LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 1 March 1990

The PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

PINNAROO AREA SCHOOL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question about Pinnaroo Area School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Members will recall the raging debate that has been conducted for many months about the future of the secondary section of the Pinnaroo Area School. As members will be aware, the Bannon Government has decided to close the secondary section of the Pinnaroo Area School. As a result of that decision, at the start of the 1990 school year a number of families in the Pinnaroo area decided to send their children across the South Australian-Victorian border to the Murrayville school, rather than to the designated South Australian school at Lameroo.

Members might also be aware that the Minister of Education and the Director-General of Education evidently petitioned the Victorian Minister of Education (Ms Joan Kirner) to take a policy decision not to accept further South Australian students in the Victorian school at Murrayville. Members might not be aware that the question of schools on the border between South Australia and Victoria—not just at Pinnaroo and Murrayville but in a number of areas in the South-East and in other parts of South Australia—has been resolved relatively satisfactorily over a number of years through sensible compromise between the Victorian Ministry of Education and the South Australian Department of Education.

For example, a good number of Victorian students attend schools in areas like Penola in the South-East, in the Nelson area of the Lower South-East and I also believe at Bordertown and in one or two other areas as well, without any problem whatsoever. In many cases it is because they may be closer to the South Australian school than the Victorian school, or they may prefer the type of education provided at the South Australian school rather than at the Victorian school.

As I said, that sensible compromise has been maintained for many years in respect of education in schools in areas on the border between South Australia and Victoria. My questions to the Minister, representing the Minister of Education, are:

1. Will the Minister provide figures of the number of students attending South Australian schools near the South Australia-Victoria border who currently reside in Victoria and who attend South Australian schools, and vice versa?

2. Is the Minister or his department currently considering placing similar bans on students residing in Victoria from attending South Australian schools?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

BUILDING INDEMNITY INSURANCE

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about building indemnity insurance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: A Mr and Mrs Driver of Moana South are having a rather traumatic experience with the building of a new house at Strathalbyn. The matter is complex, but I will endeavour to outline the main aspects of the problem. Mr and Mrs Driver have retired. Their house at Moana South was too big for them and they could no longer keep up their mortgage payments to a building society because of high interest rates. They owned a block of land at Strathalbyn and arranged in June 1988 with a builder, Huxholl and Reiss Pty Ltd, to build a smaller house on it. The foundations were laid in December 1988—15 months ago. They did not sell their Moana house because they had to have somewhere to live whilst their new house was being built, but they planned to sell their house as soon as the Strathalbyn house was completed—within something like nine months.

They have so far paid $11 000 to the builder for what was meant to pass for work, but which is a disaster. In addition, they paid something like $5 000 for experts' reports, and a similar amount in legal fees. The brick walls were a disaster and, as a result of pressure on the builder, those walls were demolished and rebuilt. The major problem was that the concrete slab had no wet areas, notwithstanding that they were provided for on the plan. The sewerage and drainage outlets were in the wrong places and the slab was laid in the wrong place on the site.

Subsequent consultation with the local council now indicates that the council does not even know what plans it approved prior to the slab being laid. As the first lot of brickwork was being rebuilt, the builder jackhammered into the slab to relocate drainage and sewerage outlets, and that is a mess. Still those outlets do not line up with the original plan. The brickwork which has been redone is quite shoddy. No-one knows whether the builder did this so-called repair work on the slab correctly, but the builder is now broke and in liquidation.

The South Australian Health Commission was invited to become involved, and its report is that the only solution to the problem is to bulldoze the slab, clear the site, and start again, as is the recommendation of other experts. A claim has been made on the housing indemnity insurance cover required to be taken out under the Builders Licensing Act, but in negotiations with the insurer it was discovered that the cost of clearing the site and starting afresh in order to put the Drivers back into a reasonable position with minimal loss will not be met.

The building society with which they have been dealing has been very supportive but, because the matter has been dragging on for such a long time, and because the date for capitalisation of interest has long since passed, the building society now feels that it has to take some action, which may well be the sale of the property over which it has security. The Drivers are desperate. They have been to see me and other members of Parliament on several occasions. I am told that they now have to obtain food from the local church because they have not been able to afford anything else. I am also told that they are selling their furniture to meet day-to-day urgent expenses. They had difficulty getting legal aid because they own two properties, despite being heavily in debt. They now finally have some legal aid.

The housing indemnity insurance will not pay out in full. The Drivers are almost broke after 18 months of trauma, and there seems to be a real impasse. They are desperate to have something done to help them solve their major problems, as no-one seems to be prepared to take a decision. Also, there needs to be a review of the way in which the whole indemnity system is operating.

The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs was consulted, but I understand that it said that there was really nothing it could do to help—something which I am somewhat surprised about. Will the Minister intervene in this matter as a matter or urgency and sort out the mess as quickly as possible in order to ensure that the Drivers are not in a position of becoming homeless and potentially bankrupt?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Certainly, the circumstances that the honourable member outlines present a very sorry picture, to say the least. If it is true that these people have approached the number of people that the honourable member says, and have not been able to achieve a satisfactory outcome to solve their problem, then it is certainly a matter that concerns me. I am not aware of any approaches that have been made to the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs on this matter, but I will certainly refer it to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and seek an urgent report with a view to doing whatever is possible to resolve the situation.

TAXI INDUSTRY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about the taxi industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yesterday the Minister of Transport decreed that the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board must act in the next few weeks to eliminate any regulations which do not cover safety and service issues. Essentially the Liberal Party supports the objective that the Minister outlined but not the Minister's ultimatum. Last year the board circulated among taxi operators draft regulations which aim to phase out the board's policing role and to provide the industry with a degree of self-regulation.

However, for these regulations to be enacted and to be effective in the longer term it will require an acceptance by the industry that it is able and prepared to take greater responsibility for its own regulation and administration. Notwithstanding the Minister's grandstanding, to date the industry has not been prepared to take this important step.

However, my discussions in recent days have also determined that industry regulations are not the only issue of concern amongst operators. The members of the industry are angry at the Minister of Transport's lack of action and resolve in issuing the 20 new taxi licences promised by former Minister Keneally in September 1988, some 18 months ago.

As small business people with large sums invested in their taxi operations, they are waiting anxiously for the Minister to take a positive decision on the number of licences to be issued in the short and long term. Yet another issue of concern is the fate of the taxi board itself and whether or not the Bannon Government will accept the recommendation in the Fielding reort that the board be dissolved with its functions to be incorporated under a new structure, the Metropolitan Transport Authority. My questions are:

1. Does the Minister accept that it would be irresponsible for the taxicab board to propose effective new regulations within the next few weeks confined to issues of safety and service until the industry itself has resolved to accept a greater degree of self-regulation?

2. When, if ever, does the Minister plan to honour the promise some 18 months ago of former Minister Keneally to issue 20 new taxi licences?

3. Does the Government intend to act on the Fielding recommendation to disband the taxicab board and to transfer all or part of its functions to a new structure, the Metropolitan Transport Authority, or is it the Minister's intention, as suggested in the *Advertiser* today, that the functions of the boad be taken over by the present Department of Road Transport?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The PRESIDENT: For members' information, in the Gallery we have a Miss D. Carter, a Senator from the State of Iowa in the United States. We wish her a very pleasant stay.

