

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 20 February 1986

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Augmentation of the EL 2275 Water Supply Pressure Zone.

Black Forest Primary School (replacement of fire damaged facilities and upgrading).

## QUESTIONS

## NURSING HOME FUNDING

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health on the subject of nursing home cost cuts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Members would have noticed in the *Advertiser* yesterday that an article indicated that massive—and I use the terminology of the article—funding cuts would be made to nursing homes and hostels. They were forecast by the Minister for Community Services (Senator Grimes). This is not a new problem in South Australia because, as I understand it, last year some problems were associated with funding of nursing homes at a time when there were to be no rises in Government funding for nursing homes.

I believe that there were some discussions in which I have no doubt the State Minister of Health took part to negotiate higher funding for nursing homes in South Australia. Thus, I read with some concern that the Federal Labor Minister was forecasting a massive cut in funding for such homes, although I understand that there are extensive waiting lists associated with nursing homes. There will certainly be no incentive for any increase in the numbers of homes or beds available if there is to be a reduction in the amount allocated to the homes. A number of other requirements on them are causing problems to existing nursing homes.

Is the Minister aware of the proposal by his Federal colleague to massively cut funds to nursing homes and hospitals? Is he aware of the alarm that the announcement of funding cuts has caused relatives of people in nursing homes and hostels? I assure him that such alarm does exist because I have had numerous phone calls about the issue. What action is the Minister taking to persuade his federal colleague to reverse this decision, which can only harm the care of our aged in a situation in which there are already severe problems from lack of funding.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In relation to the first question whether I am aware of the proposal, to date I know only what I have read in the newspapers. Apparently, the Federal Minister for Community Services (Hon. Don Grimes) addressed a national meeting of people concerned with aged care. One presumes that the speech must have been circulated so again there is a presumption that the report of the address was reasonably accurate. Apparently, some further cuts in the level of nursing home benefits have been foreshadowed by Senator Grimes. He is one of the so-called gang of seven, which includes Brian Howe, the Minister for Social Security, and Neal Blewett, the Federal

Minister for Health, who have warned the Prime Minister that, in the priorities that must be balanced in framing this year's federal budget, the human services areas, in particular health care, community services and social security, cannot stand any significant further cuts.

I am relying again on second hand information, but I believe that the Victorian and New South Wales Governments have already lodged some form of protest. Of course, our protest has been ongoing. When the Federal Government moved to cut the level of benefit in South Australia last year I protested long and hard. I flew to Canberra specifically to see the Federal Minister concerned, and I was accompanied by the Commissioner for the Ageing, Adam Graycar. We put a case, as a result of which we got an additional \$3 a day to compensate for the 38 hour week.

I cannot say whether or not this report is causing alarm. My office has received no indication in the past 48 hours of a level of alarm. I think that that would be premature. It is a battle that we have not yet lost. I shall certainly take up the cudgels. As a result of the events of last year, I established an inquiry, which is being chaired by Adam Graycar as Commissioner for the Ageing. The terms of reference of that inquiry have been expanded at the specific request of the Federal Minister for Community Services. We expect an interim report from that inquiry by the end of March or thereabouts. I believe that that will provide very good ammunition in the lead up to the Federal budget. Far be it for me to prejudice what the findings of the inquiry will be.

I shall outline the specific situation that we have in South Australia, and this is very germane to the questions that were asked. This is *apropos* the third question asked as to what action I have taken to reverse the possible change in priorities or to prevent further cuts in levels of funding.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Who gave you that tie!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is a silk Christian Dior tie your own tie: a gentleman never wears a clip-on bow tie. I was tying my own more than 30 years ago.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I point out that the level of assessment in South Australia is, I believe, better than anywhere else in the country. That means of course that the people who are being admitted to nursing homes have a higher level of dependency than is the case in many other States. They are most appropriately located in nursing homes. Our domiciliary care services—and these have been supported very well by Governments of both political persuasions in South Australia—are the best in Australia.

When you put together the assessment procedures (that is, a multidisciplinary assessment involving doctors and other health professionals) with the level of care we are able to provide for the frail aged in their own homes, it is most unlikely in South Australia that they finish up in a nursing home until they are very much in need of that level of support.

So, the level of dependency and nursing that is required for those patients in South Australia is higher than it is interstate. This was confirmed by Dr Rhys Hearn, who did an independent inquiry for South Australia some years ago. Dr Rhys Hearn has subsequently been used on occasions by the Federal Government as a senior advisor. Her expertise in these matters is beyond question. We are in the process of putting together a major home and community care program that will help to keep not only the frail aged but many disabled and disadvantaged people in their own homes and in their own communities who might otherwise need institutional care.

Notwithstanding that, we have to keep our priorities right. It is desirable that people are supported in the community

in their own homes, in their own environments, for as long as possible, but we must not get carried away: we must not overreact to the three decades of distortion that has equated aged care almost entirely with the provision of nursing home accommodation.

Moving away from that distorted position, I believe there is a danger in the Federal Government's seeing the panacea lying almost entirely in additional home and community care. In fact, the truth lies somewhere in between. We should support people, whether they be frail, sick aged or disabled in the community for as long as it is practical and for as long as it is in the interest of the individual. Nevertheless, we will always require some significant nursing home accommodation.

All of the facts and figures, all of the demographic information, suggest that the demand for that will increase rather than decrease because of the significantly ageing population in South Australia. All of us in this Chamber are part of that and—

*The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I am some months closer than the Hon. Mr Cameron. The father of the Council is of course closer than any of us but is still looking very fit. I am pleased to say. In summary, we will resist vigorously any move to further cut levels. We will use the professional and objective information that is available from the current Graycar inquiry to support that resistance. There should not be any alarm in the community at this stage. I will take whatever steps are necessary or practical to reverse to the extent I am able and to influence the decision to cut nursing home benefits.

#### COOPER BASIN ROYALTIES

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about royalties from the Cooper Basin.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The Cooper Basin oil and gas fields are paying handsome dividends to the people of South Australia in terms of direct and indirect employment at Moomba, Whyalla and Adelaide. There are several explorers and producers who co-operate in the exploration for oil and gas and who share in the revenue flowing from the sales of natural gas, crude oil condensate, propane and butane. They include South Australian based Santos Limited, the major participant in the Cooper Basin exploration and production. However, by far the most significant production in the Cooper Basin is crude oil.

Since 1 July 1985 the price of oil on world markets has tumbled from \$US28 to \$US15 a barrel. The price of oil in Australia is linked to this international price. Therefore, this savage cut in world oil prices will have a dramatic impact on South Australian Government receipts from royalties on the production of Cooper Basin oil and gas. Royalty receipts have been a significant and rapidly increasing source of revenue for the State Government in recent years. In 1983-84 actual receipts from royalties were \$13.4 million, in 1984-85 royalty receipts doubled to \$26.8 million, and it is estimated that royalties will all but double again to \$52.3 million in the current 1985-86 financial year. In each year royalties for Cooper Basin oil and gas account for all but about \$2.5 million of royalties, and the remaining \$2.5 million from royalties comes from mineral production.

I have made some calculations about the impact of falling oil prices on the level of royalties payable to the South Australian Government by the Cooper Basin participants. These calculations have been checked and confirmed by

several industry sources both here and interstate. I estimate that at the current level of world oil prices royalty revenue to the State Government will be slashed by at least 40 per cent from \$52.3 million to probably no more than \$32 million in the 1986-87 financial year. In fact, the falling oil prices will already start impacting on revenue receipts from Cooper Basin royalties in the last quarter of the current 1985-86 financial year.

In addition, falling world oil prices could impact on the revenue collected by way of franchise fees imposed on petrol and diesel wholesalers and retailers in South Australia. Given that there appears to be significant potential erosion of South Australia's revenue from royalties, what action does the Government propose to take in respect of this matter? Is the Government aware of the potential and devastating impact of falling world oil prices on the revenue base of South Australia?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Once again the honourable member seems to be exuding doom about the state of the finances in South Australia, which I would have thought was not something that really fitted his personality or his role as Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council. However, the honourable member has raised certain issues about revenue for the next financial year. Obviously at this point those matters are not included in any Budget, because that will be brought down in August. I am sure that the August Budget will explain the likely effect of the events that the honourable member has outlined in relation to the revenue that the State can expect to collect. However, I point out that it is problematical as to whether oil prices will remain at the current low levels. From the information that I have, I think that most people believe that oil prices will rise again. The argument seems to be about when that will happen and how long the current depression in oil prices will be maintained.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** I hope you have not been talking to Mr Bannon because—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member is interjecting in a quite irrelevant fashion about interest rates.

