

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES (HANSARD)

Second Session of the Forty-Third Parliament (1978)

Parliament, which adjourned on 22 March 1978, was prorogued by proclamation dated 27 April. By proclamation dated 25 May, it was summoned to meet on Thursday 13 July, and the Second Session began on that date.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 13 July 1978

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at noon.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mr. J. W. Hull) read the proclamation by His Excellency the Governor (Mr. K. D. Seaman) summoning Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

His Excellency the Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the Bar of the Council Chamber and by him conducted to the Chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the Chamber in obedience to his summons, His Excellency read the Opening Speech as follows:

Honourable members of the Legislative Council and members of the House of Assembly:

1. I have called you together for the dispatch of business.

2. Since you were last called together the State has suffered a sad loss in consequence of the death of a distinguished former member and President of the Legislative Council. I refer to the passing of the Hon. Frank Potter, who was elected to the Legislative Council in 1959 and became President in 1975. I feel sure that you will join me in recording our appreciation of the services rendered by the Hon. Frank Potter to the State and in expressing our sympathy to his family.

3. The autumn and early winter season has seen the breaking of the disastrous drought which had affected all areas of the State for three successive seasons. While follow-up rains are required during the rest of the winter, especially in the far west of the State and in the Mallee, the outlook for cereal production is the brightest for several years. Drought relief measures have concentrated upon the provision of low interest finance to primary producers so that restocking and sowing can proceed rapidly, thus ensuring a quick response to the improved seasonal conditions.

4. In reviewing the general position of the State, my Government continues to express its concern and disappointment at the depressed level of activity in the national economy, which is being reflected in our own State. The unacceptably high levels of unemployment which have been caused by this recession in the national economy continue to be a major concern of my Government. No less compelling than the constraints imposed by the conditions of the national economy are the restrictions in funding being imposed by the Commonwealth Government. Since the last session of Parliament there has been a significant curtailment in the availability of funds from the Commonwealth Government to this State. Recent announcements by the Commonwealth Government have considerably worsened the situation. It is the belief of my Government that the severe course being followed by the Commonwealth Government in relation to State programmes and activities will serve only to accentuate the difficulties being experienced in the economy, and to make even more pressing the hardship being faced by many thousands of families in this State in their attempt to cope with continued unemployment. The severity of the constraints imposed by the Commonwealth in the field of State funding is highlighted by the fact that in the past two years the Loan programme available to this State has been subject to rates of growth less than the level

of inflation, while in the forthcoming year the Loan programme is to be kept to the same dollar amount as in the year 1977-78. This means a considerable reduction in real terms. The extreme course being followed by the Commonwealth means that it is necessary for my Government to revise planned capital expenditure. The Commonwealth has also announced its intention to cut its expenditure in specific areas. In these areas the funds available nationally will be severely diminished in comparison with those provided for the previous year. Among areas affected are the hospital development programme, the school dental scheme, water resources, welfare housing, community health programmes, urban public transport, and childhood services. Thus, this State not only has less loan raising capacity than expected; it must also face the prospect of less Commonwealth money for specific programmes, including programmes started at Commonwealth initiative. Against this background, my Government is carefully examining programme priorities and commitments, recognising that many programmes are already in train and that recurrent expenditures commit a substantial proportion of State finances each year. It is inevitable that, in the situation now being imposed by the Commonwealth Government, some programmes will be eroded and others may fail. In consequence, in some areas of its administration, my Government will be unable to extend Government activities to respond to community demands, and it may even be prevented from maintaining services at a level adequate to community needs.

5. In the last financial year, my Government appropriated \$22 000 000 for the State Unemployment Relief Scheme to provide employment for those thrown out of work by the economic situation. As a result, approximately 9 000 persons who would otherwise have been unemployed obtained employment for varying periods, and support was able to be given to many local projects throughout the State. My Government regrets that, in the face of persistent refusal by the Commonwealth Government to assist this State with its unemployment relief schemes, and of the restriction of funding generally, it must reduce its programme to a level of \$7 000 000 in this financial year.

6. My Government will continue its efforts to encourage and assist the industrial development of South Australia. The South Australian Development Corporation will make financial assistance available to industrial and commercial enterprises where needed and where viability can be demonstrated. The South Australian Housing Trust will continue to provide industrial land and factories for lease. Assistance will continue to be given to small businesses through the Small Business Advisory Unit established in the Economic Development Department. My Government will continue to improve arrangements to assist local enterprises to take advantage of opportunities for overseas trade in their products, and for participation in development projects in other countries. Legislation will be presented for the establishment of a Hotels Commission to assist in the further development of the accommodation industry in this State.

7. New projects to enhance the State's energy supplies are now in progress. Work has commenced on the new Northern Power Station at Port Augusta and contracts totalling approximately \$95 000 000 have been let. This major development will provide employment for over 500 people in the northern region of the State. Three gas turbo-generators, each of 25 000 kilowatts capacity, are being installed at Snuggery in the South-East. Considerable progress has been achieved recently in relation to the exploitation of the Cooper Basin hydro-carbon deposits. The exploration programme was expanded in 1977, and

the expanded level of activity will be maintained during the current year. The Mines and Energy Department has attempted to generate interest in the exploration of other areas by drilling a series of stratigraphic wells.

8. My Government looks forward confidently to a rapid increase in the profitability of primary industry following the long-awaited improvement in seasonal conditions. The need for quick action to restore areas of soil eroded during the drought will receive attention in amendments to the Soil Conservation Act that are to be introduced during the forthcoming session. Legislation designed to accelerate payment to barleygrowers, to govern trading in seeds, and to regulate abattoirs will also be introduced. While it is disappointing that consensus has not yet been achieved on a national scheme for the marketing of dairy products, the dairy industry in this State has shown great initiative in supporting proposed new legislation to set up a State Dairy Marketing Authority.