TRAIN FUMES

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Environment and Planning a question about train fumes at the ASER complex.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Members may recall when on 27 February 1986 my predecessor, the Hon. Murray Hill, asked the Attorney-General a question about the possible problem of train fumes being expelled from the ventilation system within the railway station complex. On 25 March 1986, the Attorney-General brought back a reply indicating that the diesel exhaust fumes from the railway station at the nearest air-conditioning system air intake on the ASER site were approximately only 7 per cent of the maximum level allowed by the Australian Department of Health. He further advised that the readings of the contaminant levels were based on the worst situation, which was with 31 class 3000 railcars in the station and with prevailing westerly winds. An article, which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on 25 February 1990, described how toxic exhaust fumes from the railway station were affecting South Australian Housing Trust workers in the Riverside office complex. They suffered headaches, dizziness, nausea, watery eyes and other symptoms. My questions therefore are as follows:

1. Did the Department of Environment and Planning obtain a copy of the tests and other reports on the levels and flow of discharge patterns and the predicted threshold limits from the atmospheric contaminants generated by all activities within the ASER complex as they affected the Riverside office complex, before building approval was granted?

2. If the department failed to obtain such a report, why did the Minister give approval, particularly as the Government would have been aware of the existing emission exhaust fumes generated at the ASER site?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

MULTICULTURALISM

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, a question about multiculturalism and the law.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Last year the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, launched the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia: 'Sharing our Future'. This document outlines the Commonwealth Government's multicultural policies and goals, and a series of policy initiatives. One of the proposed initiatives is an inquiry by the Australian Law Reform Commission into multiculturalism and the law. The Law Reform Commission will review and report on:

(1) Whether the following laws to which the Law Reform Commission Act 1973 applies, namely:

(a) laws that relate to marriage, divorce and matrimonial causes, parental rights and obligations and the custody and guardianship of children, including the Marriage Act 1961 and the Family Law Act 1975;

(b) laws relating to the formation and performance of contracts, and in particular the Trade Practices Act 1974 and the Insurance Contracts Act 1984;

(c) laws creating offences;

are appropriate to a society made up of people from differing cultural backgrounds and from ethnically diverse communities;

(2) and any related matter.

The Law Reform Commission has produced the first of four discussion papers on its terms of reference (*Multiculturalism and the Law*, Issue Paper 9, January 1990). This paper has been widely circulated for comment by 1 May 1990. It is obvious that many members of ethnic communities will be interested in this important inquiry.

Many immigrants have entered into contracts by signing documents in English of which they have not understood a word. Hopefully, this inquiry will lead to greater equity for immigrants as consumers. Similarly, many immigrants who have been involved in divorce proceedings have had to face a devastating cultural shock in the Family Court. For some, the court does not seem to respect or understand their values and their religious beliefs regarding the custody of their children, maintenance or division of property. In the area of criminal law, there is a widespread belief among ethnic communities that some immigrants are disadvantaged because of ethnic stereotyping and unfounded assumptions about the level of crime among some groups.

This inquiry into multiculturalism and the law will explore the extent to which the law, without sacrificing fundamental human rights, can take adequate account of cultural diversity. Unfortunately, members of the ethnic community who hold strong convictions on these matters will find it too difficult to present their views to the inquiry, partly because of the complexity of the laws being investigated and partly because of English language difficulties. Therefore, it is important that the State Government take an active role in ensuring that well documented and comprehensive submissions are made to this inquiry. My questions are:

1. Has the Minister taken any measures to ensure that the State Government responds to the inquiry by the Law Reform Commission into multiculturalism and the law?

2. What is the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission doing to ensure that a comprehensive submission is made to the multiculturalism and the law inquiry?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I appreciate and welcome the initiatives of the Federal Government, following the release last year by the Prime Minister of the Agenda for a Multicultural Australia, to refer to the Australian Law Reform Commission the question of multiculturalism and the law. A number of issues have been raised with respect to this matter over a number of years. In South Australia, members may be aware that we have legislated to provide a right to an interpreter in police interrogations and in court proceedings. That is something that we were the first in Australia to do, but that is only one small aspect of multiculturalism or migrants and the law.

A number of other issues have been discussed in the past but I now welcome the opportunity that the Australian Law Reform Commission is giving for a more comprehensive consideration of the issue of the legal system and multiculturalism, as I said, at the instigation of the Prime Minister following the release of the Agenda for a Multicultural Australia. I will examine the discussion paper put out by the Australian Law Reform Commission. I understand that the Minister of Ethnic Affairs has arranged for a small group within the Ethnic Affairs Commission and other Government departments to consider the paper and respond to it. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague to enable him to bring back a more comprehensive reply if he feels that is warranted.

GLOBE '90

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question relating to the conference Globe '90.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have been advised that the South Australian Government was approached in September by a firm called Scott & Furphy Pty Ltd from Melbourne—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: If members listen, they will find out about the furphy. They can keep their humour until later. The point of the contact was to invite the South Australian Government to become involved in Globe '90, which is a joint conference and trade fair to be held in Vancouver in March this year. This conference is being sponsored by the Government of Canada and many other world figures and representatives. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, had this to say about the Globe '90 conference:

> The World Commission on Environment and Development has challenged all nations of the world to recognise the link between our global economy and the environment so that, together, we can progress toward a secure future through sustainable development. Globe '90 is Canada's way of inviting the world to join in our pursuit of a global economy/environment framework which traverses traditional boundaries between industry, finance, academic and management disciplines, and governments.

The Chairman of Globe '90, who is the Speaker of the House of Commons in Canada, states:

> At the heart of this challenge is the shift from an emphasis on environmental restoration to planning for prevention of ecological damage as the solutions to environmental issues become more complex. This shift is resulting in a growing demand for the products, services and technologies needed to meet the sustainable development challenge. Private enterprise, in particular, has the flexibility to respond quickly to this demand.

There will be 2 000 delegates from 50 countries, many of them from an area near to Australia comprising the Pacific islands, the Philippines and Singapore. The conference will concentrate on the Asia Pacific regions. That will be highlighted. The brochure illustrates the sorts of matters that will be dealt with at this conference, involving the development of new industries, and what is described over and over again as the emergence of sustainable development in the world as we move away from environmentally polluting industry. Globe '90 has on its advisory panel Senator Graham Richardson, Minister of the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories of Australia and representatives from Europe and America.

I have been advised that the request for the Government to participate was rejected. It was dealt with by the Department of State Development and Technology. This is despite the fact that the Bannon Government has said specifically that it wants to move towards sustainable development,

with its aim to become involved with the area close to Australia, the Asia Pacific basin zone, both of which are highlighted in Globe '90 with a world forum.

I ask the Attorney-General: Was the Government aware of the invitation to participate in this conference and, in view of the Government's statement that it wished to become involved in sustainable development and its interest in the Asia Pacific area, why did the Bannon Government ignore the invitation to South Australia to participate in the conference Globe '90?

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

SPENCER GULF POLLUTION

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Fisheries, a question about pollution in Spencer Gulf.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: This morning on the news from Port Pirie was a report from a Dr Knight who alleged that 200 tonnes of lead and zinc have been poured into Spencer Gulf. He also alleged that other pollution has been poured into St Vincent's Gulf from the city of Adelaide. Spencer Gulf is a very important part of the South Australian fishery, with some 1 600 tonnes of prawns, valued at about $12 per kilogram, 25 tonnes of snapper, and considerable amounts of whiting and other fish being caught in that gulf. My questions are: has the Department of Fisheries been monitoring lead and zinc levels in fish in Spencer Gulf and, if not, does it intend to do so? If it does, will details of those levels be reported to Parliament?

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

HOMESURE SCHEME

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Housing and Construction, a question about advertising of the Homesure scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Yesterday a rather remarkable media release emanated from the office of Kym Mayes, Minister of Housing and Construction, in which he expressed concern, 'that thousands of South Australians are not taking advantage of home mortgage relief funding through Homesure'. He further stated:

> And the blame for this situation must be shouldered by the Liberal Opposition who have put out a constant stream of misinformation about Homesure. In fact, the confusion created by the Liberals has led a number of South Australians to believe that Homesure is no longer in operation.

In fact, for Mr Mayes to claim that the disappointing response to the Homesure scheme is the fault of the Liberal Party is a little like North Adelaide blaming the goal umpires for its losing last year's grand final.

