

unjust. Surely the onus should be on the acquiring authority to justify its offer.

Under the Valuation of Land Act what are known as land valuation boards of review have been set up for the purpose of making determinations in cases in which agreement cannot be reached. I have always been concerned about those boards of review because each is composed of a chairman, to whose appointment I offer no objection, and two other members who are valuers taken from a panel. What happens in practice is that the two valuers may be sitting on the board in judgment today and tomorrow they may be appearing before the board as adversaries. Many years ago, I reached the conclusion that wolf seldom eats wolf. I believe the present situation to be improper and it should not be allowed to continue. The land valuation boards of review should be composed of two permanent members who have the necessary valuation experience.

Mr Morris also failed to deal in any detail, so far as I understand it, with the way in which it is proposed to speed up the process of settlement. I can name cases in which, after two and a half years or more, there has been no offer of settlement from the acquiring authority. Anybody who says that is fair does not have any real understanding of justice.

At page 9, Mr Morris makes an astounding statement that is worth noting:

No Government department or agency has supported the guidelines.

He is referring to the guidelines of the previous Government. That, of course, is not surprising to me, because it is only natural that Government departments should support the existing procedures. Those procedures are in their favour. They can dilly-dally as they like and, as I said a moment ago, can delay making an offer for more than two and a half years without incurring any penalty. If that is so, why should they oppose the procedures? Later on page 9, Mr Morris states:

The guidelines are also open to criticism as being unfair to the taxpayer and being too generous with his money.

*The Hon. R. J. Long*

That is another bald statement without evidence to suggest even one example of a too-generous payment to a land-owner. I am one who believes and has always believed, if the State wants to acquire my property or an interest in my property, it should fully and adequately compensate me. The State should realize that a person who moves from house to house because he has sold his former house of his own volition incurs burdens, but when he has been forced to move because the State has acquired his property the burden is even worse.

It is imperative that the guidelines should be changed as rapidly as possible to deal with these problems. I have been talking about the difficulties for a considerable period. It is now becoming a matter of urgency. The people of Gippsland want the new guidelines as fast as we can get them. The landowners cannot possibly understand the proposed legislation. A number of solicitors do not even understand it. It is because of that situation that it must be simplified for the landowners. The traumatic psychological effect that the acquisition causes the landowners must be taken away. The waiting periods that are unforgivable must also be taken away. The time has been reached when the public and landowners in Gippsland are sick of the situation and, before long, some direct action will be taken. I hope that will not happen. I hope the Government takes action and ensures that at least some movement is made in the not-too-distant future to amend the law relating to compensation of land. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and hope that something happens in this area soon.

**The Hon. G. P. CONNARD** (Higinbotham Province)—I address the House on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech, which I understand is referred to as a maiden speech. I came into this House on 29 June, so I note that my gestation period as a maiden has been twelve-and-a-half weeks, which is a long period. This is the first opportunity I have had to

speak. I shall paraphrase Keats in his *Ode on a Grecian Urn* as being the ode to a maiden member. Keats said:  
Thou still unravish'd bride of quietness!  
Thou foster-child of Silence and slow Time.

It may be applicable to me at present. I express to the House the loyalty of the vast majority of constituents of the Higinbotham Province to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I congratulate the Royal family on the birth of the heir apparent, Prince William of Wales. It is interesting to note that Victoria as a State was founded in the reign of King William IV and probably on Victoria's 200th anniversary in 50 years' time, King William V will be reigning.

As Her Majesty's representative in Victoria, I congratulate Sir Brian Murray on his appointment as Governor. I know that Sir Brian is fulfilling his role and following his predecessors with distinction, and honourable members look forward to continued contact with him. I certainly congratulate my predecessor in the province, Murray Hamilton, who served with distinction in this Chamber for fifteen years and, on behalf of my constituents, I thank him for his service. The Higinbotham Province comprises 110 000 voters and a population of 147 000. On the possibility of a redistribution, I emphasize that the Higinbotham Province is the only electorate in the State that has the right number of voters. The others have fewer or more than the correct number. The Honourable Robert Lawson and I enjoy representing the only electorate that is almost exactly the right size. The province includes the four municipalities of Sandringham, Brighton, Mordialloc and Moorabbin. I indicate my desire to represent the constituents of that area without any discrimination against the political persuasion of my constituents. It was and is a privilege to be elected to serve them and I will certainly do my best to attain their aspirations.