9. Welfare housing is another area where severe curtailment of funds from the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is proposed. In this area the Commonwealth provided only a small increase in 1977-78, after keeping constant the provision in the previous two years. However, in 1978-79 it proposes to cut this amount by \$60 000 000. Despite the restrictions placed on it by the limited availability of funds from the Commonwealth Government, my Government will continue to place considerable emphasis on the provision of attractive housing at costs which can be afforded by the average citizen of this State. Special arrangements and allocations of funds have been made to sustain the role of the major institutions in this area. Every endeavour is being made to assist the building and construction industry to weather the difficult times brought on by national economic circumstances. The Land Commission now holds a sufficient stock of allotments in the outer urban areas to provide a secure basis for orderly development and an ability to respond quickly to any upturn in the economy, while avoiding the adverse effects on land prices seen in previous times of rapid expansion of the market. My Government is proposing to introduce a major revision of the planning law of this State. Legislation will also be introduced to establish a development trust to oversee and manage the completion of the harbor works at North Haven.

10. The provisions of the South Australian Health Commission Act are being brought progressively into operation. The commission assumed the responsibilities of the former Public Health Department earlier this year and began to take over the functions of the Hospitals Department from 1 July. Health is an area which is facing considerable cutbacks in funding from the Commonwealth. The hospital development programme, which last year provided \$5 120 000 to this State, has been abolished completely. Community health programmes have also been reduced from the amount available nationally of \$73 300 000 in 1977-78 to \$52 600 000 in 1978-79. In addition, the Commonwealth has revised the 75/25 sharing formula for recurrent funding to a 50/50 formula. Major additions to the Modbury and Glenside Hospitals have been progressing, but the Commonwealth reductions will mean that further work on hospital development projects will need to be reviewed. Similarly, projects in the community health programme may also be affected. The dental health programme has made considerable progress. However, in this area also the Commonwealth is reducing its allocation of funds from \$24 500 000 nationally in 1977-78 to a proposed \$19 300 000 this financial year.

11. Particular attention will continue to be paid to matters arising in the area of community development. My

Government is considering proposals arising from the Inquiry into Community Development and Assistance relating particularly to the role of the many organisations involved in community development activities.

12. My Government is proceeding to improve the area and standard of conservation and other parks in this State. It is proposed that work will proceed on the establishment of additional trusts under the recent amendment to the National Parks and Wildlife Act. One such trust will pursue a programme to develop the unique Cleland Conservation Park to high standards. Similarly, a second trust will provide for the development of the several large recreation parks adjacent to the metropolitan area which meet the recreational needs of a very large number of residents in Adelaide. My Government is committed to upgrading the Environment Department and in particular to assisting with the formulation of policies and the co-ordination of programmes to protect and enhance the quality of the environment in South Australia. The new Co-ordination and Policy Division has been established in the department to strengthen this endeavour. My Government will pursue its general aim of preserving and enhancing buildings and structures of architectural and historic interest for the enjoyment of present and future generations. Work is also proceeding on proposals to make adequate provision for off-road recreation vehicles so that people involved in these sports may pursue them in defined areas, thus minimising damage to the environment.

13. The Commonwealth Government has indicated that it will not keep the commitment of the previous Government to fund fully the metropolitan water treatment programme and will provide only \$4 300 000 in 1978-79 for this important project. My Government has had to allocate an equal amount of State funds in order to maintain this programme. The Anstey Hill water treatment works will be completed next year and work on the Barossa water treatment works has started. But the lower level of funding by the Commonwealth will still mean a significant delay in the provision of filtered water to all of the people of Adelaide. My Government has taken major initiatives to obtain the co-operation of the New South Wales and Victorian Governments in dealing positively with salinity problems in the Murray River and a start will be made in the coming year on works to control salinity.

14. Further amendments to the Local Government Act designed to bring it into a more appropriate form for modern needs will be introduced.

15. My Government continues to attach considerable importance to the voluntary introduction of appropriate schemes of industrial democracy. As was shown impressively at the International Conference on Industrial Democracy held recently in Adelaide, great benefits to industrial harmony and productive output may be achieved through the humanisation of the work place by a change in industrial attitudes. My Government's approach is to facilitate such developments, not to prescribe them, to remove barriers which otherwise might stand in the way of changes which are being found beneficial in other parts of the world.

16. During the forthcoming Parliamentary session my Government will introduce substantial amendments to the Public Service Act, designed to enable the continued development of modern management practices within the Public Service. Some of these measures will also have the purpose of facilitating the further development of industrial democracy within departments.

17. My Government is proceeding with its policy of promoting the arts in this State. Regional cultural centre

trusts have recently been established in Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, and Whyalla. These trusts are charged with the duty of fostering cultural life within their respective sub-regions, and providing or improving facilities to be used for artistic or cultural purposes.

18. My Government continues to place considerable emphasis on programmes designed to improve the quality of public transport. Despite its election promise to spend \$60 000 000 in each year over the next five years, the Commonwealth has limited funds for urban public transport for 1978-79 to \$40 000 000 nationally. This severe reduction in funding will necessitate a close review of the State's transport programmes. My Government will, however, continue with its programme at a level commensurate with the reduced availability of finance. Orders have been placed for 377 new buses. As at 30 June 1978, 197 had been delivered. In addition, tenders have been called for a further 100 buses to replace the former private buses which are used to service areas in the Adelaide Hills and in the country. A new bus depot has been opened recently at Aldgate, and it is hoped that the depot proposed for Lonsdale will be completed by the end of 1979. Work on a major new workshop and depot at Regency Park, servicing buses, trams and railway rolling stock, is expected to commence soon. The Christie Downs railway extension was completed recently, and work on the Noarlunga railway station and associated facilities is expected to be completed in the coming year. Substantial projects relating to the purchase or rolling stock and the improvement of railways and the Glenelg tramway are in hand. My Government expects to spend about \$97 000 000 in the present financial year in extending and improving the State's road network. Portion of this sum will be applied towards upgrading the ferry services operated by the Highways Department and in renovating the *Troubridge*. The current programme for the decentralisation of the Motor Vehicles Department has recently been completed with the opening of the seventeenth branch office. Following extensive study and consultation, proposals for provision of public transport to the north-east of the metropolitan area have been received by my Government, and a decision on the route has been made. Environmental impact assessments are now being carried out.

