LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 17 September 1980

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill)—

By Command—

Department of Correctional Services—Report on Correctional Institutions.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES REPORT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a very brief explanation in relation to the report that I have just tabled.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have tabled the departmental report on the state of correctional institutions in South Australia, prepared by the Director of Correctional Services, Mr. W. A. Stewart. I draw to the attention of the Council that there are some sections of the report which have been deleted, where the tabling would cause a breach of security, and that the names of officers and references to officers in the Cassidy assessment, which is contained in Appendix B, have also been deleted. It should also be noted that some of the recommendations contained in the report have already been acted upon by the Government.

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:

Grange Primary School Redevelopment,

Naracoorte Water Storage Tank and Mains.

QUESTIONS

BEE-LINE BUS

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question regarding extending the Bee-line bus service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: As honourable members know, the Bee-line bus serves as a feeder service between the Adelaide Railway Station and Victoria Square, where it meets the terminal of the Glenelg tram line.

On its return route, the Bee-line bus continues west down North Terrace under Morphett Street bridge and, in order to turn, goes into Hindley Street and back on to North Terrace. Country people made representations to the previous Government for the Bee-line bus route to be continued from Victoria Square about a quarter of a mile west to the Central Bus Depot, which is the terminal for most country bus services, but nothing was done about that at the time. This extension could be achieved without congestion by driving west along Grote Street, turning into Morphett Street for one block, and travelling back along Franklin Street past the Central Bus Depot to King William Street.

Recently, the Australian National Railways decided to stop the passenger train service from Burra and other mid-northern centres to Adelaide and to substitute a bus service, ending at the Central Bus Depot. Some Burra residents approached me asking whether the Bee-line bus route could be extended to the Central Bus Depot. In January this year the Adelaide City Council approached the Government asking for the Bee-line bus route to be extended east to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I approached the General Manager of the A.N.R. about this matter, and he said that the A.N.R. is aware of the inconvenience likely to be caused to passengers being dropped off in Franklin Street rather than the Adelaide Railway Station, especially when they have come to Adelaide for medical treatment, or want to take a connecting train. I believe that the A.N.R. would be prepared to meet some of the costs of extending the Bee-line bus service.

Firstly, will the Minister consider asking the State Transport Authority to extend the Bee-line bus service from Victoria Square to the Central Bus Depot? Secondly, will he ask the A.N.R. to meet some of the costs of this extension, since it presumably expects to save money by closing the mid-north passenger train services and using buses instead?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring back a reply.

WEIGHBRIDGES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 28 August relating to weighbridges?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: My colleague the Minister of Transport advises that no member of Parliament is banned from entering Highways Department weighbridges to observe weighing operations or, indeed, from inspecting any departmental operation. However, those members wishing to do so are expected, as a matter of courtesy, to obtain prior permission from either the Minister of Transport or the Commissioner of Highways. Failure to do so places the Highways Department employees concerned in a very difficult position to assess their responsibilities. The two employees referred to by the honourable member are still employed by the Highways Department. No action was taken against them other than drawing their attention to the fact that persons wishing to inspect departmental operations should have the appropriate authority to do so.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I desire to ask a supplementary question. When the Hon. Mr. Cameron in this Chamber and the Hon. Mr. Chapman, member for Alexandra in another place, inspected a weighbridge facility last year, did they have the authority and permission that are apparently necessary from the answer the Minister has just given to the Council?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That is a question that should be referred to the Minister of Transport, and accordingly I will refer it to him.

ABATTOIRS

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community

Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about new rules for abattoirs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The Minister of Agriculture has stated:

> There were three options open to existing slaughterhouse operations. The first was to surrender their licence, for those who did not wish to provide premises which complied with the legislation. Or they could remain in business, in which case they would be required to prepare a schedule of improvements acceptable to the authority to achieve required standards within three years. Finally, they could upgrade to an abattoir.

Some country abattoirs are adjacent to or opposite housing developments. In the past people have complained not only about the unkempt appearance of such abattoirs but also about the drainage and obnoxious odours emanating from such premises, as well as the offal lying about the yard in drums, skins lying on fences to dry, and the flies that this activity attracts. Of course, the flies always migrate to the adjacent houses.

District councils have allowed the development of slaughterhouses on the boundaries of their neighbouring town councils and, even if the premises were upgraded, there would still be large trucks tearing up roads, killing at night and weekends, gun shots, the squealing of animals, the obnoxious smell, and an over abundance of flies. There is then the obvious environmental disadvantage. Will the Minister assure the town councils involved and the people whose houses are close to country abattoirs that such abattoirs will be required to resite their activities to areas more suitable to the trade that they practise?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

CARCINOGENS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my question of 19 August about carcinogens?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am advised by the Minister of Health that chemical carcinogenisis is a matter of considerable concern to health authorities in all countries. There are several Federal agencies in the United States with specific responsibilities in this area. One of the major agencies is the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which is presumably the agency to which the honourable member has referred as the publisher of a list of 170 carcinogenic chemicals. Attempts are being made to obtain a copy of the list and, once it is available, interested members will be provided with a copy.

ABORTION STATISTICS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to the question I asked on 26 August about abortion statistics?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am advised by my colleague the Minister of Health that the figures quoted at the meeting of the National Council of Women, to which the honourable member refers, were taken from the final report of the task force of the Queen Victoria Hospital project. My colleague has made a copy of the report available to the honourable member, although the figures contained therein refer to the 1977-78 financial year. As has been indicated previously, the abortion statistics for the 1979 year are contained within the 10th Mallen Committee report, and will not be made available before the report is tabled in Parliament, which is anticipated as being shortly after Parliament resumes.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to the question I asked on 20 February about corporal punishment?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In view of what has been said today, I think it is only fair to point out that the Minister in another place has already replied to the Hon. Miss Levy's question. The Hon. Miss Levy indicated that she would like that reply to appear in *Hansard*, so it is being given to the Council today. It is a reply that Miss Levy will receive for the second time. The Minister of Education has advised me that matters similar to those which the honourable member raised have been under consideration for some time. In responding to the honourable member's question, the current situation needs to be made clear. Regulations 132 (3) of the Education Regulations states *inter alia:*

> . . . the principal or head teacher or any teacher to whom either may delegate such authority may impose corporal punishment. The said detention and the imposition of corporal punishment shall be governed by such conditions as the Minister may determine.

With the exception of some suggestions to school principals contained in recent Education Department administrative instructions and guidelines, issued to schools, no definitive set of conditions governing the administration of corporal punishment has been determined. However, the matter is currently under active consideration by the Director-General of Education and his senior officers. Regulation 123 (3), clause 6, already states:

> If a parent or guardian makes a request in writing that his/her child is not to be caned, the principal, head teacher or delegated teacher, as the case may be, must be given to understand that the child is not thereby exempt from the discipline of the school, but is subject to appropriate action, other than corporal punishment, in the event of a serious misdemeanor.

Therefore, the matter appears to be adequately covered.

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to the question I asked on 21 August about non-Government schools?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The final draft of the legislation to set up a board for registration of non-Government schools is currently in the hands of the Parliamentary Counsel, and it is anticipated that legislation will be introduced during the current session of Parliament. South Australia has for some years been the only State not to have such control. Drafting of the new legislation was commenced in late 1979.

BUS STOP SEATS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to the question I asked on 14 August about bus stop seats?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The State Transport Authority, in conjunction with local councils and on a share cost basis, has been erecting covered passenger shelters at bus stops at the rate of 120 per year for the past six years. The maintenance of shelters after installation is the responsibility of the local council concerned. Other seats, such as the open garden type seat and bench seats, are provided exclusively by local government authorities. The condition of the seats at stops 6 and 11 on route 19 have been referred to the Unley and Mitcham councils respectively. Should any seats at bus stops require upgrading, the matter should be referred to the local governing authority.

EDUCATION SYSTEM

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of 27 August about the education system?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I had that answer with me yesterday and had the courtesy to inform the honourable member that I had the reply. Unfortunately, it has gone back to my office.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Might I say that we have heard a lot from the Opposition complaining that they were not getting answers to questions. Yesterday, I had a whole host of answers with me. I advised respective members opposite that those answers were available, but they did not ask the questions.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster will take his seat. The Hon. Mr. Foster will not stand there and yell at other members. I will hear his point of order now.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My point of order is that the Hon. Mr. Hill is not correct. Yesterday I had five slips of paper advising of replies; I asked five questions of the Attorney-General and got five answers. I ought to count myself lucky.

