



FINN IN THE HOUSE

Speeches August 2012 to December 2012



Published by Bernie Finn MP

Member for Western Metropolitan Region
Acting President of the Legislative Council
Chairman, Joint Parliamentary Electoral Matters Committee

277 Hampshire Road, Sunshine Victoria 3020
Telephone (03) 9312 1212 • Fax (03) 9312 4598
Email bernie.finn@parliament.vic.gov.au
Web www.berniefinn.com



FINN IN THE HOUSE

Speeches August 2012 to December 2012

C O N T E N T S

Planning: zoning reform	3	Greens: future	26
Carbon Tax: Health Services	3	Production of Documents.....	26
Planning: Point Cook.....	5	Justice Legislation Amendment (Miscellaneous) Bill 2012	27
Melbourne Cricket Ground Trust: report 2011-12	5	Planning: urban renewal.....	28
Roads: Essendon Airport retail precinct.....	6	Craigieburn-Hanson roads, Craigieburn: traffic lights.....	29
National disability insurance scheme: federal policy	6	Local government: elections.....	29
Building industry: federal regulation	7	Tobacco Amendment (Smoking At Patrolled Beaches) Bill 2012.....	29
Road Safety Amendment (Car Doors) Bill 2012... 7		Footscray: urban renewal	31
Valley Carers: residential facility.....	8	Health: Federal Funding.....	31
Climate change: government expenditure.....	8	Planning: urban renewal.....	32
Point Cook: swimming pool	9	Commonwealth payments to Victoria.....	33
Sunshine Football Club: ministerial visit.....	9	Planning: Point Cook.....	33
Northern Territory: election result.....	9	Classification (Publications, Films And Computer Games) (Enforcement) Amendment Bill 2012.....	33
Port Phillip Planning Scheme: Amendment	9	Western Hospital: upgrade	34
Building industry: industrial action	12	Government: Performance	34
Planning: western suburbs	13	Electoral Matters Committee: conduct of 2010 Victorian state election	35
Working With Children Amendment Bill 2012... 13		Tourism: Woodlands Park	36
Eaglehawk: sports facilities.....	14	Road Safety Amendment (Operator Onus) Bill 2012	36
United States of America: September 11 anniversary	15	Police Regulation Amendment Bill 2012	37
Evidence Amendment (Journalist Privilege) Bill 2012.....	15	East-west link: opposition policy	39
Roads: Essendon Airport retail precinct.....	16	Royal Yacht Club of Victoria: world disabled sailing championship.....	39
Carbon tax: health sector	16	Tourism: Woodlands Park	40
Public Sector: Job Losses.....	17	Federal Minister for Health: Victorian visits.....	40
East Meets West Lunar New Year Festival	18	Office of the Child Safety Commissioner: report 2011-12	41
Residential Tenancies And Other Consumer Acts Amendment Bill 2012.....	19	Craigieburn-Hanson roads, Craigieburn: traffic lights.....	42
Murray River: health	20	Health: western suburbs.....	42
Valley Carers: residential facility.....	20		
Building Industry: Dispute Resolution.....	21		
Local government: LeadWest funding	24		
Health services: western suburbs.....	24		
Planning: coastal management	25		

Planning: zoning reform

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Planning. What an outstanding minister he is. Can the minister inform the house of what action the Baillieu government is taking to reform Victoria's planning zones?

Hon. M. J. GUY (Minister for Planning) — I thank my friend and colleague Mr Finn for his excellent question about more planning reform this government is engaging in to ensure that, as the Economist has announced again today —

Mr Lenders — On a point of order, President, we have two items of government business today dealing with planning reform. Obviously Mr Finn's question is not as specific as Mrs Kronberg's earlier question, but I ask you to suppress the question on the basis of anticipation.

The second-reading speech of the legislation that is the second item of government business today refers to planning reform. I suggest that this is anticipation.

Hon. D. M. Davis — On the point of order, President, as I understand it, the items to be discussed today include a ratification motion that does not directly deal with the matters that would be the likely subjects of this question. The other is a very broad planning reform that would count out planning questions almost across the whole state. In that context it would simply be too much to rule out a question on planning.

The PRESIDENT — Order! I thank Mr Lenders for the point of order. On this occasion, as Mr Lenders has rightly pointed out, the anticipation is not as clear in respect of the items listed on the notice paper and the question that has been asked.

I will therefore allow the minister to continue his response to Mr Finn's question. I draw the minister's attention to the anticipation provisions. He might have regard to those in the context of his response to Mr Finn's question, but I do not uphold the point of order on this occasion.

Hon. M. J. GUY — Before I was interrupted I was trying to say that it is fantastic to talk about planning zone reform — which is totally different of course to the subject of applications

— in regard to the city that has today, yet again, for the second year running, been voted by the Economist to be the world's most livable city. Melbourne is the world's most livable city.

Planning zones are in need of reform, and that reform is long overdue. Many governments in the past have sought to do this but have not acted. This government is going to get on with the job of reforming planning zones.

Indeed we have released a vastly detailed program to reform the way planning zones are structured in this state. Do not just take my word for how important planning zone reform is. I refer the house to the comments of the Victorian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VECCI) in relation to the government's proposed planning zone reform.

State government plans to consolidate the existing multitude of residential and commercial zones is a positive step —

according to VECCI. Then there is small business:

Master Grocers Australia chief executive Jos de Bruin said the changes were 'probably the most positive initiative in planning in some time.'

'Anything that removed hurdles is good for independent grocers ...

The tourism sector said:

New planning reforms announced by the state government in detail this week will facilitate the development of high-quality tourism offerings ...

VTIC chief executive Dianne Smith says, 'There are gaps in our current tourism offerings caused in part by planning restrictions.

The Victorian Farmers Federation (VFF) said:

We applaud the government's proposed planning reforms, which strengthen the right to farm and remove many unnecessary and time-consuming permit requirements for agricultural businesses.

Then we have residents groups. Under the heading 'A vision we can embrace' Mary Drost, convener of Planning Backlash Inc., stated:

... a neighbourhood residential zone which will give total protection cannot be challenged in VCAT. It will be up to the residents to work with the council to decide where these zones are to be and how large and what heights.

We then have the councils. The Municipal Association of Victoria stated:

... the announcements responded to local government and MAV advocacy over many years that had called for better zones ... to give effect to local planning policy.

Councils such as Yarra Ranges Council welcome the new reforms, as does Melton Shire Council:

Council planning manager ... said the advent of new rules governing green wedge land was promising for the shire. 'We're keen for land in green wedge areas to maintain rural use in productive ways, like allowing for tourism around a winery.'

I have also received correspondence from members of Parliament urging me to reform planning zones. Some are on this side of the chamber — I will not say who, but I will just say some are on my side — and some are from the state opposition. I would like to thank those members. Mr Tee might like to ask in the party room who those members are. I will not tell him; I will just let him ask the question.

I thank all members who have made representations to improve planning zone reform to ensure that it is the best reform in Australia, which in turn puts in place the best planning system in Australia. The changes to the planning system have been advocated for and supported by councils, the VFE, residents groups, industry groups, members on this side of the chamber and even opposition members.

Carbon Tax: Health Services

Debate resumed from 9 February; motion of Hon. M. J. GUY (Minister for Planning):

That this house:

(1) calls on the commonwealth government to provide full and timely compensation to Victorian health services and health providers for the significant cost impacts on public and community health services of the commonwealth's carbon tax; and

(2) notes that when other commonwealth taxes such as the goods and services tax were applied health services were exempt, and the same principles should apply to the carbon tax.

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise to support the motion moved by Mr Guy on behalf of Mr Davis. I point

out that, whilst a number of questions are raised about this motion and about the carbon tax, there is one that we must answer today, and I suggest it will be answered before this hour is out — that is, will the Labor Party in this state stand up for Victoria? That is the big question. Will the ALP stand up for Victoria?

During this wide-ranging, to say the very least, debate, we heard Ms Hartland's contribution. She is one of a diminishing number who believe that man-made climate change exists and can be handled by taxation. She told us that everything from ingrown toenails to cirrhosis of the liver was caused by climate change and that we could control climate change by slapping a tax on everything known to man. Previously we have heard from people who, like Ms Hartland, have a similar commitment to the prospect that man-made climate change does exist — people like Professor Tim Flannery.

They call him Sandbags Flannery, because ever since he made the prediction that it would never rain again, we have had floods in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, and I think in South Australia and even down in Tasmania. The sandbags have been in plentiful use since Sandbags Flannery made that particular prediction.

The climate change industry was called, as I pointed out to this house before, the global warming industry until we discovered that the globe has not warmed for over a dozen years. We have had to change the terminology that we use; now it is 'climate change', and it is an industry.

An enormous number of people are making an enormous amount of money out of this right across the board, and unfortunately it has to be said that as a result of this carbon tax our federal government is among those who have got their hands in people's pockets and are helping themselves to the hard-earned of average Australian working families — the same working families that Labor not so long ago declared it was so concerned about.

Members might remember Kevin⁰⁷. I am not sure if anybody over the other side does remember Kevin⁰⁷ but they might remember him; he was Prime Minister for a brief period of time until the current Prime Minister, despite having declared her undying love for him, planted a knife right between his shoulderblades and dispatched him in the dark of night one evening. Of course that is just one of many lies that have come from

Canberra over recent years.

Indeed this matter of the carbon tax is another of those lies because we all remember the Prime Minister, just days prior to the last election, vowing and declaring, 'There will not be a carbon tax under any government that I lead.' That is what she said: 'There will not be a carbon tax under any government that I lead.'

Earlier I heard Mr Leane cry out the word 'fraud', and I thought to myself: when the Prime Minister goes on national television and makes a firm commitment to the people of Australia that she will not introduce a carbon tax and she is elected on that promise of not introducing a carbon tax, but then immediately she is elected she goes back on that promise, that is fraud. If Mr Leane wants to talk about fraud, I am very happy to talk about what Ms Gillard has done as Prime Minister of this nation, how she has sold the working families of this country down the drain.

I am more than happy to talk about that at length, because this is something that is of extreme importance to the people of Australia and you have to say — —

Mr Barber interjected.

Mr FINN — Small business is particularly hurt by this, absolutely — and I will get to that in a minute, Mr Barber, however briefly, because of course that is not actually what this motion is about.

Sometimes you win and sometimes you lose, but on this particular occasion, in relation to this carbon tax, there are no winners. There are losers all around. As a result of this tax we have seen an enormous attack on jobs, particularly in the western part of Melbourne that I represent. We have seen as a result of this tax an attack on industry and business, particularly small business.

Small business is going to be hurting, and indeed is hurting, as a result of this tax. We are already starting to see businesses preparing for the worst as this tax continues.

We are seeing losers all around as a result of this particular tax, and of course the losers are not just on one side. We are also seeing losers on the side of those who are and have been promoting this particular tax. The approval figures of the Prime Minister, for example, and of her government have been in the toilet for about 18 months now. I just have to cast my mind back to two days ago when I was at the MCG watching my Tiges serve up a fairly decent belting to the

Western Bulldogs. During the course of the third quarter — —

Mr Ondarchie interjected.

Mr FINN — Another loser — she just cannot help herself.

During the course of the third quarter an image of the Prime Minister was flashed onto the screen, at which point the crowd surrounding the arena erupted into loud booing to the point where I was looking around to see if someone had been hit behind the play because I had actually been watching the game. In fact the crowd was booing the image of the Prime Minister on the screen. When her image disappeared so did the booing. Just to make the point a little bit clearer, in the final quarter the cameras again swooped on the Prime Minister and flashed her image on the screen and the crowd booed again. To hear tens of thousands of people booing the leader of this nation is first of all very sad, but I think it tells us exactly what people think of her, what they think of her broken promise, what they think of the great lie that brought this government to power, and also what they think of her rotten carbon tax.

Then of course we have Senator Milne, the leader of the Greens. She has been put into that position as a result of former Senator Bob Brown seeing what was coming and doing a runner. He could not wait to get out of the place. When he realised just how people across Australia would react to his lousy carbon tax he took the money and he ran.

He may still be running or he may have settled somewhere in Tasmania, I do not know, but we know that he has got the money and we know that we have got the carbon tax, and he has left Christine Milne holding the baby, which is not a cheery prospect at the best of times.

Senator Milne, it has to be said, looks like she is sucking on a lemon even when she is cheery. She is not a naturally warm person, it has to be said, but since it has become apparent that her party is under constant attack as a result of this carbon tax, she has been going around looking as if she is going to belt somebody. That is something I do not think the average voter will take kindly to at all come the next election. I advise the Leader of the Greens in this house to give some advice to Senator Christine Milne that she get the carbon tax out of her mind and smooth her demeanour, particularly when displaying it on the small screen, because at the minute it is not working for her.

This particular tax that we are talking about this afternoon is predominately a tax on energy, and that means it is a tax on everything. Everything across Victoria will be taxed as a result of the introduction of this carbon tax. I have always believed that an unfair tax is theft; I do not think there is any doubt at all about that. We are seeing theft on a grand scale in relation to this carbon tax. It hits everybody left, right and centre and across the board. Nobody can escape this carbon tax, wherever they may be. This tax is stealing from schools, local government and, as we have mentioned, hospitals. This tax is grossly immoral.

We have heard from the Greens and particularly the Labor Party that if people cannot afford to pay increased costs as a result of a carbon tax, then they should not use power. That is the argument. As a result of this tax we have seen an increasing number of pensioners, for example, in this particularly cold winter, during this time of global warming, supposedly — —

Mrs Coote — Where's Tim Flannery?

Mr FINN — I mentioned Sandbags earlier, Mrs Coote. During this particularly cold winter we have seen an increasing number of pensioners who have gone to bed mid-afternoon just to keep warm. As a result of the introduction of this carbon tax they are not living, they are existing, because they cannot afford to heat their homes and cook their meals. This is what the carbon tax is doing.

Now we have a carbon tax that is attacking patients in hospitals and sick people. What would the federal government have us do? What would the Greens have us do? Would they have us make sick people sit in the dark? Would they have us close an extra operating theatre? Would they have us turn the heating off in hospitals? They should tell us what they would have us do as a result of the introduction of the carbon tax — this ideological push by green extremists in Canberra and elsewhere.

We are seeing real human suffering. Taxation on hospitals will hurt people. The fact is — and this will come as an enormous shock to the Greens — that when people are expected to pay a tax, they actually have to find money somewhere. Hospitals are no different. That is something the Greens probably would not entirely understand. Economics is just not their bag, is it? It is not something they excel in — by any stretch of the imagination — but that is the reality.

I am enormously concerned for hospitals in Western Metropolitan Region, including the Footscray hospital, Sunshine Hospital, Williamstown Hospital and Werribee Mercy Hospital. I am enormously concerned that these hospitals will be hurt and that the patients in these hospitals will be hurt as a result of this tax. I am concerned that they are being hurt now. It is not fair, it is not right and it is amoral. I again ask: will members of the Labor Party and the Greens in this state stand up for Victoria? Will they say to the Prime Minister and the federal government, 'We want compensation for our hospitals'?

Will they say to the Prime Minister and the federal government, 'Our hospitals are suffering as a result of your carbon tax'? Will the Labor Party stand up for patients in hospitals in this state? Will the Labor Party stand up for sick Victorians, wherever they may be suffering, because of this carbon tax? Will the Labor Party do the right thing by Victoria and Victorians, or will Labor Party members play their petty, political games as they always do?

An honourable member interjected.

Mr FINN — Well, perhaps. We are giving them the opportunity, aren't we? We are giving them the opportunity to show that they are not doing that anymore and that they have found renewal and a better way. We are going to find out very soon if that is true or not. I know where my money is, but we are giving the Labor Party and the Greens the opportunity to vote for Victoria and Victorians by supporting this motion before the house today. It is not a big ask; it is not a difficult job. We are just asking the Labor Party and the Greens to put Victoria first.

COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
14 August 2012

Planning: Point Cook

Raised with the Minister for Planning on 13 March 2012

REPLY:

The preparation of precinct structure plans is dependent upon a number of factors, and these may alter from time to time. The timing of the adoption of any individual precinct structure plan is therefore likely to vary.

The Growth Areas Authority reports to me regularly on its planning

schedule which I approve. The Growth Areas Authority publishes on its website a list and map of current and proposed precinct structure plan areas and it also provides an indication of the status of individual precinct structure plans on the program.

I will request that the Growth Areas Authority keeps this schedule up to date.

COUNCIL | Statements on Reports
15 August 2012

Melbourne Cricket Ground Trust: report 2011-12

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise to say a few words on the Melbourne Cricket Ground Trust annual report for 2011-12. I have to say up-front to the house this afternoon that I love the MCG. I just absolutely adore the Melbourne Cricket Ground. Over the last 35 years I have been there many times, and I have never failed to be in awe of this place that is an icon of Melbourne and, I think it has to be said, of Australia. To many people in places overseas — perhaps in India, Pakistan, the West Indies and even the UK — Australia is known because of the MCG and what happens there. It is always a joy to be at the MCG, but it has to be said that sometimes it is not always a joy to leave. Those of us who are Richmond supporters will sing that in unison after recent weeks.

It is interesting to note that 2011 was a highly significant year for the MCG Trust, being the 150th anniversary of the appointment of the initial MCG trustees in 1861. As I read this report I thought of what this report would have read like back in 1861. I would bet it would have been very different to what it is now. Just looking at the ground itself, we see that it is not just a ground, it is an edifice. It is a magnificent construction that is the highlight of Melbourne for anybody. The current MCG is very different to the MCG I first visited in the mid-1970s. In fact it is completely different. I recall that back in those days we used to park ourselves on the second deck of the old southern stand, where the wind and the rain used to get us if it was coming from the wrong direction. The Richmond cheer squad would sit behind the goals, out of the

rain sometimes because it was under the roof. We would sit up there and have a few blue or green cans. You cannot do that anymore at the MCG, and that is probably a pity. I am sure Mr Leane would agree with me that that is something that perhaps has gone missing from our lives.

To see the MCG as it is today compared with what it was is to see a transformation of quite extraordinary proportions. I recall the old smokers stand. Could you believe that we would call it the smokers stand? Could you believe that today, in 2012, we would have a members stand of a major sporting stadium called the smokers stand? These days you would be taken out the back, put up against a tree and shot for calling something anything to do with smoking.

I have to say I actually miss that old stand. It had character. I did not go there very often. It was a very rare visit for me, because I am basically a southern stand man — I went there every time. But it was always great to see the old smokers stand, and I do miss it. It is a great pity that it was not allowed to survive the redevelopment, but progress is progress, and sometimes there is not much we can do about it.

Of course we now see the statues and the stands that have been rebuilt: the new Ponsford stand, the new Olympic stand, the new southern stand — the Great Southern Stand, which of course was the first part of the development. I understand the possibility of redeveloping that again is being looked at, but even the insides of the new southern stand are being renovated almost on a daily basis.

One of the great highlights for me is the many statues that are popping up around the MCG — statues of champions, of cricketers, of sporting greats, of football greats. I cannot let the opportunity pass to suggest to the trustees and the committee of the MCG that they might like to erect a statue in honour of the player who has kicked more goals than anybody else on the MCG, and that of course is a great champion of the Australian Football League, Matthew Richardson.

It would be more than appropriate if a statue of Richo were erected to commemorate his great feats on the MCG. As I say, the MCG is a place to behold, I love it, and come the middle of March next year I will be there again.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment
15 August 2012**

Roads: Essendon Airport retail precinct

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I wish to raise a matter this evening for the attention of the Minister for Roads. I think it would be safe to say that one of the great success stories of recent years is the retail and DFO development at Essendon Airport. Despite the economic downturn and despite the effect of the carbon tax and other policies of the federal government that are impacting deleteriously on various aspects of the economy, the DFO and retail development at Essendon Airport is booming. It is a commercial boon for the north-western suburbs of Melbourne and is a hive of activity, particularly on weekends. I am often a customer there; you get some great bargains there, which is always very handy. It is also a great jobs hub for our part of Melbourne.

As is often the case in these sorts of circumstances, there is a downside, which is the traffic bedlam which often surrounds this particular development.

On public holidays, weekends and particularly leading up to Christmas the mayhem that occurs surrounding this development is quite extraordinary. To attempt to get in or out would add perhaps an hour or more to a trip there, and it has to be said that that end of Bulla Road is not built for the traffic load it is currently carrying.

There is no doubt that the DFO and commercial development at Essendon Airport is here to stay. People are voting with their feet, and they are most certainly voting with their cars. I believe we must address a major problem that has developed over recent years. I ask the minister to direct VicRoads to institute a traffic review of the area leading to and from the DFO and commercial development at Essendon Airport.

This is an issue that affects many thousands of people.

I have spoken to a number of people who travel vast distances to visit this particular commercial development. Such a review and an improvement of traffic conditions surrounding the development would be a major plus for many thousands of people right across the western suburbs and even

people in Mr Ondarchie's area of the northern suburbs. People travel from places as far away as Thomastown as well as from places such as Werribee and Point Cook. The development has a large catchment area. I ask the minister to direct VicRoads to investigate what can be done, and we will see if we can get a better deal in this area for the people of the north-western suburbs.

**COUNCIL | Members Statements
16 August 2012**

National disability insurance scheme: federal policy

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — In public life we sometimes see things we wish we had not seen, things that paint us all in a bad light. The recent performance of Prime Minister Julia Gillard on the national disability insurance scheme (NDIS) is certainly one of those things. Personally speaking, it left me angry and disgusted. Never did I think we would see the leader of this nation lower herself to playing cheap politics with the future of people with disabilities, their families and carers. Does the Prime Minister have the first idea of just how much these people need the NDIS and just how important the NDIS is to so many thousands of vulnerable Australians? Perhaps just as importantly, does she realise how grossly offensive her actions are?

We all know Ms Gillard is in political trouble, we all know she is as popular as piles, and we all know her tenure as Prime Minister could end at any tick of the clock. Perhaps what we did not know were the depths to which she would sink in an attempt to give her flagging public image a boost and to try to show her caucus colleagues that she is not the political basket case most of them are convinced she is. We know all that, but to use those with disabilities as a pawn in some sort of tawdry game of self-promotion is beneath contempt. Victorians with disabilities, their families and carers deserve so much more than a Prime Minister who exploits their very real human problems for her own political advantage. It does not get much lower than that. Australia deserves better.

Building industry: federal regulation

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, and I ask: can the minister update the house on the confrontational behaviour of unions in the Victorian construction sector?

Hon. R. A. DALLA-RIVA (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations) — I thank the member for his question. We have always said that these are challenging times for businesses in Victoria, in particular the retail industry, the manufacturing sector and the construction industry. We have always said that we would put forward a strong economic plan to ensure that our strategy keeps our state's industries strong and competitive so that, in turn, they can generate jobs and the investment we need.

We have always said that we need to have a strong budget and that we need to be able to fund infrastructure and provide quality services. We are doing that through our manufacturing strategy, and we are doing that through our international engagement strategy to encourage new business growth. Yet for every step forward we take, the commonwealth seems intent on taking us two steps back. Nowhere is this more evident than the damaging impact of federal Labor's changes to workplace laws.

Today, in this city's retail district, we have witnessed a resurgence of the extreme militancy of the construction unions, whereby we have had members of our police force being attacked by protesters, led by Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union officials. The police were there to protect the rights of the Grocon employees so that they could safely get to their workplace. Workers at the Myer Emporium construction site have been subjected to some very ugly vilification and intimidation by the union bosses. If anything, this sort of behaviour threatens a return to the bad old days of the Builders Labourers Federation. It is an indictment of the changes in our workplace laws that have been drafted by the Prime Minister and are now operating under

her workplace relations minister, Mr Shorten.

We said at the time in our submission to the commonwealth's Fair Work Act review that there needed to be ample scope for legislation to lift productivity and competitiveness whilst still maintaining safety net guarantees in relation to minimum wages and conditions. Yet what we are finding is that there is an increased need for the unions to have a right of entry, and they sought to whitewash the issue of productivity performance.

The two issues that we raised in our submission were about pattern bargaining and illegal pickets. They were swept right under the carpet. It is no wonder that that particular issue was swept under the carpet because — guess what! — Mr Shorten, in the dead of night in federal Parliament, abolished the Office of the Australian Building and Construction Commissioner (ABCC). That was the only watchdog available to apply heavy fines for militant and unlawful behaviour in the construction industry. We warned Mr Shorten at the time that this reckless decision to neuter the industry watchdog would unleash more lawlessness on our construction sites in Victoria. We warned him that the appalling appeasement of the standover men of the construction unions would have severe ramifications for public order and for construction costs in this state and elsewhere.