**The PRESIDENT:** I am calling him to order.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** No one has even mentioned interest rates. The honourable member's question was about oil prices and the effect that this was going to have on South Australia's revenue, and I was about to explain that it is the opinion that oil prices will not remain permanently at their current low level. The honourable member then interjects and says something about interest rates. He does not seem to be able to follow a consistent line of thought. While it is not possible to predict accurately the future of oil prices internationally, I would be surprised if they remained at their present low level indefinitely. Certainly, I would expect the prices to be increased at some stage, and that may be sooner rather than later. I do not think anyone is in a position—including the honourable member—to speculate on that.

I am sure that that is one factor that needs to be borne in mind by the honourable member. It may well be quite premature at this stage to do the calculations that he has done, given that our budget this financial year, I believe, is on course, and next year's budget will be presented, no doubt, with an assessment of the royalties that the Government expects to get in the next financial year. I am sure that Mr Prowse (the Under-Treasurer), who is a very able person, has already alerted himself to the matters raised by the honourable member, namely, the effect of the reduction in oil prices internationally on the South Australian budget.

Mr Prowse—as are all Under-Treasurers—is very concerned about revenue, and I can assure the Council that he

is also concerned about expenditure. He and his officers will have addressed this matter and will address it in the next budget. If, however, the honourable member wants any information prior to that time (and he is nodding, which I assume is an answer in the affirmative) I will refer his question to the Treasurer to see whether he is able to provide any additional information.

### LEGIONNAIRES DISEASE

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question on legionnaires disease to the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** There has been considerable comment and concern about the outbreak of legionnaires disease in the southern suburbs, and the Minister has reported on this matter to the House at great length. Can he state whether there has been any further isolation of the bacteria which causes the disease in either cooling towers or at any other source?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** As part of the policy on public health which has been adopted throughout this current investigation of legionella in South Australia, I do have a further report to make to the Council. I thank the Hon. Ms Pickles for raising this subject in what I believe was her maiden question.

*The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Certainly it is a Dorothy Dixier, but it is a matter of public importance and this is a very appropriate way to bring it up.

*The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I did not have time to prepare a ministerial statement because the material was only put in my hands at seven minutes past two and although I am articulate and quick on my feet I cannot make up a ministerial statement as I go along. I therefore intend in response to the question to read from two minutes that I have before me, the first from Dr Scott Cameron dated 20 February 1986, as follows:

As part of the investigations into legionnaires disease in the southern suburbs of Adelaide, an extensive search has been made for cooling towers inside and outside of the area bounded by Daws Road, South Road, Cross Road and Belair Road. Upward of 50 installations have been identified and sampled.

These cooling towers are associated either with large air-conditioning plants or are used in the cooling machinery to be found in areas such as shopping centres, sport complexes and factories. Based on overseas experience it is expected that some of these installations would contain *legionella pneumophila*. To date only one has returned a positive growth. Another tower grew *legionella micdadei*, which has been associated with human infection overseas but no cases have been recognised in Australia.

Independent sampling of cooling towers by Mitsubishi has detected legionella at the Lonsdale plant. This is of no importance as far as the recent outbreak is concerned, but illustrates the fact that this species is widespread in such installations and is generally not associated with human disease. The towers concerned were disinfected immediately on receipt of the bacteriological results.

To ensure fulness, frankness and fairness, I will also read from a minute obviously written late yesterday afternoon or last night to the Chairman of the Health Commission over the signature of Dr Malcolm Collings, Acting Executive Director of the Public Health Service, which states in part:

Following recent publicity about cases of legionnaires disease in the Southern suburbs, Mitsubishi embarked on their own program of sampling cooling towers associated with factory air-conditioning.

The bacteriology was conducted by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. Samples have proved positive for legionella species, and the following should be noted:

1. None of the earlier cases can be attributed to the Mitsubishi cooling towers.
2. There is no evidence of any cases in the work force.

3. Advice was given to the company regarding disinfection, cleaning and ongoing sampling.

Initial disinfection was to be achieved by dosing with Haticide LP5 on 18 February 1986. The same substance would then be used for continuing disinfection and the plant would be subject to a major clean in the immediate future. These steps are judged to be adequate to protect the work force and the public from any theoretical risk. The situation will be monitored as additional information becomes available.

In summary, there has been a further isolation of *Legionella pneumophila* from a commercial premises and there has been an isolation from cooling towers at the Mitsubishi plant at Lonsdale. On the information available to me at the moment, neither of these has been associated with the recent outbreak in the immediate area of Daw Park, nor in the other cases that have been notified around metropolitan Adelaide. However, I stress again that investigations are continuing.

I believe that the knowledge we are gaining from the summer of 1985-86 in Adelaide will certainly be the subject for not one but several very interesting contributions to the world literature about *legionella*. As I have said before, as any further information on this matter becomes available I shall make it public at once. I repeat: there is no cause for any alarm abroad. There has been and remains to this point only one confirmed death from *legionella* and two possible deaths, one of which we will never know about, of course, because at the insistence of the relatives, the patient was not autopsied.

### OMBUDSMAN

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the subject of the Ombudsman.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** In October 1985 during the Government's crisis over the Ombudsman when finally the then incumbent, Ms Mary Beasley, resigned there was debate about the capacity of a Government to suspend or dismiss an Ombudsman. The Attorney-General tabled various legal opinions at the time indicating the criteria for suspension and the difficulties involved in both courses of action.

Ultimately, there had to be a resolution of both Houses of Parliament before the Ombudsman could be dismissed. An Ombudsman could be suspended by the Governor but, unless a resolution for dismissal was passed by Parliament within a month, the suspension lapsed.

At the time I drew attention to the major problems created by the provision that only the Parliament dismisses an Ombudsman, but the Parliament had no say in the initial appointment. I made the point that it was unreasonable for the Parliament to have to exercise the power of dismissal in those circumstances. I also made the point that some mechanisms had to be developed to ensure that there were adequate consultations between the Government and the Opposition and any minor Parties with a view to achieving bipartisan support for a particular appointee to the office of Ombudsman.

The office is a high public office and as much as possible ought to be free from controversy. I am not aware of any consultation so far with the Opposition or minor Parties by the Government as to a suitable permanent appointment to the office of Ombudsman. My questions are:

1. Will the Government consult in a meaningful way with the Opposition and minor Parties about the filling of the vacancy in the office of Ombudsman with a view to achieving bipartisan support and avoiding future controversy?

2. Has the Government yet identified any person to fill the office?

3. What is the timetable for appointments?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Ever since the Ombudsman Act was passed the Ombudsman has been appointed by the Governor in Executive Council. That was the situation in 1973 or 1974 when Mr Gordon Coumbe was appointed and when members opposite (in government) appointed Mr Bob Bakewell to the position. It was also the situation when this Government appointed Ms Mary Beasley to the position. The Government does not have any plans to change that method of appointment for the Ombudsman.

As to whether the Government will consult with other Parties in the Chamber on the appointment of the Ombudsman, I was in Parliament in 1980 when the honourable member was a Minister in the Tonkin Government as Attorney-General, and I was the shadow Attorney-General and had some reasonably prominent position in Opposition at that time. I do not recall being consulted about the appointment of Mr Bob Bakewell to the position of Ombudsman when the Tonkin Government decided that it would appoint him to that position. So, we have once again a situation of honourable members opposite exhibiting double standards.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member alleges that the Government had controversies: the Government did not have any controversies about the position of Ombudsman. A controversy erupted as a result of certain actions of the Ombudsman. I do not remember members opposite objecting at the time that Ms Beasley was appointed to the office of Ombudsman: my recollection is that members opposite and members of the community welcomed that appointment.

I am not sure what the controversy in which the Ombudsman was involved last year has to do with her original appointment. I am sure that the Hon. Dr Tonkin and the Hon. Trevor Griffin, who had a significant role to play in the removal of Mr Bob Bakewell from the position of Director of the Premier's Department to the position of Ombudsman, did not consult with the Opposition of the day about whether Mr Bakewell would be a suitable appointee. They just appointed him. They are the facts. However, I am happy to discuss the matter with the Premier to see whether he believes some different procedure should have been followed in this case. A number of people are being considered for the position. I expect that an announcement will be made reasonably soon.

#### QEH ROLE AND FUNCTION STUDY

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question on the subject of the Queen Elizabeth Role and Function Study.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** The study referred to has been reported and the report has been on the Minister's desk for many months. It has been generally circulated amongst interested parties in the health professions generally. The report deals with the hospital at three levels: first, the general, medical and surgical services to the region (essentially, the community health service as it interfaces with primary care medicine); secondly, at the level of the provision of general consultant services in medicine, surgery, and obstetrics, the teaching by those consultants of undergraduates, and the affiliation of the hospital with the university; and, thirdly, the existence within the hospital of high technology super specialities, some of which are duplicated in other

hospitals and others of which provide a service to the entire State that is not elsewhere duplicated.