This morning I contacted people in financial institutions and the advertising industry to discuss with them the proposal to increase advertising for the Homesure scheme. I must say that leaders in the housing industry are surprised that the State Government is spending $36 000 on a Buspak advertising campaign to promote Homesure. One person in a financial institution said to me that the benefits of Buspak advertising will simply not be as effective as writing directly to families who may be eligible for benefits. In other words, there is more than a suspicion that the Government is using Buspak not so much to benefit families in deep distress from housing interest rates and who will get a passing glance at a very important message as it goes by on a bus, but rather to benefit its own battered image in relation to the Homesure scheme by publicly parading that it is doing something about it.

I have spoken to members of both financial institutions handling the housing loans and advertising firms who agree that the State Government's initial advertising budget of $50 000 to promote Homesure was ridiculously low. It was pitifully inadequate and a drop in a bucket, given that the Premier, Mr Bannon, had claimed that $36 million would be distributed to families in the first year of the Homesure scheme.

Everyone to whom I have spoken agrees that, if the Government was serious about promoting Homesure, it would have not used Buspak but written directly to families who could have benefited from Homesure using the financial institutions involved, and hopefully compensating those institutions for the administrative costs involved. I believe the costs of that initiative (in other words, writing directly to families who may have benefited from Homesure) could have been the same or very little more than the palpably ineffective proposed Buspak advertising campaign. My question to the Minister is a simple one. Why has the Government refused to make direct contact with families who could have benefited from the Homesure scheme?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

MARINE POLLUTION

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister for Environment and Planning, a question about marine pollution.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I also heard the radio program referred to by the honourable member in an earlier question. Mr John King made a number of serious allegations about marine pollution in South Australia. I have on a couple of occasions previously raised some of those allegations in this Council. The allegations cover the Broken Hill and Associated Smelters which, I understand, is discharging about one tonne of heavy metals a day into Spencer Gulf. There have been allegations that Port Adelaide sewage works is directly responsible for the red tides that have occurred in the area periodically; that various sewage works are responsible for the degredation of seagrass beds; and that we still have raw sewage discharged into the sea at Port Lincoln. Also, there have been allegations in respect of Lake Bonney.

Mr John King was in fact hired by the Department of Environment and Planning back in 1984 for one specific purpose, that was, to draft marine pollution legislation. In fact, he did prepare one draft that was largely kyboshed, as I understand it, by senior members of his own department. He protested strongly and I know that that caused a few waves around the place. It had two effects: first, he was moved out of the department and, secondly, draft legislation was eventually approved by Cabinet and we now see that in the Parliament. Mr King now complains that the legislation is totally inadequate to cope with the sorts of problems that we have in South Australia.

I have today spoken with several members of the media, who inform me that the Minister is telling them that this

fellow is a loony. That is certainly one way of coping with people who criticise the Government, I guess: a job of character assasination is being done at present on Mr King.

In one of the questions I asked I raised matters that were also raised by the Hon. Mr Dunn about fish in the Spencer Gulf area. I asked specifically what tests were being carried out on certain species of fish. At that time the then Minister (Hon. Dr Cornwall) assured me that he would come back with a reply. I have pulled my files apart and have found no reply to that question about testing being done on fish, although there was mention in the local paper at the time that the Department of Fisheries was going to do a study. I have no awareness of the release of such studies subsequent to that. Therefore, I ask the Minister the following questions:

1. What has happened to these tests that were being done on fish in the area?

2. Are we to expect that character assasinations are to be perpetrated on anyone who tries to bring to the public knowledge that should have been readily available to it, anyway?

3. Will the Minister take a close look at some of the senior public servants who placed obstructions in the way of this marine pollution legislation for about six years before it was finally introduced into this Parliament?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the Local Government Department.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Some time ago my attention was drawn to an advertisement in the *Advertiser* of 9 December 1989 calling for applications for the Director, Local Government Division, Local Government Department. The advertisement states:

> The Local Government Division's role is to promote, establish and monitor, within the framework of Government policy, a local government system which meets community needs and the demands for local government services in a responsive and effective manner.
>
> We are seeking a person with innovation, adaptability and proven management skills, who is able to join the corporate team in providing new directions in the establishment of policies and programs in local government issues.
>
> The successful applicant will direct and manage the Local Government Division, think conceptually, develop and implement innovative and constructive policies, practices and procedures to ensure efficient and effective achievement of Government and departmental objectives.

There are one or two other long paragraphs that I need not quote, but in none of the wording is there any mention of what local government itself needs, or what the people want. Certainly, there is reference to a local government system that meets community needs, but the emphasis in this advertisement is clearly on what the Government wants from local government, for instance, providing new directions, the establishment of policies, and the development and implementation of practices and procedures to ensure effective achievement by Government departments of their objectives. The Department of Local Government seems to have a number of directors, deputy directors and managers. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Has the position of Director of the Local Government Division been filled and, if so, by whom, and what are his or her qualifications and experience?

2. What is the structure now in the senior positions of her Department of Local Government?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The position has been filled. I presume that all the paperwork has gone through, but I certainly was informed that, as a result of the interviews held last week, the selection panel was unanimous in deciding on an applicant. The position was filled by Mr Rudi Roodenrys. I can obtain detailed information on his qualifications if the honourable member so wishes that. I am sure that the honourable member would be aware that Mr Roodenrys has acted in the position and has proven himself competent in this duties in the department over a long period.

The detailed structure of the department has been changed in recent times with a reallocation of responsibilities and lines of communication to ensure even greater efficiency and performance by members of the department. Obviously, I do not have that detailed plan with me, but I am sure that such information can be made available.

The Hon. J.C. Irwin interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have not seen one. As to some of the comments made by the honourable member, it is quite wrong of him to criticise the comprehensive and thorough advertisement that was placed in the press prior to filling this important position. The Local Government Department is a department of the South Australian Public Service and, as such, its function is to service the Government and to implement Government policy. It would be quite erroneous for the honourable member to suggest that it had any other function. Certainly, Government policy is to cooperate with local government throughout the State for the benefit of the people of South Australia. As such, the department has that as one of its roles, but to imply that positions within the department should be in some way responsible to the Local Government Association or any of its constituents seems to be a totally erroneous understanding of how our Westminster system of government functions.

The Local Government Department, for which I am responsible, is part of the South Australian Government Public Service, and its responsibilities are to fulfil Government policy in relation to matters dealing with local government, and that certainly includes cooperation and working with the LGA and local government throughout the State. It is a totally unnecessary slur and criticism to suggest that the advertisement is other than proper and very much what should be placed in an advertisement for a position such this.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the National Crime Authority (NCA).

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Over recent weeks both the Attorney-General and the Premier have stated that, in relation to the NCA investigations of allegations relating to the Attorney-General, the NCA would not report to the Attorney-General but would report to the Premier through a senior officer, Mr Bruce Guerin, in the Premier's Department. In all other matters relating to NCA references it was to continue to report to the Attorney-General. I have been advised by a source close to the NCA that a written communication from the NCA marked 'confidential' has been sent in the past two to three weeks to Mr Guerin. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Has the Attorney-General had any discussions with the Premier or Mr Guerin about this written communication from the NCA and, if so, what was the nature of those discussions?