The PRESIDENT: That is an explanation and not a point of order. The honourable Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I point out to members opposite that it is the member's right to ask the question when he or she has been advised that replies are available. If members opposite do not proceed to ask questions on the day, I can only accept the fact that they do not wish to ask them.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Your colleague made a 20-minute Ministerial statement yesterday, as you well know.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No Minister on this side has delayed Question Time. If there has been any delay in receiving answers to questions, members will still get those answers.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

PETROL PRICES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about petrol prices.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Some weeks ago the New South Wales Government reduced the maximum wholesale price of petrol by 2c in an attempt to overcome some of the problems being experienced by independent petrol resellers and by increasing the margin for them. Recently the Minister received a deputation from the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce which suggested that the same action should be taken in South Australia. At that time the Minister was reported as having told the delegation that he would consider the submission and also that he would tell oil companies that the South Australian Government would consider a 2c reduction unless they altered practices relating to franchising, company operated sites, and wholesale price discrimination.

My questions are as follows. First, does the Government intend to act in the manner suggested by the Automobile Chamber of Commerce and reduce the wholesale price of petrol by 2c and, if not, why not? Secondly, did the Hon. Mr. Burdett approach the oil companies, as he promised, and, if so, what was the result?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The New South Wales Government took two actions, not one action. It reduced the maximum wholesale price of petrol by 2c and the maximum retail price of petrol by 2c. The Industrial Relations Division of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce asked me to take not both actions but only one action, namely, to reduce the maximum wholesale price of petrol by 2c; it did not ask me to reduce the maximum retail price of petrol by 2c. In other words, clearly I was not being asked to do exactly the same as was done in New South Wales. I told them that I would consider their submission.

The Government is still considering the submission, and has not yet made a decision. Both the Automobile Chamber of Commerce and the South Australian Government have at all times considered that price control was not the answer to the franchising problems that they had, but that the answer was the franchising practices and what ought to be done by Governments if the problems were to be removed, including the enactment of franchising legislation at the national level. The so-called Fife package has been supported at all times by the Automobile Chamber of Commerce and the South Australian Government.

The South Australian Government is now withholding a decision on the submission to reduce the wholesale price of petrol by 2c because the Federal Government has now introduced legislation along the lines of the Fife package, and that has been agreed by the South Australian Government and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce as being the correct procedure. I am told that this legislation is passing rapidly through the Federal House and, indeed, that it is likely to be passed by the end of this week. So, the South Australian Government intends to withhold its consideration of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce submission until the Federal legislation has been passed.

As to the second part of the question, namely, whether I spoke to the oil companies, the reply is "Yes". I asked them to make submissions to me in writing as a matter of urgency, and they have done so.

RIVERLAND CANNERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question regarding his Ministerial statement on the Riverland cannery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yesterday, the Attorney-General made a Ministerial statement on the Riverland cannery and explained the historical back-

ground to the present problems that the cannery faces. The Minister explained how the Government had been informed about the difficulties of the cannery by a number of its officers, and he quoted from those reports. I will not read those reports, which appear in *Hansard*, again but draw honourable members' attention to them.

I was therefore surprised when I looked back at the *Advertiser* editorial written on Monday, in which it was claimed that "the depth of the problems being encountered obviously was minimised for the eyes of the incoming Government and that matter alone poses some important questions". In the light of the statements from which he quoted yesterday, does the Attorney-General believe that the cannery's problems were minimised for the eyes of the incoming Government and, if that was the case, who was responsible for minimising these problems to the Government?

The Minister also said in his Ministerial statement yesterday that the cannery's losses were much greater than the Government first thought and that it was anticipated to be $7 400 000 in debt. Some growers in the Riverland area have told me that there is a dispute as to the assessment of these losses: that some of the items that have been included could, in reasonable accounting terms, have been included as capital items associated with the extensions to the Riverland cannery when it went into general products.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: The loss might be only $6 000 000!

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It is important that the Council be told what it is. I ask the Minister whether he can provide a detailed breakdown of that $7 400 000 so that honourable members can assess for themselves whether some of those items that have been included in the loss are, in fact, capital items. One grower claimed that it could be reduced to less than half, although there is no way of knowing whether that is so.

The Minister's final remark in his Ministerial statement yesterday was that he was anxious that the cannery should continue as a viable operation in the Riverland for the benefit of the whole community. Some people in the Riverland are concerned that the cannery will not continue as a separate establishment employing a considerable number of people, and that it will be merged with the Berri Fruit Juice operation. Can the Minister give an assurance that the cannery will continue to operate as a separate establishment, employing a considerable number of people in Berri?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I indicated yesterday that the Government had asked a committee of inquiry into the South Australian Development Corporation to give a great deal more attention to the problems of the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative in an effort to find out what went wrong and why, and who was responsible for it. I think that it would be irresponsible of me at this stage to speculate on who may or may not have been responsible for the problems and how they have occurred.

Of course, one can have one's own private view as to who was responsible and how the mess occurred. However, I think that, until the committee of inquiry into the South Australian Development Corporation has had a detailed look at the cannery's problems, I should not embark upon that speculation. It should suffice if honourable members and the public were to know that the committee of inquiry into the South Australian Development Corporation has been requested by the Government to give careful and detailed consideration to that problem.

Regarding the second question, dealing with the matter of losses, I indicated yesterday that for the eight-month period from 1 October last year to 31 May this year the losses could be as much as $7 500 000. Because of the state of the accounts, it was not possible to say categorically that that would be the loss or that it might, in fact, be higher. I endeavoured to indicate that there was a marked contrast between the figure indicated to the Government late in July as a possible loss for the eight-month period (I think that it was $3 500 000) and the maximum loss indicated to us by the team of accountants appointed by the task force several weeks ago.

There is a marked difference of some $4 000 000. Then I went on to indicate that, on the interim figures which have been made available to us, the loss for June could have been between $300 000 and $500 000; the loss for July could have been at least $300 000; and we did not have any figures on the loss for August. So, if one takes it over a longer period, the potential loss is even greater than $7 500 000. One of the elements of the $7 500 000 arises out of stock valuation. There was a physical stocktake in July, and adjustments were made back to 31 May 1980. The difference is in the vicinity of $1 700 000. Some of that may have been attributed to a previous period, but no-one is able to say, at this stage, except that there is a discrepancy in the stock of about $1 700 000. There are other adjustments to be made but, on the limited information available to us, I am informed that no more than $1 000 000 maximum of that $7 500 000 could be attributed to past accounting periods.

The state of the accounts is such that I am not in a position to indicate anything more than that. Suffice it to say that that information presented to the Government, even on a tentative basis, gave us no alternative but to support the State Bank when it considered that, as a proper commercial decision, it ought to appoint a receiver. The State Bank, as I understand, was also concerned about those figures, which were prepared by a team of accountants appointed by the task force which was acting as a delegate of the board of Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd. Whilst some persons may have some disagreement with the way in which the $7 500 000 is calculated (and that may be justified in some respects, one does not know at this stage), the fact is that the postion two weeks ago was dramatically different from the position advised to the Government towards the end of July this year. It was sufficient to cause concern to the State Bank and sufficient, also, to cause concern to the Government.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I wish to ask a supplementary question. First, what is the answer to the third question I asked, because the Minister has not replied to that question, which was whether the cannery will be merged with B.F.J.

In view of his reply concerning the investigations into the cannery, is the task force that was originally appointed by S.A.D.C. still operating, or have all the investigations involving the cannery been taken over by the committee inquiring into S.A.D.C. itself?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am sorry that I omitted to answer the honourable member's third question. I am not in a position, at this stage, to identify what will be the future of the cannery—it is very much in the hands of the receiver. As I indicated yesterday, the Government is of the very strong view that it is essential that a viable canning operation be retained in the Riverland. I think, from what we have seen of the situation, that it is premature to make any prediction about the form that that will take, but I can give the assurance that we want to see a viable canning operation in the Riverland.

I have indicated, also, that the Government has requested the State Bank and the receiver to keep in close communication not only with the Government but with all those interested groups who are involved with the

Riverland cannery. I imagine that it will be some time before the receiver is able to make any decision about what ought to be done, but suffice it to say that we are in close communication. Both the bank and the receiver know what the wish of the Government is. So far as the task force is concerned, we are requesting details of its progress in preparing a report on the problems of the cannery. We are seeking information from the task force as to the present state of its work, and the likely cost of completing it, before we make an assessment as to whether or not it ought to be requested to complete that report. Certainly, the work of the team of accountants and the work of certain persons connected with the activities of the task force in managing the cannery have proved to be of assistance to the receiver. If the progress of the task force has been adequate, and the costs of finishing a report are reasonable in the light of the benefits that the receiver would obtain from such a report, then the Government is prepared to consider asking the task force to complete this work.