Today we have seen what happens when the most militant union leaders think they have the power to act with immunity. These union leaders are defying a Supreme Court order.

They are causing public disorder and stopping Victorians getting on with their legitimate business. Just a fortnight ago I raised this very issue with Mr Shorten at the workplace relations ministers select council in Melbourne. I raised with him the concerns about the ABCC, and I raised the concerns about some of the wildcat campaigns that were happening. This is not the first time; we have seen illegal pickets at Baiada Poultry, AiDair, Schweppes and Coles-Toll continue to impact on Victoria. This unnecessary burden on our business is creating enormous problems, and it is interesting that those opposite are always silent on this issue.

Road Safety Amendment (Car Doors) Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — Shared use of our roads by cars and bicycles is an issue that will be of increasing importance as time goes on. If there is one thing that came out of our investigation of this particular bill, it is that there is fault on both sides. It is very simple for some people to suggest that car dooring is purely the fault of motorists, but there is no doubt in my mind — having had a view of this and related issues — that it is not just motorists who are at fault. In terms of the sharing of roads, cyclists are also at fault. Just this morning I saw a bike rider go flying through a set of red lights without any regard at all for other users, or the law. As a result of our investigation of this bill, that might be something we also take into consideration.

I have to mention that whilst Ms Pulford had some concerns about how this committee operated — —

Ms Pulford interjected.

The PRESIDENT — Order! I advise Ms Pulford that her interjections are just not on. If she needs to converse with somebody outside the chamber, she should show other members the courtesy of leaving the chamber and meeting with that person outside. We do not lean across fences; this is not a racetrack.

Mr FINN — Ms Pulford raised some concerns in her remarks about how the committee was conducted. I did not understand what she was talking about. I am strongly of the view — and I have worked on a number of committees over a number of years — that this was a very cooperative committee.

We held a wide variety of views and we canvassed an even wider variety of views, and in the end we came to an almost complete conclusion. For the life of me I cannot understand why Ms Pulford came in here today and said what she did.

I commend the chair, Mrs Coote, on her efforts and other members of the committee because I believe they did a very good job.

Valley Carers: residential facility

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I raise a matter this evening for the attention of the Minister for Community Services, the Honourable Mary Wooldridge. It concerns a matter which the minister would be very much aware of, and it is something which occupies the minds of parents of children with disabilities, however old those children may be — that is, what will happen to those children once their parents have gone to a better place? Over the years I have spoken to a lot of parents in this situation. Some of the most distressing and heart-wrenching meetings I have had with people over the past 20 years or so have been with parents — many of them elderly, many of them in their 70s and 80s and some are even in their 90s — who say to me, ‘We cannot afford to die because we do not know what will happen to our 50, 60 or 70-year-old child with a disability.’

That is something with which society must come to grips on a much larger scale, but certainly it is an issue that affects every family where disability or severe disability is involved.

Yesterday I had a meeting with Valley Carers. It is a group based in the city of Moonee Valley and made up of parents with children predominantly in their 20s who have disabilities. They are casting their minds forward to what will happen to their children when they pass on. Members of the group put to me a range of thoughts as to what they would like to see done. They are basically looking for some form of residential accommodation for their children, perhaps a cluster housing project in the Moonee Valley municipality. Certainly they are looking for some place in the western suburbs because there is a significant lack of those facilities in Melbourne’s west, and that is something that needs to be rectified.

I am not asking the minister for money on this occasion — which will come, I am sure, as a considerable shock to her. What I am asking her to do is to direct her department to provide guidance to Valley Carers to enable its members to put together plans for exactly what they want to

set up. At that point we might ask for money, but at this point we are just asking for guidance. This is an area that affects people very deeply, and I ask the minister to provide the support and services that her department can to Valley Carers.

COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
28 August 2012

Climate change: government expenditure

Raised with the Minister for Environment and Climate Change on 15 March 2012

REPLY:

The previous government used taxpayer’s funds from the landfill levy to fund various programs under its ‘climate change’ strategy. One of these was the Climate Communities grants program. The name of the program suggested that it would provide action on climate change.

However, the program also included funding for a range of other measures including workshops, craft activities, advice on growing vegetables and even what was described as a ‘series of picnic days (to) distribute stories and songs ...’ as measures to tackle climate change.

More than \$1 million was spent on this program which the previous government implemented through Sustainability Victoria (SV). In May 2011, I announced a review into the operations and focus of SV. This provided an opportunity to examine the appropriateness and effectiveness of the operations of SV and the work it had been asked to do. In June 2011, the Victorian Auditor-General brought down a damning report on the previous government’s handling of the municipal waste issue. It criticised a failure to carry out sufficient efforts in the dealing with waste, finding:

Ineffective planning, leadership and oversight have resulted in inadequate coordination of implementation and limited progress in implementing the TZW (Towards Zero Waste) actions.

This was effectively a criticism of the direction and oversight of the previous government. The finding into the independent review into SV agreed that it had ‘lost focus’ on its waste obligations. It recommended:

SV will deliver more targeted programs with demonstrated

economy-wide impacts with a focus on enduring, measurable outcomes. A sound evidence base will also be developed to demonstrate how these economy-wide benefits have been delivered.

The coalition government is supporting this and the other recommendations of the review.

The review demonstrated the need for more effective investment in areas such as waste reduction, recycling and support for measures to increase energy efficiency.

In September 2011, the federal government introduced legislation for a carbon tax/emissions trading scheme. This automatically triggered a review of the Victorian Climate Change Act. The review confirmed that the state government should not be duplicating federal government emissions reductions measures.

It found ‘no compelling case to maintain the (Victorian) target’ when a national scheme was in place, and cited evidence that a state-based target would:

- not drive any additional national abatement;
- distort the national scheme; and
- lead to Victoria effectively cross-subsidising emissions abatement in other states at additional cost to Victorians.

Importantly, it found that:

Victoria would effectively cross-subsidise emissions abatement in other states at additional cost to Victorians: local emission reductions would reduce the incentives for other jurisdictions to undertake their own abatement.

The results of the review also confirmed that the Victorian government should not be investing in ‘mitigation’ measures. The need to avoid duplication has been confirmed by COAG which is now working to reduce duplication in carbon and energy efficiency schemes. A recent meeting of the Select Council on Climate Change has also been tasked with developing a national approach to reforming climate change policies and programs that are not complementary to carbon price currently in place.

In the meantime, the Victorian government is getting on with the job of delivering support for local, effective and practical measures. Our \$20 million Communities for Nature and Two Million Trees partnership programs are good examples of this. We provided \$8.3 million to deliver the Sustainable Schools program and \$5 million in rebates for low-income

earners to help them to purchase energy-efficient appliances.

Funding from the landfill levy is now being better targeted to support a range of new landfill, recycling and waste minimisation efforts. We are also helping charities to deal with the cost of the landfill levy and to reduce illegal dumping on their premises. The previous Labor government had failed to offer such support to charities when it raised the cost of the levy.

COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
28 August 2012

Point Cook: swimming pool

Raised with the Minister for Sport and Recreation on 22 May 2012

REPLY:

I am able to advise that:

Decisions on the planning, siting and construction timelines for local pools are coordinated by the relevant local government area, which in the case of Point Cook is the Wyndham City Council.

Wyndham City Council currently owns two aquatic facilities — the Wyndham Leisure and Events Centre in Hoppers Crossing, and the Werribee Outdoor Olympic Pool.

I am advised that on 25 October 2011, Wyndham City Council adopted the 2011-16 Wyndham Aquatic Strategy.

The strategy identifies the need for a new aquatic centre to be constructed in the north-west of the municipality in the next 10 years. Council has resolved that the strategy be rolled out in three stages:

- Stage 1 (2011-15) — undertake major upgrades and extension to the Wyndham Leisure and Events Centre in Derrimut Road, Hoppers Crossing. (This project is being supported by a Community Facility Funding Program — Better Pools grant of \$2.6m announced 2011).
- Stage 2 (2015-20)-plan and construct a new, second indoor aquatic leisure facility.
- Stage (2020-21)-operate the new second indoor centre.

The strategy identifies that council should begin planning for this new indoor centre once the visitations of the Wyndham Leisure and Events Centre reaches 850 000, which council anticipates should be achieved in 2015-16.

I look forward to receiving further advice from council on facilitation of their aquatic strategy in the future.

COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
28 August 2012

Sunshine Football Club: ministerial visit

Raised with the Minister for Sport and Recreation on 20 June 2012

REPLY:

I note Mr Finn's request to visit the Sunshine Football Club and meet with Mr Bas Tensen, president and committee members of the Sunshine Football Club, and also representatives of the Albion Football Club.

I encourage Mr Finn's office to contact my office to make suitable arrangements for all parties to meet.

COUNCIL | Members Statements
29 August 2012

Northern Territory: election result

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise to most warmly congratulate the new Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Terry Mills, and his Country Liberal Party (CLP) team on their spectacular election victory last Saturday. Terry is a straight-talking, common-sense conservative who I know will be an outstanding Chief Minister. Under his leadership the Northern Territory will go from strength to strength and all Northern Territorians can look forward to a bright and dynamic future.

As great a triumph as it was, the CLP was not the biggest winner last weekend; Aboriginal Australians registered their most significant political victory since 1967. It was Aboriginal communities spread across rural sections of the Northern Territory who really elected the new government.

There are now a number of indigenous members of the new conservative government, some of whom, I hazard to guess, will be ministers. It is a very exciting time in our nation's history. We saw the result on Saturday because those Aboriginal communities were sick of being taken

for granted by Labor. They were sick of being used and abused by Labor for its own political purposes. They were sick of being ignored by Labor and sick of the neglect they suffer as a result. They were sick to the back teeth of Labor policies that did not work and for the first time gave Labor the kicking it has so long deserved.

We in Melbourne's west know exactly how the indigenous population of the Northern Territory feel as we fight decades of neglect and abuse by Labor. As one, we in the west join together to wish our fellow Australians in the nation's north every success for a new era of freedom, independence, strength and prosperity.

COUNCIL
29 August 2012

Port Phillip Planning Scheme: Amendment

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I listened with great interest a short time ago to Mr Tee, who got up in this chamber and, in moving his motion, told us of the very deep passion and concern that the opposition holds about the matter he has brought to the house. At the time, he was standing over there by himself.

I think Mr Leane was over there in one corner, but everybody else had deserted him. As soon as he finished he scuttled out of the chamber as well, and he has not been back. You have to ask just how much the opposition is concerned about this matter when even the mover of the motion will not come back into the house to hear the debate he initiated. I find it quite astonishing that someone would have the audacity to come in here, raise a matter and disappear — poof! — in a puff of smoke. He has disappeared, and he has not been back.

And now he is back — what a marvellous thing!

Honourable members interjecting.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! Members of the opposition need to tone down their interjections. I think Mr Finn was inviting those interjections, but I suggest that he get to the motion.

I ask members of the opposition to cease interjecting.

Mr FINN — I have been speaking on

the motion. I was referring to the fact that there does not seem to be a great deal of interest in the motion among those who are behind it. However, I am glad to see that Mr Tee is back. It must be novelty hour. It is wonderful to see him back in the chamber. Perhaps somebody should give him a ribbon and welcome him back.

We have had these sorts of debates before in this chamber, and I have taken the opportunity on those occasions to point out to members of the opposition parties, including the Greens, that this is not the place to decide planning matters. There are places that you go to to decide planning matters, and the Parliament is not one of them. We are not planning experts; I am not a planning expert and Mr Tee is most certainly not a planning expert. We have other places to go to if we wish to decide planning matters.

Why members of the opposition insist on trying to turn this Parliament into some sort of planning authority is a total mystery to me. I have got up in this chamber repeatedly and told them this is not the place for that.

Mr Barber interjected.

Mr FINN — I remind Mr Barber that there is a time and a place for everything. We will get to the Greens' 3 per cent result in the recent Northern Territory election a bit later on, if he likes.

In this house we need to discuss matters that we can actually do something about, and this is not one of them. This is nonsense. Members of the opposition come in here and tell us that planning powers have been taken out of the hands of the people, and then they want to decide everything in here. I ask those in the chamber to work that out.

You can understand why members of the opposition, including its leadership, shunned Mr Tee during question time today. When they had the opportunity to run with what I would suggest is a relatively serious set of allegations, Mr Tee was, again, nowhere to be seen. He was dumped in favour of Mr Pakula, who obviously garners a much higher level of respect within the Labor Party than Mr Tee does. From listening to Mr Tee's contribution today I can understand why that is. I can totally understand why members of the opposition would say, 'No thanks, we don't want anything to do with that bloke.' I can understand it, because Mr Tee's contribution was sad.

As members, particularly those on this side of the house, know, I am

a compassionate man. I am a man who cares. I am somebody who can empathise.

Mr Ramsay — He is fair minded.

Mr FINN — I am fair minded, as Mr Ramsay says. I can empathise with what people are going through, and I felt incredibly sorry for Mr Tee today. Being dumped upon from this side is bad enough, but to be dumped upon from your own side, and so publicly too, is pretty crook. Can you imagine it? You could imagine they might take him behind closed doors and say, 'Well, mate, you're trying' — very trying — 'but let's face it, you're just not up to it, you're just not up to scratch. We appreciate the effort, but perhaps you should take up, I don't know, volleyball or something.

Being the shadow minister for volleyball might be something that you could take on.' I could understand if they did that, but for them to come in here and so publicly humiliate Mr Tee in the way they did today I think is pretty sad.

What Labor Party members did today reflects not on Mr Tee but on the Australian Labor Party in this state. It reflects on a party that once had a reputation for caring for its comrades, for those who were down at heel and those who might have been hard up against it, and certainly on both of those counts Mr Tee is flying — he is in that camp without question. And yet Labor Party members came in here during question time today and just jumped him, and did it so very publicly, as I say. That is very sad. I wish Mr Tee well in his further endeavours because, of most of the members in this house, I think he probably needs good wishes more than just about anybody else.

What we have here is a motion moved by the unfortunate member opposite that really invites us to compare and contrast. It invites us to consider a planning minister who has shown real flair and real vision, who without doubt has captured the imagination of Victorians. He is without doubt somebody who can see a vision for Victoria. He can see a vision for regional centres, for suburban life and indeed for our great city of Melbourne. This minister, the Honourable Matthew Guy, is proving himself to be a truly great planning minister. I think I can say that without fear of contradiction from anybody. He is proving himself to be a minister with something to offer in a way that perhaps few others can. We are being asked to compare and contrast him with perhaps what we had before.

We had a minister who, as I recall, used to sit where Mr Hall is sitting now. I am sure it did not rub off because Mr Hall is an excellent minister as well. But the former planning minister, Justin Madden, now the member for Essendon in the Assembly, used to sit over there, and basically he had no idea.

Again I say that without any fear of contradiction. He had absolutely no idea. He was told what to do from start to finish. He did not know what day it was. That caring side of me came out at times when I felt quite sorry for him. He had not the first idea what he was doing, and that showed pretty much on a daily basis.

Mr Ramsay — Because his head was in the clouds.

Mr FINN — It has been shown over the last couple of days. I saw him on television last night claiming that he may have brain damage as a result of playing football. I thought that was quite plausible. That is quite possible, and I hope if that is the situation, that he does get that diagnosed soon and we can get it fixed, but it certainly did not do much for the planning scenario in the state when he held the reins. To compare him with Mr Guy is quite nonsensical, because there is no comparison.

Matthew Guy is Phar Lap to Justin Madden's broken-down donkey.

Mr Ondarchie — Black Caviar.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I think the personalisation of this has gone far enough. I suggest that Mr Finn be a little more cautious in speaking about a member in another place in such terms.

Mr FINN — Deputy President, I was referring to a former minister and his record as planning minister. I think if you went out and did a survey, which I understand you have some experience in, you would discover that a majority of people share my view, and not necessarily just those on this side.

The point I make is that by moving this motion today Mr Tee has invited us to make that comparison between the two, and there is no comparison.

If we still had the situation that existed before the last election, Fishermans Bend would become another Point Cook, because we saw what Mr Madden did when he was Minister for Planning. We saw what he did to the people of Point Cook in my electorate of Western Metropolitan Region. We saw that he allowed unbounded development. We saw that he allowed thousands and thousands of people to move into

Point Cook without any reasonable planning at all. We saw him allow those people to move into Point Cook without proper public transport, without proper roads, without proper schools and without proper health care.

We saw all that, and now those people in Point Cook are coming to me and asking, 'Will you fix it for us?'

I am delighted to say that Matthew Guy as planning minister has been to Point Cook on a number of occasions, and he has given an undertaking that we will fix it. We are finding real solutions to the problem in Point Cook.

Mr Barber interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Barber over here likes to spend money. He does not care whether he has got it or not. He just does not care.

Mr Ondarchie interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Ondarchie makes a very relevant point, I think.

Mr Barber sits over there and he promises this, that and everything. He will promise the world to anybody, but he will never be in a position to have to deliver on those promises, and he knows that. He can sit over there and parrot a range of promises, he can promise the sun, moon and stars to anybody he likes, and he knows only too well that he will never, ever have to deliver. But we here on the coalition side are in government, and we have a responsibility to all the people of the state to ensure that the finances of the state are properly managed.

Mr Tee — And how's that going?

Mr FINN — It is going all right. Certainly it would be a lot better if Mr Tee's crowd, his Labor Party, had not left Victoria broke. It would be going considerably better if we had had a government that had held the Treasury together for the 11 years that it was government.

If we had had that, the financial management of this state would be going a lot better. But as it turns out, the Treasurer of this state is doing a fine job indeed in returning this state to a solid financial base from which to build. That is certainly something I would not anticipate anybody on the other side of the house understanding.

Members opposite know how to spend money and they know how to tax, but that is about it. So far as financial responsibility goes and being concerned about people's financial welfare, that is not something that they enter into at all. That reflects the attitude of members

opposite to what they have done to the people of Point Cook. The previous government took the land tax and the stamp duty, and what did it put back? Nothing. It allowed developers to put the air in shopping centres, and I might say that the Point Cook town centre is a great shopping centre. I do not know if Mr Tee has been there, but he should go and have a look. Mr Tarlamis should also head over and have a look.

There are some great restaurants there too. In fact I invite all members to visit the Point Cook town centre —

Mr Ramsay interjected.

Mr FINN — It would be, Mr Ramsay. The government of the day and the minister of the day, Mr Madden, allowed those developments to go ahead and allowed many thousands of houses to be built, but it did not provide for the needs of the people moving into Point Cook, many of whom have families and young children.

Ms Pennicuik — And buses?

Mr FINN — Yes, they need buses, they need public transport, they need new roads and they need a whole range of things that should have been provided for them long before now.

They need a swimming pool as well; they tell me that every day. They are very keen to have a swimming pool.

The proposal put forward by the Minister for Planning, Matthew Guy, will ensure that at Fishermans Bend we do not have a repeat of what happened at Point Cook. That is something that should be emphasised. This government, the Liberal-Nationals coalition, will not do to the people of Fishermans Bend what the Labor Party did to the people of Point Cook. We will not do that, and it should be pointed out that the government that did that to the people of Point Cook did so because it was elected on the preferences of the Greens. That is something the people of Point Cook should take into consideration when a few Greens types come slinging around with their own version of events. It is important that the blame be put at the appropriate place, and the appropriate place for the people of Point Cook to put the blame is at the feet of the Labor Party and the Greens.

As a result of the vision and the planning by the current minister, we will not see that happen again at Fishermans Bend.

I go back to some of the very odd planning decisions made by the previous Minister for Planning, Mr

Madden. We heard Mr Tee say earlier — and it is interesting that Mr Tee has been the only Labor speaker on this motion — that this is something of deep, vital concern to the members of the Labor Party. Mr Tee rose, spoke on this motion and disappeared. Nobody else wants to talk about it, and that is how much of a concern it is to those members. We can understand why members of the Labor Party would not want to talk about planning. I return to what Mr Tee was saying before about Mr Guy supposedly ripping planning powers away from the people of Victoria. We know that is nonsense. In fact what Mr Guy has done is hand those powers back to councils around this state. What we saw when Mr Madden was in control was planning powers ripped away from the people of Victoria and from councils right across the state.

I had a visit earlier this year from some residents of Moonee Valley who are deeply concerned about what may be about to happen at Moonee Valley Racecourse, because there is a proposal for Moonee Valley Racecourse that I think is a bit over the odds, to tell you the truth — if I could use that term. They asked me what my view is and what is the view of Minister Guy. I told them it does not matter what my view is and it does not matter what Minister Guy's view is because that matter will be decided by the Moonee Valley City Council. No more will we have someone coming in from on high and deciding for the people of Moonee Valley. That matter will be decided by the council.

The bottom line is that if Mr Madden were still the Minister for Planning, Moonee Valley Racecourse would now look like lower Manhattan. It would have the sort of skyscrapers that are being proposed and the sort of traffic problems that would be horrendous for the people of Moonee Valley. The people of Moonee Valley, Moonee Ponds and Essendon should remember what their local member would have done to them if he had retained his position as planning minister.

I go back once again to a major issue in the western suburbs — the issue of the Port Phillip Woollen Mill site in Williamstown. There has been some debate on this issue for quite some time, and I have made my view very well known. I know Mr Tee has been to Williamstown, and I know the member for Williamstown in the other place, Mr Noonan, has been out and about occasionally — he sticks his head out from behind the curtains and goes for a bit of a wander.

They have tried to, in my humble opinion, mislead the people of Williamstown as to what is going on there, but the fact of the matter is that we have carried through what we said we would before the last election. We have handed planning responsibility for that woollen mill back to Hobsons Bay City Council, and that is what this is about. The Hobsons Bay council wanted the planning powers, and that is what we have given them. The fact that some of the councillors do not actually want that responsibility now is beside the point. We have carried through on what we committed to do. Members can see that any comparison between the previous minister and the present minister is a nonsense, because Minister Guy is so far in front that it is just not funny.

We have to ask why members of the opposition would be concerned about development at Fishermans Bend at all, because if Labor's mates in the unions get their way, there will be no construction industry in this state.

There will be no development at Fishermans Bend or anywhere else if members of the Labor Party and their mates get their way. We have seen them on the streets of Melbourne over the last few days. There were some truly appalling scenes in Lonsdale Street just yesterday. And on my walk this morning I noted that they had again gathered on Lonsdale Street near the corner of Swanston Street, preparing for a decent stoush, if needs be, I would assume.

If members of the Labor Party truly cared about the construction industry and jobs in this state, they would get up in here and dissociate themselves from the actions of the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union. Let us face facts: the CFMEU is just the Builders Labourers Federation reincarnated. Bill Oliver is just former BLF secretary Norm Gallagher with an accent. That is the situation as it stands.

I am not sure if any of the opposition members in the chamber are current or past union members. At least one or two of them have done very nicely out of being union officials over the years, and after recent revelations we know how well you can do out of being a trade union official, particularly if you can get a credit card out of it. I urge those members, whether they be current or former members of the trade union movement, to get up and show some responsibility towards the construction industry and its future in the state.

How can we expect anything

to be built in Fishermans Bend if the construction industry is out of business in Victoria? How can we expect any form of development in Fishermans Bend or anywhere else if we let the trade unions — the radical, lunatic left of the trade union movement that we have seen on the streets of Melbourne over the last few days — force the construction industry out of business, force construction businesses to the wall and force their fellow workers into unemployment again?

Mr Ondarchie interjected.

Mr FINN — It is interesting, isn't it? Whenever this matter has been raised in the house over the last couple of days there has been total silence from members of the ALP. One can only assume that they know which side of the bread is buttered, or words to that effect — Mr Ondarchie knows what I mean. They know not to upset those who keep them here, and they know that the CFMEU kicks in a fair whack to the ALP coffers. They will not bite the hand that feeds them.

