

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 2 September 1982

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT ACT

The **PRESIDENT**: His Excellency the Governor informs the Legislative Council that Royal assent was proclaimed regarding the Act on 2 September 1982.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Licensing Act Amendment (No. 2),
North Haven Development Act Amendment.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin):

Pursuant to Statute—
Betting Control Board—Report, 1981-82.
South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett):

Pursuant to Statute—
Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on Abortions Notified in South Australia—Report, 1981.

QUESTIONS

TAX AVOIDANCE

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: My questions are directed to the Attorney-General on the subject of the Liberal Party and tax avoidance, as follows:

1. Is it a fact that the Party which now constitutes the Government of this State and which legislated to close a loophole in the Statute governing one important State tax (and I am referring to the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill brought before Parliament in November 1980 and assented to on 18 December of that year) itself (that is, the Liberal Party) took full advantage of the very same loophole to save State Liberal interests a sum of more than \$7 600?

2. Is it also a fact that on 16 May 1975 the Liberal Club Limited, for whom K. Trevor Griffin was named as solicitor, sold its property at 175 North Terrace, premises widely known as the headquarters of the Liberal Party in South Australia, to E. C. Holdings Pty Ltd?

3. Was this property sold for \$315 000 and was stamp duty payable on such a transaction to the amount of \$11 610?

4. Did the Liberal Club Limited and E. C. Holdings Pty Ltd divide the transfer of this property into 27 parts for the sale? And was the stamp duty thus payable \$3 948.75?

5. Was the stamp duty thus avoided, by using this artificial tax avoidance technique of multiple conveyances, an amount of \$7 662.25?

6. Did the Prime Minister say in Adelaide a few days ago:

Any Liberals involved in tax avoidance should leave the Party. I don't know if anyone in the Liberal Party has been adopting or pursuing certain techniques or approaches in relation to tax avoid-

ance, but if they have, I would like to see them leave the Liberal Party before they get caught by our special prosecutor.

I think these high-priced lawyers and accountants who have devised and promoted tax avoidance schemes do much more damage to this world than a thousand Gallaghers or a thousand Builders Labourers' Federations.

7. Did the Premier say in another place, earlier this week:

I believe that the comments made by the Prime Minister are entirely right, and they are echoed by me.

8. Was the Attorney-General correctly reported in the *News* today as saying that he was not in a position to state whether the report into tax avoidance in South Australia would be tabled in Parliament? Did this report mention the fact that his Government had tightened the legislation governing the payment of stamp duty?

9. Was K. Trevor Griffin a Director of Liberal Club Limited at the time of the sale of the North Terrace premises in mid 1975, and was he then fully aware of the practice being adopted in relation to payment of stamp duty on the transaction?

The **Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN**: I am not aware of what the Prime Minister said the other day. I have seen some newspaper reports which referred to tax avoidance. Yesterday, I made some statements to the *News*, which were reported today, dealing with tax evasion. I think the very clear message from that is that, if there is anything illegal or fraudulent or in the nature of a sham, then that is tax evasion which, whether it occurs in the Federal or State arena, is something which authorities are obligated to pursue. That, of course, is what I understand is happening in relation to bottom-of-the-harbor tax schemes, that is, that there is an ingredient of fraud or illegality involved in the nature of the scheme which was detected and about which there has been so much comment in the press recently. Again, as I said in this place several days ago, the law has generally been construed by the courts over perhaps more than a century, particularly in relation to revenue laws, in favour of the citizen. They have been construed strictly. Individuals within the community are entitled to so arrange their affairs as to minimise their obligations for their liability to taxation.

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: By artificial schemes.

The **Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN**: Not by artificial schemes.

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: If this isn't artificial, what is—27 transfers for one block?

The **PRESIDENT**: Order!

The **Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN**: If the Government or Parliament legislates in such a way that there is a loophole, ordinary citizens within the community, according to well established legal precedent, are entitled to so arrange their affairs to take advantage of it.

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: By using artificial contrivances!

The **Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN**: It is for the Government and the Parliament to close those loopholes by amending legislation. What the Government did in 1980 in bringing in amendments to the Stamp Duties Act was to close a loophole which was in the Stamp Duties Act and which quite legitimately many people in the community had taken advantage of. It was for that reason that the Government decided it was time to close the loophole. The previous Government did not bother about closing the loophole, although it was quite well aware of some of the loopholes in the Stamp Duties Act: it was very dilatory and negligent.

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: Did the Liberal Party use the loophole in 1975?

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! The Leader can ask a subsequent question.

The **Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN**: In fact, the previous Government was quite negligent in not moving to tighten a number of the loopholes that were well known throughout the community over the past decade. This Government did introduce legislation to close a number of loopholes; we acted within

one year of coming to office, and we will do so again if tax avoidance loopholes become known to us.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You do not mind using them in the meantime! What sort of morality is that?

