered the advertisements that have been placed. All along the line the Government has stressed that it is more important for those people who are committed to ensure that these young people return to the community as quickly as possible than necessarily to provide more social welfare workers and support systems on which the young people may then unavoidably come to rely.

The important thing is to ensure that those applications are properly assessed, as they are, and that the interests of the community and young people are our first concern, and not employment opportunities for social welfare workers who regard it as their right to run these sorts of homes.

BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr ROPER (Brunswick)—Will the Premier explain to the House why the Government chose to ignore the advice of the Board of Works and the advice of the legal opinion provided to and available to the board in respect of the settlement of the long-standing building dispute? The advice was that the dispute be settled out of court. Will the Premier make that advice available to members of Parliament? Will he also make any additional advice received by the Government available to the Parliament, and can he explain why that detailed advice was ignored by the Government?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—The settlement referred to by the honourable member for Brunswick...
would have represented a considerable loss to the Board of Works and for that general reason the Government considered that the final decision should be made by the Supreme Court.

**TOCUMWAL ROAD-RAIL BRIDGE**

Mr JASPER (Murray Valley)—I refer to the continuing deterioration of the Tocumwal road-rail bridge over the River Murray and increasing traffic on that bridge and the meetings which have been held on the bridge replacement programme over the past twelve months. Will the Minister of Transport confirm that this bridge replacement is still equal second on the list for the replacement of bridges over the river, and will he also confirm that contact has been made with the New South Wales Minister for Roads in an effort to have meetings on a continuing basis to discuss this bridge replacement?

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—The system that has been adopted for this project has been to try to get all the Government departments and instrumentalities from both New South Wales and Victoria around the table. The New South Wales Minister for Roads agreed that he and I would be co-chairmen of the group since it involved two States and that we would alternate the meetings on the Victorian and New South Wales sides to try to co-ordinate the approach of all Government departments. There is hardly a Government department or instrumentality which does not, potentially at least, have a finger in the pie, from the Telecom cables to the Marine Board in New South Wales, which has to set some standard for clearance for possible boat movements; the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission and Soil Conservation Authority—the whole range of Government departments. Careful and consistent consultation is needed to ensure that no one department or instrumentality is delaying progress by its failure to proceed on some design aspect of the project.

The first meeting was held in Victoria but the Minister, Mr Jensen, was not able to get to that meeting because his helicopter broke down. It was provided for him by the Department of Main Roads of New South Wales and was used by him for an inspection. The Country Roads Board in Victoria does not have a helicopter. We spend our money on roads.

I have written to Mr Jensen to ask him if he would, despite the heavy election programme he might have, be able to convene a further meeting on the New South Wales side in the next couple of weeks. I rely on the fact that his enthusiasm will not be abated because he is approaching an election and that he will organize that meeting.

The honourable member for Niddrie, who is interjecting, would know nothing about this sort of situation because he probably would not get out of Melbourne.

**RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL INQUIRY**

Mr BURGIN (Polwarth)—Following my question last week, concerning the widening of the terms of reference of the inquiry into the Richmond City Council and in the light of certain actions now being taken by Protean through the courts in an endeavour to stop inquiries being made into the leasing of the Richmond Abattoirs, will the Minister for Local Government now take immediate action—as I requested last week—to ensure that this matter can be investigated adequately?

Mr LIEBERMAN (Minister for Local Government)—Last week the board of inquiry, Mr Alastair Nicholson, Q.C., heard argument as to whether certain evidence concerning the Richmond City Council and Protean (Holdings) Ltd could be examined by him within the terms of reference of his inquiry.

Mr Ginifer—Wasn’t this done in camera?
Mr LIEBERMAN—If I could be permitted to answer the question without interference, I should be able both to concentrate on the issue raised by Mr Speaker and inform honourable members of the facts. The board, after considering the submissions, decided that the evidence that was sought to be led by counsel assisting the inquiry could be led within the ambit of the terms of reference. The parties on the other side, representing Protean, argued that that decision was not correct and took the matter to the Supreme Court on Monday of this week.

I am informed that yesterday morning Mr Justice Tadgell ruled that the interpretation made by the board of inquiry was correct and that the evidence could be led. I have since been told that counsel representing Protean (Holdings) Ltd has indicated the possibility of an appeal against that decision to the Full court of the Supreme Court.

My view is that, in the light of the decision of the board of inquiry and the confirmation of that decision by Mr Justice Tadgell, if there is any doubt remaining about the terms of reference, they should be clarified. Obviously, there is no doubt in the board's view. On that basis, I am seeking advice from the Attorney-General, seeking a clarification of the terms of reference if that is necessary, so as to ensure that no unnecessary legal expenses are incurred by any parties affected by the terms of reference and, above all, so as to ensure that the board of inquiry can complete its inquiry by the end of November, which is the Government's wish, with the minimum of upset and concern to innocent people and to other people whose names may be mentioned during the inquiry.

BOARD OF WORKS BUILDING

Mr WILKES (Northcote)—In the light of the very serious allegations made in another place yesterday and media reports today, in view of the answers that have been given to questions asked this afternoon in this House and considering the obvious right of the Victorian public to be kept fully informed of all aspects of the Board of Works building scandal, is the Premier prepared to make the files available so that they can be scrutinized in the interest of the Victorian public who, ultimately, may have to pay for the repairs to the building; if not, will the honourable gentleman explain why?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—The evidence will all come out during the course of the Supreme Court action. It is not customary to provide files while a matter is before the Supreme Court. I should like to know why this bribe allegation was not mentioned by the Opposition before 16 September, when it was discovered on 25 June.

SALES TAX ON PERIODICALS

Mr SKEGGS (Ivanhoe)—In the interests of Victoria's reading public and in the interests of ensuring that the means of disseminating information is not unduly impeded by Government through the means of taxation, will the Premier make strong representations to the Commonwealth Government to withdraw sales tax on newspapers, magazines and books?

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—The honourable member for Ivanhoe is a voracious reader and a literary minded man and, therefore, I appreciate the question. Yes, I would certainly be prepared to take the matter up with the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer to determine whether the sales tax decision can be reversed.

SUNDAY FOOTBALL

Mr TREZISE (Geelong North)—Will the Minister for Community Welfare Services explain why he misled the House yesterday during question time when he stated that, so far his department's inquiries into the social effects of Victorian Football League Sunday football were concerned, the Victorian Football League made no contribution to that survey or inquiry whatsoever? Bearing in mind the Premier's statement during the debate on the adjournment of the sitting last night that the Victorian Football League did make a
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contribution, I therefore ask the Minister to explain his position and to explain what the costs of the survey were and, in all fairness, what was the financial contributions made by the Victorian Football League and the Government.

Mr JONA (Minister for Community Welfare Services)—In the interests of accuracy, and, having regard to what was said in the House yesterday, I would ask the honourable member for Geelong North to withdraw his allegation that I misled the House and then I will give an explanation.

Honourable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! Personal remarks such as that are quite unparliamentary. I ask honourable members to cease making those remarks.

Mr TREZISE (Geelong North)—On a point of order, Mr Speaker, so as to ascertain the facts, I shall, if you, Mr Speaker, ask me to do so, withdraw the remark. However, I should like the Minister for Community Welfare Services to explain what he said in the House yesterday and to explain what the facts are so far as the Victorian Football League and the Victorian taxpayers are concerned.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! It is not strictly in order, but I shall allow the Minister for Community Welfare Services to answer that question. The honourable gentleman asked the honourable member for Geelong North to withdraw that statement. The Minister can continue with his answer.

Mr JONA (Minister for Community Welfare Services)—In the course of my answer to a question asked yesterday by the honourable member for Ringwood, I indicated that the study was being conducted by my department, with the costs to be borne by the Victorian Football League. I would have added, had I not been interrupted at that time, that the costs were of the order of $15,000. In addition to that, the honourable member then interjected and asked, “Who paid for the advertisements?” I said, “Not the league” because the advertisements that appeared in the newspaper, plus some additional work that is required to be carried out as part of that study, were costs to my department. In addition to that, as the Premier commented during the debate on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting last night, the Victoria Police Force, the Country Roads Board and other Government departments are also making a distinct contribution, at their own costs, to the study, in addition to the financial contribution from the Victorian Football League. Therefore, the House was not misled in any way and the honourable member for Geelong North had a misunderstanding of the whole situation.

SALARIES FOR HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATORS

Mr HANN (Rodney)—I ask the Minister of Health whether some hospital administrators in Melbourne, including one hospital administrator who is currently on secondment to the Health Commission, are being paid on salary ranges related to medical superintendents, rather than the normal hospital administrators salary ranges. If this is the case, is that an over-award payment and what action does the Minister intend to take to correct the situation?

Mr BORTHWICK (Minister of Health)—It is true that a number of people in a variety of health fields are, from time to time, seconded by arrangement with the administrations of particular hospitals and community welfare centres to perform specialist jobs within the Health Commission. One outstanding person is Dr Ian Brand from the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital. It would be reprehensible to second him from his position and pay him a lower rate than that which he would be entitled to in his normal position. Whether or not people agree philosophically with the new health proposals introduced on 1 September is not the point. It would have been completely impossible to move into that scheme smoothly in the way in which we did when the Chairman of the
Health Commission was ill with appendicitis; the smooth transition would not have been possible without the absolute co-operation and dedicated work of Dr lan Brand. He came in specifically to see the commission through a difficult time and he should be paid at the rate of pay of his normal position. In my view the same should apply to all the people seconded to a special job.

PORTLAND TRANSMISSION LINE

Mr BROWN (Westernport)—Can the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy explain how the new transmission line between Geelong and Portland for aluminium development is to be funded?

Mr LIEBERMAN (Minister for Local Government)—In order to provide the supply at Portland, the State Electricity Commission is required to further strengthen and extend its 500-kilovolt transmission system from Melbourne. The works involved include the earlier than otherwise required establishment of the Sydenham and Moorabool terminal stations, the construction of a second single-circuit 500-kilovolt line from Sydenham to Moorabool and the construction of a double-circuit 500-kilovolt line from Moorabool to the Portland site.

The 500-kilovolt circuit line to Portland has an inherent capability of feeding some 800 megawatts at the Portland end. This represents about double the anticipated load from Alcoa of Aust Ltd when the smelter has been constructed and is fully developed. This unused capacity of the transmission line could be used, as is intended and hoped by the Government, for further decentralized industrial development in the south-western area of the State. The capacity could also provide a long-term advantage in interconnection of the south-eastern State grids which, of course, is under investigation by a Commonwealth inquiry.