This report is of interest because of necessity it raises questions about other hospitals and the whole development of medicine in South Australia. The report necessarily comments on, for example, specialised obstetrics services in places such as the Queen Victoria Hospital, a hospital which is of the highest level of service in the area of neonatal paediatrics, which is regarded as equal and similar to a number of other hospitals in the area of general obstetrics, and which is also regarded as providing a lesser service than many other hospitals provide in the area of general medicine and surgery such as it affects persons who might have an intercurrent illness while being obstetric or gynaecological patients of that hospital. I do not wish to emphasise just that one issue. There are many instances in this regard.

I do not wish to emphasise just that one issue. There are many instances in this regard.

*The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** We can argue that point for a long time, but in that event Madam President would seize on my matters of opinion.

**The PRESIDENT:** Quite right!

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** I just thought I'd help you.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** It is not fair for the Minister to raise that matter by interjection when he knows that I cannot enter into debate.

*The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** It is not a question of that at all, but a question of architecture and physical location, as much as anything else, but that is another question. The report refers to the distribution of beds generally throughout the metropolitan area, and the needs in the south. It also implies that there may be no future for individual departments of general medicine and general surgery but rather that general physicians and general surgeons, at least in those hospitals, ought to be working as members of a team within a sub-specialty, such as gastroenterology, trauma surgery, etc.

If implemented, it is believed that it will not be possible to obtain the unanimity of the senior clinicians who will necessarily be involved in changes to their professional lifestyle, but it is also believed by a significant body of salaried and visiting medical officers that nevertheless some of these changes should be brought about by strong ministerial decision, despite the fact that such decisions may generate controversy.

As I have said, the report has been on the Minister's desk for many months and little has been heard about it. What are the Minister's policies in regard to implementing the report? What sorts of decision are in train, and will the Minister inform the Parliament in general of the effect of that report on the future of hospital services in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I regret that a time constraint applies, since in the third question I am asked to inform the Parliament generally of my plans for the South Australian hospital system. However, I shall try to keep the answer as short as possible. First, in relation to strong ministerial decisions being required, I agree with that. I think my record shows that I do not back off from making strong ministerial decisions or from taking strong ministerial action. Although I tend to do it more in private these days than in public, nevertheless my resolve I can assure honourable members and all South Australians has not changed.

The role and function study showed that one cannot really look at any major teaching hospital, or indeed any of our major public hospitals, in isolation. It was a very positive

role and function study. It assures the future of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a major teaching hospital to the end of this century and beyond. However, the study points up a number of difficulties in looking at any hospital in isolation. It was as a result of this that I called together the chief executive officers, the chairmen and the medical superintendents of all of Adelaide's public and teaching hospitals for a very constructive meeting, held about two weeks ago.

Let me make a number of points. First, with regard to implementation, we have already appointed Dr Trevor King, who is specifically guiding the implementation of the recommendations of the role and function study. I am sure Dr King would be known to Dr Ritson. He was originally one of the team from interstate who undertook the major role and function study. He became very well known to the hospital staff during the course of that study. He is very well accepted by almost all the key players, if not all of them. At the moment he is busily engaged in implementing the recommendations.

The other thing that was reinforced by the role and function study was the dilemma in which any health commission, health department or State Government may find itself with respect to the extent that they are unable to control university generated costs and activities. Because it is a university teaching hospital the policies are to some extent beyond the control of any State Health Minister. This was specifically so with the ongoing controversy whether or not the obstetrics and gynaecology department would withdraw from the QEH. I am happy to reassure everyone that that will not occur. Nevertheless, because the University of Adelaide Medical School vacillated for a very long time concerning an appointment and where the appointee would be located a great deal of uncertainty was generated at the hospital. I learned a great deal from that exercise and I can assure anyone who needs to know that it will not happen again.

With regard to the duplication of existing neonatal and paediatric services, the appointment of a neonatologist, which occurred recently at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, whether we should confine these services to level two or otherwise; and the rationalisation of existing services: all those matters are being addressed. If the Hon. Dr Ritson has not already received a summary of the minutes or the proceedings of the meeting which I held with the representatives of the hospitals I would be very pleased to provide him with that. It is a public document. Among other things I have asked that those people should meet again, without my being present, to look at the establishment of a task force to see whether we can not amalgamate the two medical schools. I think that is a basic decision which must be taken at some time.

I suspect that there will not be a lot of unanimity about that decision, but we cannot continue to produce 165 medical graduates a year. As Minister I am required to find internship positions for 165 medical graduates. It is too many; it is foolish, and we should be putting some of the additional existing resources into post-graduate studies—without diminishing the status of any of the hospitals.

The second thing that is obvious is that in 1986, if we are to have a sensible allocation of financial resources, among other things we will need a lot of inter-hospital and trans-hospital rationalisation, in terms of appointments and clinical and admitting privileges and procedures. All these matters are being addressed very early in my second term.

I have also asked that the key players recommend to me some mechanism whereby we can establish an inquiry which would use key local players who know the system intimately and who would be able to recommend to me, and ultimately, the Government, how we can best implement a

system which ensures a rational, integrated and coordinated use of existing resources. The inquiry would not duplicate the Sax recommendations, as they were basically about quality assurance. That inquiry would also be able to recommend how we can get a better balance between the number of people in respective consultancies, so that somehow we can redress the imbalance that has occurred in areas like orthopaedics, ENT and urology, and in general see the hospitals cooperating rather than competing.

As part of this I also need recommendations as to how we can develop much more sophisticated mechanisms of reporting, whether financial reporting, management information, or general reporting. All these matters have been canvassed very early in my second term. I am looking to a bipartisan approach in this area. I think it is extremely important that we get it right. The decisions that are made will impact on the continued guarantee of high quality public hospital services in this State for the next generation and beyond. They are matters of great moment. They will be addressed during 1986 and I would hope that the Hon. Dr Ritson, in particular, because of his training and skill in the area, will be one of those who can contribute in a positive way.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** I desire to ask a supplementary question. Does the Minister recall that in my explanation I referred to the report and its remarks on the disparity of different levels of service at the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital—as between different disciplines—and its canvassing of the option of, in fact, closing the hospital and transferring its functions to one of the existing major general hospitals? Will the Minister comment briefly on his impressions of that aspect of the role and function study?

**The PRESIDENT:** Did you say 'Queen Victoria Hospital'? I rule that supplementary question out of order. The original question was on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital role and function study.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** The role and function study did cast a wide net. The report 'The role and function study of Queen Elizabeth Hospital' in fact reported on other major institutions and on the problem of the universities, and the Minister has just answered. It was a good answer, but he must have missed my reference to the report's comments on Queen Victoria Hospital where in fact I referred to the medical and surgical services being at a lower level than neonatal services. The Minister said, 'Are you calling them second rate?' I said, 'No, it was a question of geography and architecture.' In his answer he did not—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! You need not debate it any further. I accept your point and I will call on the Minister to answer the supplementary question.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** The Labor Party first saved Queen Victoria Hospital in 1980. At that time a report was made public by the then Minister (Hon. Jennifer Adamson) that canvassed the desirability of transferring Queen Victoria Hospital—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** The Hon. Jennifer Adamson was never in favour of that and you know it.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** She made the report public.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** Do not try to put the boots into her.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Certainly not.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I call the Council to order. Repeated interjections are not permitted.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** As briefly as I can, I have been attacked by the grandfather of the Council—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** No. The report canvassed a number of options, including consolidating the services on the campus of Royal Adelaide Hospital and associating

it with a major university teaching hospital; that is a convenient and sensible option to canvass. It canvassed the possibility, as I recall, of locating it on the Adelaide Children's Hospital campus and consolidating it. They were two very sensible options that were canvassed. They were looked at by us, but the political reality was that I had to save Queen Victoria Hospital twice a year during the three previous years as Minister of Health—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** You had to save—

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I announced it would continue at its present site—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:**—twice a year for three years while I was Minister. As a result—and I may yet save it again—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** No.

*The Hon. C.M. Hill interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! My comments apply to the Hon. Mr Hill as much as anyone else. Will you cease interjecting, or I will have to name you.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** As a result of canvassing all of the options, a firm decision has been taken and announced and reannounced, and it will no doubt be announced again.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** That is fairly typical of your Government.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** We find that people like you are fairly slow to pick these things up. We always speak slowly and recycle information, which was a technique that your now diminished Leader picked up with great vigour: he was programmed to talk about three or four very simple things three times a day, seven days a week for two years. In the event, it did not help him but that was the technique—I must not be diverted.