The Hon. L. H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Davis is in the same category.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The real danger about lumping avoidance and evasion into one broad package is that people who ought to know better tend to corrupt the law, and the Leader of the Opposition is endeavouring to do that. If it applies to the tax area, where does it stop? Do we get to the criminal law where this person is guilty morally but has a loophole and can take advantage of it? Does the Leader say that that is wrong? That is a new principle in the law—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are getting agitated—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: If the Leader is seeking to apply this principle to taxing and duty legislation, he has to be aware of the consequences, because it must necessarily flow through to other areas of the law. He would be the first one to complain if there was an attitude in the criminal law that one was morally guilty but legally not guilty.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Come on!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is an analogy—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The Liberal Party used an artificial tax scheme to avoid \$7 000 of duty in 1975, and you will not answer the question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader will come to order, or I will name him. I have asked him enough times to enable the answer to be heard. He can ask as many subsequent questions as he likes.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Leader does not appear to really like the principle which he is suggesting with taxing legislation to be applied to the general law. He is hopping on a band wagon, which seems to be emotively popular in certain circles at the present time, but ignores the reality of the law and the way that the courts have developed the principles of construing Statutes.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Put up the price—it's in the report.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Frank Blevins: There were 27 different transactions—talk your way out of that.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am waiting for honourable members to stop talking so that I can answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: What I have been endeavouring to do is put this matter into some sort of perspective. Quite obviously, the Opposition is on some sort of kick where it thinks that it can make moral judgments regardless of the provisions of the law. I have never said, and the Government has never said (and will never say), that, if there is any tax minimisation scheme that has a hint of illegality, fraud or sham about it, it ought to be approved. We say to the contrary, namely, that if there is any such scheme which is a sham and which has any element of fraud or illegality about it, those who perpetrate the scheme ought to be brought to justice.

The Government has demonstrated its willingness to do that in whichever context it arises. That is the way I understand that the Commonwealth is also moving in enacting retrospective legislation to deal with the so-called bottom-of-the-harbor schemes, because there is an element of illegality involved in the transaction. There are many other schemes of which lawyers and members of the community will be aware, whether in the stamp duty field or the income tax field, and which are generally regarded as quite legitimate.

Many people are involved in family trusts, which, I might add, came into vogue in the nineteenth century, fell out of vogue for a while when everyone started to go mad about limited companies, and came back into vogue in the late 1960s and during the 1970s. Creating a company to carry on one's business can, in itself, be a means of minimising one's liability to tax. In that context, can one say that, by taking advantage of the law relating to incorporation of companies, and minimising one's liability, one is involved in tax avoidance? I do not believe that the Leader is so naive as to be suggesting that.

Entering into a partnership with one's wife or husband, as the case may be, may be a means of minimising one's liability to tax. Does the Leader say that that is wrong? Is that tax avoidance? The Leader ought really to get his act together, because he does not seem to know what he is talking about. He has jumped on the band wagon and, although he purports to be a lawyer, the Leader seems to ignore all legal principles when jumping on that band wagon.

I was a director of the Liberal Club Limited, and, as far as I know, I am still a director of that company, which was formed, I think, in the 1930s by some people who were interested in providing a home for the Liberal Party in South Australia. It is provided under the memorandum and articles of association of that company that (I think from memory) the President of the Liberal Party for the time being should be one of the directors of that company. I was State President of the Liberal Party for three years during the 1970s. I am proud that I was President, and I have nothing to run away from in anything that I did while I held that position. The Liberal Club Limited acted independently of the Liberal Party, and, if the Leader looks at the list of directors, he will see it was largely independent of the executive of the Liberal Party of the day.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: John Coumbe M.P. was the Chairman.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Good on him!

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He is not in the Liberal Party.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: So what? The Leader is not even bothering to listen, because he is on his own kick. If one looks at the list of directors of that company, one sees that there are very few directors who are members of the State Executive of the Liberal Party from time to time. It was kept separate from the day-to-day activities of the Party organisation.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are on it, and Coumbe's on it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Of course I am. I am not running away from that. I am proud to be a Director of the Liberal Club Limited, just as I was proud to be President of the Liberal Party in this State.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Are you proud of the 27 separate transactions?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: He should be.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: During the mid-1970s, the building on North Terrace, which was called the Liberal Club Building, was sold by Liberal Club Limited to, I think, E. C. Holdings Pty Ltd. The Liberal Party did not dictate how the transfer was to be made. As I recollect, there was a sale and purchase agreement which was signed by the Liberal Club Ltd as vendor. It was a straight sale for a fixed price, and the solicitors for E. C. Holdings, the purchaser, prepared the documents of transfer. I cannot remember whether there was one transfer or a number of transfers, but—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I have the title; there were 27 separate transfers.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: All right. I am saying that I cannot remember. This must have been seven or eight years ago.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: There were 27 separate transfers, but you didn't notice that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Does the Hon. Mr Blevins want to come to order, or shall I name him? I have asked the honourable member repeatedly to desist, and I intend to take action the very next time he interjects.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's been turned into a Caucus meeting, that is the trouble.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I cannot remember whether it was one transfer or 27 transfers, but, whether it was one or 27, I would have no doubt that it was done within the law. I know that there were many types of these transactions. One hears about these things in the legal profession and in the real estate industry. This scheme was entered into, and it was perfectly legitimate.

In 1980, within one year of coming to office, this Government acted to close the loophole, and it did so properly, in accordance with established precedent, by enacting amending legislation. The previous Government had about five years and probably longer within which to take action. No-one can tell me that the previous Government did not know about this sort of scheme being adopted. If the previous Government did not, then it was stupid.