The total estimated cost of the project was $200 million and the funding arrangements are that 58 per cent will be supplied by the State Electricity Commission, 21 per cent by the State Government and 21 per cent by supplementary tariffs from Alcoa over and above the charges levied on the company under industrial tariff M. The 58 per cent provided by the State Electricity Commission will be recouped from Alcoa of Australia Ltd through normal tariffs.

I have answered the question at some length because of public interest and the fact that the Age published an editorial this week which suggested that Victorian consumers would have to bear a substantial extra burden and that the State Electricity Commission had been forced to add the $200 million cost of the Portland transmission line and ancillary works to an already overcrowded works programme.

Mr WILKES (Northcote)—On a point of order, Mr Speaker, honourable members have listened to a lengthy answer to a question by the Minister who is now beginning to debate the matter. It is out of order at question time for the Minister to debate an article that appeared in a newspaper.

Mr RICHARDSON (Forest Hill)—On the point of order, the question specifically asked how the transmission line was to be funded, and the Minister is answering that question. It is an important question and on the point of order raised by the honourable member for Northcote, the failed Leader of the Opposition, he stated that this matter is being debated. The only debating that came into it was when the honourable member for Northcote himself rather stupidly entered into the matter. The Minister is answering a question of particular significance and importance to the people of Victoria. The question related to the funding of the transmission line and the Minister is answering that question. I submit that the answer is completely in order.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—I uphold the point of order. The Minister has given considerable detail beyond that requested in the question, which was specific and simple: How is the line to be funded? The Minister has answered that question. Further information regarding the Age editorial
and so on would properly be part of a Ministerial statement if the Minister wished to expand on his answer. Unless the Minister has further specific information regarding the funding of the line, he has given sufficient answer to the question.

Mr Lieberman (Minister for Local Government)—I accept your ruling, Mr Speaker, with the addition of just one sentence: The information I have just communicated to the House was provided by me while I was Minister for Minerals and Energy in a written form to all members of Parliament in April and also to the Age.

Personal Explanation

Mr Austin (Minister of Agriculture)—I desire to correct a statement I made last night relating to the use of brands in meatworks. I stated that meat workers did not have access to brands. Although this is so in most establishments, there are a few works in Victoria—fewer than ten—where employees assist inspectors to impose those brands. I make this statement to put the record straight.

Petitions

Women's Refuge Referral Service

Mr Hockley (Bentleigh) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that permanent and adequate funding be guaranteed for the Women's Refuge Referral Service so as to encourage confidence in the continuity of this essential community service. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 521 signatures.

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

Retail Trading Hours—Abortion

Mr Mackinnon (Box Hill) presented two petitions from certain citizens: 1. Praying that the House take action to ensure that there be no further extension of those trading regulations already provided relative to week-end trading; and 2. praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petitions were respectfully worded, in order, and bore 60 and 859 signatures respectively.

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

Upfield Railway Service

Mr Gavín (Coburg) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that action be taken to reverse the decision to close the Upfield railway passenger service and to provide funds for the service to be improved. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 760 signatures.

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

Coeducational Technical School for Keilor Downs

Mr Ginifer (Keilor) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that the Minister of Education take immediate steps to establish a coeducational technical school on the Keilor Downs site to be ready for occupation at the commencement of the 1982 school year. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 1227 signatures.

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

Retail Trading Hours

Mr Cox (Mitcham) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that the House take action to ensure that there be no further extension of trading regulations already provided for week-end trading. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 298 signatures.

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

Mr Burgin (Polwarth) presented a petition from members of the Ararat Chamber of Commerce and certain residents praying that trading hours for retail shops not be increased, in view of the sluggish growth of population.
and of retail sales, and the penalties prescribed for breaches of the trading hours provisions of the Act be properly enforced. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 440 signatures.

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

Mr COLEMAN (Syndal) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that the House take action to ensure that there be no further extension of trading regulations already provided for week-end trading. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 204 signatures.

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

Abortion

Mr ROPER (Brunswick) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 275 signatures.

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

Mr WILLIAMS (Doncaster) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 175 signatures.

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

Mr JASPER (Murray Valley) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 613 signatures.

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

Mr KIRKWOOD (Preston) presented a petition from certain citizens praying that legislation be introduced to establish a legal definition to the effect that an unborn child is a life in being and therefore a legal person for the purposes of the law relating to murder or manslaughter. He stated that the petition was respectfully worded, in order, and bore 538 signatures.

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

PAPERS

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

- Police Regulation Act 1958, Determination Nos. 349 and 350 of the Police Service Board (two papers).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND EXPENDITURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That Standing Order No. 208 be suspended in respect of the Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee to allow—(a) publication of fair and accurate reports of evidence given by witnesses examined at public hearings; and (b) the release of evidence, discussion notes and other documents and the publication thereof at the discretion of the committee.

The committee is being given the additional powers to support its public hearings in relation to expenditure review inquiries. Similarly, powers to release evidence, discussion notes and other documents is necessary with respect to witnesses contributing to the work of the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATION MESSAGES

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman) announced that he had received messages from His Excellency the Governor recommending that appropriations
be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the following Bills:

  Council of Adult Education Bill
  Films (Amendment) Bill
  French Island (Land Exchange) Bill
  Port of Geelong Authority Bill
  Public Trustee (Amendment) Bill

**APPROPRIATION (1981–82, No. 1) BILL**

*(Budget Debate)*

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman) announced the presentation of a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the Appropriation (1981–82, No. 1) Bill and transmitting Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1981–82.

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer), pursuant to Standing Order No. 169, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to appropriate certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund for the service of the financial year 1981–82 and to appropriate the Supplies granted in the preceding session of Parliament and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

Mr THOMPSON (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

There has been a considerable change in the format of the Budget speech. It virtually has been divided in two, one part to be read in the House and the other to provide additional information for honourable members. Six documents have been distributed, which provide the most comprehensive budgetary information provided in a State Parliament of Australia.

I present to the House the Estimates of the Receipts and Payments of the Consolidated Fund for the 1981–82 financial year.

This is the third successive year in which it has been my privilege to bring forward the Budget for the consideration of Honourable Members. The highlights of the Budget include:

- Staged abolition of probate duty and gift duty.
- Reductions in stamp duties.
- Land tax exemption for family home lifted to $100,000.
- Boost for works programmes included record allocations for public transport.
- Increased benefits to Budget from use of non-renewable energy resources.
- A lift in State housing effort and a four-fold increase in rebate of stamp duty for first home buyers.
- Reductions in payroll tax for small business, including primary producers.
- Special rebate of payroll tax for new apprentices.
- Introduction of temporary payroll tax surcharge on larger firms.
- Special provisions for new initiatives by the Ministry of Employment and Training and the Ministry for Economic Development.
- Increase in Pensioner Rate Concession ceiling.
- A boost for Mental Retardation Services.
I am already on record as saying that this has been a most difficult Budget to frame, certainly the most difficult for many years. I shall be dealing with the reasons for this situation during the course of my Speech but, at the outset, I must stress the point that these reasons are to be found outside the control of the Government. Nevertheless they represent very real constraints on the degree to which, and the manner by which, the Government can progress in a positive way towards the achievement of its declared policy objectives for the development of the State.

The Budget has been framed to play an important part in the pursuit of these objectives, and during the preparation of the Budget for 1981–82 we have given special consideration to four relevant areas. These are:

- expenditure restraint in the running costs of government
- the promotion of growth and development to create additional employment opportunities
- the importance, to the whole State, of Melbourne as the national commercial and financial centre
- the enhancement of the living standards and general well-being of our people

Before developing the Government’s revenue and expenditure proposals for the current financial year I want to refer to the actual Budget result for 1980–81.

The Year 1980–81

At pages 30 and 31 of the Budget Papers (Budget Document No. 3) which have been distributed to Honourable Members the actual results for 1980–81 are compared with the Budget Estimates for that year in summary form.

This time last year I presented the House with a Budget with a Current Account in balance, taking into account a surplus in the Consolidated Fund of $32.4 million brought forward from the previous year. The resources of the Works and Services Account were supplemented by an amount of $29 million, also brought forward from 1979–80, to implement an expanded capital works programme.

The Current Account Surplus of $61.4 million which was achieved in 1979–80 as a result of a tight control on expenditure, and with the benefit of some windfall increases in several revenue items, was clearly of material assistance in framing the 1980–81 Budget.

In 1980–81 Current Account spending was also tightly held. Apart from an increase of $15.4 million in Railway working expenses, other expenditure was only $6.8 million, or less than 0.2 per cent, higher than estimated. In a total of some $4000 million this was an excellent result by any standards.

Current Account Revenue finished up $34.6 million ahead of Budget. Variations in the major revenue areas were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Area</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Taxation</td>
<td>$33.0 million above estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway operating receipts</td>
<td>$8.7 million below estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth payments</td>
<td>$8.2 million below estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State sources</td>
<td>$18.5 million above estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— a net overall improvement of $34.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Account transactions within the year resulted in a deficit of $20 million, and it was only necessary to draw this amount from the $32.4 million balance in the Consolidated Fund at 1 July 1980 instead of using the whole of this balance as originally anticipated. As a consequence there remained a balance of $12.4 million in the Consolidated Fund at 30 June 1981 to assist the new financial year. This was certainly an acceptable situation but it was much less than the $61.4 million benefit brought forward into the 1980–81 year.

The Year 1981–82

Estimates of the transactions of the Consolidated Fund for 1981–82 compared with the actual figures for 1980–81 are set out in summary form at pages 8 and 9 of the Budget Papers which have been circulated. Further details of the nature of these transactions and much supplementary material is contained in the Budget Papers and in the "Estimates of Receipts and Payments of the Consolidated Fund for the year ending 30 June 1982".

In comparing the Budget Estimates for 1981–82 with the actual figures for 1980–81, account must be taken of changes in a number of financing arrangements which by their nature destroy a straight comparison.

These changes are explained in the Budget Summary Statement to be found at page 3 of the Budget Papers 1981–82. However, the major factor affecting the Budget arises from the change in the method of treating the Commonwealth funding for health services.