What we are doing at this very moment is to produce suitable plans for consideration by Cabinet and for referral to the Public Works Standing Committee that will involve major refurbishment of the Queen Victoria Hospital at an estimated cost in 1985 dollars of about \$7 million. There is no intention to relocate Queen Victoria Hospital. It may be that in generations to come—after my time—in the next century or beyond the wisdom of the time will dictate that it ought to be relocated. That will never happen while I am Minister of Health—but it will be saved; it will be refurbished and it will continue as the centre of excellence in obstetrics—

**The Hon. Peter Dunn:** In the world!

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** No, in South Australia—but very good by world standards.

### CROP RESEARCH INSTITUTE

**The Hon. PETER DUNN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a question about the Crop Research Institute.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. PETER DUNN:** Through a working party the UF&S made a report after much deliberation that the new Crop Research Institute be located at Waite Research Centre. There have been many secondary additions to that working party report causing what some people in the industry believe to be a blurring of the original aims. The Minister has said that the institute would be situated at the Northfield Research Centre but, since announcing that decision, he has made himself incommunicado to some of the relevant bodies who now carry out pure research on cereal crop breeding.

Those bodies affected are Roseworth Agricultural College, Waite Research Centre and the UF&S (the body asked to set up and report to the Minister). Therefore, I ask the Minister:

1. Is the Minister so familiar with his portfolio that he need not listen to those bodies I have named?

2. If not, will he call the Waite and Roseworthy plant breeding personnel and the UF&S officers immediately and seek their ideas?

3. Before he spends precious dollars on an institute situated in an area that has been planned to be sold in the next few years, will the Minister read the 1982 Department of Agriculture internal report prepared by the Research Centre Review Committee?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I will refer those important questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply

### ASH WEDNESDAY COMPENSATION

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government in this Council a question about the 1983 Ash Wednesday fires in the South-East.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN:** My attention to the slowness of hearing claims for damages arising out of the 1983 fires was drawn by a recent South-East newspaper article. Although the tragedy of the Ash Wednesday fires was three years ago, there is unrest about the delay in finalising compensation. As there is a need for a great deal of information from ETSA, I ask the Minister:

1. Will he assure me that there will be and is full cooperation from ETSA?

2. Can the Minister indicate now or later whether there are any other factors causing a delay in dealing with this compensation?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I will refer the matter to the responsible Minister and bring down a reply.

[Sitting suspended from 3.15 to 3.50 p.m.]

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 19 February, Page 283.)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** First, I thank the Attorney for his consideration in the organisation of the procedures of the Council this afternoon. I appreciate it and, as a result, I have reorganised the dot points in my Address in Reply speech: instead of the dot point 'shaft Sumner' the dot points now read 'shaft Cornwall'. That is a political pay back. I congratulate the new members who have been elected to the Chamber and, in particular, I congratulate my new room mate, the Hon. Jamie Irwin. The Hon. Jamie Irwin and I have now been sharing an office for about a month. I am seeking to educate him in the ways of SA FM while I now have my very own rural adviser to provide me with advice on rural matters.

I point out to the Hon. Jamie Irwin that I have noticed that as yet his name over the door has not been altered by the 'phantom name arranger' of the lower reaches of Parliament House. For much of the past two years as a result of the activities of the 'phantom name arranger' my former room mate, the Hon. Legh Davis, was known, as the 'Hon. V.D. Lash'. I suspect that whoever the 'phantom name

arranger' is has yet to come up with something quite so witty for the Hon. Jamie Irwin, but I suspect that it will not be for much longer.

I congratulate the new members in the Chamber on their maiden speeches. Having listened to their maiden speeches and having had the opportunity to reread my own maiden speech and that of the Hon. Frank Blevins, I must say that certainly time in the Legislative Council and the wisdom of the more experienced members clearly must have some sort of modifying influence on members in this Chamber, as it obviously did with the Hon. Frank Blevins and clearly with me. I hope and expect—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** You learn to count.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** As the Hon. Mr Hill says, you learn to count, and I realised that one against many does not work. I, too, was sorry that, in the dying hours of the last Parliament, we did not have an opportunity to listen to the members who were about to leave this Chamber making valedictory comments to the Chamber. I think one of the more enjoyable aspects of the last Parliament for me was to be sitting in the gallery of another place at about 2 a.m. on the very last sitting day and listening to the contributions from the members who were about to retire from the House of Assembly. For about one hour the House was regaled with stories of previous members, their foibles, and some of their funnier moments in the House. I think it was a very nice way to end a session of Parliament and in effect the parliamentary careers of those members. I certainly would have been most interested in the contributions of, first, the Hon. Ren DeGaris. The Hon. Mr DeGaris and I over more than a decade spent many hours together working on matters of an electoral nature, redistributions, electoral results, and electoral systems.

I say quite frankly (and the Hon. Mr DeGaris would agree) that we often took differing views on matters of an electoral nature but, nevertheless, I respected the man and I respected the way in which he set about the particular views that he had on electoral matters through the years. I think it is fair to say that in certain of those circumstances in relation to electoral matters the views that he was putting towards the end of his political career will prove in a number of instances to be quite correct. In addition, the Hon. Mr DeGaris was a staunch defender of the Legislative Council, and that was quite evident through the three years of my service in this Chamber. I would hope that all members here will remain staunch defenders of the Legislative Council.

My fondest memory of the Hon. Arthur Whyte was as a result of my first entry into this Chamber—tieless and coatless. There I sat on the backbench when a little note was delivered to me by the messenger and it went something along the following lines:

I am sure you have just forgotten your tie and your coat. I am trying to maintain the dress standards in this Chamber and I would appreciate your assistance in this regard.

I might say to the Hon. Arthur Whyte (with due respect to his memory in this Chamber) that whilst delivering this Address in Reply speech I have made sure that I am certainly with tie and with coat. As the Hon. Mr Davis says, the Hon. Arthur Whyte would have been proud of at least that particular aspect of this contribution. I wish Arthur all the best in his retirement.

I enjoyed my time on committees with the Hon. Cec Creedon. As other members have indicated, Cec Creedon's abilities were most evident during committee debates. Cec—who was fondly known to those of us on this side as 'Cecil B. de Creedon'—and I spent a lot of time together in committee debates, and I think it is fair to say that the only time I, certainly, clashed—and I think other members on this side of the Chamber clashed—with the Hon. Cec Cree-

don was in relation to his parting contribution in the Chamber. I think the Hon. Murray Hill summed that up pretty well when he said that the Hon. Cec Creedon, after he had assured himself of his superannuation payout, decided that the Chamber ought still to be abolished.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** And that a speech should only go for 30 minutes instead of 45.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** That was one other aspect of the contribution. Lastly, the Hon. Frank Blevins—who left the Chamber in slightly different circumstances; he and I and other members obviously had some harsh words across the Chamber on occasions, and I guess we will continue to parry and thrust in the political arena over the coming years. I think the kindest thing that I can say about the Hon. Frank Blevins is that we certainly agreed on which soccer team was the best, and that was Manchester United. I suspect that was where our agreement on many things ended.

I apologise for the disjointed nature of what is to be my short contribution to the Address in Reply. I want to touch on four or five matters briefly, and a number of these I intend pursuing at later stages in this Parliament. First, I want to make some comments in relation to what I call procedures in the Council. It is a matter that I have raised on a number of previous occasions. I think that what is required in the Standing Orders is some forum for members to grieve on particular matters of interest to them in the Legislative Council program for the week.

I would suggest not an excessive period; perhaps only one hour a week should be set aside, or maybe even half an hour a week should be set aside so that, perhaps, three members could have a 10 minute griever each week on a matter of their choice. It has been a long standing problem for me and for other members, that when there are certain matters one wants to put to the Chamber and to the public, the forum of Question Time is not appropriate and there really are no opportunities other than the Address in Reply at the start of each session where one can griever.

**The Hon. R.J. Ritson:** And the Appropriation Bill.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I will lead on to that—where one can raise matters of a grieving nature. For three years I had a long standing battle with the previous President (and I will certainly be interested to take up that particular debate with the new President) in relation to the use of the Supply Bill as a wide-ranging debate on particular matters of interest to members of Parliament. Certainly, the precedent was established under the previous President and has been established previously with contributions from the Hon. Mr Sumner on a number of Supply Bills as well. Members were able in Supply Bills to raise matters of interest during the second reading debate on those Bills.