I report to the House that, in my opinion, each of the four municipalities with which I am concerned is fulfilling its functions as the third tier of government in a proper and orderly

manner. Each of the municipalities is being led by mayors of outstanding ability, three of whom are women. I am delighted in this "decade of women" to be working with them. They are Councillor Julie Cooper of Moorabbin, Councillor Lesley Falloon of Sandringham and Councillor Doris Stockton of Mordialloc, who are serving their community well, together with Councillor Les Coysh of Brighton. They will take those municipalities into the 1980s. There is no doubt that municipal councils will have an increasing role to play in local cultural activities and in social development and social welfare. Each of those councils is progressively moving towards those goals.

On entering this Chamber on 29 June, I noted that only two provinces were named after people, namely, Monash and Higinbotham provinces. Sir John Monash is well-known to most of us, but few people seem to be acquainted with Higinbotham. I have done some research on George Higinbotham, who had a most interesting life. He was born in Dublin in 1826 and graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, with a B.A. He tried to become a barrister, but was not too successful in that field and turned to journalism, becoming a reporter on the *Morning Chronicle* in London. Some of our journalist associates will probably find this interesting to listen to. While he was involved in journalistic activities, he entered Lincoln Inn and was subsequently called to the bar and then emigrated to Melbourne. He decided not to go to the goldfields, which was while the gold rush was at its peak, but practised as a barrister. Again, he was not highly successful as a barrister and, in 1856, became editor of the *Argus*. After three years, he could not reconcile his opinions with the conservative views of the proprietors and returned to the bar. In 1861 he stood in his electorate unopposed for the seat of Brighton. He lost that seat at the next election and regained it in the following election. He held the seat for nine years, during which time he became Attorney-General. Mildly reminiscent of some of today's problems, he was involved in the struggle

between the Assembly and the Council over finance Bills. He lost his seat in 1871 to Thomas Bent, not for the reason I have just mentioned. He returned to Parliament as the honourable member for East Bourke Borough and then became disgusted by the waste of time in politics generally and left politics for ever. He became a Supreme Court Judge and subsequently Chief Justice. He refused the opportunity to become Lieutenant Governor because of interference of the colonial office in Victorian affairs.

George Higinbotham was best known for completing the consolidation of the entire statute law of the Victorian Colony in the 1880s in two years. When one considers the work he did, one realizes that his abilities were remarkable. Honourable members will have noted George Higinbotham's statue on the corner of Spring and Collins streets. Since 3 April I have noted that the old gentleman has tears running down his cheeks. Undoubtedly, he is distressed at the present Government in Victoria. I look forward to the days when the tears are removed and the Liberal Party is returned to Government in this State.

During the autumn sessional period, I listened with attention to the maiden speeches of my colleagues on the Government side of the House. I was particularly impressed with Mr McArthur's remarks on education and Mrs Caroline Hogg's speech. Mrs Hogg's remarks and concern with the development of a multi-cultural society, which is being encouraged in Australia, were laudable. There is no doubt in my mind that access to an alternative language in schools is desirable. However, I wish the House would carefully consider all the implications of the matter. As Australia is attracting migrants, it is essential that we do not permit any of the migrant populations to degenerate into cultural and intellectual ghettos. Experience in other countries has indicated that this can occur.

It is important that English remains the language of primary importance in schools and elsewhere. Australia has been enriched by the culture of many

*The Hon. G. P. Connard*

and diverse nations over the past 30 years, but it is extremely serious when many of these people cannot speak or understand English properly, particularly women. I am concerned with the apparent limited ability of one or two groups in the ethnic community to be integrated into Australian society. Because of some original national concepts, women are sometimes not being permitted by their families to take equal status with men. This gap will be overcome only when all the family, including women, can speak the universal language of English fluently. It can be extremely difficult at times to enter into the family life of the groups to which I refer, but it is important for succeeding generations that we do so.