I see Mr Pakula over there. Mr Tee is pretending that it is not happening. Ms Pulford does not want to know. At least Mr Tarlamis gives me a nod and smile. He knows exactly what I am talking about, but as for the others, they do not want to know. We saw it during question time yesterday and today, and we see it again now — members of the Labor Party do not want to know when we talk about the extremes of the trade union movement forcing the Victorian construction industry to its knees, because they are complicit in that action. They stand shoulder to shoulder with their comrades on the streets of Melbourne who yesterday hit police horses, hit police officers, generally caused a disturbance and tried to force people who were going about their daily business, people who were trying to go to work, construction workers — people who may well be working on the Fishermans Bend development next year —

Mr Ondarchie interjected.

Mr FINN — Indeed, Mr Ondarchie, working families — spot on. These people want to go to work, but the mates of the Labor Party, the CFMEU — the BLF reincarnated — will not let them. And what do we get from the Labor Party? Dead silence.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I have allowed Mr Finn to pursue that line of argument, but if he continues it, I will need a closer link to the motion before the Chair. If he wishes

to continue that line of argument, I ask him to establish a link to the revocation motion.

Mr FINN — I hope to do so, Deputy President.

There is a very clear link, as I said earlier, because if the CFMEU forces construction companies out of business, this motion will become irrelevant because there will be no development of Fishermans Bend as there will be nobody to build anything. That is a simple fact of life. We would be wasting our time. If the CFMEU, in conjunction with the ALP, force Grocon and other companies to the wall, there will be no construction and no development in Fishermans Bend, so this motion will be irrelevant.

I will depart from that point and conclude by saying that I sincerely hope to live long enough — that I will be walking this earth long enough — to see the Victorian branch of the Labor Party put forward something constructive and worthwhile. It has to be said that this motion does not, and could not in any circumstances be said to, fit that category. I urge the house to vote against this motion, just as I urge members of the opposition to condemn the actions of their CFMEU mates on the streets yesterday.

**COUNCIL | Members Statements
30 August 2012**

Building industry: industrial action

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — The rule of law is essential for the survival of any civilised society. The scenes we have witnessed in Lonsdale Street in recent times are most certainly threatening that rule of law. The Construction, Mining, Forestry and Energy Union thugs running amok in our city signals a return to the worst days of the Builders Labourers Federation. Those having doubts about reincarnation need look no further than the current leadership of CFMEU to see modern day Norm Gallaghers plying their trade. The violence directed toward police and police horses on Tuesday was despicable and cannot, indeed must not, be tolerated ever again. It angered and disgusted every right-thinking person in this state and, I suspect, in this nation.

Of almost as much concern as the

behaviour of the union thugs is the attitude of the opposition in this place to their tactics. Not once have we heard a word of condemnation of this outrageous behaviour from members of the Australian Labor Party in this place. In fact whenever this matter has been raised this week opposition members have gone out of their way to appear uninterested and detached. They cannot get away with that. Labor cannot pretend the union thugs have nothing to do with them.

The government has made its position very clear. It has loudly condemned the action. Labor members, in their silence, are complicit in the disgraceful actions of their union mates. I call on those opposite to stand up in this house today, disassociate themselves from this behaviour and condemn the thugs in the union movement or be condemned by every Victorian.

**COUNCIL | Questions without Notice
30 August 2012**

Planning: western suburbs

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister inform the house of what action the Baillieu government has taken through the planning system to ensure that our fast-growing western growth corridor has access to class A recycled water to ensure that this growth corridor remains sustainable as well as livable?

Hon. M. J. GUY (Minister for Planning) — Some people talk down our outer growth areas, but not the members of the Liberal Party and The Nationals. We stand by our growth areas as sustainable, innovative places to live. These new suburbs that are developing on the edge of Melbourne are producing, on a grand scale, some of the most ecologically sustainable and environmentally friendly homes we have seen anywhere in the world.

I thank Mr Finn for this question. He and Mr Elsbury represent some of the fastest growing areas in Australia. I recently had pleasure in bringing forward an amendment to the Wyndham planning scheme to allow for a dual water supply project that will bring drinking water, and importantly class A recycled water, to 20 000 homes in that growth corridor. That project will also bring class A recycled water to 143 hectares of open space, which is an area almost as large

as the Melbourne CBD, also known as the Hoddle grid.

We — that is, the agriculture and water minister, Mr Walsh, and me — are bringing forward fantastic new initiatives to ensure that our suburbs not only grow but grow sustainably. I say again that the Baillieu government — the Liberal Party and The Nationals — stand by outer growth areas. We stand by people who want affordable housing, who want a chance to live in a home — but more to the point, to live in an affordable, sustainable home — in a new suburb in one of Australia's fastest growing areas. This contrasts with some comments that have been made about those suburbs in the past.

Mr Leane — By whom?

Hon. M. J. GUY — I was not going to say anything, but I will take up Mr Leane's interjection. Members might be aware that the former Minister for Planning used the terms 'obese housing' and 'McMansions' in a disparaging way in relation to people who live in outer growth areas. They were shameful and disparaging comments that put down people who live in outer growth areas. His parliamentary secretary, Ms Mikakos, sits in this chamber; I wonder if she endorsed that point of view.

I do not think these homes are McMansions; these areas are new, sustainable suburbs. In the western growth corridor 20 000 of them will have access to class A recycled water because of the planning scheme amendment the Baillieu government has brought in and because of the actions of the water minister, Mr Walsh. The advocacy of Mr Finn and Mr Elsbury has seen those areas advance in terms of environmental sustainability.

I find it interesting that the growth corridor plans brought forward by this government, plans which were opposed by the opposition, contained references to Living Melbourne, Living Victoria, which is a plan to ensure that we get sustainability in our new suburbs. This plan was of course opposed by those opposite, and it was opposed yesterday by Steve Bracks, the man who brought more land into green wedges than any other Premier. What a rolled gold, gold medal hypocrite Steve Bracks is! He is the man with the shortest memory span in this state, who brought 47 000 hectares of land into the urban growth boundary.

Forty-three thousand hectares were brought in by John Brumby, and not even 6000 hectares have been

brought in by this government. A gold medal hypocrite is Steve Bracks. We are building sustainable suburbs. Steve Bracks and his colleagues are out there canning and bagging those new communities that the Baillieu government stands up for.

**COUNCIL | Second Reading
30 August 2012**

Working With Children Amendment Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise with some reluctance to speak this afternoon. What Mr Davis said about this being a sad bill is very true. I have expressed the view in this house before that the fact that we have to have legislation of this nature reflects very badly on modern society. The fact that we have to have legislation to check for people who would use children for their own purposes, whether for sexual gratification or whatever it may be, to prevent them from working with children reflects very badly on the values of perhaps far too many people in modern society.

I have to say up-front that for the life of me I do not understand how anyone could hurt a child.

I do not understand how anyone could use a child, in all his or her innocence, for their own personal sexual gratification. I do not understand anybody who would deliberately harm a child in terms of physical or mental abuse. I do not understand anybody who would deliberately go out of their way to cause pain and suffering to children in the way that has been highlighted all too often in recent years.

Perhaps it is a symptom that the society we live in is not as healthy as it used to be, or perhaps we now live in a society that highlights this behaviour far more than has ever been the case before. Perhaps in years gone by this sort of behaviour did go on but it was covered up and the newspapers and media did not talk about it. It is a very good thing that it has been uncovered because this sort of thing, as with any evil, flourishes when it is covered up. It flourishes when it is not exposed to the light. In its own way it is a good thing that this sort of mistreatment and evil activity has been exposed for what it is.

Over the years some people have said to me that they believe people who harm children in this way — particularly sexual deviants and people who have committed vile sexual abuse of children, often abuse that has resulted in the child's death — should be liable for capital punishment. As a father of young children, I find that a very tempting proposition, but it is not a proposition I support. Quite frankly, I do not fully understand what goes on in the mind of somebody who involves themselves in that sort of activity. In my mind there is some doubt as to the fitness of the mental state of anybody who, for example, is involved in child pornography, who uses a child for their sexual gratification or for their own gratification in any way. There is some doubt in my mind as to whether those people are in full control of what they are doing.

Perhaps it is more from hope than anything else that I say that.

Perhaps it is the naive part of me hoping that nobody in their right mind could possibly commit the sorts of heinous acts that we have seen committed against children over recent years. I hope against hope that anybody who involves themselves in the sort of dreadful activity that we are endeavouring to further legislate against today has some mental problems that force them into these sorts of acts.

I am a great believer in the fact that the rights of children in society must be protected at all costs, and I have said this on the public record for almost 20 years, since I first entered Parliament. The rights of children are absolutely paramount. We as adults have a fair chance of looking after ourselves. We can stand up and defend ourselves and look after our own rights, but children cannot. Children need legislative and other protection.

Those of us who are big, ugly and loud and who can stand up and maybe swing the odd punch or make enough noise to ensure that we are able to look after ourselves perhaps do not need as much protection as the little innocent ones.

I spend a fair portion of my life defending children from a very early age.

Mrs Kronberg interjected.

Mr FINN — As Mrs Kronberg knows, I defend children from a very early age. It is sad that what we have seen in this society over the last 20 years is an undermining of the rights of children. Over the last

20 or perhaps even 30 years we have seen various interest groups pushing their own agenda to the detriment of the rights and welfare of children. Unfortunately we have seen it in this house. Over the last few years we have seen some major pieces of legislation passed in this house which have worked against the best interests of children. I do not want to go into the specific pieces of legislation because that would start another debate altogether, but I assure the house that on at least one of those issues there will be a debate very soon as we wind back the legislation which has harmed the rights of tiny, innocent children.

The bill we are debating today is not a new issue. Back in the 1990s during the Kennett years I was a tad confused — and it confuses me still — about why anybody would oppose mandatory reporting. There was such a brouhaha; some people were talking about civil liberties and all that sort of thing.

Civil libertarians have a tendency to get a bit carried away from time to time, but for those of us who believe that the rights and the welfare of children are paramount it was not an argument. It was never something that could seriously be debated. Of the many things the Kennett government achieved in its seven years, we can be very proud of the mandatory reporting legislation that was passed in that time. As a member of that government, I am very proud of what we did way back in the 1990s.

One of the issues this legislation brings to this Parliament is the question: do kids really matter? As a father, I have to say that they most certainly do. I heard a talkback caller on the radio this morning who was asked, 'Would you like a mansion, or would you like kids?'. The discussion on the radio was about those who have chosen material wealth over a family, and it is a pity we have got to the stage in this country where such a choice is necessary.

Without hesitation this particular chap said, 'Kids', and I thought, 'Well, there is hope for the world yet'. As far as I am concerned the greatest gift we have on this earth is children. There is no question in my mind when I say that. I think of my own children at home, whom, despite their tremendous capacity to destroy things, I still love more than anything else — more than I could ever have imagined before they came along.

To people who say, 'Kids do not matter; there are other priorities, and children have to be put on the

backburner', I say, 'They have got it completely wrong'. To those people who use children to make money in ways that are quite despicable and totally evil in every way — for example, purveyors of child pornography — I say, 'You are surely the lowest form of life to use children in a way that completely destroys the innocence of childhood to which every child is entitled'. Childhood is one of the great times in our lives. In this place I often think, 'If only I could turn the clock back a few years'.

Everybody is entitled to a childhood and that innocence, and everybody is entitled to feel safe during that time.

The tragedy is that we have to have legislation such as this to ensure that that safety is there; we have to have legislation instead of being in a situation where we know parents will look after their kids, as happened in my family — I was very fortunate. I certainly go out of my way at every opportunity to ensure that my children know they are safe and secure, and I do everything I possibly can to make them happy. I have to say that if anybody hurt them in the ways we have talked about in relation to this bill, I would not be held responsible for what I did to the perpetrator of that act. Anybody who is even thinking about that should be warned. It would not be a matter of capital punishment because they would not get that far.

This legislation is very important. It is welcomed.

I am not delighted that the opposition is not opposing it; I wish it was supporting it. I wish the bill a speedy passage, and I sincerely hope that every child in our state is safe and can feel safe for the entirety of their lives.

**COUNCIL | Members Statements
6 September 2012**

Eaglehawk: sports facilities

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I share Mrs Coote's delight in being here in Bendigo. This is the site of the first political conference I attended many years ago. I am sure members of the Labor Party will be delighted to hear that. It is also the place where I met my wife.

The city of Bendigo brings back many happy memories for me. As someone who was born and bred in country Victoria I understand the importance of football to country

people. The local footy club is truly the heart and soul of country communities. I feel sorry for those who refer to football as 'only a game'. The football and netball games are the highlight of the week for many country people, and I well remember that many years ago I played full-forward in the Warrion under-14s, which, I have to say, had to be seen to be believed!

It is with some excitement that I report today that the coalition promise of \$400 000 for sporting infrastructure in Eaglehawk is in the process of being delivered. I am sure that will bring great joy to the people of Eaglehawk, as it will to every country Victorian who knows and loves their sport. That is what makes country Victoria such a great place to be.

**COUNCIL | Members Statements
11 September 2012**

United States of America: September 11 anniversary

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — Today marks the 11th anniversary of the day that changed the world. I am sure most of us will remember exactly where we were when terrorists flew planes into New York's World Trade Centre and the Pentagon and caused another jet to crash into a field in Pennsylvania. Last night I was among a sizeable group of prominent Victorians who joined the American Australian Association and the US Consul General, Frank Urbancic, in Queen's Hall to commemorate the evil attacks of September 11 2001. Those present vowed we would never forget the barbarity of the attacks or the almost 3000 innocent souls who were murdered in cold blood on that dreadful day. We will remember those victims, who were from over 90 countries, Australia among them. We will remember that the events of 9/11 were not just an attack on the US; this was an attack on us all. It was an attack on freedom by those who still seek to oppress us.

We will also remember that numerous repeats of the carnage of 9/11 have only been avoided through the efforts of our troops in Afghanistan and the international intelligence community — and thank God for them! We should use today

to recommit ourselves to defeating terrorism and crushing the threats posed by extreme Islam. We must never forget what lies ahead if we lower our guard. Our freedom is too important.

**COUNCIL | Second Reading
11 September 2012**

Evidence Amendment (Journalist Privilege) Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise to support this bill this afternoon. Given my background there is a great deal I could say on this particular matter because before entering this Parliament I was in the media for many years working with many journalists over a long period of time, and indeed on my sabbatical when I was not in this Parliament, after I left it and before I came back, I again worked in the media and again worked with a good many journalists.

There is one thing that has to be said about a journalist's source, and that is that there is nothing in journalism that is more sacred than the journalist's source, because without that source the journalist does not have a story, and the story — in my experience with journalists over a long time, longer than I would like to mention — is what matters. A good journalist sets out to provide a story which is illuminating, is truthful and provides the listening or reading public with the sort of background information they need to properly understand all facets of the issues surrounding the story. For journalists to have their sources threatened is something they take very much to heart.

As we saw with the McManus and Harvey scenario not so long ago, they were two journalists who were prepared to go to jail rather than give up their sources. I have known many journalists over the years who have said the same thing to me.

They have said to me that rather than give up their sources, rather than tell people who their sources are, they would go to jail; that is how seriously they regard this matter.

In order to prevent an attack on the sources that journalists have it

is important that journalists display the appropriate degree of integrity. It is important that journalists display the appropriate degree of honesty, because from time to time there are some journalists who, it has to be said, do not do their profession any good at all.

Mr O'Brien — Name them.

Mr FINN — I could. I would be very happy to name them. Unfortunately I do not have enough time here this afternoon, but there are some who do that.

It is unfortunate that some journalists do drag their profession down to a level from which sometimes it has some trouble returning, and that is sad. I think it is even sadder when some people decide they know better than the journalists involved and they know better than the media. We have people who have decided that they are the ones who should be telling the journalists what to write and they are the ones who should be controlling the media in this country.

We had the former federal Leader of the Greens — this is when the Greens were popular — Senator Bob Brown, who went to some considerable length to ensure that the media was dragged into line, and of course it was at his insistence that the Finkelstein inquiry was established. The proposal contained in the Finkelstein report is that we should have a media regulator in this country. So no longer would we have journalists saying, 'This is a good story. This is what the people need to know. This is my source for this story. This is what I need to write'; instead we would have somebody in Canberra telling journalists what they could and what they could not write.

Of course this is something that is important to people on the left of politics. As we know, over the decades through the last century governments of a totalitarian nature have taken control of countries, and the first thing they have gone for is freedom of the press, because they know that once they have control of the media they have no further problems. We have now seen the Greens and, to a degree, the federal government under the Prime Minister attempting to do the same thing. I would hope that those members of the federal Parliament and those members of the ALP in Canberra who are concerned about democracy and who are concerned about freedom will stand up and fight any move from Canberra to regulate the media.

Each and every one of us in this

house and outside it has from time to time become very annoyed with some journalists. I have certainly done it; I see Mr O'Brien nodding his head furiously, and Mrs Coote is over there chuckling hilariously because she certainly has had a few run-ins with journalists from time to time. Just because we have had a disagreement with them does not mean you should shut down the whole show; it does not mean you should take freedom away from the press and place it in somebody's hands in Canberra. That is just not on. It might be the way they do things in the Australian Greens and it might be the way they do things in the Australian Labor Party, but that is not the way that we do things in Australia. That is not the way that things should be allowed to develop in the free world, in the Western world, and I sincerely hope that any thought of a media regulator is knocked on the head very quickly. I am sure that after the next election, when Tony Abbott is installed as Prime Minister by the people of this country, that will indeed happen.

I do not have much time to speak this afternoon, but I have to say that today of all days it is important that we be debating this matter because freedom of the media, freedom of the press and freedom of journalists to write what they believe they need to write is fundamental to democracy and it is fundamental to freedom. For us to be debating this matter today on 11 September is of some significance because 11 years ago the most savage attack of the recent era on freedom and democracy took place. So for us to be debating a bill, and I trust supporting a bill, on 11 September has some significance.

I am very happy to support this bill. I wish it a speedy passage. I hope the words that I have uttered this afternoon in this house will be listened to by people in Canberra who are attempting to control the media, to shut down the free press in Australia and, in doing so, to shut down democracy as we know it. As I said earlier in my members statement, our freedom is precious and it is worth defending.

I believe by supporting this bill today that that is what we are doing. I urge the house to pass the bill quickly to ensure that the journalists we are speaking of today will continue to have the freedom that they have always enjoyed.

COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
11 September 2012

Roads: Essendon Airport retail precinct

Raised with the Minister for Roads on 15 August 2012

REPLY:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

VicRoads is continuing to monitor traffic issues surrounding the Essendon Airport retail development. In addition, VicRoads is currently working with Essendon Fields to investigate and develop an appropriate treatment, to address the expected traffic impacts resulting from the proposed expansion of its retail operations.

COUNCIL | Questions without Notice
12 September 2012

Carbon tax: health sector

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Health, and I ask: can the minister inform the house of challenges facing Victorian hospitals and health services regarding energy efficiency and the impact of the carbon tax?

Hon. D. M. DAVIS (Minister for Health) — I thank the member for his question and for his interest in energy efficiency and the impact of the carbon tax on hospitals and health services in Victoria. I note the important report tabled by the Auditor-General today entitled *Energy Efficiency in the Health Sector* and welcome it. The report has been assisted by the Department of Health and a number of key health services and the Department of Treasury and Finance. There has been an acceptance of the findings and an acceptance of the recommendations.

The reality is that we can do things better in our hospitals and health services. We can use energy more efficiently and thereby lower costs.

I am aware that the previous government began that process, and I am happy to note that and to indicate that this government has continued and expanded that. I pay tribute in the health sector to a number of health services, particularly Austin Health

which has been very successful in reducing energy consumption by 30 per cent in the period from 2005-06 to 2010-11. I note the cogeneration projects that are being undertaken and the governance structure the Department of Health has put over this. We will certainly be saying more about this area. Energy efficiency is important.

Mr Barber interjected.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — Mr Barber and I have had this discussion before.

Mr Barber — Set a target.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — Mr Barber, we are working on this matter, and we will be making very clear efforts with individual health services.

Under the government's green building program there will be a number of key steps at each health service level. There will be support provided to health services to make those steps.

This house will also know that the Gillard government has imposed a carbon tax across the economy that will be put on energy producers, both gas and electricity and others across the economy. That will impact on health services, public and private. That carbon tax has been applied without compensation by the commonwealth government. The agreement in February was signed before the carbon tax was applied. The carbon tax had not been legislated for, and we will seek compensation — as I have sought it — from the federal minister.

I can inform the house that the government's modelling of the carbon tax impact indicates a substantial impost on the sector — a substantial impact.

Concerningly, bills are coming in, and those bills are indicating that the costs may be even greater.

Mr Lenders interjected.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — I have a bill, yes, an invoice — that is what I call it — from Bendigo Health, and I notice that the July bill for Bendigo Health shows a \$17 329 impost —

Mr Finn — How much?

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — It is \$17 000 — for one health service for just one month — of additional cost listed as 'Carbon charge'. This is a new impost that will land on hospitals. Bendigo Health has modelled this out over the year, and it suggests that at Bendigo Health it will cost \$570 000 across a full year.

Obviously that is subject to actual usage, and actual usage will obviously vary, dependent on the temperature

and the intensity of energy use. But that modelling indicates that it is a more significant impost than the state government's modelling suggested. At whatever level the carbon tax is set and whatever level of energy efficiency health services are able to implement, for even a very efficient health service that is able to lower its energy cost there will be a higher impost with a carbon tax.

COUNCIL
12 September 2012

Public Sector: Job Losses

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — Having listened to Ms Pulford, Mr Barber and Mr Scheffer, there is one thing I have to say about the Labor Party and the Greens: that is, they have more front than Myer, and that is with or without the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union out the front. They have more front than Myer and more gall than all of France. They are absolutely staggering when they come into this house and whinge and complain about what is happening in the state and in the country, when they are the ones who caused it. They are the ones who are responsible for the situation that Victoria finds itself in now. It is staggering. It has to be said there are three things that Labor is particularly good at — three things. I have had to work hard to find three things that Labor is particularly good at, but I have.

Mr Viney interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Viney should listen to this, because he will learn something. Firstly, members of the Labor Party are very good at slapping taxes on people. If it gets a bit warm, they will slap a tax on it. If somebody digs a hole in the ground, they will slap a tax on it. Whatever you want to do, Labor will find a reason to slap a tax on it.

One of the things members of the Labor Party love to do is take people's hard-earned money from them and put it God only knows where.

Mr Scheffer — On a point of order, Acting President, I know at this early stage Mr Finn is only 11/2 minutes into his contribution, but the motion before us is very precise. It asks the government to define the difference between front-line and backroom administrative services. I ask you, Acting President, to remind Mr Finn to return to that point.

Mr FINN — On the point of order, Acting President, I think I was less than 1 minute and 30 seconds into my contribution on this matter. I suggest to you very strongly that Mr Scheffer is taking this opportunity to have a lend of you, to have a lend of this house and to continue the promotion of the point that he was trying to make in his contribution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ramsay) — Order! I do not uphold Mr Scheffer's point of order.

Mr FINN — As I was saying, one thing members of the Labor Party are particularly good at is slugging people with taxation. Another thing they are really good at is what we have just heard from Mr Scheffer and what we heard from Ms Pulford earlier. They are very good at whingeing. They are prize whingers. Nobody can whinge quite like members of the Labor Party, except when it comes to their coalition colleagues, who I reckon have probably been to university and studied the subject. They have come out with honours degrees in whingeing. Between the two groups, they come in here and bleat to us until we cannot take any more.

Mrs Peulich — Carp.

Mr FINN — Carp is another word, Mrs Peulich; there is no doubt about that. They love to tax us, and they love to whinge. What is the third thing and the crux of this motion that is before the house this afternoon? The third thing that the Labor Party excels at is stuffing up. It will make a mess of anything and has shown that time and again. In 1992, when I first came to this Parliament, almost 20 years ago, this state was a basket case — a disaster area — and that situation had been created by none other than members of the Labor Party. It is members of the same Labor Party who sit in this house today and refuse to accept what they did all those years ago. They refuse to accept what they did for 11 years.

Hon. M. P. Pakula — You're a liar!

Mr FINN — Acting President, I think Mr Pakula is letting his union tuggish tendencies get the better of him at this particular point.

Hon. M. P. Pakula — You've given the same speech every week for six years.

Mr FINN — Why don't you face up to what you did? Why don't you face up to what — —

Ms Crozier — On a point of order, Acting Speaker, I think Mr Finn is referring to Mr Pakula's commentary in calling him a liar. I would ask you to ask Mr Pakula to withdraw.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ramsay) — Order! I actually heard Mr Pakula say that and, in the rush of blood I experienced from Mr Finn's contribution, I let it go to the keeper and waited for him to raise a point of order. However, given that that has not happened, I caution Mr Pakula that that was a particularly unparliamentary term directed at Mr Finn. I ask him to not do that again.