19. The Legal Services Commission, which will embrace the legal aid services currently provided by the Australian Legal Aid Office and the Law Society of South Australia, will begin to provide services to the public in the final quarter of this year. It is hoped that the commission will proceed to establish offices in suburban and larger country centres during 1979.

20. My Government has recently established a Women's Switchboard to provide information and assistance directed primarily to the problems of women in the community. By promoting projects of this kind, my Government hopes further to overcome disadvantages suffered by women in various areas of activity.

21. My Government accords a high priority to the enlightened treatment of offenders. In the forthcoming session of Parliament, legislation will be proposed to give effect to proposals of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee on this subject. This legislation will widen the range of sentencing alternatives available to the courts and at the same time improve arrangements for the treatment of adult offenders.

22. Education is a field in which the financial constraints imposed by the Commonwealth Government are having a heavy impact. Notwithstanding the severe reductions in Commonwealth funding, substantial progress has been made towards my Government's policy

objective of providing universal pre-school education to children from the age of four years. In 1977-78, the Commonwealth provided \$44 000 000 nationally, but in 1978-79 it will provide only \$32 750 000. My Government will introduce legislation in the forthcoming session of Parliament giving effect to the recommendations of the Anderson Committee of Inquiry into Post-Secondary Education. This will involve the amalgamation of the Kingston College of Advanced Education with the Murray Park College of Advanced Education, and of the Adelaide College of Advanced Education with the Torrens College of Advanced Education. Certain other recommendations for rationalising and co-ordinating tertiary education in this State will also be implemented.

23. The initiative taken by my Government last year in providing a sum of nearly \$1 000 000 for the establishment of public libraries in the western suburbs of Adelaide has had substantial results. All the councils in this area have agreed to co-operate in providing the new services. Ten new libraries will open in the western suburbs and a further 150 000 people will have, for the first time, ready access to a public library.

24. Within the near future it is hoped to present legislation to vest inalienable freehold rights to their land in the Pitjantjatjara peoples. These provisions, which will modify existing arrangements for the control of Aboriginal lands, will mark a further important stage of progress in the advancement of the Aboriginal peoples of this State.

Members of the House of Assembly:

25. In due course the Estimates of Expenditure will be laid before you in the usual way.

Honourable members of the Legislative Council and members of the House of Assembly:

26. My Government intends to lay before you a substantial legislative programme. Included in this programme will be measures dealing with the Art Gallery, the South Australian Theatre Company, the State Bank, the Boating Act, the Harbors Act, the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act, the Public Works Standing Committee, the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, the Mines and Works Inspection Act, urban land price control, psychological practices, the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, the Highways Act, the Levi Park Act, the Road Traffic Act, the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act, the Keith Sheridan Institute, the Kindergarten Union, wheat industry stabilisation, employees registry offices, lifts and cranes, children's protection and young offenders, consumer product safety, criminal law and procedure, evidence, incorporated associations, land and business agents, contractual capacity of infants, occupiers, liability, secondhand motor vehicles and secondhand goods.

27. I now declare this session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the people of this State.

The Governor retired from the Chamber, and the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly withdrew.

The President again took the Chair and read prayers.

[Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15 p.m.]

PETITIONS: MINORS BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 239 residents of South Australia, praying that:

- (a) good relationships between parents and their children are as important as medical treatment,

(b) parents have a right to be involved in consent to medical and dental treatment of their children,

(c) children need the protection that parents can offer,

(d) emergency procedures allowing doctors to treat patients without consent are adequate, and

(e) the common law protection of children, parents and doctors is already satisfactory.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will either:

(a) reject the Minors (Consent to Medical and Dental Treatment) Bill, 1977, or

(b) amend the Bill to ensure that responsibility for consent to the medical and dental treatment of minors lies with a parent or guardian for minors below the age of 16 and jointly with both the minor and the parent or guardian for minors of or above the age of 16 years.

Petition received and read.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES presented a similar petition signed by 293 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. C. M. HILL presented a similar petition signed by 237 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY presented a similar petition signed by 239 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT, on behalf of the President, presented a similar petition signed by 471 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS presented a similar petition signed by 163 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER presented a similar petition signed by 331 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am not convinced that the matters mentioned in (a), (b), (c), and (d) are denied under the proposed Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On a point of order, Mr. President—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Was I not permitted to say that? Under Standing Orders, if I may make the point to the moans and groans of people opposite—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Do you want to present the petition?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, with a record of what I said, namely, that the Bill did not deny what was set out—

The PRESIDENT: This is not a debate. Do you wish to move that the petition be received?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, with the remarks that I have already made to it.

The PRESIDENT: Do you move that—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In such case, I cannot conscientiously suggest that the petition be entertained by this Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS moved:

That the petition be received.

Motion carried; petition received.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT presented a similar petition signed by 179 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE presented a similar petition signed by 389 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON presented a similar petition signed by 62 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON presented a similar petition signed by 55 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES, on behalf of the President, presented a similar petition signed by 70 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER presented a similar petition signed by 316 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORT ADELAIDE VALUATIONS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 508 residents of South Australia, alleging that the valuations placed on houses in the Port Adelaide area were quite unrealistic compared to today's prices, and praying that the Council would review the increases with a view to amending the valuations or seeing that the valuations were the same as in previous years.