2. Why has not the Premier or the Attorney-General revealed publicly this correspondence from the NCA?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not know to what correspondence the honourable member is referring. For the honourable member to suggest that all items of correspondence that go from the NCA to the South Australian Government should be revealed publicly is ridiculous. For a Leader of the Opposition—a would-be Minister if the Party opposite won government—to suggest that reflects on his understanding of how government operates.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Do you deny it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute! The notion that the Government should announce every item of correspondence that it gets from the NCA to the public as soon as it is received is ridiculous. I would have thought that the Hon. Mr Lucas might understand that. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Griffin would understand it. Often communications between the NCA and government, the police and government and others are very sensitive matters that could affect law enforcement in the State, the reputation of individuals and so on. The notion that simply because the NCA sends a letter to the Government it should be made public is an astonishing proposition from the Leader of the Opposition. Still, he is the Leader of the Opposition and apparently enough of his colleagues opposite thought that he should become the Leader of the Opposition in this State.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: He's the only one who stood.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Ms Laidlaw says that he was the only one who stood. That bit of information might be of interest to the Parliament or to the media. Whether or not he was the only one who stood in the final analysis is probably beside the point. I suspect that others would have liked the job had they been able to get the numbers such as the Hon. Trevor Griffin who was Leader of the Liberal Party in this place for three years. The Hon. Mr Cameron was also Leader, and I am sure that they would have aspired to the position.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Answer the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am answering the question. First, I am answering the question by saying that the proposition put by the person you have elected to be your Leader, that every item of correspondence from the NCA to the Government should be made public, is ludicrous.

As to the other letter to which the Leader referred, I will have to make inquiries and ascertain whether such a letter exists and, if so, to what it relates.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have had no discussions?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have had a number of discussions with many people in relation to NCA matters over time.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I understand the situation, the Leader did not say in his question that the letter was in relation to matters that I had referred to the NCA allegedly related to me. He asked whether there was a letter marked 'confidential'.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: To Bruce Guerin?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Frankly, I do not know—I would have to check. I have certainly seen correspondence addressed to Mr Guerin, but not in relation to matters involving me. I do not know to which letter the Leader is referring or indeed whether there is such a letter. However, I will make inquiries and bring back a reply.

FESTIVAL CENTRE CAR PARKING

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Has the Minister for the Arts an answer to a question that I asked on 22 February about Festival Centre car parking?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am delighted to be able to tell the honourable member that the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust has approached the Army and has obtained agreement from it for the Torrens parade ground to be available during the Adelaide Festival of Arts for daytime use during Writers Week and for evening use for the period 5 to 16 March inclusive. Unfortunately, the ground is already committed for other uses on the remaining dates in the evening during the Adelaide Festival (on 1, 2, 3, 4, 17 and 18 March). The Festival Centre Trust will be advising patrons on the availability of the parade ground in general Festival advertising. I am sure that this will make quite a difference to the people who wish to attend Festival productions in any venues around the Festival Centre.

ABORTION

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about abortion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: My question is directed to the Attorney-General as the Minister charged with the general administration of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Obviously, it is also directed to the Minister of Health. I refer to a report on the front page of the Adelaide *News* of last Friday 23 February under the heading 'SA abortion storm'. The article states:

> Doctors have slammed State Government-funded family planning clinics after the release of a report which they claim shows more women are using abortion as a means of contraception. The doctors, who for legal reasons cannot be identified, blame 'blatantly biased' counselling at the clinics for many women no longer regarding abortion as a moral issue.
>
> The paper, tabled in Parliament this week, is from a committee appointed to examine and report on SA abortions. It calls for a comprehensive review of abortion services in the State.

I refer to the report itself—a report by Professor Lloyd Cox as Chairman of the committee and a person for whom I have the highest regard. He begins by stating:

> There were 4 255 terminations of pregnancy notified for the year 1988. There were two late notifications for 1987, making the corrected total for that year 4 229. The number notified each year has varied between 4 036 and 4 327 since 1980. The committee reported last year that the number of women having more than one termination—

that was picked up in the report in the *News*—

> appeared to be increasing. The proportion has increased very slightly in 1988, from 22.9 per cent to 23.1 per cent. The committee considers that this number is unduly high, having regard to the efforts made at the major clinics to advise contraceptive methods for all women having pregnancies terminated.

Most of the rest of the short report is statistical. However, on page 2, it states:

> In view of the consistent pattern that is seen in the abortion statistics, the committee is of the opinion that a confidential inquiry should be conducted at one or more major clinics concerning the use and efficiency of contraceptive methods in the various age groups. Such an inquiry was conducted in 1972-74 and was valuable in developing educational and family planning services.

My questions are:

1. Will the inquiry to which I have just referred and which was recommended in the report be undertaken?

2. Will the Government investigate the allegation that abortion in South Australian hospitals is being used not for

the medical purposes set out in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act but as a contraceptive measure?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer those questions to the appropriate Minister and bring back a reply.

CADMIUM

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health, a question about cadmium contamination.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: On 6 October 1988, I asked the Minister of Health questions about cadmium in various offal meats. Following those questions the Minister replied that a joint working group from the Departments of Agriculture and Health was to be set up to review the state of knowledge, and report to the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture on further action that needed to be taken to address the cadmium issue. Also, the Minister talked about an intention to regulate, legislate, or obtain voluntary agreements. He noted that there was already a voluntary agreement in relation to kidneys from older sheep, and that work had commenced on a cattle survey.

Nothing more has become publicly available on this issue and it was eventually conceded that levels were exceedingly high and that action was necessary. I ask the Minister when that information about what action is being taken will be made publicly available? At the time of asking those questions, I was informed by a high source that cadmium levels were so high in some vegetable crops that they did not know what to do. Will the Minister inform this Council about the levels of cadmium that are being found in certain vegetables and what is intended to be done about it?

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

ISLAND SEAWAY

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to a question I asked on 14 February about the *Island Seaway*?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Marine provided me with the following responses to the honourable member's questions:

1. No.
2. The Department of Marine and Harbors is preparing a business plan covering the subsidy arrangements for the vessel. In this context, the Kangaroo Island Transport Committee has been concerned at the level of freight rates to the island. Consequently, the Government in reviewing the subsidy arrangements must explore all costs relating to *Island Seaway* operations. This will include an examination of the utilisation and costs relating to the Port Lincoln leg.
3. The running costs are, for all practical purposes, static; they would increase in accordance with CPI. The major running costs are crew costs which are the same as before. There is no increase in fuel costs due to the modifications carried out during refit.

LIQUOR LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act 1985. Read a first time.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Liquor Licensing Act 1985. The Liquor Licensing Act which came into effect on 1 July 1985 was the culmination of a comprehensive review of the State's liquor licensing laws and administration which included an exhaustive process of industry and public consultation.

This Bill does not alter the finely balanced philosophy and policy of the 1985 Act but merely incorporates housekeeping amendments to improve the administration and enforcement of the Act.

The Bill expands on some definitions, in particular the definition of 'live entertainment', to accommodate the common and popular discotheque where the entertainment comprises pre-recorded amplified music.

The respective roles of the Licensing Court and the Liquor Licensing Commissioner have been clarified in relation to matters ancillary to an application without affecting the concept of the two tiered licensing authority or the division of powers and responsibilities between the court and the commissioner.

In order to curb the 'sham meal' practice, particularly in relation to hotels and entertainment venues on Sunday nights and hotels which do not meet the requirements for a late night permit, the Bill tightens the provisions of the Act which authorise a licensee to sell liquor at any time to a diner for consumption with a meal. Under existing legislation some licensees use 'sham meals' as a means of operating discotheques on Sunday nights and after normal trading hours.

The Bill relaxes the provisions for the grant of a producer's licence to allow the licensing authority to grant a producer's licence where it is satisfied that the applicant is a genuine wine maker who will in due course establish his or her own wine making facilities at or adjacent to the licensed premises. Currently, the premises must actually be used for the production of liquor and this restricts genuine wine makers new to the industry.

The Bill also expands the grounds on which a council may intervene in proceedings before the licensing authority to include the question of whether, if an application were granted, public disorder or disturbance would be likely to result. This provision, together with the current practice of the licensing authority to require applicants for late night permits to obtain the views of the local council, will further protect the rights of local residents.