Under the previous hospital cost-sharing arrangements the Commonwealth payments were not taken through the Consolidated Fund, but were paid into the Commonwealth Assistance—Medibank Trust Account in the Trust Fund for on-payment to public hospitals and other health institutions.

Following its consideration of the report of the Jamison Commission of Inquiry into the Efficiency and Administration of Hospitals, the Commonwealth Government announced that it would not renew its cost-sharing agreement with Victoria. It proposed to return to the State the full constitutional responsibility for the provision of health services and the determination of priorities within its overall health system. A detailed statement of the new arrangements, and their impact on Victoria, is contained in Budget Document No. 5.

So far as the financial arrangements are concerned, the Commonwealth payments for health will eventually be fully absorbed into the State's tax sharing grants. For the current financial year they will be general purpose grants temporarily identified as a health grant and, as a consequence, must be brought to account in the Consolidated Fund. The amount involved, $316.7 million, substantially inflates both the receipts and payments of the Current Account.

The total estimated Budget expenditure in 1981–82 is $5430.6 million, allowing for the changed treatment of the financing of health services and the other special factors which are detailed in the Budget Summary at page 3 of Budget Document No. 3. The increase if $605 million, or 12.5 per cent, over 1980–81.

It must be emphasized that in the recent Commonwealth Budget expenditure on the Commonwealth's own activities, excluding payments to the States, was much higher at 15.1 per cent increase over the previous year.

Mr Thompson
I spoke earlier of the very real constraints which have been placed on the State Government in framing its 1981–82 Budget. In the context of Commonwealth Payments, the treatment of the States by the Commonwealth Government in its 1981–82 Budget must be made perfectly clear.

This can be seen in the following table which sets out the position and requires no elaboration from me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments for Commonwealth activities</th>
<th>Payments to the States</th>
<th>Payments for Local Government and Northern Territory</th>
<th>Total Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 355</td>
<td>26 885</td>
<td>12 045</td>
<td>36 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 045</td>
<td>12 981</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>40 862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>36 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commonwealth attitude to the budgetary requirements of the States was made quite clear during the Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings held during recent months when tax sharing arrangements and works programmes were under consideration. I shall be dealing with these matters later in my Speech and they are also covered in the Budget Documents in the hands of honourable members.

As I have demonstrated in my two previous Budgets I have insisted on a rigorous examination of departmental expenditure programmes and an efficient use of manpower resources. I have already indicated that there is a tight control exercised on departmental spending against the appropriations approved by the Parliament, which is reflected in the Budget result for last year. Departments have been given more flexibility in the use of the financial and manpower resources at their disposal.

However, as we approached the 1981–82 year it became obvious that we would have to look even more critically at the level and content of our spending programmes, particularly in the light of the prevailing Commonwealth attitude.

At the same time there were new initiatives which had to proceed to fulfill our policy objectives. There were basic services in the fields of health, education, law and order and community welfare which had to be maintained in an effective way.

Accordingly, following the Premiers' Conference held on 4 May 1981, the Government established a Ministerial Economies Committee charged with the responsibility of streamlining Government operations and expenditure, and of re-assessing the need for programmes. The aim of the review was to achieve more cost-effective expenditures and further encourage the development of an environment which would foster private sector activity, the development of increased job opportunities and rising living standards for Victorians generally.

Over the past three months or so an intensive examination of departmental activities has been undertaken, with a consideration of detailed submissions and with lengthy discussions with all Ministers and Permanent Heads.

Some of the results of this review will not materially affect this Budget. They will show up in subsequent changes and emphases in departmental structures and programmes and in more effective delivery of services. Others are reflected in the Budget, both by way of reductions in expenditure growth and of increased revenue effort on the "user-pays" principle.
It is not easy, at this stage, to precisely quantify the benefit of the Committee’s work to the 1981–82 Budget, but to the extent that it is quantifiable the figure would approach $30 million. This is a valuable contribution in itself, but perhaps equally important has been the benefit to management of an external critical appraisal of departmental programmes.

The Government does not propose to stop with this exercise. It is still actively pursuing the matter of presenting more meaningful material to the Parliament on departmental performance to build on the significant improvements made over recent years. All the review work done by the Ministerial Economies Committee and the Manpower Advisory Committee has been based on a programme approach. The Treasury is proceeding with the development of programme based budgeting on a pilot basis to determine the most appropriate basis which might be generally introduced for the State. Last year a major seminar on Zero Base Budgeting was conducted by Treasury, with the assistance of an overseas expert, for senior financial managers in the Public Service to facilitate the acceptance and development of methods of improved financial accountability. This initiative will be further developed this year.

Complementary to the work of the Ministerial Economies Committee a detailed examination of the manpower resources required for the efficient service of Government in the State has been undertaken by the Manpower Advisory Committee. Departmental staff ceilings were reviewed to reflect the Government’s policies and initiatives, and redeployment of officers was facilitated to improve efficiency and effectiveness. The approved staff ceilings for 1981–82, compared with average staffing levels in the departments last year, are set out on page 91 of the Budget Papers. The 1981–82 ceilings reflect the staffing of new Ministries and initiatives and the redeployment of staff within departments, as well as reductions in the staffing levels recommended by the Manpower Advisory Committee. The Committee is closely monitoring the overall staffing situation to ensure an effective administrative structure.

With the introduction of departmental staff ceilings and greater flexibility in the use of manpower resources within budgetary cash provisions, the traditional departmental establishment structure has lost its significance. Accordingly, the Government has decided to cease the publication of the Salary Schedules as an attachment to the Estimates of Expenditure. For the future, the relevant information will comprise the overall staff ceiling for the department concerned and the estimated salary provisions in the respective Divisions in the Estimates.

This is an addition. I shall place on record that the approved staff ceilings for 1981–82 represent a reduction of 1.8 per cent on ceilings in force at the end of 1980–81.

In an overall sense, the total number of employees on the Departmental payrolls in 1980–81 was 119,033. This represented a slight decline over the previous year and followed decreases in staff numbers in each of the three previous years.

There has been some public discussion about movements in public sector employment in Victoria and, for the record, I have included a statement in the Budget Papers at page 90 which sets out the aggregate position over recent years. This statement clearly shows that the growth of employment has been limited to activities which are wholly or partly funded by the Commonwealth, or which are State-owned business enterprises which must be staffed to provide services to customers.

Mr Thompson
As I stressed in my last Budget Speech, the bulk of our Current Account expenditure, by its very nature, comprises wages and salaries. The cessation of the wage indexation system has been another factor in making the framing of the 1981–82 Budget a difficult task.

The total direct wage and salary bill supported by the Current Account will increase by $190 million on the basis of award rates operative at 1 September—an increase of 7.6 per cent over actual expenditure on this bill in 1980–81. There are, of course, other claims to be heard and settled by the relevant tribunals, including a possible major National Wage case to be heard before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that if there are significant increases in wage rates, there must inevitably be a corresponding reduction in the level of works effort and employment opportunities in areas which are funded from the Consolidated Fund. In current circumstances it is essential that restraint and common sense should prevail in the industrial arena to maintain competitive and viable enterprises in both domestic and overseas markets, as well as maintaining a viable public sector.

The total direct wage and salary bill to be supported by the Current Account in 1981–82 is $2695 million at current wage and salary levels.

Other significant areas of expenditure are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>An Increase of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$'Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Charges</td>
<td>489.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway operating costs, other than wages and salaries</td>
<td>185.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions</td>
<td>133.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds of petrol franchise tax paid to Trust Fund</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to other Governments in relation to Tattersall consultations</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appropriation to the Works and Services Account from the Consolidated Fund for 1981–82 is estimated at $426.3 million. I shall deal with the overall works programme and its financing shortly.

**Revenue**

It is proposed to finance the estimated Current Account expenditure in 1981–82 of $4975 million, which the Government regards as necessary and inescapable to meet its commitments and initiatives, in aggregate terms, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$'Million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Consolidated Fund</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State taxation</td>
<td>1893.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway operating income</td>
<td>269.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State sources</td>
<td>817.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Payments</td>
<td>2009.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Total of</strong></td>
<td><strong>5003.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of these estimated receipts the Current Account shows an estimated surplus of $28.2 million for 1981–82.
However, $15-5 million of this amount merely represents a necessary transfer from the Current Account to the Works and Services Account. This year the Commonwealth has absorbed into our General Revenue Grant several Specific Purpose Grants of a capital nature for Urban Public Transport and Soil Conservation projects.

In order to make this amount available to VicRail, the Tramways Board and to the Soil Conservation Authority it is necessary to transfer an equivalent sum via a Current Account surplus to the Works and Services Account.

Allowing for this adjustment the expected Current Account Surplus will be $12-7 million, and this sum will also be transferred to the Works and Services Account towards our increased works effort. It is equivalent to the balance brought forward in the Consolidated Fund from 1980–81.

As I have indicated, the estimated receipts by way of Commonwealth Payments include $316-7 million as a general purpose grant, identified as a health grant by the Commonwealth, which was previously disbursed through the Trust Fund under the former financial arrangements for health services.

Commonwealth Payments include an amount of $1502-2 million which can be compared with the State’s Personal Income Tax Sharing Entitlement received in 1980–81. This amount for 1981–82 represents an increase of $147-3 million, or 10-9 per cent, over the 1980–81 Entitlement.

As Honourable Members are aware, 1980–81 was a year in which there were very significant developments in the tax sharing arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States. These developments are by no means concluded but they have materially affected our Budget planning for the current financial year. In order to assist in the understanding of these effects I have included a detailed explanatory statement at page 7 of Budget Document Number 5, “Payments to or for Victoria by the Commonwealth 1981–82”.

The two main elements were the transitional arrangements for 1981–82 before tax-sharing moves from personal income tax sharing to total tax sharing in 1982–83, and the report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission on its review of tax sharing relativities.

There was no real review of the personal income tax sharing arrangements in accordance with the terms and spirit of the Points of Understanding agreed to in 1976. Although the six Premiers presented a unanimous case in respect of the review in February 1981 the Commonwealth Government did not respond until the Premiers’ Conference on 4 May last when the States were presented with a non-negotiable set of tax-sharing arrangements which represented a substantial reduction in the reasonable expectations of the States. The substance of the case put forward by the Premiers and the basis of the tax grants determined by the Commonwealth are contained in the explanatory statement to which I have referred.