The second matter in the first heading of procedures in the Council on which I want to touch is a matter I have raised previously and want to refer to again very quickly. It is my view that we need, in the Legislative Council, greater provision for standing committees. It remains my view that we ought to have two more standing committees of this Council. In general terms, the first one I would model on the Senate Constitutional and Legal Affairs Committee, which would cover that whole range of law reform and constitutional matters that are always being put to this Parliament.

The second one would, once again, be modelled on what was originally known as the Rae committee in the Senate and would cover finance and Government operations. I think that that particular forum would give members of the Legislative Council an opportunity to oversee the operations, in particular, of the ever burgeoning number of statutory authorities that we have in South Australia, and a whole range of other financial operations in South Australia



that currently are very difficult for members of the Council to keep an eye on.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What are the two that you want?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Constitutional and legal affairs and finance and Government operations, or something to that effect. I think that constitutional and legal affairs is very similar to the Attorney's concept in relation to a law reform standing committee. The second one does not correspond with the research paper that the Attorney's research officer presented to the joint select committee during the last Parliament. I think, nevertheless, that it is a matter worthy of consideration by members of the Council.

Finally, a matter which will relate indirectly to procedures in the Council, a matter that I know is near and dear to the Attorney-General's heart, a reform that I know that he has been fervently arguing for in Caucus and Cabinet for the past 4 years but has not been able to deliver, is the matter of freedom of information legislation. I appreciate that the Attorney, as a true democrat, realises that the strength of the Parliamentary institution would be increased by the introduction of freedom of information legislation.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** And there is the revenue of the State.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The Attorney is now commencing to use the easy escape route of reformers gone bad: having come up with a good idea he starts complaining a la Gareth Evans in the Commonwealth Parliament and now Jim Kennett in Victoria and John Cain who have got cold feet over the openings made for better government and for better parliamentary discussion by the freedom offered by freedom of information legislation. This is not a 'shaft Sumner' speech any more; it has been redrafted. I have indicated previously that I have always had great respect for the abilities of the Attorney-General. I am sure that he will be true to his own commitment, given over the past two elections, and will not use the easy escape route of costs of such a much needed reform as a reason for not introducing freedom of information legislation. I am sure that should he choose to use that particular reason in Caucus debate that at least our good friends thus far on the left may well put a very strong view in Caucus to the Attorney-General on the need for such a reform.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** They will keep him honest; and we will, too.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The second matter that I wish to touch on briefly—

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** We don't need it.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** We do not need freedom of information legislation?

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** That is not what I said.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I did not hear what the Attorney said. We do need freedom of information legislation: is that what you said?

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** I will be responding shortly. I was referring to the Hon. Mr Davis's interjection.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** He should not have been interjecting.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce):** Order! If the honourable member were to address the Chair he would be better off.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I will be looking forward to a commitment in the response from the Attorney-General about the early introduction of freedom of information legislation in South Australia.

**The Hon. M.J. Elliott:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** A 'Hear, hear!' from the Democrats, so there is certainly strong support in the Chamber for such an introduction. The second matter that I refer to, which I understand the Hon. Trevor Griffin covered yesterday very fully, relates to the matter of facilities available

to members of the Legislative Council. As the Hon. Mr Griffin indicated, they can best be described as appalling.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** They are better than what they were. If the honourable member describes them as appalling now you should have been here—

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I am not about to shaft the Hon. Mr Sumner.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** You should have been here—

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** It is disappointing that the Attorney-General, for whom I have much respect, continues to live in the past in relation to the question of the facilities of members of the Legislative Council. I hoped that he would be big enough to forgive the sins of the past, having extracted three years of retribution during the last Parliament. He is now 15 all with the Liberal Government, which refused to give him facilities during the period 1979 to 1982 and the Attorney-General has had 1982 to 1985 to extract retribution. We are suitably chastised and chastened.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** As we are suitably chastened for the sins of the past what I hope is that, in a bipartisan or tripartisan spirit (with, I am sure, the support of the Democrats), we can move ever onwards and upwards in a joint request to the Attorney-General and the Premier for some—

*The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I am quite happy to get together with the Attorney-General and the Democrats to ask the taxpayers and to explain to them that in the Legislative Council one hard working and perspiring secretary must look after five Legislative Councillors including three shadow Ministers of the Council and keep up with the workload of those particular members. I am sure the Attorney-General will not refer to the past in his response and may well, as I have said, look to the future with a reforming zeal to try to right the wrongs of the past.

The third matter on which I will touch briefly relates to electoral matters and the electoral system. I want it indicated on the record that I do not believe that the system was the reason for our loss at the last election.

**The Hon. K.T. Griffin:** I have said that.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I do not think anyone is suggesting that that was the reason for our loss at the last election and I want it on the record that I agree with that particular analysis. I will address electoral matters again later, but will not address them in detail now. What I will refer to at a later stage is what I see as a change of heart of psephologists or electoral analysts such as Dean Jaensch, Don Hopgood and company (and I would not put them in the same kettle of fish). I am not suggesting that Dean Jaensch is a supporter of the Labor Party but Don Hopgood and other supporters of the Labor Party have mentioned electoral concepts such as uniform swings and two-Party preferred votes. What I will say, and I will devote time to this matter later in the year, is that through the whole period of the 1960s and 1970s there were a myriad of articles written by Jaensch, Hopgood and others with the use of the two-Party preferred vote concept and uniform swings to put a point of view in relation to electoral systems in the Playford era and shortly afterwards.

When these same concepts were used most effectively by the Liberal Party and other psephologists in the late 1970s the same concepts—two-Party preferred vote, uniform swing—we had people like Dean Jaensch and Don Hopgood at the last electoral redistribution hearings pooh-poohing or pouring cold water on the concepts of two-Party preferred vote and uniform swing and, in effect, arguing that they were concepts not worthy of consideration by the electoral tribunal and others if they are to be serious analysts of electoral systems.



One has only to look at the recent article by Dean Jaensch in the *Advertiser* soon after the election. 'Under the electoral pendulum of Dean Jaensch', in which he once again poured cold water on the concepts of uniform swing and, indirectly, the two Party preferred vote. I intend to take that matter up at a later stage in some detail and I intend to trace the arguments of people like Don Hopgood and Dean Jaensch. Also, I will consider the PhD contributions and articles leading to the PhD of Dean Jaensch, the academic work on which his doctorate was based, together with the latest statements that he has made.

Finally I understand that the Hon. Legh Davis touched on the matter of electoral systems last night in relation to redistributions, and I think that the points he raised in relation to the Constitution Act and the frequency of redistribution now that we have a four-year Parliament and not a three-year Parliament is a matter of concern for our reforming Attorney-General. I hope that we will look at some corrective measures some time during this Parliament.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Referenda.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I am sure that with the support of the Attorney and others we can even get a referendum proposal through on that matter—

**The Hon. R.J. Ritson:** How long could it be now before a redistribution?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** It could well be 1998 before the next election, based on a new redistribution.

**The Hon. R.J. Ritson:** A bit scary!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** It is a long period. The Hon. Legh Davis has explored that matter in some detail. We can consider that later.

The fourth matter on which I want to touch relates to the teacher/staffing formula in schools in South Australia and the problem with respect to displacements. Members will certainly be aware that late last year and just prior to the last election there was considerable agony and activity in our schools as a result of the teacher/staffing formula being applied by the Education Department in a number of schools because of declining enrolments, particularly in secondary schools and also some primary schools. The current teacher/staffing formula necessitated, in some cases, wholesale displacements.

As a result of that, as I said, there was certainly agony in a number of schools, such as Enfield and the Parks, which resulted in teacher and student strikes, in some instances for the very first time. I want to quote briefly from that august journal—the *South Australian Teachers Journal*—of Wednesday 30 October 1985. Under a banner headline, 'Statewide displacement crisis; it states:

Displacement is about subjects coming to a screeching halt for kids. It's about enormous energy being wasted. It's about forcing people to move. It occurs in the name of falling enrolments. That's why the Parks Community School teachers voted to strike. They are the first individual school in State history to have taken such action. The loss of five staff last year and the expected 7.4 this year is too much. Education Minister Lynn Arnold's statement that 'it's no different this year than previous years,' is a miscalculation.

It is clearly different because the deep feeling parents and teachers have for their kids' education has erupted across the State. Far removed from the classroom and parents, the educational bureaucrats and politicians misread the mood of that community. They seem to have missed the fact that each year displacement has worsened. It's become more traumatic and complicated and, naturally, teachers don't want to see their students disadvantaged because of a staffing formula.

