

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 27 August 1985

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

PETITION: CONSUMPTION TAX

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the Council urge the Government to reject a 12½ per cent consumption tax on services and fight its introduction in South Australia was presented by the Hon. Peter Dunn.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health on behalf of the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—
Electoral Act, 1985—General Regulations.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

Pursuant to Statute—
Architects Act, 1939—By-law 38—Promotion of Services.

Coast Protection Act, 1972—Regulations
Coastal Protection Districts (Revocation).

South East Coast Protection District.
Dentists Act, 1984—General Regulations, 1985.

Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—Low Alcohol Beer.

Nurses Act, 1984—Regulations—Nurses Board Elections.

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by SA Planning Commission on proposed—Borrow pit, Sec. 200, Hundred of Pyap.

Redevelopment of Rendelsham Primary School.
Erection of classroom at Loxton High School.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Pursuant to Statute—
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956—Regulations—One Plate system.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—
Betting Control Board—Report, 1984-85.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SCHOOL TRANSPORT

The **Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. BARBARA WIESE**: In April 1983 the Minister of Education established the School Transport Policy Review Steering Committee to undertake a comprehensive review of school transport policies. It was the first such major review of school transport for nearly 30 years. After receiving 175 formal submissions and meeting over an extensive period, the task was completed and presented to me in May this year. The Minister of Education provided the Education Department with the initial opportunity to examine its implications and, having received its advice, now tables the report and authorises its public release.

The report is being made available for public comment and a schedule is now being prepared for implementing changes. Release of the recommendations does not, of course, mean they have all been accepted, as each of them is being examined in the interests of both good economic manage-

ment and the needs for choice in education. One recommendation to which the Minister has already attended concerns the use of spare capacity on existing bus services to enable students to attend a school which is not necessarily the one closest to their home. The Minister has approved a modified version of the recommendation contained in the report.

An exchange of letters between the students' families and the Education Department will make it clearly understood that, when spare capacity no longer exists, the right to free bus travel to the more distant school also ceases. Students will then have to make private arrangements or opt to return to their local school, using its free bus service. This approach will make planning much easier. Without clear policies about 100 complaints arise each year, mainly because of different perceptions of the rights of students and their families.

We cannot afford to have so much uncertainty in what is a big operation. Each day 25 500 students travel by school buses run under an annual budget of about \$13 million in operating costs, and involving a fleet of 412 departmental and 295 contract buses. This and other recommendations in the report deserve careful consideration.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The **Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.R. CORNWALL**: On Thursday last the Premier undertook to provide a full report in another place concerning alleged attempts to cover up financial mismanagement of the Lyell McEwin Health Service. These allegations were raised—in rather curious circumstances—by the Leader of the Opposition and several of his colleagues in the House of Assembly and by the Hon. Mr Cameron in the Council. They based their questions on a front-page report in the *News* of 22 August 1985. Under the headline 'Uproar over hospital cover-up' the *News* purported to reveal that the hospital and the South Australian Health Commission had attempted to cover up an auditor's allegations of falsifying records and gross financial bungling.

Mr Olsen and his cohorts (with the notable exception of the member for Coles) chose to pursue this matter with such vigour, including demands for the tabling of documents, that it is necessary for me to cover the events since mid-1983 in some detail. In the process, the shabby political opportunism of the Opposition will be exposed and the completely unfounded and scurrilous allegations of cover-up by the South Australian Health Commission will be refuted. The grotesque posturing of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues would be comic if they had not contrived to malign senior public servants. The fact of the matter is that the Leader of the Opposition, egged on by the member for Hanson, Mr Becker, took deliberate aim and shot himself in the foot.

I was asked on Thursday last to table the auditor's report for the hospital 'to the end of the 1983 period and to the end of the 1984 period'. Although I agreed to consider this request, I said that I was reluctant to do so because of the precedent such action would create. Concerned as I am with good management, I stressed the importance of ensuring that auditors feel free to report fully and frankly to an administration or board on a confidential basis. I emphasised that I had inherited the mess at the Lyell McEwin Health Service and that I was perfectly happy for any member of the Opposition to inspect that auditor's report. Of course, no-one took up that offer. The following day,

however, the *News* published extracts from the auditor's report to the South Australian Health Commission, together with a tearsheet of the first page of that document.

Since this makes any reservations about confidentiality irrelevant, I will shortly seek leave to table the auditor's report to the South Australian Health Commission for 1982-83, which is dated 12 March 1984 and signed by Donald James Venn, a partner in Dean, Newbery and Partners, chartered accountants. I will also seek leave to table the auditor's statement to the board of management of the Lyell McEwin Hospital for that year, which statement is dated 12 March 1984 and which was subsequently published in the hospital's annual report and presented at the annual meeting.

I also table, as part of the auditor's report to the Health Commission for 1982-83, four interim reports made to the board of management and dated respectively 27 June 1983, 7 September 1983, 27 October 1983 and 12 December 1983. I seek leave to table all these documents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the four interim reports be authorised to be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Health Commission became aware of the serious problems of financial mismanagement at the Lyell McEwin Hospital following the 27 June 1983 interim report of the auditor. As honourable members with an appetite for details of the sort of bungling and deception which was going on under the Tonkin Government's administration can plough through the 14 close-typed pages of the document I have tabled, I will list only the main elements of the auditor's findings. There was concern over cash controls, delays in bank reconciliations, 'borrowed' funds from the daily cash receipts which appeared to have been repayed later, discrepancies between bank records and hospital records, and inadequate debtors control and revenue collection procedures. In relation to the problem with outstanding debts, the auditor was critical of the hospital administration's performance and practices, indicating that large amounts of money which might have been recovered were being forgone. In particular, he said there was 'little interest' in following up debts which were outstanding before 30 June 1982 because the hospital's policy was to write off all debts more than 12 months old.

The South Australian Health Commission reacted quickly and effectively. Senior experienced officers were dispatched to the hospital to begin an urgent investigation of financial management and accounting and to ensure that remedial measures were put in place. It was their work which revealed that bank reconciliations had been fabricated over at least the previous two years. Their probing established that the expenditure for the year 1981-82 had been understated by \$106 291.42, even though the auditor had certified the expenditure as correct. This information is crucial for anybody who wishes accurately to assess or report the Health Commission's role in this matter, and it is cold comfort for a cynical Opposition which connived at the defamation of the commission, particularly its senior officers.

The charge of cover-up against the commission is as monstrous as it is inaccurate. For the information of the Council I seek leave to table a memorandum sent to the Chairman of the Health Commission by the Executive Director of the Central Sector.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the memorandum be authorised to be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That memorandum details the action taken by that officer in the wake of the auditor's

interim report of 27 June 1983 and his strenuous objections to the false allegations made against the commission. The auditor's reports to the Health Commission and to the Lyell McEwin Hospital for 1981-82 contain no references to the matters brought to light by the commission's own officers in their subsequent investigations. I seek leave to table those documents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the documents be authorised to be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Comparing the auditor's remarks with the memorandum prepared by the Executive Director of the Central Sector, it can be seen that, far from concealing poor management and false reporting, the commission's officers immediately informed the auditor of what they found. These matters themselves then, quite properly, became the subject of further comment by the auditor in his additional interim reports to the board of management of the hospital which I have tabled.

Under the Tonkin Government, and particularly the administration of the member for Coles (Mrs Adamson), there was a total commitment to the concept of autonomy for health units. The former Minister of Health publicly stated her commitment, having discussed matters with the then Premier, to a policy of vesting a greater degree of managerial responsibility in hospital boards not only in the health area but also in the industrial relations and fiscal areas. According to her, boards could have great managerial responsibility without detracting from the need for all health units to observe an overall commitment to Government policy. The Tonkin Government, she said, had decided that the commission should only make rules about matters on which it was prepared to take some action if those rules were broken. In a speech to the Australian College of Health Service Administrators on 19 September 1980, the former Minister of Health had this to say:

I feel I can speak frankly among friends in saying that the role of a Minister who is responsible for a statutory authority as distinct from a Public Service department requires an understanding of the special relationship which exists in these circumstances. The Minister of Health does not control the Health Commission; she controls the exercise by the commission of the powers entrusted to it under the Act.

The case of the Lyell McEwin Hospital demonstrates the futility of this religion of 'autonomy' espoused enthusiastically by the previous Government and the weakness of the disclaimer by the member for Coles with regard to her role in supervising the commission's protection of taxpayer funds. Up to mid-1983, that is, shortly after I became the Minister, it was not required of health units under independent audit that their audit reports be submitted to the Health Commission for examination. That is a remarkable situation. Honourable members who take the trouble to examine the auditor's interim report of 3 September which I have tabled will note that the auditor had not received replies to five reports made to either the Chairman of the board or the Administrator between 13 April 1978 and 7 April 1982.

