LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 15 October 1985

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

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Labour, on behalf of the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

Pursuant to Statute—

Coast Protection Act 1972—Regulations—Identity Cards for Wardens.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—

Fish Processors—Tuna.

Lake and Coorong Fishery—Licences.

Marine Scale Fishery—Licences.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—

Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—Long Service Leave.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): A paper tabled on Thursday last entitled 'Supreme Court Act 1935—New rules of court for proceedings under the Companies (South Australia) Code' was incorrectly tabled. I therefore seek leave of the Council to withdraw that paper.

Leave granted; paper withdrawn.

QUESTIONS

AIDS IN SCHOOLS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about AIDS in schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: An article which appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday headed 'Victims of AIDS not obliged to tell schools' states that a document had been produced with help from the South Australian Health Commission. It was reported that South Australian teachers and students who have the AIDS virus are not obliged to report the condition. In regard to teachers, it was stated that it would be prudent of them to do so through school principals. It was also stated that it would be very rare for persons in schools to be carrying the AIDS virus, and, although I do not disagree with this, that is perhaps a factor that would make it more important that the condition be reported where it did occur. The question of confidentiality was raised, and I certainly believe that the confidentiality of AIDS sufferers or carriers should be respected. However, principals of schools have access to all sorts of confidential information, and disclosure to the school principal would not create any problem.

The rest of the policy document, as reported, seems sensible, but I would have thought that it could be more effectively carried out if reporting were compulsory. For example, it is stated that a child with a positive antibody test, who has impaired immunity, should be removed from school during any outbreak of measles, chickenpox or any other serious contagious diseases. This seems to be an eminently sensible precaution, but how can it be carried out if it is not known that the child has impaired immunity?

In view of the reported Health Commission involvement, I ask the Minister whether he and the Health Commission support the proposition that students and teachers in South Australian schools should not be obliged to report the matter to the school principal if they are carrying the AIDS virus.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I have told this Council before on a number of occasions—and I will repeat it today—that AIDS is far too important to be made some sort of political football. AIDS is also far too important for the politicians to blunder into an area about what, by and large, they probably know very little. I have been scrupulously careful not to involve myself in any direct way with the arrangements and the control except to go to Cabinet and get its endorsement for a $1 million program for 1985-86 to ensure that we continue to make preparations for the inevitable day when our first case or cases of clinical AIDS occur.

It was to ensure that there were education programs for health professionals right across the professions, particularly the medical profession but also the nursing profession. It is important that we have adequate arrangements so that in appropriate cases any victim of AIDS, whether in the clinical form of lymphadenopathy syndrome (LAS) or full-blown AIDS, could be nursed with compassion and care in their own homes and environments where it is considered appropriate. On all occasions I have taken my advice from Professor Penington and the national task force on AIDS and from Dr Scott Cameron and the South Australian AIDS advisory committee.

It was made very clear from the outset by all the professionals who advise me that clinical AIDS should be a notifiable disease under the South Australian legislation and that AIDS related complex and lymphadenopathy syndrome should be notifiable diseases under the South Australian legislation. However, it was made just as clear that none of the experts who were involved, whether experts in communicable diseases or epidemilogy or any of the other facets that are so necessary to put an AIDS control program in place, thought that one could make out a case for making a positive blood test for AIDS, in the absence of any other symptoms, a notifiable disease.

They made it very clear to me and to everyone else who was involved in control programs that to do so would inevitably drive cases underground. One of the reasons why we have been so successful to date in combating AIDS in South Australia and, more particularly, as I believe at this stage, in arresting the spread of AIDS is that we have had the full support of the male homosexual community in this State.

It was considered highly desirable that we did nothing that would be prejudicial to the ongoing contact with that community for two reasons. First, of course, we needed their full cooperation both in terms of arresting the spread of the disease and, secondly, we needed to know where to contact them so that effective education programs could be maximised. For that reason we have developed a policy which respects the privacy of the individual. Individuals are counselled and they are given all the appropriate attention by professionals—not by politicians.

Again, the question has arisen in New South Wales quite recently as to whether a preschool child should be admitted to kindergarten. That is quite different from a school child. One must look at the behaviour patterns. In the case of children in primary or secondary school, the chances of casual transmission of AIDS are virtually nil. In those circumstances, a person has every right to confidentiality and to expect that that confidentiality will be respected, particularly (if one wants to go further into the matter) in view of the fact that, if a child in that age group is AIDS positive,

the chances are overwhelming that that child is AIDS positive because he or she is a haemophiliac and because AIDS has been transmitted to that child because of a very large number of injections.

So, to be seen to discriminate against these people in any way, given that the chances of their catching AIDS through casual contact are virtually non-existent, would be discrimination in its worst form. It has been said that AIDS phobia is 10 times the problem that clinical AIDS is. There has been a lot of fear and alarm abroad. In South Australia, the reality is that, on the best estimates available, there are about 120 serum positives to AIDS. We can expect our first clinical case in the reasonably near future. To date there have been no cases.

The control programs that have been devised and put in place by public health authorities and our experts in communicable diseases and epidemiology have been a model for the rest of Australia and, indeed, in many ways, a model for the rest of the world. The fact remains that we do not intend to deviate from that practice. We do not intend to allow AIDS to be politicised. The Government will continue to take the best advice that is available to it: that very best advice certainly does not come from the Opposition benches in the form of Mr Burdett.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RETIREMENT VILLAGES

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In the past 12 months a significant number of retirement villages have been established in this State. Because an ever increasing percentage of the population is in the upper age group, it is possible that this type of lifestyle, which provides a mix of independent living with communal support facilities, will meet with increasing acceptance of the community. The Government supports the development of retirement villages and also seeks to ensure that persons who take up residence in such villages are accorded that degree of protection and security of tenure that is appropriate for an investment of this type.

Instances have come to the attention of the Corporate Affairs Commission of retirement villages where an offer is made to the public to invest in the village and there has been a failure to comply with the existing legislative requirements. The retirement villages to which I refer are those which are 'resident funded' and which are marketed to the public on a commercial basis as an investment in retirement accommodation. In these developments the potential resident buys the right to occupy the unit in the village for a lump sum consideration, and agrees to pay a further maintenance fee which is designed to cover weekly rates and taxes, the upkeep of the unit, and the maintenance of the communal facilities.

The statement therefore does not refer to accommodation for elderly citizens which has been traditionally provided by charitable organisations with a long history of aged care whose activities are usually subsidised by the Commonwealth Government.

It is not widely known that the resident funded accommodation to which this statement refers is structured on a basis which makes this type of investment a 'prescribed interest' as defined in the Companies (South Australia) Code. This means that organisations promoting the scheme must comply with those provisions of the Code which regulate the offering to the public of an investment opportunity. These provisions do not ensure that a correct investment decision is made, but rather their purpose is to ensure that a decision is made on the basis of full disclosure of the relevant particulars. This regulation encompasses advertising which, if it were not regulated, may well be of an emotive nature, and contain false or misleading claims as to the facilities available to the residents of the retirement village and the security of tenure available.

At a meeting of the Ministerial Council for Companies and Securities held on 1 May 1985, it was resolved that retirement villages would be excluded from the definition of 'prescribed interest' with effect from 1 July 1987 and that each State/Territory would regulate retirement villages in the manner considered most appropriate to the needs of that State/Territory.

Given the substantial amount of money required to secure accommodation in retirement villages and the possible vulnerability of the persons seeking this accommodation, it would be irresponsibile to have no regulation in this important and rapidly growing market. In consequence, interim regulation up to 1 July 1987 will be undertaken by the Corporate Affairs Commission, which has a delegation to exercise all of the powers of the National Companies and Securities Commission in relation to retirement villages.

Prior to 1 July 1987 the Government will, in consultation with interested parties, seek to develop proposals that can be the basis of regulation of investment and other aspects of this important area. It should be noted that the Corporate Affairs Commission has already held discussions with representatives of the voluntary care sector and private developers on this matter with a view to the development of a basis for regulation in this interim period. The commission will grant appropriate exemptions from the strict requirement of the Companies Code where it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so.

In the most common resident funded situation, the potential resident is required to pay a substantial sum for a licence to occupy a unit in the village. Because this interest cannot be registered on the title to the land, the licensee is at risk if the village is sold by either the promoter or by a mortgagee exercising a power of sale. Many licensees may not realise that they are not getting freehold title, or that a licence may well include conditions which place the licensee at the mercy of the developer. While I am not for one moment criticising the licence concept, which may well be the only way to maintain the character of a retirement village development, it is essential that some security of tenure be afforded to those who have paid large sums of money for what they often believe is the right to occupy a unit for life. It is equally important that licensees should be aware that the lump sum payable to secure the licence, a portion of which is, subject to the contractual relationship in each particular case, repayable on a subsequent resale following the licensee's death or departure from the village, is not the only payment which the licensee is required to make. As I indicated earlier in this statement, all licensees must contribute towards rates and taxes and maintenance in an amount which will probably increase over the years.

There are two important matters that should be emphasised. The first is that promoters of retirement village schemes should be aware of the likelihood that their scheme is regulated as a prescribed interest under the Companies (South Australia) Code where an offer has been made to the public and that they should seek legal advice as to documentary requirements and permissible advertising. On 19 September 1985 on the application of the Corporate Affairs Commission, the Supreme Court made an order restraining the promoter of a retirement village and an Adelaide daily newspaper from further publication of an advertisement which had not been approved by the commission. The second matter to be emphasised is to express the concern of the Government that persons entering retire-

ment villages at considerable cost should have security of tenure in the sense that the village will not be sold out from under their feet for whatever reason, and be fully informed as to their rights and obligations.

That the concern of the Government is justified is borne out by recent events in Victoria. In Victoria as reported in the *Age* of 19 September 1985 a very large retirement village promoter is unable to pay its debts, and has sought help from the Victorian Government. Not the least of these debts are amounts aggregating almost $500 000 due to the estates of former residents who are deceased. In the imposition of both the interim and the long term regulation, a balance will be struck between the need for developments of this kind to be viable commercially and the need to give residents security commensurate with the cost of entry into this type of accommodation.

In summary, the Government seeks to encourage the initiative being taken to assist in the accommodation needs of aged persons, but at the same time is concerned to ensure, where there is a substantial investment in retirement accommodation, that that investment is made on an informed basis and that appropriate protection for security of tenure is provided.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

LIFE SENTENCE PRISONERS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on prisoners serving life sentences.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last Thursday, the Court of Criminal Appeal handed down its decision not to interfere with the decision of Mr Justice Johnston. This now means Mackie's immediate release unless there is an application to the High Court for special leave to appeal. The court said that, but for the expectations of early release created both by a letter from the Minister of Correctional Services and this Government's Parole Board, there would have been a non-parole period of 25 years for Mackie. Two disturbing matters are referred to by the Chief Justice in his judgment. He says:

> The approach which this court should take in these circumstances has had to be considered in the case of four other prisoners undergoing life sentences whose expectations of release were created and then dashed under similar circumstances. In each case the court has fixed a non-parole period which has enabled the expectation to be fulfilled. In two such cases there was no appeal by the Attorney-General. In the third case leave to appeal was refused. Leave to appeal was granted in the case of David James Flynn and that appeal by the Attorney-General was considered by the Full Court on 20 February 1985. The court on that occasion was told that Flynn's situation was unique and that there were no other cases in which expectations of release created by the Parole Board in the belief that it was performing its legal function had been frustrated. Counsel for the Attorney-General on that appeal indicated that his real concern was that the court should not appear to approve a relatively short non-parole period as appropriate for the crime and he recognised the obstacle for the appeal presented by the expectations which had been created by the Parole Board.