I can certainly have some of the other questions checked, if that is what the Leader of the Opposition wishes. However, there was nothing illegal, fraudulent, or in the nature of a sham, in that transaction. In any event, the documents were prepared on behalf of the purchaser, which is the normal practice in South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have a supplementary question. It is quite clear that the Attorney-General should resign.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is this a question?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that in 1975 the Attorney-General, as a member of the Board of Directors of the Liberal Club Ltd, in concert with other members of the Liberal Party, knowingly engaged in an artificial tax avoidance scheme, and as the Prime Minister said recently in Adelaide that any Liberals involved in tax avoidance (and that is what the Prime Minister said—not tax evasion) should leave the Party, will the Attorney-General submit his resignation?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answer is a clear and categorical 'No'.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JULIA FARR CENTRE

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement on the subject of the Julia Farr Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In his Budget speech yesterday, the Opposition spokesman on health, Dr Cornwall, made a series of serious allegations about the Julia Farr Centre, formerly known as the Home for Incurables. His attack under Parliamentary privilege on the Julia Farr Centre is the latest in a series of attacks on South Australia's great voluntary institutions, ranging from the St John Service to the Adelaide Children's Hospital and a large number of other health organisations.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, Mr President, surely those comments that were just made by the Minister of Community Welfare are a breach of Standing

Order 193. They are an injurious reflection on the Hon. Dr Cornwall, and as such should not be permitted.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: One rule for the Opposition, and another for the Government.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: No, I did not refer to all that nonsense.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I wish the halo would fall around your neck and break it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Don't say those things within my hearing.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Hon. Dr Cornwall alleged—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I did raise a point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Which I am considering and, as I do not have the Hon. Dr Cornwall's speech in front of me to weigh both up, I find it very difficult. From memory, I believe that the Hon. Dr Cornwall's attack on the Julia Farr Centre was quite forthright.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: On a further point of order, my attack was not on the Julia Farr Centre. On several occasions during the course of the speech I made very clear that I was talking about some of the senior administrators and the administration, but not the centre as such.

The PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon. I think that this statement is dealing with the same matter.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Hon. Dr Cornwall alleged (and he cannot resile from this) that 'incompetence, intrigue and exploitation' have marred the administration of the centre in recent years. His charges against a board of South Australian citizens working in an honorary capacity for a voluntary charitable organisation were both cowardly and, in many respects, incorrect.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order. To accuse another member, in a Ministerial statement, of a cowardly action is surely an injurious reflection under Standing Order 193. I ask two things. First, I ask that the Minister of Community Welfare not abuse the leave of the Council to make an attack on another member; there are forms of the Council for doing that in the proper manner. I ask also that he withdraw the word 'cowardly' and apologise, because it is clearly unparliamentary.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I was simply accurately stating the nature of what the Hon. Dr Cornwall said yesterday.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: With the greatest respect, I have raised a point of order. The word 'cowardly' was used not by the Hon. Dr Cornwall but by the Minister of Community Welfare. Under Standing Order 193, I believe that it is unparliamentary, and I suggest that you, Sir, should ask the Minister to withdraw the word and apologise to the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In view of the intemperance of the Hon. Dr Cornwall's speech yesterday, I do not propose to apologise but, if members wish it, I will withdraw the word 'cowardly' and rephrase the sentence. His charges against a board of South Australian citizens working in an honorary capacity for a voluntary charitable organisation were in many respects incorrect, and I wish to set the record straight. The broad outline of this Government's relationship with the Julia Farr Centre is set out in a letter that my colleague wrote to the President of the centre dated 27 August 1982. I seek leave to have that letter incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The PRESIDENT: The letter cannot be incorporated in *Hansard*; it can be tabled.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to table the letter.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Leave is not granted until the Opposition has seen the letter. That is common courtesy.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted at this time.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will come back to that. This outline demonstrates the dramatic difference between the approach of this Government to the centre and that which existed under almost 10 years of Labor Administration. During this time the Labor Government simply paid taxpayers' funds to the centre without any guidance as to accountability for those funds or the need to administer the centre in the context of an overall health policy.

On assuming office, and recognising the inadequacies of the relationship that had existed between the centre and the Government, my colleague had a series of discussions, commencing in late 1979, with successive Presidents of the centre's board. She also set in train a series of investigations so that the Health Commission could obtain the necessary information on which future administrative and policy decisions could be based. I stress that, in initiating these investigations, my colleague was at all times conscious of the fact that the Government was dealing not with a public organisation but with a private charitable organisation which received some of its funding from the Government.

For this reason, my colleague believed that it was important to preserve the independent nature of organisations such as the Julia Farr Centre, and that its board be given the first opportunity to respond to inquiries, investigations and studies rather than have the Government intervene and issue directions. When my colleague initiated the cost allocation study at the centre in April 1981, it was on a co-operative basis with the board's full agreement.

The Health Commission was at all times at pains to ensure that the study was carried out in a spirit of full co-operation, and honoured its agreement with the centre that the report of the study be jointly reviewed by the board and the Health Commission in draft form prior to its presentation to Government.

This report was reviewed by officers of the commission and the centre, and a number of drafts were prepared, leading to a final report which was presented to the Chairman of the Health Commission and the President of the centre in early June. They met to discuss this report in July and agreed to the report. The commission was not carrying out an audit or trying to score points. It was, however, trying to establish information which could be used for the proper management of the centre and for sound planning for the future.