Honourable members can be reassured that, since I became Minister, the Health Commission has taken action to require that the auditor's reports on the financial management of health units whose administration is examined by independent auditors are submitted to the commission as well as to the respective boards of management. So that honourable members can see for themselves the type of critical reporting by the auditor in the period before it became necessary for such reports to be submitted to the Health Commission, I seek leave to table two further documents. These are an interim auditor's report to the board of management at the Lyell McEwin Hospital dated 19 June 1980

and a similar report to the same board dated 7 April 1982. Both documents are marked 'private and confidential'.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the documents be authorised to be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The 1980 report is a nine-page document detailing inadequate controls over payments, bank reconciliations and poor accounting procedures. There are also specific criticisms relating to payroll audit. The 7 April 1982 document constitutes two pages dealing with problems relating to bank reconciliations, cheque payments and credit notes.

The auditor's interim report of 7 September 1983 contains an exhaustive list of the inadequacies of the administration at the hospital. The document was submitted on a private and confidential basis for action by the board. The auditor's interim report of 27 October, also private and confidential, concentrates largely on the understatement of expenditure outlined earlier in this statement and the subsequent preparation of false returns by the hospital administration. The records were falsified to compensate in 1982-83 for the understatement of 1981-82 which would otherwise have caused the hospital to suffer a cash deficiency equal to the understatement.

While the auditor's report contains no suggestion that the Health Commission was involved in the deliberate falsification of records, the auditor did question the ethics of the Health Commission providing additional funds to the hospital to compensate for the over-expenditure during 1981-82. The Health Commission rejects any implication that there was anything unethical or improper about its action in allocating additional funding to the hospital to meet a shortfall in the hospital's budget. Nor was there anything unethical or improper about the administrative process involved in supplying those additional funds.

In cases where health units overspend their approved allocation, the commission has two basic choices. The first is to insist that the shortfall is found from some other source, such as capital account or overdraft. The second is to supply additional funds, always providing that the relevant sector has sufficient funds within its own overall allocation to do so. On this occasion the final consolidation of funds available to all the health units in the Central Sector meant that total expenditure was less than funds available and, consequently, it was decided to provide additional funds without increasing the hospital's approved allocation.

The auditor's comments upon this matter are contained not in a report to the Health Commission but in a report to the hospital board of management. Although the commission strenuously denies any suggestion of manipulation or deceit, the Executive Director of the Central Sector wrote on 8 December 1983 to arrange for a review by the commission's own Internal Audit Unit of the financial audit situation of the Lyell McEwin Hospital for the years 1981-82 and 1982-83 with particular reference to actions taken by officers in his sector concerning financial transactions between the commission and the hospital. Last Thursday I tabled the Internal Audit Unit's report on these matters.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Doctored!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Dealing with any implication by the external auditor that items of expenditure may have been manipulated with the knowledge of the South Australian Health Commission, the Internal Audit Unit report says, 'We believe it to be quite conceivable that Central Sector personnel were not involved in or had knowledge of the falsification of the returns . . .'

The Hon. Mr Lucas interjected while I was speaking then and said 'doctored', and that certainly ought to be on the

record because that is just about the most heinous of all the allegations made by the Opposition over recent days. He is a disgrace to this Parliament and to his Party.

This did not satisfy, as I said, the Executive Director of the Central Sector who insisted that the Internal Audit Unit be more precise in its findings. Accordingly, the Chief Internal Auditor wrote to the Executive Director on 14 March 1984 and stated that, while no conversations had been held with the hospital officers responsible for the fabricated summaries or the external auditor, 'We found no evidence to support the external auditors' allegations.' I seek leave to table that letter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the letter be authorised to be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: On 24 February 1984 the new Chief Executive Officer of the Lyell McEwin Health Service, Dr David Reynolds, wrote a long letter of reply to the interim reports provided by the auditor, including this excerpt:

In the case of the Health Commission only funding the service up to the level of the approved budget, the service would have had to fund the overspending level of \$148 951.06 from the Capital Account in order that the Medibank account reconciled to a nil balance at 30 June 1983. In my view there is no question of manipulation, as implied in your letter of 27 October 1983, but merely the submission of financial returns to the Health Commission in accordance with the funds provided as distinct from expenditure incurred by the service.

It has taken some time to set out the main issues in relation to this matter because of the nature of the attack which has been launched against the Health Commission in the vain hope that the smear would rub off on the Government. The facts expose the Liberal Party for its inefficiency in office and its bankruptcy in opposition. The fact that the Health Commission agreed to underwrite the hospital's expenditure above the approved level was not a secret process because it was published in information supporting the 1983-84 Estimates presented to Parliament as part of the Estimates Committee hearing in September 1984.

The fact that there had been administrative problems at the hospital was disclosed by me in answer to a question in the Council from the Hon. Miss Laidlaw in February 1985, six months ago. I repeat what I said on that occasion:

I can say in general terms that the accounting practices at the Lyell McEwin Hospital two years ago left an enormous amount to be desired.

I also said:

The administration generally at the Lyell McEwin Hospital two years ago left a great deal to be desired. A new and very senior administrator, Dr David Reynolds, was appointed fairly early in my term. The whole administration, including the financial administration at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, has been very substantially upgraded.

I was, of course, absolutely correct in that assessment. The actions taken to upgrade financial accounting and administration at the hospital have been approved by all parties. The external auditor's 1982-83 report to the Health Commission, which I have tabled, concludes as of 12 March 1984:

. . . We are satisfied that improved accounting systems and controls have since been implemented in an endeavour to overcome some of the matters contained in the various reports contained above. We are also satisfied that the board of management of the health service has resolved to rectify the matters raised in those reports where practicable and to date has initiated significant administrative measures in this regard.

The upgrading I have described is continuing, now under the scrutiny of the Auditor-General, who was prescribed as the hospital's auditor as from 1984-85. In a letter to the board of management on 24 January 1985 the Auditor-

General, while calling for urgent action to tighten controls, said it was:

... apparent from the audit that considerable efforts, particularly in the revenue area, were being made to overcome serious problems in internal controls that had been revealed in the past.

The House of Assembly Notice Paper of 15 May 1985 contained question No. 578 from the member for Hanson, asking the Minister of Health for a reply on 21 May, as follows:

What were the findings of the auditor's audit of Sir Lyell McEwin Hospital for the years ended 30 June 1983 and 1984, and what remedial action has been taken?

As the answer was not made before the parliamentary break, I wrote to Mr Becker at Parliament House on 1 August providing a detailed, three-page answer. That letter not only spelled out action taken by the Health Commission but canvassed the criticisms made by the auditor. It said, in part:

The Lyell McEwin Health Service received a qualified auditor's report for the year ended 30 June 1983. The Auditor, Mr D.J. Venn, partner of Dean Newbery and Partners—Chartered Accountants, stated that in his opinion the accounting and financial functions including the overall system of financial internal control of the health service was inadequate. In particular, Mr Venn was not prepared to state that the balance of outstanding debtors, as at 30 June 1983, could be relied upon as being the total amount recoverable as of that date. It was also stated that in his opinion the service had not adhered to the 1982-83 Revenue Collection Guidelines for Hospitals as formally outlined by the South Australian Health Commission.

My letter also revealed that:

For the year ended 30 June 1984, the auditor qualified the financial statements in that he was not prepared to state that the details relating to the reconciliation of outstanding patient accounts, and the categorisation of those accounts, could be relied on.

So that honourable members can satisfy themselves beyond the slightest doubt that there was no cover-up, I now seek leave to table the auditor's report to the South Australian Health Commission for 1983-84.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the report be authorised to be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to table the auditor's statement to the hospital's board of management for 1983-84.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the statement be authorised to be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I regret that I have been forced to spend so much of the Council's time on this matter, but it has been necessary to refute the scandalous allegations made against the Health Commission without the slightest basis in fact.

The Opposition's role in defaming the commission and its officers is crystal clear. On Thursday last when the Leader of the Opposition and his gang of knockers rose in the House of Assembly to ask questions based on the *News* report, they were perfectly well aware that the Health Commission itself, through me, had provided detailed information relating to the questions asked by Mr Becker. Indeed, Mr Becker was given credit for his role. The fifth sentence in that sensational front-page report said:

Today Liberal MP Mr Becker, whose question in Parliament last week helped expose serious problems at the hospital, called on the Public Accounts Committee to investigate the matter.

An honourable member: There were serious problems.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: During your administration, exactly. I have spent almost 30 minutes outlining it. Honourable members opposite have really shot themselves in the collective foot.