Two matters which arise are: first, that there were four other cases where expectations were raised by this Government's Parole Board; and, secondly, the misleading of the court in Flynn's case that his case was 'unique'. It now transpires, from the judgment of the Chief Justice, that it was not.

The Chief Justice's reference to four other cases raises also the question of how many other cases there may be where expectations of early release have been raised, thus compromising the powers of the Supreme Court. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Why, and on whose instructions, was the Supreme Court misled in Flynn's case that his case was unique?

2. How many other prisoners serving life sentences have had their expectations raised by either or both the Parole Board or the Minister of Correctional Services such that the powers of the Supreme Court will be likely to have been compromised?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The first thing that needs to be repeated is that the system of parole in operation which led to the Parole Board's making decisions about when prisoners should be released on parole was the system in existence when Mr Griffin was Attorney-General.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member insists on coming into this place and saying that it is this Government's Parole Board. The fact is that there was a change with the Chairman of the Parole Board, but the Parole Board's powers which it used in considering the prisoners to whom the honourable members has referred was a Parole Board system similar to the one in operation when the honourable member was Attorney-General—he cannot deny that.

He also fails to point out to the Council in these questions that the non-parole periods now being awarded by the courts under the new system established by this Government are very much greater than the periods served by prisoners before being released under the system over which Mr Griffin presided when his Government was in office from 1979 to 1982. In fact, the periods of non-parole now being fixed mean that prisoners are staying in gaol longer under the new parole system than was the case under the old parole system.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Three to four times longer.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Blevins interjects 'Three to four times longer', and that is certainly the case with respect to the non-parole periods that are being set. That is the first point that needs to be made: prisoners under the new parole legislation are receiving much longer non-parole periods, as was exemplified in Von Einem's case.

An honourable member: Creed and McBride, too.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes. All of them have been given much greater non-parole periods than would have pertained under the pre-existing situation. In Von Einem's case a record non-parole period of some 36 years was imposed by the court of criminal appeal on appeal from the Attorney-General. It is worth reminding the honourable member, too (because he persists with this line of questioning), that while he was Attorney-General only 17 appeals were launched by the Crown under his jurisdiction against sentences thought to be lenient. In my three years as Attorney-General I have authorised about 80 such appeals against lenient sentences.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: The legislation wasn't in force all that time.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It was not in force for the whole period; it was in force for about two years. If the honourable member is sensitive, I will add another eight appeals to make the two periods comparable. I will give the honourable member the benefit of the doubt and take his total to 25 appeals during his period as Attorney-General—compared to 80 appeals while I have been Attorney-General. That says a lot for the honourable member's record of appeals against lenient sentences. The fact is that the Hon. Mr Griffin talks about this, but when he is in a position to do something about it—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has raised an interesting question, and I will certainly deal with it. The fact is that the honourable member authorised 25 appeals in his time as Attorney-General as against the 80 appeals that I have implemented as Attorney-General. The honourable member's concern about lenient sentences was not demonstrated when he was Attorney-General. His concern only becomes clear when he is in Opposition, so that he can come into Parliament and score what he sees as political points out of the issue. That is the only reason that the honourable member is raising this question in Parliament at this time: he can see some politics in it. The honourable member talks about the crime rate. I have some interesting information for the Hon. Mr Griffin with respect to the crime rate during his period as Attorney-General—it went up quite substantially.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is absolute nonsense.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is absolute arrant nonsense, and the Hon. Mr Griffin knows it.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Hon. Mr Griffin wants to ask further questions, I ask him to do so properly and not interject.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Griffin will be given the figures. If the Hon. Mr Griffin wants to pursue this line of questioning, it will be demonstrated how dishonest the campaign was that he and his colleagues conducted in 1979 because, under the Tonkin Government, the crime rate went up in a number of significant areas—and it went up quite substantially. In due course, the Hon. Mr Griffin will be provided with that information, as indeed will the public of South Australia, if the Hon. Mr Griffin decides to go down this political track with respect to a very important issue of concern—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I would have thought that it was of concern to the whole community but, obviously, it is not of concern to the Hon. Mr Griffin. In relation to the sentencing policy followed by the Hon. Mr Griffin as Attorney-General and to the assertions he has made about the crime rate, in Government he does one thing and in Opposition he asserts another. I can tell him that in many significant areas of crime under his Government the crime rate rose. It is an unfortunate situation, recognised by me and throughout Australia and virtually the world, that we are in a phase when crime rate is on the increase, and that situation is not peculiar to South Australia or Australia.

If the honourable member wants a further lecture on it, I can tell him that, with respect to the increase in the crime rate, South Australia certainly is not in as bad a position as most of the other States of Australia. That is also some information that he may well wish to take on board when he decides to go out into the community and play his grubby political tricks concerning this issue. This matter ought to be of concern to the community, and I think the fact that the honourable member treats it in this way says more about him and his attitude to these issues than it does about their substance. With respect to the Hon. Mr Griffin's second question, I do not know whether there are any other prisoners who are being dealt with under the Liberal Government's parole system.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Under the Liberal Government's parole system, the Parole Board dealt with applications for parole. In relation to the cases mentioned by the honourable member, including the case of Mr Mackie, it was the Parole Board that made recommendations concerning his preparation for parole. That is a system similar to that to which the honourable member wishes to return. As stated, I believe, in the press recently, he wishes to return to a system where the Parole Board makes the decisions about when a prisoner should be released on parole.

That is a matter that this Government gave to the courts. The courts set the non-parole period and, provided the prisoners are of good behaviour, they know when they are due to be released. Under the previous system, namely, the system in which the former Attorney-General (Mr Griffin) was involved as a member of the Government, the Parole Board made assessments as to when a person should be released on parole, and that is what happened with respect to these cases in the transitional period between the law as it was under the honourable member's period in Government and the changes in the law that occurred in December 1983.

That should be made quite clear. I am not sure how many prisoners were being dealt with by the Parole Board under that old system in the transitional period from the old parole system to that introduced by this Government.

In relation to the first question, the response was given to the Full Court that this was a unique case. I can only assume that that is information—obviously now incorrect—that was ascertained by the prosecuting counsel who appeared for the Crown in that case.

MUSEUM REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for the Arts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: There has been in existence a plan for a building to be constructed close to the north-west corner of the Art Gallery. The proposed purpose of the building is to assist with displays and assembly for Art Gallery purposes. The building is part of phase B of stage 1 of the Museum redevelopment. Other parts of phase B are in the course of construction and restoration, namely, the old destitute building that is to become the Museum of Immigration and Settlement, and the Armoury and police barracks complex which are to be used for display and information for History Trust purposes.

As these other parts of phase B are under way and are to be completed in April next year, there does not seem to be any action being taken at all with this proposed building for the Art Gallery, and so my questions seek to ascertain the reasons for the apparent delays in this plan. What is the current position in regard to that proposal? What are the reasons for the apparent delays and when does the Minister expect that such a building will be completed?

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

CHEMICAL POLLUTION

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about chemical pollution of underground water in the Coonawarra area.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: There is a proposal for a copper chromium arsenate pine post treatment plant at Coonawarra in the South-East in the immediate vicinity of some vineyards and within a kilometre of the Penola water supply. These vineyards, which are a valuable resource to

the State, obtain their water from an underground water table. In many cases the bores are only 30 feet deep and yet up to 100 000 gallons per hour can be obtained from them. In the winter time the water level rises to within three feet of the surface.

The porous nature of the underground system means that it is very susceptible to pollution, and grave concern has been expressed at the potential for pollution, particularly since the accidental spillage at Gillman from a similar copper chromium arsenate timber treatment plant. The local council has, by a narrow majority, approved this plant. However, there is growing concern being expressed by vignerons. Nobody in the South-East wants to stop such a plant being established, but the location presently decided on is considered to be highly inappropriate and potentially dangerous to the underground water basins.

There are many other locations in the vicinity where such pollution would not occur, and it is considered to be of the utmost importance that some input come from the Government through the E&WS Department. In addition, it is believed that the Minister of Agriculture should consider very carefully the effect any pollution may have on agricultural production in that area. My questions are:

1. Are the Ministers of Water Resources and Agriculture aware of this problem? If so, what steps have been taken to ensure that the interests of vignerons in the Coonawarra are protected?
2. If no steps have been taken, will the Government immediately institute an inquiry to ascertain the suitability or otherwise of this project and, if necessary, recommend to the Planning Appeal Board that the plant not be allowed to proceed at that site?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will have those questions examined and bring back a report for the honourable member.

MARRIAGE SUPPORT SERVICES

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Community Welfare a question about marriage support services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: A phone-in survey conducted by the Marriage Guidance Council of South Australia earlier this month revealed that married couples needed more support to sort out problems in their relationships. Over half the callers commented that there were adequate support services for separated or divorced couples but inadequate services for married couples. This assessment appears to be sound; indeed the funding allocations reveal that the Commonwealth Government spends more than $1 250 million a year on divorce services and only $4 million (or less than .3 of a per cent of the divorce services funding) on marriage support services. This distribution would seem to be highly questionable.

Surely, if it is deemed necessary to provide help and support to married couples, a fair proportion of this assistance should be made available to support services before a couple's relationship reaches crisis point. Does the Minister agree with the conclusions of the survey that the Commonwealth Government should review its policies and priorities on funding support for marriage and diverse support services? If so, what measures will the Minister pursue in an endeavour to persuade the Commonwealth Government to undertake such a review?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I understand the issues raised by the honourable member in her question, and I have previously made representations to the federal Attorney-General whose responsibility the Family Law Act is on the question of additional support for such organisations as the Marriage Guidance Council. I do know that the federal Attorney is concerned about the increase in the divorce rate and the way that the Family Court is operating in this environment.

I cannot give the Council any specific details of the sort of action that he has taken, or intends taking, but I know that it is something that he has under consideration at present. He would agree with the honourable member in her assessment that more support needs to be given to prevent marriage break-up rather than having the emphasis in resources at the other end of the process, namely, when there has been an irretrievable break-down of the relationship.

I would not wish to argue with the issues raised by the honourable member and the points she has taken, with which I think anyone would agree in principle. I know that the federal Attorney-General (Mr Bowen) has taken action in this area already. I have previously made representations to him about the sorts of issues that have been raised and, in particular, I recall that last year representations were made with respect to Marriage Guidance Council funding.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Your representations were not listened to.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member will realise, after she has been in Parliament a little longer, that representations made by State Governments are frequently not listened to by Federal Governments. I do not believe the honourable member would want me to upset her afternoon or to delay Question Time unduly by reciting examples of that sort of thing under Governments of both Parties at both State and federal levels. I would not want to argue with the point she has made. I undertake to refer the question to the federal Attorney and bring back a reply so that the honourable member can be fully informed about the initiatives being taken by him in this regard.