Provision is also made for the licensing authority to approve agreements or arrangements between the holder of a wholesale licence and an unlicensed agent allowing the agent to be remunerated by reference to the quantity of liquor sold, provided that the authority is satisfied that the agent is a fit and proper person and that the nature and scale of the operation is such that a licence is not appropriate.

The Bill includes several housekeeping amendments relating to sale or supply of liquor to minors and also strengthens the provisions empowering a member of the Police Force to require a person who the police suspect on reasonable grounds to have consumed or to be in possession of liquor on prescribed premises or in a public place to provide evidence of age. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the Act by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends various definitions. The definition of 'live entertainment' is expanded to include functions at which recorded music is played by a disc jockey. A definition of 'public place' is inserted. The definition of 'retail licence' is tightened to make it clear that all general facility licences that are not wholesale licences are included in the definition.

Clause 4 obliges the commissioner to provide inspectors with an identity certificate which must be produced on request.

Clause 5 makes it clear that the Licensing Court has jurisdiction to deal with any matter that is ancillary to the other areas of its jurisdiction, except for the assessment of licensing fees.

Clause 6 makes it clear that where the court is reviewing a decision of the commissioner to refuse the transfer of a licence, the transferor, as well as the transferee, is a party to the review proceedings.

Clause 7 re-casts section 22 so as to include a power to award costs against a person who exercises a right of objection frivolously or vexatiously.

Clause 8 tightens the 'ancillary meal' condition of a hotel licence, by making it clear that the alcohol has to be sold in the dining room to the diner for consumption in the dining room with a meal served in that dining room. A similar provision is made in relation to designated reception areas.

Clause 9 effects a similar amendment to the ancillary meal provisions relating to entertainment venue licences.

Clause 10 provides that a club that is required by licence conditions to purchase its liquor from a hotel or retail liquor merchant must do so either from a licensee in the vicinity nominated by the licensing authority, or from a group of licensees nominated by the authority. A name change of the old Adelaide Democratic Club to the Adelaide Sports Club is reflected in this section.

Clause 11 provides that it is to be a condition of a wholesale liquor merchant's licence that he or she can only sell by retail during the same hours as apply to a retail liquor merchant. This clause also provides that the condition that 90 per cent of a wholesale liquor merchant's gross turnover must be derived from sales to liquor merchants also includes sales to persons licensed to sell liquor pursuant to Commonwealth law.

Clause 12 expands the provision relating to the grant of producers' licences, so that such a licence can be granted to a person who is a wine maker and who satisfies the licensing authority that he or she will in the near future be operating the relevant premises as a winery.

Clause 13 makes it clear that a limited licence authorises the supply of liquor as well as the sale and consumption of liquor.

Clause 14 amends the conditions of a limited licence. It is made clear that not only admission charges but other forms of charge are covered. It is provided that a limited licence cannot be granted if the licensing authority believes that some other licence would be appropriate or that an extension or variation of an existing licence would suffice to cover the planned event. It is further provided that such a licence must not be granted if the licensing authority is satisfied that the venue of the proposed event cannot lawfully be used for the sale, supply or consumption of liquor.

Clause 15 adds a further condition to those licences that authorise sale of liquor for consumption off the licensed premises. The condition requires that the liquor be supplied from the licensed premises unless the licensing authority approves otherwise (that is, from adjacent unlicensed premises).

Clause 16 adds further situations in which licence conditions can be imposed, varied or revoked. This may be done when the licensing authority approves a person to assume a position of authority in a body corporate that holds a licence, or when the Licensing Court approves certain profit-sharing arrangements between a licensee and an unlicensed partner or other person. It is also provided that licence conditions can be imposed, varied or revoked on an application of the licensee for some other imposition, variation or revocation of conditions.

Clause 17 makes it clear that a licensing authority may permit an applicant to vary an application between the dates of lodgment and hearing of the application.

Clause 18 deletes the provision that enables the licensing authority to require advertisement of certain specified classes of application and replaces it with a generalised power to require advertisement of any class of application.

Clause 19 inserts a new provision that provides that the licensing authority may require an applicant to produce any specified documents that the licensing authority believes to be relevant to determination of the application.

Clause 20 makes it clear that the licensing authority must look to the operation of the licence in determining whether annoyance, disturbance, etc., is likely to be caused if the licence were to be granted.

Clause 21 provides that the licensing authority, in determining whether to grant an application for a late night permit or entertainment venue licence in respect of uncompleted premises, must be satisfied that the premises are of an exceptionally high standard.

Clause 22 makes a similar amendment to the section that deals with removal of a licence from old premises to new unfinished premises.

Clause 23 is consequential upon the insertion of new section 58a in the Act.

Clause 24 provides that the surrender of a licence is only effective from the day on which the commissioner endorses acceptance of the surrender on the licence.

Clause 25 provides that a licensee may, during the currency of the licence, apply for approval of the designation of an area as a dining area or reception area.

Clause 26 makes it clear that the power to extend the trading area under a licence covers premises adjacent to the trading area, as well as an adjacent area.

Clause 27 provides that a lessor will be presumed to have consented to the grant of a liquor licence in relation to the leased premises if, at the time of granting the lease or assigning it to the lessee, he or she knew that liquor was to be sold or supplied on the premises by the lessee.

Clause 28 broadens the application of this section so that where a company is under receivership or management the receiver or manager can continue to carry on the company's business under the liquor licence.

Clause 29 extends the right of the Commissioner of Police to intervene to not only applications for licences, but to any application under the Act. The right of local councils to intervene is extended to include a clear right to intervene on the ground that the grant of a particular application would cause undue disturbance, annoyance, etc., to residents or others who work or worship in the area.

Clause 30 provides a right of objection on similar specific grounds.

Clause 31 makes it clear that a licensing authority can permit an objector to vary his or her objection between the times of lodgment and determination of the proceedings.

Clause 32 provides that where a 'BYO' endorsement is removed from a restaurant licence, a fee will be payable as if a new licence were being granted. A provision is inserted

empowering the licensing authority to attach a condition to a retail licence setting out the method of licence fee assessment in respect of liquor that has been produced by the licensee, thus enabling a value to be determined for such liquor as if it had been purchased by the licensee for retail sale. The provision setting out the basis for licence fee assessment is made to apply to all classes of licence, not just to general facility licences. It is also made clear that the provision exempting export sales means export sale for consumption outside Australia. The sale of liquor to a person who holds a restricted club licence only is deemed not to be sale to a liquor merchant. It is further provided that where a minimum licence fee is payable it is payable in a single instalment.

Clause 33 provides for the payment of a minimum licence fee on the grant of a licence during a licence period.

Clause 34 provides for the payment of a fine where a licence fee, or any instalment, is more than 14 days overdue. At the moment a fine is payable only where an instalment is overdue.

Clause 35 provides that the commissioner must specify the period of deferment when exercising the discretion to defer payment of a licence fee.

Clause 36 extends the power to estimate a licence fee to the situation where a licence has not been in force for the whole of the relevant assessment period. The commissioner must assume, in making an estimate, that the business was not only of the same nature but also the same scale during the whole of the assessment period.

Clause 37 gives the commissioner the power to credit overpayments in fees against the licensee's future liability for licence fees. Any credit must be paid on surrender or cancellation of the licence.

Clause 38 provides that any amounts due and payable by a company may be enforced against persons who were directors of the company at the time the liability arose, and also against any company that was a related company at the relevant time. Registration in the local court of Licensing Court orders is provided for so that such orders may be enforced as if they were local court orders.

Clause 39 provides that a person who manages the business pursuant to more than one licence is exempt from this section if the licences relate to separate parts of the same premises. It is made clear that infringements of subsection (2) are offences and also that an unlicensed person who manages the business under a licence for more than 14 days without the approval of the licensing authority is guilty of an offence.