The hypocrisy of this righteous Opposition is matched only by its staggering capacity for self-mutilation. To prop up the phoney line that he had 'exposed serious problems' by asking questions in Parliament the previous week, Mr Becker contrived to put his question back on the Notice Paper. He had the answer in writing from me, but there on the House of Assembly Notice Paper for 6 August—five days after my letter was sent—and still on the Notice Paper for last Thursday, is the same question. And where was this tremendous piece of political sagacity and investigative reporting to take the Parliament? Directly to the years 1981-82 and 1982-83 and the sorry mess presided over by the Tonkin Administration and, more particularly, the member for Coles, from whom not a peep was heard. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Coles can rest assured that the Bannon Government will cooperate fully with any Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee investigation into the financial mismanagement and the bungling which occurred at the Lyell McEwin Hospital during that period.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: But not after it. I have set the record straight. The Health Commission, once it became aware of the problems that existed—and members opposite are still prepared to defame senior officers in the Health Commission: they are prepared—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: —to propagate untruths—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leave having been granted for a ministerial statement, we will listen to it. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I have set the record straight. The Health Commission, once it became aware of the problems that existed, acted efficiently and with complete propriety. I defy anybody who has any integrity to say otherwise.

If the Public Accounts Committee wishes to pursue any inquiries into this matter we will be delighted to make available all documents and witnesses. No doubt the member for Coles can be prevailed upon to give convincing evidence of her own blissful ignorance of the sorry state of affairs that existed at the hospital during the period of autonomy that she insisted hospitals must have.

QUESTIONS

INTERNATIONAL SIX-DAY ENDURO EVENT

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about the International Six-Day Enduro Event.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It appears that a submission has come forward on the matter of the Six-Day Enduro Event, which has been a premier international motorcycle event since its inception in 1913 and, significantly, has been held outside Europe only once since 1973, when the United States of America successfully bid for the event. A submission has been prepared by consultants on this matter and it appears that a South Australian submission could well have ground into the dust.

The submission indicates that this event runs for six days and is a test of endurance for both man and machine. It is expected that competitors from up to 28 countries, excluding South Africa, ranging from Europe, the Americas and Asia, including representation from Eastern Bloc countries, will take part. It has been indicated that up to 5 000 Americans alone faithfully follow the event. This submission indicates that substantial media coverage and observers will

give this event as much impact as the Grand Prix, if not more. It has been recommended by the consultants that no venue in Australia can be better placed than the Barossa Valley and the city of Adelaide to host the 1988 International Six-Day Enduro Event. The Hon. Mr Chatterton will be all in favour of this. It is indicated that advice was sought from the Department of Tourism—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: They can hold it where they like—the Bicentennial Authority, Adelaide Visitors and Convention Bureau, South Australian Premier's Department, Qantas Airways Limited, Ansett Airlines, City of Adelaide Lord Mayor's Office, Gawler Shire Council, Tanunda Shire Council, Nuriootpa Shire Council, the Department of Recreation and Sport, Hilton International Hotels and Barossa Junction.

It is indicated that it will be a major event in terms of money coming into the State, and the indications are that, as well as people coming from the 28 countries, it could attract up to 6 000 international visitors and 20 000 spectators and that the return to this State could be up to \$6.5 million. It indicated that no road closures are required. Private property tracks will also be used, but subject to the owners' full approval. Australia has been given the opportunity to host this event, and South Australia certainly should be prepared to take some part in it.

The *News* would be appointed as the official newspaper, and Qantas and Ansett have already agreed to assist the event and have been appointed as official carriers. My questions are:

1. Is it a fact that expert opinion was sought from all of the bodies that I listed earlier to support the proposal for South Australia, and did any of those bodies oppose that proposal?

2. Did the Minister of Tourism reject her Department's advice that she should recommend Government support for the world six-day Enduro? If so, on what grounds did she do so and on what advice did she base her decision?

3. Has the Cabinet made a final decision on that matter? If it has, and if it has been negative, will it retract that decision and reconsider the matter as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Everybody seems to be hysterical about this matter, and I cannot understand why. The Government is still considering whether or not to support the Six-Day Enduro Event. We are still assessing the matter because the evidence that has been presented to us on various points so far has been inadequate, to say the least. It is my view that the motorcycle organisation that is bidding for this international event has been rather poorly served by the consultants that it has employed, if the information that has been put before me is any indication of the sort of argument on which it is basing its claims. So, when the matter was brought to my attention, based on the information that was presented to me I raised a number of reservations about certain points, and I passed those on to the Director of my department. Indeed, some of the points that I raised were raised by officers within the department when a list of benefits and disbenefits was put together.

An honourable member: A new word!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This is a new word from the Department of Tourism, as a matter of fact. Based on that, the Director of the Department of Tourism wrote to the Director of the Department of Recreation and Sport, because it has been determined by the Government that this is primarily a Recreation and Sport, not a Tourism, issue, although there are obvious tourism implications and benefits to be gained from international events of this kind.

The minute to the Director of the Department of Recreation and Sport indicated that the department supported

the proposal. However, we had a number of reservations about various aspects of the effect of the six-day Enduro in South Australia that had not been covered adequately by any of the submissions that had been put to the department and to me at that stage. As a result, an interdepartmental committee has been established, on the recommendation of the Premier, with representation from the Department of State Development, the Department of Recreation and Sport, the Department of Environment and Planning and the Department of Tourism.

The committee is meeting for the first time on the 29th of this month and will seek the sort of information from the consultants which we have agreed is not contained in the original submissions. It is then intended that the interdepartmental committee, the consultants and the Adelaide Convention Centre (which is also involved in this matter) should report to the Government by 18 September so that the Government can make a decision on this matter. That is the current status of the proposal, and there is little more to say.

COMPUTER SERVICES

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Labour, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about the Pandora software package.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have had a chance to look at the replies to previous questions on this matter, and it is obvious that those replies are inadequate to allay the fears of those who are concerned that the proper procedures for selecting a computer software package in the Department of Mines and Energy were not followed and that there were deficiencies in the procedure. Serious concern has been expressed within the department itself. Very strong reservations are expressed by people on the Automatic Data Processing Technical Committee of the Department of Mines and Energy about the Pandora project. I can cite several considered opinions of members of that committee. It has been stated:

Looking at the system, it is hard to see justification for its enormous cost.

It was further said:

A simple, non-technical data base which contributes little towards the evaluation and monitoring of the State's gas or oil reserves.

Another person said:

Expensive, non-technical, non-essential system.

Another member of the committee said:

I believe I could set up a system on our own NEC computers using \$1 000 data flex software that would do most of what Pandora claims to do and in only a few days.

It was further said:

It is very poor value for money.

Another member of the committee said:

Pandora is unsuitable as an all-purpose drilling data base.

It was further said:

A separate evaluation of the Ultra data base manager on which Pandora is based leads me to the conclusion that Ultra is not suitable for a general geoscience data base manager. My casual gut feeling evaluation of Pandora is that it is an incredibly expensive package to do a job which a competent programmer should be able to tailor in a relatively short time using a fourth generation data base language. I can well believe that many man years have gone into its development and it is clearly a system which has been converted from an old card based batch oriented process.

Further it was said:

My recommendation is that the package is not purchased.

I am concerned that within the Department of Mines and Energy there appears to be a very clear indication that the Pandora option is being considered seriously. My information is that the package was virtually accepted earlier in the year when the Department of Mines and Energy paid for a couple of representatives from Scicon, the company that is marketing the software, to fly to Australia to give a demonstration. I remind honourable members that that was the only demonstration that people from the Department of Mines and Energy saw. It was only after certain protests that the department eventually got around to advertising for registration of interest. The reply I received last week indicated that 38 Australian companies had registered their interest. However, just over one week was allowed for registration of interest—a very short time in any circumstances—and I believe that that may well have been a half-hearted apology for a public demonstration of a search for other competitors.