KILLER

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the game *Killer* organised by the student union over the weekend.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have received a letter from a woman who is concerned about the encouragement of children at a private school to take part, through cadets, in a game organised at the university. The age of the child who was referred to me was 12. I understand that it was a function organised by the students union partly as a fund-raiser. I have copies of the background for the game. I realise from what I read that the Attorney may already have answers to these questions and may have seen this material. The game is called 'Killer: a game of assassination, a live role playing game for any number of players'. It goes into considerable and graphic detail on how people may be assassinated in various ways, and lays down some ground rules for it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Apart from the aside, it is a game which to a lot of people is more than the innocuous cowboys and Indians. Assassination is certainly not a subject about which any society can be frivolous and light-hearted. The introduction to this game, written by its originator, Steve Jackson, states in part:

Killer is that "something more". In KILLER, you don't create a paper character . . . you *are* the character. Players match skills and wits on a personal level. It's all a game—but, while it lasts, it's real. The object of KILLER is to eliminate the opposition by fair means or foul . . . usually foul! Under the supervision of a game master, players attempt to score "kills" with dart guns, confetti "grenades," balloon booby-traps, and dozens of other ingenious devices. The survivors win. Good luck—and watch your back.

Then, there is a disclaimer, stating:

Players are encouraged to play this game in a reasonable and sensible fashion. Because the information and suggestions in this book may be used in circumstances outside his control, the author assumes no responsibility for any loss or injury occasioned by such use.

It is obvious that one can be hypersensitive to this, and I have not made a detailed psychological analysis of it. However, I assure the Attorney that many parents are anxious that their children are being encouraged to take part in this game. Is the Attorney familiar with the game 'Killer: a game of assassination'? Does he see that there are any grounds to curtail its implementation or performance? If so, does he intend to take any steps in relation to the encouragement of schoolchildren to take part in this game through the auspices of the university students union?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I imagine that the honourable member is referring to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday (14 October). I have not yet seen this game, although the information that I had—and it would appear that that is the case from the article—is that it is a book, although the book may describe how to play this game. The honourable member will recall that as a result of amendments introduced by me to the Police Offences Act it is possible for the Classification of Publications Board to deal with violence in publications and, if the board refuses to classify a book that is in the violent category, there is the possibility for action to be taken if the book is sold.

That extended the previous categories that could be dealt with by the Classification of Publications Board and the Police Offences Act beyond obscenity and indecency, which had been the traditional areas of censorship. When this matter was referred to me, I said that I was not aware of the book (that is still the situation) but that, if complaints were received, I could ask the Classification of Publications Board to look into the matter. I made that statement yesterday, and it appeared in the press: that is the position as it is today.

I notice that the *Advertiser* article about the book contained a defence of it by someone from the University of Adelaide, but I am not in a position to express an opinion one way or another on it. Suffice it to say that there are mechanisms in our community for dealing with issues such as this and, if a complaint is received, and if it comes within the authority of the Classification of Publications Board, I would ask that board to examine it.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I ask a supplementary question. I will make a copy of the book available. Will the Minister undertake to have the appropriate authorities investigate it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If the honourable member would like me to refer it to the Classification of Publications Board, I will do that.

SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about social security reciprocal agreements.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: As the Minister, and I am sure members of the Opposition, would know, the Commonwealth Government has initiated, and proposes to sign, an agreement on social security matters with many countries from which thousands of citizens of this State and Australia have come. This has caused very hot debate, which has been reported by non-English language media, and concerns about the effects of these agreements on social security pension entitlements have no doubt been expressed to various members of Parliament, including me, and I would say also the Minister. Will the Minister inform this Council whether or not he has taken up these concerns on behalf of the State Government with Mr Howe, the Minister responsible for social security?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Mr Groom raised this question with the Premier in the House of Assembly on Thursday 8 August 1985, and the Premier conceded that the proposal as originally put forward by the Commonwealth Government and the Hon. Brian Howe, Minister for Social Security, had caused concern in some groups in the community. The Premier further stated:

The State Government certainly is ready, willing and able to take the concerns of those in the community to the Federal Government.

After Mr Howe made his announcement in the House of Representatives on Wednesday 8 May 1985, and the text of that announcement became available to me, I wrote to him on 17 June 1985 expressing concern about several aspects of the proposal. My letter expressed support for Mr Howe's desire to make agreements which would ensure that, if a person decided to return to his or her country of origin after reaching pensionable age, between them these countries would ensure that that person became eligible to receive at least some minimum pension payment. However, I expressed concern with some aspects of the proposal.

I pointed out that if persons stayed in Australia they would be entitled to the full amount of the pension after 10 years residence. However, if they left Australia they would be entitled to the full amount of pension only after 35 years residence. Potentially, people who may have contributed more to our economy would be penalised for wanting to reside outside Australia on retirement. I noted that this was causing concern in the minds of people, especially those who may have wanted to return to countries that do not have well developed age pension systems or those who through no fault of their own had never contributed to such systems as now exist in these countries. I also alluded to some other technical matters which placed doubt on the veracity of fixing on a notional 35 years as the proper basis for agreements which established reciprocal responsibility for the payment of pensions.

Between the time I sent this letter and 20 September 1985, when I received Mr Howe's reply, Mr Howe moved to appoint a liaison committee which would assist him in conducting wide-ranging consultations across Australia on the matter and which was to report to him with recommended changes to his original proposed bases for agreements. I understand that the committee will shortly make its report and that Mr Howe will shortly announce that changes will be made to bases of agreements sought.

Under the present system, many former residents currently have no entitlement under the Australian system and reduced entitlements to the system of the country to which they have returned because of contributions not made while resident in Australia.

Mr Howe's proposal would overcome those problems which have been identified but not acted upon for many years. The people who have left Australia after many years working here but who had not qualified for a pension at the time of departure and who do not receive either an Australian pension or one from their present country of residence would now be covered under the scheme which is proposed by Mr Howe, in consultation with the Italian

Government, and which it is believed will form a model for similar such agreements with other countries. Overall, the proposed agreement with the Italian Government is beneficial, but there are some problems which have been identified and made known by me to Mr Howe. I am now awaiting Mr Howe's decision following the consultations.

Mr COWLEY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question that I asked recently regarding Mr Cowley?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. I have answered previously.
3. See 2 above.

SALISBURY SHOPFRONT HEALTH CENTRE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the Salisbury Shopfront Adolescent Health Centre?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The reply is as follows:

1. The Salisbury Shopfront Adolescent Health Centre agreement is a significant and important part of a community health program which the Government has consciously entered into with local government. Adolescent health cannot be dealt with in isolation, and it is stressed that funds provided are spent on community health and welfare programs.
2. Financial control does exist.

COURT REPORTING

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to a question I asked on 15 August in relation to court reporting?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the reply is to some extent statistical, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

1. The following charges apply:

(a) All courts, boards and tribunals other than the Industrial Jurisdiction
Monitoring fee: $85 per day
Fee per page of transcript (running transcript) $5.75 per page
Fee per page of transcript (delayed transcript) $5.20 per page

(b) The Industrial Court and Commission
Monitoring fee: $11.71 per hour
Fee per page of transcript (running transcript) $5.75 per page

To facilitate a comparison with the Government reporting services, the average cost per page in the courts precinct has been calculated for the 1984-85 financial year. An administration cost of 51c has been added to the average cost per page to cover items such as contract supervision, quality control and accounting.

	$
Average cost per page—(courts precinct) 1984-85	7.60
Plus: Administration cost	0.38
Total cost per page	7.98

2. Standard costs for the two Government court reporting services for the 1984-85 financial year are as follows:

(a) Government Transcription Service (Tape)	$
• Direct Costs i.e. salaries, workers compensation insurance, payroll tax, materials, equipment, photocopying, etc.	5.34 per page
• Indirect Costs i.e. supervision, support services costs, superannuation, etc.	1.88 per page
Total Cost Per Page	7.22 per page

(b) Court Reporters	$
• Direct Costs—as above	8.22
• Indirect Costs—as above	2.46
• Total Cost Per Page	10.68

It should be recognised that a hearing reported by court reporters would usually result in a shorter transcript than would have been produced by either of the tape-based services. This results from the court reporters' ability to cull unnecessary material. If this factor is taken into account, the cost per page of transcript is reduced to $10.15.

The costings shown in *(a)* and *(b)* above are both based on full pages of transcript.

3. *(a)* There has been no expansion in the establishment of court reporters in the Court Reporting Branch by flexible part-time employment or other means.

(b) As advised in the previous written reply, the Government Transcription Service was expanded to the extent of four full-time-equivalent officers on 27 May 1985, and a further increase of 10 full-time-equivalents is planned for January next year. This initiative will divert approximately 38 000 pages of transcript from the private contractor in the current financial year and 60 000 pages in a full year. The expansion of the Government Transcription Service is expected to result in a cost saving of $40 000 in the current financial year and $147 000 p.a. thereafter. The assumption on which the expansion is based and the financial calculations have been verified by the Public Service Board and the Treasury Department, respectively.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I also seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it an answer to a question asked by the Hon. Mr Griffin during the last session, to which I responded but which has not yet been so incorporated in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

On 15 May last the honourable member asked a series of questions in the Legislative Council regarding court reporting services.

Regarding the question whether the Government has terminated or not renewed the private contractor's arrangement for court reporting, or reduced the volume of work to be undertaken by the private contractor, the reply is as follows:

The agreement between the Attorney-General and Spark and Cannon Pty Ltd expires on 30 June 1985. However, there is an option to extend the period of the agreement for two further periods of 12 months and it is anticipated that the option will be taken up.

The Government Transcription Service is to be expanded to the extent of four full-time-equivalent officers from 27 May 1985, and a further increase of 10 full-time-equivalent officers is planned for January next year. This initiative will divert approximately 60 000 pages of transcript from the private contractor to the Government Transcription Service. This volume of pages represents approximately 48 per cent of the work that the private contractor does on behalf of the South Australian Government.

Regarding the question about what arrangements are now in place and what further changes are proposed with respect to court reporting services, the answer is as follows:

The Courts Department employs three court reporting services including the private contractor, and the breakdown of output this financial year to date is:

	Per cent
• Court reporters	46.0
• Government Transcription Service	17.5
• Private contractor	36.5

The organisational arrangements for court reporting have changed significantly since the review referred to by you was completed in March 1983. The review, which was carried out by a committee comprised mainly of reporting staff, identified numerous means of improving productivity.

The manual court reporting group has become far more flexible through the introduction of casual court reporters and a new scheme known as "flexible part-time employment". Whereas in 1982 there were no casual court reporters, there are now 11 and this has improved cost-effectiveness as well as flexibility. The flexible part-time employment scheme was developed in conjunction with the court reporters through their consultative committee and the Public Service Association. The main thrust of the scheme is that the employee is employed for a number of days per month rather than set days each week. This enables the Chief Reporter to roster a reporter to work additional days during busy weeks and reduce the number of days worked in subsequent weeks.

During the past few months the Court Reporting Branch has been experimenting with the use of dictation-typists to assist court reporters. This initiative was directed at the repetitive-strain-injury problem that has occurred in the branch over the past few years. It is envisaged that the use of dictation-typists will continue at the present level during the 1985-86 financial year.

The branch is also in the process of evaluating computer-aided transcription, a system which, in effect, reduces the transcription process to a word processing operation, and has the potential to significantly improve the productivity of court reporters. Trials of CAT equipment should be completed during the 1985-86 financial year provided that a suitable supplier is prepared to establish support facilities in Australia.

The Government Transcription Service has been restructured and is now comprised of both permanent and casual officers. The casual component will be substantially increased as the Government Transcription Service is expanded. The use of casual employees has given the service greater flexibility to cope with an extremely variable workload.