Clause 40 provides that not only is a licensee guilty of an offence for an infringement of this section but so also will the unlicensed person be guilty of an offence. A power is given to the Licensing Court to approve an arrangement between a wholesale liquor merchant and a commission agent, provided that the court is satisfied that the agent is a fit and proper person to so act and also that the agent is not holding so many similar agencies that he or she should more properly hold an independent licence. An exemption from this section is given in relation to agreements for disbursing profits to a person in a position of authority in a company that is a licensee or to any other person approved by the licensing authority.

Clause 41 makes it clear that an infringement of this section is an offence.

Clause 42 gives an exemption from this section to a person who is a lodger or resident of the licensed premises, or who is a guest of such a person and is supplied the liquor by the lodger or resident. Such a lodger or resident may also take liquor away from premises. For the purposes of these exemptions, a resident is a person who is the licensee or manager, or a member of the licensee's or manager's family.

Clause 43 provides that consent of the licensing authority is not required for the provision of entertainment on premises adjacent to licensed premises if the adjacent premises are the subject of a licence under the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913.

Clause 44 provides that the Commissioner of Police, instead of any member of the Police Force, may lodge a complaint in relation to noise coming from licensed premises. This amendment is only for the purpose of consistency throughout the Act—other similar provisions give these powers to the Police Commissioner.

Clause 45 amends the penalties for sale of liquor to minors to the nearest equivalent divisional fine. It is also made clear that purchasing liquor on behalf of a minor is only an offence if the minor makes the request for the liquor on the licensed premises.

Clause 46 provides a defence for a licensee charged with an offence of permitting a minor to be on premises subject to a late night permit or entertainment venue licence. The licensee will not be guilty of an offence if he or she took reasonable steps to remove the minor or prevent the minor from entering the premises.

Clause 47 adds a power for a member of the Police Force to require a person in a public place who is suspected of being a minor and of consuming or being in possession of liquor in that public place to give evidence of his or her age.

Clause 48 defines licensed premises to include areas appurtenant to licensed premises, so that the powers conferred by this section may be exercised in relation to minors who are just outside of the actual licensed premises.

Clause 49 changes a fine to a divisional penalty and makes a consequential amendment.

Clause 50 provides that it is grounds for disciplinary action against a licensee that is a body corporate if a person who occupies a position of authority in the body corporate is not a fit and proper person to occupy such a position. Further grounds are added where a licensee sells or supplies liquor otherwise than in accordance with the authorisation conferred by the licence, where a licensee contravenes the Act or an order made under the Act, or where the licensee alters the licensed premises without the prior approval of the licensing authority. The latter ground can found a complaint by a local council.

Clause 51 makes it clear that the power to impose conditions on a licence pursuant to disciplinary action being taken against a licensee is not limited to those conditions specifically provided for in subsection (3) of the section.

Clause 52 creates an offence of falsely impersonating an authorised officer.

Clause 53 broadens the scope of the power to enter and search premises to include not only licensed premises but also any other premises on which an offence against the Act is suspected to have been committed. The power to confiscate liquor is widened to cover liquor suspected to be in the possession of a person unlawfully or for an unlawful purpose.

Clause 54 amends a penalty provision to bring it to the nearest divisional fine.

Clause 55 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 56 repeals the Grand Prix provisions that expired on 30 June 1986.

Clause 57 brings the general penalty provision into the divisional penalty system.

Clause 58 provides that criminal liability of directors will be incurred not only when the body corporate is convicted of an offence but also where the body corporate is found guilty of an offence but not convicted.

Clause 59 extends the evidentiary provisions of the Act to cover disciplinary proceedings against a licensee as well as proceedings for an offence. Five new matters are to be deemed proved in the absence of proof to the contrary, namely, an allegation in the complaint that a person is a minor, that a licence is subject to specified conditions, that a person is a manager of licensed premises, that a person occupies a position of authority in a body corporate and that a person is an inspector. If it is proved that a person has advertised or otherwise represented that he or she will sell liquor, it is deemed proved (in the absence of proof to the contrary) that he or she has sold liquor. A certificate from the commissioner as to a delegation of powers under the Act is proof (in the absence of proof to the contrary) of the matters certified.

Clause 60 extends to two years the period within which proceedings for offences against the Act may be brought.

Clause 61 changes regulatory offence fines to divisional penalties.

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

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Real Property Act 1886 and other associated statutes to enable the computerisation of the Torrens register. The Torrens system provides for the issue of a certificate of title to the owner of a land parcel. The certificate guarantees certainty of title. This Bill does not set out to change the system but simply to record and register land in digital form.

Land in South Australia has been registered pursuant to the Real Property Act 1886 and its precursor, the Real Property Act 1858, for more than 131 years and in that time more than one million certificates of title have been issued. The original Act was enacted through the perseverance of Robert Richard Torrens (later Sir). The Torrens system, as it has become known, quickly spread to all other colonies of Australia and more recently to other countries of the world. This State can be justifiably proud that the system was developed in South Australia.

The Lands Titles Office, like its counterparts in the other States and Territories of Australia, is striving to increase its efficiency and service to the public by making use of the latest technology. In the late 1970s the Department of Lands developed the world acclaimed Land Ownership and Tenure System (LOTS). In 1985, further progress was made in this area with the advent of the Registrar-General's automated unregistered document system, automated registration, indexing and inquiry system (ARIES).

Today, clients of the office can obtain a wealth of information concerning land and the transactions that affect the title to land from terminals in their own offices. The next logical step in this direction is the computerisation of the title register. At present, both the original and duplicate certificates of title are maintained in a paper form; under a computerised system the original will be in digital form on a computer while a duplicate will be issued on security paper and retained by the owner or lending institution. This task is being successfully achieved in New South Wales, and several other States are currently developing computerised title systems.

Three problems can be readily identified with a paper register. First, it is very labour intensive, secondly, access can only be provided directly from one location in the State and, thirdly, it causes some duplication of effort. Every component of the existing registration process is performed manually. These components include the retrieval of the titles and instruments from a file for endorsing; the actual endorsement on the titles and instruments; and the sealing of these endorsements and the subsequent re-filing, etc. upon completion of the registration process within the Lands Titles Office. In addition to maintaining this paper register, the same information is required to be captured in an automated form for inclusion in the State's world renowned Land Information System (LIS) This can only be achieved by duplication of input in the present system.

In February 1987, a study was carried out to assess the feasibility of computerising the South Australian title register. This study and subsequent development work has shown that the project is feasible and cost effective. The cost of maintaining the manual system is high and access is limited to inquirers attending the Lands Title Registration Office in Adelaide. The need for a computer based Torrens system has been assessed, with research and development being carried out over the past two years.

The computerisation of the Torrens register will provide the following advantages in real terms.

- It makes use of technology to reduce the manual effort required to operate and maintain the register whilst preserving its integrity.
- The computerisation of the Torrens register enhances the Land Information System (LIS).
- Benefits will accrue incrementally as staged computerisation of the register occurs. Maximum benefits will be attainable from the system when the total register is computerised; it is anticipated that total conversion will take 10 years to achieve, as there are approximately 800 000 current titles to convert.
- Remote Access to Title Register:
  Currently over 2 000 photocopies of titles are requested each day, necessitating clients to physically attend the Lands Titles Office to collect these prints. Photocopies of titles are ordered by clients in all of the department's regional and metropolitan offices, these orders being filled in Adelaide and dispatched by courier for delivery to the client. The Department of Lands data communications network, which now encompasses over 600 terminals throughout the State, can in the future be utilised to deliver this title data. Computerisation of the title register will not only make title data immediately available from any terminal connected to the system, but it will negate the current problems of certificates of title not being available because they are 'out of file' for any reason. This will eliminate most of the handling and consequent deterioration of the manual register.
- Simplification of Titles:
  One of the basic tenets of the Torrens title system is to simplify title to land. For a variety of reasons titles are often complex and therefore require a relatively high level of expertise to interpret. It is intended to rectify this problem in the computerised environment by separating the current and historical elements of the data, standardising the format and by simplifying the wording of titles.

