

lead into the atmosphere by motor vehicles. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr RICHARDSON (Forest Hill), the debate was adjourned.

Mr ROPER (Minister of Health)—I move:

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, June 8.

Mr RICHARDSON (Forest Hill)—The Opposition would prefer an adjournment of two weeks.

Mr FORDHAM (Minister of Education)—I draw to the attention of the honourable member for Forest Hill that an adjournment until Tuesday week is a fortnight less one day. It is a fairly accepted procedure that was followed by the previous Parliament. It allows two party meetings for the relevant parties to consider the recommendation from the person handling the Bill.

Another reason for the practice is that it allows for the proper organization of the week's activities between the party managers. On that basis I hope the honourable member will consider favourably the request for an adjournment until Tuesday week which has been made in good faith and without malice.

Mr RICHARDSON (Forest Hill)—The Opposition regards this as a significant Bill, as I am sure the Government does, and believes an adjournment period of two weeks should be allowed for the measure. The Opposition also seeks an assurance from the Government that access will be allowed to departmental officers for briefing during those two weeks of adjournment.

Mr ROPER (Minister of Health) (By leave)—Certainly the information required by the honourable member or the spokesman for the National Party will be readily available. There are a number of sources of information and much work has been done in several Government departments in relation to unleaded strategy—in the Department of Transport, the Environment Protection Authority and my own commission.

This is hardly a new matter before the Parliament because it was a private member's Bill introduced time and again. It was not possible to have it debated, but it was widely circulated and aroused much public interest. For the benefit of organizing the House the week after next, it would be appropriate for this measure to be debated on Tuesday week. If the honourable member runs into difficulties, the Government will consider providing the extra day, but it would suit the House better to have the proposed legislation debated on Tuesday week.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until Tuesday, June 8.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Address-in-Reply

The debate (adjourned from the previous day) was resumed on the motion of Mr McCutcheon (St Kilda):

That the following Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor to both Houses of the Parliament be agreed to by this House—

YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, assembled in Parliament, wish to express our loyalty to our Sovereign, and to thank your Excellency for the Speech which you have made to the Parliament.

and on Mr Thompson's amendment:

That the following words be added to the proposed Address:

"but expresses its concern at the failure of the Government to inform the people of Victoria fully, truthfully and in advance, of its real intentions, particularly with respect to financial and industrial matters."

Mr DELZOPPO (Narracan)—I wish to convey to His Excellency and ask him to pass on to Her Majesty the loyalty of the people of Narracan, the electorate that I have the privilege to represent. I also congratulate His Excellency and Lady Murray on their appointment and wish to say how delighted the electorate of Narracan was when the announcement was made that their Excellencies would be visting the electorate in July this year.

As a new member, I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, and state how impressed I am by the good wishes that have come from both sides of the House and the obvious confidence of

your colleagues that you enjoy. They are delighted that you are installed in the Speaker's chair.

I congratulate all the new members of the House. No doubt they, like me, regard it as a privilege to be elected by their various constituents to represent them in this place. In my case the privilege is even greater as I follow in the steps of the previous father of the House, James Charles Murray Balfour, who is regarded by many honourable members with a great deal of affection. It is a privilege to follow in his footsteps because Mr Balfour served this House and the people of Victoria for three months short of 27 years. He was elected to the then new seat of Morwell in 1955 and following the redistribution became the first member of the new seat of Narracan. He held this position until his retirement on 24 February this year.

Mr Balfour was a member of the State Development Committee from 1955 to 1961 and the Government Whip from 1958 to 1961. In 1961 he became Parliamentary Secretary to Cabinet, a post he retained for three years until he was appointed Minister of Water Supply and Minister of Mines in April 1964. Later that year he became Minister of Mines, Minister of Soldier Settlement and Minister of Conservation. He retained this portfolio until May 1967 when he was appointed to the important portfolios of Minister for Fuel and Power and Minister of Mines.

In September 1977 the Ministry for Fuel and Power and the Mines Department were amalgamated to form the Department of Minerals and Energy. At the same time Mr Balfour became the Minister for Minerals and Energy, a position he held until 3 February 1981. It is interesting to note that as Minister for Minerals and Energy Mr Balfour was responsible for the development, utilization, co-ordination and protection of the present and future supply sources of minerals and energy for Victoria. He was responsible for all mining activities and extractive industries in Victoria. Amongst the most significant events during this century has been the discovery of off-shore natural gas

Mr Deizoppo

and the crude oil fields of East Gippsland and the development of extensive brown coal reserves in the Latrobe Valley. Mr Balfour was also responsible for the operation of the Gas and Fuel Corporation and the State Electricity Commission of Victoria.