TUINAL

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about the drug Tuinal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Perhaps partly because the drug Tuinal is commonly referred to as "chewey", some of the people who have used it are dead. I am very concerned about the widespread use of Tuinal in our society. I am amazed and concerned, and my constituents are likewise concerned that the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson) has not taken some action as a result of a recent press statement. I am a constituent of Mrs. Adamson.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Bad luck!

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I did not vote for her because I could see through her.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has asked leave to explain a question he wishes to ask. Will he get on with that explanation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It is a shame, because we do not have many women Ministers, and I am one who has always supported equal rights and opportunities. I am very disappointed that the first woman Minister we have had of any note—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I call the Hon. Mr. Dunford to order and ask him to make his explanation or resume his seat.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You do not give me much time, Mr. President. You give other fellows half an hour.

The PRESIDENT: I will give the honourable member plenty of time so long as he stays with his explanation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I want to point out what was said on 12 September in a newspaper article, headed "New Drug Craze Hits our Young" by Penny Kearns, as follows:

> A new drug craze sweeping through Australia is killing a growing number of young people.
>
> Deaths from the drug, a barbiturate known as Tuinal, have soared in South Australia in the past three years.
>
> South Australian police also are encountering the drug more frequently in illicit drug seizures.
>
> Abuse of Tuinal—a legally available sleeping tablet—was virtually unknown here until 1976.
>
> It has now become the greatest single cause of accidental drug deaths in the State, according to a report by an Adelaide pathologist.
>
> One Adelaide girl, 21, was found dead by her boyfriend earlier this year after injecting Tuinal.
>
> In another incident, a group of youths spent an evening "popping" Tuinal in an Adelaide hotel.
>
> The capsules were "washed down" with bottles of beer. Three of the group survived but one of the youths, aged 19, was found dead.

How long will we see this going on, our young people getting killed in Adelaide hotels through popping pills? It makes one wonder where the police are. I have a fair idea where they are, but they are never where they are required. Here we have this problem throughout society, and the police are doing nothing about it, the Government is doing nothing, the Minister nothing, and the youth of Australia are dying because of lack of concern. This Government is the greatest do-nothing Government ever in the history of South Australia. It is an indictment on this Government.

I have seen programmes on television claiming that the Opposition is not doing enough, but how can we do anything when we do not sit, when we cannot meet, and when a question asked almost 12 months ago is not answered? I doubt whether I will get an answer to this question and, even if I do, the answer will probably be that the matter is being investigated or that a committee is being established, or there will be some other rub-off. It is a indictment of this Government, which has crook Ministers. You have Rodda and Chapman—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will not reflect in that manner on members of this Council or another place. I ask him to ask his question.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I wish the public was not saying the things that I am saying. Will the Minister, as a matter of urgency, ask the Minister of Health whether she will, as the Minister responsible, take immediate action to have the legally available drug Tuinal withdrawn from sale to the public?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

CRASH REPAIR COMPANIES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about a crash repair company or companies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Honourable members will recall that a few months ago I came across a document that forced the Minister of Transport to reveal the Government's intention regarding the crash repair industry. The document provided information concerning legislation only for the tow truck area. It is quite unfair for that section of the industry to be singled out for some form of Government legislation when other parts of the industry were also the subject of a detailed inquiry by this Council about 12 months ago. I refer to the need to protect members of the public. Will the Minister advise the Council whether Modbury Crash Repairs is no longer accepted by the State Government Insurance Commission, as that company has falsified documents in an endeavour to obtain payments before any work is undertaken to repair crashed vehicles? What other crash repair companies are similarly involved? Thirdly, does the Minister agree that such a practice is both illegal and a denial of the rights of vehicle owners?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about the Auditor-General's Report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: At page 388 of his report, the Auditor-General deals with shortages and thefts of cash, irregularities and thefts of Government property. Many of the items referred to have probably been pilferred or stolen through breakings into premises of the Education Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, two items interest me, and the explanation given by the Auditor-General deserves further enlargement. Under the heading "Public Buildings" it is stated that $100 has been lost, that the amount has not been recovered and that the loss is due to a shortage in cash received from the Reserve Bank. Again, under the heading "Police", it is stated that $40 has been lost, the amount has not been recovered and it is claimed that the loss is due to a shortage in cash received from the Reserve Bank. I do not know that the Reserve Bank needs that kind of money to keep proper accounts. How can this happen? I can understand some of the other losses but I cannot understand this situation. I hope I can obtain a better reply than is printed in the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I commend the honourable member for his diligence in having read the report. I will refer the honourable member's question to the appropriate Ministers and bring down replies.

BLACK HILL NATIVE FLORA TRUST

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to the question that I asked yesterday about the Black Hill Native Flora Trust?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The reply is as follows:

1. I have advised the Black Hill Native Flora Trust of my concern relating to the commercial state of the nursery. A final decision about the future role of the nursery is still yet to be made. I have called for a review of the role of the nursery in selling plants to the public following a request from the Nurserymen's Association. That review is under way, but any final decision regarding the nursery's role in plant selling will not be made without full and proper consultation with the Campbelltown City Council.

2. The date is 24 March 1980.

3. He was moving to Inman Valley in June, and it would be quite impossible to maintain the necessary close contact with the Executive Officers and the trust from such a distance.

4. The date is 26 June 1980.

5. No. I feel quite confident in Mr. Lasscock's appointment. His depth of experience in his field, his detailed knowledge and his management capabilities will be a very valuable and positive addition to the trust. The Opposition's continuing bitter personal attacks under Parliamentary privilege on innocent people who have accepted Government appointments are scandalous in the extreme. I am satisfied that the decision to appoint Mr. Lasscock is quite sound and that he will meet his appointment with the integrity for which he is known.

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my question of 20 August about PET bottles?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am advised by the Minister of Environment that the Government has not stopped, nor attempted to stop, any manufacturer from installing equipment to manufacture or use PET bottles. The soft drink industry is well aware of the status of the product and the Government's intention to reconsider its approval at the expiration of the 12-month trial period. Any manufacturer who chooses to ignore the Government's position is perfectly at liberty to make capital investment. However, the level of their investment will in no way influence the decision of this Government as to the environmental impact of PET bottles.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister of Community Welfare request the Minister of Environment—

The Hon. L. H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Shut up! I wish you could hear him sometimes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: I wish I could hear him, too. The Hon. Mr. Foster's supplementary question must be related to the question already asked.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister request the Minister of Environment to extend to the public, particularly people living in the eastern suburbs, the courtesy of having the right to information that the Government acquires in its attempt to make a decision on the closure of the nursery? Will he further request his colleague that no decision be made on this matter until the public has been informed of anything connected with closing the nursery?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will pass the honourable member's request on to my colleague and bring down a reply.

PUBLIC SERVICE FILES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to a question I asked about Public Service files on 16 September?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Mr. Taylor is able to view his personal file under the supervision of an officer from the Personnel Branch of the department. If Mr. Taylor rings the Personnel Branch on 217 0461, extension 316, to make an appointment, the file will be made available.

BLUE ASBESTOS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about blue asbestos at Adelaide University.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Honourable members may be aware that recently there has been concern and action in a number of major public buildings which were built 18 to 20 years ago and which contain asbestos as an insulation or protective material, as was common practice during that building period. I am sure that members of the Government are well aware of the major work that has been undertaken in the Public Library over the last few months to remove the asbestos which was used there and which was considered to be a health hazard both to the library staff and to the public visiting the library. That removal work has been carried out at considerable expense.

In a like manner, the Soils Division of the C.S.I.R.O. has recently completed a major project at a cost of about $100 000 to remove asbestos that was built into that building during that same building period (about 20 years

ago). The asbestos has now been removed from that building. Fairly recently it was announced that a number of university buildings built during that same period also contain a considerable quantity of asbestos. In particular, one building at the university has been found to contain blue asbestos as its insulation and protective material.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Which university?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The University of Adelaide. I am sure that honourable members would also be aware that, while all forms of asbestos can be very dangerous to people who breathe in the fibres, blue asbestos is by far the worst. The maximum permitted dose of blue asbestos is about one-twentieth that of other types of asbestos, as set down by the National Health and Medical Research Council. Since the asbestos was found at the university, it has been estimated that the cost of removing all the asbestos will amount to about $1 250 000. However, the two areas that contain blue asbstos, which is far more dangerous, will involve a removal cost of $250 000.