I am concerned that the South Australian taxpayer will have to foot the bill for imported computer software that is limited in its application. This is contrary to our 'SA Great' campaign and the emphasis on buying Australian. There was imprecise use of language in the replies to my questions in regard to the experience and skill of Ian Northcott and Mr Polatayko in assessing computer hardware. I am not reassured that those people were competent to make the judgments and recommendations they have made. It is very disturbing that half of the members of the Automatic Data Processing Technical Committee of the Department of Mines and Energy have expressed extreme reservations about the Pandora package. I believe that it is likely that the Department of Mines and Energy will decide in favour of Pandora. Therefore, I ask the following questions:

1. On what date was the registration of interest to tender advertised and when did registrations close?
2. Was the description of requirements in that advertisement a description of the Pandora package?
3. Have any of the other companies that replied to the advertisement been given the opportunity to tender?
4. Aside from being involved with and/or responsible for various aspects of computer technology, what particular experience in this field have Mr Ian Northcott and Mr Orest Polatayko to make them suitable advisers to the department in relation to the \$600 000 worth of computer software?
5. What was the name of the company that advised on estimated costs to prepare the package internally, and were members of the ADPTC invited to make an input to that assessment?
6. Who is the local agent for Scicon, that is, the supplier of the Pandora package, and would Ian Northcott and Associates, a South Australian company of which Ian Northcott is the principal, be in a position to provide software back-up and servicing for Pandora?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

PARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a very brief explanation before asking you, Mr President, a question about parliamentary language.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure that all members of the Council are aware of Standing Order 193, which states that the use of objectionable or offensive words will be considered highly disorderly. All Parliaments have Standing Orders that are similar, if not absolutely identical, to our

Standing Order 193. For many years the Speaker and President of the Houses of the federal Parliament have maintained that certain words are considered to be undesirable or objectionable and have not permitted their use: one of those words was 'drongo'.

I understand that the use of the word 'drongo' will now be permitted in the federal Parliament and that the Speaker and President of the respective Houses will no longer regard the use of that word as being objectionable or offensive. Will you, Mr President, follow the example set by the federal Parliament and permit the use of the word 'drongo' when the behaviour of certain members opposite renders the use of such a word desirable and opportune?

The PRESIDENT: My brief answer to the honourable member is that, as I am in the twilight of my Presidency, I do not intend to make any great alterations to present procedure. What is done by Commonwealth officers in the administration of that Parliament is their business and not mine.

REST HOMES

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about rest homes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: About 90 per cent of the 150 000 South Australians over the age of 65 years live at home where they are eligible to receive a \$4 a day subsidy for domiciliary or family care. Of the 15 000 elderly people not living at home, about 7 300 live in nursing homes, where they receive quite extensive Commonwealth Government subsidies. Some 400 elderly people live in 19 rest homes in the Adelaide metropolitan area but receive no Commonwealth or State Government benefit whatever, and no other concession. In other words, a \$4 a day home care subsidy ceases if a person transfers from his home to a rest home.

The Minister established a task force to examine rest homes, and it reported in November 1984. It conceded that about 26.4 per cent of rest home residents required a higher level of care. This reflects in part the shortage of nursing home beds, yet rest homes charge on average only \$14 to \$15 a day—about one quarter of the cost of nursing home accommodation. The federal Minister for Community Services, Senator Don Grimes, was approached in January 1985 to ascertain whether domiciliary nursing care benefits could be made available for rest home residents who were assessed as being eligible for those benefits. As yet, there is apparently no reply to that request. On 2 May the President of the Rest Homes Association, Mrs Stoppel, received a letter from the South Australian Health Commission which said, in part:

The Commission has approved in principle a policy for the provision of domiciliary equipment and services to persons residing in private rest homes.

A Commonwealth Government report on rest homes, commissioned in 1983, has yet to be made public, despite an assurance given to me by a Commonwealth public servant that it would be printed in February or March 1985. In July 1981, when the Hon. Dr Cornwall was shadow Minister of Health, he said that the lack of funds for rest homes in South Australia was irremediable and disgraceful.

Yesterday I received a telephone call from the manageress of one rest home who was in tears and whose electricity bill had doubled from \$950 to \$2 000 a quarter. I spoke to another manageress of a rest home whose electricity bill had also doubled from about \$1 000 to \$2 000 per quarter for some 25 residents, or \$7 a week for each resident. The

financial plights of these two rest homes is more than desperate.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Over the past 12 months it has doubled as against the comparative quarter in 1984. Both manageresses share the view that the Minister of Health does not care about their plight. He has previously in this Council insulted the integrity of rest home proprietors; suggesting that they were mere rip-off merchants. These manageresses are happy for me to refer to them by name in this Chamber, so I will refer to them explicitly. The two rest homes involved are Hillview and Argyle. The proprietors, as the Hon. Dr Cornwall may well know, are respectively, Mrs Shirly Stoppel (President of the South Australian Rest Homes Association) and Mrs Fay Cook.

One manageress to whom I spoke yesterday said that she had had enough, was sick of working 16 hours a day seven days a week and receiving no support from the Minister and was, therefore, putting her rest home on the market. The Minister of Health has not been near a rest home in the 33 months that he has been Minister. There are many people in the South Australian Rest Homes Association who believe that the Minister would be happy to see them disappear. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister concede the financial plight of rest homes in South Australia?
2. When does he expect that their long-standing claim for a \$4 a day domiciliary care subsidy will be resolved?
3. When will the Health Commission provide domiciliary equipment and services to rest homes as promised in its letter of 2 May 1985?
4. Will the Minister at a time of his own choosing accompany me to see either the Argyle rest home or the Hillview rest home in order to ascertain the truth of what I am saying and to show some concern for the plight of the people in those rest homes who are so well looked after by caring manageresses?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In response to the last question first, my mother told me when I was a very small boy never to keep bad company. I have tried throughout the years of my life to take note of that very good advice. Therefore, the brief answer to the Hon. Mr Davis' question whether I would accompany him to a rest home (or anywhere else) is very definitely 'no'.

However, I return to matters of more substance. It was at my instigation that a State review of rest homes was undertaken. It was a fairly unsatisfactory report in the sense that proprietors of those rest homes were somewhat less than frank and forthcoming with regard to their financial statements. That is a matter of record. The task force report is a public document, and I refer the Hon. Mr Davis both to that report and to an *Advertiser* newspaper article based on the task force which was written and published at the time.

I am aware that a Commonwealth review has been carried out. I expected that report to be released before now. It is certainly taking much time in its incubation, but that, of course, is beyond my control. I undertake to mention that fact to the federal Minister, Senator Grimes, next time I am talking to him. I anticipate that this will be in about two weeks. In the meantime, I am unable to say. I did gain an impression during my discussions with Senator Grimes when this matter was raised some time ago that the Commonwealth in general might have been reasonably sympathetically inclined to the difficulties being experienced by rest homes in Victoria and South Australia.

Having said that, I must say that people ought to be very clear about what rest homes are—they are not nursing homes or hostels but are in the general sense for profit boarding houses for elderly residents. They do not or should

not purport to provide any nursing services, although some of the proprietors style themselves under the title 'matron'. Some of them have nursing qualifications; some of them most certainly do not. So, they are in fact, boarding houses.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I make the point again, as I have done previously—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: There are people dying of cancer in rest homes.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: If there are people dying—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Hon. Mr Davis wants to ask a further question he can do so later. I draw the Minister's attention to the time.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable Question Time to continue for a further 30 minutes.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Davis interjects and says that there are people in rest homes suffering from dementia and other disorders. The inference from that is presumably that they require nursing and extended care. If that is the case, and the task force certainly did a random assessment of rest home residents, so I believe it to be the case, those people who are accommodated and who are suffering from medical conditions requiring nursing or extended care in rest homes are inappropriately accommodated. We have made that offer. Indeed, I have made it on two occasions, the most recent through the commission many months ago, to provide domiciliary care services—both equipment and services—where it was appropriate to residents.

We also made the offer that, if it was requested from any proprietor, we would provide a full assessment of the residents. If any of those residents were found to be in need of extended care, of nursing home care or of more extended or intensive care, we further undertook to place them appropriately. It is my understanding from recent discussions with the Chairman of the Health Commission that none of the rest home proprietors has ever taken us up on that offer. Therefore, it seems to me that the ball to a significant extent does lie in the court of the rest home proprietors. They must prove that they have the interest of their residents at heart to the same extent, in my view, as they have the \$4 a day interest at heart.

I am sympathetic. I have consistently been sympathetic to the difficulties that some of those people face. As I said, I will again make suitable requests to the Minister responsible for community services when I next talk with him; it is obviously a federal matter. In the meantime, I would repeat the offer—for the third time—that we would be very happy to provide domiciliary equipment and services where residents are assessed as needing it, and we are certainly willing to do an assessment of all residents of all rest homes upon request.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: One of the keys to the current Lyell McEwin Hospital controversy is four letters or reports from the external auditor (Mr Venn) to the hospital's board of management. I understand that the letters, which have been tabled today, are dated 27 June, 7 September, 27

October and 12 December 1983. Whilst I have not had the opportunity of reading them in detail, because they have only just been tabled, I will do that later. Generally, however, I think it is fair to say that they express concern about financial management practices at Lyell McEwin.