Both current and historical information will be available on line to the user.

- Title Diagram:
  A computerised title will be accompaned by a title diagram, if requested. The form that the diagram will take will vary with the category of title and the level of technology that can be economically provided. The department is currently investigating the latest developments in scanning and imaging in order to produce title diagrams more efficiently than at present.
- Improve Efficiency in the Lands Titles Office:
  The processes of issuing new titles and updating existing titles as regards changes of ownerships and encumbrances are very labour intensive. Significant savings in human resource requirements will be achieved by manipulating data currently input to ARIES to build new titles and to update existing titles. Some current duplication in effort will also be eliminated.
- Records Management:
  The manner in which the automated title register will be stored will eventually stop the growth of the manual register. This will have the effect of containing accommodation and storage levels within the present capacity of the Lands Titles Office.
- Greater security of the Torrens register will also be obtained.

The system has been designed to meet the requirements of South Australian real estate industries and to become an integral component of the successful Land Information System. The system designers have closely followed the development of similar programs in other states and have drawn from their experiences to provide South Australia with a superior computer title. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition of 'appropriate form'. Instead of forms being set out in regulations it is proposed that the Registrar-General should have a discretion to approve the form to be used. There are many references throughout the Act to 'appropriate form' and rather than change each of these it was considered more convenient to alter the definition.

Clause 4 deletes words from section 21 that are superfluous.

Clause 5 removes an anachronistic requirement that the address for service under section 29 must be within the City of Adelaide.

Clause 6 provides new headings to Part V. The Bill divides Part V into three Divisions. Division I deals with registration of title by the traditional folio bound in a register book. Division II deals with registration by electronic and similar methods. Division III caters for general provisions that apply to both methods of registration. Conversion of the register to the computer system is expected to take about ten years and during that period it will be necessary for the old and new systems to operate side by side.

Clause 7 replaces section 47 of the principal Act which is obsolete with a provision that confines Division I of Part V to the traditional method of registration.

Clause 8 repeals section 50 of the principal Act. New section 56a inserted by a later provision provides the point in time at which registration of a certificate takes place.

Clause 9 makes an amendment to section 51 of the principal Act.

Clause 10 inserts an evidentiary provision which replaces the evidentiary component of section 80 as it applied to the traditional method of registration.

Clause 11 inserts new Division II into Part V. New section 51b provides for registration by different methods and also provides for interpretation of existing provisions of the Act in relation to the new system of registration. Upon registration of an estate or interest under the new system the Registrar-General will issue a certificate of title to the holder of the estate or interest. This title will be equivalent to a duplicate title under the present system. It must be produced for registration of a subsequent dealing and will be destroyed by the Registrar-General who will issue a new certificate in its place (section 51c). Section 51d is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 12 inserts the new heading for Division III of Part V.

Clause 13 replaces section 52 of the principal Act.

Clause 14 replaces section 53 of the principal Act. The new provision is a general requirement that information once recorded by the Registrar-General must be retained.

Clause 15 makes an amendment as to forms that has already been discussed.

Clause 16 repeals section 54a.

Clause 17 inserts new section 56a which pinpoints the time of registration.

Clause 18 simplifies section 66 of the principal Act.

Clause 19 makes an amendment to section 74 that requires the shares in which tenants in common hold an estate or interest in land to be stated in the certificate of title.

Clause 20 removes subsection (3) of section 79.

Clause 21 replaces section 80 of the principal Act.

Clause 22 strikes out the requirement for a plan of an easement in the certificate of title.

Clause 23 provides for registration of Crown leases by computer.

Clauses 24 and 25 make consequential amendments.

Clause 26 replaces section 143 of the principal Act.

Clause 27 removes from section 156 of the principal Act a requirement that is considered to be unnecessary.

Clause 28 makes a consequential amendment.

Clause 29 replaces section 177 of the principal Act with a provision that gives the Registrar-General a discretion as to the details that should be recorded when registering transmission to the personal representative of a deceased proprietor.

Clause 30 replaces section 184 of the principal Act.

Clause 31 repeals section 189 which will serve no useful purpose in view of the proposed amendment to section 220.

Clause 32 amends section 220 of the principal Act. The amendment expressly empowers the Registrar-General to keep the register book up to date. Paragraph *(d)* of the amendment gives the Registrar-General power to destroy duplicate certificates of title.

Clauses 33, 34 and 35 make consequential changes.

Clause 36 tightens the wording of paragraph (III) of section 229.

Clause 37 makes a consequential amendment to section 233 of the principal Act.

Clauses 38 and 39 make consequential changes.

Clause 40 removes an anachronistic provision from the Act.

Clause 41 makes a consequential change.

Clause 42 makes consequential changes to other Acts.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 22 February. Page 341.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Liberal Party supports the second reading of this Bill, the objective of which is to raise the monetary penalties, both minimum and maximum, in relation to drink driving, to a level which is considered to be sufficient to deter people from driving after drinking. I understand that work undertaken by the former Road Safety Division in 1988 identified that drivers believe that penalties for drink driving are no longer of sufficient severity to act as a deterrent, and this perception undermines the impact of random breath testing, as there is little point in raising the perceived risk of detection if the penalties for detection are considered to be minor. That work was undertaken by the Road Safety Division with a target group of males aged 18 to 55 years: the group that is involved in the greatest number of drink driving offences.

The Hon. Peter Dunn interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, you are still in the target group. It is important, therefore, to note that there is a perception within this target group that the current penalties are not a deterrent to drink driving, notwithstanding the larger number of random breath testing units and facilities within the community. Therefore, it is entirely acceptable that the penalties be increased, to ensure that they act as a deterrent. It would be preferable, in my view, for these penalties to be increased on a more regular basis than has hitherto been the case. I understand that the penalties have not changed since 1981, and the monetary penalties have not changed at all in that time.

In the meantime, the consumer price index has increased by about 80 per cent in Adelaide; therefore, the values of fines in relation to the average wage have been almost halved. Currently in South Australia the maximum fines for drink driving offences are the lowest or equal to the lowest of all the mainland States and, given the discussion between Federal and State Ministers about uniform road laws and penalties, there may be a further argument with respect to this Bill to raise the maximum fines to the nationwide average.

The Bill also aims to raise maximum fines to ensure that the percentage relationship to minimum fines is maintained. Increased fines relate to the following offences: drinking under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs; driving with more than a prescribed concentration of alcohol in the blood; refusing or failing to comply with a direction to take a breath test; and refusing to submit to the taking of a blood sample. I have received correspondence on this subject from an organisation called People Against Drink Driving. Its submission suggests that there should be dramatic increases in minimum and maximum penalties for drink driving offences relating to fines and licence suspensions. I am keen to have discussions with this group at a later date because their submission gives rise to further thought. However, with respect to this Bill, I received the submission a little late to be able to present the group's arguments in more detail.

The Minister noted that effective deterrence requires the high risk of being caught drink driving and the severe consequences arising from that. Random breath testing was introduced to raise the perceived risk of being caught drink driving. After operating at optimal levels, random breath testing was increased in 1987 and was found to succeed in deterring drink driving. As a resident of Lower North Adelaide, living very close to the Old Lion Hotel, I am well aware that, virtually every Friday and Saturday night, many people, who are clearly intoxicated, drive cars. I go out most Friday and Saturday nights, yet I have never seen a random breath test unit in the Lower North Adelaide area. I am not sure how those units are allocated to various areas but the behaviour of many youths—one could easily call them louts—in their cars is of enormous concern to residents. I repeat: I have never seen a random breath test unit in that area and I call for one to be located there on an intermittent basis to ensure that some of the behaviour that we as residents experience can be deterred, for the sake of the residents and of these drivers and their passengers.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I said that I call for this not for the residents but for these drivers, their passengers and for other people using the road. It is obvious to residents that many young people are drink driving in this area.