This excellent article continued under a number of headlines. I do not have the time now to debate it, but some of those are: 'Minister refuses to meet Parks Council'; 'Cummins School special problems'; 'Moorak Primary's problems' (and that is a small town near and dear to the Hon. Mr Elliott and myself). Other headlines are: 'Modbury High under microscope'; 'Modbury staff walkout'; and 'Vale Park

Primary lose too'. As a response to that activity from teachers and students prior to the last election, the then Education Minister (Mr Lynn Arnold) in an endeavour to take the heat out of the situation indicated that a joint working party of Education Department officers and South Australian Institute of Teachers officers would be formed as soon as possible—that promise was made in October last year—and would report on a new teacher/staffing formula by April this year.

The sad fact of that promise—a promise to take heat out of a political situation prior to the last election—has been that as of last weekend some four months after the promise made by the Minister on behalf of the Government that joint working party has not even been formed, let alone commenced its work on what is a critical issue for teachers, parents and students in South Australia. Mr Acting President, I am sure that you and other members would be appalled to be made aware of that situation. Clearly, if that joint working party has not even been formed there is no likelihood at all of its being able to report by April this year.

If that body cannot report for some time after April this year, there must be some doubt whether any new teacher staffing formula can be operating for the 1987 school year. If that is to be the result of the inactivity of the Government and two Ministers involved in this issue, I am sure all members of this Chamber would join as one in condemning the Government on that inactivity.

The last matter to which I refer today involves, as I indicated to the Attorney, a change from 'shaft Sumner' to 'shaft Cornwall'.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** It's not very dignified.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** That is quite true: it is not very dignified at all, but I am happy to concede it. The last point to which I refer relates to a matter pursued at some length during the past Parliament by the Hon. Mr Cameron and me. At the start of this session the Minister of Health tabled an Auditor-General's report and I wish to quote two extracts from a Ministerial statement attached to the Auditor-General's report on the Lyell McEwin. The Minister said:

In doing so, I want to remind the Council of the performance of members of the Opposition, particularly the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Hon. Mr Lucas, who chose to make irresponsible and slanderous statements under parliamentary privilege about the behaviour of senior officers of the Health Commission in the execution of their duties. At the time they were making their allegations—allegations unsupported by any evidence—I warned them that they were acting unfairly and that they were departing from the accepted standards of public behaviour, particularly with regard to the denigration of those who were unable to defend themselves.

Finally, he said:

In closing I ask the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Hon. Mr Lucas to apologise to the Health Commission officers that they have maligned. I believe it is reasonable to expect them to acknowledge that they were mistaken. They cannot redress the hurt that they caused to individual officers at the time, but they can certainly remove any remaining slight upon the reputation of those officers of the Health Commission. I expect they will have the integrity and decency to apologise and withdraw unreservedly.

That is a further indication of the intemperate nature of the remarks that have been made in this Chamber by the Minister over the past three years. Members who have been here for the past three years are well used to them, but perhaps for the newer members that was the first exposure that they have had to the Minister of Health in full flight. The problem with the Minister of Health's statement and the Auditor-General's report on the Lyell McEwin Hospital is that it did not address the most significant piece of evidence that was raised during the last Parliament. I do not intend to go over the whole Lyell McEwin debate again. However, a piece of evidence was not referred to. An article in the *News* of 25 August 1985 stated:

...but the South Australian Health Commission Chairman, Professor Gary Andrews, denied that the \$148 000 was related to the falsification of an entry.

That is probably double dutch to those who did not follow the debate during the last Parliament. Suffice to say that even the Auditor-General's report, tabled by the Minister last week, concedes that the \$148 000 did relate to the falsification of entries in the months of April, May and June of 1983, under the heading of 'Nurses Salaries' in the Lyell McEwin statements. Yet, there is the *News* reporting Professor Andrews as saying that the \$148 000 was not related to falsification of an entry. That statement was made in an endeavour to head off both press and Parliamentary scrutiny of what in effect had been occurring at the Lyell McEwin previously.

That matter is not addressed by the Auditor-General. I indicated previously that the journalist involved had some evidence of the accuracy of that statement made by Professor Gary Andrews, and yet the Auditor-General did not seek to have any discussions with that journalist to verify the accuracy of that statement of Professor Andrews.

In his contribution, the Hon. Mr Cameron referred to criticisms made by the Auditor-General of the central office of the Health Commission in relation to overseeing the financial and management matters of individual health units. I will not repeat those matters raised; suffice to say, I agree with the criticisms made by the Auditor-General of the oversight of expenditure of the individual health units by the central office of the Health Commission. I need only remind the Minister of Health of the debacle that occurred in relation to an adolescent health centre in the northern suburbs—for which some \$250 000 was to be spent over a period of four years on a non adolescent health area—as further evidence of the lack of oversight by the central office of the Health Commission in relation to expenditure by individual health units.

It is a further indication of the blind spot of the Minister of Health in relation to criticism of himself, his department, or the Health Commission. Unfortunately, the Minister of Health's ego will not permit him to accept that he is not super human, that he is a mere mortal (although some members on this side of the Council might suggest that he is something less than a mere mortal), and that he has a blind spot in this area. Perhaps after the Auditor-General has reported and the independent review of the activities of the central office of the Health Commission has reported we will have an efficient and effective Health Commission, befitting the people of South Australia.

Having touched briefly on those five matters, I indicate my support for the motion and once again I thank the Attorney-General for his courtesy in allowing me to make my speech at this late stage of the debate.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General):** I was quite happy to accommodate the honourable member in the circumstances in which he found himself, and I would be quite happy to do it again, as I am sure anyone in the Council would be. Traditionally, the Address in Reply allows members to range over a number of topics, unrelated to any specific Bill or motion, and this opportunity is particularly used by members who have just been elected to Parliament to set out their general philosophical position and system of beliefs upon which they intend to act as members of Parliament.

Once again, the Address in Reply debate on this occasion, the first following an election, allowed the Council to have the benefit of contributions from all the new members. May I say that I have attempted to listen to all those contributions. I found them interesting and commend those members on their speeches to the Council, their first speeches as

new members of Parliament. I look forward to reviewing at some time future contributions by members and their actions, in the light of the general position that they outlined so ably during their contributions to this Address in Reply debate.

That brings me to the Address in Reply debate in this place immediately after the 1982 election. In considering contributions made by members in their first Address in Reply debate and comparing them to their later contributions, it is probably worth while referring to the contribution made by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. The Hon. Mr Lucas is a very good example of a new member ardently expressing a certain view during his maiden speech in the Parliament and then subsequently pursuing a course of action in direct conflict with sentiments expressed in that speech. It is worth referring to the Hon. Mr Lucas's view whether there should be Ministers in the Legislative Council. Three years ago the Hon. Mr Lucas had this to say about the Hon. Dr Cornwall, the Hon. Mr Chatterton, and me, the three Ministers in this place at that time:

The three members are in effect three Trojan horses in the Legislative Council on behalf of the Executive. Of course the Ministers are charming people, but the Trojans thought their horse was charming, too, and look what happened to them. It is inconceivable that the Legislative Council could act as an effective House of Review while three of its most distinguished members are devoted to getting Government legislation through with the minimum of fuss, a minimum of alteration and a minimum of delay. There is an inherent and insoluble conflict of interest in this.

That is the end of the quote, and a very eloquent quote indeed from the Hon. Mr Lucas.

I said in my reply then that I would be surprised if the Hon. Mr Lucas persisted with those views during his period as a member of the Legislative Council. It has taken him three years to jettison the view that there should be no Ministers in the Council. If the Hon. Mr Lucas still perceives my colleagues and me as Trojan horses, one wonders in what role he has cast himself and his fellow shadow Ministers—not three of them but five of them in this Council. I hope that most honourable members who have contributed to the debate for the first time on this occasion do not find themselves in the same unhappy position of contradiction in which the Hon. Mr Lucas has found himself.

I would like to address not all the matters raised by honourable members, as there is neither the time nor the inclination for that, but I would like to deal with a few issues that have been raised. First, the Hon. Mr Elliott raised the question of petrol prices. On behalf of the Australian Democrats, I assume, he put forward the proposition that petrol prices in the metropolitan area and the country should be equalised, such that metropolitan consumers were paying the same as country consumers. The first question that needs to be asked about that proposition is how he intends to implement that policy.

Before attempting to answer that or to give possible answers—none of which I find satisfactory—I think it is worth pointing out to the honourable member that implicit in the Prices Surveillance Authority's reports in recent times has been an acceptance that in fact (and this might not apply with continuous discounting) in general metropolitan consumers are already subsidising country consumers. To equalise prices throughout the State, as the honourable member seems to suggest, would involve substantial increases in the cost of petrol to metropolitan consumers.