Petition received and read.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. Is it possible for a member of the Council to be furnished with a copy of the signatures on a petition?

The PRESIDENT: A petition, having been tabled, becomes public property, and the honourable member is entitled to peruse it, and take a copy if he so wishes.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Hillcrest Hospital (Assessment Unit and Psychogeriatric Ward Block),

Whyalla Hospital Redevelopment (Phase II).

QUESTIONS**LIBERAL PARTY ADVISER**

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: A report in the *Advertiser* early this week dealt with an adviser who I understand is regarded as the attic adviser sitting in the upper storey of this building to control and advise members of the Liberal Party Opposition in this Parliament as to what questions they will ask, what petitions they will present, and what notices of motion they will give on behalf of their political machine. I would think—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I was never on any Minister's staff.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I was pointing to the Hon. Mr. Sumner.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like to impress on honourable members that leave is a privilege granted so that a question can be explained. I ask honourable members to refrain from turning each explanation into some sort of interrogation and to make their explanations as explicit and brief as possible. The Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Interjections are out of order, as the Hon. Mr. Blevins reminds me in a low voice. I remind members opposite that they were critical, without justification, of Labor Party members allegedly being controlled by outside bodies. In what capacity does Mr. Story occupy an office in this building? Is he the same Mr. Story who was previously a member of this Council and who asked so very few questions during his period as a member of this place? Who employs Mr. Story? At what salary range is Mr. Story employed, and under what determination does he receive his remuneration? If he is employed by the Liberal Party, are the privileges extended to his position far beyond those extended to any elected member or Minister in this place? Finally, will the Minister ascertain,

through your good offices, Mr. President, whether the information given to the public in last Monday's *Advertiser* indicates a breach of the rights of the elected members of the Liberal Party in this place and in the Lower House?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will have to rely on you, Mr. President, to provide answers to a couple of the honourable member's questions, particularly in relation to the allocation of an office to outside people. I am sure you will have that matter checked, and I ask that you do so to see whether such a person is, in fact, in an office in Parliament House. Provided the office is on this side of Parliament House, it is under your control. Mr. Story is the same person who was a member of this Council. He has been called upon by the Liberal Party, in its dying stages as a political Party, to provide advice to try to get it out of the mess it is in. I understand that he is employed by the Liberal Party.

If he is getting free rental, I do not know whether he will be taxed on it by the Federal Government. I understand that, because of the high salary that the Liberal Party is paying Mr. Story, that Party cannot get its propaganda over in the way that it would like to do, because it cannot afford it. I am not sure of the determination under which Mr. Story's salary is paid. I hope we have not got an intruder who is getting privileges not available to members.

I was concerned when I read the newspaper report, because for years we have been told that no pressure is put on Liberal Party members by outside influences. Here we have a leading member of the Liberal Party saying, "Those boys will not ask questions unless I tell them." That is a breach of Standing Orders, and I am surprised that you, Mr. President, have not taken action in this connection. It is a breach of Parliamentary rights. Everybody in this Council has the right to ask what questions he likes; he should not be dominated by an outside person. For the future, I am concerned to know to whom I have to give answers when honourable members ask me questions. Do the answers have to go back through Mr. Story?

I should like your guidance on this matter, Sir, because I do not want to cause a further split in the Liberal Party. Perhaps the Leader might say to whom I should direct my answers in future, provided, of course, that the matters involved have been directed through Mr. Story.

The PRESIDENT: As one of the questions was directed to me, I should like to explain that, if Mr. Story has an office in this building, it does not come within my jurisdiction.

The N. K. FOSTER: Would it come under the jurisdiction of the Speaker of the House of Assembly?

The PRESIDENT: First, the honourable member needs to establish whether Mr. Story has an office in the building, and then make his inquiries in the proper manner.

REDCLIFF PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I should like to direct a completely unsolicited question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Many people are concerned that no decision was made at the last Loan Council meeting regarding permission for this State to borrow sufficient money to enable the petro-chemical plant at Redcliff to be built. Can the Minister of Mines and Energy

say how far the talks have proceeded and when a decision is likely to be made, hopefully in favour of this State?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring back a reply.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding the computer controversy at Flinders Medical Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In May, it was reported in the press that computer equipment at Flinders Medical Centre to the value of \$1 800 000 or \$2 000 000 had either hardly been used or had not been used at all for the centre's requirements and was obsolete. The report went on to say that the centre was believed to be seeking authority to buy and install a new system. The Minister commented on this matter, as reported in an article dated 27 May and headed "Flinders computer to be dismantled", as follows:

The Flinders Medical Centre computer system will be dismantled. One part of the system will be retained to service the Modbury hospital's needs. The Minister of Health, Mr. Banfield, said later yesterday the rest of the equipment would be "distributed to other users where feasible".

Later, when referring to the Minister, the report states:

He said the picture presented by the press was "grossly distorted and gave a most unfair and unbalanced representation of the true situation."

The *Advertiser*, in the first sentence of the leader of 26 May, said the following:

It is not good enough for the Minister of Health, Mr. Banfield, to brush aside the serious allegations made about the suitability of a \$2 000 000 computer system installed at the Flinders Medical Centre.

In view of the allegations of waste and incompetence involving the Minister and his department in relation to this question, will the Minister give the Council a full explanation of the matter, including the reasons why the system was installed, his justification for the installation, and the exact loss of public money involved?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course, the honourable member has been taken in by the *Advertiser* report regarding the cost involved. Even when the figure was corrected, members opposite continued to spread lies about the cost and to exaggerate the cost of the equipment. Although the *Advertiser* knew better, it continued to spread malicious lies and exaggerated about the position at Flinders University.