As I have already said the tax grant for Victoria for 1981–82 is $1502-2 million. This is more than $100 million less than Victoria would have received if the previous personal income tax sharing arrangements had been continued. This reduction has been a major constraint on our Budget planning for the current financial year.

The tax grant for 1981–82 includes a special component of $15 million as part of the final adjustment which will be made in favour of Victoria in the tax sharing relativities following the detailed review undertaken by
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the Commonwealth Grants Commission. If the Commission's recommendations had been accepted by the Commonwealth our tax sharing entitlement this year would have been $55 million higher, using a base of three years to 1979-80, or $108 million higher based on 1979-80 figures. While Victoria, together with New South Wales and Queensland, was prepared to accept the Commission's recommendations it was clear that the new relativities would create financial difficulties for the three less populous States of South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. For this reason the Commonwealth decided not to implement the Commission's recommendations without receiving a further report from the Commission. However, it did agree to provide additional grants to the three larger States in recognition of the likelihood that following the consideration of the further Report the relativities would be adjusted in their favour.

At the Premiers' Conference held in June the Commonwealth did recognize the strength of Victoria's case for a better financial deal within the federal system.

As well as special additions totalling $26 million to the State's basic tax sharing entitlement, and $16 million benefit from the adoption of a more realistic basis of population estimates in the tax sharing formula, the Commonwealth also agreed to provide grants of $70 million and special borrowing authority of $40 million over a two year period as a contribution towards the urgent requirements of public transport.

The estimated receipts from Railway operations and Other State Sources reflect the additional revenue which will be received following the usual annual review of fees and charges for services.

In view of the factors and constraints which I have outlined, and taking into account the opening balance in the Consolidated Fund, the level of Commonwealth grants and estimated revenue from Railway operations and Other State Sources, the receipts from State Taxation at current rates and conditions would not be sufficient to make up the balance required to cover the estimated expenditure requirements.

The Government has accordingly undertaken a careful review of the areas of State taxation open to it and, with due regard to its policy undertakings, has decided on a combination of revenue measures and taxation concessions which will bring the Consolidated Fund into balance.

Before proceeding to outline the revenue action which is proposed I want to refer to the importance which the Government places on the role of Melbourne as the leading commercial and financial centre in the nation.

In the Government's policy document "Strategy for the Eighties", we have set out our objective to promote and advance Melbourne in this role by reducing or removing regulatory barriers and to take other action so as to facilitate the further development of financial markets in this State.

In this regard the Government has encouraged, undertaken or will put into operation the following major initiatives—

* Semi-Government Securities Secondary Market*

We have recently established in Victoria, through the State Bank, the first central secondary market in the Nation for the purchase and sale of listed semi-government securities. The net effect will
be to give investors in Victorian semi-government public securities a better investment and at the same time make these securities more attractive, particularly to the small investor. Victoria is the only State to offer this service.

Secondary Mortgage Market

At present the development of a financial market based on the discounting of mortgages is in its very early stages in Australia, although such markets have been developed and form a useful role in some other countries. The main impetus for such a market in Australia has come from a number of innovative companies in Melbourne, and we are lending our support to its further development.

The development of the market is inhibited to some degree by institutional practices and the form of mortgage documents. However, the Government also recognizes that another important factor is the existence of the 2·1 per cent loan duty which such dealings would attract under the Credit and Rental provisions of the Stamps Act. We will amend the Stamps Act to exempt discount transactions in mortgages from this duty.

Credit Duty

Currently the Victorian duty on credit transactions is 2·1 per cent. This can act as a deterrent to arranging such transactions within Victoria. To help overcome this deterrent, we propose to restructure this duty and reduce the rate from 2·1 per cent to 1·2 per cent.

Rental Duty

It is proposed to reduce the rate of duty on rental transactions from 2·1 per cent to 1·5 per cent. In addition, it is intended to extend to rental arrangements the current maximum limit of $4000 on the amount of duty payable on loans. This should attract more of the growth area of leverage leasing business to this State.

Cheque Duty

We propose to reduce the stamp duty on cheques to 10 cents. I will refer to cheque duty again shortly.

Negotiation of Loans

The Stamps Act currently provides that transactions at a rate of interest above the prescribed rate negotiated in Victoria will be liable for stamp duty if they have a nexus with Victoria, notwithstanding that the arrangements are to be settled outside this State. This was intended to prevent avoidance of duty, notably through Canberra. The lender must also be registered with the Stamp Duties Office. The result has been to inhibit the negotiation of bona fide credit transactions in Victoria by overseas banks not registered in this State.

I propose therefore to introduce an amendment to the Stamps Act to permit the Comptroller of Stamps to exempt such lenders from the registration provisions of the Act, although duty will still be payable.
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Offshore Currency Unit

With the emerging climate of greater freedom in financial markets, and with the greater maturity of our financial institutions, the time would seem to be appropriate for the Commonwealth to consider relaxation of the Foreign Exchange Control provisions to allow the operation of an offshore currency market in Australian dollars. While this issue is under consideration by the Campbell Committee of Inquiry into the Australian Financial System, the Victorian Government desires to be fully advised on the implications of possible developments in the currency markets. We are keen to ensure that institutions based in Melbourne, where most foreign exchange operations are now undertaken, are able to take advantage of any changes which may be made in the present Commonwealth regulations. Accordingly, I am setting up a small team to report to the Government on the potential for such a market and its development. This report will provide the basis for an appropriate submission to the Commonwealth Government. I will also be making representations to the Prime Minister and Commonwealth Treasurer to ensure that, as a result of the recommendations of the Campbell Committee Inquiry, overseas banks are to be permitted entry to Australia, licences will be allocated on an appropriate basis.

Development Lending

The State Bank Act has been amended to facilitate the Bank’s activity in the field of development lending. The Bank is now operating in this field and this will enable business projects to begin or expand, which otherwise would be unable to do so, because of the lack of acceptable security, even though they have quite sound and viable proposals to put forward. This initiative is seen by the Government as an important step in the growth of business activity, particularly small business, and consequently in employment prospects. It will also supplement the support being given in this area through the Victorian Economic Development Corporation.

Permanent Building Societies Trustee Status

The Government has recently announced its decision to provide trustee status for approved permanent building societies.

I turn now to outline the Government’s package of revenue proposals.

Probate Duty

The Government’s announced policy objective has been to abolish probate duty altogether. As honourable members are aware, we have taken a number of important steps in this direction which have resulted in the total abolition of probate duty on property passing within the immediate family.

Revenue constraints have so far prevented the Government from taking the final step towards total abolition of probate duty. The revenue collected from this source in 1980–81 was some $51 million. Nevertheless, the Government will meet the commitment which has been made.

We will be introducing legislation during the current Session to commence a staged programme of probate duty abolition. Where death occurs on or after 1 January 1982 existing rates of probate duty will be
reduced by one-third. Where death occurs on or after 1 January 1983 the reduced rates then applying will be halved and from 1 January 1984 probate duty will be totally abolished.

While the probate duty legislation is being amended, the opportunity will be taken to provide a further concession, designed to moderate the application of Victorian probate duty to the estates of people dying when domiciled outside Victoria, but with assets in Victoria. Under existing legislation the assets in Victoria of such estates are not eligible for the concessions which have been granted on property passing within the immediate family.

Much attention has focused on this problem in recent years, particularly as a result of work done by the Border Anomalies Committee. Difficulties have also arisen for older people who have retired and moved from Victoria while leaving behind Victorian assets.

The Government has decided to legislate to provide that from 1 January 1982, the present family concessions will apply to such assets. This will, of course, be an interim concession and will have no relevance after 1 January 1984 when Probate Duty has been abolished.

Gift Duty

The basic exemption from gift duty in Victoria has been progressively liberalized so that over the last two years it has doubled from $10,000 to $20,000. As with probate duty, the Government's stated policy is to abolish gift duty altogether. Although this duty is not of great revenue consequence, it has been retained as a means of preventing probate duty avoidance, but with the progressive reduction of probate duty in the family area the need for retention of gift duty on those grounds is losing validity.

Accordingly, the Government has decided to implement its policy of abolition of gift duty in two stages. We will lift the exemption to $50,000 in respect of gifts made on or after 1 January 1982 followed by total abolition in respect of gifts made on or after 1 January 1983. These gifts will, however, be taken into account for aggregation purposes in respect of gifts made before 1 January 1982. There will be some consequential amendments made in the Stamps Act, where gift rates of stamp duty apply, when a Bill to amend the Stamps Act is introduced later this Session.

Land Tax

Legislation was passed during the last Budget Session to defer for twelve months the application of the 1978 valuations for land tax purposes. These would otherwise have automatically been used for the 1981 tax year. This deferment was undertaken to enable the Government to assess the effect of the new valuations and to decide on any appropriate changes to the land tax legislation.

The changes in valuations have now been assessed and it is evident that, on average, the movement in site values from 1974 to 1978 has been relatively moderate, at approximately 30 per cent. However, behind this average is a range of movement including an absolute decline in site values in the City of Melbourne and an increase of some 57 per cent in lower valued land. Excluding the City of Melbourne, the overall average increase in site values is still moderate at about 35 per cent.

The Government has concluded that these changes do not warrant special adjustment of the land tax rate scales and the new values will therefore apply at existing land tax rates to assessments based on ownership of land as at 31 December 1981. The average increase of 35 per cent is
equivalent to an annual rate of only 7.8 per cent, which is much less than
the inflation factor over the four year period, while the average increase for
lower valued holdings has been about the same as inflation.

Special consideration has been given to the position of home owners,
particularly in the light of our undertakings in respect of relief from land
tax for the family home. We have decided to substantially increase the
principal residence exemption, which will have the practical effect of
meeting this commitment. The Government proposes to increase the
present maximum exemption by more than 120 per cent, from $45 000 to
$100 000 in assessments based on ownership of land as at 31 December 1981.
This is well in excess of the average site value increases at the lower levels
arising from the new valuations. It will accordingly exempt most family
homes, even with the new valuations, and will also provide a very generous
concession to all other home owners, that is, the limited number owning
principal residences with site values in excess of $100 000.

**Taxation Collections**

The Government has been paying special attention to the collection
of outstanding tax. This is a problem with payroll tax, land tax, stamp duty
and business franchises. The problem is largely attributable to the ineffect
level of penalties presently prescribed. For instance, the present statutory
penalty for late payment of land tax is only 8 per cent which, in relation
to commercial interest rates currently running at about 16 per cent, is
clearly a positive disincentive to tax payment. It is proposed to increase the
penalty rate to 20 per cent throughout all tax legislation, which is more in
line with the penalty rate envisaged when the 8 per cent figure was set
initially, I understand, over 100 years ago. The new penalty rate will apply
to all tax outstanding at the date the amending legislation comes into effect.