Although the fibre content of the air in those buildings is well below the maximum permissible dose, that same comment could be made about the fibre content of the air at the Public Library and at C.S.I.R.O. before the programme for removing the asbestos was undertaken in those areas. The University of Adelaide believes that the danger from the blue asbestos is such that immediate action should be taken to remove it from the two areas concerned. Will the Government give sympathetic consideration to helping finance the removal of this blue asbestos in the two affected areas at the university, because the university has no source to fund the approximate cost of $250 000? The university regards this matter as an extremely urgent health and safety measure that cannot be postponed, despite the fact that there is no indication of where the money to finance this project will come from.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring down a reply.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to request the Parliament of the Commonwealth to enact an Act to remove certain restrictions on the exercise of legislative power by the Parliament of South Australia. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill of considerable constitutional significance for South Australia. It is not well known publicly that the South Australian Parliament does not have full legislative competence and is still restricted in the laws that it can pass because of Imperial legislation. The Opposition believes that the South Australian Parliament should be able to pass legislation subject only to the requirements of the South Australian Constitution and the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia. At law, the Australian States are still colonies and subject to the laws of the United Kingdom's Parliament which apply to them.

As the wellknown Australian constitutional authority, Professor Geoffrey Sawer, has said, "The grotesque constitutional situation is created that the Australian Federal Government could enjoy the fullest degree of national autonomy while the States of the Federation remained in a legal status of dependent colonialism." This position has arisen because the Statute of Westminster, 1931, an Act of the United Kingdom Parliament, applied to the Commonwealth of Australia, but not to the Australian States.

The current fetters on the Australian States' legislative competence has come about because the Colonial Laws Validity Act passed by the Imperial Parliament in 1865 still applies to the Australian States. This Act was largely prompted by the decisions of Mr. Justice Boothby, a judge of the Supreme Court of the Province of South Australia, who believed that the colonial Legislature could not pass laws which were repugnant to the laws of England. The Colonial Laws Validity Act was designed to clarify this position. With the passage of the Act, the colonies acquired a much larger and more independent control of their own affairs than had previously been possible. The vital sections of the Colonial Laws Validity Act were, and still are, sections 2 and 3.

Section 2 of the Act preserved the operation of Imperial legislation which extended to the colonies. To such legislation the colonies could not pass repugnant laws. Section 3 stated the reverse proposition that no colonial law should be or be deemed to have been void or inoperative because of repugnancy to the law of England, as distinct from repugnancy to the Statute law of England, extending to the colony in question. The Colonial Laws Validity Act not only applies to the Australian States but also to the Commonwealth of Australia and other dominions. When Federation took place at the turn of the century, the Commonwealth, like the States, was bound by it and also by its incapacity to enact laws having an extra-territorial operation.

With the changing world situation and greater emphasis on the independence of nations, the Imperial Parliament enacted the Statute of Westminster in 1931. The Statute enshrined resolutions passed at Imperial conferences that had been held in 1926 and 1930. The purpose of the Statute was to cut the remaining ties which restricted the ability of the Parliament of Australia to legislate and to ensure that it had real independence. The Statute stated:

> And whereas it is in accord with the established constitutional position that no law hereafter made by the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall extend to any of the . . . dominions as part of the law of (those) dominions otherwise than at the request and with the consent of the dominion . . . the Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865 shall not apply to any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a dominion.

The Statute also gave the Commonwealth Parliament full power to make laws having extra-territorial operation and so completed the process of conferral of full independent sovereignty upon the Australian nation. The Act, however, did not apply to the Australian States, although the Canadian Provinces had agreed to the application of the Statute of Westminster. Had the Australian States done likewise then these anachronistic colonial ties would no longer exist.

During the last decade considerable thought has been given to how these restrictions on State Parliaments' authority can be removed. Initially, thought was given to an approach to the United Kingdom Parliament from the Commonwealth and all the States to request the United Kingdom Parliament to pass the appropriate legislation. There are a number of difficulties with this course of action, including the fact that it is unlikely that the United Kingdom Parliament would consider acting without the consent of all the Parliaments involved in the Federation of Australia and, in any event, there are political difficulties demeaning to Australian sovereignty to be

forced to resort to this course of action.

Accordingly, in 1973 the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General commissioned a committee of the Solicitors-General of the several States to investigate the possibility of an Australian solution to the problem. The Solicitors-General have closely examined section 51 (xxxviii) of the Commonwealth Constitution and have concluded that there is a likelihood this section can be successfully used to effect a transfer from the Commonwealth to the States of powers exercisable by the Imperial Parliament at the time of establishment of the Constitution. The section (omitting the irrelevant parts) provides:

> . . . the Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth, with respect to . . . the exercise within the Commonwealth at the request or with the concurrence of the Parliaments of all the States directly concerned of any power which can, at the establishment of this Constitution, be exercised only by the Parliament of the United Kingdom . . .

It is the opinion of the committee of the Solicitors-General that this section offers a method by which the States can request, and the Commonwealth can enact, legislation conferring on the individual States the powers to pass legislation repugnant to that of the United Kingdom, applying to the States. The advantage of this approach is that the Commonwealth can probably act for those States which make the requests without the concurrence of all of them. It is surprising (indeed inexcusable) that the Commonwealth so far has not chosen to do so.

In March 1977, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General adopted a report based on the opinions of the Solicitors-General which recommended that section 51 (xxxviii) of the Commonwealth Constitution could be used to achieve the desired ends. I believe that this report would be useful for members in determining their attitude to this legislation and accordingly I seek leave to table a copy of the report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Since March 1977, four Australian States, namely, New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia, have indicated their willingness to enact legislation making the necessary request to the Commonwealth Parliament. Legislation in the same terms as this Bill passed the New South Wales Parliament on 13 December 1978 and the Victorian Parliament on 8 May 1980.

On 5 January 1978 the then Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan, M.P., wrote to the Commonwealth Attorney-General, Senator Durack, in the following terms:

> My dear Attorney-General,
>
> The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has been advised by the Solicitors-General that one method of freeing the States from the repugnancy provisions of the Colonial Laws Validity Act is for the Commonwealth to enact legislation under section 51 (xxxviii) of the Constitution upon a request by the State Parliament so to do.
>
> The South Australian Government is anxious to introduce such legislation in the near future.I therefore seek an indication of the views of the Commonwealth Government to a request by the South Australian Parliament for the Commonwealth Parliament to legislate to free South Australia from the fetters of the Colonial Laws Validity Act.

On 12 January 1978 an acknowledgement was received from Senator Durack but to my knowledge no further reply has been forthcoming. I understand that the Commonwealth, despite requests, has failed to indicate whether it will agree to the approach of the States. I believe that the passage of this legislation will indicate to the Commonwealth Government the determination of the South Australian Parliament and the people of South Australia to rid themselves of this relic of the colonial era. I believe that we should support, by legislation, the Parliaments of New South Wales and Victoria, and the request that has come from Tasmania.

The problems caused by these restrictions on the State Parliament's legislative authority were highlighted recently by Mr. Hamer, the Victorian Premier, whose Government is of the view that the British Act of Settlement of 1700 precluded anyone born outside Britain or her dominions from holding public offices of trust, and that this had forced a person who was an American citizen to resign from a position on a Victorian statutory authority. Mr. Hamer is quoted as describing the situation as "archaic and totally unacceptable", and saying that every step should be taken to ensure that the Act no longer has any force in Victoria.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: The Victorian Parliament specifically adopted the Act of Settlement of the United Kingdom Parliament in the 1920's.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Be that as it may, the point is that there are still the fetters on the South Australian Parliament. That was included in the second reading explanation as an example of the sort of thing that can occur.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: But it is unlikely to apply in South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That may be so, but there are other problems that do apply, as the Attorney-General will learn as I proceed with my second reading explanation.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: Don't base that on something that does not apply in South Australia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. Frank Blevins): Order! The Attorney-General will have a chance to respond to the debate.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: A further example of the potential difficulties because of the application of the Colonial Laws Validity Act was highlighted by the case of *Gilbertson v. The State of South Australia and the Attorney-General for the State of South Australia,* 15 S.A.S.R., p.66. Honourable members will recall that this case involved a challenge to the electoral boundaries legislation that had been passed by this Parliament as amendments to the Constitution Act in 1975, and to the resulting redistribution. The basis of the argument in that case was that the provisions of the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1975, were void and inoperative by virtue of repugnancy to Imperial law in that they purported to confer on the Supreme Court a function that was inconsistent with the established judicial character of the court.