The honourable member knows very well that on 26 May I issued a press statement concerning this matter, indicating the cost of the computer to be just over \$1 000 000 and not \$2 000 000. The honourable member also knows that on 29 June the Premier announced that an independent inquiry would be held into the Flinders Medical Centre computer system. The Premier said that the committee would inquire into the acquisition of computer equipment and associated software for Flinders Medical Centre, and would report to him. The Government intended to make the findings public. The committee includes prominent people who are outside the Government service, including Mr. R. B. Molloy, head of the School of Business Administration, South Australian Institute of Technology; Mr. S. E. Huddleston, the former General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia; and Dr. D. Overheu, head of the School of

Information Sciences, Canberra College of Advanced Education. The Premier said that the committee's terms of reference were as follows:

To inquire into and report to the Premier on the acquisition of computer equipment and associated software for Flinders Medical Centre; and in particular:

- (a) the reasons for selecting the equipment which was acquired;
- (b) the adequacy or otherwise of the analysis of requirements for a computer system or systems at the Flinders Medical Centre;
- (c) the adequacy or otherwise of the evaluation of available equipment and software and of subsequent decisions for the acquisition of further equipment or software; and
- (d) the adequacy or otherwise of the management and development of the computer systems for the Flinders Medical Centre.

If inadequacies are found, to recommend steps to be taken to avoid their recurrence. Subsequently to inquire into arrangements for the selection, development and implementation of computer systems in other Government departments and report to the Premier on any inadequacies identified.

I think that answers the questions asked by the Hon. Mr. Hill this afternoon. The honourable member knew that this inquiry was taking place. I assure him that the report will be made public when it comes to light. I suggest that, instead of the honourable member's running around the country and continuing to make these gross exaggerations, he be patient and wait for the report. He will then find that he has once again put his foot in it.

ANGLE VALE ROAD

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport, a question regarding Angle Vale Road.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to Heaslip Road and the portion of the Angle Vale to Virginia road between the Gawler by-pass and Heaslip Road. Last year I asked a question regarding Heaslip Road, which, with the Angle Vale to Virginia road, takes a very large amount of traffic from the Main North Road from Gawler to the city. To turn off the Gawler by-pass at the Angle Vale turn-off sign and travel in the direction to the city involves travelling about three miles farther, but it avoids speed restrictions and several traffic lights. In my previous question, I asked the Highways Department to note the increasing traffic on Heaslip Road, particularly the number of very heavy vehicles using this alternative route, and I indicated that portions of Heaslip Road were not standing up to the strain and badly needed resealing. This also applies (probably more so) to Angle Vale Road. The reply that I received passed the buck by stating that the road was under the care and supervision of the District Council of Munno Para, which I understand has made representations to the department on this matter. The questions I wish to raise now are as follows:

What criteria does the Highways Department use when deciding, for example, that Heaslip Road (Main Road No. 410), which carries much through traffic, remains under the local council or is returned to it, whilst, as another example, the sealed portion of Main Road No. 409, which is in an adjoining council area and which has not so much through traffic, was taken over by the Highways Department on completion of sealing? Will the Highways

Department again consider the problem I have raised, take a road count, and try to acquaint itself of the large number of very heavy vehicles using these roads? If the department intends to leave these roads within the care of the District Council of Munno Para, will it assist that council to maintain and reconstruct them, as they are taking a large amount of traffic off the lower portion of Main North Road?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to you, Mr. President, on the subject of a list of Parliamentary business being published in the daily press.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: You may recall, Mr. President, when you were a back-bencher in this Council, hearing me ask questions of your predecessor about whether a list of Parliamentary business could be published each day in the press so that the people of the State would be better informed on what was being deliberated on in the Parliament.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did you include regulations in that?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. The honourable member asked me that last time. It now seems that a member of another place has shown an interest in this matter and has gone to the press about it, advocating precisely what I have been advocating ever since I entered this Chamber in July 1975. My first Parliamentary question was on this subject, yet a Johnny-come-lately in another place—

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: A Jenny-come-lately.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Perhaps that is giving the game away. That member has now decided to get on the band wagon, but obviously she has not perused *Hansard* and she has been remiss in this matter, not having realised that I have raised it several times with a Liberal President of the Council.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Are you looking for a gold medal for your initiative?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must request that members on the opposite side of the Chamber, when asked for order, will concede that to the Chair and to the speaker on his feet.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Thank you for the protection, Mr. President. The point about this matter is that I had asked a Liberal President whether he would take it up with the daily press and anyone else who might be interested, to find out whether this information could be published, and he said that he had previously taken it up and it had always produced a negative result, despite the fact that on 11 November 1975 the previous President had received a letter from the Editor-in-Chief (Mr. Colquhoun) of the *Advertiser* stating that that newspaper was interested in the proposal and had asked Mr. Colquhoun to assure the President that the service was very much in mind. Since then, I have raised the matter on at least three occasions, the most recent being 14 December last year, so, despite the fact that the *Advertiser* has had the matter very much in mind since November 1975, we have not had much action on it. In my question on 14 December last year, I asked the President whether there had been any further developments and, if there had not been, whether he

would take up the matter again with the *Advertiser* and the *News*. The reply given by your predecessor, Mr. President, was as follows:

There have been no further developments, but I will take this matter up again with the *Advertiser*, in particular, because that newspaper prints the daily business of the courts, and it seems to me that that is the appropriate newspaper with which to discuss this matter. I will try to ascertain whether something can be done, and I will convey to the *Advertiser* Editor the statements made by the honourable member.

I ask whether your predecessor took up the matter, or you, Mr. President, have taken up the matter again with the *Advertiser* or anyone else who may be interested in this subject and, if so, what has been the result of those communications. If there has been no further action, are you prepared to take up the matter again with the *Advertiser* and other interested parties?