A number of matters dealt with in the earlier report were either not of major substance and were corrected progressively, or were drawn to the centre's attention in correspondence during the course of the review. The final draft report was presented to my colleague at the end of July, not before Christmas last year, as alleged by Dr Cornwall. There was no mention in the draft report of Raylen Pty Ltd, the broking organisation with common directorship of A.E.H. Evans and Company, which handles the centre's insurance. The first that my colleague knew of this firm was when she provided answers to questions asked by Dr Cornwall in the Legislative Council. Health Commission officers had been aware of the general broking arrangements but had no information which suggested anything improper in these arrangements.

I now turn specifically to Dr Cornwall's allegations in four areas. They were, first, the employment and method of payment to two senior partners of the accountancy firm of A.E.H. Evans and Company as the chief executive officer and the accountant at the Julia Farr Centre. This arrange-

ment, as Dr Cornwall himself said, has existed for a very long time, was well known to Labor Ministers of Health, and was allowed by them to remain undisturbed for 10 years.

Dr Cornwall's description of the arrangement as employing Mr Raymond Griffith Rees as administrator and chief executive officer and Mr Brian Curtis as assistant secretary and accountant is incorrect. The reality is that the firm has contracted to the centre for the provision of a management and accounting service, including a provision of a nominated secretary and assistant secretary. This included provision of adequate staff to provide these services, including servicing the board and many subcommittees of the board, providing cover for long service leave, superannuation and board-room and other facilities to the centre.

When the above is taken into account, Dr Cornwall's claim that Mr Rees received \$50 000 per annum for only 30 hours work per week is obviously wrong and makes no allowances for any out-of-hours work by the partners of A.E.H. Evans and Company. As indicated to the President of the board at the end of July, and as my colleague confirmed in her letter to the President on 27 August 1982, this arrangement is not regarded by the Government as acceptable for the management of a large health institution.

Accordingly, the board has been asked to create and advertise the position of chief executive officer. Secondly, the Hon. Dr Cornwall alleges that there have been irregularities and financial mismanagement in the provision of insurance cover for the centre and that I was aware of this late last year. As I have indicated, my colleague knew nothing of the insurance arrangements until A.E.H. Evans provided information to answers on the Hon. Dr Cornwall's questions in the Legislative Council last week. My colleague has since been advised that Raylen Pty Ltd was formed in 1965 to provide an insurance brokerage service for other clients. The Chairman of the Finance Committee of the then Home for Incurables sought to have the home included in this arrangement in the belief that a better and more cost-effective service would be achieved.

It is normal business practice in an organisation the size of the centre to employ a broker to advise on the type of cover, to obtain cover at best advantage, and to attend to all claims on behalf of the organisation. Instances of claims averaged 250 per annum and thus have to be handled by the broker. It is wrong for the Hon. Dr Cornwall to suggest that there was little or no work involved in handling the centre's insurance. The Hon. Dr Cornwall's calculation that the centre's premiums amounted to 90 per cent of Raylen's premium income is incorrect. In comparing Raylen's income with the premium payments made by the centre, the Hon. Dr Cornwall has confused two financial years. A more realistic estimate is that the premiums bought by the centre amounted to approximately 50 per cent of the premiums for the business handled by A.E.H. Evans on behalf of its clients.

Thirdly, the Hon. Dr Cornwall criticised the accounting of the fund-raising efforts of the Miss Industry Quest. The practice by which the centre has transferred the gross proceeds of fund-raising to its furnishing and building account, while the costs of that fund-raising are met from the centre's operating budget, dates back to the early 1970s, when the Labor Government of the day agreed to this arrangement. It needs to be understood that, unlike other organisations, the Julia Farr Centre has a practice of crediting bequests to operating revenue. Other charitable organisations in receipt of Government funds generally accumulate bequests as capital reserves. In 1980 bequests amounted to \$429 478, compared with the fund-raising expenses of the Miss Industry Quest of \$230 205. Therefore, it cannot be suggested that the centre has inappropriately gained from this unusual

arrangement. This accounting treatment of fund-raising income was changed by the centre in September 1981 with effect from 1 July 1981 as a result of the commission's response and the board's response to the cost allocation study.

Fourthly, the Hon. Dr Cornwall alleges misrepresentation of the profit and loss account of the centre's kiosk. Payments and receipts in respect of the kiosk's operations have only been partly matched, and it is true that the kiosk has run at a loss when indirect costs are taken into account. The Hon. Dr Cornwall's implication that the gross proceeds of the kiosk have been transferred to a capital fund is not correct. Providing a kiosk service in an institution such as the Julia Farr Centre is a necessary part of the life and functioning of the institution. It is not unusual for such kiosks to make a loss and for this loss to be borne from the operating funds.

The cost allocation study has drawn attention to this matter and in future the centre will adequately relate receipts and payments of the kiosk's operations, and by so doing will be better able to manage that function. From what I have said, it is clear that the Hon. Dr Cornwall's allegation that little has been done since the cost allocation study, which my colleague initiated, has become available, is completely wrong. In his vicious attack—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order. It is quite clear that the rest of this so-called Ministerial statement is a clear abuse of the leave granted to the Minister by the Council. It has developed into an attack on the Hon. Dr Cornwall and, consequently, I withdraw my leave.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: There is no attack. I have simply been stating facts.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister cannot persist; leave has been withdrawn.

CARDBOARD

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, aware that the recycling of cardboard at Port Pirie and other regional centres has fallen dramatically? Is the Minister also aware that Orana workshops, which is a collecting agent, has received notice from Cellulose mills that it will not purchase paper from country areas? Will the Minister investigate the possibility of stock-piling supplies of paper being cleared by Cellulose paper mills? Finally, will the Minister respond to a call by Councillor Crisp of the Port Pirie council who called upon the Government to introduce a form of subsidy for the recycling of paper?