The honourable member also asked what would be the increase in cost of any changes made or proposed to be made by the Government in the court reporting services. The reply thereto is as follows:

None of the changes made or proposed to be made in court reporting services will result in any cost increases. On the contrary, every change and proposed change has been specifically aimed at improving productivity and cost-effectiveness.

The expansion of the Government Transcription Service is expected to result in a cost saving of $40 000 in 1985-86 and $147 000 p.a. thereafter. Whilst the use of dictation-typists has not had a direct effect upon the cost of providing court reporting services, it is anticipated that the incidence of repetitive-strain-injury amongst court reporters will decrease and savings to the Government will be achieved in workers compensation payments.

Computer-aided transcription has the potential to improve the productivity of stenotype reporters by approximately 40 per cent. However, it is too early to estimate what cost-savings would be achieved if such a system can be implemented.

The honourable member asked the following supplementary questions:

Will the Attorney-General supply to me in due course information as to the increase in productivity of the manual court reporters that has occurred since the 1982 State election, as well as details of any increases in costs that have been incurred as a result of the Government's implementation of its commitment to increase the core of Government court reporters, as indicated in the answer to the question.

The reply is as follows:

The Government gave a commitment that the establishment of court reporters would be maintained at the level that existed on the date of the last State election, and it has honoured that commitment. A stenotype training scheme was re-introduced in 1983 to provide replacements as natural attrition occurs. Two courses have been held to date, and a third is planned to commence in October this year.

Productivity has been improved in the Government Transcription Service as well as amongst manual reporters, and the percentage increases when current levels are compared with 1982 levels are as follows:

	Per cent
• Court reporters	63.4
• Government Transcription Service	82.1
• Overall	68.2

The overall figure is the most relevant because there is a great deal of cooperation between the two services, and this has raised the general level of productivity.

These very significant increases equate to a cost saving in present values of more than $1.4 million since the beginning of 1983, and savings during the past year alone, again compared with 1982, equate to more than $600 000. These savings have been achieved with a financial investment of $200 000 in training courses. The court reporting staff are to be commended for their motivation and dedication in improving productivity and performance to this extent.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Health a question about Royal Adelaide Hospital finances.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I understand that the 38 hour week for nurses has not been fully implemented at major teaching hospitals, including the Royal Adelaide Hospital, although provision had been made for its introduction as from 1 July 1985. This is due primarily to the critical shortage of trained nursing staff. Consequently, nurses are working 40 hours a week, are attracting overtime rates and are therefore being paid the equivalent of 41½ hours a week.

In addition, the 20 per cent-plus devaluation of the Australian dollar against the United States dollar and other major currencies has led to a sharp increase in the price of drugs and other hospital supplies from overseas. I am reliably informed that in the first three months of 1985-86 the Royal Adelaide Hospital is $2 million to $3 million over budget, that there is no apparent reason for this trend to be reversed in the near future, and that a 1985-86 budget deficit of $8 million is in prospect. One long time and respected hospital watcher describes the position at the Royal Adelaide Hospital as arguably the worst financial situation that the RAH has faced in the past decade.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: A what?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: A hospital watcher. I should make it clear that I have the highest regard for the RAH management team. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister confirm this alarming overrun in the RAH budget?

2. Does the Minister accept that the Royal Adelaide Hospital's essentially standstill budget makes it difficult, if not impossible, for it to meet its 1985-86 budget target?

3. What contingency plans, if any, does the South Australian Health Commission have to cope with the expected budget run at the RAH?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That was not one of the Hon. Mr Davis's better performances—he does not give many good ones, but that was perhaps the worst ever. I have been 'reliably informed', he said. I asked by whom had he been informed, to which he replied, 'A Royal Adelaide Hospital watcher.' Did someone casually walk past on North Terrace? I have been reliably informed, he says, that the hospital is already $2 million over its budget in the first quarter. Whomsoever the RAH watcher was, he, she or it got their facts absolutely upside down. More seriously, of course, repeated attacks have been made on the Royal Adelaide Hospital, its financial integrity and its security. At one stage Mr one per cent himself (Hon. Mr Burdett) came

in here drumming up stories about armed patients, a total lack of security, and so forth.

I want to tell members of the Opposition in general, and the Hon. Mr Davis in particular, that neither staff nor members of the board, and perhaps most important of all, the patients—the very grateful patients of the RAH—appreciate Opposition members drumming up false stories in this place for cynical political purposes.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Are you saying that it is untrue?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am saying that that is a lie.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is very much in the record. I am saying that the Hon. Mr Davis's suggestion from a Royal Adelaide Hospital watcher that the hospital has already blown its budget by some $2 million to $3 million in the first quarter of this year is a lie. It does not do the Hon. Mr Davis or other Opposition members any good at all to peddle falsehoods about the financial integrity of the RAH. To suggest that the hospital will be over budget by a factor of some 12 per cent in the first quarter of this year is totally outrageous. It is also disgraceful. I do not intend to dignify any of the other questions with a detailed answer.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No, you are going over the top, as have the Hons Mr Lucas and Mr Burdett. The Hon. Mr Burdett, and particularly the honourable member and the Hon. Mr Lucas, are so desperate and cynical that—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Yes. How many shadow Ministers of Health are there? However, I point out to the honourable member that, as Mr Lucas did recently, today the honourable member went over the top, and it will do his political career no good at all.

HOSPITAL MAINTENANCE

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question concerning maintenance in the public hospital system.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: It was drawn to my attention when the budget papers were distributed that the expenditure on maintenance in the public hospital system appeared unrealistically low and in many cases it was lower than the electric light bill. It has been suggested that the Government, in order to bring in its favourable budget, has deferred much expenditure, including the deferral of expenditure on maintenance in the hospital system. Is the Minister personally aware of any attempt to defer maintenance for the purpose of budgeting and, if so, what is the extent of such deferred liabilities that future Governments will have to pick up by way of paying for deferred maintenance?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The maintenance may have been low in some cases but certainly not as low as some of the questions that come from members such as Mr Davis and Dr Ritson. It amazes me that they raise the matter of capital spending. I have said many times, but I will say it again for their benefit today, that the onslaught on the capital works program was led by the Tonkin Liberal Government. It used the mortgage money to buy the groceries. It ran down capital works spending in the health area in its last budget to $11.7 million.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: So that they could get enough money to balance the budget.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It pinched other capital moneys of course to try and balance the budget—some $150 million from recollection. With regard to the capital budget, I have worked very diligently and very hard to ensure that this year, 1985-86, the capital works budget in the health area, with the additional Commonwealth funding, will be somewhere in excess of $30 million. I want to tell the Council that any expenditure less than $28 million to $30 million annually, at 1985 prices, in the health area in the longer term leads to disaster. It is living off artificial depreciation. It is like the farmer who does not worry about his fences for 10 or 15 years or the householder who does not paint his house. You can do it for a year or two or three but you certainly cannot do it in the long term. We inherited that disaster and we have rectified it. For Dr Ritson to stand up and ask whether somehow or other the commission has conspired or the Minister of Health has conspired with the hospitals to somehow or other lower their spending on maintenance for the financial year 1985-86 is just about as silly as the question that was asked by Mr Davis based on his hospital watcher. I suggest that both of them require new watchers with much more credibility.

WATER FILTRATION

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Tourism an answer to the question I asked on 21 August about water filtration?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In its 1985-86 budget the Commonwealth has provided funds of $5.6 million for South Australia's water filtration program. However, the Commonwealth has recognised the justification of South Australia's need for filtration of its water supply and this year and in the past two years, has provided additional funding for water treatment in the form of special purpose grants. In June 1985 the State received $8.25 million in respect of 1984-85 and $12 million in respect of 1985-86 from the Commonwealth. The latter amount will facilitate a planned expenditure program of $18.6 million for water treatment in 1985-86. Such grants enabled the State to achieve expenditure on construction of water filtration plants of $18.4 million in 1983-84 and $19.7 million in 1984-85 compared with only $11.5 million in 1982-83 and $9.7 million in 1981-82.

These funds will enable the Morgan water filtration plant to be completed in mid 1986, following which the construction of the Stockwell plant is planned to commence. The Happy Valley plant, which is planned to serve approximately 40 per cent of metropolitan Adelaide, is scheduled to supply filtered water to the Adelaide plains in 1988 and to the southern suburbs upon completion in 1990.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PAROLE

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. How many prisoners who were convicted before the present parole system came into effect remain in South Australian prisons?
2. When was each of such prisoners sentenced?
3. For what crimes was each such prisoner sentenced?
4. In each case—
   (i) what sentence was imposed?
   (ii) what, if any, non-parole period was set?
5. In what cases, if any, has the Crown applied to extend non-parole periods, on what grounds and with what success?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The reply is of three pages which are essentially tables. I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

1. 80.
2. 3 and 4.

		(i)	(ii)
5.5.69	Rape—female	10 years	9 years
9.7.73	Murder	Life	20 years
1.4.74	Murder	Life	20 years
1.10.75	Murder	Life	N/A
18.12.75	Gross indecency with female <16 years	G.P.	—
26.4.76	Murder	Life	14 years
31.5.76	Gross indency with female <16 years	G.P.	—
30.8.76	Murder	Life	22 years
14.10.76	Murder	G.P.	—
1.2.77	Murder	Life	8 years
6.7.77	Attempt to commit murder	G.P.	—
26.10.77	Murder	Life	N/A
6.2.78	Murder	Life	N/A
24.2.78	Murder	Life	N/A
2.10.78	Rape—female	16 years 2 months	10 years
6.11.78	Murder	Life	14 years
8.1.79	Murder	Life	N/A
5.2.79	Rape—female	15 years 6 months	3 years
30.4.79	Murder	Life	N/A
4.6.79	Murder	Life	16 years
7.6.79	Murder	Life	N/A
5.11.79	Murder	Life	N/A
5.11.79	Murder	Life	N/A
7.1.80	Murder	Life	N/A
7.1.80	Murder	Life	N/A
1.2.80	Murder	Life	N/A
4.2.80	Murder	Life	N/A
31.3.80	Murder	Life	N/A
1.7.80	Assault with intent to rob	12 years	8 years
2.2.81	Murder	G.P.	—
2.3.81	Murder	G.P.	—
4.9.81	Murder	Life	12 years
2.2.82	Murder	Life	5 years
1.3.82	Rape—female	16 years 11 months	8 years 6 months
1.3.82	Murder	G.P.	—
3.5.82	Murder	Life	7 years
31.5.82	Murder	G.P.	—
31.5.82	Offer to sell/supply indian hemp	14 years	6 years
1.6.82	Rape—female	10 years	5½ years
1.9.82	Import addictive drugs illegal	15 years	8 years
6.9.82	Rape—female	8 years	5 years
6.9.82	Arson of goods against/under building	15 years	8 years
6.9.82	Robbery/att using firearms	9 years 6 months	4 years 6 months
1.10.82	Murder	Life	2 years 3 months
1.10.82	Murder	Life	12 years
21.10.82	Murder	Life	10 years
1.11.82	Robbery/att with violence using firearms	13 years 6 months	5 years 1 month
1.11.82	Break and enter	7 years 3 months	3 years 7 months
1.11.82	Robbery/att using firearms	6 years 6 months	5 years 6 months
1.11.82	Murder	Life	10 years
1.11.82	Robbery/att with violence using firearm	14 years	5 years
14.12.82	Murder	Life	20 years
20.1.83	Murder	Life	8 years
1.2.83	Murder	Life	7 years 6 months
1.2.83	Murder	Life	11 years 6 months
4.2.83	Possess indian hemp for sale	9 months	—
21.2.83	Break and enter dwell with intent	7 years 6 months	4 years
28.2.83	Robbery/att with violence using off. weapon	10 years	6 years 2 months
28.2.83	Murder	Life	3 years 6 months
28.3.83	Break and enter house commit felony	7 years	3 years 6 months
5.4.83	Murder	Life	14 years 2 months
7.4.83	Robbery/att with violence using off. weapon	8 years	5 years
1.5.83	Murder	Life	15 years
2.5.83	Murder	G.P.	—
10.5.83	Abduct female	10 years	6 years
19.5.83	Rob/steal from person with violence	12 years	6 years
6.6.83	Abduct female	10 years	9 years
14.6.83	Cultivate indian hemp	10 years	5 years 2 months
2.7.83	Possess heroin	10 years	7 years 6 months
2.7.83	Possess heroin	8 years	6 years
4.7.83	Murder	Life	16 years
17.7.83	Rape—female	6 years	4½ years
1.8.83	Possess drug of addiction for sale	8 years 3 months	4 years 3 months
5.9.83	Break and enter shop commit felony	6 years 6 months	4 years 2 months
5.9.83	Larceny of person	9 years 11 months	3 years 3 months
1.10.83	Robbery/att violence with firearm	9 years	6 years
3.10.83	Robbery/att violence with firearm	9 years	6 years