The PRESIDENT: Both the honourable member and the member of the House of Assembly about whom he spoke in regard to vying for credit on this matter will be pleased to know that my predecessor did act on the request made to him, and I understand that a list of Parliamentary business will be published in the daily newspaper from this coming week.

McDONALD'S

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question to the Leader of the Council, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, regarding hamburgers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I commend the Acting Minister for the publicity he has given in recent days regarding the junk food places that have been established in this city (in fact, all over the Commonwealth) in the past few years.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The honourable member would not eat a hamburger, and, if he keeps interjecting, it is quite unfair to the person in the Chair who is trying to do the job on behalf of the members in this place. The President is not being afforded common courtesy by a shadow Minister. It is one thing to see such behaviour from a back-bench member; it is worse from the honourable member.

The PRESIDENT: I would prefer that the honourable member get on with the explanation.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I commend the Acting Minister for making the statement. It would not be a bad idea if food from Hungry Jack's and hamburger joints were sent to a qualified dietitian, but that is not why I am on my feet. My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry because the matter deals with wage rates or structures. I understand that this company's practice of evading the industrial laws of other States is scandalous.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Which company?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: McDonald's Hamburgers, or whatever else the company might call itself. Will the Minister find out whether employees of the company are required to enter a contractual basis outside the industrial laws of the State? Does the actual paid time of McDonald's employees cover the time that the premises are open for business? Does it include time spent by employees in preparing food before the business premises are opened? Does it exclude time spent after the business has closed when cleaning and other associated duties may take place?

What is the average age of the employees? What is the company's attitude regarding what ought to be the normal procedure for juvenile employees returning to their places of residence late at night? The company should be the subject of investigation so that either its honesty and integrity regarding these matters can be confirmed or the company can be forced to comply with industrial laws of this State.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In view of the Hon. Mr. Sumner's claim that he deserves some credit for the forthcoming publication of the business of the House in the daily press, will the Leader of the House give an undertaking to this Chamber that he will not seek to have any legislation passed through this Chamber before such Bills have been advertised (as explained), and the public has been given reasonable time to make representations as a result of reading that public announcement?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. Hill should be careful about asking a question in that way. I am sure Mr. Story has not looked at it, so the honourable member is taking a chance. The honourable member knows very well that no-one wants to hold up the business of the House simply because something is not printed in the newspaper.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Government doesn't.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: True, the Government does not want anything held up in this Chamber. If Opposition members want the business to be held up, they can do that whenever they like; they have the numbers and have done so from time to time. The Government wants to get on with the job and will continue to do so. We will not waste Opposition members' time. When Bills come here we will present them and attempt to process them.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In view of the Hon. Mr. Hill's question, will the Leader of the House ascertain from the Federal Parliament and its officers the system operating in the Australian Capital Territory, where the *Canberra Times* prints in full the business of the day of both Houses of the Parliament?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will look into the matter. Orders of the Day are published every day in the Notice Paper, and the press has a hot line to that information. There is no attempt to keep anything from the public, as was insinuated by the Hon. Mr. Hill, who knows that these papers are available daily to the press. He knows that each night notices are given and the press can print them the following day. No attempt whatever is made to deny to the press the right to know what is going on. The press should accept responsibility, not only in regard to what it does print but also in regard to other matters that it does not print when they do not assist the Opposition.

MCDONALD'S

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You might remind them about Vietnam, and the attitude to conscripts.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Question!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is about time that you, as a so-called responsible citizen, woke up. The President's attention was taken by one of the Clerks.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I rise on a point of order. I have called "Question". The honourable member should be

made to ask his question without further comment.

The PRESIDENT: I have no option but to uphold the point of order.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. I stood up and noticed that you, Mr. President, were engaged with the Clerk. I did not even direct my question or seek leave to explain. Burdett, you are an idiot. If I have to withdraw it, I will. You are just a pest.

The PRESIDENT: "Question" has been called.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the firm known as McDonald's Hamburgers requested or negotiated for the provision of a special machine at Samcor, or for the use of an existing machine at Samcor, just before McDonald's set up business in this State? Was it then used on one occasion or not used at all? Was the State, through Samcor, put to any expense through the actions of this company? Did the company not use that facility and get its raw material from interstate?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I believe that there have been some negotiations between McDonald's and Samcor. I am not sure whether or not any binding agreements were broken, but I will certainly find out for the honourable member.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY

The PRESIDENT: Recently the Speaker of the House of Assembly and I circulated to honourable members and to the media a reminder as to the areas media representatives and other strangers are permitted to enter. There have been a number of complaints from the media and some honourable members that the conditions as set out are too restrictive. However, I wish to make the point as strongly as I can that these are the conditions that have always applied in Parliament House.

In the past these provisions may not have been as strictly enforced as they should have been, but recent experiences in other Parliaments indicate that unfortunately it is now necessary that these provisions be more rigidly enforced. In doing so, I make clear that there is no intention of restricting access to honourable members by the media and, with the full co-operation by members, access should in fact be easier. The suggested requirement will be for representatives of the media to identify themselves to any of the messenger staff, who will then contact the member concerned.

MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL

The Hon. ANNE LEVY brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and ordered to be printed.

DEBTS REPAYMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That the Select Committee on the Bill have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended to 12 September 1978. Motion carried.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Towards the end of the last session of Parliament a Bill to amend the Mining Act was passed by both Houses of Parliament. The major provisions of the Bill related to the mining of radioactive minerals and the creation of a new species of lease. Unfortunately, the document that was submitted to the Governor for assent did not reflect the true text of the Bill as passed by Parliament: it did not contain an amendment made by the Legislative Council and agreed to by the House of Assembly. There is therefore some doubt as to whether the Bill, as passed by Parliament, was validly assented to at Executive Council on 6 April 1978. The present Bill is designed to put the matter beyond doubt. It is in the same form as the previous Bill, as passed by Parliament, except that it contains a provision that will repeal the former amending Act (if it is in fact an Act).