This argument was rejected by the Full Court of the South Australian Supreme Court and subsequently by the Privy Council. However, it highlighted the point that the South Australian Parliament did not have supreme legislative authority and, had it been found that the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1975, had been repugnant to Imperial law applying to the colonies, then because of the Colonial Laws Validity Act a law passed by this Parliament with the support of South Australians would have been struck down. This is clearly an intolerable situation.

A further implication of these restrictions is that the South Australian Parliament probably cannot pass a law to abolish appeals to Privy Council. Whether those appeals should be abolished is a matter that some honourable members may wish to dispute, but I put to them that, if the Parliament of South Australia wishes to abolish such appeals, there should be no United Kingdom law that

prevents them from doing so. Immediately following the introduction of this Bill, I intend to introduce legislation which would, if the Commonwealth agrees to the passage of the provisions contained in the schedule to this Bill, abolish appeals to the Privy Council.

It is the firm view of the Labor Party that modern concepts of constitutional sovereignty and the dictates of Australian nationhood demand that we finally cut the umbilical cord which legally makes us subservient to certain Statutes of the United Kingdom Parliament. I commend the Bill to honourable members, and seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

The Bill consists of two clauses and a schedule. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 contains a request to the Commonwealth Parliament to enact an Act substantially in the terms set out in the schedule. The schedule contains the proposed Commonwealth Act, the detailed provisions of which are as follows.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 contains definitions. The definition of "the Parliament of the United Kingdom" is deliberately wide so as to include any Parliament that at any time has or had general power to enact laws having force in England. The definition has been framed in this way so as to obviate any need to have English Parliamentary history examined every time one considers the application to the State of some old Imperial enactment.

Clause 4 (1) provides that, notwithstanding the repugnancy provisions of the Colonial Laws Validity Act or any principle or rule of the common law, first, no State law or part thereof made after the date of commencement of the Act shall be void or inoperative because of repugnancy to any legislation of the United Kingdom Parliament; and, secondly, the powers of the South Australian Parliament shall include the power to repeal or amend any such legislation applying to the State.

Clause 4 (2) provides that the principal thrust of section 3 of the Colonial Laws Validity Act, namely, colonial laws, shall not be deemed to have been void or inoperative because of repugnancy to the law of England. Clause 4 (3) adds two further provisions. First, clause 4 (1) does not operate so as to give the State Parliament power to abrogate section 5 of the Colonial Laws Validity Act in so far as that section requires an Act of the State Parliament respecting the constitution, powers or procedure of the Parliament to be passed in such manner and form as may from time to time be required by any State law for the time being in force in the State. Nor does it operate to give effect to any State Act that might purport to repeal, amend, or be repugnant to, the Imperial Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, the Commonwealth Constitution itself or the Statute of Westminster.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS ABOLITION BILL

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to abolish appeals to the Privy Council from courts of South Australia. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to abolish appeals from courts of South Australia to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. While it is open to some legal debate, it is generally conceded that the passage of a Bill through this Parliament would be of no effect because this Parliament's authority to pass it does not exist. However, if the Commonwealth Parliament enacts the State Powers (South Australia) Act, the Act scheduled in the Constitutional Powers (South Australia) Act 1980, which has just been introduced and read a first time, this Bill can proceed.

In view of this situation, which is one that I trust will not exist for much longer, I do not propose to proceed on this Bill at this stage beyond the second reading debate. The measure has been introduced to indicate firmly the Opposition's attitude that the residual rights of appeal to the Privy Council should be abolished and in the hope that it will be passed into law shortly after the Commonwealth acts to grant the request in the Constitutional Powers (South Australia) Act 1980.

Appeals from courts in the dominions and colonies have always existed, initially as a prerogative right of the Sovereign exercised at common law by the Sovereign in Council. In 1883, a Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was established to hear all appeals which might be brought before the Sovereign in Council from the order of any court or judge. Thereafter, all such appeals were to be referred by the Sovereign to, and be heard by, the Judicial Committee.

In 1968 the Commonwealth Parliament abolished appeals from the High Court of Australia on Federal matters and, in 1975, removed the Privy Council's power to grant leave to appeal from High Court decisions. There is, therefore, now no appeal from the High Court of Australia to the Privy Council.

The Labor Party believes that the High Court of Australia should be the final court of appeal in our country. If appeals from the State courts to the Privy Council were abolished, it does not mean that there would be no further appeal from the South Australian Supreme Court. An appeal would exist to the High Court of Australia. We believe that it is clearly inconsistent with Australian sovereignty that we should have to resort to a foreign court to have disputes resolved. Australians sitting in Australia familiar with Australian conditions and interpretations of Australian law should be the final court of appeal. The High Court of Australia is recognised as one of the significant common law courts of the world.

The maintenance of Privy Council appeals has come under increasing criticism in recent times. In a recent case in the South Australian Supreme Court, reported in the *Advertiser* on 3 June 1980, Mr. Justice Zelling was quoted as saying it was with great regret that he was "constrained by authority" to grant leave to appeal to a court of a foreign country. He said:

> We are today foreigners in Britain, as anyone who has had to queue up in the foreign column at Heathrow knows only too well. Appeals to a foreign country are demeaning to the status of Australia as a sovereign nation. No Australian Government should permit this to continue. I trust that speedy steps will be taken to end the state of affairs that is contrary to the dignity of this country. Ultimate appeals from Australian courts should go to the High Court of Australia, whose proper status has so recently been re-emphasised to all of us by the opening of its new building in Canberra by Her Majesty the Queen, as Queen of Australia.

Also the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice King, was quoted as saying that he thought under the present circumstances it was regrettable that there was an appeal as of right to the Privy Council. He said it was both undesirable and

inconvenient that there should be an appeal from judgments of the Full Court to the Privy Council.

One of the substantial practical problems which arises as a result of continuation of Privy Council appeals is that the Australian court system becomes double headed. In other words, it is possible to have competing judgments as between the Privy Council and the High Court. If identical principles of law are involved in two separate State Supreme Court actions and appeals are lodged against the Supreme Court decision, the appellants now have a choice of appeal courts. If one appellant appeals to the High Court and the other to the Privy Council and these two courts differ on the correct principle of law, future litigants will have a choice of appeal forums available to them, depending on whether the decision of the High Court or that of the Privy Council suits them best.

That is, in one instance the South Australian Supreme Court could decide a case based on the principles of law enunciated by the High Court of Australia. The litigant could appeal to the Privy Council and have that decision reversed on the grounds that those principles were wrong. In the next case dealing with the same point of law, the Supreme Court could apply the principles enunciated by the Privy Council and the litigant could then appeal to the High Court and be upheld on the grounds that the principles applied by the Supreme Court were wrong.

This most unsatisfactory situation should not be permitted to continue. Certainty as to what is the state of the law is the basis of our legal system, a system which has only ever contemplated since its inception the existence of one final appeal forum. To permit two such final arbiters is absurd—with two appeal courts there can be no finality. Apart from rendering the law subject to great uncertainty, it also adds disproportionately to the cost of litigation.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal or contain definitions. Clause 4 prohibits appeals to the Privy Council in respect of any decision of any court of South Australia. Clause 5 provides that the Act shall not apply to proceedings commenced before the commencement of the Act. I commend the Bill to all honourable members.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will recall that, when a Ministerial statement was made on 4 June regarding speculation in shares of the South Australian Gas Company, the Minister of Mines and Energy referred to the fact that "changes to streamline the South Australian Gas Company's Act are contemplated". This Bill represents the outcome of that process.

Honourable members will also recall that in that statement my colleague pointed out that "the Government has no intention of altering the legal framework applicable to the South Australian Gas Company". He went on to say:

> This framework has been built up over a long period of time, under successive Governments, with a view to protecting the interests of the people of South Australia as a whole as well as shareholders and debenture holders in the South Australian Gas Company. This is because of its role as a "utility" company supplying an essential commodity to the people of this State.