3.10.83	A.O.A.B.H.	4 years 6 months	3 years
31.10.83	Robbery/att with violence using firearm	8 years	4 years
31.10.83	Cultivate indian hemp	4 years 6 months	3 years

5. There have been no cases in which the Crown has applied to extend non parole periods.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I ask the Minister of Correctional Services question on notice No. 2.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The response to that question has not been compiled yet. I point out that some of these questions are making extensive use of the time of officers that could be better utilised elsewhere. I am in the process of getting them together but we are dealing mainly with a manual system and one has to go through thousands of dockets to get this information, and quite frankly it is an outrageous waste of public money. However, I will eventually tell the Department—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —when they are not doing anything more important and when they have time, to go through all the dockets and get all this information out. For instance, the answer to the question I gave the honourable member a moment ago was three pages of dates and times—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: This is only one line.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is only one line to print, but an awful lot of taxpayers' money wasted. However, the money is being wasted for the Hon. Mr Griffin and he will get his figures.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I put it on notice for Thursday of this week.

YOUTH ORGANISATIONS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. To provide a breakdown of the estimated $700 000 total cost of 'The Second Story' and in particular estimated expenditure on rent and salaries.

2. *(a)* Have any guarantees been given by the Minister or a Government representative to other youth organisations working in this field about levels of future funding?

(b) If yes—

(i) What are the guarantees?

(ii) Which organisations have received such guarantees?

(iii) Who gave the guarantees?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I ask that the question be placed on notice for Tuesday next.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I place it on notice for Tuesday next, but we will be raising it tomorrow in the Committee stages.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Bash it as much as you like—it is great policy. I have all the figures, but this trap question, 'What guarantees have been given by the Minister or a Government representative'—it could be anybody in the Public Service. I am not falling into one of your bear traps.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have done it many times in the past.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the two gentlemen want to have a conversation, please leave the Chamber and let us get on with the business.

DIVISION OF TISSUE PATHOLOGY

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

1. Would the Minister ascertain whether a pathologist in the Division of Tissue Pathology at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science has recently been using taxis supplied at the expense of the IMVS for his private use?

2. Who is the Head of the Division of Tissue Pathology?

3. If the answer to the first question is positive, what is the name of the pathologist, was the Head of the Division aware of the misuse of public money, what action did he take and how much money was involved?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The replies are as follows:

1. A thorough examination of IMVS records indicates that no pathologist in the Division of Tissue Pathology at the IMVS has recently been using taxis supplied at the expense of IMVS for his private use.

2. Professor Barrie Vernon-Roberts.

3. Not applicable.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parks Community Centre Act 1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Parks Community Centre Act 1981 was brought into operation in January 1982. Since that time the board of management has been able to assess the operation of the provisions of the Act. A small subcommittee of the board was formed in 1983 to recommend any changes that might improve the administration of the Act. The amendments in this Bill largely reflect recommendations of the board of management of the centre. The scope for representation on the board for staff members is to be widened to include any person employed at the centre. In addition, membership is being increased to 13, with the additional member being nominated by the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. This will ensure that the views of the ethnic community, which is very large in the area served by The Parks, can be adequately voiced at board level. Provision is also made for the appointment of a Deputy Chairman and the clause relating to the occurrence of a vacancy is to be altered.

Furthermore, the community centre occupies some land on the northern side of Cowan Street. Vacant land to the south of Cowan Street is also under the board's care and control. However, this vacant land is not required by the board and it may be that other instrumentalities might have a use for the area. The Crown Solicitor has advised that the centre only has statutory power to dispose of land that is vested in it after the commencement of the principal Act. The amendment will therefore provide for the title of the land to be vested in the name of the centre and will revise the powers of disposal, subject to ministerial approval. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends the definition of 'member of the staff' to make it clear that any person employed at the centre, whether employed by the Government, a council or a pri-

vate organisation, is eligible to vote for the staff representative to the board of management.

Clause 4 increases the membership of the board from 12 to 13. The extra member will be a nominee of the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. Provision is also made for the appointment of a Deputy Chairman, after consultation by the Minister with the board.

Clause 5 is consequential upon the decision to appoint a Deputy Chairman from the membership of the board.

Clause 6 provides that an appointed member vacates his office if his nomination is withdrawn by the person or authority who nominated him for appointment to the board.

Clause 7 provides that the Deputy Chairman will preside at meetings of the board in the absence of the Chairman.

Clause 8 gives the centre the power to both acquire and dispose of land, with the prior approval of the Minister.

Clause 9 vests in the centre all the land that currently comprises the premises of the centre. This statutory vesting is exempt from stamp duty and registration fees.

The Hon. C.M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, which is the main Appropriation Bill for 1985-86, provides for an appropriation of $3 234 182 000. The Treasurer has made a statement and has given detailed explanation of the Bill in another place. That statement has been tabled in the debate on the motion to note the budget papers and made available to honourable members.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): In speaking to this Bill it is my intention to go through some of the detail of tax collections and to address the problem that has arisen lately of interest rates and to talk about the effect that the Government's programs have had on private sector employment. I also intend to say something about this Government's policies in relation to the prison system and their effect on the community. It is fairly obvious that we are heading for an election, first, by the behaviour of some of the members on the front bench, particularly in the last few minutes of Question Time, when Ministers were very nervous—and that is understandable, as their policies are undoubtedly coming unstuck, not the least of which is the issue of interest rates.

I remember very clearly the question of interest rates arising just prior to the last election, a time about which certain Ministers are so fond of reminding us. The Premier of the day was attacked by the Labor Party on the subject of interest rates. I will quote from *Hansard* of 21 July 1982.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Interest rates then went as high as they are today.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is exactly right. The then Leader of the Opposition moved a motion on interest rates and stated:

> Let us look at some of the basic facts concerning interest rate increases which have occurred over the past three years. In 1980 savings bank rates stood at 9½ per cent and they are now at 13½ per cent and likely to increase by another 1½ per cent in the near future in response to the ASB increase. Building society rates have also climbed and now temporarily sit at 14.25 per cent, and they also are likely to go higher very soon. Each 1½ per cent rise in mortgage interest rates excludes a further 4 000 potential home buyers from the national housing market. It increases the deposit gap and the capacity of those people to pay. Translated into South Australian terms, that means that 3 200 couples have been denied the chance to own a home during the past three years, and, if the further 1½ per cent rise goes through, another 1 200 will miss out.

Mr Bannon went on to say:

> However, I am talking about the total situation, which is what that figure refers to: it is not just building societies whose rates will increase; other institutions will pick up the increase. In time the banks will follow, as there is no indication that bank interest rates have peaked and so will the credit unions.

He went on to state:

> The repayments on an average loan have jumped by $90 per month over the past three years and will move upwards by a further $35 per month when this extra 1½ per cent is added on.

He then gave an example of a person, supposedly from Mount Gambier. He quoted a letter, and the person, a former Liberal voter, was supposed to have stated:

> I am writing to you about the rising interest rates and this last bit of news that interest rates will rise again. This will take our monthly repayment over the $300 a month. When we took out our loan three years ago our repayments were $254 per month. It is getting harder and harder to make repayments. We have only one income.

If that is the case, that person must be in a desperate position now, because that person who was paying just over $300 per month (a figure quoted by the Labor Party at the time of $331 per month—a figure put out in its pamphlet) would now be paying $513 a month. Repayments have gone from $331 to $513 in three years. Repayments under our Government went up by $50 per month whilst under this Government they have gone up by almost $200 a month.

I hope that the Attorney-General is suitably embarrassed by the obvious failure of the Premier and the Labor Party in that regard. Mr Bannon went on to talk about a hoax and stated:

> It is a hoax because people are being given the impression (that is the intention of the Government) that this is something to protect them from the interest rate increases to come.

The word 'hoax' came into it. We have just seen the greatest hoax ever attempted to be pulled on people, namely, giving those people who borrowed money from building societies a reduction in the interest rates—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Which badly backfired.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes—of .75 per cent.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You don't support it?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I will tell the honourable member where his Government has gone wrong. The Government selected one group, because it was desperate after an opinion poll showed that it was at the bottom of the rung. The Government thought that it had to do something about it and, as a result, Mr Burke from Western Australia arrived here to discuss the problem with the Premier. Mr Burke probably said, 'We just fixed that by lending people money interest free so that they could reduce their interest payments.'

The Premier must have thought that that was a good idea and adopted it without thinking through the consequences. The Government is now talking about how it is opposed to deregulation of home interest rates—totally opposed to it. However, the Government has presided over a very real increase in home interest rates implemented by the State Bank at a time when the State Bank is making an extremely high profit and giving bonuses to its staff.

Interest rates on home loans have risen, for those people who do not meet past deposit criteria (the people who have not deposited with the bank before), up to 16 per cent from 14.5 per cent. That is a scandal. How can the Government oppose deregulation of home loan interest rates when it allows that to happen within the State Bank? The State Bank, unlike other banks, does not have to conform with the level set by the Reserve Bank.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What about Howard's policy?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: We have made absolutely clear that we are opposed to Mr Howard's policy in that regard.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: No, you haven't.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: If we have not, I will now. The Attorney takes a little bit of convincing: perhaps he should read his newspapers in the morning, because then he would have seen it. The Government has presided over an increase in home loan interest rates in its own institution, at a time when it is taking more out of that bank than has any other Government in the history of the State. What has the Government done to provide relief from this increase up to 2 per cent—absolutely nothing. Home loan repayments have risen by $100 a month for some people. It is total discrimination.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It's against the Reserve Bank.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Morally it is; but legally it is not against the Reserve Bank guidelines, because the State Bank does not have to conform with them. However, morally it is wrong. The Government is taking advantage of people in the community, and at the same time it is trying to woo back support from those people who borrow from building societies. The Government has forgotten that the relief it has provided is a one-off occurrence. It will not work. The relief applies only for six months after which people will be again facing rising interest rates. In fact, in six months the interest rate will rise from 14 per cent to 14.75 per cent, and it will not matter what the Government has done.