Mr FINN — We had a Mexican stand-off because you were waiting for me to do something and indeed I was waiting for you to do something. That is just the way it goes. Today we had a senior member of the Labor Party — the leader-in-waiting of the Labor Party in this house — come into this house and deny that the Cain and Kirner governments destroyed this state.

Mr Leane — On a point of order, Acting Speaker, Mr Finn seems to be embracing what a lot of ministers did in question time today. Rather than addressing his contribution through the Chair he is aggressively pointing towards this side of the chamber, which we find quite intimidating.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ramsay) — Order! I advise Mr Leane that that is not a point of order. However, I ask Mr Finn to direct his contribution through the Chair.

Mr FINN — Acting President, I think if you listen to the audio or indeed read Hansard, you will find that I was doing that. I was referring to Mr Pakula in the third person, as I so often do.

Hon. M. P. Pakula — There is only one of me.

Mr FINN — Mr Pakula is so good that perhaps there are three of him. I do not know. Is there anybody in this house who reckons he is as good as Mr Pakula thinks he is?

Mrs Peulich — He refers to himself in the third person.

Mr FINN — Mr Pakula does refer to himself in the third person, and then he leaves the chamber. But here we have Labor members coming into this chamber today, 20 years later, and they still refuse to accept responsibility for what Labor did to the state. They still refuse to accept responsibility for the fact that Labor bankrupted Victoria. They refuse still, 20 years later, to accept responsibility for Tricontinental, for losing the State Bank of Victoria, for the Victorian Economic Development Corporation (VEDC) and for so many other disasters. Here we are, 20 years later, and it is the same old story. Members opposite say, 'It wasn't us. You're a

liar.' Let me tell you, Acting President, it was them, 20 years ago, and Labor did the same thing for 11 years up until the last election.

One has got to wonder. I mentioned some of the disasters that occurred under the Cain and Kirner governments, and we have heard today of some of the many disasters that occurred under the Bracks and Brumby governments.

One has to compare them. Was myki comparable to the VEDC debacle? Was the State Bank of Victoria disaster comparable to the desalination plant blow-out? Where exactly does that fit in with the electronic gaming machine option, which cost Victorian taxpayers billions of dollars thanks to the Labor Party? When you add up those losses and those Labor disasters, something has got to give.

We were elected on a platform of economic responsibility, just as Barry O'Farrell was elected on a platform of economic responsibility in New South Wales, and just as Campbell Newman was elected on a platform of economic responsibility in Queensland after 16 years in which Labor absolutely ravaged that state. I agree with what Mr Pakula and Ms Pulford had to say. We are doing in Victoria what the Liberal-National Party government is doing in New South Wales and what the Liberal National Party is doing in Queensland. We are doing what we were elected to do. We are getting this state back on a proper footing.

We are returning the state to responsible economic management, which is something that members on the other side of this house have no understanding of. They know how to tax, they know how to spend, but they do not know anything about responsibility. Mr Pakula can work himself into a frenzy as much as he likes.

Hon. M. P. Pakula — On a point of order, Acting President — —

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ramsay) — Order! I ask Mr Pakula to refrain from debating with Mr Finn during his contribution. The acoustics in this chamber are quite good without Mr Finn's amplified volume. I ask him to speak a little quieter into the microphone.

Hon. M. P. Pakula — On a point of order, Acting President, I was wondering whether Mr Finn is aware that the 2012-13 tax takings were the highest in the state's history.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ramsay) — Order! That is not a point

of order.

Mr FINN — Mr Pakula is again showing his fondness for being a goose, and that is a fact of life.

I do not intend to speak for very long today and I understand I may have already exceeded my limit; in fact Mr Koch is making that very clear to me right now. I wanted to make the point that when members of the Labor Party and the Greens get up here and talk about how dreadful the coalition is for making all of these tough decisions, they are the ones who are responsible for it. We do not like sacking people; we do not like moving people on.

But you have got to do what you have got to do, and when the state, and indeed the nation, is facing the sort of financial situation that we are in, you have got to make some tough decisions.

I remember just how tough those decisions were in 1992 and 1993, and I am now going through it again. You would not read about it, would you? To have to cop it twice in a lifetime — the legacy of a Labor government — is more than one would expect. I listen to what members of the Labor Party have to say. I hear their bleating and I hear their whingeing. But I ask them to do one thing. I ask them to go into the room of mirrors and take a good hard look at themselves, because they are the ones who have put Victoria where we are today. They are the ones who have endangered the economic future of Victorians. Labor did the same thing in New South Wales, in Queensland and in South Australia. God knows what it will do in Tasmania when it gets the opportunity. And of course, as we know, the federal debt goes on and on forever.

I say to members of the Labor Party that they should not waste the time of Victorians bleating about what their party has done. They should go away and have a think about what they can do to ensure that when they get the opportunity they never do it again, because frankly we Victorians have had more than enough.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment
12 September 2012**

East Meets West Lunar New Year Festival

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan)
— I raise a matter for the attention of

the Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship. The matter concerns the Vietnamese community in my electorate of Western Metropolitan Region, a community for which I have a very high regard and work with a lot, in particular the Footscray Asian Business Association (FABA), which was founded in 1990 and represents the interests of the increasing numbers of traders from the Far East who are revitalising and developing Footscray. I am delighted to see the Minister for Planning in the chamber. He knows a fair bit about redeveloping and revitalising Footscray as well. As community leaders and with very close involvement with the Vietnamese Community in Australia and other community groups, FABA helps to represent the interests of cultural groups and community organisations as well.

Approximately one-third of the 65 000 people in Maribyrnong were born in the Far East, or are children of parents from that region. Footscray also attracts large numbers of customers and visitors from all cultural backgrounds, who come to shop, to eat and to join in its rich cultural life. I can fully understand that; Footscray is a great spot, particularly every year when it holds the East Meets West Lunar New Year Festival. The festival has been the centrepiece of Vietnamese cultural life and for 21 years has been celebrated in Footscray as an inclusive event that recognises and celebrates the importance of the lunar new year to the Chinese, Thai, Cambodian, Lao and other Australian Asian communities. The festival also celebrates the economic and cultural contribution the Vietnamese community has made to Footscray and to Australia, because the Vietnamese community has made and continues to make an enormous contribution to its new home.

The East Meets West Lunar New Year Festival is also an inclusive event that celebrates other Far Eastern communities and their close cooperation with other multicultural communities, including the Indian and African communities. I invite members to attend the East Meets West New Year Festival, which is usually held in January. It is pretty warm out there, but the streets of Footscray will be alive and throbbing with the joys of community life. To put on such a magnificent festival every year takes some financial support from sponsors, and in years gone by one of those sponsors has been the

Victorian government through the Victorian Multicultural Commission. I ask the minister to speak to people in the commission with a view to suggesting that once again the commission supports the festival, as it is very important for the Vietnamese community, for Footscray and for the western suburbs.

**COUNCIL | Second Reading
13 September 2012**

Residential Tenancies And Other Consumer Acts Amendment Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I will endeavour to keep my comments in their correct context today, and to keep the volume down as much as I possibly can for your benefit and edification, Acting President.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise to support the Residential Tenancies and Other Consumer Acts Amendment Bill 2012. This bill has been a long time coming, but I will get to that a little later.

Shortly after I was elected to this place in 2006, I had a meeting with a social worker who had been active in the western suburbs for many a long year. He expressed grave concerns about the circumstances in which people found themselves living. As Mr Elsbury said earlier, they were people who found themselves down on their luck.

He expressed his concerns to me about some of the conditions that he was witnessing every day — that is, conditions that people were living in or attempting to live in, or existing in might be better terminology. At that time he invited me to go with him for a tour of boarding houses or rooming houses — call it what you will — throughout the western suburbs, which I did.

While there were some facilities that were of a reasonable standard — and I say reasonable because none of them were luxurious by any stretch of the imagination — there were some that absolutely shocked me. I could not believe the conditions that some people were forced to live in. I saw rooms which had nothing more than windows that would not open, a dirty — and I do mean really grotty

— mattress in the corner and maybe a chair and a table. People were being charged \$90 a week for that. For the life of me I could not understand the mentality of an individual who could charge someone that amount of money for such an appalling standard of accommodation, if you can call it that.

I am really struggling to even describe it as accommodation.

I thought at the time, and I have often thought since, of just how difficult it would be for somebody such as me — somebody who has been around a bit and probably seen a bit — to live under such circumstances. But then I thought of how difficult it would be for a woman, particularly a woman with children, to live under such circumstances. That embedded my shock even further, and I immediately raised the matter with my colleagues, and in fact I recall I raised the matter in this Parliament at that time.

The tragedy is that nothing happened back then. The government of the day decided it was not particularly interested in hearing about what was going on in the western suburbs. It was not particularly interested in what was happening in the western suburbs on a number of fronts and not just in terms of accommodation.

Despite the fact I had been there and I had seen it and I had brought these matters to the attention of the government of the day, it was not all that keen to do anything and, as a result, nothing happened.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this legislation today. I believe it gives us some balance, because we cannot overregulate people out of business. If we do, these places will close, and we will see what I witnessed on my walk around the Carlton Gardens at 6.30 a.m. yesterday. We are going to see people huddled all night in doorways because they have nowhere else to sleep. In a country as rich as Australia, a country that prides itself on the outstanding standard of living we enjoy, it is extraordinary that even in a city such as Melbourne there are so many people who are quite literally living on the streets, huddled up in doorways to get out of the rain or the wind or trying to stay warm in cardboard. Yesterday morning I saw a number of people who were in exactly that situation.

We do not want to regulate the people providing these rooming houses out of business, but at the

same time it is just not right that the accommodation provided should be of such an appalling standard. I am not just talking about it being of a poor standard; I am talking about it being of a truly disgusting standard. That is what this bill is all about. It is about providing that sort of balance, and it is long overdue. To tell you the truth, the action is not needed now; it was needed 10 years ago. It did not happen then, but it is happening now, and I am very proud to be a member of a government that is bringing that action about.

Astonishingly, after 10 years of neglect, after 10 years of nothing being done at all, when this caring Liberal-Nationals government brings a piece of legislation to the house, what do the Labor Party and the Greens want to do? They want to shunt it off to a committee. Why?

Mrs Coote — Whinge and moan.

Mr FINN — They whinge and moan very well, Mrs Coote, as we discussed yesterday. But what do they want to do on this occasion? They want to shunt the legislation off to a committee. Why? Because the committee has nothing better to do. In all my born days I have never heard such a nonsensical argument coming from anybody.

‘We must get this off to a committee,’ those opposite say, ‘because the committee has nothing to do.’ What about the people living in the rooming houses? What about the people living in these appalling, disgraceful conditions? They are the ones who should be of utmost concern. They are the ones who should be at the forefront of our minds in this regard, not a committee that has nothing to do. This legislation is about helping people who need help, not about giving a committee something to do. That is the problem with the Labor Party. That is the problem with the Greens.

Mr Ondarchie — They’re hopeless on ideas.

Mr FINN — They are, as you point out, Mr Ondarchie. Spot on! They are absolutely hopeless on ideas.

I find it astonishing that anybody would have their priorities so screwed up that they would put the interests of a committee ahead of the interests of people who are currently trying to exist in such appalling conditions.

The inaction we have seen over the past decade is truly disgraceful. On my understanding this matter was brought to the attention of all and sundry way back in 2002 when sections of the media started running

stories on dodgy and unsafe rooming houses. Having been through many of the rooming houses in the western suburbs, I can vouch for just how dodgy and how unsafe they are. I can understand why people would fear for their safety and indeed in some instances for their lives in some of these places. It was 2002 when that started to happen, but the then Labor government did nothing. Then, in 2006, there was a fire in Brunswick that killed Leigh Sinclair and Christopher Giorgi, and there was continuing media coverage of these dodgy operators. Still the former Labor government did nothing.

This is the party that claims to care about the people who are down on their luck. It did nothing.

In 2009, three years after the fire, and when the coroner was about to hand down the report on the fire, what did Labor do? It established a task force. It was yet another task force or committee, the sort of body the former Labor government specialised in. It is not that anything came from that task force. It handed down a report, again in 2009, but nothing happened. Now, in 2012, it is the Liberal-Nationals government, a caring government, as I said, a government that actually has the interests of people at the forefront of its concerns and a government that is acting. That is why we have this legislation before the house today, and I hope it has a very speedy passage.

It was fascinating to hear Ms Mikakos get up and say that this bill did not go far enough.

One has to ask one question: what did those opposite do for 11 years? They get up today and say, 'The government has failed; this legislation does not go far enough,' yet they sat on their hands for 11 years and did sweet all.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr FINN — I have cleaned that up substantially, it has to be said; it was a close call.

For Ms Mikakos or anybody else from the Labor Party to come into this chamber and criticise this government or this legislation today is the height of audacity. I said yesterday that those opposite had more gall than all of France, and they have proven it yet again today. They have come in here criticising this government for taking actions they should have taken 10 years ago — probably longer.

Mr Ondarchie — They failed in their duty.

Mr FINN — They have, indeed, Mr Ondarchie. They have been total, unmitigated failures. Here is a government that has seen a problem and is acting to resolve that problem. As time goes on it may appear that this is not the complete answer. If it is not, we will revisit it. We are not afraid to follow up on these sorts of issues that affect people. However, today we have a piece of legislation that Labor would not have introduced — in fact, Labor did not introduce it at any time. For 11 years it did nothing. For 11 years those people struggling in rooming houses felt the full neglect of the Labor Party — the neglect the Labor Party specialises in. As I said earlier, I am particularly proud to support the bill. It is a product of a vigilant government which is prepared to stand up for those who may have some difficulty standing up for themselves. As Ms Hartland said earlier, those who stand up for themselves in this situation often find themselves on the street. Obviously we cannot allow that to happen. The legislation will go a long way towards ensuring that that situation no longer occurs. I am particularly pleased about that.

The bill is a giant step in the right direction. I am sure it will ease the minds of everybody who is concerned about the homeless and those who have to put up with substandard accommodation. It gives me enormous pleasure to see a government actually caring about people who need the protections that only governments can offer. I wish the bill a speedy passage and congratulate the minister. I have no doubt that in the months and years ahead this government, unlike the previous government, will continue to care about the most vulnerable people in our community and those who most need our protection.

COUNCIL | Members Statements
9 October 2012

Murray River: health

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I recently had occasion to visit the Murray River, by way of a fond farewell to a great Australian icon. I had been listening to our green friends, and I went to bid goodbye to a river that I had heard was on its last legs. You could have knocked me down with a European carp when I saw the Murray flowing free. I am here

to report that the Murray River has never looked healthier. Far from being near death, water levels were high and currents were exceedingly strong.

It left me slightly confused, and I wondered out loud if I had been misled on more than just the state of the Murray. My mind sprang to the words of Tim 'Sandbags' Flannery, who told us it would never rain again. He was wrong. I thought of the warning that the earth is warming. We have been hearing that for years, but it is wrong.

I remembered our green friends warning us of the melting of the polar ice caps. They got that wrong too. Then, of course, there is the mother of all falsehoods, and I am sure members opposite can join me in saying this, 'There will be no carbon tax under a government I lead' — a whopper, and nothing but a sop to the Greens. It is little wonder that peddlers of green lies and scams are shaping up to be swept away down the electoral bunglehole, just as sure as if they had fallen into the mighty Murray River.

COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
9 October 2012

Valley Carers: residential facility

Raised with the Minister for Community Services on 28 August 2012

REPLY:

I assure Mr Finn the Victorian government is working to deliver on its election commitment to develop greater innovation in disability accommodation and improved outcomes for people with a disability and complex needs.

The Victorian government recognises the stress on families and carers who are planning for future support and accommodation needs for their family member with a disability. We've listened to Victorians with a disability, their families and carers, and we are funding services that that they want most.

The Victorian government's contribution of \$50.2 million over four years will develop a total of 118 new and innovative supported accommodation options across the state. This includes operating funds of \$37.4 million and capital funds of \$12.8 million. The Victorian government has secured a further \$17

million from the Commonwealth's Supported Accommodation Innovation Fund which will also contribute to capital costs.

I can also assure you that since Mr Finn raised this matter, my department has been liaising with the Valley Carers to arrange mutually convenient time discuss their plans.

Further, I encourage parents to contact Disability Intake and Response Service on 1800 783 783 should they require individual assistance and planning support.

COUNCIL
10 October 2012

Building Industry: Dispute Resolution

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — In recent times there have been various accusations, particularly in Canberra, and some dirty tricks have been played. Some dirty pool is being played in the Parliament, but I have to say I do not think the federal government has been able to outdo the dirty pool that the Victorian Labor Party has come up with.

To start the day with Mr Tee is just not fair. Those of us who are having a bit of trouble waking up in the morning are immediately put back into a comatose state by the tones of Mr Tee as he goes on about the many and varied matters that he drones on about. Then we have to snap out of it in some way to come up with a reasonable and sensible response to the nonsense he is peddling.

If Labor Party members want to say that theirs is a party of fairness, a party that wants to give people a fair go, they should not inflict Mr Tee on us first thing in the morning. That is just not fair to anybody. I am sure there must be some human rights commission somewhere that is just waiting for a case based on that at some stage.

I thought the Prime Minister had a bad day yesterday, but you have to wonder what sort of day Mr Tee is having if he has to rely on Mr Leane to come in and fix up his mess. One of the major problems with this particular motion is that despite everything Mr Tee said about how important this motion is and how desperately we need this inquiry and all the rest of it, he has given us approximately five weeks to get to the bottom of it all.

This is fascinating. Mr Tee is now out of here. He has done this before. He comes in here and tells us how important this motion is.

He tells us how much we need this motion, and then he is out the door. He is scurrying down the stairs, and the only person left in the chamber on the opposition side is our good friend Mr Leane. I want to publicly thank Mr Leane for his contribution today because compared to Mr Tee he was a breath of fresh air. Compared to Mr Tee he was the personification of common sense. I am willing to bet that nobody has ever come into this chamber and said that before about Mr Leane, but I am saying it today. I want to thank him for bringing us out of the snooze zone that Mr Tee had placed us in.

As for the amendment, it is a fascinating proposition Mr Leane has put forward and one that obviously had not occurred to Mr Tee; otherwise he would have tried to fix it up at some stage. However, as we know, Mr Tee is not too bright. There is not much we can do about that. Apart from the time provisions in this particular motion —

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr O'Brien) — Order! The advice from the Clerk is that perhaps the reference to not being too bright is a bit unnecessary. I am not asking for a withdrawal; I just caution Mr Finn about his language.

Mr FINN — I will most certainly be extraordinarily cautious from this point on. As I say, I was a bit confounded to begin with about this motion giving us about five or six weeks to discuss this extraordinarily important matter that Mr Tee droned on about for so long. He is not even here now, but that is by the by. I was going to raise this, but Mr Lenders beat me to it, and I thank him for that once again. At least there is one member of the opposition who appears to be on the ball. I do not say he is, but he appears to be on the ball, and that has to be a good thing.

The other part of the motion I have some concerns with is not what is actually in the motion but what is not in the motion. I have to say to the house that it absolutely astounds me that anybody would come in here with a view to talking about the building and construction industry in this state without making any reference at all to industrial relations. I find that absolutely astonishing because the history of some sections of the trade union movement and the construction industry is almost parallel. I have enormous difficulty

understanding how one could separate the two because the history of the construction industry in my lifetime — let us not go back any further than that — in this state has been dominated by thuggery, criminal activity and people you would cross the road to avoid if you saw them coming.

We can go back to 1961, which was in fact the year of my birth. There was a bloke called Norm Gallagher who was elected as secretary of the Builders Labourers Federation (BLF). There might be members of the opposition who will get up and genuflect at the mention of his name. Mr Tee might be out there doing that at the moment. I know the left in this state adore the memory of Normie Gallagher. When you looked at Norm, he seemed almost a comical character. You would look at him and almost say to yourself that this bloke is just stumbling and bumbling. He was sort of like a poor man's Wayne Swan, if I can call him that; he was just stumbling and stumbling from one thing to another and really did not know what he was doing. However, unlike Wayne Swan, he very much knew what he was doing. Norm Gallagher led the BLF through a period of industrial anarchy in Victoria that is probably unparalleled in this country apart from perhaps what the BLF did in Western Australia some years ago.

Mr Ondarchie interjected.

Mr FINN — As Mr Ondarchie points out, Mr Gallagher was a dedicated Maoist. Whilst I will not delve into the intricate political intrigues of the various communist parties of the 1960s and 1970s, it is interesting to note that many of the tactics used by Mr Gallagher during his period in charge of the BLF were in fact direct from the communist handbook, and violence was certainly among them. You would have to say that the internal battles within the BLF were marked notably by those who in any way opposed Mr Gallagher finding themselves in very short order with broken arms and legs and down the bottom of a pit. That was the way Norm Gallagher and the BLF at the time ran things. If you showed any sign of opposition at all to Mr Gallagher or the way he ran the BLF, you needed to make sure that you had medical insurance. I know of one chap many years ago who found himself with broken arms and legs and down the bottom of a pit as a result of his relatively mild challenge to the authority of Mr Gallagher. To those who say Mr Gallagher was a

harmless and quite humorous figure I suggest very strongly that he was anything but that.

We well remember the way Mr Gallagher used to negotiate terms and conditions. He would have a concrete pour, and halfway through the concrete pour he would say to the employer, 'Give me a 100 per cent pay increase, or give me this or give me that. Give me A, give me B and give me C.' If the employer said, 'No, we can't do that,' he would stop the concrete pour there and then. This happened time and again, and the company would then have to dig it up again.

Mrs Petrovich interjected.

Mr FINN — As Mrs Petrovich points out, this was a tactic — a form of industrial terrorism, I would describe it — that was used time and again by Norm Gallagher against employers in this state, and I think it may even have taken over in other states as well, because there was that internal battle, from memory.

I am going back to the dim, distant past now, but there was an internal battle within the BLF between Norm Gallagher and Jack Munday from New South Wales, who ran the green bans. I think Jack was done over by Normie. I think there were a few people in New South Wales who tasted the New South Wales health system firsthand as a result of Mr Gallagher's involvement in that particular internal dispute in the BLF. There is no way that Mr Tee — if indeed he ever bothers coming back into the house — or anybody else can come in here to try to claim, by omission in this particular case, that the history of construction in this state and the history of militant trade unions can be separated, because they cannot. It is just not on.

It has been interesting to see what has happened on the streets of Melbourne over recent months.

I will be very careful here because I do not want to tread on any court cases that may be pending, but I have to say that what we saw on the streets of Melbourne, particularly in Lonsdale Street, very much reminded me of what the Builders Labourers Federation used to get up to in its heyday. These people were on the streets doing exactly what the BLF did. We saw the same degree of violence. In those days the BLF loved nothing more than to belt a few police, and we recently saw the CFMEU (the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union) also get into the field of belting a few police at the

Myer site in Lonsdale Street. I think a couple of them might have come off a little worse for wear, and that cannot be a bad thing. But it certainly raised a great deal of interest from the construction industry and did nothing to promote Victoria's ability to look after those who wish to invest in our state. That is something which concerns me enormously.

A story on that particular matter by David Chandler appeared in the Australian Financial Review. It was interesting to read that David Chandler is the principal of Resolution Services Group, a group with which I am not overly familiar. He is also deputy chairman of the federal Labor government's Building the Education Revolution implementation task force, so he is no stranger to the Labor Party. On 31 August this year he wrote a letter headed 'Bad old days of the BLF return to menace us.'

This has not been written by the state president of the Liberal Party or somebody from The Nationals; this is somebody who is intimate with the federal government — as unfortunate as that might be — and, as we know, generally speaking you do not get a job with the federal government unless you get on with it pretty well. It is interesting that Mr Chandler writes:

The industrial anarchy on Grocon sites this week by the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union reminds me of the Builders Labourers Federation activities during the 1960s, 70s and early 80s.

I have to say to this house that I absolutely agree with Mr Chandler. He goes on to say:

The Hawke government finally deregistered the BLF in 1985.