I am re-emphasising these points because the Government has been watching very carefully the stock market trading in shares of the South Australian Gas Company. Because it appears that trading of a speculative nature is continuing, and because it appears that the limit of 5 per cent on shareholdings is not being observed, this Bill, in addition to containing clauses requested by the company's Directors to (as I referred earlier) "streamline" the company, also contains provisions proposed by the Government in order to preserve the company's status as a utility, serving the interests of all South Australians.

It may be of assistance to honourable members if I outline the legislative background to this Bill. The South Australian Gas Company was constituted by a deed of settlement dated 19 September 1861 and was incorporated by the South Australian Gas Company's Act, 1861. The deed of settlement contained many of the provisions which are necessary for the regulation and management of the internal affairs of the company. Those provisions are equivalent to those found in the articles of any company.

As well as incorporating the company, the Act of 1861 clothed it with certain specific powers and protections essential to the running of its business. Thus the Act empowered the company to construct gas works, break up streets and to lay pipes, subject to certain conditions. That Act also repeated *verbatim* a number of the clauses from the deed of settlement, and it incorporated many of the sections of the Companies' Clauses Consolidation Act, 1847, and the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1847. The Act of 1861 has been amended on seven occasions.

In 1924 the Gas Act was passed to make special and detailed provisions relating to the price and quality of gas and the testing of meters, but it also contained sections relating to the capital of the company, issue of shares, its dividends, interest on bond, and the establishment of a superannuation fund, and it provides that its bonds shall be trustee securities. This Act has been amended eight times. It is this Act that currently gives the Government control of the company's dividends and capital.

This structure has led to areas of conflict between the provisions of the deed and the Acts, and of course the provisions of the latter prevail. This has meant that most of the provisions of the deed of settlement (which the deed allows to be altered by a general meeting of shareholders) could not be altered unless the appropriate Act was also amended in a similar manner. Nonetheless, the deed has been amended for an increase of capital on 12 occasions and its clauses have been amended by special resolutions of shareholders five times, as well as by the abovementioned Acts.

Honourable members will therefore appreciate that the constitution of the South Australian Gas Company is extremely complicated, and many of the provisions which regulate its affairs are archaic and anachronistic. In these circumstances, the Directors sought substantial changes in order to "Achieve simplification and modernisation of the corporate structure of the company". I will outline the nature of these changes in a moment.

However, I believe it is appropriate to reflect for a moment on the achievements of the South Australian Gas Company. Notwithstanding the legal complexities to which I have just referred, the company has been able to manage its affairs to the point where it is a major supplier of energy to the South Australian community. Natural gas is reticulated to 208 000 consumers in Adelaide and Port Pirie, and at Whyalla and Mount Gambier a further 5 250 are supplied with gas manufactured from l.p.g.

Approximately 5 000 kilometres of underground gas

mains are presently operated to supply these consumers. Outside these gas reticulation areas, the company's L.P. Gas Division supplies 35 000 consumers who are served by 157 agents throughout the State, Alice Springs and Central Australia and as far north as Tennant Creek.

The company serves three distinct markets: domestic, 206 994 consumers; commercial, 4 987; and industrial, 1 206. Since natural gas was introduced in late 1969 the use of gas has increased over five-fold. Usage by domestic consumers has increased steadily at a rate of 7½ per cent per annum, but the greatest change has been in industry.

Prior to natural gas in 1969, only 15 per cent of the gas sendout was consumed in industry, but last year 60 per cent went to this market. This has mainly been at the expense of oil, and clearly indicates the dependence of South Australian industry on reasonably priced, environmentally accepted natural gas. Honourable members will, I am sure, agree that control of the marketing of this valuable indigenous fuel supply should be undertaken having regard to the best interests of the people of South Australia.

It is for this reason that the Government has regarded some aspects of recent share dealings as being of great concern and seeks in this Bill to ensure that the interests of all South Australians are protected. However, before dealing with Government initiatives in this regard, I should indicate the changes sought by the company's directors and contained in the present Bill. These are as follows.

First, it was sought that those sections of the Gas Act relating to Government control and administrative matters of the company be repealed and re-enacted in the company's own Act. This leaves untouched those provisions of the Gas Act relating to the quality and price of gas.

Secondly, it was sought that the whole of the Gas Company's Act be repealed but in such a way as to ensure that the identity of the company be preserved and continued, and so that the company remain a body incorporated by the 1861 Act. In particular, it was proposed that certain key provisions of the company's Act be re-enacted with appropriate amendments and in modern language. This was to apply particularly to provisions relating to limiting the liability of shareholders, providing for the authorised capital and the manner in which it can be increased, giving the company powers in respect of the property of others and indemnifying it for damages inflicted and those relating to offences against the company.

Thirdly, it was sought that the company's operations no longer be limited to South Australia and that a provision be included in the Bill exempting the company from all liability for damage suffered by any consumer as a result of failure of the supply of gas at any time. Such a provision gives the company protection similar to that enjoyed by the Electricity Trust of South Australia in its conditions of supply and by similar utilities interstate.

Fourthly, it was sought that the deed of settlement be repealed and in its place substituted a schedule in three parts comprising the equivalent of the memorandum and articles of a company incorporated under the Companies Act together with a power to amend that schedule.

In its discussions with the company, prior to the introduction of this Bill, the Government identified four further changes to the Act of 1861 to ensure that the company's status as a utility was preserved despite recent share dealings. First, the provisions relating to the enforceability of the 5 per cent limitation on shareholdings, inserted by means of an amendment to the 1861 Act passed by this Parliament in 1979, have been strengthened. Experience with those controls has shown that they are not totally adequate to deal with the situation with which they were intended to deal: the holding of more than 5 per cent of the shares of the company by or on behalf of an individual, group of individuals or companies. The Bill before the Council therefore seeks to strengthen those provisions in the light of the experience of the past 12 months or so in administering the 1979 amendments and the review of companies and takeover laws by the Ministerial Council on Companies and Securities.

Thus the Bill contains provisions tightening the definition of "associate", defining "relevant interests in shares", tightening the definition of "groups of associated shareholders", strengthening the power of the company to "request information from shareholders" and enabling the company or the Corporate Affairs Commission to take court proceedings to ascertain whether the Act has been breached and empowering the Minister to order a divestiture of shares acquired in contravention of the Act.

It is the view of the Government and its legal advisers that these provisions will close any loopholes existing in the 1979 amendments. In passing, I point out that a major difficulty with those amendments was to obtain the information in the first place in order to ascertain whether the Act was being breached.

Secondly, the Bill empowers the company to issue 20 000 class B shares to the State Government Insurance Commission. These would each carry 100 votes at a general meeting. All other shares would be class A shares and would have one vote at a general meeting. The price of shares to the S.G.I.C. will be negotiated between the company and S.G.I.C. but it is understood between the Government, the company and S.G.I.C. that the price of those shares will reflect the price for the company's shares on the South Australian Stock Exchange as at the date of introduction of the Bill in the Assembly. This provision, combined with the fact that S.G.I.C. is subject to Ministerial direction, will effectively put the company under Government control. The mechanism to achieve this result has been chosen with a view to minimising any undue impact of this step on the company's share prices and limiting the amount of funds that the S.G.I.C. will be required to tie up in this way.

Thirdly, the Bill provides that the company shall not sell, assign, transfer, change or otherwise deal in shares held by the company in South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Proprietary Limited. Honourable members will recall that one of the factors leading to speculation in the company's shares was the possible value to shareholders of the company's interest in S.A.O.G.

In my June statement I pointed out that South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation was set up to undertake exploration of the Cooper Basin to locate additional gas reserves for this State and "this activity is expected to use up all the funds available to it". I went on to say that "in this sense, South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation should not be regarded as a normal commercial enterprise". The provision in the Bill before the Council today is intended to put beyond doubt that South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation is seen by the Government purely as the vehicle for essential and costly exploration activity, not as the basis for a windfall gain to the South Australian Gas Company's shareholders.

Finally, as the measures contained in this Bill are directly related to the Government and, presumably, Parliament's expectations that the company continue to operate as a utility, any changes to the company's objectives agreed on by shareholders are not effective until approved by the Minister.

That, in broad terms, outlines the Bill that is before the

Council today. I emphasise that the Government has proposed additional measures to those proposed by directors in order to preserve the company's status and role as an energy utility. It is essential that its management and its expertise be directed to ensuring that the State's needs for energy in the form of reticulated natural gas and l.p.g. are met as efficiently and responsibly as possible. This would not be possible if there was to be continuous speculation in the company's shares and attempts to obtain control of it that might not be in the best interests of the people of this State and its customers.