The fee for a Section 97 Certificate, which gives prospective purchasers
information in relation to arrears of land tax, is to be increased from $3.20
to $5, to bring it into line with the administrative costs involved. The flat
fee for a Tobacconist's Licence and fees for the transfer of such licences
are to be increased from $12 to $50.

**Statutory Corporation Payments**

Gas prices in Victoria are exceptionally low, by comparison with other
forms of energy, such as oil or electricity, and by comparison with gas
prices in other States. They would have to be increased very substantially
to reach the levels applying in New South Wales and Queensland.

This low price level is a substantial natural advantage available to
Victoria, benefiting both domestic and commercial/industrial consumers,
and is important in attracting industrial development which can effectively
use this source of energy. However, this is only part of the picture. Natural
gas is a finite Victorian natural resource and its use should benefit all
Victorians, not only direct consumers. It is also necessary to ensure that
this important resource is not used uneconomically due to an unduly low
price structure.

Other States such as New South Wales, Queensland and Western
Australia are able to ensure that all their citizens share in the benefits from
mineral resources in those States through appropriate royalty rates and
other revenue benefits to help their Budgets. However, because the oil and
gas fields are offshore, Victoria does not have a similar freedom with regard
to royalties. Victoria can nevertheless achieve a similar result through
the Statutory Corporation payment from the Gas and Fuel Corporation and
other measures.
Accordingly, it is proposed to increase the 1981–82 payment by the Gas and Fuel Corporation from 8 per cent of 1980–81 turnover to 15 per cent, giving an additional payment by the Corporation estimated at $17.3 million.

There will be no change in the present 5.5 per cent rate of payment by the State Electricity Commission.

**Pipeline Licence Fees**

Bass Strait crude oil and natural gas liquids are transported from Longford (Sale) to Long Island (Westernport) by pipeline. At the present time only a nominal fee of $12.50 per kilometre per annum is paid to the State for a licence to operate these pipelines, over some 200 kilometres, under the authority of the *Pipelines Act* 1967.

While the State does receive a share of the royalties levied on the well-head value of all Bass Strait oil, natural gas and gas liquids, this royalty revenue is subject to Constitutional constraints. These prevent the State from increasing its share of the benefits from the depletion of this natural resource. The royalty revenue is shared with the Commonwealth Government which takes about one-third—estimated at $58 million in 1981–82—and is based on value net of the substantial Commonwealth levy, rather than being based on a market value related to import parity. The difference in value for royalty purposes can be considerable—for example, a value net of Commonwealth levy of $2.58 per barrel for half the product from the large fields, compared to an import parity price of about $31 per barrel.

Victoria has to share this royalty revenue with the Commonwealth, and has no opportunity to increase its royalty take because the royalty rates are determined by the Commonwealth.

Having in mind the fact that the Commonwealth not only takes one-third of royalties but also will receive more than $3,000 million from its levy on Victoria's Bass Strait oil and gas in 1981–82, the Government recently suggested to the Commonwealth that it should withdraw from the royalty field in favour of Victoria, or agree to increases in royalties, particularly what is called the "over-ride" royalty, the revenue from which accrues solely to Victoria. However, the Commonwealth Government would not accede to these requests.

The Government has therefore decided to gain access to additional revenue from oil and gas liquids by imposing a new flat rate licence fee on each of the two pipelines involved. The fee for each pipeline will be $10 million in 1981–82 and the legislation will provide for this fee to be maintained in real terms in future years.

A pipeline licence fee of $10 million, similarly maintained in real terms, will also apply to the natural gas pipeline system linking Longford and Dandenong.

The new licence fee and the increased Statutory Corporation Payment will necessarily involve higher prices being charged by the Gas and Fuel Corporation and I have already outlined the justification for this situation. However, the Government would expect the Corporation to keep the increases as low as possible. Even after these price increases, Victorian gas will still be cheaper than gas in other States, and much cheaper than in New South Wales and Queensland.
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Lottery Revenue

During the last financial year the Government agreed to Victoria and a number of other States joining together to form an Australian Lotto Bloc. Members of the Bloc now promote Lotto competitions throughout Australia, with New South Wales being the only State to continue to operate its lotto game independently.

The combining together of the total subscription received in the lotto games in the various States has enabled the Bloc to offer consistently a first prize in excess of $1.5 million per week, which in turn has caused the popularity of the game to grow.

In the terms of the Tattersall Consultations Act the full duty on the lotto operation is paid into the Consolidated Fund and the appropriate share of that duty is returned to the other Governments involved.

Gross receipts from duty on the Tattersall operations in 1981–82 is estimated at $158.8 million and the total estimated payments to other Governments in 1981–82 by way of return of duty on Tattersalls operations, including Tattsotto, is $47.7 million.

Insurers' Guarantee and Compensation Supplementation Fund

This Fund was established under the Workers Compensation (Amendment) Act 1975 to cover the cost of the retrospective application of new compensation benefits—the supplementation element—and to provide a “guarantee fund” to cover the cost of claims, awards and judgments in circumstances where an approved insurer fails to provide the necessary indemnity.

The Fund currently has a balance of some $47 million which is generating income from investments of about $5 million per annum.

Interest earnings have been higher than were originally anticipated because of higher interest rates and there has been a lower level of claims on the Fund.

After making an allowance for estimated outstanding supplementation liabilities in terms of the 1975 legislation, and for some support, on a temporary advance basis, to the Workers Supplementation Fund in terms of the Workers Compensation (Miscellaneous Provision) Act of 1979, as well as preserving a balance for “guarantee” purposes, it is expected that there will be an uncommitted balance of some $35 million at June 1982.

The Government proposes to take this balance to the Consolidated Fund to assist the Budget. Legislation will be introduced to provide that, if necessary, future out-goings from the Fund, to the extent that the balance in the Fund is inadequate, will be met from the Consolidated Fund.

Refund of Stamp Duty for First Home Buyers

Last year the Government introduced a $100 refund of stamp duty on real property transfers for eligible first home buyers.

In current circumstances it is desirable to increase the level of support being provided for this group in the community and the Government has decided to increase the refund to $400. The additional cost to Revenue is estimated at $3 million in a full year.

Other Stamp Duties

I referred earlier to the proposal to reduce the present stamp duty on cheques from 12 cents to 10 cents. This follows a review of the present taxing arrangements in this area. As part of a new package
the Government will remove the present exemption from cheque duty provided for building societies and credit unions. These institutions have significantly increased their range of financial operations and now compete directly with the banking system in important respects, particularly in the provision of cheque-issuing facilities. The Government believes that in this latter respect they should compete on an equal footing.

At the same time it is recognized that the credit unions do provide a valuable community service by assisting their members to reconstruct their financial affairs when they are in difficulties. Special provision will be made in the amending legislation for a rebate to be paid to credit unions in respect of cheques drawn as part of a bona fide financial reconstruction plan on account of hardship.

It is also proposed to impose a new duty at the rate of 10 cents on credit card transactions with all merchants, except the first, in each month. Thus, if a customer deals with three merchants during a month he will be liable for 20 cents duty. This is irrespective of the number of individual transactions with those merchants, and represents the loss to revenue in paying all accounts through the credit card instead of by separate cheques to merchants. A similar duty applies in Queensland.

At the same time, steps will be taken to remove existing anomalies by means of which customers of the Commonwealth Bank avoid duty on their loan transactions, including Bankcard, and by which users of credit cards other than Bankcard also avoid duty.

Another amendment to the Stamps Act will substitute a flat rate of duty of $200 on settlements for the present ad valorem scale.

Earlier in my Speech I announced a number of changes to stamp duties with the objective of maintaining Melbourne's permanent position as the financial centre of Australia. Those proposals are part of a major review of our stamp duty legislation which is already in course.

Following the completion of the review I would hope to be in a position to announce further restructuring of stamp duties with the aim of incorporating any necessary changes in legislation during 1982.

Payroll Tax
Special Rebate for new Apprentices

The Government is already giving substantial support and encouragement to the expansion of apprenticeship training.

A further initiative in this Budget is to provide for a special rebate of payroll tax in respect of the first year's wages paid to all new apprentices engaged after 1 January 1982. This rebate will be paid to employers on the successful completion of the first year's training by the apprentice concerned.

Increased Exemption Level

The Government has had a consistent record of progressively alleviating the impact of payroll tax on small businesses. Since the States took over this tax ten years ago, the basic exemption level has been increased well ahead of the rate of inflation to help smaller employers. Last year we increased this basic exemption figure by 15 per cent to $96,600. This year, as a special effort, we propose an increase of almost 30 per cent to $125,000 to operate from 1 January 1982. This is expected to provide for the complete exemption of a further 2000 present taxpayers. It will also alleviate a problem which the Government has had under notice in relation to the employment of seasonal labour by primary producers.
The new exemption level will reduce on the usual formula by $2 for each $3 increase in payrolls above $125,000 to a flat exemption of $37,800 at payrolls of $225,800 and above.

The cost of the increased exemption level will be $14 million in a full year, and $6 million in 1981–82.

**Temporary Surcharge**

The net result of the revenue proposals which I have outlined still leaves the Government short of funds to meet essential expenditure requirements. Because the taxation concessions which I have announced represent permanent reductions in revenue raising capacity they should be replaced with a long-term revenue source. On the other hand there is every prospect that the State’s entitlement under the tax-sharing arrangements will be further improved next year when the matter of new State relativities is settled in line with the outcome of the further Commonwealth Grants Commission review. In addition, the prospective increase in the total tax sharing pool for 1982–83, based on total Commonwealth tax collections in 1981–82, should also result in a relatively improved Budget position next year.

In these circumstances the Government has decided that it would be inappropriate to propose further taxing increases of a permanent nature but that it will introduce a temporary payroll tax surcharge of 1 per cent to operate on payrolls during the period 1 October 1981 to 30 June 1982. This surcharge will apply only to payrolls of $1 million or more in 1981–82 and is expected to yield an additional net revenue of $61 million during this financial year.

It is emphasised that the legislation imposing the surcharge will provide that it will terminate on 30 June next. As payroll tax is a deductible business expense for income tax purposes, the net impact on the limited group of employers concerned will be effectively about halved.