Mr Balfour is a well-known identity in the Latrobe Valley and when he moved throughout the electorate it was amazing to see how many people he knew personally. He obviously had a deep interest in the welfare of the constituents of Narracan during the time he was in Parliament.

Mr Balfour served for 21 years as a councillor on the Shire of Narracan and, on three occasions, was shire president. For this reason he was quite interested in the relationship that exists between local government and the Parliament of Victoria. After such a distinguished and valuable contribution to Victoria I am sure honourable members from both sides of the House will join with me in wishing a successful and happy retirement to Mr and Mrs Balfour.

The electorate of Narracan includes some rural areas as well as the western edge of the brown coal field of the Latrobe Valley. It is interesting to note that this includes the proposed Driffield power station. Like any other developing part of Australia such development needs planning and co-operation from the Government. Of course, one of the problems that any Government has to face is to give the local people a say in their destiny as well as maintain the Government's overseeing of the State and national objective in developing such a viable resource. I will be interested in the debates on the planning proposals in the Latrobe Valley because I have had some experience in planning and local government in the Latrobe Valley.

The Labor Party has said that it intends to allow a greater say by local people in determining their own destiny. Although that might be easy to say, I know full well it has sometimes led to trouble. I will be interested to see what sort of system and proposal

the Labor Party puts forward to oversee and encourage development in the Latrobe Valley.

Although I congratulate the Government on its overwhelming victory at the last election, I should like to add that in some of the rural areas, and especially in the election of Narracan which I have the honour to represent, certain fears exist with which the Government would be familiar. One fear is that because the Government is regarded as a metropolitan Government some of the problems of the rural areas will not receive the attention they deserve. I notice some back chat has taken place in the Chamber about the country versus the city. I do not want to become involved in that controversy.

However, I shall draw to the attention of the House the importance of the rural sector of country Victoria. In the electorate of Narracan the value of agricultural products grown and produced is approximately \$83 million a year. It is estimated that the value of milk production is \$30.7 million a year, which is equivalent to 10 per cent of the State's production. The value of beef production amounts to \$17 million a year, which is equivalent to 3.5 per cent of the State's production. Other rural pursuits include the growing of potatoes and the timber industry.

Returning to the idea that the Government is a metropolitan Government, I point out concern about the decision by the Government to abandon the connection between the Mulgrave and the South-Eastern Freeways. Thirty-two municipalities were represented, namely, all the municipalities from Frankston to the New South Wales border. Those municipalities unanimously decided to protest to the Government about its decision.

The basis of the objection was that although they recognized that the Government had every right to set the priorities over road funding, it was considered that the decision to sell compulsorily acquired property would lose for all time the opportunity of this vital connection to Gippsland and the State.

The importance of that action is extremely relevant to Gippsland and eastern Victoria in general. The former Government decided—I am sure the Government endorses the fact—that the resources of the brown coal field and the tourist potential of Gippsland are important. Any moves to change the priority in providing adequate road access to the hinterland of Gippsland would be to the detriment of the State.

I had one fear about making my maiden speech, Mr Speaker, which has plagued my dreams over the past couple of months. After spending sixteen years as a member of a shire council I was afraid I would address you, Mr Speaker, as Mr President. I am sure that if I had you would have forgiven me! I look forward to entering debates and making a contribution, not only for the benefit of my constituents, but also for the State in general.

Mr McNAMARA (Benalla)—In formally speaking to the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor, I do so with the exultation of a newly-elected member, mingled with the trepidation of one rising to speak in this august Chamber on his first occasion.

I congratulate the Premier on the success of his party at the recent State election. Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation to the high office of Speaker of the Victorian Legislative Assembly. From the comments of many long-serving members of this Chamber who know you better than I do, I am sure you will leave your mark as a Speaker of some stature.

My appearance in this Chamber is made possible only by the decision of Mr Tom Trewin to retire after 21 years as the National Party member for Benalla. After more than two decades in the "hot seat", possibly one of the greatest satisfactions for a member of Parliament is to be able to see his electorate grow and see it gain some benefits as a result of his work. There is no doubt this electorate has grown and it has achieved many benefits.