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition):

Last session the Council was presented with a Bill to validate actions taken by Governments that had not been constitutionally performed. Today, at the opening of this new session, we are presented with a Bill to correct another mistake. The Mining Act Amendment Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly last session. It was passed by that House and came to this place, where amendments were made. The Bill was then returned to the House of Assembly, which accepted the amendments. However, the Bill presented to the Governor for signature at a meeting of Executive Council was not the Bill that had been passed by both Houses of Parliament. A Bill was signed which had not been passed by both Houses of Parliament. The Minister's second reading explanation states:

The present Bill is designed to put the matter beyond doubt.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What happened in the Commonwealth Parliament under the Liberals?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not saying that any Government is in the category of not making mistakes. All Governments make mistakes, but this is the second Bill of this type that we have had in a short period. Later, I intend to deal with the Federal Bill. The Minister's second reading explanation states:

The present Bill is designed to put the matter beyond doubt. It is in the same form as the previous Bill, as passed by Parliament, except that it contains a provision that will repeal the former amending Act (if it is in fact an Act).

That presents me with a difficult conundrum in trying to understand exactly what the Government is doing. The procedure being undertaken by the Government may be the correct procedure, but I draw attention to the fact that, if this Bill is passed in its present form, we are virtually admitting that a Bill signed by the Governor which was not passed by both Houses of Parliament could become the law of this State; that presents me with some difficulty. I ask whether we should contemplate passing a Bill that gives any credence to the question that a Bill signed by the Governor and not passed by both Houses of Parliament ever was an Act of Parliament.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is why you need a new Act.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The point I am making is difficult, and I may be wrong. I want to come back to the Hon. Mr. Foster's point: that the same thing has happened

in the Federal Parliament. I will point out how the problem was overcome there. I ask whether this Council should ever contemplate that it is possible that a piece of paper signed by the Governor should ever become an Act of Parliament. I agree that it is important that this Bill be not delayed. Nevertheless, this Council must display some caution in respect of the way in which the Government solves the problem in which it finds itself. It may be the only way in which the problem can be solved, but I do not think that that is the position. I ask the Minister to allow us some time (it need not be a very long time) to consider the ramifications of this Bill. I refer particularly to clause 2. Last evening the Hon. Mr. Geddes and I read both Bills and found that they were identical, except for clause 2, which provides:

The Act (or purported Act) No. 34 of 1978, entitled "An Act to amend the Mining Act, 1971-1976", is repealed and shall be deemed never to have come into operation.

That is the point I am trying to make: what we are doing in clause 2 is admitting in this place that it is possible that an Act of Parliament signed by the Governor became an Act when the Governor signed it; indeed, it was an Act of Parliament when the Houses of Parliament had not passed it.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That was an Act.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It was not an Act, and it never was an Act.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are missing the point.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. In 1976, there was a similar occurrence in the Federal Parliament. The Hon. Mr. Foster referred to this point. In 1976, two Bills came before the Federal Parliament. Bill No. 1 passed both Houses. Bill No. 2 was still being debated. The Bills dealt with the same general question: grants to the States in relation to Aboriginal reserves. Bill No. 1 was passed by both Houses, but the Clerk certified Bill No. 2 and sent it to the Executive Council. The Governor-General signed Bill No. 2, which had not been passed by both Houses. The mistake was discovered in January 1977. The Governor-General then cancelled his signature on the wrong Bill and merely gave assent to the correct Bill.

There is a further complication here, in that Parliament prorogued in the meantime; that is the only difference in the circumstances as between what happened here and what happened in Canberra. The correct procedure should be the same: the piece of paper signed by the Governor in Executive Council never was an Act of Parliament, and no recognition should be given in any way that it ever was or even that it purported to be an Act. Now, we come to the question under our Standing Orders as to what is the standing of this Bill. Standing Order 346 states:

A Bill which has passed its second reading in either House, but shall not have been finally disposed of at the close of the session, may, in the next session of the same Parliament, be restored to the stage reached in the previous session by the carrying of a motion, after notice, that the Bill be restored to the Notice Paper.

That is the correct procedure in regard to this Bill.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It had passed both Houses.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, it had not. That is the point that I am making. One must return to Standing Order 346 and begin from that point because the Governor, in Executive Council, signed a piece of paper that is not, and never was, an Act of Parliament.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Bill passed both Houses.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, it did not. The Bill signed by the Governor did not pass both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: But the Bill itself did.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He signed the incorrect one; certain amendments had not been included in it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is so. No recognition should be made of the fact that a piece of paper signed by the Governor was ever an Act of Parliament, or ever could be purported to be such. That is what concerns me regarding this Bill: there is a recognition that it could be an Act of Parliament. However, it never could be an Act of Parliament. I should like to ask the Government, if it consulted the Solicitor-General (as no doubt it did), what his advice was on the matter.

I believe that the correct procedure was followed by the Federal Government in 1977 in the way in which it handled the problem then facing it. The only complicating factor between the two situations is that there has been a prorogation of Parliament in South Australia whereas there was not one in the Federal sphere.

I am not concerned about the Bill, because it has been agreed to by Parliament and should go on the Statute Book as soon as possible. However, the point that concerns me a little (perhaps I am straining at something that may mean nothing) is that there is a recognition in the Bill that it may be possible for a signature by the Governor on a piece of paper to be considered an Act of Parliament when the Bill concerned had not at any stage been agreed to by both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It says, "Act or purported Act". So, it is recognising that perhaps it was an Act of Parliament.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is so. I do not believe there should be any recognition by this Council that this piece of paper was ever an Act of Parliament. Perhaps I could quote from the 1912 edition of Halsbury's *Laws of England*, as follows:

It is a recognised rule of Parliamentary procedure that, in addition to bringing a session of Parliament to a conclusion, a prorogation puts an end to all business which is under the consideration of either House at the time of such prorogation. In both Houses, therefore, any proceedings either in the House or in any committee of the House lapse with the session, and any Bill which does not receive the Royal assent before Parliament is prorogued must be reintroduced as a new Bill in a subsequent session.