**Petroleum Franchise Licence Fees**

Legislation will be introduced during the current Session by the Minister of Transport to provide for an increase in fees under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act.

In the terms of that Act the revenue from these fees is initially taken into the Consolidated Fund and then paid over to the Roads and Special Projects Fund. The figures in the Estimates of Receipts and Payments reflect the proposed increases which will apply from 1 November next.

The fee for licences for petroleum wholesalers and retailers will increase from 4.5 to 5.4 per cent of the value of motor spirit, and from 7.1 to 8.6 per cent of the value of diesel fuel sold for road vehicle use. The effect of these changes will be to increase the price of motor spirit by approximately one-third of a cent per litre and the price of diesel fuel by about one-half of a cent per litre.

The additional revenue, which is estimated at $8.7 million in 1981–82 and $14.9 million in a full year, will be used for roadworks and other transport purposes throughout the State.

**Works Programme**

One of the major concerns of the Government in framing the 1981–82 Budget has been to achieve a maximum works effort, notwithstanding the very tight constraints which the Commonwealth has placed on the basic funding resources for overall State works programmes through the Loan Council.
The overall works effort of the Budget Departments and the major statutory bodies in 1981–82 is estimated at $2263 million, an increase of $340 million, or 17.7 per cent over last year. Summary statements of these programmes are contained at pages 78 to 80 in the Budget Papers.

In order to assist Honourable Members in their consideration of the Government's Works Programme it has been decided to bring forward a consolidated Works and Services Appropriation Bill to cover the required appropriations from the Works and Services Account, instead of the four Bills which have traditionally been introduced. This will allow a better overall picture of the works programme to be presented to, and debated by, the House.

The structure of the Consolidated Bill this year will follow the format used in the previous separate Bills, but I will be giving further consideration to the form of the Bill and the associated explanatory material for future years.

Government Works Programme

The Loan Council allocation to Victoria for its general Government works programme for 1981–82 was $328.4 million—the same as last year. It should be noted that the allocation is some $32 million less than it was in 1977–78, despite the substantial increases in construction costs which have occurred since that time. In real terms there has been a reduction of about 50 per cent.

In these circumstances it has been necessary to supplement the Loan Council allocation by every means at our disposal and to the maximum extent that is feasible and prudent. However, by their very nature these arrangements provide only short-term, and expensive, relief to the fundamental problem of inadequate funding from Canberra for our basic works programme to cover essential community requirements.

To provide a fuller picture of our total works effort I have expanded the scope of the Government works programme this year. The details set out at page 79 of the Budget Papers give a summary of works effort by the Budgetary Departments, the Country Roads Board and the Housing Commission which are funded from both Commonwealth and State sources.

The Government works programme on this basis will involve an estimated expenditure this year of $968 million, an increase of 12.9 per cent. This has been achieved despite the fact that the basic Government works allocation from the Loan Council and the aggregate figure of roads, housing and other works grants from the Commonwealth have remained virtually constant in dollar terms.

An important source of funds for this increased effort has come from part of the estimated Current Account Surplus for the current financial year. I referred earlier to the fact that it was possible to bring forward a balance of $12.4 million in the Consolidated Fund from last financial year. It has been possible to retain the benefit of this balance and transfer it to the Works and Services Account for expenditure on works this year.

The main thrust of this additional effort has been to increase the works programme of VicRail by $40 million in order to meet out commitments for public transport—particularly for new and improved rolling stock. The increased effort reflects the special borrowing allocation of $20 million approved under the Semi-government programme and the use of leverage leasing arrangements for the rolling stock fleet. In order to take advantage
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of the special borrowing allocation it will be necessary to introduce legis­
lation to allow the Victorian Railways Board to borrow. Funds raised by the
Board in this way will be paid into the Works and Services Account and
will be subject to Parliamentary Appropriation from that Account for
approved projects.

Another new item on the receipts side of the Works and Services
Account represents the proceeds of borrowings by the State Rivers and
Water Supply Commission in relation to the provision of water and sewerage
services in urban areas. Legislation will be introduced in the current Session
to enable the Commission to borrow under the Semi-government Programme
and on-lend funds to supplement borrowings by the larger water and
sewerage authorities. An initial allocation of $3 million has been made in
the Semi-government Programme this year. The proposed amendments to
the Water Act will also provide a funding option in future years for the
Commission to borrow towards the capital cost of those urban services
for which it is responsible and which are of a self-financing nature.

Details of expenditure from the Works and Services Account will be
available when the new consolidated Works and Services Appropriation
Bill is introduced.

Semi-Government and Infrastructure Borrowing Programme

The semi-government and infrastructure borrowing programme
approved by the Loan Council for Victoria for 1981–82 is $600.7 million,
up 8 per cent on last year. This programme covers the new money
borrowing requirements for authorities each borrowing more than $1.2
million under the normal semi-government programme. It includes the
special temporary borrowing allocation of $20 million for Railway upgrading
and an amount of $3 million allocated for borrowing by the State Rivers
and Water Supply Commission, both of which, as I have already indicated,
have supplemented the works programme.

The increase in the borrowing programme approved by the Loan
Council does not allow for expansion in real terms. Wage pressures,
particularly in the Latrobe Valley, are forcing up construction costs on the
vital new electricity projects at a rate faster than the rise in costs generally
in the community. An increase in the real level of works by the Melbourne
and Metropolitan Board of Works and the State Electricity Commission
on essential water and power supply works has only been possible by
drawing on financial reserves, using contractor financing and leverage
leasing arrangements.

While the semi-government and infrastructure borrowing programme
approved by the Loan Council is a key element of our overall works
programme, it represents less than 45 per cent of the estimated works
expenditure on the major semi-government bodies. I have included in the
Budget Papers at page 80 a table which shows the sources of funds available
for capital works to the major authorities. This table shows the extent of
the use of internally generated funds, reserves, contractor finance, leasing
and other funding sources available to authorities under current Loan
Council guidelines. The total works effort of the bodies concerned will be
$1295 million—an increase of 22 per cent.

Details of the allocation of the approved semi-government and infra­
structure borrowing programme for 1981–82 are given at page 81 of the
Budget Papers, together with data on actual borrowings by semi-government
and smaller authorities during last financial year.
The programme provides for a borrowing allocation of $5 million for the Portland Harbor Trust. This will provide for the berth which is currently under construction to serve the Alcoa smelter development.

Last financial year, municipalities and smaller authorities, each raising $1.2 million or less, raised a total amount of $134.5 million. For 1981-82, the Loan Council has retained the threshold borrowing limit of $1.2 million, which is making it difficult, having regard to the constraints placed on the semi-government programme, to meet the needs of the larger and developing municipalities in providing the necessary facilities for their ratepayers. Victoria’s request, at the June 1980 meeting of the Loan Council, that the present arrangements be reviewed with a view to assisting developing municipalities is still under consideration.

The semi-government programmes include expenditure on 42 major projects, each costing over $5 million, which are currently in progress at an estimated total cost of nearly $6000 million at current prices. These projects are listed at page 82 of the Budget Papers.

During my outline of the overall works programme for the year I have indicated the extent to which the major statutory bodies involved in construction activities have used their internal funds and other sources of funding available to them within the Loan Council guidelines to supplement the basic borrowing programmes.

There has been discussion about the manner of investment of funds held by statutory authorities and cash management procedures and practices generally. For the information of Honourable Members I draw attention to a number of tables contained in the Budget Papers which should be given careful consideration in this context. These relate to the Treasury cash position and the investments held by major statutory bodies as at the end of the past three financial years.

As I have indicated on previous occasions, the Government has taken action to ensure that, consistent with the requirements laid down by the Parliament and with the need for the acceptance of full financial responsibility by the bodies concerned, having regard to their short-term, seasonal and longer term liquidity needs, these funds should be used as productively as possible for the benefit of the ratepayers or customers concerned and the State generally. This amplifies my answer to the question asked by the Leader of the National Party yesterday.

To provide an independent assessment and an on-going monitoring of this requirement I have arranged for Professor Donald Cochrane, Chairman of the State Bank, and Sir Laurence Muir, a leading Australian financial and investment expert, to act as a special review team for this purpose. These gentlemen will report and give advice direct to me on these matters.

Expenditure

I have already outlined to the House the main aggregates of the expenditure programme for 1981-82 and explained the main factors that have influenced those aggregates. I now turn to the Government’s expenditure programme in more detail.

This year a new Budget document has been provided for the information and assistance of honourable members. It is entitled “Supplement to the Budget Speech: Expenditure Proposals 1981-82”, and sets out detailed comments on the Government’s expenditure proposals. The information in the Supplement has been structured to bring out particular items which may be of interest to honourable members. We have taken
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particular note of constructive criticism offered in previous Supply debates and adopted a number of suggestions. Because of the format of the new Works and Services Appropriation Bill to be introduced shortly, and the detailed information to be provided with that Bill, there is more emphasis in the Supplement on Current Account expenditures.

With the introduction of this document and the additional material included in the other documents, this Budget comprises the most comprehensive documentation ever presented to the Parliament of Victoria. This is in line with the undertaking which I gave to the House when I presented the 1980–81 Budget last year.

I propose now to draw to the attention of the House expenditure programmes which incorporate new policy changes or where the change in expenditure from 1980–81 is of significance.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Total funds for the new Ministry for Economic Development, the Ministry of Tourism and the Victorian Economic Development Corporation for 1981–82 will be $61·6 million, an increase of 23·9 per cent over expenditure in 1980–81.

Provision for assistance to approved decentralised industries for 1981–82 will be $31·6 million, an increase of 14·2 per cent over last year.

$5·5 million will be provided for the Development Fund, an increase of 11·8 per cent over last year.

Total provision in the Budget for the Victorian Economic Development Corporation is estimated at $8 million. An additional $1·2 million from borrowings, together with internal funds, will be available to the Corporation in 1981–82.

The allocation to the Ministry of Tourism is estimated at $5·7 million for 1981–82. Special emphasis this year will be given to publicity and promotion of tourism in Victoria.

POLICE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

The Current Account provision for Police is $226·6 million, an increase of $23·1 million or 11·4 per cent over 1980–81.

This includes provision for the strength of the force to increase by 200 to an estimated 8186 by 30 June 1982. In addition, 70 police will be released for active duty as a result of the reorganization and merging of the Transport Regulation Board and the Motor Registration Branch.