*The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member interjects and says that he never said 'equalised', but obviously he wants them more equal than they are now. The Hon. Mr Elliott should attempt a detailed examination of the matter before he gets caught advocating an increase in the

price of petrol for motorists in the metropolitan area. If he is serious about this proposition he also ought to advise Parliament and metropolitan consumers on behalf of the Democrats just how he intends to implement this policy.

As many people are aware, the Commonwealth Prices Surveillance Authority (PSA) approves the maximum wholesale price of petrol for the whole of Australia based upon an analysis of the costs and profitability of the oil industry. Capital city prices are determined by adding State charges and low lead premiums to the basic wholesale price.

The approved maximum wholesale prices for sales by oil companies in country areas are determined by adding to the approved capital city price the appropriate freight differential, also approved by the PSA to offset additional transport costs associated with distribution to country areas.

However, it is generally conceded that the freight differential added to country wholesale prices is only a portion of the overall cost for the majority of country consumers. At present Port Pirie and Port Lincoln are paying an additional .2 cents a litre. Port Augusta is paying one cent, Mt Gambier 1.2 cents, Whyalla 1.4 cents and even areas as far from Adelaide as Ceduna pay a freight differential of 2 cents a litre on the wholesale price.

In other words those amounts are added by the PSA to the basic wholesale price that it sets for South Australia. In the past the PSA has acceded to the view that these freight differentials do not cover all the additional costs incurred by oil companies in marketing in country areas. The capital costs of establishing and upgrading rural agent depot facilities, the operating costs of selling through those channels, the cost of delivery to rural consumers and the cost of coastal shipping a product from refineries to seaboard terminals where freight and output differentials do not cover these costs are not specifically included in country price levels. Rather, these costs are absorbed in both the country and metropolitan wholesale prices.

Therefore, in a normal situation at the wholesale level I would suggest that metropolitan consumers are subsidising country consumers as the significant additional costs of country distribution are not wholly reflected in the approved wholesale country prices. The allowance made by the PSA in its price for the country, which amount that is allowed, it is argued by the oil companies and, I believe, conceded by the PSA, is not sufficient enough to cover the extra costs involved in the distribution and sale of petrol in country areas.

In the past some oil companies that are not represented in country areas to any extent have used their cost advantage to cut metropolitan wholesale prices to the detriment of companies that need the metropolitan subsidy to support their country operations. In general, the reason for the wide variation between retail prices in the metropolitan and country areas is the frequent periods of heavy discounting that take place in the metropolitan area.

The periods of discounting are not sustained indefinitely, however, as both the oil companies and resellers suffer losses at such times. To add to the variation in prices, retail competition in country areas is much less intense, and so country resellers are able to obtain higher money margins that serve to offset their longer trading hours and lower sales volume. In essence, higher prices prevail in country areas because of higher operating costs and lower turnover, less competition at the wholesale level and little competition at the retail level.

*The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** There is a wholesale price which is similar and to which in country areas there is added the freight differential that I have mentioned. So, the wholesale price established by the PSA is fixed for South Australia with a supplement in country areas and an addi-

tional amount can be charged by the oil companies, depending on which country area one is talking about, in the manner I have just outlined.

*The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member says the oil companies give rebates in the city. They give rebates in the city in order to meet competition in the city. It is not always the competition which is started by the oil companies in the city. In fact, it is generally conceded in the industry that in recent times competition in the metropolitan area has been led by independents who own their own sites, who are aggressive competitors. They wish to increase their own share and are comprised of people like Mr Skorpos, and Mr Nemer. They want 24-hour trading, they are willing to discount and compete. They get from their oil companies better terms and conditions because they have high volume and because they own their own site and have put in a significant capital investment on that site. The oil companies argue that in that competitive environment they have to provide rebates to the dealers in the metropolitan area. The fact is that the competition that occurs in the metropolitan area does not occur in country areas.

It does not occur in the country areas because retailers generally need a higher retail margin and, as I say, they generally do not discount to the extent that discounting occurs in the metropolitan area. That is the basic reason for the disparity between the general level of petrol prices in the metropolitan area and in country areas. Even if one concedes that the honourable member has a point, and obviously this matter has exercised the Government's mind over a considerable period of time (just as it exercised the previous Government's mind over a considerable period of time), the question is, if it is conceded that some action is to be taken, what action do you take. As I understand it, the honourable member is in effect suggesting that Parliament pass legislation to fix the price of petrol in the metropolitan area and in the country areas, in other words, to remove competition from the market place.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** Do you think that would be popular?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** It certainly would not be popular in the metropolitan area.

**The Hon. M.J. Elliott:** Lower the wholesale price.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member says, 'Lower the wholesale price'. That is the simple solution. The oil companies would then say, 'If the wholesale price is lowered, we have a certain capital investment in South Australia; we are not getting a sufficient return on that capital investment; we are over capitalised in your State and in Australia as a whole; we have an excess of refining capacity in Australia; therefore, we will have to review our capital investment in South Australia.' That also has a flow off in relation to jobs and the like. If that is the honourable member's solution, he can put it forward. However, I can assure him that the PSA has been established to examine the wholesale price based on submissions from not just the oil companies but from consumers and retailers, and based on the profitability of oil companies, their costs and what is considered to be a reasonable return on their investment; and the PSA has set the price that we have at the present time. If the honourable member wants to suggest that we should cut the wholesale price, he must also contend with the question of investment policies in this State that the oil companies may have and whether they might change those policies.

**The Hon. M.J. Elliott:** You could reduce the excise.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member says that we could reduce the excise, but that would not reduce the differential between country and city prices. The hon-

ourable member's suggestion would result in a cut in wholesale prices. That did occur for a short period in this State, but it did not resolve the differential between country and city prices—discounting continued in the city but did not occur in the country. The honourable member has interjected with a number of solutions, but they all lead into a blind alley. If the honourable member has a better idea, fine. However, in the ultimate analysis he is saying that the metropolitan consumer should subsidise the country consumer.

**The Hon. M.J. Elliott:** That's not it. It is the other way around.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member's solution would have the metropolitan consumer subsidising the country consumer, and there is no question about that. I am quite happy for the honourable member to peruse the PSA reports on the analyses that have been done on whether or not the price allowed by the PSA for the oil companies in the country covers their distribution costs. The evidence to date has been that it does not. It may be that for discounting that continues over a long time the honourable member's suggestion may be correct for a period of time. That is not necessarily a permanent situation, in any event.

The honourable member wants to reverse that situation. That is the only solution which will allow metropolitan consumers to subsidise the country. Quite simply, the honourable member's proposition would lead to a significant increase in the price of petrol in the metropolitan area, and there is no doubt about that. I am quite happy for that to be argued with the honourable member anywhere at any time. I can assure the honourable member that the possible solutions that he has put forward (not that he has offered many, and all of which I am fully aware) all lead him into a blind alley.

The only way out of it is for the honourable member to fix prices, which will increase the price to metropolitan consumers. I am interested to see that apparently that is the Hon. Mr Elliott's policy, and I assume that it is endorsed by his colleague, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan. So, the Democrat policy is to increase petrol prices for metropolitan consumers.

*The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** It is not, because you have no other choice, if the honourable member wishes to advocate that position. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Burdett, who sat in the chair as Minister of Consumer Affairs for three years, would wholeheartedly endorse what I am saying on this topic. The differentials are a matter for concern. The level of discounting is a matter of concern, and perhaps we need to do something about examining the number of sites. That is being examined by the ad hoc committee that I have already referred to in this Chamber and which is chaired by the Hon. Geoff Virgo.

The Hon. Mr Irwin referred to the question of privatisation and advocated a policy of privatisation. For a country member, once again, he is going to find himself very much on a cleft stick in advocating a policy of privatisation. The fact is that most of the public utilities such as ETSA and the E&WS involve a significant subsidy to country consumers. If you privatise them, the subsidies are not available. You get back to a strict 'user pays' principle and, if that occurs (which apparently the honourable member is advocating), that would further disadvantage the people that he purports to represent.