Last Thursday in this Council when the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Martin Cameron) asked a question of the Minister of Health, the Minister in his response indicated that, although he was not willing last week to table certain documents and wanted to think about it, he was willing to table the document 'South Australian Health Commission: Internal Audit Unit Review of the Financial Audit Situation, Lyell McEwin Hospital for the Financial Years 1981-82 and 1982-83'. On Thursday the Minister said words to the effect, 'I have nothing to fear; I have nothing to hide.' He went on to indicate that he would table this report, and he did so. Page 1 of the introduction states:

The external audit findings—

that is, the findings by the external auditor—

were communicated to the Chairman of the board of management in letters dated 27 June 1983, appendix A, 7 September 1983, appendix B, and 27 October 1983, appendix C.

No reference is made to the fourth letter of 12 December 1983, even though that document was written in February 1984. The report refers clearly to three most important letters, as I understand, particularly the letter of 27 October, which contains some rather damaging allegations about management and financial practices. Having read the document, I anxiously went to the back of it where one normally finds appendices, to find appendices A, B and C, the three letters referred to. Lo and behold—they were certainly not contained in the report that was tabled by the Minister in this Chamber.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Is that why you thought—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I did make the interjection earlier, which the Minister kindly took up, that the document had been doctored. Perhaps a more appropriate term is 'dog doctored'. Certainly, it had been got at. This document would appear to have had the most important appendices removed from it.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Whipped out.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes—removed from it prior to the tabling of it in this Council. Last week, the Minister, in an atmosphere of 'I have got nothing to hide; I will table the document,' has done that but then has removed all the good bits—the three appendices at the end of it. Clearly, over the weekend the Premier and wiser political counsel have prevailed and the Minister has been prevailed on to come clean over this matter, and those letters have been tabled. My questions are:

1. Were the three letters or reports to which I have referred attached as appendices removed from the Internal Audit Unit report tabled last week and, if so, by whom?

2. If they were removed, why did the Minister doctor this internal audit report tabled last week in this Chamber, and did he do it to deceive the honourable members of this Council?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Lucas has shown not only that he has the same capacity for self-mutilation as his Leader in another place but also his gross and crass insensitivity. The fact is that last Thursday, as all honourable members in this place and elsewhere are well aware, I was trying to make family arrangements for a family funeral. I was telephoned at 8 o'clock in the morning by Frank Pangallo from the *News*, who was somewhat out of his tree, claiming that he had this evidence of a so-called cover up at Lyell McEwin Hospital. I denied it then, and I have denied it strenuously and consistently every since. It is a libel. It is quite libellous, and I am disgusted that the Hon. Mr Lucas, given that he now has all the facts at his

fingertips and that I also have all the facts at my fingertips, would repeat that scurrilous libel in this Council today. I would like to quote an opinion from the Crown Solicitor that was sought by the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is a nonsense to talk about whipping anything out. I offered to table the internal audit report, and that is precisely what I did.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I took on notice the question of—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Did you take them out?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The man is a fool. He is an incorrigible fool.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Why don't you answer the question?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will quote from the Crown Solicitor's report, in part.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It would be quite laughable, Sir, if it was not serious. I was making those inquiries on the run. I literally had not even seen the beat-up in the *News* until after I arrived in the Parliament last Thursday. I was given a very quick briefing. The internal audit report was put in my hand, all 16 pages of it, complete with marginal annotations and I tabled it on the spot because, as I said at that time, I had nothing to fear and nothing to hide. I did have to take on notice whether I would table in this place external auditors' reports. I explained the reasons why I took those on notice. It is a very regrettable practice and I must say that I am very sorry to have been put in a position where I had to set a precedent today which I think may well come back to haunt members in the future. In view of the fact that the *News* was already running tear sheets and had documents and so forth, I did it. I did not want to do it on the run without due consideration for the very simple reason that auditors' reports, particularly interim statements, by their very nature are directed in a private and confidential way—whether it be to a hospital board, a hospital chief executive officer or to a public company, management or board—in order that they can be as frank and as full as possible. I said last week, and I repeat today, that if they are written in the knowledge that they are liable to become public documents or, indeed, more than public documents (given the status of parliamentary privilege—that is what has happened today with, I think, the 13 documents that have been tabled) then, of course, no auditor would be prepared to be as frank as he might be in a circumstance where he knew the confidentiality of his report was going to be respected, even by a scurrilous and desperate Opposition.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I would ask that that remark be withdrawn and that the member apologise because it is a grossly defamatory remark.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: No, it isn't. He wants an answer: 'Yes' or 'No'.

The PRESIDENT: I think that was part of his question. If you believe it is scurrilous, then we will see what Mr Lucas has to say.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, I do not believe it to be a scurrilous comment at all. It was a rhetorical question put to the Minister, who is not answering the question that I put to him. He is wandering all over the place. I do not know what he is talking about. It is certainly not an answer to the question that I have asked. I want to know whether he has doctored the document which he has tabled in this Chamber. That is the simple question that I put to him and

I believe there is nothing scurrilous contained within that question.

The PRESIDENT: I accept that that was part of his explanation.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is all right. I just want to have him on the record. I believe he is the lowest form of animal life and he is proving it today very conclusively.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I really think that that is going too far, Mr Minister.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am being defamed, libelled and abused by everybody opposite but particularly by the Hon. Mr Lucas. What is fair for them is all right, but apparently I am not allowed to retaliate.

The PRESIDENT: I really think that that was an extreme expression.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is not the one that I had in mind at the time, I can assure you. I can do much better where the Hon. Mr Lucas is concerned, the way he is behaving today.

The PRESIDENT: I am suggesting that you should not do any better at all, not even to stoop that far.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I did not stoop anywhere. It is Mr Lucas who has the supple loins. He of the supple loins goes into the gutter on numerous occasions in his vendetta. In his sick vendetta against me as Minister of Health, he spends a great deal of time in the gutter.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: If he feels offended—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister should proceed.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I think it is important that we put on the record part of this opinion which the Health Commission has from the Crown Solicitor. It states:

In these circumstances there would not appear to be any factual foundation for the allegation of a 'cover-up' by the Health Commission.

The words 'cover-up' mean 'to attempt to conceal'. In recent times the words have carried an imputation of impropriety in that the attempt to conceal is wrongful or for illicit purposes.

It follows that the allegation made against the commission is that the commission has wrongfully attempted to conceal certain information relating to the hospital. This allegation is untrue.

That is the Crown Solicitor's opinion, not mine. The opinion continues:

As such it would seem that the *News* has committed an actionable libel against the commission. . . . I understand that the allegation of 'cover-up' was not made in Parliament and that the reporting of the allegation is not protected under the Wrongs Act, 1936.

In these circumstances there are various options available. These include taking legal action against the proprietors of the newspaper or seeking an apology and retraction of the allegations.

That is the Crown Solicitor's opinion to the commission, not to me. I am not involved in this at all.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Get back to the question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In terms of the alleged doctored document that Lucas is on about, I repeat that a 16 page report of the internal auditor was given to me in a very quick briefing last Thursday. I did not remove the appendices—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Who did?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I did not see fit to table them at that time for the very good reasons which I have outlined on at least six occasions—first, I wanted to take the matters on notice and, secondly, I believed then (as I believe now) that it set a most unfortunate precedent in the circumstances, and, having given the matter due consideration over the weekend and in the light of the fact that the *News* has continued its libellous allegations over four consecutive days of publication, my considered opinion was I

had no option, no real alternative, but to put the matter to rest for all time today and to show in the starkest possible way just what complete fools members of the Opposition were making of themselves.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise on a point of order. Under Standing Order 452, a document that has been quoted from in debate—the particular file sitting in front of the Minister there—may be called upon at any time during the debate. I move:

That, without the documents being removed from the file, the documents contained in the file that the Minister is now trying to remove be laid upon the table in this Chamber.

I ask that you, Mr President, ensure that the Minister does not remove any documents from the file which is in front of him.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The man is right out of his tree. Part of the material in front of me—I will tell the Council what it is before I table the whole blooming lot. I must be given an opportunity to show what a goose that Mr Lucas is. He is really a goose, because I intended to table the Crown Solicitor's report from which I quoted. Underneath that is a letter from a Dr R.D. McArthur, Chairman of the Lyell McEwin Health Service Medical Staff Society. I think I ought to read that into the record before I table it. It is dated 26 August—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise on a point of order. I have moved a motion. I do not understand what the Minister is doing on his feet at the moment until you, Mr President, have ruled.