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

JULIA FARR CENTRE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In view of his Ministerial statement, has the Minister of Community Welfare any further information on the Julia Farr Centre that he thinks should be provided to the Council?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes. My reply will be completely factual, as was everything I said before. Evidence of my colleague's actions over the past two and a half years—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. The Council has withdrawn leave for this statement to be made, and it is quite clear that the Hon. Mr Cameron, in collusion with the Minister, is trying to flout the wishes of this Council. Every part of the reply to this Dorothy Dixier question which reflects on the Hon. Dr Cornwall will be called to account under Standing Order No. 193, which means that for the remainder of Question

Time the Council will degenerate into little better than chaos. I therefore request that you, Sir, ask the Minister not to attempt to complete his Ministerial statement in another guise.

The PRESIDENT: As a question was asked, I rule that if the Minister can reply to it he should have the opportunity to do so. I hope that he can do that without—

The Hon. Frank Blevins:—reflecting on an honourable member.

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that there is any reflection on an honourable member.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I intend simply to state facts, and I will not reflect on anyone. Evidence of my colleague's actions over the past 2½ years demonstrates the Government's commitment to three important principles, namely, accountability for the use of public funds; conformity with Government policy by organisations in receipt of public funds; and support for the concept of assisting voluntary organisations in their difficult and challenging task of providing health services to the community.

I believe that the patients and their families, who are and have been associated with the Julia Farr Centre, will find that the Government's actions are correct. I wish to reassure them that the Government is fully committed to assisting the Julia Farr Centre in the performance of its important role and that the considerable achievements to improve the administration of the centre that have taken place over the past two years, have helped to establish a sound foundation on which further progress can be made.

LANDS DEPARTMENT FILES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Lands, a question about Department of Lands files.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: In the *Advertiser* of Saturday 28 August it was revealed that certain recommendations had been hidden from the Chairman of the Pastoral Board, Mr Vickery. The *Advertiser* report states:

Mr Vickery said some field staff recommendations to the board had been 'hidden' from him. The recommendations generally involved compulsory removal of stock from properties, some of which had about double the maximum legal stocking rate. Mr Vickery said he had been approached last year by two field staff members who were worried at the board's failure to act on their recommendations. He said that was the first he had known of the recommendations—in one instance, three months after one had been officially lodged. 'There have been a number of things hidden from me,' Mr Vickery said.

This is an extremely serious situation and has obvious parallels with the Deputy Crown Solicitor's Office in Perth where many documents had been hidden in bottom drawers of senior officials of that office, much to the detriment of tax collection in Australia.

These very serious instances of negligent administration obviously need to be corrected, and I would like to ask the Minister what documents were hidden from Mr Vickery, the Chairman of the Pastoral Board? What recommendations were contained in those documents, who was responsible for hiding the documents, and for how long? What action is now being taken to discipline those people who were responsible for hiding the documents referred to? Is the administration of the Lands Department being restructured in view of these serious deficiencies?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Minister of Lands and obtain replies for the honourable member.

CEREAL CROP DISEASES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about cereal crop diseases.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have recently had it reported to me that there is a considerable incidence of powdery mildew prevalent in the barley crops of Yorke Peninsula, particularly on the clipper variety but not on the new galleon variety. Of course, powdery mildew is not the correct botanical name for the disease but it is the farmers' name for the disease. The question has been raised with me about what research has gone into combating this problem, which has shown up significantly in the variety referred to in the present dry conditions.

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

BAIL

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question that I asked on 31 August and 1 September about bail for an alleged murderer?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The question was asked by the Hon. Mr Foster on 31 August and was referred to again yesterday. Peter Charles Hughes, 18 years, was charged with having murdered Ross Leonard Whitwell at Kimba on Sunday 22 August. He was remanded in custody and appeared in the Whyalla Magistrates Court at 10 a.m. on Tuesday 31 August. The granting of bail was strenuously opposed by the Assistant Police Prosecutor at Whyalla. Defendant was represented by counsel. His parents were present with a large cash sum to tender against bail.

Mr Boxall, S.M., admitted the defendant to bail of \$10 000 with a further surety of \$10 000 and an additional cash surety of \$5 000 which was promptly met by the defendant's parents. Bail was conditional upon the defendant staying away from Kimba and reporting daily to Port Adelaide Police Station.

Defendant Hughes has been remanded to appear in the Whyalla Court on 7 September 1982. The magistrate's power to grant bail is given by section 143 of the Justices Act. There is no right of appeal from an order of a magistrate in respect of bail. In particular, I am advised that the right of appeal from orders of a magistrate under section 163 of the Justices Act does not give a right of appeal from an order granting bail.

The Supreme Court does have an inherent jurisdiction to grant bail where the magistrate refuses to grant bail. However, this inherent jurisdiction only arises upon the application of the accused for bail and is not a review of the magistrate's decision. I am advised that this inherent jurisdiction cannot be invoked to seek an order that bail should be refused. The only procedure that might be available in some circumstances is by prerogative writ. This could only be done where the magistrate had exceeded his jurisdiction or had acted 'non-judicially'. I am not aware of any evidence which would suggest that any prerogative remedy is available in this case.