I have some recollection that Premier John Cain was also heavily involved in that deregistration. It would be very interesting to know what John Cain thinks of the Labor Party's apparent sympathies with the CFMEU in 2012. Mr Chandler goes on:

At the time I was in charge of the new Parliament House project in Canberra.

Bob Hawke had the guts to say 'enough' and put the industry first.

This is interesting; Mr Chandler points out:

The CFMEU absorbed much of the former BLF membership, and since then has almost emulated the BLF of old. Its recent behaviour across high-profile projects such as those of Grocon and Bovis Lend Lease indicate that the bad old days are again pressing.

That is a warning that should concern us all. Nobody in Victoria would want to go back to those days, certainly not Mr Ondarchie. Mr Chandler goes on to say:

For anyone who does not have direct insight into just how intimidating and soul destroying the unlawful behaviour now being served up to Grocon is, the transcripts of the 1992 Giles royal commission into the New South Wales building industry make confronting reading.

Unions have always picked issues such as safety and consultancy as platforms from which to assert their moral righteousness. But these should and can be addressed lawfully as was the case under the now-defunct Australian Building and Construction Commission.

What a tragedy it is that that body is defunct.

I certainly welcome the call by and clear intention of Tony Abbott to reinstate that particular body if he becomes Prime Minister sometime next year. Mr Chandler goes on to point out:

The replacement overseer, Fair Work Australia, seems toothless and not up to the task.

I think that has been obvious to most of us for quite some time.

And don't expect the federal government to do much about it in the countdown to the next election. CFMEU campaign donations will be too important.

What a tragedy it is when the Labor Party and the federal government of this nation put campaign donations and the support of a trade union ahead of what is best for the people of this nation. That is shameful in every way.

Mr Chandler then points out:

Bill Shorten is clearly no Bob Hawke, as evidenced in his comments in Monday's Australian Financial Review, where he reportedly said 'the government would not support any unlawful behaviour, but the [Grocon] blockades were not covered by industrial legislation ... This is a matter of tort.' What an abject failure in government leadership.

I am pleased to see that Mr Shorten's name has been mentioned in all this because I was a bit concerned that he may well have disappeared overseas. For all we know, given Mr Shorten's absence from the political scene in recent weeks, he may well be in the Ecuadorian Embassy in London with Julian Assange.

You just would not know, because

the last thing Mr Shorten wants to do at the minute is to be associated with that debacle of a government in Canberra for which, I might point out, he is responsible as he is the one who put the Prime Minister in the position she currently occupies.

Mr Chandler pointed out:

It is good to hear the opposition spokesman on employment and workplace relations, Eric Abetz, reinforce why the Gillard government was wrong to disband the ABCC. The argument that the building industry does not need special attention is wrong.

I want members to particularly listen to this:

Everyone knows that union strategy starts with chipping away at the big contractors first and getting all or part of their ambit claims locked in before flowing these on across the industry.

Dealing with these tactics cannot be left to individual companies that at some stage have to fold their case and make some albeit unreasonable concessions. That's how the scourge of site allowances came into the industry.

Initially these started as shopping voucher claims on major retail developments. This was the price for some short-lived industrial peace.

What transpired is that site allowances are now an embedded major cost of projects nationally.

Mr Ondarchie interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Ondarchie has absolutely hit the nail on the head. That is extortion, and it is outrageous that the Prime Minister of this country and indeed the Leader of the Opposition here in Victoria would turn their backs on what is happening on building sites from one end of this country to the other. It is a disgrace, it is outrageous and it works against the best interests of this nation and the people of this nation.

Mr Chandler continued:

The Prime Minister recently announced a review into construction costs and productivity, a reluctant concession to the strong representations made by Victorian Premier Ted Baillieu.

The review was resisted by the CFMEU.

Surprise, surprise!

While all facets of the construction industry's management and work practices need significant changes to improve overall performance, unions put themselves into the spotlight as the primary causes of inefficiency through the actions now being

played out on Grocon and other major contractor sites. Government leadership is urgently needed.

We are talking about a Prime Minister and a Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations in Canberra who could not lead to save themselves and who would not know how to lead if you pointed them to the door and gave them a Melway street directory. They have absolutely no idea at all what is going on. Is it any wonder that the inquiry that Mrs Peulich referred to has not been able to get off the ground when the CFMEU is against it?

As we all know, and as has been pointed out specifically in this particular article, the CFMEU is a major part of the ALP and at the moment the Prime Minister needs every friend she can get, even if they are a member of the CFMEU. That is sad in itself.

Mr Chandler pointed out:

The CFMEU just doesn't get it.

The cost of construction is going up faster than any other part of the Australian economy. That is why major projects are becoming harder to justify and are now being placed on the backburner. Businesses and households do not have the capacity to pay for unchecked rising construction costs.

The challenge for the CFMEU is to recalibrate its business model.

It should be looking at how to improve skills, to broaden the potential for multiskilling and to establish meaningful dialogue with employers about ways to innovate and improve the sector's performance. But I think this is too big an ask.

I think Mr Ondarchie may have indicated that he too believes it is too much of an ask.

It is worth pointing out, in the context of the history of the BLF that I have outlined, that Mr Chandler concluded by saying:

The unions appear to have learned nothing in the 27 years since the deregistration of the BLF. They will probably just play havoc in the last of the sunshine leading up to the next federal election.

I hope that the new generation of construction workers and managers does not have to go through the horrible experiences of intimidating and threatening union behaviour that most will not have experienced in their careers to date.

At a time when construction needs to attract the brightest to lead it into a more productive future, CFMEU behaviour on

Grocon's sites must be stamped out forthwith. Projects are hard enough, and attracting new investment is even harder.

I do not think a truer word has been spoken, particularly in this area. It is, I believe, a national tragedy that we have a federal government and a Labor Party in this state that just refuse to bite the bullet on this issue. Labor members come in here and put forward a motion such as this — it is good to see that Mr Tee has wandered through the chamber for a minute — which does not mean much at all.

They will give us five weeks to discuss it all and then they will walk away, as they have always done.

Why would that be the case? Is it because of Mr Leane's, Mr Tee's, Ms Darveniza's or Ms Pulford's preselection? They may well have representatives of the CFMEU present — they might; I am not suggesting motive here to anybody. Might it just be that the ALP at this stage does not want to take on the CFMEU, because members of the opposition may find themselves on the wrong end of the preselection process? The CFMEU boys will go into the preselection room and they will remind — I think Mr Tarlamis is taking particular interest in this — members opposite of how they were treated at the hands of the parliamentary Labor Party during the course of this term of government.

There are people in the Labor Party who are exhibiting the same sort of fear, the same degree of fear, that has previously been exhibited by people on construction sites who took on Norm Gallagher. As I said, way back then those who took on Norm had their legs and arms broken and were dumped down a pit. But here, in 2012, there are members of the parliamentary Labor Party who might find themselves getting the same treatment at the preselection conference if they take on their comrades — they are more than comrades; they are their masters really — in the CFMEU.

It is fascinating to see blokes like John Setka — talk about conviction politicians; this bloke has more convictions than anybody else I can think of — who is about to take over as secretary of the CFMEU. The Gallagher era is back with us, and that will inevitably flow through to the internal politics of the ALP. We can well understand why they are loath to take a stand against the thuggery that the CFMEU has embarked upon and will continue with, given half a chance.

Mr Leane may well like to talk about what the Electrical Trades Union might get up to. I would love to discuss that. Mr Leane might like to put forward a motion himself at some stage so that we can discuss the internal politics of the ETU, because that would probably be more fascinating than what is going on in the CFMEU.

We have an opposition that has come in here with no intention of doing anything about the problems facing the construction industry. We have here an opposition that has come in here with a motion that does not even mention the major problem affecting the construction industry — the union. That is the thing that worries employers and worries those who seek to invest in construction in this state more than anything else. The opposition, for various reasons that I have outlined, does not want to know about it. It is very much a case of 'Don't mention the war! Don't mention the CFMEU. Don't mention the BLF!' It is astonishing for those of us on this side of the house. We are astonished —

Mr Ondarchie — Yet not surprised.

Mr FINN — Yet not surprised at the same time, if one can be astonished but not surprised. We are amazed that the Labor Party, in the person of Mr Tee, would come in here to try to pull this one on us. Give us a break!

I say to members of the opposition, especially Mr Tee: get fair dinkum. There are real problems in construction in this state; there are real problems in the building industry. They should not come in here with their grandstanding, making all sorts of funny noises about things that are not directly related to the major problems the construction industry has in this state. If members opposite wish to have a constructive discussion about the building industry, its problems and the problems facing people who work in it, they should put a motion up so that we can discuss all the issues, so that we can have a discussion that is fair dinkum and that will actually contribute to the general welfare and benefit of the construction industry and the Victorian economy, but this motion does not do that.

The fact that Mr Tee has spent most of his time out of the chamber since moving the motion indicates that he too knows it is not fair dinkum.

If the mover of the motion is not interested in the debate, I fail to see why any of the rest of us should be. It is yet another wacky Wednesday

special. It is a great pity that the Labor Party has again taken the opportunity to waste the time of the house. I believe that is something the people of Victoria will not take well. It does not serve the best interests of the state or the people of Victoria.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment
11 October 2012**

Local government: LeadWest funding

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I wish to raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Local Government, and it concerns an organisation in the western suburbs called LeadWest. This particular organisation has listed as its objectives:

The objective of LeadWest is to foster and undertake actions that will support sustainable growth and regional development of Melbourne's west.

Regard will be given to:

- legislative requirements;
- available resources;
- existing initiatives and programs;
- economic, social and environmental values; and
- respecting individual differences between communities.

This organisation was founded in 2007 and is funded, with significant sums of money, by the Brimbank, Maribyrnong, Melton, Moonee Valley and Wyndham city councils. As I say, a good deal of ratepayers money goes into the maintenance of this particular organisation, LeadWest. I have been watching LeadWest for about six years now, and whilst impressed with the objectives, I am not seeing a lot of action as a result of those said objectives. As things stand I think there is a fair argument that the objectives replicate a plethora of economic units, tourism task forces and other in-house council business promotion bodies in every council that funds LeadWest.

Replicating what councils already do on a daily basis is the kindest description of what LeadWest activities do. The less-than-kind description may be just as accurate. There is a view in Melbourne's west that LeadWest is just an extremely well-funded organisation to

provide an independent third-party endorsement for the Labor Party. The view cannot be easily dismissed when we consider that the only group in the west that defended the Gillard carbon tax last year during my campaign against it was indeed LeadWest. A recent dossier issued by LeadWest on TAFE services in the west could very easily have been issued by the shadow minister. Those who attend LeadWest functions report seeing more Labor luminaries than the average ALP state conference — and I am told those conferences can be very average indeed.

I am deeply concerned at the huge amounts of ratepayers funds that are possibly being wasted, and I ask the minister to conduct an inquiry into the funding of LeadWest by western suburbs councils.

Residents need to know if they are getting value for money from this particular investment. We must ascertain if these hundreds of thousands of dollars each year are being expended on activities already conducted by councils or being wasted on party political activities, supporting a party that is yet to return that support to Melbourne's west.

**COUNCIL | Questions without Notice
23 October 2012**

Health services: western suburbs

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Health, and I ask: can the minister inform the house of recent challenges in responding to demand as a result of growth in Melbourne's western suburbs?

Hon. D. M. DAVIS (Minister for Health) — I thank the member for his question and for his long-term advocacy for health services in the western region of Melbourne. Some members in this chamber will be aware of the neglect and the failure of the previous government that was pointed to directly by the Auditor-General — the failure over 11 years of the previous government whose members are over there, the now opposition, to build the services that were required for the delivery of babies on the western side of the city. Let me be clear: it is true that the number of births has increased statewide.

It is also true that there has been a shift in the number of births from

private to public hospitals. That is because of the federal government's decision to wind back support for private health and private obstetric services, which means the demand is falling back on public services.

In recognition of that and in recognition of the points made by the Auditor-General the government this year put money into expanding intensive care unit services and maternity services at Sunshine Hospital. We also put money into additional neonatal intensive care unit capacity statewide. The key point here is that there has been 11 years of neglect, and we have needed to respond to that. We have established a perinatal committee to help services coordinate these matters. It is headed by Dale Fisher from the Royal Women's Hospital. The point here again is that this is a response to the Auditor-General's important report, which laid out the failure of the previous government to undertake the expansion of services that is required.

There is no question that there will be further need for an expansion of maternity services, but I make the point that this is going to be made more difficult by decisions of the commonwealth government in recent days. I refer to the recent budget update by the commonwealth and its sneaky decision to strip money out of the health agreement — \$67 million this year and \$430 million over the four years ahead. It is not just Victoria that it is intending to strip money out of.

Mr Jennings interjected.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — You are an apologist — Labor first, Victoria second. You need to tell the commonwealth — —

An honourable member interjected.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — Of course I am being provoked here, President, but the key point is that the commonwealth government is making it more difficult by pulling money out of private health insurance and support for those who would make some private provision for themselves. It is also making it more difficult by pulling money out of the health-care agreement and doing that by a sneaky adjustment which does not accord with the shape of the deal. The shape of the deal is very much about growth and utilisation.

No-one in Victoria accepts what the federal Treasury is saying — that the population of Victoria fell by 11 000 last year. Nobody accepts that. You only need to go out to the

western suburbs and see the growth in the demand for maternity services to know that the population is not falling in Melbourne. It is not falling in Victoria; it is growing.

It is sophistry, it is slippery and it is all designed to prop up Julia Gillard's budget problems in Canberra — ripping money out of the state agreements, ripping money out of the territories, ripping money out of health, which will hurt people. It will make it harder to grow the services and respond to exactly the sort of maternity demand that people are talking about in the western suburbs today.

It is clear there is increased demand across the state. It is clear the commonwealth is not recognising that and is shirking its obligations. It is pulling back from the sensible decisions that were made about incremental and careful planning and the predictability that was meant to be at the heart of the health agreement. The unilateral decision of the commonwealth to fiddle the numbers and to pull back \$67 million this year will make it more difficult to provide the services that are needed in the inner west, Mr Finn.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment
23 October 2012**

Planning: coastal management

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I wish to raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Planning, and I am delighted to see him in the chamber this evening. This matter concerns an issue that he is no doubt grappling with at the moment — that is, the alleged rising sea levels, which would affect in my region places such as Williamstown, Altona, Point Cook and the newly developing Wyndham Harbour, which is a very exciting development indeed. All those areas would be greatly impacted if there were rising sea levels.

I ask the minister to take into consideration the cost to the taxpayer of the claptrap that has come from the climate change industry to this point. The minister may take into consideration desal plants around this country which were built on the basis that, according to Sandbags Flannery — Professor Tim Flannery — it would never rain again.

Of course he is known as Sandbags Flannery because since he made that statement we have had floods — —

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! The President has made rulings about Mr Finn's reference to Mr Flannery before, and I ask Mr Finn to respect those. I confess that I do not recall the precise details of the President's ruling, but I ask Mr Finn to — —

Mr FINN — I am sorry I thought that was just in reference to me referring to him as a shyster and a shonk, so I apologise.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! If Mr Finn wants to behave that way he will not have the rest of his adjournment matter listened to. He knows that that was completely out of order.

Mr FINN — I honestly thought that was the case.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I remind Mr Finn that we are not in primary school, and I will not accept his look of innocence.

Mr FINN — Perhaps I should write it out a hundred times. The desal plants are costing many billions of dollars around the country because of that particular individual.

Then of course we have the carbon tax, which is costing Australians very dearly. That carbon tax was introduced because, according to the Prime Minister, 'The earth is warming'. We now know, according to the British bureau of meteorology, that it is not warming, it has not been warming for at least 16 years and before that 16-year period any warming was negligible.

It is just nonsense that has been pumped in to drag a dollar out of the government and out of the taxpayers of this country.

Then of course we have to take into consideration the great hot gossellers of climate change — Al Gore, Kevin Rudd, Greg Combet and Tim Flannery himself — who have all moved to waterside residences. They are obviously deeply concerned about rising sea levels.

I ask the minister to take these matters into consideration because there are a number of people in my electorate who are obviously concerned about decisions that may be made which will affect their properties and their suburbs. This is a very important issue. It is far too important to be decided on the advice of people who have been proven to be wrong time and again.

I ask the minister to not accept the advice from the climate change industry willy-nilly but look at this — as I am sure he will — in a reasonable and balanced manner to deliver the right results for the people of Victoria

in this very important matter.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! That was bordering on a set piece. I will allow it, but Mr Finn was disrespectful in pushing the envelope in the way he did.

Mr Finn — On a point of order, Deputy President, I hear what you are saying; I do not understand it, though, and I would be grateful if you would explain that, please.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I do not have to explain it. I am telling Mr Finn that it was bordering on a set piece.

His behaviour in relation to Mr Flannery after I asked him to be careful and respect the President's rulings was disrespectful to the Chair and to Mr Flannery.

COUNCIL | Members Statements
24 October 2012

Greens: future

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — Early this year, in the course of addressing this house, I made the prediction that the Greens party days are numbered; not all that sad but very true. My words were based on the unmitigated failure of the Greens in the most recent elections in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. Since those words left my lips, more disaster has befallen our Greens friends. They were so confident of winning the by-election for the Assembly seat of Melbourne that they had ordered the cupcakes and widely distributed the running sheet for the victory party. It was not needed. I cannot vouch for the fate of the cupcakes, but even Fitzroy and Carlton rejected the Greens on that occasion.

Much anticipation surrounded the recent Northern Territory election, with truckloads of hippies hitting the streets of Darwin in support of their sun-blessed Greens of the north. The result: they polled a miserable 3 per cent. Some have suggested that many Greens voters smoked their ballot papers, but I cannot be sure of that. Then last Saturday our Green friends suffered their greatest humiliation yet. In the natural home of the Greens, a place where cardigan-wearing Volvo drivers are further removed from reality than anywhere else in this nation, the Greens bombed big time. The voters of the Australian Capital Territory sent the Greens packing, slashing their vote and costing them at least two and probably three of the four seats they held prior to the

election.

Predicting the demise of the Greens is not a result of any gift. One does not have to be a prophet to know the Australian Greens are on their last legs — a move that will make our state and our country — —

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! The member's time has expired.

COUNCIL
24 October 2012

Production of Documents

Mr BARBER (Northern Metropolitan) — I move:

That this house requires the Leader of the Government to table in the Legislative Council by 12 noon on Tuesday, 13 November 2012, all documents provided to Infrastructure Australia by the Department of Premier and Cabinet since January 2011 relating to the proposal for an east-west road tunnel.

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise to express my support for Mr Barber's motion, and I hope that is recorded in Hansard because you will not hear me saying it all that often. As a representative of the western suburbs who gets beyond the inner city, I very strongly support the east-west link. I am an enthusiastic supporter of a road which is going to free up the lives of literally millions of Melburnians, not only those who are around now but also future generations.

This is a project that must surely happen, one that is deserving of being given no. 1 priority by us — not just by the government but by all Victorians. As Christmas rapidly approaches, I have to say that if Santa were to fill my stocking this year and give me exactly what I wanted, it would be the east-west link. The anti-Santa in Canberra, however, who is not coming to the party, presents some difficulties just at the moment.

Mr Leane — Oh, oh!

Mr FINN — Mr Leane over there is making some very odd noises, as he is known to do — as is his wont. He is making some incredible noises, but they are nowhere near as incredible or extraordinary as his contribution to this debate today. We pleaded for Mr Leane or somebody else from the Labor Party to tell us exactly where the ALP stood on this project. Do ALP members support it? Do they not support it? Might they support

it sometimes? Where are they at? If there is a by-election called, might they withdraw support? What exactly is the position of the Labor Party and the chap whose name escapes me at the moment who leads it?

Mr Leane got up — and it has to be said that this was not coming from a shadow minister. I have the utmost respect for Mr Leane. Indeed I am very fond of Mr Leane. He gives me hours of amusement, it has to be said.

It also has to be said, however, that he is not about to become a high-flyer in the cabinet or the shadow cabinet at any time soon. The fact that the Labor Party had Mr Leane get up and make the contribution he did in this chamber today is indicative of how ALP members regard this project. They do not want it to happen, and they sent Mr Leane in here to make that clear without actually saying it — without those words actually passing their own lips. They sent Mr Leane in to say they do not want it either. They do not want it, even though they used to, and all the members in the west want it. I think Mr Pallas, the member for Tarneit in the Assembly, wants it. Ms Thomson, the member for Footscray in the Assembly, wants it. Mr Languiller, the member for Derrimut in the Assembly, who sometimes goes out west, wants it. Ms Kairouz, the member for Kororoit in the Assembly, wants it. Everybody out in the west wants it, and indeed I was sure, listening to the multitude of western suburbs Labor members, that the ALP wanted it.

Then of course, Bronwyn Pike, a former member for Melbourne in the Assembly, gave it away. She resigned her seat, and there was a by-election. All of a sudden all those noises and all that support for the east-west link evaporated. It disappeared — poof! It was gone. Why was it gone? Because ALP members needed to win a few votes on Brunswick Street. It has to be said it worked. As I said in my members statement this morning, the Greens did not do exceptionally well in the Melbourne by-election, which did not upset me enormously. It is sad, however.

Mr Barber interjected.

Mr FINN — That got the Greens going. That has fired Mr Barber up. He longs for the cupcakes of election night. He is filthy that the Greens did not get to implement that running sheet they had lined up in minute detail for their victory party, which did not take place.

One day he might tell me where they went instead, but that is a matter

for another day.

It is a pity when we look across this chamber and see a Labor Party, at the moment comprised of two members, which will sacrifice the future of this state for a few votes today. The Labor Party will look at a project which is absolutely crucial for the future of this city and of this state, and it will sacrifice those affected for the sake of a few votes in a by-election — to win a few votes in the inner suburbs.

Mr Leane — Earth to Bernie: you're in government.

Mr FINN — We are, Mr Leane, yes. We are in government.

Mr Leane — And you have a majority in both houses.

Mr FINN — I am glad you have picked up on that. It is very good; you are coming along very nicely. You keep taking the lessons, and by the end of the year you might get somewhere. I listened to Mr Leane's contribution, as I often do, because I like a bit of a laugh from time to time. He got up and told us exactly how the Labor Party stuffs up everything it touches. He told us how the Labor Party stuffed up Victoria. He told us how the Labor Party has stuffed up Australia. He got up and said, 'You're in government; you spend the money.' The fact that we have not got the money did not enter into it at all. The fact that we are unable to get the money has absolutely nothing to do with it at all.

The basis of everything the Labor Party does is: spend the money. Who cares where it comes from? That is the attitude of the modern Labor Party.

There was a time when the Labor Party in this country was economically responsible.

Mr Ondarchie — When?

Mr FINN — A very long time ago, Mr Ondarchie. Compared with the Labor Party today, former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam was an economic conservative. Compared with Mr Leane and his comrades over there, Gough Whitlam knew how to run an economy. He knew that you do not just walk in and spend every cent you have and commit yourself not just up to your gills but beyond. He knew that that was not the way for a government to behave.

Here today, however, we have a member of the opposition, junior as he may be, coming in here and making hand gestures and facial gestures, as he is at the moment.

Mr Leane interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Elasmarr) — Order!

Mr FINN — Acting President, in a moment we may have to call in somebody in a white coat for Mr Leane and have him sedated; he is getting very excited indeed, and I am a bit concerned for his welfare — he is going very red in the face. Whilst I appreciate his support for the points I am making, I am concerned for his welfare.

It just goes to show once again the point Mr Elsbury and I have made time and again — that is, despite the fact that members of the Labor Party like to think of the western suburbs as their personal property, we have known for decades, and we know now, that Labor neglects the west. Labor members did so when in government, and now they are doing so in opposition. Through Mr Leane's contribution today they are telling us that if as a state we ever have the misfortune of Labor governing us again, then Labor members will neglect the west again. The Labor Party does not care about the hundreds of thousands of people stuck on the West Gate Freeway, the Tullamarine Freeway and the Western Ring Road. As long as Labor members win a few seats in their internal battle with the Greens in the inner suburbs, they do not care about the people in the outer western suburbs. They do not care about Point Cook, and have they not made that perfectly obvious in so many ways?