I believe that that is exactly where this Bill rests. Erskine May expresses a similar view in his wordy book on Parliamentary practice. Perhaps I am wrong in what I have said and the Bill is all right as it stands. However, I have raised the point to which I have referred for the Council's consideration.

[Sitting suspended from 3.28 to 3.58 p.m.]

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Bill has initially presented some concern to the Opposition, particularly in the light of some difficulties in establishing the procedure followed by His Excellency in signifying assent to the earlier Bill. I think it appropriate that we know the procedure that is followed when His Excellency signifies his assent to a Bill. Apparently the procedure is that a list of Bills is presented to him for signature. The statement commences with a reference to the fact that His Excellency signifies his assent to the "following" Bills, and then a list of the Bills appears and he signs. Subsequently, a copy of the Bill is attached to a piece of paper, on which is written similar words, namely, "I signify my assent to this Bill," being the one annexed.

In this instance, I have been told, His Excellency signified his assent to the Mining Act Amendment Bill as one of those on the list that he first signed, and that, in

itself, suggests that the Governor had signified his assent and exhausted his responsibility so far as that Bill was concerned and that the Bill did come into effect as a Statute of the State of South Australia. The secondary assent is, I suggest, unnecessary in the circumstances. Apparently, on previous occasions when similar inconsistencies have occurred regarding the annexed copy of a Bill to which the Governor has signified his assent, supplementary to a list he has signed on which a list of Bills has appeared, certain remedies have removed that defect without the matter having to come back to Parliament.

However, there seems to be some difficulty in the mind of the law officers of this State on whether the Governor has exhausted his function in signifying his assent to a particular list of Bills. Therefore, I raise no opposition to the Bill and the form in which it is before us, except to say that the form probably is different from what it technically ought to be. It could have been a Bill that declared the previous law effective for the purpose of resolving doubts, to take effect from the date that that Act had come into effect when His Excellency signified his assent to the list of Bills.

If the procedure to which the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has referred had taken place, there was not a particular Act of Parliament validly enacted as having received the imprimatur of both Houses of Parliament and of the Governor. In that event, it would have been appropriate to bring the Bill back to this Council under joint Standing Order 17, which would have effectively dealt with the difficulty as well. Therefore, I draw attention to what I suggest is a somewhat sloppy procedure in obtaining the assent of His Excellency to Bills, and I hope that in future such procedure will be rectified so that as much as possible the difficulty that has arisen about this Bill will not occur again. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I, too, support the second reading and I support what the Hon. Mr. Griffin has said. In slight further elaboration of what he said, I point out that I understand that in the past, when a similar kind of mistake has occurred, the Governor, having first signed the list of Bills as the Hon. Mr. Griffin has outlined, subsequently, when the mistake has been found, has signified the correct Bill and signed a certificate stating, "This is the Bill that I assented to on" such and such a date.

Therefore, he has identified the Bill with the certificate that he originally signed. I understand that the procedure in the past has been that His Excellency has signed the list and, as the Hon. Mr. Griffin has said, has thereby exhausted his powers and has assented to the Bill and, when it has been found subsequently that the Bill has not been correct, he has signed the certificate to which I have referred. I have been told that if this procedure, which has not now been agreed to by the Solicitor-General or the Government, is not correct, there are many invalid Acts, because in the past what I have explained has been done.

However, on this occasion the Government has elected to introduce a Bill such as the present one. I support the measure, but I support what the Hon. Mr. Griffin has said about the procedure being sloppy. It should be corrected and made watertight so that what the Governor assents to when he signs the list or a Bill is clear.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Repeal of Mining Act Amendment Act, 1978."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Minister for the time given to study the Bill. I

received it yesterday, and I thank him for giving me prior knowledge of what it contained. I looked at it last evening, and I was concerned about the point that I have raised. This afternoon several members, including the Hon. Mr. Griffin, the Hon. Mr. Burdett, and the Hon. Mr. Sumner, with assistance from Parliamentary Counsel, have examined the position.

The point I raised has been satisfactorily answered. However, I agree with the point made by the Hon. Mr. Griffin and the Hon. Mr. Burdett that the procedure relating to the signing of the Bill (and I do not criticise the Government, as this has been the procedure for a long time) is sloppy and creates the difficulty that we have struck here. I support the views of the Hon. Mr. Griffin and the Hon. Mr. Burdett that the Government should look at the procedure to overcome any difficulties that may arise in future.

I was concerned about clause 2 because it appeared to me that we might be giving some credence to the fact that whatever the Governor signed could be construed as an Act of Parliament. In the procedures whereby he signed the list of Bills, it may be that Governor assented to the Bill as passed by Parliament in the first place. If those procedures are corrected, the problem will not arise in future.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I express my appreciation to members opposite for the attention they have given the Bill; I realise that there were some difficulties. I shall raise the matter with the Government and try to see that the problem is corrected.

Remaining clauses (3 to 21) passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, J. C. Burdett, R. C. DeGaris, and C. J. Sumner.

Library: The President and the Hons. Jessie Cooper, J. R. Cornwall, and Anne Levy.

Printing: The Hons. F. T. Blevins, M. B. Cameron, J. E. Dunford, R. A. Geddes, and C. J. Sumner.

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The PRESIDENT having laid on the table a copy of the Governor's Speech, the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield (Minister of Health) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, R. C. DeGaris, N. K. Foster, and C. M. Hill be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to the Speech delivered this day by His Excellency the Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.16 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 18 July at 2.15 p.m.