YOUTH REMAND ASSESSMENT CENTRE

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about the South Australian Youth Remand Assessment Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: Concern has been expressed over the possible closure of a first offenders unit for girls at the South Australian Youth Remand Assessment Centre, formerly known as Vaughan House, and the placement of those first offenders with repeat offenders. It is believed that the effect of this may be detrimental to their subsequent rehabilitation. First, is it true that the first offenders unit for girls at the South Australian Youth Remand Assessment Centre will be closed on or about 10 September 1982? Secondly, will this result in first offender girls being placed with repeat offenders? Thirdly, are moves also being made to accommodate girls with boys? Fourthly, is this step being taken only as a cost-cutting exercise? Finally, if this is not the case, why is it being contemplated, if it is being contemplated?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The department does not contemplate any plan to close any portion of SAYRAC. It is a fact that staff from the centre have proposed a restructuring of the present unit system. This proposal has not yet been considered by the department, and I emphasise that the initiative came from the staff, but it has not yet been considered. The director responsible for SAYRAC is considering suggestions for reorganising the unit system, having regard to the staff's request. He intends to discuss those suggestions at the department's next executive meeting on Tuesday 7 September 1982.

The position is that the department is not contemplating any closure at the present time. There have been suggestions from the staff, but there is no question of cost saving: it is simply a question of what is best for the centre. The proposal for the reorganisation of the unit system would not result in a reduction in the centre's residential capacity, nor would there be any reduction in service or in the number of staff to provide those services. SAYRAC is comprised of five units, and there have been low numbers for quite some time. This is in accordance with the policy of the previous Government since 1970 and the present Government to keep children out of institutional care wherever possible and wherever practicable by means such as INC, the intensive personal supervision scheme, the community work order scheme and other methods. It has been a concern to the department for some time that there are low numbers in the five SAYRAC units, and some question of restructuring may have to be considered. At present there is no proposal by the department's executive to close the unit: the suggestions have come from the staff. They will be considered and such action as is deemed to be proper will be recommended to me by the executive.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Roxby Downs project.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Attorney-General seen the headline on page 3 of today's *News* which states, '18 600 jobs likely in Roxby bonanza'? The report by Frank Jackson states:

Roxby Downs could create up to 18 600 jobs and inject up to \$640 000 000 a year into the South Australian economy during its development, according to a new university report.

The prediction by Monash University's Policy Studies Centre says these jobs would be created during a four-year development phase of the giant copper, gold and uranium mine in South Australia's Far North.

Would the Minister care to comment on the predictions by the Monash University and would he agree that the fact that those predictions have been made by the Monash

University gives them greater credence? Also, would the Minister agree that the great potential of this project reflects great credit on the Hon. Norman Foster for assisting to get this legislation through the Chamber?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You were going crook at academics yesterday you blokes.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not criticising academics.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Cameron was.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I understand that this research was undertaken by researchers at Monash University.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Not by the University.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Their research is under the umbrella of the university, presumably because they are engaged by the university and must have ability.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Who pays them—the university?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The fact is that they are researchers at the Monash University who have undertaken an independent review of the Roxby Downs project. They have examined the indenture, too, and, as I understand, have made a number of projections at 3 levels: most pessimistic; most optimistic; and something in between. As I understand, the pessimistic approach reaches a conclusion that the project will generate 9 300 new jobs and an extra \$230 000 000 in annual State output.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: What is the time frame on that?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That is during the 1980s.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Good God, is that right.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Attorney-General does not need to reply to interjections, but should reply to the question asked by the Hon. Mr Dawkins.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I agree that the interjections are not worth answering. On another projection it states that, during the operational stage, there will be something like 6 200 jobs, injecting a further \$115 000 000 into the State output. Then, there is another projection of up to 18 600 jobs and an injection of up to \$64 000 000 a year into South Australia's production output.

That, of course, has tremendous advantages in it for all South Australians. That is what this Government was looking forward to when it put the indenture to the Parliament earlier this year. We recognise that any sort of resource development of this magnitude will obviously take a period of time to wind up until it is at the full production stage. We have never denied that in the short term there would be a few jobs created.

I think that when the debate was proceeding on this matter in June the figure quoted was about 207 direct jobs at Roxby Downs with perhaps another 800 indirect jobs reliant upon that. Therefore, that is 1 000 jobs directly and indirectly generated, even at the feasibility stage. We also recognised that there would be real potential for a significant number of jobs to be created for the benefit of all South Australians, and we were looking to the future in introducing that indenture. I recognise, also, that the Hon. Norman Foster was doing likewise, that he was looking to the future and to the jobs that would be created. We are, as a Government, reassured by the independent assessment that has been made of this matter. It confirms what we believed to be the position leading up to the presentation of the Indenture Ratification Bill to the Parliament.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Call on the business of the day.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I have a supplementary question.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Question Time to continue until 3.25 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have a supplementary question. In his reply to the question asked by the Hon. Mr Dawkins the Attorney said that this would occur in the 1980s. Would the Attorney-General advise me where he got that figure from, because it certainly was in the article quoted by the Hon. Mr Dawkins?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: What is the question?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Attorney said that an extra 18 600 jobs would be created in the 1980s and I am asking where he got that particular date from.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: I did not say that 18 600 jobs would be in the 1980s—check the *Hansard* record.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Also, would the Attorney-General approach the Western Mining Corporation and ask whether it will confirm this figure of 18 600 jobs and the amount of money it is claimed will be generated for South Australia in the 1980s, and whether that squares with the company's time-frame estimates?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I did not say that 18 600 jobs would be in the 1980s. What I indicated was that during the 1980s the decision would be taken as a result of the feasibility study and that there would be a build-up in jobs during the 1980s if a decision to commit was taken by the company consequent to the feasibility study.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Check *Hansard* tomorrow. If honourable members opposite would care to cast their minds back (although I am sure that they would want to hide in their little hollow logs to avoid the embarrassment of their voting against the Bill) they will remember that there were projections made about the prospects for this potentially massive development in South Australia and that under the terms of the indenture the joint venturers have to make a decision on commitment by 1987. It is quite possible that they will make a decision before that time. Once they make a decision to commit there will be a rapid build-up of jobs in South Australia.