Members of the Labor Party do not care about the people in Werribee, Tarneit, Caroline Springs, Melton or Altona. The Labor Party shows time and again that it just does not care, and if it ever gets the opportunity, it will continue to neglect the west in the way it did for 11 years when in government. That is the message Mr Leane gave us today, and I thank him for it. His greatest contribution today was his personal commitment that if the Labor Party were ever to win another election, he would not go out and fill in the hole the tunnel would be to begin with, and I suppose that is something, because I suggest to the house that Mr Leane with a shovel could be a very dangerous individual, and that is not something we should be encouraging at all.

Acting President, there is much I could say on this motion and on this particular project, because it is a project that is crucially important to the future of the western suburbs of Melbourne.

It is a project that is crucially important to the future of Melbourne itself and indeed to the state of Victoria, as was made clear by Mr

Elsbury and Mr O'Donohue before me. Members of the government have no objection to providing the information Mr Barber has asked for, but we would like some information on exactly where the Labor Party stands on this because, with all due respect to him, Mr Leane has not exactly been forthright in telling us that today. If Mr Andrews at some stage would like to consult with his members in the western suburbs —

Hon. M. J. Guy — Who?

Mr FINN — He is a big bloke with glasses; you might have seen him around the place sometimes. At some stage Mr Andrews, the Leader of the Opposition and member for Mulgrave in the Assembly, might like to consult with his members in the western suburbs, who apparently are as enthusiastic about this project as I am. He might like to consult with them, and members of the Labor Party at some stage might like to make up their minds and send a message to the people of the western suburbs whether or not Labor is on their side.

**COUNCIL | Second Reading
13 November 2012**

Justice Legislation Amendment (Miscellaneous) Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — For somebody who was not going to say much on this bill, Mr Pakula has given us, as he said, all the talk and has spread his wings, as it were, not just on this legislation but it seems on everything known to man that may possibly be associated with anything that the government does in the state of Victoria as he sees it.

One of my great hopes is that before very long we will see the legal system in this state become the justice system. What concerns me enormously is the number of people in our community who are so totally alienated from what happens down at the County Court, the Supreme Court or the Magistrates Court. They just do not want anything to do with them, and you can understand that, because for the overwhelming majority of people being involved with anything to do with the law is going to cost them money, and it is going to cost them big money. That is something

that I hope will be addressed at some stage, and Victorian mothers and fathers and workers in suburbs and country towns and on the farms of Victoria will feel that the legal system is theirs and that it is in fact a justice system. Is that not what it is supposed to be about?

Is that not what we are striving for — justice?

Mr Pakula might object to this very strongly and strenuously, but the legal system does not exist to employ lawyers. It does not exist to make lawyers rich. It exists to provide justice for all. I am very hopeful that at some stage we might actually get to the point where that will occur. I would like to go on at much greater length on this particular subject, but unfortunately time is against me on this occasion, and I see Mr Koch over there preparing to do what he does best — and that is not something that I wish to encourage, so I will not go into greater detail on that particular topic.

But I just want to say a few words with regard to the Justice Legislation Amendment (Miscellaneous) Bill 2012 and the component of the bill which refers to the facilitation of a full and proper consideration of a review of counter-terrorism legislation being undertaken by the Council of Australian Governments. It is very important that we realise that in 2012 terrorism is still very much a real problem for Australians and indeed for those of us in the Western world. It did not end on 9/11. As we saw in fact in Libya just a couple of months ago, terrorism is alive and well, and we saw a repeat of 9/11 in an attack which saw the murder of the US ambassador and three other officers of that particular American embassy.

We have to be aware that terrorism is still very much alive in this world of ours but particularly in those countries that regard us as their enemies. It is not something that we have done or caused: these people regard us as their enemies purely because we are who we are and we stand for what we stand for.

We stand for freedom, and that is not something they will tolerate.

It is most important that this particular legislation addresses this matter and allows a full examination of terrorism and a full consideration of counter-terrorism in this country. I commend the government for the introduction of this legislation, and I trust it will have a speedy passage. And — I look over at Mr Pakula when I say this — I hope we will see

everybody get what they deserve, and that would be the full justice provided in this legislation.

**COUNCIL | Questions without Notice
14 November 2012**

Planning: urban renewal

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is to the outstanding Minister for Planning, and I ask: can the minister advise the house what action the Baillieu government is taking to bring forward a new metropolitan planning vision for Melbourne?

Hon. M. J. GUY (Minister for Planning) — I thank Mr Finn for his important question in relation to metropolitan planning and this government's vision for a new metropolitan planning strategy for the metropolitan area. Members may be aware that this government is engaging in nine regional growth plans for this city. Importantly —

Mr Viney interjected.

Hon. M. J. GUY — Is Mr Viney conducting an audition for a different job? I am sorry for the distraction, President, but Mr Viney's relevance deprivation is getting to extreme levels in this chamber today. This government is going through nine regional growth plans, eight for regional Victoria and one for the metropolitan area. Importantly, we view metropolitan planning and the metropolitan planning strategy initiative as an addendum to the regional growth plans — something that will complement the growth of our state as one entity, not in silos as was done in the past.

I am pleased to inform this chamber that recently the government launched a draft document for discussion entitled Melbourne, Let's Talk About the Future. It is vitally important because some of us are talking about the future and some on the other side of the chamber are still talking about the past. Melbourne 2030 is dead; it is gone, it is finished. You may not believe that if you read the comments of the shadow Minister for Planning, Mr Tee, who wants to just reinstate it, but it is finished.

This document, Melbourne, Let's Talk About the Future, talks about strategic principles that build upon Melbourne and its competitive strengths that will make sure our city is not just the most livable today but, as Mr Finn knows, will be the most

livable in the future.

We are making sure that the city we have today and that we will bequeath to future generations will be more sustainable and have better transport access. It will be a 20-minute city with a 24-hour hub, a city that has neighbourhood character kept intact, a city that respects its growth corridors — —

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! As we all know, interjections are unruly at the best of times. They are tolerated, but they are not welcomed. They are particularly not welcomed by me when they are not even apposite to what is being discussed. This persistent talk about photos has got absolutely nothing to do with the minister's answer or the question proposed by Mr Finn. I ask members to desist, because it is not relevant or helpful to this chamber's understanding of the answer to this question. The minister, to continue.

Hon. M. J. GUY — As members know, and as I have said before, the government is certainly committed to key points in a new metropolitan planning vision for this city. It is committed to growing our capital city — the centre of our city — as a 24-hour hub, a 24-hour jobs precinct, an employment precinct and a precinct where people can live, operate, work and have a great lifestyle without needing to own a car. We also need to respect our existing suburbs. That is why zone reform is so important to the question Mr Finn has asked about implementing a strategy. Importantly we need to factor in respect and sustainable growth in growth corridors. On top of that, this government, unlike previous governments, is actually ensuring that metropolitan growth occurs in conjunction with the development of regional growth plans.

Victoria is not a city state. It is not just about focusing growth in Melbourne. This state and this government are about focusing growth on all of Victoria.

That is why we are, importantly, focusing on regional growth plans at the same time as we are focusing on our metropolitan growth strategy. I would encourage all Victorians to be a part of the discussion of what is outlined in Melbourne, Let's Talk About the Future. Our city is changing, but the character and the livability of it do not need to change along with population growth. We have a chance to get it right. The government is putting the building

blocks in place, and we believe that with the right work, which is being done, we can grow Melbourne sustainably and along with it make sure that our state grows sustainably as well.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment
14 November 2012**

Craigieburn- Hanson roads, Craigieburn: traffic lights

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I wish to raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Roads, Mr Mulder, and it concerns a letter that I received recently from the secretary of the Craigieburn Residents Association, Ms Debra Phippen. It revolves around urgently needed traffic lights at the intersection of Craigieburn Road and Hanson Road in Craigieburn. Among other things, on behalf of the Craigieburn Residents Association, Ms Phippen writes with respect to the intersection of Craigieburn Road and Hanson Road, Craigieburn:

This is an issue of priority for many local residents.

Hanson Road and Craigieburn Road are the major roads connecting Craigieburn's business and service precinct to the northern and western residential growth areas.

The intersection of these two roads is dangerous and congested and needs to be upgraded as soon as possible.

She points out that in the years to 2011 Craigieburn's population has more than doubled to almost 33 000 residents, a doubling of its previous population of 15 000 in 2001. In the next 10 years it is forecast to grow to 54 000 residents and for a period of time will become the largest suburb in the city of Hume.

The intersection is a key thoroughfare to all locations throughout the suburb, and the problem that exists now will only worsen over the next few years. With a higher than average rate of car ownership and 258 bus services travelling through the intersection every weekday — that is one service every 4 minutes — Craigieburn has clearly outgrown an intersection that was designed when it was a semirural satellite town, and that is the problem.

We have a situation in Craigieburn, as has happened in a number of former small towns on the outskirts of Melbourne, where the population has exploded in recent years, the number of dwellings has exploded and as a result the traffic has exploded as well. We have a real problem in many of the townships in the outlying areas of Western Metropolitan Region. Craigieburn is most certainly one of them. I ask the minister to give this intersection at Craigieburn and Hanson roads some urgent consideration. I ask him to give this matter the priority it deserves and give the people of Craigieburn the traffic lights and safety they need at this intersection.

**COUNCIL | Members Statements
15 November 2012**

Local government: elections

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I congratulate the Minister for Local Government, the Honourable Jeanette Powell, on her campaign to introduce more women into local government. It is clearly working. Five of the seven councils in Western Metropolitan Region this year have women mayors. For those who believe that women show more common sense than men, that may well be the case, because each and every one of those women mayors is a non-Labor mayor. It gives me unbridled joy to congratulate Cr Catherine Cumming in Maribyrnong, Cr Heather Marcus in Wyndham, Cr Narelle Sharpe in Moonee Valley, Cr Kathy Majdlik in Melton and in particular Cr Angela Altair in Hobsons Bay. At the risk of being accused of being a misogynist, I should also mention Cr Geoff Porter in Hume and Cr Oscar Yildiz in Moreland, who are Labor mayors.

I particularly congratulate Cr Angela Altair and her deputy, Luba Grigorovitch, in Hobsons Bay because they have introduced, I believe, a new era of respect, cooperation and working for the benefit of all residents of Hobsons Bay. This is somewhat of a change for the people of that municipality. There has been a great time of darkness throughout that region, but it is a delight to report to this house today that the sun is finally shining again in Hobsons Bay.

**COUNCIL | Second Reading
15 November 2012**

Tobacco Amendment (Smoking At Patrolled Beaches) Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — It is a great pity that Mr Leane is not in the chamber at the moment. I have had the opportunity to follow Mr Leane in debate on a number of occasions over the last six years, but I have to say that on this occasion he has outdone himself. I was quite astounded by his performance today. I am not at all sure what it was about.

Honourable members interjecting.

Mr FINN — He talked about the message, but I have no idea what his message was — I have not the first idea. He did mention he was going to get out his Cuban cigar at the beach, and I can only suggest that if he does get out his Cuban cigar, he is going to have to worry about more than the lifesavers. I am sure there will be people who will take strong objection to that on a whole range of fronts.

In my view the beaches of this state are some of the best in Australia. I grew up near Colac. Each summer Lorne became Colac-by-the-sea; we all packed up and went down to Lorne. I am told there is a fair chance that that may still happen to a very large degree. So I grew up there, and I love the west coast beaches of this state. I live now in the north-western suburbs of Melbourne, and when a day reaches 30 degrees it is mandatory at our place to pack the kids in the car and head to the beach. I appreciate Mr Elsbury's love of Altona beach — it is an exceptionally good beach, and I quite enjoy going to Altona — but my preference is surf beaches.

I love to get down to Anglesea, and I love to get down to Torquay or Lorne if I feel like driving that far. All of these beaches are sensational places for anybody and particularly for families, so it is a matter of extreme annoyance when you have set up your little camping area on the beach, the kids are there and have got their — —

Mrs Coote — Buckets and spades.

Mr FINN — Buckets and spades — that is exactly what I was trying

to think of. I thank Mrs Coote. They have got out their buckets and spades and are burying the person next door, and it becomes a matter of extreme annoyance when the person next door lights up a gasper and the smoke drifts over into the family area. On a hot day these beaches are very tightly populated. There are thousands of people on these beaches, and you do not need too many smokers to make it a pretty miserable day for a lot of people. So I believe this bill is a very positive move, and I congratulate and commend the government for bringing it forward.

I have to admit that I used to be a smoker. I smoked for many years, and I remember when I first took up smoking back when I left school, when I was first working in radio. Back then in radio if you did not smoke, there was something wrong with you. That was the late 1970s, and if you did not smoke, people would look at you and wonder if you might have some strange condition that should be treated. I did what everybody else did: I took up smoking and of course became addicted, because as we know tobacco addiction is one of the strongest addictions there is. There was a period some years ago during which I gave up for four years, but unfortunately I took it up again. I learnt something from that — that is, that I should never even have one cigarette. Not that I am counting, but a little over four years ago, at 11.15 on 15 August 2008, I had my last cigarette. I will never touch another cigarette — never.

I would not say that I was a strong supporter, but I used to have some recognition of what I would have described then as the rights of smokers. The reason I am so strong on this now and what changed my mind was a very tragic event where just a few months before I gave up smoking a very dear and close friend of mine died of lung cancer at the age of 48. She was diagnosed with lung cancer in September 2007, and we buried her in April 2008. I have to say that one of the most difficult tasks I have ever taken on was to deliver the eulogy at her funeral. Even with the knowledge of what smoking cigarettes had done to her, with her death at that very early age — as I say, at 48 — even then I had enormous trouble giving the things up. I must have tried at least a dozen times before actually succeeding, and that was actually after she died. Some members might find this slightly amusing, but it took hypnosis to get me off the dreaded weed.

Mrs Peulich — And the cigarettes!

Mr FINN — Thank you, Mrs Peulich. I appreciate very well just how strong the dreadful addiction of tobacco is. Something that has concerned me for quite some time is the professional anti-tobacco lobby — if we can call it that — and what I would describe as its seeming lack of understanding of just how tough it is to give this away and what is needed for people who are hard-core smokers. Let us face facts: anybody who is still smoking in this day and age is a hard-core smoker. They do not need persecution; they need help — they need our support.

It just seems to me that some people are living in another world. Perhaps they are people who have never smoked. Quite often they have never smoked but have become quite zealous on this particular subject, and they have no understanding and perhaps no desire to understand what smokers go through in an effort to give up what I describe as and what I know to be a dreadful addiction.

I hope some of them will read this and have a think about what it actually takes for some people to give up tobacco. It takes more than somebody yelling or wagging the finger at them and telling them how naughty they are.

It is a real problem. I am sure we all know people who have told us that they would dearly love to give up smoking but have been unable to do so. There are some who hide behind the bravado of saying, 'I don't want to give up'. They say, 'I am not a quitter', when we know only too well that given half a chance they would dearly love, as I have done, to give up the smokes. I hope professionals in the antismoking lobby will take note of my comments and perhaps readjust their thinking.

This bill is about continuing down the path of progress to make it nigh impossible to smoke just about anywhere in public. I do not think that is a bad thing.

Back in the days when the ban was introduced in hotels, I well remember that I was quite stunned. The prospect of having a pot without a cigarette was something I could not quite comprehend or come to terms with, but I was amazed how quickly I did come to terms with it. Now I am very pleased the ban was introduced because, looking back on those days, it must have been hell on earth on a Friday or Saturday night for a non-smoker to go to a pub or a venue where people gathered to have a drink. As I said, for those of us who were drinkers back in those days, it

was inevitable that we would have a cigarette as well. I am pleased that the ban was introduced, just as I am pleased that this particular ban is in the process of being introduced at the moment.

As I mentioned earlier, there will be some people who will try to make objectionable noises about this legislation. A little bit earlier Mr Leane made noises. I am not sure entirely whether he was opposing or supporting the legislation, though the noise may well have been objectionable.

I am not entirely sure where he was coming from on this bill, but it was fascinating to hear him. It seems Mr Leane has not recovered from losing his traveller. I can understand the psychological trauma he must experience as a result of a stubby being ripped from his hand as he climbs behind the wheel of a car on a Friday night — I am trying to show empathy to Mr Leane in this regard.

As I said earlier, smokers do not need to be persecuted; smokers need help — and Mr Leane needs help as well. He does not need our condemnation of his psychological affliction. He clearly needs help, because here we are now, close to 18 months after the introduction of the ban on the traveller, and he is still getting up in the house bemoaning the fact that he cannot get behind the wheel of his Statesman, or whatever vehicle he has got, and open a Victoria Bitter. Those of us who care about people's lives and safety do not have a problem with that, but clearly Mr Leane does. I assure him that he will not have the same problem with this smoking ban as he has had with the traveller ban. It is a pity he was not in the house earlier. I strongly urge him to keep his Cuban cigar to himself, and then he will have no problems. That is something he should very much take to heart.

I support this legislation. It is a very good move because it will make Victoria a better place.

It will make Victorian beaches better places, and it will make this summer and future summers better for us all. I urge the house to pass this bill in a speedy manner.

Footscray: urban renewal

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the visionary Minister for Planning, and I ask: can the minister advise the house what action the Baillieu government has taken to advance urban renewal in the new capital of Melbourne's inner west, Footscray?

Hon. M. J. GUY (Minister for Planning) — Mr Finn and Mr Elsbury know, as they are from the western suburbs, that the mantra of this government is 'the right development in the right locations', and that is indeed what we are getting on with and what this government is focusing on when it comes to urban renewal. I had much pleasure in recently approving a new apartment complex in the central Footscray activities area.

It is a \$318 million development which will be a central part of the Footscray urban renewal precinct that will breathe new life, as Mr Finn and Mr Elsbury know, into Melbourne's inner western suburbs and, as Mr Finn correctly says, the capital of Melbourne's new inner western suburbs.

It is a five-stage development of two 17-storey towers, one 19-storey tower and two 32-storey towers on a 9500 square metre site. There will be 970 apartments in total, 1030 car spaces, 21 separate retail spaces throughout the ground level and a subterranean supermarket. As I said, it is a near \$320 million investment — \$318 million. This is about the right development in the right locations. This government is ensuring that development in defined activities areas allows development and investment to continue in Melbourne's activities areas, particularly in the western suburbs, and particularly in Footscray, which has a massive future ahead of it.

As Mr Finn and Mr Elsbury know, Footscray has a massive future ahead of it. There is the same number of kilometres between Footscray and Docklands as there is between the CBD and a number of major activities areas, such as South Yarra on the other side of the city. Footscray is in close proximity to our ports. It is in close proximity to the standard gauge railway, the broad gauge railway and new jobs precincts. It

has a bright future, and as such the Baillieu government has much pride in bringing forward this development to provide an impetus to the development of the central Footscray activities areas.

With the Baillieu government's zone reform package, we will take a lot of pressure off the existing streets surrounding that activities area where existing urban character can be preserved. Hundreds of apartments and new dwellings can be focused in areas that the community know and accept will sustain urban change, but we will allow for the preservation of existing urban character outside those activities areas.

As such, I have much pleasure in informing the house of the approval of that project and great new confidence in Melbourne's growing inner western suburbs.

COUNCIL 15 November 2012

Health: Federal Funding

Debate resumed from 13 November; motion of Hon. D. M. DAVIS (Minister for Health):

That this house —

(1) expresses its serious concern at the recently announced reduction in commonwealth health funding, changes which, if implemented, will result in retrospective, current year and future year reductions to state hospital funding which will seriously impact state budgets that have already been set;

(2) expresses concern about the factual basis of the commonwealth's decision, which relies on disputed population figures, noting also the lack of consultation with states and territories prior to the decision;

(3) calls upon the heads of treasuries to convene urgently to discuss the commonwealth Treasurer's determination and report on the basis of this decision, noting that the reductions in commonwealth funding for public hospitals will, unless reversed, be implemented in early December 2012 in the form of a \$39 million clawback of funding to Victoria from the 2011-12 financial year and a \$67 million reduction in the 2012-13 financial year for Victorian hospitals and large reductions in forthcoming financial years bringing the total commonwealth funding reductions of the health

and hospitals funding through the health-care SPP and national hospital agreement to \$475 million since the announcement of the commonwealth's 2012-13 budget; and

(4) further notes that six state health ministers expressed concern about the announced reduction in commonwealth health funding at the recent Standing Council on Health meeting.

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I will move along with my contribution — very quickly. I did have 15 minutes, but as a result of the government cuts I now have 5!

What we have seen over the life of this government in Victoria is an attack from Canberra the likes of which I have not seen in my political life, which spans some 35 years. I have never seen a Prime Minister go out with such enthusiasm to attack the state that she allegedly represents. I have never seen a Prime Minister go out with malice aforethought, in my view, to declare war on any state of the commonwealth, but to do that to the state that she allegedly resides in is particularly appalling.

You have to ask why Victoria has been subject to these cuts from day one of the Baillieu government. Going back to day one, one of the first things the Gillard government did was to cut half a billion dollars out of the regional rail project budget. The first thing we had to do was find half a billion dollars to allow that project to continue. This state of affairs has been ongoing to the point where it has gone to a committee, and a report to Parliament will be produced very soon discussing the federal-state funding arrangements. I would hate to anticipate what may be in the report, but there may be some reference to the fact that Victoria is not getting a fair go.

In part this means that at the moment we cannot get the east-west link, which we desperately need in Melbourne. It means that we cannot get the Sneydes Road overpass at Point Cook. It means that we cannot get the Duncans Road interchange at Werribee, which is vitally important. We have got the Wyndham Harbour development, which is currently going ahead. We have got Point Cook, which is not growing so much now, but it has been growing like Topsy until very recently, and we have the Werribee tourism precinct, which is severely affected by the fact that we do not have the Duncans Road interchange we desperately need. Why do we not have that?

We do not have that because the Labor government, whose local federal Labor member for that area is the Prime Minister, will not give us the money. She will not give Victoria the money. That is something she should be held accountable for; that is something that the people of the federal electorate of Lalor should look to their local member for and ask, 'Why aren't you giving us the money we need for these very basic roads, for these basically needed roads?'. It is appalling. Those people are entitled to ask, 'What is the deal with Canberra?'

What is going on in Canberra over funding for the states? It is clear to me, as I think it is clear to everybody in this country, that the only thing that matters to this federal government is politics. Justice for the states and their residents does not enter into it. This is all about propping up mates.

Members might recall that the Prime Minister and the federal Treasurer pulled out hundreds of millions of dollars from the coffers and put them into Queensland to try to save Anna Bligh, the former Premier of Queensland. What a total failure it was! It was just like everything else Julia Gillard has done. We saw what happened to Anna Bligh earlier this year in the Queensland election. Now the Prime Minister is trying to save her mate over in South Australia, whose name completely escapes me at the minute, but anyway that does not matter. The fact is that Victoria is missing out and the Prime Minister is sending big dollars over to South Australia in an attempt to save a state Labor government which is doomed. Why she would even bother I do not know.

I am not sure if the Prime Minister is sending huge sums of money down to Tasmania. I think by any measure Tasmania is stuffed economically. It is gone for all money. When you have a Labor-Greens coalition it has to be said you have got no hope. Before you start, you have got no hope, and of course they have had that very unfortunate combination down there for some years. There is literally no hope for Tasmania. I think even the Prime Minister has accepted that that would be pouring good money after bad.

The situation we have in the states is that we have limited capacity to raise funds. We have a few taxes here and a few taxes there, but overwhelmingly the majority of our revenue comes from the federal government. The federal government taxes the people of this state and gives only some of it back, it has to be said. My view is

that much of the money that goes to Canberra is wasted. One thing that is totally unforgivable is the sin of waste.

My suggestion to the federal Treasurer is that he could have a surplus this year — I am not talking about this financial year; I am talking about this calendar year — if he cut three-quarters of the federal government. We do not need a federal department of health; we have got a state one. We do not need a federal department of education; we have got a state one. We do not need a federal department of agriculture; we have got a state one. There are literally dozens of departments and thousands of public servants in Canberra we do not need, because we have the people here in the states doing the job.

Why would you need an education department in Canberra that does not run any schools? Why would you need a health department in Canberra that does not run any hospitals? It is a nonsense. Get rid of these departments that we do not need. It is just a nonsense and outrageous in the extreme. As a result of this criminal waste we are seeing the states, where these services are delivered to the people, missing out. That is just not good enough.

As representatives of the people of Victoria we should be screaming from the tops of the mountains about this. I certainly am and have been for a while, and, if I have to, I will continue to do so for some time. It is just not good enough.