The PRESIDENT: I think he was trying to help you by saying that he was prepared to table the document. I just ask you to give me time to consider the motion.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am perfectly happy to table the entire document when I have finished reading from it. Everything that is in the folder—I am only too happy, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is a motion before the Chair on which I must give a ruling. If the Hon. Mr Lucas is satisfied with the Minister's intention to table the document that is of so much concern, I presume that he will be quite happy to withdraw the motion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek some clarification, Sir. I do not want to give the Minister another opportunity during Question Time to read the whole lot. I would just like it tabled. As I understand it, I have moved a motion.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What do you want tabled?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The whole file. The Minister has indicated his preparedness to do so, and I thought that meant that there was agreement for it to be tabled. We can do that without taking up any more of Question Time.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I rise on a point of order. Before you, Sir, formulate your reply, I remind you that Standing Order 452 states:

A document quoted from in debate . . .

The Hon. Mr Lucas stated that he wanted the whole folio. Does the Hon. Mr Lucas's motion relate to just one document or can he demand the whole folio?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not take that as a point of order until I resolve the first matter. The Minister still has the right to continue his reply. I will take the motion if it is seconded.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member called a point of order in the middle of his explanation.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, that is not true. I took advice; the Minister had sat down; I waited until the completion of his reply; and I then took the point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I had no need to call 'Order!' and sit the Minister down if, in fact, he had finished his reply. I ask that the Minister conclude his reply.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Thank you, Mr President. As I indicated, I am perfectly happy to table the full contents of this folder. It contains a question on notice from Mr Becker and a reply, which is public knowledge; a question from the Hon. Miss Laidlaw and a letter I wrote to her during the recess dated 30 July; sundry cuts from *Hansard*; odd bits and pieces; a couple of cuttings from the *News*; a Crown Solicitor's report; and a letter from the Chairman of the Lyell McEwin Health Service Medical Staff Society. It is worthwhile reading that letter into the record. The letter, addressed to me and dated 26 August 1985, is as follows:

Dear Dr Cornwall,

At a meeting today of the Lyell McEwin Health Service Medical Staff Society with the additional attendance of representatives of the Lyell McEwin Health Service Resident Medical Officers Association, the following statement was proposed and agreed to unanimously:

The Medical Staff Society representing the doctors of the Lyell McEwin Health Service deplores the scurrilous attack on the administration of the Lyell McEwin. We express our confidence in the officers of the Health Commission, the Lyell McEwin board of management and its administrators. We are grateful to the Minister for having initiated the new development of the Health Service after years of neglect.

Yours sincerely, R.D.A. McArthur, Chairman, Medical Staff Society.

If the Hon. Mr Lucas has any more dorothea dixers, I would be pleased to respond to them in the five minutes remaining.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas moved a motion, and has the right to do so. Under Standing Orders no confidentiality was claimed by the Minister and therefore the Hon. Mr Lucas is quite in order to move the motion. However, I suggest that the motion is of little value seeing that the Minister has now indicated his intention to table the document.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy to withdraw the motion as long as the whole folder is tabled.

Motion withdrawn.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to have the contents of this document tabled and ordered to be published, including the cuttings from the *News*, provided that it is not re-publishing a libel.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not involved in whether or not it is a libel. You are tabling the document, not me.

Leave granted.

NURSE EDUCATION

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about nurse education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I understand that the Federal Government recently announced, in principle, its support for the full transfer of nursing education from hospital schools to colleges of advanced education. In the past I have asked the Minister questions about the State Government's capacity to fulfil an undertaking to expand tertiary nursing education in South Australia over a three-year period from 110 students in 1985 to 300 in 1987. In response, the Minister acknowledged, on each occasion, that it would not be possible to implement this undertaking unless South Australia received federal funding for further tertiary based courses.

Has the Federal Government's support, in principle, for the full transfer of nursing education to colleges of advanced education been accompanied by a commitment on funding to South Australia that will enable the Government to implement its program to expand tertiary nursing education in South Australia? What are the terms accompanying the

Federal Government's in principle support for tertiary based nursing education?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Federal Government has offered and is paying \$1 500 per student per year. The South Australian Government regards that amount as being quite inadequate. It has protested on numerous occasions and put its case to the relevant federal Ministers. I believe that it has been taken up at Premier to Prime Minister level, also. To this moment the Federal Government is refusing to budge. Notwithstanding that, our commitment to the move to tertiary education during the triennium is such that we have, as I am sure the honourable member knows, recently approved the establishment of a further college of nurse education on the Salisbury campus of the SACAE for a further intake of 110 students next year, so that by 1986 the full student intake will be 220.

If we are able to maintain further intakes at around those sorts of levels into 1987 then we will have honoured our undertaking for the triennium. However, we are increasingly doing that with great difficulty because, for a variety of reasons, the net cost of the transfer from hospital based nurse training to tertiary based nurse training per student per year, from memory, is almost \$4 000.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Without capital cost.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: As my colleague reminds me, that is without capital cost. It is an expensive business. There is a long tradition going back to the early days of Prime Minister Menzies that the Federal Government is responsible for tertiary education. We will certainly continue to protest to the Federal Government in quite strong terms.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

The Hon. M.B. Cameron, on behalf of the **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (on notice), asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General: Will the Minister advise which statutory authorities required to report annually to a Minister or the Parliament have not yet presented annual reports for—

1. The 1982 calendar year or the 1982-83 financial year; and
2. The 1983 calendar year or the 1983-84 financial year?

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall, on behalf of the **Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The reply to that question is not immediately available. I ask that the question be put on notice for Tuesday 10 September.

NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

The Hon. M.B. Cameron on behalf of the **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. How many properties on the North-South transport corridor owned by the Highways Department have been sold following the Government decision to abandon the corridor?
2. What is the value of the properties sold?
3. How many properties remain unsold?
4. What plans exist for the sale of unsold properties during the balance of 1985?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I regret that that answer has not been forwarded to me for the honourable member. I ask that he put it on notice for another day.

PRISONERS ON PAROLE

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services: In relation to prisoners released from gaol since this Government's parole scheme came into operation in December 1983:

1. How many of the prisoners released on parole since that date have committed offences since release?

2. How many of the prisoners on parole and referred to in paragraph 1 of this question were convicted before the current parole system came into operation and how many were convicted after that date?

3. For what offences were the prisoners on parole and referred to in paragraph 1 of this question originally convicted and what offences have they committed since their release on parole and what penalties have been imposed for the offences committed whilst on parole?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I regret that the answer to that question has not yet been supplied to me.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: What is happening in the departments? Questions should come first.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Lots of good things are happening in the departments, particularly in the Department of Correctional Services.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: You had better buck them up a bit. Perhaps you have lost control of your department?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If the Hon. Mr Hill wants a full list and details from me as regards what is happening in the Department of Correctional Services, I will be very happy to give it to him forthwith.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: You are spending a lot of money.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, we are.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It needs no explanation to the Hon. Mr Hill: it has nothing to do with him.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sorry, but I was asked several questions, politely, by the Hon. Mr Hill, and I felt it incumbent on me to respond.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hill need not be responded to.

EYRE PENINSULA REGIONAL CULTURAL TRUST THEATRE

The Hon. C.M. HILL (on notice) asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General: In regard to the recent fire at the Eyre Peninsula Regional Cultural Trust's Theatre at Whyalla:

1. What was the extent of the damage?
2. What was the estimated cost of the damage?
3. Was this covered by insurance?
4. What was the cause of the fire?
5. What action, if any, is proposed against those responsible?
6. Is the trust proceeding to repair the damage?
7. When does the Minister expect such work to be completed?

It is the second time that I have asked the question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member is getting old and crabby. The replies, which have been promptly produced, are as follows:

1. The fire was basically contained in the stage area and damage is being assessed by insurance assessors, engineers and architects. To date, the following has been identified:

- a. Destroyed—all stage drapes, curtains and travellers including the cyclorama, front of house curtain and the cinema screen.
 - all electrical wiring and fittings in the stage area.
 - stage floor.

—fly equipment (ropes, etc.).

—all scenery, props, etc., for The Dancers Company production of *Giselle* (which was set up on stage at the time of the fire).

- b. Damaged (and in need of repair/replacement)
 - auditorium walls and ceiling are smoke damaged; need cleaning and repainting.
 - carpet is smoke and water damaged; needs cleaning;
 - 500 seats smoke damaged; need dismantling, dry cleaning and reinstallation.
- c. Damaged (and still under assessment)
 - fly tower steelwork and grid steel is heat damaged and may need replacing
 - control room (lights, sound and dimmer) electronic equipment is water and smoke damaged.