The article, in fact, talks about the operational stage of the project as well as the construction stage. There is no doubt that during the construction stage, it states in this article in the *Australian*:

If there are no supply constraints the report estimates that an annual investment outlay of \$350 000 000 during construction of Roxby Downs would generate roughly 18 600 jobs and \$638 000 000 in gross State production output.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: When?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have just told you.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: He doesn't want to believe.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They are knockers.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The worst knockers in the world.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Gloom and doom. Members opposite cannot face the facts of life. They cannot be positive. All they can do is criticise. It does not fuss me, because the people of South Australia will see them for what they are at the next election and will prefer a positive Government that is looking to the future of South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. I asked the Attorney-General whether he would take up with Western Mining Corporation the question of this project and whether the numbers and time frame mentioned squared with the company's figures.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have no influence over what the Minister might tell the honourable member.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Answer the question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot influence what the Minister says.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JULIA FARR CENTRE

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: During my Ministerial statement on the subject of the Julia Farr Centre, at one stage I sought leave to table a letter from the Minister of Health to the President of the Julia Farr Centre. At that time the Opposition correctly took the point that it would not grant me leave until the Opposition members had seen the letter. In the meantime, the Opposition has seen the letter and I am informed that it has no objection to the letter being tabled. Therefore, I seek leave to table the letter.

Leave granted.

SECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question about secondary school education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The Keeves Committee inquiring into education in South Australia observed that the retention rate of secondary school students to year 12 was well below that of most other Western countries. In fact, in 1981 the retention rate for South Australian secondary school students was 38.9 per cent, marginally higher than the national average. Even allowing for the fact that some 17-year-olds are already engaged in tertiary studies, this figure compares most unfavourably with Japan where well over 80 per cent of all 17-year-olds still engage in full-time secondary education, and the United States, where the figure is close to 80 per cent.

The current South Australian retention rate of 38.9 per cent of year 12 students is well short of that projected by the Karmel committee of inquiry into education in South Australia in 1970, which assumed a retention rate in excess of 50 per cent for the year 1981. The Federal Schools Commission Report 'Schooling for 15 and 16 year-olds' published in November 1980, was also concerned about this. It observed that the existing school system was not designed to meet the new social and economic pressures existing in the 1980s. Both the Keeves Report and the Federal Schools Commission Report observed that the secondary school curriculum had been dominated by the requirement to prepare 15 per cent to 20 per cent of students for a tertiary education.

The Senate Standing Committee on Education in the Arts, in a recent paper on preparation for the work place, suggested that 25 per cent of young people who leave Australian schools each year are educationally disadvantaged in that they have inadequate basic skills. The Keeves Report observed that during the coming decade it will be increasingly difficult for a student who leaves school at 15 years of age and, therefore, that a more appropriate and relevant secondary education programme is required. Although the Keeves Committee observed that—

The PRESIDENT: Can the honourable member say whether this is part of an explanation?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I am coming to the question now. The Keeves Committee observed that the State school education system in South Australia compared most favourably with those of other States. First, recognising that there already have been significant initiatives through work experience, school-to-work and pre-vocational training schemes, will the Minister consider implementing the Keeves Committee recommendation to broaden year 11 and year 12 curriculums and also ensure greater flexibility within those curriculums, so providing students with a more adequate preparation for life and work? In particular, will the Minister

look at the possibility of broadening curriculum areas relating to legal studies (including basic consumer and commercial law), the role of banks, building societies, credit unions and finance companies as vehicles for savings and loans, insurance, sport, recreation and leisure programmes and knowledge of the economy, in programmes such as those provided by Enterprise Australia? Given that Australian secondary school students as future workers are in effective competition with students of other countries, will the Minister consider upgrading the emphasis on technology, science, mathematics and trade studies in the secondary school curriculum? Finally, does the Minister intend to review the existing minimum school leaving age of 15 years and, in any event, will the department seek to encourage both parents and students to recognise the benefits of a five-year secondary school education?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Minister in another place and bring back a reply.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I rise on a point of order. In view of the Minister's long statement, can Question Time be extended a further 10 minutes?

The PRESIDENT: Your appeal is to the Minister.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I was going to ask the Hon. Mr Sumner a question about Roxby Downs.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It took 10 minutes to give the Ministerial statement and I have extended Question Time by 10 minutes, which is a normal courtesy agreed between me and the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: In spite of the circumstances, will the Attorney-General consider permitting another 5 minutes of Question Time?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: No, I will not.

STRATHMONT CENTRE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many residents were accommodated at Strathmont Centre at 30 June 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982?