The Bill seeks to achieve the Government's objectives in this regard fairly, firmly and effectively. I commend the Bill to the Council and seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the principal Act by striking out all of its present provisions (except for the section dealing with short title) and inserting entirely new provisions in their place. These new provisions are as follows. New section 2 sets out the definitions that are required for the purposes of the new Act. New section 3 defines the conditions under which a person is to be regarded as an associate of another person for the purposes of the new Act. These provisions follow fairly closely the similar provisions in the Santos Bill and in various other Acts dealing with company takeover situations.

New section 4 deals with the cases in which a person will be regarded as having a relevant interest in a share in the company. A relevant interest arises where a person has power to exercise or control the exercise of a voting right attached to a share or to dispose of or to exercise control of the disposal of a share.

New section 5 defines what is meant by a group of associated shareholders. Where one or more shareholders are associates of any other shareholder, those shareholders and the shareholder of whom they are associates constitute a group of associated shareholders. Where two or more shareholders are associates of a person who is not a shareholder, those shareholders constitute a group of associated shareholders. New section 6 provides for the company to continue in existence as a body corporate. It deals with the objects of the company, which are to be set out in Part A of the schedule to the Bill, and provides that the administration of the company's affairs is to be governed by Part B of the schedule. Thus, the schedule constitutes in effect the memorandum and articles of the company.

New section 7 provides that the company is a company limited by shares, and a liability of its members for the debts of the company is limited to the amount unpaid upon the shares. New section 8 deals with the share capital of the company. The share capital is to be $2 500 000, divided into shares of 50c each, of which $4 980 000 are to be class A shares and 20 000 are to be class B shares. All the existing shares of the company will constitute class A shares, and the class B shares are to be issued by the directors as soon as practicable after the commencement of the amending Act. The class B shares will be issued to the State Government Insurance Commission and the moneys payable upon the issue are to be paid as soon as those shares are issued. New subsection (5) provides that each class A share carries one vote at a generl meeting or poll of the shareholders and each class B share will carry 100 votes. New subsection (6) empowers the company to increase its share capital by the creation of new shares, to consolidate or divide any of its share capital into shares of greater or lesser denomination, or to convert or make provision for the conversion of shares into stock. Subsection (7) provides that these powers are not to be exercised in such a manner as to reduce the proportionate voting power of the holders of class B shares.

New section 9 limits the power of the company to issue shares, bonds or debentures. The issue must be approved by the Treasurer. In addition, the dividends payable upon shares are not to exceed a rate that is two per cent per annum in excess of the semi-government (private) loan rate. New section 10 provides that a shareholder is not entitled to vote unless he is registered in respect of the shares that he holds.

New section 11 provides that no shareholder or group of associated shareholders is to hold more than five per cent of the shares of the company. This percentage may be increased by regulation. The prohibition does not, however, apply to the State Government Insurance Commission or a group of associated shareholders of which the State Government Insurance Commission is a member. In determining the number of shares held by a shareholder for the purposes of this provision, if the shareholder or an associate of the shareholder has a relevant interest in shares, those shares must also be brought into account, and, if a person has a relevant interest in the shares of a shareholder, any other shares held by that person or any of his associates, or in which that person or any of his associates has a relevant interest, must also be brought into account.

New section 12 empowers the company to administer interrogatories to a transferee of shares in order to determine whether he is a member of a group of associated shareholder, whether he has a relevant interest in shares other than those subject to the transfer, and various other related matters. Subsection (2) provides that if the transferee does not reply to the interrogatories, or if the directors are not satisfied of the veracity of the declaration, the company may refuse to register the transfer. New section 13 is a somewhat similar provision relating to shareholders.

New section 14 provides that a person may be summoned before the Supreme Court to be examined in relation to the question of whether a shareholder or a group of associated shareholders holds more than the maximum permissible number of shares in the company. The answers that he gives upon an examination under this new section will be admissible in legal proceedings that arise under the new provisions.

New section 15 empowers the Minister to require a shareholder or a member of a group of associated shareholders that holds more than the maximum permissible number of shares to dispose of his shares or a specified number of them to a person who neither is nor intends to become an associate of that shareholder or of any other person specified in the notice.

New section 16 deals with the company's superannuation scheme. New section 17 is a power of compulsory acquisition. New section 18 empowers the company to lay or install pipes or apparatus under public roads and to excavate roads for the purpose of repairing pipes or apparatus previously laid. New section 19 empowers authorised employees of the company to enter premises for the purpose of inspecting pipes and apparatus to ensure that they comply with the appropriate safety regulations of the company. New section 20 empowers the company to cut off the supply of gas to premises after a final account has been rendered and a notice of the

company's intention to do so has been given to the occupier of the relevant premises.

New section 21 provides that the company is not to deal in its shares in South Australian Oil and Gas without the approval of the Treasurer. Subsection (2) provides that the State Government Insurance Commission is not to deal in its class B shares in the company without the approval of the Treasurer. New section 22 establishes an offence relating to the unlawful diversion of gas. New section 23 deals with wilful damage to the pipes or equipment of the company. New section 24 provides that pipes and apparatus laid and installed by the company do not become fixtures and remain the property of the company. New section 25 protects the plant and equipment of the company from execution under the judgments of courts.

New section 26 provides that the company does not incur liability in contract or tort as a result of the cutting off or failure of the supply of gas to premises. New section 27 provides for the summary disposal of offences, and stipulates that an allegation in a complaint that the defendant acted without the consent of the company is to be accepted as proved in the absence of proof to the contrary. New section 28 deals with service of notices. New section 29 provides for the revocation of the deed of settlement.

I need not deal in detail with the contents of the schedule to the Act. As I mentioned earlier, Parts A and B correspond to the memorandum and articles of a company incorported under the Companies Act and contain the kinds of provisions that one would expect to find in the memorandum and articles of such a company.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUDGET PAPERS

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

> That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Expenditure, 1980-81, and the Loan Estimates, 1980-81.

In so moving, I am following the recently established practice of combining discussions of the Revenue and Loan Accounts so that all members may have the opporutnity to understand more clearly, and consider more effectively, the Government's overall financial plans. I am also continuing the practice I began last year of tabling the Budget papers before debate is called on the Appropriation and Public Purposes Loan Bills so that every member will have more time than has been available in the past to consider their contents.

The Government's Revenue and Loan Budget proposals for 1980-81 plan for a small deficit of $1 500 000 on the year's combined operations. It is planned to finance that small deficit by using the accumulated surplus of $1 500 000 held on the combined account as at 30 June 1980. Accordingly, it is expected that the combined accounts will be in balance as at 30 June 1981.

The Budget of a State cannot be regarded as an instrument of economic policy in the same way as the Budget of the Commonwealth, but it is influenced significantly by, and to some extent can influence, general economic trends and developments in the State. I believe it would be useful, therefore, if I were to refer briefly to the economic background against which the Budget has been framed.

In general terms, economic performance among the Western industrialised nations is currently weak, with problems of recession in the United States being a most important factor. Inflation and unemployment, although varying markedly from country to country, both remain generally at high levels. This picture is not likely to improve rapidly.

In Australia, the national economy continues to grow modestly. In 1979-80, non-farm product is estimated to have been about 3 per cent higher than in the year before, while total employment in the economy, on average over the year, was 2·4 per cent higher than the average for the previous year. However, that growth in total employment was accompanied by an increase in the numbers seeking employment, with the result that the number of unemployed remained virtually constant.

The Commonwealth Government's economic policy, as recently reiterated by the Federal Treasurer continues to be based on fiscal and monetary restraint, designed to keep inflation under control and below the level of our trading and investment partners. The Commonwealth Government sees this strategy as the most effective way of improving the economic conditions of this country, particularly of employment. I turn now to South Australia. When I presented the Budget papers to the Council in October last, I stressed the enormity of the task of economic reconstruction in this State. Experience since then has underlined that point. Although confidence is returning to the South Australian economy, unemployment in the State remains at an unacceptably high level. This matter is of great concern to the Government, and I am sure it is of concern to every member of this Parliament. It is a situation which results from an accumulation of factors operating over a number of years, and the Government does not believe, nor has it ever pretended, that this tragic problem can be solved overnight.