I know money is tight, but the trouble is I know why money is tight, and it does not need to be tight. If we got rid of all these bludgers in Canberra, we would not have to worry about it; it would not be an issue. It just would not be an issue. Give the money to the people who use it for the benefit of the community. Do not give it to people who shuffle it around for a while and give it back to you.

Mr O'Brien — Or don't.

Mr FINN — Or do not, indeed, as Mr O'Brien points out.

Give it to the people who are in the best position to use it for the advancement of the community and the people of this state. If Mr Swan wants his surplus this year — and I think his getting it is highly debatable; even Mr Pakula would say it is highly debatable that Mr Swan will get his surplus this year — that is all he has to do: eliminate waste in Canberra and get rid of three-quarters of the federal government. He should go back to what was the original intent of the Australian constitution.

Mr O'Brien — We don't have a Victorian army.

Mr FINN — No, we do not have a Victorian army, and that is one department I would not be cutting in Canberra, I can assure Mr O'Brien. We would keep the federal Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, obviously; we would keep the defence forces and we would keep a number of areas where the states would obviously not have a say. If we were to make cuts in many other areas, we would be able to provide the services that we need. We would be able to provide a new hospital in Footscray, which is urgently needed. We would be able to provide the east-west link.

In conclusion, I will say it again because it has to be said. There is a lot more that I could say on this subject, but apparently I have run out of time.

There is a way to fix this problem and to fix it now, but the federal government needs the political courage to do it. I am not holding my breath. I have not seen any evidence that the federal government has any courage of any kind at all.

**COUNCIL | Questions without Notice
27 November 2012**

Planning: urban renewal

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Planning, and I ask: can the minister inform the house what action the Baillieu government has taken to drive new urban renewal in Melbourne's inner west?

Hon. M. J. GUY (Minister for Planning) — I thank my good friend and colleague Mr Finn for his important question. Last Wednesday I was joined by Mr Finn in Sunshine at the launch of a project called the Foundry, which has been brought forward by this government and which will inject more than \$150 million worth of confidence into the Sunshine activities area. The project will be the first major development of its kind for central Sunshine.

It will bring a new era of confidence to that activities area and it will set the standard for new urban design and urban renewal within an activities area precinct that has huge opportunities. This area is just 11 kilometres from the Melbourne CBD.

A number of projects are already under way, including the Visy Cares Hub upgrade, stage 1 of the \$4.3

million Sunshine library and learning centre and the Hampshire Square \$3.2 million development, which Mr Finn, Mr Elsbury and I launched last year. A further \$880 million is being spent in the Sunshine activities area as part of the regional rail link project. That will eliminate two level crossings, which are causing backlogs and long delays in the activities area.

It was with much pleasure that I went to Sunshine with Mr Finn to launch this project, a project that is iconic for central Sunshine and a project that, as I said, will see renewed confidence in that activities area. It comes on top of a number of projects in Melbourne's inner west that this government has facilitated and brought forward. A number of the projects are in Footscray, where Mr Elsbury, Mr Finn and I have been to launch them in the last few months. A number of them have seen a growth in the inner activities areas to Melbourne's west and a new era of confidence in our inner western suburbs — places such as the Joseph Road precinct, the Grollo development in central Footscray and the project Mr Elsbury, Mr Finn and I attended at the government services building in Footscray.

Together those projects show renewed confidence in Melbourne's inner west, confidence that is again strengthened by this government's urban renewal agenda and confidence that is strengthened by our metropolitan planning strategy agenda around urban renewal for inner city activities areas. This government has a great level of confidence and a huge level of faith that Melbourne's inner west will be the place to do business and live into the future. It has an exciting future ahead of it.

COUNCIL
27 November 2012

Commonwealth payments to Victoria

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise to speak on this particular report, as tabled by Ms Pulford. I congratulate the staff of this committee, in particular Robert McDonald, who has been able to ease us through some very difficult issues that have been hard to grasp for some of us.

Mr Ramsay interjected.

Mr FINN — More than one of us, I think, Mr Ramsay. Quite a few of us were a little bit perplexed from time to time by some of the issues that were raised. It is a credit to the other members of the committee as well as the staff, who were able to put together a report that has put forward some degree of a solution to the issues we have in this area.

At the end of the day, without putting too fine a point on it, we have to say that Victoria is being ripped off by the federal government. I do not think there is any doubt about that. We are being ripped off in a number of ways. Even though the Prime Minister comes from Victoria and she says she is a proud Victorian, supposedly — —

Mr Elsbury interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Elsbury says she is a South Australian, and South Australians will vigorously deny that. She says she is a Victorian, but she is leading a government that is ripping Victorians off. It does not matter whether it is transport or taxes of various sorts, we are not getting our fair share from the federal government, and you have got to wonder why. You have got to wonder why the Prime Minister of this country would be ripping off the state she is supposed to represent. I wonder if it is a result of what happened two years ago today when the Labor Party was turfed out of government in this state. As we know, the Prime Minister is not beyond vindictiveness, and I think in this particular instance she is showing plenty of it.

COUNCIL | Members Statements
27 November 2012

Planning: Point Cook

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise to congratulate and most warmly thank my friend and colleague the Minister for Planning, Matthew Guy, for his efforts in solving the problems faced by the people of Point Cook. As has already been pointed out by Mr Elsbury, last week the Premier, the Minister for Agriculture and Food Security, Mr Walsh, and Mr Guy visited Werribee — both Mr Elsbury and I were also there — for some exciting announcements about new developments in and around Werribee, including a new suburb, which is an exciting event in itself. Perhaps something that trumps that is the employment precinct, which will

bring some 50 000 new jobs to that section of the west of Melbourne.

But the thing that really grabbed my attention and particularly made me excited for the people of Point Cook is the Sneydes Road interchange. This is a \$40 million project which has been needed for many a long year.

This project will be a godsend for the residents of Point Cook.

I should point out that the former Labor government had allowed Point Cook to develop without any proper infrastructure at all. As a result, thousands of people in Point Cook face gridlock every morning. It is not unusual for them to face an hour trip or more just to get onto the Princes Freeway, and we know how hard that can be at that particular point. I am delighted to say that we have been working with the Minister for Planning, Mr Guy, to overcome Labor's legacy. I believe we are well into the process of doing that, and I assure the people of Point Cook that the coalition government is working for the west.

COUNCIL | Second Reading
27 November 2012

Classification (Publications, Films And Computer Games) (Enforcement) Amendment Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise to speak briefly this evening on this bill. I come to this debate with the fundamental view that adults should be allowed, within reason, to view what they want to view.

I suppose I could be described by some as a bit of a libertarian when it comes to that. I am sure that will come as a shock to my friends from the Greens in particular.

Putting aside the issues of child pornography and child exploitation that Mr Ondarchie raised and the issue of bestiality and some of the other matters that Mr Elasmara raised, the thing that really concerns me about this legislation and something that I believe we should monitor

very closely is what an influx of an ultraviolet series of computer games will potentially do to our society. I think we have to accept that not all adults are as mature as perhaps we are. We have to accept that some will be greatly influenced by what they see in such computer games. The point that Ms Pennicuik raised was a particularly good one, and that will not be said too often by me; she may be thrown out of the Greens if this ever gets out! She said that computer games are different from movies. What she said is true. In fact there is that interaction — that stimulation, if you want to call it that — which is not necessarily there in movies. That can affect people who are unbalanced. It can send over the top people who are already close to being over the top.

I have seen some of these kinds of computer games in gaming arcades — even just down the road in Bourke Street, where they were in years gone by. Certainly I have seen them in shops in my electorate. They are vile; they are dreadful. They allow an individual to blow the head off another person. They allow some of the most degrading and gross acts of violence to be perpetrated on another person. To my way of thinking, they undermine our respect for each other as human beings.

If I had my way — and let me say I am not having my way too much at the moment — I would ban those computer games.

I do not believe a healthy society is assisted by the sorts of computer games that have activities that allow people to get their jollies, if I can use that term, by inflicting pain on or causing mayhem for other human beings. Members have to wonder. I am not a psychologist — although perhaps I should be in here from time to time — but I have to wonder just how close some individuals are from viewing and participating in those sorts of computer games and then getting a gun, a bomb or some other weaponry and committing the same sorts of acts on others. That is something that should concern us all as legislators and, indeed, as human beings.

I will support the bill, but not, it has to be said, with a great deal of enthusiasm. I urge the government, the Attorney-General, the medical profession and the law enforcement agencies in this state to watch very carefully the impact of this legislation. I believe we are potentially playing with fire.

I believe we could be impacting on or increasing a problem that has been

with us for perhaps too long. With those few words, I commend the bill to the house but with a sense of deep caution. I urge all to take my words into consideration. This is a very serious issue now; it could be a fatal issue for many.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
27 November 2012**

Western Hospital: upgrade

*Raised with the Minister for Health
on 31 August 2011*

REPLY:

The Baillieu Government recognises the need to provide high quality health care to all Victorians.

I am informed that Department of Health officers are working with Western Health to undertake a Masterplan Study of three Western Health Campuses, including the Western Hospital Campus. This study is targeted for completion in December 2011. The findings from this study will assist the department in future planning and development of capital works on the Western Hospital site.

The Victorian Health Priorities Framework 2012-2022: Metropolitan Health Plan released in May this year, establishes a framework for the planning and development of priorities for health services across the State over the next decade. The framework articulates reform priorities and sets out the long-term directions for metropolitan Melbourne's health services. The Rural and Regional Health Plan 2012-2022 and the Health Capital and Resources Plan 2012-2022 are currently being developed and will be released later this year.

This planning process recognises the importance of planning services in alignment with demographic trends including the population growth occurring in outer metropolitan Melbourne. These plans will provide health services with the policy direction within which to set out their planning and service delivery strategies to meet the needs of communities in western metropolitan Melbourne. The Baillieu Government will work with the health sector on the implementation of these plans.

Western Health has as you are aware been the recipient of significant new capital to improve maternity service capacity and build long

awaited ICU capacity.

**COUNCIL
28 November 2012**

Government: Performance

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I congratulate you, Acting President, upon your elevation to greatness as an Acting President.

As you, Acting President, and other members of this house know, I am a man of compassion. I am a man who views the plight of people with compassion; I feel empathy for them.

On that basis, I will not ask where Mr Lenders is at the moment. I will not point out that it is his motion that members are debating and that he has not been in the house for the last hour at least. I will not ask why he shows as much interest in his motion as it warrants — which is about none at all.

Instead, I will feel deep sorrow, which I have been feeling since I heard Mr Lenders's contribution to the debate this morning. As I heard Mr Lenders rambling on, I thought, 'Oh, how the mighty have fallen.' There was a man who just a couple of years ago was the Treasurer of the state and who was part of a team whose members were charged with the responsibility of ensuring that Victoria went from strength to strength. This morning we heard him quoting George Orwell and wandering all over the place. His rambling efforts made me think that he might not have written his speech at all. I thought that it sounded very much like a contribution from Mr Leane. I wonder whether there was a bit of plagiarism going on there.

It is sad when we hear a man — who, as I said, was once the Treasurer of this state — rambling on in the incoherent fashion that he did this morning.

Despite his efforts, Mr Lenders attempted to rewrite history. Going back into history, I can only sum up his contribution by quoting a former Prime Minister of Australia, Paul Keating. Members all know the quote I am talking about. When I think of John Lenders's contribution to the debate in this house this morning, blah, blah, blah is what it was like. It made no sense to anybody who had even just a passing interest in what was going on; it made no sense at all. That is a great pity. I think the poor swine has lost it, and that is a great pity indeed.

I regret that I do not have a lot longer to speak on this matter, but a bit earlier we heard Ms Broad speaking about the number of public servants who may be departing the service in the not-too-distant future. It got me to thinking ever so briefly about the Labor Party's obsession with the size of the public service. It seems to me that the Labor Party judges its success by how many public servants it can employ. It is almost as if Labor has a large weighbridge over there at Treasury Place; it herds them all onto the weighbridge, and if it has a certain maybe 600 or 700 kilos extra a day or a week, then it has succeeded. If it can spend more and more of the taxpayers dollars on the public service, then it believes it has succeeded. This tells us how Labor gets it wrong and gets it wrong so often.

The key to success in business, government and life is to get value for money. It is not to throw good money after bad.

Mr O'Brien interjected.

Mr FINN — Indeed, as Mr O'Brien points out, the key to success is not to throw other people's good money after bad. It is to get value for that money — not to spend the money just because you want to spend the money but to spend the money and get a result for the people of Victoria. That is what this government is on about. It is not just taking from the people of Victoria and throwing money at a problem. It is actually seeking solutions and spending money in a way that people in Victoria get value for that money.

We have seen over recent years, and indeed probably going back over the last three decades, incompetence from Labor on a grand scale. We see that on display in Canberra today. We see the Gillard government in its death throes as it approaches its last Christmas.

We see it thrashing about, desperately gasping for air, saying and doing anything to try to distract from the fact that it has made a complete mess of this country and has made a complete mess of attempting to be what one would describe as some sort of government for the people of this country.

That sadly is Labor's story, not just in Canberra now but in Victoria, in New South Wales, in South Australia, in Queensland and in Western Australia. Of course as we know now, Tasmania is a basket case as a result of the Labor-Greens minority government down there, and one has

to wonder exactly how that is going to be solved.

In the area of Melbourne's west, which I am particularly familiar with, we have to say that Labor failed very badly. In its supposed heartland, Labor failed.

Now we see, with this new government, ministers coming into the western suburbs almost on a daily basis, ministers like the Minister for Planning, Matthew Guy, who came to Point Cook and saw the problems firsthand and spoke to people about the problems that had been created by Labor and about Labor's legacy. He then set about solving those problems and providing value for money and real solutions for the people of Point Cook.

I could go on about this particular matter for quite some time, but I will not because I understand we have other matters that need to be discussed. But it should be pointed out that after two years this government is succeeding where Labor failed, not just in the western suburbs but right across this great state of Victoria. I say to Mr Leane, Ms Broad and Mr Lenders, if he was here, stick around. It is good now, but the best is yet to come.

**COUNCIL | Statements on Reports
28 November 2012**

Electoral Matters Committee: conduct of 2010 Victorian state election

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise to speak to the report entitled Government Response to the Electoral Matters Committee's Report on the Conduct of the 2010 Victorian State Election and matters related thereto. It gives me particular pleasure as chair of the Electoral Matters Committee to report to the house that the committee continues to meet on a regular basis to discuss matters that are of great consequence to the electoral administration of this state. It is wonderful to see that at least one of my colleagues who is a member of that committee — the deputy chair — is in the house tonight. I refer to Mr Somyurek.

Mrs Peulich interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Tarlamis is also a

member of the committee.

There are a number of members who wish they were on the Electoral Matters Committee, and I can understand that. I should say that Dee Ryall and Heidi Victoria, the members for Mitcham and Bayswater in the Legislative Assembly, are also members of that committee, and we work in a very harmonious manner. It is entirely appropriate that we act in a harmonious manner, given that the electoral system in this state is one we can be justifiably proud of.

The government response to the Electoral Matters Committee report into the 2010 state election is very welcome, and it is supportive of many, if not all, of the recommendations in the report. I thank the Attorney-General in particular for his prompt response to the committee's report. But there are a number of outstanding matters the committee is continuing to investigate, one being the matter of early voting. I think we have to get to a point very soon — and I may have told the house this before — where we decide whether we have an election day or an election fortnight.

Recently the President of the United States declared that he was voting early — and possibly quite often as well. He voted early and urged everybody else to do the same. That was a week and a half out from the election. If that is a path we might be going down, it is something we need to consider. We certainly welcome the opinions and submissions of all interested parties, including members of this house.

Another matter which is of interest, and which I am able to say is under consideration, is the possibility of changing from the preferential system that we currently have to an optional preferential system. As we know, the optional preferential system is in operation in New South Wales and in Queensland. In the two most recent elections in those states it has been ragingly successful, and I believe it is worth considering in Victoria. It will cut the rate of votes that are lost to us, and I think it is something that is well worth considering.

I should say that one matter that has created a great deal of interest and discussion is the possibility of changing the name of this chamber to the Victorian Senate. I noticed that Mr Barber from the Greens made a disparaging comment about this prospect — not because, I suspect, it is a bad idea, but because it came from the United States, he said. Anything from the United States, according to the Greens, has to be

bad. That is just the way they are. It does not matter if it is the Senate or McDonald's; it has to be bad. That is just the way the Greens are.

In the time since the report was delivered to the house and the suggestion was put out I have taken a straw poll, particularly in many multicultural areas in my electorate. I found that there is zero understanding of what the Legislative Council is or what it does. However, when one mentions that we are the state senate, there is immediate understanding of exactly what we do. People know what the Senate does, but after 150 years they have not got a clue what the Legislative Council does. I think this is something that we should all take into consideration. If we want people to participate and if we want people to understand what is going on, we need to demystify the situation. I believe that is something the committee will report on at a future time.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment
28 November 2012**

Tourism: Woodlands Park

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Tourism and Major Events. It concerns a matter which is close to the hearts of those who live around and who are employed at Melbourne Airport. Across the road from Melbourne Airport is Woodlands Park, and within that park there has been an increasing population of kangaroos over recent times due, firstly, to the drought. Now that the drought has broken and we have had significant rain, there is plentiful food, so there are huge numbers of kangaroos roaming through the park and getting onto the roads. There has been considerable concern expressed about the numbers of kangaroos in the area, particularly by people who have been driving cars that have struck kangaroos. Kangaroos can make a very nasty mess of your car, and kangaroos usually come off second best.

My matter this evening concerns the possibility of establishing some sort of access from the airport to the park so that visitors to the airport can go over the road in a safe manner and see kangaroos in their natural habitat. As we know, tourists from overseas, particularly from Asian countries, come to Australia mainly to see our wildlife. I believe it would

be a major attraction for Melbourne if we had a park with kangaroos next to Melbourne Airport so people flying in can see them when they first arrive and before they do anything else. Perhaps we could offset the costs by setting up an eatery or a kiosk of some sort.

We already have the best airport in Australia, and such a facility could only add to it. The prospect of selling Melbourne overseas as the place where you can fly in and head across the road and have lunch with a kangaroo could be very appealing to millions of people, particularly those to our north who are considering where they might spend their vacation.

I ask the Minister for Tourism and Major Events to take what I have said into consideration and conduct an examination of the feasibility of this idea, including discussions, with the Minister for Environment and Climate Change with a view to putting forward a plan which may see this very appealing proposition come to fruition.

**COUNCIL | Second Reading
29 November 2012**

Road Safety Amendment (Operator Onus) Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise this afternoon to speak on the Road Safety Amendment (Operator Onus) Bill 2012. It gives me considerable pleasure to do so, because I believe anything which adds to safety on our roads has to be a good thing.

I speak following a tragic experience that hit our family many years ago when I lost a cousin who was killed on New Year's Day in 1970. She was three years old; I was not much older at the time. I should point out that it was nobody's fault; she ran across the road, as young ones have a tendency to do from time to time. We were living in the country at the time. She was hit by a truck and tragically passed away later that evening. It left me with an indelible impression of the impact that these tragic deaths have on people and families, sometimes for many years. Quite often they are easily avoidable deaths.

That is why it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this legislation

here today, because whilst we talk about the health costs, the impact on budgets, the Transport Accident Commission and a whole range of economic conditions concerning trauma on our roads we cannot put a monetary value on the human impact. That sort of impact has a far more devastating and long-term effect than anything else.

The fact that I am standing in this house today with a very vivid memory of the occasion when somebody was taken from us almost 43 years ago indicates that what I say is true — the impact is long-lasting; quite often it lasts for the rest of people's lives.

One cannot begin to imagine the impact on parents in particular when their children are killed in road trauma. I use the phrase 'road trauma' because quite often these are not accidents; these are incidents that, as I said before, can be easily avoided and are often caused by sheer laziness on the part of those involved, and that perhaps adds to the tragedy.

My daughter is approaching the age when she will gain her drivers licence and she discusses that with great enthusiasm and excitement on a regular basis including what colour car she would like me to buy for her — before I tell her that perhaps that might not be happening.

It frequently sends chills down my spine when I think about what may happen when she gets out on the roads. I am not a pessimist by nature — being a Liberal from the western suburbs it would not be a good thing to be a pessimist by nature — but one does have major concerns when faced with the prospect of a child reaching 18 years of age, getting her licence and heading out on the roads. We have to face facts, there are a lot of lunatics out there behind the wheels of their cars. There are people who, from my perspective, do not seem to have any understanding of the road rules. They have no understanding of why we have road rules much less of what they are. You see them on a daily basis, young people — generally blokes it has to be said — with baseball hats on backwards.

Mr Barber — Caps.

Mr FINN — Peaked caps. Some would call them baseball caps. They wear them backwards, Mr Barber, and they are usually driving Commodores.

I am informed by police who are experienced in these matters that Commodores are the cars of choice of hoons everywhere, and I am sure they say that with some justification. I am sure they would not say it otherwise.

To put a young person on the road almost in competition with the sorts of people I am talking about is scary. It may be scary for the young 18-year-old first-time driver but it is even scarier for her dad. I am not looking forward to the time when I will be lying awake at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning until such time as she makes it home — and knowing how well she gets along with people I anticipate that will be happening on a pretty regular basis.

Mrs Peulich interjected.

Mr FINN — No, I think as a pedestrian she will be pretty right, but her getting behind the wheel of a car, Mrs Peulich, is something that worries me a little.

Mrs Peulich — You won't be sleeping peacefully.

Mr FINN — No, that is correct and that is a concern.

Whilst this legislation covers some important and distinct areas there are a couple of areas that it does not cover that perhaps it should, and I might very briefly canvass them with regard to road safety. I am constantly amazed by the number of people who drive around in pouring rain when visibility is sometimes down to mere metres and who refuse point-blank to turn on the headlights of their car.

Mrs Peulich — They are worried about global warming.

Mr FINN — They may be worried about global warming. I do not know why they would be worried about global warming, Mrs Peulich, because you and I know, as the British bureau of meteorology has pointed out, that there is no global warming and there has not been for a very long time. But that is another issue. I will continue to express my absolute dismay at these people who get around in conditions where it is nigh on dark and they will not turn on their lights.

Can I send a message to those people? Turning on the headlights of their cars does not cost them anything — not one cent — so I ask them please to do so, because doing so may well be the difference between living and dying.

On a couple of occasions I have been in situations where I have almost been collected by or almost collected a car that I just did not see in those sorts of conditions. One can be doing all the right things — slowing down for the conditions, having one's headlights on in the car and be driving very safely and doing everything one should — but if somebody comes out of the dark at you and you do not see them until

the last minute, that can be fatal. The people who drive around in such conditions without their headlights on are not only risking their own lives but risking mine as well — and that of every other road user. As legislators I do not think we should tolerate this. Perhaps the government might introduce some form of mandatory use of headlights during conditions such as the ones I have described. I think it is very important that we do so.

I also think it is important that, as drivers, we respect other drivers. We all have to use the roads, and quite often driving is seen almost as a contest about who can get to the next red light first. It amuses me no end to see people rip past me at a rate of knots — usually in a Commodore, I might say. They rip past me at a great rate of knots, only to pull up beside me — or I pull up beside them — at the next set of traffic lights. I think to myself, 'What was that all about? Why would you do that?'. Some people seem to think driving is one big game, and it is about getting there first, even if it means nothing in the end. This is something that amuses me enormously. I just shake my head sometimes and wonder where some of these people's minds are; it is extraordinary.

We have to have respect for each other, and we have to have respect for other road users, because that sort of competition mentality, if I can call it that, can create situations where the sort of road trauma we are discussing with this bill can occur, and as road users we cannot tolerate that.

We have to be mindful of respect for other people, other road users, and I sincerely hope that respect will become ingrained in our thinking as we get into our cars, turn them on and drive off — starting this evening, hopefully at about 5 o'clock.

I raise another matter, which I have raised in the house before and which really gets on my goat — that is, drivers who decide, quite arbitrarily and unilaterally, that a speed limit is way too high. We might be in a 100-kilometre-an-hour zone with one lane of traffic going each way. Some people decide that it should not be a 100-kilometre-an-hour zone, so they drive at 60 kilometres an hour, and everybody behind them is forced to drive at 60, unless of course one person gets sick of driving at 60 and attempts to get around the lead car and continue on up the road at 100 kilometres an hour.