2. How much residential accommodation was available in each of the following annexes—

- (a) Northcote House;
- (b) Marden Hill Hostel;
- (c) Newton Lodge Hostel;
- (d) The Pines Hostel;
- (e) Mareeba;
- (f) Charles Blaskett Centre;
- (g) Athelstone Group Home,

in the financial years 1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82?

3. (a) What accommodation for intellectually retarded persons has been closed during this period and in which financial year?

(b) How much accommodation was lost?

4. (a) What accommodation for intellectually retarded persons has been opened during this period and in what financial year?

(b) How much accommodation was gained?

5. What was the total number of intellectually retarded residents accommodated at Strathmont, the annexes previously mentioned, and at any other State Government institutions or cottages in each of the financial years 1978-79 to 1981-82?

6 (a) What were the budgets (expenditure) for residential care of the intellectually retarded in South Australia in the financial years 1978-79 to 1981-82?

(b) What amounts were spent on residential and non-residential care in each of those years?

7. What was the increase or decrease, in real terms and percentages, in the budgets (expenditure) for all intellectually retarded persons in South Australia in each of the financial years 1979-80 to 1981-82, using 1978-79 as the base?

8. What was the increase or decrease, in real terms and percentages, in the residential care component of the budgets (expenditure) for intellectually retarded persons in South Australia in the financial years 1979-80 to 1981-82, using 1978-79 as the base?

9. What was the increase or decrease, in real terms and percentages, in the non-residential care component of the budgets (expenditure) for intellectually retarded persons in South Australia in the financial years 1979-80 to 1981-82, using 1978-79 as the base?

10. What was the total number of staff expressed as full-time equivalents (excluding personnel formerly employed by the Public Buildings Department, if any) at the Strathmont Centre in the financial years 1978-79 to 1981-82?

11. What was the number of nursing staff, expressed as full-time equivalents, employed at Strathmont in the financial years 1979-80 to 1981-82?

12. What was the staff establishment, both total and nursing (expressed as full-time equivalents), at all other annexes and cottages providing residential accommodation for intellectually retarded persons in the financial years 1979-80 to 1981-82?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The time required to provide answers to these questions is not considered to be warranted. Most of the information sought is to be found in: (a) Annual Reports of the Health Commission or of the organisations mentioned; (b) Parliamentary Budget papers and the Auditor-General's Report for the years in question.

PENSIONER DENTURE SCHEME

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many eligible pensioners were on the waiting list for dentures at the Dental Hospital at 30 June 1979?

2. How many eligible pensioners were on the waiting lists for dentures at the Dental Hospital, the Flinders Medical Centre, Gilles Plains, The Parks or any other centre at 30 June 1982?

3. How many dentures were supplied through the Pensioner Denture Scheme in the financial years 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82?

4. How many dentures were supplied to non-metropolitan pensioners by private dental practitioners through the Australian Dental Association's modified Licensed Dental Operators' scheme funded by the South Australian Health Commission in the financial year 1981-82?

5. (a) What were the budgets for the pensioner denture scheme in the financial years 1978-79 to 1981-82, both inclusive?

(b) By what amounts, in real terms and percentages, did they increase or decrease in 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82?

6. (a) What percentage of Federal funds, if any, does the scheme attract?

(b) What amounts were made available from this source in the financial years 1978-79 to 1981-82 inclusive?

7. What inflation rate has been used in each of the financial years 1979-80 to 1981-82 in making calculations?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. Dental Hospital statistics for the week ending 29 June 1979 indicate that there were 3 435 patients on the Prosthetic Waiting List.

2. Dental Hospital, 809; Flinders Medical Centre, 313; Gilles Plains, 374; The Parks, 175.

3. The Pensioner Denture Scheme commenced in November 1981. As at 30 June 1982, 3 095 pensioners were offered care under the scheme and a total of 1 191 claims from private dentists were paid. Details on the number of denture units provided are not readily available.

4. Of the 3 095 pensioners offered care under the Pensioner Denture Scheme as at 30 June 1982, approximately half were from country areas of the State.

5. (a) Total expenditure on the Pensioner Denture Scheme in 1981-82 was \$265 372.

(b) Not applicable.

6. (a) Where services have been provided for patients of recognised hospitals, they are cost-shared with the Federal Government.

(b) \$125 000 approximately in 1981-82.

7. Not applicable.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the Council at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 14 September at 2.15 p.m.

Motion carried.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE

Adjourned debate on motion of Minister of Local Government:

That the following resolution of the House of Assembly be agreed to:

That portions of the travelling stock reserve, sections 292, and 293, hundred of Copley, and sections 255, 256, 257, 258, 263, 264, hundred of Gillen, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 23 June 1981, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1977.

(Continued from 1 September. Page 886.)

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: This is a fairly routine motion that has been researched very carefully by my colleague in another place, the Hon. Dr Hopgood, who spoke to it when it was debated in that place. There is really nothing more that I need say about this matter. Accordingly, the Opposition supports the motion.

Motion carried.

WATER RESERVE No. 87

Adjourned debate on motion of Minister of Local Government:

That the following resolution of the House of Assembly be agreed to:

That Water Reserve No. 87, section 1172, out of hundreds (Ooldea), as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 23 June 1981, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1977.

(Continued from 1 September. Page 886.)

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Once again, this motion was very carefully researched by my colleague, the Hon. Dr Hopgood, who spoke to it in another place. I agree entirely with his speech which is very good and cannot be improved on in any way.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.37 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 14 September at 2.15 p.m.