2. Estimated cost of reinstatement at current stage of assessment, \$500 000.

3. Yes—with SGIC.

4. Not known at this stage.

5. Police investigation to identify both the cause and the culprits, if any, is still in progress.

6. Yes—repairs are in the hands of the SGIC, architects and builders.

7. Restoration is estimated to take at least three months.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND ENERGY CONSULTANTS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. (a) Will the Minister outline the procedures followed by the Department of Mines and Energy for the selection and continuing employment of consultants?

(b) Will the Minister identify the consultants presently employed and the terms and conditions of their employment?

(c) Will the Minister detail the sources of funding for expenditure incurred in such employment?

2. (a) Did the department use a consultant or consultants for the recent evaluation of or recommendation of software package(s) for oil and gas data management to be acquired by the department?

(b) Will the Minister detail the expenditure incurred in this evaluation?

3. If consultants were used in this evaluation, was the selection of consultants for this purpose itself put out to tender?

4. What steps does the department take to ensure that any consultants used in the process of evaluation and selection of contractor services of any type make full disclosures of any beneficial interests likely to result from their recommendations?

5. (a) When did the department advertise for tenders for the provision of software packages referred to in question 2?

(b) What selection procedures were to be used for the choice of a package?

6. (a) Are such decisions systematically considered by committees or officers of the department?

(b) If not, why not?

(c) If so, which committees and officers are involved in evaluation of the software package?

7. (a) What is the current status of the selection process?

(b) What expenditure has been incurred to date on the selection?

(c) When is a decision anticipated?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Consultants are used by the Department of Mines and Energy when it has been established that certain work has priority and cannot be carried out effectively or efficiently by internal resources. In all cases local consultants are given first consideration. However, if no suitable local consultant is available, national and occasionally international consultants are considered. Except for specific projects of short duration, consultants are contracted on the basis of a certain minimum number of days that they will work for the department.

(b) J. Lacey; I. Northcott; R. Knight; P. Coulson; Petroleum Management Associates.

Other Divisions—Dr N. Ludbrook; E.D.J. Stewart; R. Wilmshurst; C. Hall.

The consultants for the Oil, Gas and Coal Division are hired on the basis of a daily rate, plus, in the instances of long term contracts, an annual retainer. The others are paid on the basis of an annual retainer except C. Hall, who is paid a fee.

(c) The main source of funding is derived from the gas-fields and oilfields consultancies provided in the department's budget.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) Approximately \$20 000 for consulting fees and \$9 000 for travel expenses.

3. No.

4. Only one consultant has been retained by the department for assistance in evaluation of contractor services. The department has written assurances from this consultant that he will not receive any beneficial interest from either software or hardware acquisitions that may result from his assistance in providing advice. The department has complete confidence in the integrity of this consultant.

5. (a) The department has not yet advertised for tenders for the provision of software packages.

(b) Not applicable: see above.

6. (a) Yes.

(b) See above.

(c) Recommendations as to the purchase of a software package are prepared by the officers of the division proposing acquisition of the package. This recommendation is submitted to the ADP Technical Committee for comment and subsequently to the ADP Management Committee for approval. The majority of the ADP Technical Committee comprises officers with computing knowledge, and the ADP Management Committee consists of the division heads of the department.

7. (a) The Oil, Gas and Coal Division is preparing a proposal to acquire software and hardware for a computer system to service the division's needs and provide some support for other divisions. This proposal will shortly be submitted to the ADP Technical Committee for comment, the ADP Management Committee for approval and then to the Data Processing Board for consideration before placing calls for tender.

(b) \$46 800.

(c) In approximately two weeks.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 22 August. Page 489.)

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I thank all honourable members for their contributions. The Address in Reply debate offers the chance to speak, as we have seen

over the years, on an infinite variety of topics and, as has been the custom in this place, at least in the 10 years in which I have been a member, members took the opportunity to canvass many areas of specific interest to them. Three members were speaking in the Address in Reply debate for the last time and will be leaving us soon when this parliamentary session is concluded. I refer to the Hon. Lance Milne, the Hon. Ren DeGaris and the Hon. Cec Creedon, and it is appropriate that I should look at their contributions first.

The Hon. Mr Milne on this occasion expressed his views on industrial relations and, rightly, had praise for, first, the success of the accord between the Federal Government and the unions, secondly, the new workers compensation scheme, which owes very much to the labours of my friend and colleague Jack Wright and, thirdly, the ever increasing rapport between all parties in industrial negotiations, which are becoming more relevant than the old formal processes of arbitration and conciliation. This is an ever changing area. It was interesting to hear the Hon. Mr Milne's report on the social partnership system that has been adopted so successfully in Austria.

I will miss the Hon. Mr Milne, not least because, as one who occasionally likes to live dangerously, it is always very interesting to me in this place whenever a division is called to speculate on which side of the Chamber the Hon. Mr Milne might find himself at the end of that division. I do not say that in a derogatory sense. Although the Hon. Mr Milne and I have had our contretemps on occasions over the years, by and large I have been pleased to regard the Hon. Mr Milne as a good friend, and I think that that has been reciprocated.

The Hon. Mr DeGaris, who has been here, as one journalist put it, 'one day short of for ever' (and for those of us who have been observers of the political scene in South Australia for more than 20 years, that certainly seems so), also had good words to say about the performance of this Government and of the Ministers in the Council, although he referred to me, perhaps regrettably, as the stormy petrel, despite my much publicised new lifestyle.

I must differ with the honourable member on the question of privatisation, which he argued was the best way to reduce the size of government and the impact of taxation. I am on the record on numerous occasions (and I am happy to go on the record) as being a very staunch adversary of privatisation. I do not believe that the assets that rightly belong to the people, whether they be the citizens of South Australia or the citizens of the nation, should be sold off, and I refer particularly to those assets that are saleable. If we take privatisation to its ultimate, of course, we sell the successful enterprises in the first instance. I agree very strongly with Steele Hall, who believes that the land of the dries is very arid indeed, and, of course, he will not have a bar of selling the strength in the form of the Commonwealth Bank or the national flag carrier, Qantas. I believe that privatisation in that sense will become very much an electoral incubus about the neck of the Liberal Party. The last thing we in this country need is to import the conservative wisdom of Margaret Thatcher.

I believe also that, like the federal Liberal Opposition, the Liberal Party in this State has gone too far on this issue. Steele Hall, when talking about the arid land of the dries, also made the correct and very biting observation that the concentration on privatisation in its narrow sense may lead the Liberal Party up the side track and off the highway of national development. I would caution very strongly against that occurring.

As always, the Hon. Mr DeGaris, who remains a keen and astute observer of Parliament and its processes, com-

mented on the need for the role of the Legislative Council to change if it is to remain a true House of Review.

The Hon. Mr Creedon, I would argue, prompted the greatest debate that he has ever prompted in his career in this place over the past 12 years with his references to the Council and his continued belief that it should be abolished. Not surprisingly, this sparked quite differing remarks, but I believe it was unfortunate that some of those remarks became rather specific and tended, on one or two occasions, to generate into virulent attacks on Mr Creedon's performance during his many distinguished years in this Council.

The Hon. Mr Creedon referred to the ever increasing workload and the importance of the committee system. He has continually been one of the most willing and able participants in what he saw as an opportunity to be of considerable service to this State. He put on record his long service on the Public Works Standing Committee. I believe that we are all grateful to the Hon. Mr Creedon for his work on that committee. The honourable member also made personal observations about the length and quality of some speeches made in this place, and I do not have to expand in that regard.

In the course of his remarks, the Hon. Mr Hill commented on what he called the rather gloomy picture presented by each of the speakers on his side, and that seemed to me to be a fairly pertinent observation of the general attitude of the Opposition, as members opposite always seem to be knocking South Australia. Of course, no-one does that more frequently than the Leader of the Opposition in this place, the Hon. Mr Cameron. In his emotional tirade, the Hon. Mr Cameron remarked that the traditional Governor's speech was somewhat different from the norm and that he believed that it clearly signalled the start of an election campaign. However, it was the Hon. Mr Cameron, rather than the Governor, who seemed to be in the election mode as he pulled out all the old chestnuts about which we have heard so much in this place over the years in an attempt to discredit the Government's very strong performance.

Of course, the honourable member was joined by his colleagues, who pulled out the old arguments that we have heard year after year—that Labor Governments cannot be trusted on tax questions, that they treat the rural sector with disdain, that they cannot control the Public Service, and that they are poor economic managers. Time does not allow me to take up all those issues, and I have no intention of detaining the Council for that reason, but I ask that honourable members cast their minds back four years to the dark days of the Tonkin interregnum. It is interesting to compare the state of the South Australian economy around 1981 with the state of the economy in 1985.