That leads to others doing the same thing, and such situations can lead

to what can only be described as people doing things — although quite often they would not — that are quite stupid and very dangerous. People who take it into their own hands to lower the speed limit and get in front of a queue of sometimes hundreds of cars are a grave danger on our roads. I know that that is against the law and is regarded, quite rightly in my view, as dangerous driving.

I also note that roads in some outer suburban areas — and I am sure, Acting President, you would be aware of some of the areas I am talking about — used to be country roads but are not any more. Those roads now provide an avenue for vehicles that would never have been contemplated when the roads were built. These are areas that are particularly possessed by these menaces on the road, and I hope the police at some stage conduct some sort of charge — a blitz — against these people, who cause great frustration, great annoyance and, I believe, a great deal of danger on our roads.

It is incumbent upon each and every one of us as we get behind the wheel of a car to be mindful of our own safety as well as the safety of other people. It is absolutely crucial that we do that. We should not accept having a drivers licence as a right; it is not a right, and we should all know that a drivers licence can be taken from us if we have lost the confidence of the police and other drivers. I ask the house to give this bill speedy progress.

**COUNCIL | Second Reading
29 November 2012**

Police Regulation Amendment Bill 2012

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise this afternoon to support the Police Regulation Amendment Bill 2012. I heard Mr Eideh making references to what the minister may or may not do and there was, it has to be said, a fair bit of exaggeration involved in his contribution — not just exaggeration but a good deal of imagination as well. I commend him, because I think at this stage on a Thursday afternoon it would be easy to become a little weary and a little jaded.

It was good to have Mr Eideh getting up this afternoon and using his

imagination in the way he did, talking about what Daniel Andrews, the Leader of the Opposition and member for Mulgrave in the Assembly, would do in government — as if we are ever going to find out. That is not going to happen. As if Daniel Andrews is ever going to get the opportunity to do anything in government! Give it a rest! Fair dinkum! He comes in here on a Thursday afternoon having a lend of us — that is what he is doing here this afternoon, having a lend of us. I have come here to talk about the Police Regulation Amendment Bill.

Mr Leane interjected.

Mr FINN — I have come here, Mr Leane, to talk about the Police Regulation Amendment Bill, and Mr Eideh has come in here spinning tales and fanciful yarns about what might happen in the magical world of a Daniel Andrews government.

God help us all if that were to happen, but that is not something that we need worry about in any way, shape or form.

Acting President, I heard very early in this debate Mr Pakula, on his hindquarters over there, asking the question, 'What is the difference between now and 2008 with regard to the Chief Commissioner of Police?' I would have thought to even the most nonchalant of observers the answer to that question would have been extremely obvious. Now we have a good Chief Commissioner of Police; now we have a Chief Commissioner of Police who knows policing and understands what is going on in the streets of Melbourne and in the country areas of Victoria. He knows policing because he is a policeman — a copper. Ken Lay has spent his entire life coming up through the ranks of the police force. He knows law enforcement. We had not had that for some time before the appointment of Ken Lay, first as acting police commissioner and then as a permanent Chief Commissioner of Police.

Members of this house who have been here for a few years would have heard me speaking at some length about the deficiencies of previous chief commissioners, in particular Chief Commissioner Christine Nixon, who one would have to say was an unmitigated disaster not only for Victoria Police but for law enforcement in this state. She allowed Victoria Police to fall into a state of disrepair from which I suggest it will take some years to recover. Her term as chief commissioner left Victoria Police as an organisation that had its morale shot to pieces. It was an

organisation that did not quite know where it was.

We well remember lawlessness running riot on the streets of Melbourne. At that time the then chief commissioner, Chief Commissioner Nixon, told us everything was just fine. I remember gangs running riot on the streets of Melbourne; I was a representative of the western suburbs. In fact I was reminiscing yesterday with Les Twentymen about this. Almost 20 years ago we were discussing what was going on with gangs in the western suburbs. In those days we worked with Vin Heffernan, the then Minister responsible for Youth Affairs. Vin did a great job — the late Vin Heffernan, God rest his soul. He was a sensational minister, and then tragically we had the change of government in 1999 and the appointment of Christine Nixon as Chief Commissioner of Police.

All of a sudden everything was coming up roses. According to the then Chief Commissioner Nixon, we had a situation where apparently all the crime was in the police force. That seemed to be her view. We well remember at her first press conference as Chief Commissioner of Police she said that she believed the Victorian police force was as corrupt as the one that she had come from in New South Wales.

That is an outrageous suggestion from anybody, but coming from a Chief Commissioner of Police it was a real kick in the guts to every police officer in this state. That was the assumption — the prejudgement — that she had made about Victoria Police, of which she was chief commissioner, and that is what she worked on. It seemed that she did not really care about what was going on in the streets of Melbourne or in the country areas of Victoria. She was more concerned about the internal politics of Victoria Police. I well remember, as I said earlier, gangs running riot through the streets of St Albans, Sunshine and Footscray. I well remember Chief Commissioner Nixon going on radio: 'No gangs', she said.

Hon. R. A. Dalla-Riva interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Dalla-Riva is spot-on the money. 'No gangs', she said.

In fact I recall her speaking to Neil Mitchell on 3AW. She said, 'I wouldn't even utter the G word' — the G word being gangs. They were the ruffians, the no-hopers, the lawless thugs who were roaming the streets and causing no end of mayhem from one end of the west to the other.

Mr Leane interjected.

Mr FINN — If Mr Leane has some doubts — —

Mr Leane — It hasn't stopped.

Mr FINN — It has not as yet, but it will. Things have got considerably better since Ken Lay took over. As I said, he is a real copper and he knows what law enforcement is about. But way back then we had a Chief Commissioner of Police in this state who refused to accept that there was a problem at all.

I knew there was a problem, because I had been out there and I had seen it. I had sat there, I had stood there and from time to time I had actually escaped it. I knew what was going on, but Chief Commissioner Nixon was far more interested in what was going on down the corridor in the head office of Victoria Police — who was backstabbing whom, who was spreading rumours and who was speaking to which journalist and all the sort of nonsense and internal politics that engulfed Victoria Police during the Nixon reign.

We have seen since the quality that Ms Nixon brought to the Victorian police force exposed for the world to see by her performance on Black Saturday, including where she was and what she was doing as Victoria burnt. That is something that I think is to her eternal shame, and it exposed her many faults much later than should have been the case.

Then of course Ms Nixon retired and the Victoria Police members celebrated from one end of Victoria to the other. I think it would be safe so say there were a good number of parties.

Mr Scheffer interjected.

Mr FINN — Perhaps not all of them, but those who actually knew the caper did celebrate. Let me tell you, they celebrated. We all know that the police know how to celebrate, and they celebrated — my word they did.

Hon. R. A. Dalla-Riva interjected.

Mr FINN — That is what they said. They were ecstatic.

They thought, 'At last we will have a chief commissioner who cares about policing, who cares about the Victorian police force and who cares about law enforcement and law and order in this state.' And who did they get? It is extraordinary. The previous government in this state had for years had a chief commissioner who did not have a clue what she was doing and was far more interested in the internal politics of the police force than law enforcement. She left, and who did they appoint?

Ms Pennicuik — On a point of order, Acting President, I think the speaker has strayed from the purposes of the bill.

Mr FINN — On the point of order, Acting President, if Ms Pennicuik is referring to the matter of relevance, as I think she may be, the fact is that there is a clear reference to the Chief Commissioner of Police in the explanatory memorandum of the bill.

There are many references throughout this to the chief commissioner, so I am just establishing the historical — —

Ms Pennicuik — On a point of order, Acting President — —

Mr FINN — You cannot take a point of order while you have already got a point of order under discussion.

An honourable member — Stop the clock!

Mr FINN — Indeed, stop the clock, please, if that is possible. What I am doing is in fact revisiting the recent history, not the long-term history, of chief commissioners in this state, to establish — —

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ondarchie) — Order! Mr Finn has made his response to the point of order. I acknowledge that.

I do not think there is a point of order here, but I ask Mr Finn to come back closer to the bill.

Mr FINN — I will think about it. I will have to think on my feet about that. The point that I am trying to make, and I think I have made the point to a certain degree — I was responding to a question that Mr Pakula had asked in his opening speech on this bill — is that the Chief Commissioner of Police in this state is the best chief commissioner that we have had for some years. That is why we can have confidence in him and we can have confidence in his judgement and his ability to lead Victoria Police.

Hon. M. P. Pakula interjected.

Mr FINN — Mr Pakula thinks that is an amazing proposition.

I cannot begin to imagine why it is an amazing proposition for Mr Pakula, because I find that the current Chief Commissioner of Police is doing a damn good job. If Mr Pakula does not believe me, he should go out and see the numbers of police on the streets. We have not seen those numbers before.

Hon. M. P. Pakula — On a point of order, Acting President, I do not want Mr Finn to mislead the house either in his own contribution or about what I might have said. Is Mr Finn proposing

or suggesting that legislative powers should be different dependent on who the office-holder is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ondarchie) — Order! That is not a point of order. Mr Finn can continue.

Mr Leane — On a point of order, Acting President, I bring to your attention the President's comments just before lunch about individuals in here not channelling nasty shock jocks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr Ondarchie) — Order! Thank you, Mr Leane. Mr Finn can continue in the 2 minutes he has left.

Mr FINN — I assure you, Acting President, there is nothing shocking about my jocks!

I make the point that what we have now in this state is a chief commissioner who has Victoria Police heading in the right direction. This legislation will support him and will support the members of the police force, who I have complete and total admiration for. These are men and women who put themselves on the line for us every day and every night.

These are men and women who when they leave for work every morning, or every night, do not know whether they are going to come back. They actually put themselves in physical danger. When we leave home, whenever it may be, we believe we have a fair chance of making it back home again. There are no guarantees with members of our police force because they are committed to protecting us and our families and they put themselves on the line in order to do that.

I know every member of the government totally supports our police and the work they do. It is important that members of the Victoria Police force are made aware that we respect what they do, we appreciate what they do, we know that they are doing their job to the best of their ability and if it were not for them, this state would be in a right old mess — indeed we would all be in a right old mess. I ask the house to support this bill, and again I salute the men and women of Victoria Police.

East-west link: opposition policy

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise in the hope that the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, Mr Lenders, may take time out from his busy schedule of defending the \$2 million per day wasted on Labor's desalination plant to explain an issue that has come to my mind. The issue concerns exactly where his party stands on the subject of the east-west link. This issue, in my view, is crucial. I am a very strong supporter of the east-west link. I thought Labor was with us in times gone by. I thought the Labor Party was very supportive of this proposal — —

Mr Barber interjected.

Mr FINN — Until a few votes were needed from a formerly safe inner city constituency during the by-election for the Assembly seat of Melbourne, and I am sure Mr Barber will never forget the Melbourne by-election. All of a sudden Labor was dead against this vital project. It used that policy to ruin the Greens' cupcake party, and I am sure the good burghers of Carlton and North Fitzroy were sure that Labor was violently opposed to this road, until yesterday. Then I heard the shadow minister for major projects and infrastructure, the member for Tarneit in the other place, Tim Pallas, on the radio telling the government, 'Get ahead and build it; go on, you have got to build this thing, we cannot get this thing built quickly enough.' That is where my confusion arises. Is the Labor Party for or against this project? It seems that for the Labor Party 2012 ends where it started — it is clueless and without any idea at all.

Royal Yacht Club of Victoria: world disabled sailing championship

*Raised with the Minister for Tourism
and Major Events on 6 June 2012*

REPLY:

I refer to the matter raised by Mr Bernie Finn, Member for Western Metropolitan, on 6 June 2012,

regarding the opportunity for the Royal Yacht Club of Victoria to host the International Association for Disabled Sailing world championships in 2015.

I have recently met with the events organising committee and informed them that the event needs to meet the criteria for an allocation from the Major Events Fund.

The criteria for consideration includes the number of attendees from interstate and overseas; the amount of interstate and international broadcast coverage; branding, tourism and employment opportunities for Victoria; and future event acquisition opportunities as a result of hosting the event.

I note that Yachting Victoria, as part of the State Government funding it receives for the staging of the International Sailing Federation Sailing World Cup, will actively promote the event in the lead-up to 2015.

Also, Hobsons Bay City Council has also indicated that it is supportive of developing an appropriate event support package, including sponsorship and in kind support to assist with the staging of the event.

COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply) 11 December 2012

Tourism: Woodlands Park

Raised with the Minister for Tourism and Major Events on 28 November 2012

REPLY:

I refer to the matter raised by Mr Bernie Finn, Member for Western Metropolitan on 28 November 2012, regarding the kangaroos which are located in Woodlands Park, near Melbourne Airport.

Victoria has a unique range of flora and fauna, which form an important part of the visitor experience. In this context, visitors may engage with native wildlife in a range of locations including Victorian Zoos and wildlife sanctuaries, and in their natural habitat.

With regard to access to the kangaroos at Woodlands Park from Melbourne Airport, the relevant bodies are Parks Victoria and the airport itself.

In response to you raising this matter, I will write to both the airport and to Parks Victoria conveying your adjournment matter.

COUNCIL | Questions without Notice 12 December 2012

Federal Minister for Health: Victorian visits

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Health, and I ask: is the minister aware of visits to Victorian health services by the federal Minister for Health, Tanya Plibersek, and would he explain the purpose of such visits?

Hon. D. M. DAVIS (Minister for Health) — I thank Mr Finn for his question and for his strong advocacy for Western Health, and I note Western Health is another health service that faces a significant cut under the federal arrangements — of the order of \$6.5 million. However, as members in the chamber will understand, funding for our health services comes from a number of sources, some private, but mostly government money now paid through a pool.

Some federal money goes into the system and some state money goes into the system. The state amount is overwhelmingly greater and growing as time goes on. The most recent Australian Institute of Health and Welfare figures show that the federal contribution to our health services fell from 42 to 39 per cent.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — The last AIHW figures show the federal component fell from 42 to 39 per cent — the most recent AIHW figures show that. Let me be quite clear with Mr Finn, though, the federal health minister is visiting Victoria today and I welcome that visit. I am hopeful that she has in her pocket a cheque for \$107 million, which would plug the hole created in the system.

Mr Jennings — On a point of order, Deputy President, I just want to go back to the question that Mr Finn asked and ask whether it is within the competence of a state minister to attribute the purpose of the visit of a federal minister to Victorian health services? I thought the question was not within the competence of the Victorian minister to answer in the first place, and his answer is amply demonstrating that that is true.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I will not uphold the point of order, although I think there are some issues associated with asking a minister

what might be in the mind or intent of a minister in another jurisdiction. With regard to that, I suggest that the minister needs to be cognisant of his obligation to be responsive in relation to state administration.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — As I was explaining, the system is jointly funded — —

Mr Jennings — On a further point of order, Deputy President.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I advise Mr Jennings that I have ruled on the point of order and ask if this is a further point of order.

Mr Jennings — On a further point of order, Deputy President, and it does relate to that matter in that if the member had asked the Victorian minister what was in his mind, then I suggest that you would have ruled the question out of order, because the minister's opinion is not relevant and should not be asked for in this place. Therefore I cannot see how on earth a member in this chamber can ask a Victorian minister what is on the mind of a federal minister, given that they cannot even ask what is on the mind of the minister in question.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — On the point of order, Deputy President, the minister has written an article in the Geelong newspaper today outlining the purposes of her visit, and I am relying on the published reports and what I understand was the result of a meeting today. I think when the federal minister met with officials at Barwon Health today, they were hopeful she would have \$4.9 million to plug the hole.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I advise the minister that that is not on the point of order. That was just debating the point.

I will not uphold the point of order on the basis that I do not think it was asking for the minister's opinion, although I agree it was close. There is a prior ruling from President Gould in 2004 which may be of assistance.

In relation to a matter raised about a federal government policy or issue, she ruled that so long as the answer was related to the effects of federal policy on Victoria and was within the bounds of the minister's portfolio responsibilities, it was in order.

I think my earlier ruling on the member's first point of order was to give the minister advice that he should stick within those grounds, and having now been advised of the previous ruling I continue to be confident of that position. Therefore my ruling on Mr Jennings's first and second points of order is that whilst

I acknowledge there is some validity in the concerns he raised, so long as the minister stays within the bounds of his portfolio administration, then I will allow the question.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — The federal Minister for Health has visited Geelong today and met with officials at Barwon Health. While I do not have a report on that as such, I am aware that no additional funding was provided. Hopes were dashed at Barwon Health, and I think people in the community of Geelong and region will be very unhappy that the federal minister was not carrying a \$4.9 million cheque.

The federal minister is also to attend a meeting of board chairs, and at that meeting she will be asked very directly about the cuts visited on Victorian health services halfway through the financial year. One of the purposes of the new system was to provide — in the words of the secretary of the federal Treasury — a stable and secure basis for funding and to provide budget certainty. Let me be quite clear, this is a cut halfway through the financial year to the health services budget, because the amount going into the pool from the federal government will impact directly on budget certainty and predictability.

The money paid into the pool by the federal and state governments sets the parameters for the pool. If the federal government cuts the funding to the pool, there is less money — and you cannot get blood out of a stone. You cannot squeeze more than is there. That might be a Labor approach to economics and to budgeting, that you just keep spending, even though the amount coming in has fallen short. I know it is the federal government's approach; it has never returned a budget surplus. I know Mr Parkinson will be working hard to deliver a surplus as the new federal Secretary of the Department of Treasury. I hope he does it, but I know he is like a man grasping at straws.

Mr Jennings — On a point of order, Deputy President, I draw to your attention that you have created for the minister an opportunity to answer his question in accordance with his responsibilities and the effects of the Victorian health system, and he is now talking about the capacity of the Secretary of the Department of Treasury in Canberra to deliver a surplus.

I do not think he has kept within the guidelines that you have created for him.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! I uphold the point of order. I gave the minister some guidance in relation to how he should answer a question that was seeking his opinion about a minister in another jurisdiction and what might be in their mind. Whilst I thought the question was on the edge, I allowed it but gave the minister some guidance as to how he should answer it. I might also add that I believe he is verging on debating the question and that is invoking interjections, so if we are going to have order for the remaining 30 seconds of the minister's response, I suggest he cease debating the question and answer it specifically in relation to the guidance I gave him in relation to this question.

Hon. D. M. DAVIS — Deputy President, I thank you; I did stray just a little bit there.

I will return to what I think was the purpose of Mr Finn's question, which was to seek information about what the federal minister might be doing in Victoria. As I said, she is to meet with board chairs following a letter that was sent to the Prime Minister by board chairs that sought the intervention of the Prime Minister to turn these cuts around and to stop them. I hope the message comes through to the federal minister loud and clear at that meeting that the impact on our boards, whether it be Bendigo — —

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT — Order! The member's time has expired.

**COUNCIL | Statements on Reports
12 December 2012**

Office of the Child Safety Commissioner: report 2011-12

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I rise this afternoon to speak on the 2011-12 annual report of the Office of the Child Safety Commissioner. As I read this report I felt considerably conflicted, because whilst there are many good things being done by the child safety commissioner, you have to wonder what sort of a world we live in when all these things are necessary; you have to wonder why we need a child safety commissioner. I was fortunate enough to grow up in a loving and caring family, and I would like to think that I have a loving and caring family at home as well.

It makes those of us who are in that situation wonder what is going on out there in what appears to be another world. It is a world apart from the one in which I exist.

It is very distressing reading, I have to say, knowing what is behind many of the initiatives in this report.

I know from working with Les Twentyman — who I have known for a couple of decades now, if not a little bit longer — that some dreadful things are happening in society. I believe we will be judged as a society by how we treat the elderly, the vulnerable and in particular our children. As a father who loves his children more than anything else on this earth, I can say that when we see children under attack in the way they are in this day and age there is something severely wrong with our society.

I commend Bernie Geary, the child safety commissioner, who is totally passionate and committed to getting the best possible result for the area in which he is involved. I commend him as a fine and outstanding servant of the people of Victoria. He is somebody who really wants to make a difference. I wish that more people in similar positions to his had the same enthusiasm, commitment and dedication for what they are doing.

He says in the report:

'Victorian children, seen and heard', has been the vision of the Office of the Child Safety Commissioner since its inception in 2005.

That is a pretty good mission statement. You do not dismiss children. Kids matter, and their futures matter. If they have a great future, then we will have a great future and we will have a great society. We are all getting old. Let us face it — those children who we may not be treating now as well as we should are going to have a say in a few years as to how we are treated. If we do not do the right thing by them, can we really expect them to turn around and look after us? I do not think so.

Apart from anything else, we have a vested interest, I suggest, in ensuring that children are looked after.

Another point Mr Geary makes in his opening comments is:

Child protection, youth justice and out-of-home care systems cannot bear the whole weight of community fragility all on their own. They need backup from the rest of the community.

That is so very true. We, as individuals and as a community,

have a responsibility to ensure that we look after children; we have a responsibility to stand up if we see children being mistreated; and we have a responsibility to report such mistreatment if we believe it is happening. It is not good enough for us to say, 'It is none of our business. They are other people's children and they will look after them.' Children are not shackles. They are human beings with the same rights as you, Acting President, and me. But when they are unfortunately unable, in many instances, to stand up for those rights then we have a responsibility to stand up for them.

I could talk on this subject for quite some time, but my time to make a contribution is finishing. I commend Bernie Geary once again. I suggest to members of this house that they have a good read of this report; it is a particularly good one.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment (Reply)
12 December 2012**

Craigieburn-Hanson roads, Craigieburn: traffic lights

Raised with the Minister for Roads on 14 November 2012

REPLY:

VicRoads is working with the Growth Areas Authority and the Department of Transport to investigate longer term plans to duplicate Craigieburn Road between Hanson Road and Waterview Boulevard. VicRoads will consider possible improvements to the Craigieburn Road-Hanson Road

intersection as part of the duplication proposal.

VicRoads will continue to monitor the operation and safety of this intersection, to identify any possible short-term improvements.

**COUNCIL | Adjournment
13 December 2012**

Health: western suburbs

Mr FINN (Western Metropolitan) — I wish to raise a matter for the attention of the Minister for Health. The minister would be aware that in the six years I have been in this place I have on a number of occasions raised the issue of the neglect of health services in the western suburbs by Labor governments. I have spoken about the dental service based in Footscray that has suffered under Labor's neglect for many years. I have visited the Western Hospital in Footscray, and I have reported to the house just how badly that hospital needs a refit to say the very least. I have spoken about the need for paediatric services in an area that has a huge number of families, which obviously include children, and so the need there for paediatric services is very strong.

I have also spoken about the carbon tax that will hit hospitals throughout the western suburbs. Indeed, it is hitting hospitals throughout Australia.

Mrs Peulich — It's a Christmas gift from the Greens!

Mr FINN — It is a Christmas gift from the Greens; that is exactly right. The Grinch over there is smiling as he takes money out of the pockets of sick people throughout the western suburbs.

We have seen growth in the west over the last five or six years, and the services provided have really been struggling to keep up with the demands of a booming population. I have been staggered and absolutely amazed to see the federal Labor government slashing health funding for services that are already struggling, scrimping, saving and pulling every which way just to keep going.

This is hurting many newly arrived migrants and many asylum seekers who find themselves in the western suburbs; it is hurting the unemployed; it is hurting the battlers of the western suburbs; and of course it is hurting Labor's much-beloved working families, although we do not hear Labor talking about them much anymore.

I ask the minister to assure the people of the west that he will stand up for their needs, both in and against Canberra, and that he will defend and extend the health services we need in Melbourne's west. I ask the minister to give that assurance in the knowledge that the people of the west are deeply concerned at this time about what will happen to the health services they so desperately need.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr FINN — I do not think Bill Shorten, the member for the federal seat of Maribyrnong and Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations, gets out there much, so he probably would not know.

I also take this opportunity to wish the President, members, and staff of this Parliament and their families all the very best for a happy and safe Christmas, so they can come back to see us all in 2013 for another exciting and fun-packed year.



FINN IN THE HOUSE

Speeches August 2012 to December 2012



Published by Bernie Finn MP

Member for Western Metropolitan Region
Acting President of the Legislative Council
Chairman, Joint Parliamentary Electoral Matters Committee

277 Hampshire Road, Sunshine Victoria 3020
Telephone (03) 9312 1212 • Fax (03) 9312 4598
Email bernie.finn@parliament.vic.gov.au
Web www.berniefinn.com