In recent years I have served as an elected community representative to the Regional Consultative Council of the family and community services programmes—the FACS programme. This was an incentive of the former Government and is again an excellent ideological concept for the distribution of social welfare funds. However, it is no secret to any in this Chamber that there are not sufficient funds to satisfy all the real and the supposed needs of the community.

It was recommended by one of the new members that similar projects will be available with sufficient funds after his party has "redeployed the resources". I would warn my political opponents that if they attempt to massively redeploy resources of the community there will not be any resources to deploy and consequently less money will be available for the truly needy.

However, as this programme has gone on, there is no doubt that the process of funding requires refinement. It is of concern to me that the majority of people who are endeavouring to serve their community are bogged down by social welfare jargon and, at the same time, many of the people are social welfare officers who are anxious to spend a maximum of funds to research and develop unapparent needs of the community rather than spend available dollars on the existing urgent requirements of people.

As our society progresses and for a variety of reasons, including the fact that more married women are entering the work force, we are told that fewer people will volunteer to assist social development programmes, and we are told that more money is required. I for one do not believe that volunteerism is dead. Let me tell honourable members of one marvellous programme.

Some years ago when the City of Mordialloc built a new library building, the old building became vacant and the council held a public meeting to determine the use of the old hall. Several groups came together at that meeting and formed a group called the Aged Persons Service Committee, with the intention of using the hall as a day hospital and day care centre. Unfortunately, the council bowed to other pressures and the hall was not used.

The committee continued, however, and attracted to itself a number of local organizations, with the intention of looking after the variety of problems of the aged. Last year the committee regularly serviced nearly 2000 aged persons, with an outstanding 29 000 man-hours of voluntary labour. Within the committee there are a multiple sclerosis service agency, swimming groups of over-60s, over-70s, over-80s and over-90s, a socialization group, a hospitality group and a co-ordinated self-help programme of the aged themselves. All this has been done with a \$5000 grant from the FACS programme, together with a small grant from the city council.

I am suggesting that a large number of volunteers in society are willing to serve. We must encourage this and not necessarily permit laudable projects to die because of lack of funding. Surely as a Parliament we must responsibly indicate that Government cannot supply paid staff for all projects and that the community must also be responsible for assisting its own with Government support.

Finally, during my presence in this Chamber, I will be pursuing the completion of several projects important to

Higinbotham Province. Firstly, it is important that the widening of the Nepean Highway to South Road be continued as rapidly as possible. Secondly, it is essential that the Nepean Highway be connected to F6 Freeway so that traffic to and from the Mornington Peninsula and Westernport is not retarded. Thirdly, it is equally essential that the third line from Caulfield to Mordialloc and perhaps beyond be started as soon as possible. Fourthly, together with the Honourable Robert Lawson, I will be pressing the Government for proper development of hospital services at Sandringham, Moorabbin and Mordialloc. Fifthly, it is also essential to continue the excellent conservation programmes of the foreshore from Brighton to Mordialloc.

I thank the members of the Council for their welcome to me and I look forward to working with them and with you, Mr President, in the years ahead.

The Hon. F. J. GRANTER (Central Highlands Province)—The Minister for Conservation asks me, by interjection, whether this is my maiden speech. I point out to him that it is nine years since I have participated in the debate on the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency. I put my name down to participate in the debate after hearing Mr Baxter and a member of the Labor Party, Mr Butler, speak. I then decided that I should like to join in this worthwhile debate.

Victoria has a distinguished new Governor who, with his wife, Lady Murray, took part in an impressive opening ceremony of the new State Parliament. It was a ceremony that really made me proud to be an Australian and to live in a democratic country.

I express my loyalty and that of the constituents of the Central Highlands Province to Her Majesty the Queen. I know that I express that loyalty not only on my own behalf but also on your behalf, Mr President, as do other elected representatives of that province.