

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: At what point did I attack direct grants?

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU: Although he did not explain it the Minister made it appear that the only reason why the Whitlam Government ignored Richmond and certain other parts and why we got money in Essendon, for example, was because of its traditional loyalty to the Labor Party. The Minister should talk to the Speaker in another place and ask him all about it. It seems extraordinary that a Minister of the Crown would make that assertion because it is patently not true.

It also seems that if we are concerned with ensuring the development of local government correctly, Mr. Ward's point is perhaps valid. Clause 19 of the Bill refers to an option which is open. Although the clause has been examined by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, it is far more obvious to me what the clause provides than it was to the committee. That left me a little dumbfounded. I am a new chum in this place and I could not understand why he did not take issue with the Government on that and accept Mr. Bradbury's suggestion to propose an amendment. I am told that one of the ways this place justifies its enormous cost to the taxpayers is by allowing people such as Mr. Ward to make these observations. Perhaps he might convince me of its value. He will have six years in which to do that.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: I enjoy this presentation even though I cannot follow the logic.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU: I can understand the Minister's difficulty in following any logic because he displays none, particularly in relation to Richmond and Sunshine. If Mr. Ward was serious, some course of action in respect to clause 19 could have been proposed.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: The clause has not been reached yet.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU: I understand that but all honorable members could see the advantage if Mr. Ward gave advance notice of his intention to accept the invitation of Mr. Bradbury.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT: Mr. Ward had already given notice of his intention.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU: He had not made it clear to me. If I have erred in that regard, I apologize. I return to the point on which I began. Any measure taken by any Government which overlooks the unfair and inequitable nature of municipal rating continues the unjust nature of that type of taxing. To an extent, in a showcase way, this Bill perpetuates what was initiated by the Whitlam Government. For that reason and because it takes into consideration the needs of people to the extent to which funds will be available, the Labor Party will support the Bill. However, it should be remembered that the Government will have ample opportunity to correct the imbalance it has talked about in relation to the Shire of Orbost and other areas and the City of Richmond.

The Hon. J. A. TAYLOR: We have already corrected it.

The Hon. W. A. LANDERYOU: It will be interesting to know what funds are finally allocated through time. In the sense I have indicated, the Bill will be supported by me. I look forward with interest to finding out how the Government deals with the proposal of Mr. Ward with respect to clause 19.

The Hon. Dr. HOWARD (Templestowe Province): I feel grateful for the anticipated indulgence which is customarily extended to members making their maiden speeches. But to some extent it fills me with a little terror. When I am speaking, I like the interplay with an audience. Perhaps I will be able to stir a little laughter if not adverse comment.

During the suspension of the sitting for dinner, as a contribution to my diet I was able to attend a function in a district shopping centre in the province that I represent. It was easier to speak among the hurly-burly of people packing together than it is here. I instance this as a real indication of the fact that I approach this speech with some trepidation. Silence is always frightening.

Mr. Galbally recently introduced the Wildlife (Performing Animals) Bill. Dolphins are very much performing animals which enjoy playing to an audience. I am told by those who are versed in the ways of science that we have close connections with the dolphin. At one time when I was lucky enough in my business activities to be conducting business on a cruiser in waters around the Barrier Reef, I watched dolphins sporting themselves in the wake of the cruiser. To me, it seemed incredible, but when people tired of watching, responding to, and applauding them, they went away. I will not go away quite so easily. I hope, like Mr. Landeryou, to be in the House for some time.

I wonder if you, Mr. President, would extend your indulgence a little further while I attempt to make some comparisons between the two of us, you in your exalted status sitting in the presidential chair of this Chamber and I, very much a new, junior-boy back-bencher on the back benches to your right. If we wanted to seek points of similarity and difference, possibly they would not be too difficult to find.

We probably do not have a great deal in common in our backgrounds. You, Sir, I understand came from the teaching profession and you have a long Parliamentary career behind you. I have had an extremely short Parliamentary career although, looking at the date, I realize it is now almost twelve months since I was designated as a contestant for election to this House. There must be many who wondered when my voice

would ultimately be heard. But my Parliamentary experience is short. I come from a combined medical and business background. So, Sir, we have no great similarities of background.

If we consider physical characteristics, we could compare heights. Here, I think I have the edge on you. I realize that I am standing in an elevated position but I know from standing beside you that I am a little taller. So we do not have a great deal in common there.

When it comes to sight, you view the Chamber with the benefit of glasses. I am unencumbered in that way because of an element of subterfuge, as I am wearing contact lenses. In a fair contest I would probably be found to be blinder than you are.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. G. Fry): I have never been blind.

The Hon. Dr. HOWARD: With the aid of subterfuge and the mysteries of modern medical science, we have a seeming difference.

Then I think we come to a winning point of dissimilarity. I am lightly adorned with hair and you, in your role in this House, have the edge on me. Perhaps this is again, to an extent, a diversion into the realms of subterfuge but this is one which I commend. It endorses long-tried principles, and customs and habits of long duration which are to be admired and should be retained and nurtured. In this case I can forgive you for your superiority over me and our dissimilarity.

In the area of political views, we again have dissimilarities. My views, certainly to those who know me, are well known. I will not say much about them at this time as I am speaking in a privileged fashion. But you, Sir, have no views at all in your position as President. In this area we have strong dissimilarities.

However, I suggest we have one remarkable thing in common; we have a common predecessor. In your