The Government has agreed to an increase but has offset it temporarily. That is an absolute hoax on the people. Fortunately, people in the community have seen straight through it and, again, the Government has done itself a lot of damage. The Government should face up to the fact that it has failed the people of this State. It has failed to carry out what it said it would do. The Government has failed to keep interest rates down, and it has presided over the greatest increase in the State's history. People in the community who were making home loan repayments of $300 a month are now paying $500 a month—an increase of $200. In that same time, weekly earnings have risen by only 15.8 per cent, compared with the rise in home loan repayments of 55 per cent. That is a disgraceful situation, and I am sure that the Government will get its just desserts.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Of course it is—the Attorney-General's Party is in Government. Prior to 1983 the Attorney continually complained in this Chamber about the Tonkin Administration. We are now talking about the Bannon Labor Administration. I am willing to wager that the Attorney-General himself would know all about interest rates on home loans, like most of the people in this Chamber. The Attorney-General would be aware of the effect of his own Party's policies. I am surprised that the Attorney-General has not defected from his Party because of this failure.

Of course, taxation collections is another area where the Government has really put it over the people. Whenever I have spoken during recent budget debates I have referred back to the famous promise of a few years ago when we heard the now Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon) say that he would not introduce any new taxes and that he would not use State Government charges as a backdoor method of collecting tax. Of course, we all know that that was an absolute lie, and it has been proved to be a lie time and time again. The present Government was the first Administration in 10 years to introduce a new tax; and it increased State taxation collections from the community to an extent that has never been seen before.

Stamp duties have risen above budget by $20.6 million over and above what the Government expected to get. That in itself is an indication of the way in which the Government has operated. Taxation collections are $27 million (or 3.5 per cent) above estimate. That in itself indicates that this is a high taxing Government—a Government that does not care about the people or about the effect of its policies on them. Land tax collections are forecast to grow by 14.5 per cent. There has been a reduction in the number of people paying land tax but, of course, those left to pay it will be paying more in terms of individual amounts and more overall. Where has the reduction occurred? In 1984-85, 91 000 taxpayers were paying land tax; in this coming year 24 000 people will be paying it, but the amount they will be paying has risen from $365 to $1 583. Over the past three years the average growth in land tax has been 19.3 per cent.

I now turn to financial institutions duty—the wonderful new tax introduced by the Government. I repeat: three years ago the Government said that it would introduce no new taxes. This year, there will be an increase of 7.6 per cent in the financial institutions duty collected, although the Government has kept the rate at .04 per cent. Anyone who has travelled interstate will know that Queensland and Tasmania have no financial institutions duty. Where on earth does the Government think people will go when they want to start up a new company? Of course, they will not look at South Australia.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They're certainly not going to look at Tasmania.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Attorney-General may be surprised at that, also. People are certainly going to Queensland, where there has been a tremendous increase in the number of industries and in the population. Stamp duty collections have risen by 9.6 per cent this year from $207.6 million to $227.5 million. The average growth over the past three years has been about 25 per cent, with windfall gains of $56.9 million above budget estimate for the past two years. However, the Government says, 'We have been good about tax; we have given some back.' The Government took too much from people in the first place; it has gone completely against the promise it made and now says that it is giving money back. However, the Government is not giving back the amount above budget; it does not get around to that. The Government has reintroduced the tax on ETSA that was abolished by the previous Government, and forced ETSA into a deficit situation. However, the Government now says that it will give some money back so that rates do not rise as much.

So, an offset of a 14 per cent rise in ETSA rates makes the increase only 12 per cent. If the Leader of the Government took the trouble to go out and visit people in the community he would know what they are saying. In relation to ETSA, let me assure him that they are very angry about what his Government has done to them and their household budgets, particularly when their own salary base has remained fairly static in comparison with the Government's tax collections.

Over the past three years ETSA's contribution has been considerable. In 1984-85, ETSA provided the Government with $25.7 million in tax collection and the estimate for this year is $28.5 million, with $11 million paid back to offset a 2 per cent tariff reduction. Of course, again that is a one-off tariff reduction. It is exactly the same situation as applies to the building societies' interest relief—it is a temporary relief in order to get over the election period, but fortunately the people of this State see through it. They know that the actual amount of the tariff decrease is about the equivalent of two Mars bars in a person's monthly bill—that is about $1 per week.

An honourable member: Put your Mars bar on Bankcard.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, you can do it on Bankcard, but you would find it rather hard to get it down to that amount. The amount of total State collection has gone from an actual figure in 1982-83 of $549.1 million to an amount this year of $852 million. That is not bad for a Government that said it would not bring in new taxes and would not use Government charges as a means of backdoor taxation. The growth in the first two budgets of the Tonkin Government, which the Leader and others in his Party are so fond of referring to, was in money terms 17 per cent and in real terms minus 3.1 per cent. The first two Bannon budgets in money terms rose by 44.6 per cent and in real terms by 28.8 per cent. In that time the CPI movement was 12.3 per cent.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I will deal with that in a moment, because the Government has found a brand new method of offsetting its budgetary problems. It has been borrowing from statutory authorities and saying, 'What we have done is transfer all the money into housing, and we are then getting borrowings from the statutory authorities to offset that.' What it has not said is that it is borrowing more from the statutory authorities than it is putting into housing, so it has tried to hide the fact that it is forcing the taxpayers of this State further and further into debt with the end result of an increase in the net debt upon which we have to pay interest and eventually repay.

In money terms, the growth from the 1982-83 budgets to the 1985-86 budgets of this Labor Government was 55.2 per cent and in real terms it was 27.9 per cent, when the CPI movement was 21.3 per cent. Again, that gives the lie to the fact that this Government has shown any restraint whatever. The latest budget indicates an increase of total tax collections of 55.2 per cent over the past three years, which is nearly three times the rate of inflation since 1982-83, and an increase in real terms of 27.9 per cent. The additional tax collections have brought in $662.6 million. Of course, the per capita State taxation shows exactly the same increases.

In relation to a family of five, which is a normal size family in this community, the end result of the Labor Government for this time is that the estimate above what was the case when it took office is $91.70 per week. That is the additional cost of this Government to a family of five. In those three years that is an incredible increase. They are figures that perhaps the Attorney-General should look at before he offers his resignation for failure to provide reasonable financial management of this State, because I think that the performance of this Government has been absolutely disgraceful and, when the election is held, it will find the same answer from the people of this State. Frankly, we do not care when it is held, because the result will be the same. The Attorney-General and his friends are finished.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Minister of Health is one of our greatest assets. We are very grateful to him. Although we do not conduct polls very often and we have not done one for a while, when we do, while some people turn up as pluses for the Government (the Attorney-General is not known), one good negative factor is the Minister of Health. We are always delighted to have him on board and running around the State or standing up in Parliament assisting us.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: We do not really care what you say, old fellow: you can say anything you like, but let me assure you that we are very grateful for your presence in Parliament: you are a big plus to us. I have indicated that the Government has found a brand new trick—I think it calls it creative accounting—whereby money is shifted around, but in the process more is borrowed than is shifted. This is a way of overcoming any difficulties. This Government has shifted an amount and increased its borrowings by about $66 million, which is a 56 per cent increase over last year on the same level of borrowings from statutory authorities. This is a remarkable trick discovered by the Government and one that I suppose it hopes the people of this State do not pick up. It certainly did not draw attention to that when it brought down its budget, but the fact is that it has increased borrowings in order to offset changes in the overall works program. Again, that is not a situation that the Government has got away with. We are fully aware of the Government's new method, and of course attention has been drawn to it in the press.

It was rather interesting that the Premier, when defending his budget first of all got it wrong when he said in a statement in the *Advertiser* that royalties would increase. He had to withdraw that statement, and he then made the following statement:

> If this year goes anything like last year, we will finish on our targets or better, which will give us a further capacity to reduce the accumulated deficit.

Frankly, I think that he has underestimated some of his tax collections in order to make his budget look better. He says that he expects to receive more from his taxation collections than he is disclosing. The words 'or better' mean just that—that he in fact expects to receive a greater amount than he has indicated in his budget. That is another lie that is contained in this budget and one that I am sure, if Labor remained in Government (which it will not), would show up. As I have said—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Attorney can say what he likes, but his Government will not be there. If Labor remained in Government it would show up as being a lie, but of course the Labor Party will not be in charge of the budget next year, because there will shortly be a change of Government.

I have already referred to the debt and the borrowings on the State. We have seen a very interesting change in the public sector employment level. It has increased by 6 130 persons, which is the equivalent of $102 million. These additional tax collections were necessary because the Government has employed that extra number.

Of course, what has happened is that public sector employment has risen by 6.4 per cent, whereas other employment areas have increased by 3.4 per cent. The Government has exactly doubled the increase in other areas. Why has that occurred? The Government has not left enough money in the community to provide employment in the private sector because of the increase in its tax collections.

We achieved a reduction in that area but this Government has completely turned that around. This is the last budget to be brought down by this Labor Government. It is a budget that I hope we will be in a position to amend shortly—the sooner the better—because it is a very deceitful document. Indeed, the Attorney knows it is a complete lie compared with the statements the Government made when it came to office.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Did you say 'lie'?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I have copied its use from the Minister of Health. The Government has completely reversed the position from when you came into government—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. C.M. Hill): I hope the honourable member is addressing the Chair.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am addressing you occasionally, Mr Acting President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: You should do so at all times.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The shadow Attorney has raised the question of the parole system. Certainly, people out in the community are most concerned, and if the Attorney and the Minister of Correctional Services think that they have cured the problem they have another think coming. I can assure the Government from my experiences door knocking that people raise this issue with me and with other members.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: With all of us—especially in Unley.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes. Let me tell the Council what has happened since I last door knocked in an election period. Women in the community are extremely fearful.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It is a laughing matter to you. Government front benchers need to get out into the community and see what you have done to it.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That's outrageous.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It is not outrageous. About half the people in the community have installed security doors, and they will not open them until they have seen who is there. Half the households have dogs inside their houses, and I am pleased that they do not open the doors quickly. You say you do not care about them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On a point of order, Mr Acting President, that is grossly incorrect. I did not make that statement either in this Council or anywhere else. While I clearly cannot get the honourable member to withdraw that statement, my point of order is that I did not say that; I have never said it in this Council. I did not just say it, and it is quite inaccurate.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Mr Acting President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! I think we should try to reduce the amount of provocation and the number of interjections and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to address the Bill.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I say to the Attorney that if he did care about the matter he would not have laughed when I raised this issue—he would have listened. When I raised the matter he laughed. I was going to make a serious point—this is a serious issue and one that the Attorney should consider. I assure the Council that half the people who sit at home during the day live in fear and will simply not answer their doors and, if they do, they stand behind a locked door. Why is that? Because they are fearful of the system that allowed so much crime in the community.