The police vehicle fleet will increase by 30 vehicles in addition to the 48 vehicles which will become available after the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Melbourne.

COMMUNITY WELFARE SERVICES

The total provision for Community Welfare Services is $145·2 million for 1981–82, an increase of $16 million or 12·4 per cent over 1980–81.

The ceiling for rate concessions for pensioners will be increased from $120 to $135 and the allocation of funds for 1981–82 is $35·8 million, an increase of 13·3 per cent over 1980–81.

Funds for fare concessions for pensioners this year will be $71·3 million, an increase of $1·8 million or 19·5 per cent over 1980–81. New fare concessions will be introduced for all widows of World War 1 veterans.
Funds are provided for the expansion of two existing attendance centres, the introduction of 2 new Regional Foster Care Programmes and 1 new Protection unit in the metropolitan area. Funds have also been provided to begin the Community Work Order Scheme.

Funds have been provided within the Family and Community Services Programme for support of the honorary probation officer system and an expanded court advisory service.

YOUTH, SPORT AND RECREATION

The provision for Youth, Sport and Recreation is $20.9 million.

$12.6 million is provided for racing, an increase of $4.2 million over 1980–81. This provision reflects previous undertakings and includes provision to underwrite payments to racing clubs from the Totalizator Agency Board, and $1.7 million for special assistance for country racing. An allocation of $250,000 for the Sires' Stakes Programme will also assist country racing.

In accordance with the Government's commitment $6.5 million will be made available towards construction of the State Indoor Sports Centre at Olympic Park.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

The Budget allocation for employment and Training is $14.5 million, an increase of $6.1 million or 72 per cent over 1980–81.

$5.2 million is provided for grants to organizations and costs associated with employment and training schemes and programmes.

The contribution to the State Additional Apprentices Scheme Trust Account is $3.4 million, an increase of 25.9 per cent over last year. $600,000 has been allocated for the Co-operative Development Programme. The scheme for meeting workers compensation premiums for first year apprentices will cost $1.5 million.

EDUCATION

The provision for Education is $1690.6 million which is $132.6 million or 8.5 per cent more than in 1980–81.

Following review by the Ministerial Economies Committee, the following decisions have been incorporated in the Budget:

Redeployment of professional staff from administrative positions to teaching positions including the rationalization of the Special Services Division, Teacher Education Division and Planning Services Division.

Significant reduction in paid study leave.

Maximum possible transfer of in-service education to the vacation period.

Rationalization of long service leave arrangements with the aim of reducing inconvenience to the operation of the Department.

Deferring the increase in per capita grants for non-government schools from 22 to 23 per cent of the cost of a pupil in a Government school, until the second half of the 1982 school year.

The above decisions are estimated to save almost $8 million in 1981–82.

Provision has been made for a further improvement in the staffing position in primary schools to complete the policy commitment made prior to the 1979 election.
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Expenditure on capitation grants for non-government schools for 1981–82 is estimated at $81 million, an increase of 17·5 per cent over last year.

Grants to government schools will cost $85 million in 1981–82, an increase of 12·4 per cent over the previous year.

The provision for school bus services, pupils’ travelling allowances and fare concessions for students in 1981–82 is $49·9 million, an increase of 13·3 per cent over the previous year.

Funds have been provided for the second stage of the Special Assistance Resource Teacher programme and for internal training courses for teachers responsible for the programme in primary schools.

In the International Year of the Disabled, the Government has decided that the special conveyance allowances for handicapped children should be significantly increased by amounts ranging from 33½ per cent to 100 per cent.

$100 000 has been provided for the development of community languages and multi-education teaching materials.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

$68·7 million has been allocated for the Law Department this year, an increase of 16·4 per cent over 1980–81 expenditure.

This reflects the establishment of the new Legal Aid Commission and the provision of $1·8 million for the upgrading of the Titles Office.

CONSERVATION

Funds for expenditure by the Ministry of Conservation have increased by 3·1 per cent to $37·3 million.

The Ministry is closely involved with the implementation of the New Directions Policy. It is currently undertaking work aimed at reducing the delays in project planning and development by identifying those sites most appropriate for major industrial developments, and by attempting to assess environmental effects of major projects at an early stage in the planning process.

The Ministry is also linked with developments in the Government’s tourism policy, through the substantially increased areas of national parks now administered by the National Parks Service. It is expected that the three new parks, including Bogong, which will be declared in 1981–82 will contribute significantly to the tourist industry within Victoria. A total of $7·7 million has been provided for the National Parks Service in 1981–82.

The Soil Conservation Authority has an important role to play in achieving improved productivity in agriculture through its continuing work in soil erosion control and reclamation of dryland salinity-affected areas. Total funds for the Authority will increase by 11·9 per cent this year to $5·3 million.

DEPARTMENT OF CROWN LANDS AND SURVEY

Funds available to the Department of Crown Lands and Survey are $43 million, an increase of 7·6 per cent.

As a result of the review by the Ministerial Economies Committee, work has begun on establishing a register of all Government-owned property, with a view to disposing of those parcels which are no longer
required. This register will ultimately become part of the comprehensive Computed Based Land Information System. A target of $5 million has been set for sale of redundant properties by the Department in 1981–82.

Survey fees will be increased with an estimated benefit to the Revenue of $30,000.

Funds have also been provided through the Rural Finance Commission to enable it to enter into initial commitments of $3 million this year under the loan scheme for Young Farmers.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

As a result of the review by the Ministerial Economies Committee, expenditure through the Local Government Department has been reduced. This has been achieved by an amendment of the cost-sharing arrangements for supervision of school crossings, so that ROSTA will bear one-third of the cost, the Government one-third and municipalities the remaining one-third.

Also, as a result of the review by the Ministerial Economies Committee, charges will be introduced by the Valuer-General for organizations outside the Budget. This is expected to benefit the Budget by $500,000 in a full year and by $200,000 in 1981–82.

The Government has made provision for two new initiatives within the Department, arising from the recommendations of the Board of Review of Local Government. Consultants will be engaged to conduct research into the Municipal Accounting Regulations and the Local Government Act with the aim of substantial simplification and updating.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The total funds available for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture in 1981–82 amount to $62.3 million, an increase of 11.6 per cent over expenditure in 1980–81.

Emphasis is being given by the Department to control of the serious problem of salinity. Staff have been redeployed to participate in an extensive research programme which will complement the other forms of assistance being provided by the Government, including the Salinity Loans Programme.

Work will begin in 1981–82 on extensions to the Crops Research Institute at Horsham. The estimated cost of this project is in excess of $2.5 million.

As part of the Government’s stated policy of encouraging increased agricultural output, funds have been provided to allow the development of agricultural engineering services to assist farmers through improved mechanisation.

HEALTH

Total expenditure on Health services is estimated this year to be $1,104.8 million for 1981–82—an increase of $90.4 million or 8.9 per cent over the previous year.

Hospital expenditure is the largest element of health expenditure.

Total recurrent expenditure from the Budget on Hospitals for 1981–82 is estimated at $762.5 million. In addition, hospitals will have available additional revenue, assessed by the Commonwealth at $80 million for 1981–82, from the new fee structure.

Total works effort on hospitals is estimated to be $49.9 million for 1981–82.
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The allocation of funds for Mental Health totals $122·3 million, including $8·5 million from the Works and Services Programme. This represents an increase of $12·7 million or 11·6 per cent over expenditure in 1980–81 and reflects the continuing emphasis placed by the Government on the Mental Health programmes.

Subsidy rates for infant welfare centres and home help will be increased to cover existing wage award levels. The total provision for these subsidies to municipalities and for elderly citizen clubs will total $19 million in 1981–82, an increase of 15·2 per cent over 1980–81.

The Budget provides for a special boost for Mental Retardation Services. The allocation from the Works and Services account is $3·7 million, an increase of $1·6 million. This includes provision for 11 new group homes and for the development of regional services. The total provision for Mental Retardation Services is $58·4 million—an increase of $8 million or 16 per cent.

$842 000 is provided for grants to the five medical research institutes that keep Melbourne in the top rank throughout the world in this area.

The provision for the Foster Grandparents scheme has more than doubled to $50 000.

MINISTRY FOR ARTS

The allocation from the Budget available for activities coming under the administration of the Ministry for the Arts is estimated at $65·3 million for 1981–82.

There will be a peak expenditure of $52 million on the Victorian Arts Centre this year. In addition to the building works and associated costs $1·25 million has also been provided towards meeting the operating costs of the Concert Hall element of the Centre which is due to open this financial year.

Subsidies for municipal library services have been increased from $3·25 to $3·40 per head, costing an additional $0·6 million in 1981–82.

The programme of assisting with the construction of regional performing arts centres will continue this year with an estimated expenditure of $2 million.

$567 000 is provided for the running costs of Country Art Galleries.

HOUSING

State effort in Housing will be increased to $91·2 million in 1981–82. This is an increase of $10·9 million, which more than offsets the decrease in Commonwealth funds. $1·8 million has been provided for the existing interest subsidy scheme, and $1 million for special assistance to homeowners, in hardship cases, in danger of losing their homes.

Commonwealth funds for Welfare Housing have been reduced from $67·9 million in 1980–81 to $59·8 million in 1981–82.

Housing in Victoria will also be assisted by the:
- increased concession in stamp duty for first-home buyers;
- reduction in credit and rental duty;
- reduction in duty on transfer of mortgages.

The State Bank which advanced a record $474 million for housing in 1980–81 is targeting to lend more than $500 million in 1981–82.
WATER RESOURCES

The Current Account provision for Water Resources for 1981–82 will be $92.5 million, an increase of 12.5 per cent over 1980–81.

TheBudget provides for an increased provision of $4.3 million or 28.5 per cent in funds for maintenance and renewal work on the irrigation and country water supply systems.

Subsidies to waterworks trusts and sewerage authorities will be reduced following review by the Ministerial Economies Committee. Interest charges will only be subsidized to 4 per cent. in 1981–82 instead of 3 per cent as a first step to an overall revision of the existing basis of Government assistance towards the capital works programmes and operating costs of these bodies. The benefit to the Budget in 1881–82 will be $5 million.

The payment to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works on account of interest costs for water supply for non-metropolitan areas will be $16.6 million in 1981–82—an increase of 16.5 per cent over last year.