The Government has set in train policies which it believes will encourage broad economic growth in this State and create jobs. There are favourable signs in terms of particular natural resource and industrial development projects, and we will continue to do everything we can, responsibly, to encourage and assist the establishment of those projects. However, it needs to be recognised that the main impact of these policies and developments will be felt in the medium to longer term. It needs to be recognised also that economic conditions in South Australia are heavily dependent in some areas on levels of demand in the country as a whole. Motor vehicle production is one example, but by no means the only example.

The Government perceives its task in this area as doing all within its power to establish the pre-conditions for economic growth in the State. However, it should be emphasised, and emphasised strongly, that, although we see certain actions by the Government as necessary to create the climate for economic growth, they are not by themselves sufficient to ensure that growth. Ultimate success will depend on other factors, including decisions taken in the private business sector, consumer confidence, the attitudes of employees and their representatives and economic management at the national level.

It is the belief of the Government that there are a number of inter-related factors which are prerequisites for renewed and sustained economic growth, namely: low levels of taxation; firm control over public sector expenditures; the provision of essential infrastructure, including that associated with major development projects; responsible programmes to encourage specific industries and firms to establish or expand operations in this State; reduction in direct Government involvement in the economy and in controls over the private sector; responsible restraint in the growth of wage and salary rates and other incomes; and an appropriately trained work

force ready to take up employment opportunities as they arise. The Premier's Financial Statement deals in detail with those prerequisites, and I would like to highlight some of them. In the Financial Statement, under the heading "Taxation", the Premier states:

> In the Budget introduced to Parliament last week, I announced major taxation changes in accordance with our election undertakings. Those changes involved the abolition of stamp duty on first home purchases up to $30 000, with effect from 1 November 1979, the abolition of succession and gift duties from 1 January 1980, increases in the exemption levels for pay-roll tax with effect from 1 January 1980, together with pay-roll tax concessions for additional youth employment and the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence from 1 July 1980. The cost to Revenue Account in 1979-80 was some $5 000 000. The full effect will be felt in 1980-81, when the cost is expected to be about $28 000 000.
>
> I regret to say that, with one exception, it is not possible to introduce further taxation reductions this financial year. That is not to say, of course, that we believe nothing further should be done. On the contrary, we will continue to pursue a policy of lower taxation. A review of possible changes to the existing structure and the practicability of further reductions is being made. In respect to pay-roll tax, however, we believe that some further relief is necessary. the Government proposes to increase the present exemption level of $72 000 to $84 000, tapering back to $37 800 at a pay-roll level of $153 300, with effect from 1 January 1981. This will bring the exemption level into line with the level operating now in Victoria. It will be above the level currently operating in all other States, with the exception of Queensland.
>
> The Government believes that a sustained policy of reduced taxation is essential to encourage private spending and investment. We are committed fully to that policy and we will continue to pursue it in a responsible way as circumstances permit. Implementation of that policy requires restraint in public spending. It requires also that charges for business undertakings, operated by the Government, keep pace with increased costs in order to avoid deficits by those undertakings with consequent ill-effects for the Budget and for taxation. Therefore, we propose to keep the adequacy of charges under close scrutiny, with particular emphasis on equity and efficiency.

Dealing with expenditure control, the Premier states:

> Firm and responsible control over all public expenditure represents the single most important element in the financial policies of this Government. The 1979-80 Budget result bears testimony to that policy. In pursuing that policy, the Government has regard to three key factors: holding the aggregate level of expenditures within the level of available funds; ensuring that, within the aggregate, individual allocations are made responsibly to reflect community needs and; ensuring that resources are used to provide for those needs in the most effective way so that maximum benefit is obtained for each dollar spent.
>
> In preparing this Budget, the Government has paid considerable attention to the third of these elements. In respect to Revenue Account, it has had all departments and relevant statutory bodies examine carefully their objectives, the specific functions they perform, the effectiveness of those functions in meeting the needs of the community, the resources allocated to the performance of those functions, and savings which might be made. The result has been most encouraging. It has enabled the Government to do two things.
>
> First, we have been able to reallocate almost $10 000 000 of existing resources, to enable us to take on a number of important new initiatives. Secondly, and in addition to the reallocation of $10 000 000 we have been able to save a further $2 500 000 and so reduce the extent to which the Government needs to call on Loan Account (and the capital works programme) to support Revenue Account in 1980-81. That reallocation of resources and saving is not being achieved at the expense of a diminished or less effective service to the community. It is being achieved by improved efficiency, eliminating unnecessary expenditure, and using natural wastage as a planned means to reduce gradually the size of the public sector.

Some comments also need to be made about the Government's role in relation to the provision of infrastructure. The provision of basic infrastructure is an essential requirement for the development and expansion of industry in this State and, in particular, for the development of our natural resources. In framing its capital works programme for 1980-81, the Government has sought to strike a balance between those works which are productive, in the sense that costs are recovered through appropriate charges, and those works of a more social nature. We make no apology for believing that, in the current circumstances, major emphasis should be given to the first of these two categories. Clearly, within this broad context, energy supplies are of vital importance to this State. The Government is giving top priority to this area.

Greater details of programmes are set out in the Premier's statement. I need only refer briefly to some of them to indicate the emphasis to which I have referred. First, the construction of the northern power station at Port Augusta and the associated development of the Leigh Creek coalfield is well under way. The Electricity Trust is engaged also on work necessary to prove the suitability of a coal deposit near Port Wakefield. The Government also proposes to see that further funds are made available through the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation in 1980-81 for continued exploration in the Cooper Basin and other areas. Of course, there is the emphasis which the Government gives to the important development of the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical complex.

Encouragement of industry is another important emphasis. In addition to various general measures which the Government has introduced with the aim of establishing a climate favourable to industrial and commercial growth in this State, and in addition to the major resource development projects to which I have already made reference, the Government sees it as important that every effort be made to encourage specific firms and industries to establish or expand in South Australia. The active programme being pursued by the State Development Office and the Department of Trade and Industry has achieved considerable success, and signs for the future are encouraging. Some of the specific developments proposed by individual companies in recent months were referred to in His Excellency the Governor's Speech on the opening of this Parliament. I would also refer honourable members to the recent survey of major mining and manufacturing investment projects released by the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce in June 1980. It shows that, at May 1980, capital committed to manufacturing projects, involving $5 000 000 or more, already under way in this State or reasonably expected to commence within three years, amounted to about $140 000 000. This figure at May 1980 was very much above the figure at October 1979. The Government also places some emphasis on that.

The Government is committed firmly to a policy of reducing unnecessary Government interference and involvement in matters which are best left to the private sector and to the operations of the market place. Some

controls and some associated costs are, of course, unavoidable if the community interest is to be protected properly. However, there are some controls which appear to have outlived their usefulness or which can be streamlined or otherwise improved. In South Australia there are more than 500 public Acts on the Statute Books, spanning a period well in excess of 100 years. There are some 2 000 gazetted regulations. A detailed review of this legislation is now well under way and, in fact, a report on deregulation has been tabled by the Premier this week in the House of Assembly which indicates some recommendations for the Government in coming to grips with the process of deregulation. South Australia has approximately 260 statutory authorities. A review of the number and functions of these authorities has been commenced.

Another important emphasis of the Government's Budget strategy is in the area of wage and salary restraint. Departmental allocations proposed from Revenue Account in this Budget are based on wage and salary rates in operation as at 30 June 1980. The Revenue Budget also incorporates a round sum allowance of $79 000 000 for increases in wage and salary rates which have occurred since 30 June 1980 or which might occur during the rest of 1980-81. I am sure that every member in this Council realises the importance of wage restraint in both the public and private sectors. It is vital if inflation is to be kept under control. It is vital if employment prospects are to improve as rapidly as we would like. It is vital if the security and well-being of those people on fixed (and often low) incomes are to be protected. The Government will continue to vigorously support responsible restraint in national wage cases and in other arbitration matters.

The next matter to which I will refer briefly is that of an appropriately trained workforce. It is essential that, as employment opportunities arise, an appropriately trained local workforce be available to take advantage of them. One of the objects, although by no means the sole object, in establishing the Committee of Inquiry into Primary and Secondary Education, was to review the education system as it relates to this question. The Government has already announced that it plans to introduce major new legislation to increase the number of skilled tradesmen through the apprenticeship system and other means of training. It has also announced the establishment of a manpower forecasting unit within the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. I refer honourable members to the papers which have been tabled for more details of other matters affecting the finances of the Government. I commend those papers to honourable members' attention. I also commend the motion to honourable members.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to move a motion without notice dealing with the question of a Select Committee on unsworn statements.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 18 September at 2.15 p.m.