The Attorney can say what he likes, but that is the question in the community mind. If he thinks that, by sitting in here with the Minister of Labour and by reassuring each other it has any effect in the community, he has another think coming. Frankly, the community is not being assured, especially concerning the way people are begin treated in prison. I advise the Goverment that, rightly or wrongly, people in the community are angry about that—they are angry about what has happened in this State. People are angry that screen doors that used to be needed to keep out flies are now needed to keep unwanted people from their homes. People are now living in fear. I advise the Attorney to get out into the community and learn a bit about what is happening and what attitudes are now showing up, rather than just sitting in this Council and laughing when a question is raised. That gives—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I raise a further point of order, Mr Acting President. Once again the honourable member has misrepresented the position. I am certainly not laughing about the crime rate in this State generally. It is quite inaccurate for the honourable member to assert that that is the case.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is an interesting point of order that is being allowed by you, Mr Acting President. If the Attorney thinks that by taking points of order he is changing attitudes in the community, he has another think coming. The community is soon going to pass judgment on this Government.

It will be on the question of taxation, on which the Government has failed dismally. It has reversed completely its promises made at the last election. People will not believe the Government this time. People will judge the Government on its past record. As to crime, they will judge the Government on its soft attitude towards people who commit crimes in this State.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That is absolute nonsense.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: You have a record of being soft. The people will judge you on the waste that you have shown in the community: for example, the waste involved with the swimming complex at North Adelaide. We all know what happened there. The Government could not run a butchers picnic. The community knows it, and it will make a judgment on the Government. The Government will not like the judgment, and the end result will see a change in Government.

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

BUDGET PAPERS

Order of the Day, Government Business, No. 2—adjourned debate on the question:

That the Council take note of the papers.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENERGY PLANNING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1260.)

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: This Bill places the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the Pipelines Authority subject to the control and direction of the Minister and provides that the South Australian Gas Company shall provide the Minister with such information in relation to its acquisition, supply and delivery of gas as the Minister may request.

The question of ministerial control had its beginnings in the British Parliament in the middle of the nineteenth century. It brought to the British Parliament the right to hold responsible a person of the Parliament for any Government expenditures. This doctrine of ministerial responsibilities was one of the most important changes made in the history of parliamentary democracy. Since that doctrine was established there have been means of undermining it, until today we have academic writers who doubt whether the doctrine has any further meaning. I do not wish to canvass that question in this debate.

However, one of the procedures that Governments have developed to get themselves out of the throes of ministerial responsibility is the establishment of statutory authorities. This procedure began with the Victorian move in 1865 to establish the Railways Commissioners Act in that State. The reason for the establishment of that statutory authority was to overcome the problem that they saw developing where the railways system of Victoria was being developed

in relation not to a general transport means in that State but to achieve votes in particular seats at the next election. The establishment of that statutory authority was to overcome the political problem and the political judgments in relation to the establishment of the railway system in Victoria. Since that original statutory authority, Australians, both State and federally, have established thousands of such authorities, some under ministerial control and others under no ministerial responsibility.

If we believe in the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, any activity carried out on behalf of the public should be responsible to a Minister or to a committee of the Parliament. Parliamentary responsibility on the whole is not a suitable vehicle for such responsibility. When the SGIC Bill was passed in 1970, I took the view in this Council that that organisation should not be under ministerial control. The Bill, when introduced, had the SGIC under direct ministerial control. My reason for that view was that the SGIC is a Government operation in direct opposition to the private sector, so that the case for ministerial control was not justified. But, in the whole Parliament—House of Assembly and Legislative Council—only three members took that view: the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan, the Hon. Boyd Dawkins and I. It appears that the Parliament took a firm view on the question of ministerial responsibility in 1970.

However, neither the Pipelines Authority nor the Electricity Trust of South Australia is a competitor with the private sector, and the reasons that I have followed for the removal of ministerial control of the SGIC do not apply in that way. Both the Electricity Trust and the Pipelines Authority are under Government influence: I do not think that any member would doubt that statement. The idea that those authorities are totally outside Government influence is without foundation. Questions in the Parliament are directed to Ministers on ETSA activities and on Pipelines Authority activities, and ministerial answers are given to those questions.

It is reasonable that ministerial responsibility should be made clear in our Statutes. It has been claimed that ministerial responsibility would give the Government probably an electoral advantage in relation to the Electricity Trust of South Australia, but electoral advantages can already be achieved through the Electricity Trust, if the Government so desires, without any ministerial responsibility. There are also plenty of avenues available to the Government if it wants to use them to provide services in a particular way for electoral advantage: I refer to the provision of water, sewerage, health, hospitals, roads, transport, education, housing and a host of other services. The Government can undertake programs in marginal seats to enhance its electoral chances. I do not see any reasonable argument for refusing ministerial control for the Pipelines Authority and the Electricity Trust.

Finally, in the budget papers debate, I stressed the need for the use of the private sector to provide more of the services provided by the Government in the general interest of the taxpaying public of South Australia. There are two ways for the Government to provide services: the first is for the Government to provide those services, with the Government being responsible through a Minister to Parliament; and the second is for the Minister to call tenders or let out those services and still be responsible to the Parliament for their delivery. These two services—the Electricity Trust and the Pipelines Authority (with its gas delivery services to South Australia) should be subject to ministerial decision and responsible to this Parliament.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LIQUOR LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No.2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1259.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Some 3½ weeks before the Grand Prix this Bill has been introduced. It is designed to make some quite dramatic changes relating to the law concerning the licensing of certain liquor outlets. The Bill comes before the Council for further debate 2½ weeks before the Grand Prix; it is unlikely to be considered by the House of Assembly until next week, leaving just over a week to go before the Grand Prix.

That means that there will be very little, if any, opportunity available for consultation to occur in the wider community among the licensed liquor outlets to which the legislation applies or those with a genuine concern to make representations about the impact on them or their community of the proposal which this Bill seeks to place in law for the purposes of the forthcoming and subsequent Grand Prix.

I am sure that a number of members of the community would like an opportunity to consider not only road traffic implications but also aspects concerning noise and disruption to community life. However, because of the way in which the Bill has been brought into the Parliament that opportunity for consultation will be limited, if available at all. Of course, one would suppose that even expressing reservations about the extension of trading hours during the period of the Grand Prix may well give the Government and others the opportunity to say that that reflects opposition to the Grand Prix.

Whilst I have raised numerous questions with Ministers in this Council about the arrangements for the Grand Prix, those questions have been directed towards ascertaining the level of competence that they have displayed in tying up all the legal and formal ends pertaining to the Grand Prix and have not been an indication of opposition to the event. However much disruption members of the community might experience because of the event, there is no doubt that it will have an important international impact on South Australia in the promotion of this State. On the one hand, undoubtedly many South Australians favour the Grand Prix, while others either have no feeling one way or the other or oppose it. The Opposition has said that it supports the Grand Prix: it has only been anxious to ensure that the ramifications of it as well as the commercial aspects of the event have been fully explored and properly sorted out.

The aspect of unlimited liquor trading for a period of some six days, starting the day before the Grand Prix, going for a declared period, and ending the day after the Grand Prix, is a matter about which I have considerable concern. I do not have so much objection to some licensed outlets opening for longer periods during the Grand Prix. I understand that, for example, the Hilton Hotel has a 24-hour trading licence. It is a hotel of international standard, and in those circumstances one can understand that 24-hour trading can be undertaken with a significant measure of control being exercised by the hotel. However, this Bill seeks to make 24-hour trading for a period of six days over the Grand Prix period available to numerous licensed liquor outlets, not just in the vicinity of the Grand Prix venue or even the metropolitan area of Adelaide but across South Australia.

One can envisage that there would be places outside the metropolitan area which would not open for the 24-hour period and, undoubtedly, a number of facilities in the metropolitan area of Adelaide would decline to exercise that option to open for a full 24-hours a day for six continuous days. However, some facilities would exercise the option

and would seek to make the best commercial use of that period of unlimited trading.

Certain journalists and others have suggested that this provision would bring South Australia into line with the European trading position, but I suggest that not every European country has 24-hour liquor trading; it is not necessarily in the same context as that proposed in this legislation; and other controls are imposed to ensure that the longer trading hours in some European countries do not precipitate community disruption, which undoubtedly this provision will involve when it is applied in certain areas.

So, although the European position has been compared with the South Australian situation, I suggest that there are many areas of difference which would distinguish the South Australian trading hours position from that which applies in other countries. Earlier one of my colleagues referred by way of interjection and in the debate to the fact that one would expect that, if this provision is to apply to liquor trading, logically it could also apply to groceries and other necessities, the outlets for which will be restricted from opening for a full 24-hour period during each of the six days of the Grand Prix.

I have grave reservations about allowing for 24-hour liquor trading without any adequate controls. I refer to the areas where there have been complaints even with the extended trading hours that are presently available, particularly those trading outlets which provide discotheques or other entertainment facilities in conjunction with the supply of liquor.

During the course of the debate on the Liquor Licensing Bill previously I certainly referred to some of the problems which had been experienced at Glenelg, North Adelaide and Henley Beach, to name but three suburban locations where extended trading hours and the results thereof were causing considerable concern to local residents. That concern comes from noise made by individuals, traffic, and bottles being thrown over the front fence, as well as from other incidents which have made the whole aspect of extended trading unsavoury for people living in close proximity to certain trading outlets.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They can take action under legislation that is now in effect.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Under the new legislation they can, but that is not provided for in this Bill. The Bill provides only that the police 'may issue directions prohibiting the activity, behaviour or noise or directing that the level of noise be reduced'. I suggest that that is not an adequate method of control.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Close them down.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I suggest that the Commissioner of Police or his representatives would not exercise that discretion. If they did, that would be great, but my opinion is that the police would be very reluctant to step in and close down a licensed activity. They would give some warnings and might arrest a few people, but they would be very reluctant to act as the judge and issue an order which closes down the premises.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: And will all the local police in fact be authorised?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That is the other question. They must be authorised by the Commissioner of Police to do that, and those who get all the calls are usually the patrols or the local police stations that are open around the suburban areas—and there are not too many of them at the present time.

I would suggest that it is by no means an effective way to regulate the inconvenience to the local community from extended hours of trading over this six-day Grand Prix period. It must be recognised that, whilst there is limited Sunday hotel trading under the present Licensing Act, the fact is that this will allow on one Sunday during the period of the Grand Prix unlimited all day trading.

It is all very well to say that, if there is unsatisfactory behaviour, the police can step in. However, the fact is that that part of the community, which does not support Sunday trading or which prefers to have a relatively uninterrupted Sunday, will now be substantially inconvenienced by the behaviour of some hotel patrons. It is not all of them, but there is behaviour which is adverse to the interests of the whole community.

There is again no mechanism for control of that other than through an authorised member of the Police Force being able to give certain directions to a licensee. I do not believe that that will be exercised. I can envisage that in places like Glenelg there will be a very significant congregation of people who will abuse the privilege to be able to have access to liquor on Sundays and that Glenelg may well be a place to stay away from on that Sunday of the Grand Prix. It may also be a place to stay away from on other days during that period if the 24-hour trading continues for that six-day period. It is correct to say, as I indicated earlier, that some licensees would not exercise the option, but many will, particularly if they are in localities where they believe that they can attract patrons who will not necessarily behave in what one would regard as being in the best interests of the community.

So, I think there are problems with the Bill. I am not suggesting that some outlets should not be licensed to sell and serve liquor for extended hours during periods such as the Grand Prix, but, I am suggesting that it is unwarranted to introduce this legislation at such short notice to give a six-day non-stop ability to sell and serve alcohol during this event. It will create unnecessary concern and disruption within the community if it is exercised in those areas such as Glenelg, North Adelaide and Henley Beach, where undoubtedly entertainment will be provided for patrons to attract them to these facilities.