$2.7 million will be spent by the Commonwealth and State Governments on salinity control and drainage works in northern Victorian irrigation areas.

$1.5 million will be spent on the flood-prone land problem.

A total of $12.1 million will be spent on the Blue Rock Dam, the Sandhurst Reservoir and the Mitchell Dam during 1981–82. The Cardinia/Frankston pipeline will be completed during the year at a total cost of $7.5 million.

TRANSPORT

The Budget provision for public transport in 1981–82, will be $551.1 million, an increase of $112.4 million, or 25.6 per cent over expenditure in 1980–81.

The Railway deficit is estimated to increase by $44 million to $233.1 million in 1981–82.

A significant part of the increased provision for VicRail reflects the enhanced capital works program which will rise from $61.6 million in 1980–81 to $102 million this year. This will ensure that significant progress is achieved with the Government's commitment to upgrade both suburban and country passenger services through new and improved rolling stock. For the suburban system the planned delivery rate is 60 new carriages a year for five years.

As an aside, the Government is also committed to buying 54 new country carriages and to rebuilding 26 local carriages.

Further sections of the underground rail loop, which is making a significant contribution to the operation of Melbourne's urban public transport system, will be opened in 1982.

The deficit of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board is estimated to increase by $11.9 million to $49.4 million in 1981–82.
Substantial upgrading of Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board rolling stock is also being undertaken, with 28 new trams being delivered each year. The number of new trams will total 204 by the end of this year. Over the past two years the Government has assisted the Board to purchase 130 new buses for its replacement programme. A further 30 new buses are on order for delivery in 1981–82.

Funding for roads will increase by 10.9 per cent to $316.4 million. Emphasis will be on increasing the safety and efficiency of the road system for road users.

CONCLUSION

At the outset of my Speech I indicated that the Budget for 1981–82 had been a difficult one to frame.

The proposals which I have outlined, and which can be studied in more detail from the comprehensive supplementary material which has been circulated, reflect the Government’s efforts in seeking to achieve its policy objectives in a period of special, and in a sense unique, circumstances so far as State finances are concerned.

The clearly expressed policy of the Government is for development, growth and jobs.

In preparing the Budget the aim has been to ensure that there is a climate which enables sound growth and development to proceed throughout the State.

I have great confidence in Victoria because of its rich natural resources, its highly trained work force and sound manufacturing and agriculture bases, its fine international airport and well equipped container port, and favoured geographical situation.

My confidence is shared by many other people, and this is reflected in the many major projects now under way. So far as the public sector is concerned these projects are clearly evident in the Budget Documents which have been circulated. The private sector is showing a similar resolve to proceed with large-scale developments, both in the metropolitan area and in the country.

The end result of these developments is the creation of new business and employment opportunities, and a general enhancement of living standards in our community.

The Budget is fully consistent with these aims and it builds on the momentum which is under way. I am satisfied that the Budget contains measures and initiatives which are necessary and appropriate in the situation which the State is facing.

Most, if not all, nations of the world envy Australia and the advantages which it enjoys in so many respects. Victoria is fortunate in being in a position to capitalise on those advantages. As a State we have a tremendous potential for the future. With sound financial management, co-operation and sensible constraint in the field of industrial relations, and wise use of our natural resources, the future of the State is assured.

I commend the Budget to the House.
On the motion of Mr CAIN (Leader of the Opposition), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, September 23.

EDUCATION OF DISABLED PERSONS BILL

Mr LACY (Minister of Educational Services) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to make provision with respect to the education of disabled persons, to amend the Education Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

SWAN HILL PIONEER SETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr WEIDEMAN (Minister for Tourism) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Swan Hill Pioneer Settlement Act 1974.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr WOOD (Minister for Property and Services) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Friendly Societies Act 1958 to increase the maximum payment which may be made pursuant to section 5(3) and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

CO-OPERATION BILL

Mr KENNETH (Minister of Housing) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to re-enact with amendments the law relating to the formation, registration and management of co-operative societies and purposes connected therewith.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTION

The SPEAKER (the Hon. S. J. Plowman)—Order! For the information of honourable members I advise that, pursuant to Standing Order No. 53, the honourable member for Rodney lodged at the table earlier today an amended Notice of Motion in respect of General Business Notice of Motion No. 1 appearing in his name on today's Notice Paper.

The alteration in the terms of the notice given earlier by the honourable member was as a result of the honourable member's attention being drawn to the problems arising because of the rule against anticipation now that the Budget debate has been set down as an Order of the Day for resumption of debate.

The new terms of the motion reduce the scope of the earlier notice and, of course, the notice will appear on the next Notice Paper in its altered form.

FOREIGN JUDGMENTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Foreign Judgments Act 1962 makes provision for the reciprocal enforcement of judgments between the State of Victoria and Papua New Guinea. That legislation contains a provision specifically excluding claims "for taxes and like charges".

Papua New Guinea raised the question of that exclusory provision with the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, on which it is represented, and submitted that such a provision should not exist in the modern economic community especially in the context of a situation such as prevails between Papua New Guinea and Australia.

Papua New Guinea's view was that the existing provisions for the reciprocal enforcement of judgments between the Commonwealth and the States on the one hand and Papua New Guinea on the other ought to be extended to include revenue judgments.
The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General decided that individual Ministers should seek the views of relevant departments and authorities within their respective States and territories in relation to Papua New Guinea's proposition. This was done and ultimately all members of the Standing Committee supported Papua New Guinea's proposal for the extension of reciprocal enforcement to include revenue judgments.

It was agreed by the Standing Committee that the proposal should be implemented by uniform legislation in the Commonwealth and the States. It was to be restricted to revenue judgments relating to income tax of superior courts and such judgments were to have no priority over other judgments entered against the person concerned.

This Bill gives effect to the decisions arrived at by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General and similar legislation has now been enacted in all other jurisdictions throughout Australia save the Australian Capital Territory.

Honourable members will recall that this Bill was introduced in the last session of Parliament but was discharged upon the prorogation of Parliament. Details of the proceedings upon the previous Bill can be found in Hansard No. 17 of 1981 at pages 6376 and 6377. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr MILLER (Prahran), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.

**PENALTY INTEREST RATES BILL**

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for a higher rate of penalty interest in the Supreme Court Act 1958, the Property Law Act 1958, the Transfer of Land Act 1958 and the County Court Act 1958 and inserts in both the County Court Act 1958 and the Magistrates' Court Act 1971 a provision similar to section 161 of the Supreme Court Act 1958 to provide for interest on judgment debts.

Honourable members will appreciate that in this day and age an interest rate of 8 per centum or lower is an extremely moderate rate of interest. Both the Law Institute of Victoria and various individual judgment creditors have been urging an increase in penalty interest rates for some time.

One can readily appreciate that if judgment debtors are slow to pay even when they incur a penalty interest rate of 8 per centum, it is even more difficult to obtain payment when a judgment debt attracts no penalty at all in the form of interest. Thus there is the need to make provision for a penalty interest rate on judgment debts in both the County Court Act 1958 and the Magistrates' Court Act 1971.

The existing statutory provisions impose penalty rates of interest referring to amounts not exceeding 8 per centum per annum, or simply 8 per centum per annum, or sometimes a lower percentage. The new provisions provide for a penalty rate not exceeding the maximum rate approved by the Australian Loan Council for long-term borrowing for new public securities issued by semi-government authorities, or, in appropriate cases, simply the maximum rate approved by the Australian Loan Council for long-term borrowing for new public securities issued by semi-government authorities. That rate, at the present time, is approximately 15.5 per centum per annum. This formula will allow penalty interest rates to change as interest rates generally change.

Honourable members will recall that this Bill was introduced in the last session of Parliament. Proceedings on the previous Bill are to be found in Hansard No. 18 of 1981 at pages 6713 and 6714 and No. 20 of 1981 at pages 7472 and 7473. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr MILLER (Prahran), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.
SUMMARY OFFENCES (FALSE REPORTS TO POLICE) BILL

Mr MACLELLAN (Minister of Transport)—I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend section 53 of the Summary Offences Act 1966 which deals with the making of false reports to the police.

Recently, the police have submitted evidence concerning the increasing problem of hoax calls being received by them and other emergency services which results in these resources attending to distress calls when not necessary and thereby depriving the community of these services in genuine cases.

In its present form, the existing legislation has been found to be inadequate in dealing with certain contingencies and there is a need for legislation capable of dealing effectively with the menace to public safety and interference with the efficiency of public utilities.

The major problem with the present provision relates to the interpretation of the words “causes to be reported” in section 53 of the Act.

The narrow definition of the words “causes to be reported” has meant that police have had great difficulty prosecuting persons who faked crimes which resulted in a police investigation. The offender only has to claim that he did not “cause” the matter to be reported but someone else who received the distress call caused the matter to be reported to the police.

As an example of the difficulties encountered, I refer to a situation some time ago wherein a taxi driver abandoned his vehicle and disappeared in circumstances which suggested that he had been murdered. A considerable amount of time and energy was expended by the police in investigating the case. When the person concerned was eventually located, he was charged with causing a false report to be made to the police. However, the charge was dismissed by the magistrate on the basis that the driver had not caused the report to be made because he had no contact with the person who, innocently, reported the matter to the police.

The Bill makes two amendments with respect to offences of this nature. The first amendment provided for in clause 2 is to widen the definition of the words “causes to be reported”, whereby, conduct of the nature to which I have just referred will be caught by the provision. “Causes to be reported” will now encompass conduct which creates any circumstances or the doing of any act which induces some other person to report to the police that an act has been done which calls for an investigation. The wide definition of these words is expected to overcome the present difficulty experienced with the section.

The second amendment effected by the Bill is to insert a new provision in section 53 which empowers the court to order a defendant to pay for the costs incurred by the police in mounting an investigation on the basis of the false report made to them. I have already indicated the interference caused to public utilities where a false distress call is answered. I would point out that in many instances the State is put to considerable expense in mounting such investigations.

The existing compensation laws do not allow for the payment of compensation to the police for expenses and other charges incurred by them by reason of a false report being given. Accordingly, clause 3 inserts a compensation provision in respect of offences against section 53 of the Act. I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that the compensation provision found in clause 3 is in similar terms to an existing provision in the Summary Offences Act which empowers the court to order the defendant to pay a compensatory payment to the appropriate fire authorities in respect of false alarms of fire. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr MILLER (Prahran), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, September 22.