I am sure that with privatisation, as with deregulation, there are two sides to the story—particularly for country people. One of the most interesting things that we will see over the next three years is the Liberal Party nationally and the National Party attempting to resolve what are basically irreconcilable differences between on the one hand the How-

ard free trading group in the Liberal Party and, on the other hand, the National Party which of course wants more subsidies and does not necessarily support deregulation of interest rates and the like (all of which are free market Liberal Party policies). One will see a very interesting exercise over the next two years as the Liberal Party and the National Party attempt to patch up what are really fundamental irreconcilable differences over issues such as that between the traditional free marketeers like Mr Howard and the National Party people who are becoming increasingly disillusioned with deregulation and with so called free marketing policies.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** It will be just as interesting in the next few years to see the battle between the centre left and the progressive left.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** That is an irrelevant interjection. There is a quite reasonable accommodation between the various sections of the Labor Party which make up our—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** You got rolled the other day.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not a member of any faction, so I do not get rolled. If I was personally defeated, that would be something to be very concerned about. I can assure members that the accommodation between the factions in the Labor Party is much more amicable than the current uneasy alliance within the Liberal Party between the free marketeer Howard and those who wish for a more sensible policy, such as Mr Macphee. Then we have the problem between the Liberal Party and the National Party, so we have a split within the Liberal Party itself and a problem between the Liberal Party and the National Party.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** There's your faction versus the left.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member is very ill informed about what factions there are in the Labor Party and about my position. I am not a member of a faction. The Hon. Mr Hill is wrong.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** You're a supporter of Bannon.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Yes, I am a very strong supporter of the Premier, and the interesting thing about the Premier is that not only do I support him but, according to the last opinion poll, a majority of Liberal voters in this State support him. I suggest to the honourable member that if he has any brains he will get with the strength and also indicate that he supports the Premier.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** The trouble is that you do not have very many supporters on your own side, if you look around at the numbers.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not sure what that comment is meant to indicate.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** It means that you've got more left wing supporters on your side of this House than you have moderates like yourself.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I see. But I have already said that I am not in any faction.

*The Hon. C.M. Hill: interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I have so far. I will mind my future: I am sure that I have a much longer future in politics than the Hon. Mr Hill.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** Look at Mr Jacobi. He didn't join any faction and now he has to get out.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** That is not true.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** On which side is the Hon. Miss Wiese?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The Hon. Miss Wiese has declared herself.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** On which side is she?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** She can speak for herself at the appropriate time. I understand that the Hon. Murray Hill has declared himself, too: he is part of the Macphee

faction of the Liberal Party—the Robert-Hill-Macphee group. They are the wets.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** I am not a member of the Macphee faction, but Macphee is a first rate politician.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I agree with that. I think that Mr Macphee has some very sensible ideas, as opposed to some other members in your Party of whom one could be very critical.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** I am just trying to help you by warning you to look over your shoulder.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Madam President, I thought interjections were out of order.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** They are all sitting on the back bench waiting their chance.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I will only be worried when they start crossing the floor and voting against me. That has not happened yet, and I do not envisage it happening in the near future. May I return to the sensible comments made by some honourable members during the Address in Reply debate, and leave aside the Hon. Mr Hill's fairly inane interjections.

Dealing with the question raised by the Hon. Mr Burdett on regulations and subordinate legislation, one can only agree with his sentiments that we must always remain vigilant and that we do not pass legislation that leads to too much regulation, but the fact is that over a period of years—taking it in the historical context—as a society becomes more complex, if you are going to introduce legislation which involves regulation of more and more complex areas, then naturally more and more matters will be dealt with by regulations than has been the case in the past or, indeed, in the last century or in the early part of this century.

That does not mean we should be complacent about it, and I agree that we should keep a careful watch on the extent to which we are legislating by regulation, but the honourable member knows that there is parliamentary control over regulations. The role of the Subordinate Legislation Committee will be examined as part of the review the Government intends to carry out on the committee system of the Parliament, as we pledged to do during the last Parliament.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** It hasn't got any teeth.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I said that we are examining the role of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. We pledged to examine the role of committees in the last Parliament and we will pursue that this time, but no longer through the vehicle of that Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Reform that was thwarted by actions of Liberal members in another place, who simply would not respond to any of the propositions put forward.

The Hon. Mr Griffin raised the question of suppression orders. My only answer to his comment on that is that the report which led to legislation on suppression orders, passed in Parliament about two years ago, was prepared after a period of public debate and submission. I believe that the two years since the passage of that legislation do not indicate such problems with it as to justify a further review at this time of the law relating to suppression orders. Obviously, again that is an area that needs to be kept under review.

With respect to domestic violence and matters raised by the Hon. Miss Laidlaw, may I say that that is an issue of great concern to the Government. The Government is addressing it in a number of ways but, in particular, through the establishment of the Domestic Violence Council, who will come up with a comprehensive set of recommendations later this year that will, I am sure, also involve some legislative action and law reform just as, indeed, will the task force on child abuse which has been established by the Government and which will report later this year.

The Hon. Mr Davis raised the question on electoral redistribution and the fact that redistribution will not now take place as often as they did previously when we had three-year Parliaments. That is a matter that may need to be examined at some stage, although I would suggest at this time it is somewhat premature. One would have expected that, no matter what electoral system one has, at least we will have two elections on existing boundaries.

I think there is a case for some degree of stability in the boundaries that are established, to avoid confusion of the voters and to enable members to identify with their electorates over a reasonable period of time, so I do not see it as an immediate difficulty. I think it is something that may need to be examined after the next election, if the disparity in populations of electorate districts gets too great.

There was one problem, from the honourable member's point of view, if he wants to change it, and that is that these provisions are entrenched in the South Australian Constitution Act and would require a referendum to change. The only other way of getting a redistribution is to change the size of the House of Assembly: increase or decrease the numbers. That can also provoke government redistribution. The honourable member's point is known to the Government, but I do not believe that any action is needed on that at this stage. It may need to be examined after the next election.

*The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not in a position to comment categorically on that interjection, except to say that the time between redistributions has been lengthened as a result of the extensions of the House of Assembly term from three to four years, but I do not see that it is something that needs to be addressed immediately.

Whatever redistribution system exists one would expect that there would be at least two elections under each set of boundaries and, I suppose, in a stable world one could anticipate three elections as being not unreasonable under the one set of boundaries. As I have said previously, I do not see this as an immediate matter for concern and it may be something that the Parliament has to address in due course.

The Hon. Mr Lucas, in his contribution today, mentioned a number of matters that I will address briefly. First was the matter of freedom of information legislation. That is something that is desirable and the Government does not wish to resile from that proposition. However, there is no doubt that freedom of information legislation in the Commonwealth Parliament and in Victoria has caused certain problems, not necessarily in its administration but mainly in the cost that is imposed on the Government and therefore on the taxpayer to implement that legislation.

That is a matter that really needs to be very carefully considered. When one is looking at whether there should be more money for schools, hospitals or other issues (or, indeed, whether there should be tax cuts) one has to weigh up what priority should be given to freedom of information legislation. There is a review under way at the moment in the Federal Parliament by the Senate Select Committee on Constitutional and Legal Affairs on freedom of information legislation. There is also a review being carried out by the Federal Attorney-General, Mr Bowen, and I understand that the matter is also being examined in Victoria. The principal difficulty is one of cost and cost effectiveness. I do not wish to resile from the principle of freedom of information as being desirable, but if we are to implement it then we must ensure that we are doing it in the most cost effective way possible.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** You won't follow the timetable you set out last year?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** That timetable involved some administrative action in the next two or three months. The matter will be re-examined and I have asked my officers to examine the proposal again in the light of the experience in the Federal Parliament, and in the Victorian Parliament in an attempt to ascertain what can be done to get effective freedom of information legislation without imposing the sorts of administrative burdens and costs that have resulted in the other States: the matter has not been shelved.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** The other problem you have is that your records systems are a shambles and could not cope with freedom of information.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not sure whether or not that is correct. The record systems are not that bad. The Government seems to work quite efficiently with a minimum of problems from that point of view.

Nevertheless, I merely wanted to respond to the honourable member. I have asked for freedom of information principles to be examined in the light of what has happened in the eastern States with a view to having it implemented, but whilst making every attempt to reduce the burdens that are involved in that legislation.

The Hon. Mr Lucas mentioned standing committees of the Legislative Council. I repeat that the Government is committed to examining the role of parliamentary committees between now and August and a proposition will be put to the Parliament then for a revamping of the Committee system. Whether or not there should be a grievance debate in the Legislative Council is also something that honourable members may wish to consider through the Standing Orders Committee between now and August. They are the only specific matters that I wish to address. I once again commend all honourable members who made their first contribution to the Address in Reply debate and look forward to their further deliberations in this Council during the period of their parliamentary term.

Motion carried.

**The PRESIDENT:** I inform the Council that his Excellency the Governor has appointed 3.30 next Tuesday day afternoon as the time for the presentation of the Address in Reply to him by this Council.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 25 February at 2.15 p.m.