In 1981, for example, house prices were so depressed and interest rates were so high that a quite significant proportion of home buyers found that they had no equity at all in their homes. Indeed, it was not uncommon in those dark years—thankfully now behind us—to find that families literally put their few sticks of furniture in a trailer and simply abandoned their homes because they had no equity in them and no incentive whatsoever. In fact, in many cases the amount of the mortgage was greater than the market value of the home.

The Hon. Dr Ritson made his usual rather extraordinary and remarkable contribution to the Address in Reply. He dragged up claims that the Government had attempted to force compulsory unionism on individual contractors and had expanded the Public Service to pay back the Public Service Association for its previous election help. Perhaps the greatest surprise of all that the Hon. Dr Ritson pulled out of the hat and tried to make a case for was that somehow or other this Government had failed to come to terms with

workers compensation. That most certainly defies logic and reason, given that we have continually worked (and Jack Wright in particular) in this period of office to put together a very comprehensive reform package for workers compensation in this State.

The Hon. Dr Ritson also drew what I believe is a rather strange comparison between the Hawke and the Bannon Governments and appeared to see something strange and sinister in the likes of the Hons Frank Blevins and Anne Levy lurking, as he would put it, behind a middle of the road Premier. I do not believe that there is anything strange or sinister about my friends and colleagues, Frank Blevins and Anne Levy, or their political attitudes. It is well-known that Frank Blevins has been quite an outstanding performer since his elevation to the Ministry. That is acknowledged by primary producers, rural industry, employers, industrialists, the trade union movement, and just about everyone else with whom we come into contact.

However, I must say that the Hon. Dr Ritson saw fit to mention the roles of the Hon. Barbara Wiese and Senator Rosemary Crowley in their positive promotion of the public image of the Upper Houses in the political system.

The Hon. Mr Cameron, in his customary negative role, to which I referred earlier, also saw fit to attack, as he put it, the dreadful things I had done to country doctors, although, not surprisingly, it was the Hon. John Burdett who had the most to say on this subject. As usual, the Hon. Mr Burdett got it wrong, but he also got wrong the situation with regard to Medicare generally, the Central Linen Service in particular and alleged staff discontent in the Health Commission.

I mentioned the Hon. Mr Hill's reference to the gloomy picture painted previously by the Opposition. He was even able with great dexterity to paint a gloomy picture of the Government's ability to make the biggest tax cuts in the State's history. He said that it was a belated rebate, and that, meanwhile, the threat of tax measures, particularly a capital gains tax, the assets test and other Government policies were causing great concern to migrants. It is perfectly true that some of the Federal Government's proposals have caused concern to the migrant community. However, the State Government has done nothing to cause concern to the migrant community or anybody else.

There is, however, a degree of misunderstanding abroad, and it is my information that currently an active effort is being made to get the message across to ethnic communities. I hope that the Hon. Mr Hill, in his position as Opposition spokesman on ethnic affairs, does not misrepresent the situation to people who have a poor understanding or appreciation of the English language in such a way as to cause unnecessary or very much unfounded concern. He also chose, for some reason that escapes me, to criticise what he described as the hypocritical stance of this Government on Roxby Downs. This Government's position on Roxby Downs has consistently been one of support, and it remains one of support. We have done that in a most responsible way. I must say that, to the Premier's credit, in particular, he has sometimes done it under difficult circumstances. It is a nonsense to suggest that the State Government has had any particular problems, either with the public or with the joint venturers. The Hon. Mr Feleppa was far more positive when he praised the Government's careful reasoned and responsible approach to this issue. He compared it with the brash Opposition approach, which ignores the proven fact that human beings can be unreliable and that it is wise always to be on the safe side in these matters. The Hon. Mr Feleppa was one of three honourable members who expressed concern about the plight of many people in rural areas. He mentioned particularly the Riverland, where many growers, particularly migrants, have experienced hard times.

I want to make very clear that the Government has been aware of the problem and has consistently been sympathetic to the difficulties, and has committed millions of dollars on a number of initiatives in the Riverland area. In particular, I was pleased that the Hon. Mr Feleppa noted the success of the Riverland Development Commission.

The Hon. Mr Dunn made some very astute observations about future needs for rural education in South Australia. As happens when he confines his remarks to things about which he knows a good deal and does not wander too far into urban tracks, he revealed a sound knowledge and an obviously keen interest in the area.

The Hon. Mr Chatterton voiced his concern about what he saw as a critical situation in some of this State's arid zones. He was one of a number of members who commented on the work of the select committee into native vegetation, the report of which is due soon. The Hon. Mr Chatterton was heavily involved with that committee and spoke very well on the need to rationalise the notion of Government controls with the economic realities of the man on the land. I think that the vegetation retention saga, or the vegetation clearance saga, whichever way one wishes to style it (I must say I prefer 'vegetation retention'), at last appears to be drawing to what I believe will be a happy conclusion.

I mentioned previously the Hon. Mr Feleppa's interest in the Riverland. He is also very concerned about migrants in South Australia and mentioned in what I thought was an excellent contribution the very good feedback that he is receiving about the number of initiatives taken to help the ethnic community in the past 12 months. He mentioned in particular the efforts of the Minister of Ethnic Affairs (Hon. Mr Sumner), and the personal efforts of the Premier and of the Minister of Community Welfare. I am not sure from memory whether he mentioned the efforts in the health area. If he did not, he most certainly should have.

We have, following the report of the migrant health task force, taken a number of very significant initiatives in the area of migrant health to make sure that every person in this State, regardless of race, country of origin or command of the English language, will have equal access to the benefits of a first class health system.

The Hon. Ms Levy presented a most enlightening address on the role of women in the Parliament over the years. I must say that, in my view, it is most unfortunate that she was not able to present that paper at a major international gathering in Nairobi. Clearly, the number of women in Parliament is increasing year by year, albeit slowly.

The Hon. Mr Lucas made the point that the figures do not give much cause for backslapping on either the left or right of politics. I do not believe that either of the major Parties has a great deal to boast about in the equal opportunities stakes. The Hon. Mr Lucas dedicated most of his speech to the question of streamlining the processes of the Parliament, although at times it tended to become more of a debate across the Chamber with the Attorney-General.

The Hon. Mr Griffin spoke on a Bill of Rights and the Constitutional Convention and the Hon. Miss Laidlaw on the future power needs of this State. It seemed to me that her contribution stamped her as something of a chip off the old block. She spoke in favour of the Governments considering importing black coal from New South Wales rather than starting its own mine at Sedan or Lochiel.

The Hon. Mr Davis, for some reason that was not quite clear to me, spent a considerable time speaking of the sad decline of debating in schools and, perhaps more importantly, verbal skills in Australia in general. He concluded with a big sell for the independent school system.

Two members spoke on the tragic increase in road deaths in this country and on the need to do more about that. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan, to whom I must pay credit as a keen campaigner for greater road safety measures, particularly lower speed limits, has been completely consistent in this area, and his contribution on this occasion was very much in line with the sorts of things that he has been saying and with the very positive message that he has been delivering in this State in recent months.

The Hon. Mr Bruce, who is a great supporter of the select committee and the committee system generally, praised the work of the standing committee which looked at random breath testing. He also praised the Government for the prompt implementation of many of the recommendations of that select committee. I will conclude by placing on the record my appreciation, and I think that of all responsible members of both Houses, of the work done by the Hon. Mr Bruce on the random breath testing select committee.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am perfectly happy to pay due credit to the Hon. Mr Cameron on any occasion when it is due. I certainly do not get hoarse doing that, because those occasions are few and far between. The Hon. Mr Cameron played a positive role on that select committee but nobody played a more positive role than did the Hon. Mr Bruce, who was faced with a cruel dilemma, as he is still an active member and office bearer of the Liquor Trades Union. Fears were expressed by the liquor industry generally—and not least by the Liquor Trades Union in particular—that more stringent random breath testing might have a further adverse effect on the industry generally and particularly on the hotel and restaurant industries.

The Hon. Mr Bruce took what he believed to be the right course and acted in a most honourable way. As a result, we have taken another significant stride towards having in place a random breath testing program which really works and which can be a real and positive deterrent to drink driving and, consequently, to the all too familiar tragic road toll.

In very broad terms, that covers the contributions that were made on this occasion, and I thank all honourable members for their contributions.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that His Excellency the Governor has appointed 4.30 p.m. today as the time for the presentation of the Address in Reply. I ask all honourable members to accompany me now to Government House.

[Sitting suspended from 4.17 to 5 p.m.]

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that, accompanied by the seconder and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's opening speech adopted by this Council today, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the fourth session of the forty-fifth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

I would like to inform the Council that I rang Mrs Creedon this morning and the report on the Hon. Cecil Creedon is quite good.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.3 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 28 August at 2.15 p.m.