There is inadequate control, and I will therefore be prepared to support the amendments that my colleague the Hon. John Burdett proposes to move: first, to give local councils an opportunity to opt out of the operation of this legislation for the whole or some part of their local government area; and, secondly, to put a sunset clause in the Bill so that, for the next Grand Prix, any extension of licensing hours comes again before the Parliament and is not automatic.

There ought to be a more appropriate way by which an assessment can be made as to what hours should be allowed for hotel trading during major events—not just the Grand Prix—and I do not believe the sort of blanket provision that is provided in this Bill is the appropriate way to deal with that. So, we will have an opportunity before the next Grand Prix to review this, and hopefully it will be on the basis of much earlier notice than has been given in this Bill. I think it requires a significant level of community involvement in determining what is an appropriate level of liquor licensing.

The other aspect, which of course is yet to be assessed but which nevertheless causes me grave concern, is the extent to which the road toll will accelerate during this period of extended licensing hours. It is all very well to say that hospitals will be open and that emergency services will be on alert. The fact is (and there is no doubt about it) that liquor contributes quite markedly to the road toll, and I expect that during this six-day period it will rise dramatically. I find that a matter of considerable sadness but, if there is to be an extended period of trading, I would suggest that is a necessary consequence of that course being followed by the Government.

I think that the Hon. Mr Burdett's mechanisms will give local communities at least some opportunity to be involved in the final decision in respect of the present Grand Prix, and hopefully their experience will be taken into consideration in determining what hours should be available during other major events. I will therefore be prepared to support the second reading with a view to supporting the amendments during the Committee stages.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I join with my colleague the Hon. Trevor Griffin and indicate that I will support the Hon. John Burdett's amendments which are on file. Certainly, the Government has introduced this legislation very late in the day. Indeed, it may be difficult to force some hotels that wish to take advantage of this arrangement perhaps to obtain the necessary staff to look after the liquor outlet on a 24-hour basis. However, I accept that this Adelaide Grand Prix is a first and that some difficulties are necessarily associated with providing for all the aspects associated with it. To that extent I accept that, although this legislation is coming to the Parliament late in the day, there may be good reason for it.

There is, of course, essentially a paradox when we come to deal with this matter. The Attorney-General and the Hon. Gordon Bruce, who have both been on random breath test committees, would readily agree with that observation. On the one hand, the random breath test committee has drawn attention to the heavy correlation between drinking and accidents on the road, given that some 50 per cent of road deaths are directly attributable to drink driving, and that half of those—that is, one-quarter of road deaths—are innocent victims of drink driving. It seems somewhat at odds with the observations of the random breath test committee to be proposing 24-hour liquor trading for a prescribed period during the Adelaide Grand Prix.

I drew attention to that paradox when we were debating Sunday trading measures, when the new liquor legislation was before the Parliament in recent months. Nevertheless, although it is paradoxical, I support it, because I sense that there is a growing awareness within the community of the dangers of drink driving. Hopefully, the younger generation at least, who have had the benefit of education in these matters, will take greater responsibility when it comes to drinking and driving.

I would ask, however, that in the response to the second reading the Government indicates what random breath testing measures are going to be taken during this period to counter the rightful concerns that the Hon. Trevor Griffin has expressed, namely, that 24-hour a day liquor outlets could well have the result of increasing the number of road accidents and, indeed, deaths on our roads.

I turn now to my own local council area of Kensington and Norwood. Our house is so close to the Grand Prix track that I will smell the fumes and, most certainly, hear the noise.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You should let out your house.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Attorney-General suggests that I should let out my house. I am a bit of a home person and not terribly avaricious, so I am happy to stay there and bear the brunt of people clamouring for valuable parking space in adjacent streets. Kensington and Norwood council is an interesting case in point. It is a close knit and vibrant community, as the Attorney-General would know. It is the closest suburban council to the Grand Prix track and contains nine hotels and three other liquor outlets—the Redlegs Club, the Norwood Club and so on. Clearly, there are advantages in 24-hour trading for that council. The council, I understand, really does not have a view on what it will do.

The important proposal that has been put on file by the Hon. John Burdett gives that council the option whereby, if it is concerned by undue pressures or perhaps some difficult aspects that relate to 24-hour trading, it has the right under this amendment to close down part of the area, to restrict the 24-hour trading to parts of its council area or, in fact, to resist it altogether. That is its option and is a responsible measure as it recognises the important third tier of government, which is closest to the people. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment and, indeed, the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I thank honourable members who have seen fit to give their support to this legislation. The amendment to be moved by the Hon. Mr Burdett, which would enable a council to declare that the new sections do not apply in its area, is unacceptable. One would get a quite bizarre result if that amendment was passed into law, and I do not believe that the Government would be prepared to proceed with the legislation if it was so passed. I say that not in any sense of being bloody-minded but, as honourable members would know, one of the reasons for introducing the extended trading hours during the Grand Prix period is to cater for the people who come to this State from interstate and overseas. It is clear that the numbers from interstate at least will be quite substantial and there will be indeed many visitors from overseas, also.

It would be quite counter-productive if we ended up with a situation where the Kensington and Norwood corporation decided that it would prohibit extended trading hours in its locality. It would be even more bizarre if the Adelaide City Council decided to prohibit trading within its jurisdiction. We could end up with a situation where, dotted through the metropolitan area of Adelaide, there were councils which had declared that the extended trading hours would not apply. I am not quite sure what sort of image or impression that would create for interstate or, worse still, international tourists visiting Adelaide.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not saying that New Zealand might not have some scheme. I am saying that, if we accept that one of the reasons for the extended trading hours is to enable the hospitality industry to cater for interstate and overseas tourists, to then allow a situation where those extended hours could be administered in a different manner in various parts of the metropolitan area would completely defeat the reason for proceeding with the legislation. So, I do not believe that that amendment would be acceptable to the Government and I do not believe that the Government would proceed with the legislation if it was passed as it would cut out the ground from under one of the reasons for introducing the legislation in the first place. I have no objection to the sunset clause and I am prepared to let it pass in the Committee stage.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In respect to RBT, I understand the points raised by the Hon. Mr Davis and the question of drink-driving generally. The ultimate logic of his argument is prohibition and partway down the track is a restriction on trading hours. We have got beyond that situation. We have to cope with a situation where there will be extended trading hours, and probably in future trading hours will be extended beyond what they are at the present time and we will have to cope with drink-driving in another way. There is no point in turning the clock back with respect to trading hours for liquor outlets. The point the honourable member raises is one that I do not believe can be coped with by trading hour restrictions. The problem has to be coped with by tougher penalties, greater surveillance on

drink-driving and publicity and education about the dangers of such driving.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, it has to be tackled in a different way. To go back to the stage of saying that we can solve the problem of drink-driving by a restriction on trading hours is something that cannot be done.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is the logic of the proposition if the honourable member wishes to put it that way. However, he is supporting the Bill, so I will not pursue it. I will draw the honourable member's remarks on random breath testing to the attention of the Commissioner of Police and one would hope that there could be upgraded surveillance during this period. I will certainly refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and to the Commissioner. I do not know that the Police Commissioner was specifically consulted on the Bill but, obviously, as the proposal had to go to Cabinet, the relevant Minister would have been aware of the matter and I am sure that, had there been any concerns, they could have been drawn to the attention of Cabinet.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Insertion of new Division IIA.'

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Before moving my amendment, I would like to state that I asked a question during the second reading debate which I think is pertinent. During the debate I pointed out that some hotels had conditions attached to their licences. Some hotels have beer gardens which cannot trade after 11 p.m. notwithstanding that other bars of those hotels can trade until midnight. I pointed out that it seemed to me to be perfectly clear that with 24-hour trading for the period of the Grand Prix these conditions would still apply so that, if for example it was a licence condition that a beer garden attached to a hotel could not trade after 11 p.m., that condition would still remain. That seems clear to me. However, because this has been brought to my notice, I ask the Attorney to confirm that it is his understanding that any conditions with any restrictions as to trading times would still apply notwithstanding the general 24-hour trading for hotels.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I agree with the honourable member. Any existing conditions would apply with respect to certain parts of premises. In the example given by the honourable member where a beer garden was prohibited from trading after 11 p.m., that would still be the case. The Bill does not affect the terms and conditions of a licence. It simply allows within those terms and conditions trading for 24 hours a day during the Grand Prix. If there is any problem or difficulty with that, I will examine it again before the Bill goes to the other place. My reading of the new section is that existing terms and conditions of a licence would remain in place during the period of the Grand Prix.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Mr Chairman, I seek your guidance. I have one amendment which is in two parts—to insert new sections 132d and 132e. It appears that it is the one amendment, but it has two completely different parts. Some members may want to support one part and not the other. In fact, the Government has indicated that it does not object to the second part but does object to the first part. I will move the amendments and speak to both parts, and I ask you, Mr Chairman, to put the two parts separately.

The CHAIRMAN: That can be done.

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

Page 2, after line 24 insert sections as follow:

132d. (1) A council may, by notice published in the *Gazette* not more than one month before the commencement of a prescribed period, declare that sections 132b and 132c will not apply in the area of the council, or such part of the area as is delineated in the notice, during that prescribed period.

(2) A declaration under subsection (1) has effect according to its terms.

132e. This Division expires on 30 June 1986.

This matter was canvassed very thoroughly during the second reading debate, and I do not propose to speak to it at great length. As I said during the debate, if the Bill passes in its present form, it will apply right across the State, including Mount Gambier and Ceduna. It does not appear appropriate to me that there be 24-hour trading on account of the Grand Prix in Mount Gambier and Ceduna and perhaps in some other places. During the second reading debate I also pointed out, as did a number of other members, that I think there will be a good deal of disruption in some areas as a result of 24-hour trading. I refer, for example, to some hotels in the Glenelg area, where there have been continuing problems.

During the second reading debate I repeated several times my support for the Grand Prix and for the Bill. I repeat that. However, there will be some problems, and I believe that councils should be able to opt out in respect of the whole or some part of their areas. I do not believe that that will create any confusion. In addition to 'not more than one month', I would also have liked to see 'and not less than a fortnight', for example. Because the Bill has been introduced so late—notwithstanding the fact that the Government has been aware of its need for a long time—it is too late to do that. At this stage, a council could do it one or two days before the event. I think that would be most undesirable. It is as a result of the Government's introducing this Bill as a matter of some urgency so late in the piece that that cannot be changed at this stage.

The second part of my amendment provides for a sunset clause as at 30 June 1986. This is a first, and it is very good for South Australia. It is the first time that we have had 24-hour trading in this form in this State, and I support that. I hope that it will be effective and that there will be no problems. However, it might be a disaster. I think it is necessary for it to be compulsorily brought back before Parliament after the event. In his reply the Attorney suggested that he had no objection to that part of my amendment.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have already responded to the first part of the amendment, namely, the provision giving councils the power to opt out. Quite frankly, I do not think that is workable. One either decides to do it or one does not. It would create quite a shambles if several metropolitan councils decided to opt out. That would leave interstate and overseas tourists in a more confused situation than would be the case if they knew what the hours were when they arrived. That part of the amendment is unacceptable, but I am happy to agree with respect to the second part.

New section 132d negatived.

New section 132e inserted.

Clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.1 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 16 October at 2.15 p.m.