Another issue concerns a person's capacity to pay these fines which I have acknowledged will be increased substantially. Some of my colleagues and people in the community have expressed concern about the capacity of people to pay these substantial fines. I have little sympathy for their arguments because I believe that the offence of drink driving is one that should be dealt with severely. However, I note that there is a community service order provision in relation to drink driving offences. With respect to the highest fine in this Bill, that of $2 500 for a second and subsequent drink driving offence, it could be equated to a 25 day community service order.

On behalf of my colleagues who are concerned about this issue, I have discovered that, on the recommendation of the Social Development Committee in Victoria, from 1 July this year Vic Roads will require the installation of alcohol ignition interlocks into the cars of drivers who apply for their licence to be restored following a disqualification period. I understand that, in California, there has been a large scale trial of interlock devices for convicted drink drivers. While a full evaluation of that trial is still under way, initial results indicate that this measure is promising in tackling the problem of drink driving.

These interlock devices are fitted to the interior of one's car and a driver is required to breathe into the device, which is set so that the maximum level is well below the blood alcohol concentration permitted in the State. If the driver is above the limit set on the device, that person cannot physically start his or her car. The device interlocks with the ignition and an alcohol affected driver is physically prevented from operating the car.

As I said, the trial will commence in Victoria on 1 July and the devices will be fitted to the cars of drivers who have lost their licence ensuing from offences involving a blood alcohol concentration level of .2 grams per 100 millilitres of blood or more. That is a very high blood alcohol concentration, and it is the wish of the Victorian Government that the level be brought down in time and that these interlock devices be more widely used in Victoria in the future.

In each instance, licences would be renewed only on condition that these interlock devices were fitted to the driver's vehicle. This system should be explored by the Government as a possible further means of dealing with drink drivers. It would be an effective way of deterring people who drink from driving and would keep them off our roads. It would, therefore, be an effective road safety measure. I hope that the State Government will explore this system, which is to operate in Victoria from 1 July 1990 and which, I repeat, has been operating in California and

possibly elsewhere for some time. I support the second reading.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I, too, support the amendments to this legislation, but I have some reservations on which I will comment. It is my opinion that these fines are being implemented primarily to raise funds for the Government. If we counted the number of drink drivers from 1984 or 1985—whenever RBT was introduced, or the last time that fines were increased—and excluded the inflation factor, I wonder whether we would find that the incidence thereof had increased. I believe we would find that approximately the same number of people are being caught, or that no more people are being caught for drink driving now than there were in the early 1980s.

If the argument that we are just keeping up with inflation is true, we would have reason to expect that there would be a greater number of drink drivers, but that is not what is happening. I think the Government wants more money and, like with other things such as when it reneged on its promise prior to the election to help first home buyers, it now finds that some of its extravagant promises made during that period cannot be funded easily. It is therefore using this method to increase money for its coffers. If the Government was fair dinkum it would have introduced this Bill prior to the election and flagged what it intended to do.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The Government said that it would amend the legislation but it did not say that it would increase the fines to the degree that it proposes. I think that a better public education system is needed. A frightening advertisement is seen on the television where a person is playing a card game and the inference is that you can be caught for drink driving. That sort of an advertisement has an initial impact, but in the long-term people do not take any notice.

A better system would be to introduce television programs which demonstrate to people the way in which their reaction times and judgments are impaired by the intake of alcohol. I believe that such programs would be of interest and would demonstrate that a person's reaction time is impaired by drinking one glass of beer or whisky and that, if five, six or seven glasses are consumed, reaction time and judgment are impaired even further. I know that such information could be extrapolated and demonstrated—I have seen it done—but at present we do not have such an education process.

If the Government was fair dinkum about this Bill there would be more cases of people convicted of drink driving spending more time being educated in classes and at lectures about what is involved. The few people I know who have been caught drink driving do not seem to worry very much about it.

One of the greatest deterrents is that one is made to exhibit a P plate for some time after being caught driving under the influence. This is a great deterrent because it is flagged to the public that the driver has been drinking and driving. I do not believe in drinking to excess and driving. I believe that the limit of .08 in South Australia is a sensible compromise. The difference between .05 and .08, with the equipment that we have, is minuscule. The reaction time from one person to another can vary, but I do not believe that a great deal of variation exists between .05 and .08. Possibly, when .1 is reached a problem occurs. It appears from most of the medical evidence that at this point people's reactions become severely affected. I believe that the limit of .08 is a sensible one and that the Government should retain it.

It is not necessary to drink and drive. I do some flying, and I am required to have nil alcohol in my blood for at least eight hours prior to flying. I stick rigidly to this rule. I cannot remember ever having consumed alcohol within eight hours of flying. If that is good enough for me, I think there should be a similar requirement for drivers. It is true that people drive more than they fly and, therefore, more of an impediment exists if this restriction is applied to driving.

I will now demonstrate what happens in the country. Drinking has been a social pastime for at least 2 000 years or longer. Attempts have been made to prohibit it, and we saw what happened during the prohibition era in America. It has grown up in the community and is part of our society—it is a web within society—and any attempt to stop it will not work. In the city one can meet friends and have a few drinks. Indeed, one can drink with a meal, and that adds to the quality of life for many people. At least in the city when you do that you can catch a taxi or an STA bus home or, for 30c, you can ring someone and ask them to come and get you. However, in the country it is not that easy.

In the country the only social contact people have is at local sporting clubs, and quite often after a day's sport people stay and have some sort of social interaction while partaking of alcohol. I do not in any way wish to prevent that, but this legislation contains an impediment and a difficulty for such people. A lot of single people in the country attend functions on their own and wish to go home on their own. So, an impediment exists for country people that does not apply in the city. Country people who wish to have a few drinks and then travel home are putting themselves at risk. Therefore, I say to the Government and to the Police Force that they should be a little more lenient on those areas in the country that have small communities and do not have the social interaction of people in the city. People in country communities may drive long distances to have such social interaction, and a lot of them live considerable distances from their communities. Indeed, some of them have to drive 60 or 70 kilometres to get to their local towns.

If you take their licences from them you cause them an enormous imposition—far greater than any imposition you can apply to a person in the city. I hope that the courts, when they look at these cases, will consider those things before they decide on the period of licence suspension.

I believe that first time country offenders should spend some time under a rehabilitation order and have demonstrated to them the implications of taking overdoses of alcohol. True, the costs involved are astronomical. I saw yesterday some National Roads Authority figures which indicate that, for every death in our community, the cost is approximately $568 000, and that is very high. For serious injury it is in the order of $240 000.

The fact that a number of accidents involve positive alcohol tests implies that alcohol has some effect on people's judgment and their reaction times, and that is fundamentally what driving is all about. Although I agree that there need to be random breath testing, fines and methods of making it work, the Government ought to realise that there are people who live under different circumstances from those in the city. There needs, in my opinion, to be a change in the method by which you demonstrate to the public what happens when you do take overdoses, or large doses, of alcohol, and the effect that this has on your driving. I guess that, if we could all be videoed when we had a little too much to drink and looked at it when we were sober, we probably would not drink as much as we do.

The Government really has introduced this measure as a fundraiser as much as anything else. Although I understand the reason for high penalties, I am a little perturbed about the timing of this and in the fact that the Government is not demonstrating very clearly to the public the effects that alcohol may have.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I support this Bill because, as far as it goes, it does make sense to bring penalties into line with modern facts of economic life. There is not much more than that to be said about the positive aspects of the Bill but, like my colleagues, I express some concern about the problem as a whole. As the Attorney-General will know, the question of general deterrence is not simply a question of the consequences of being caught, because many offences are committed in the firm belief that one will not be caught. So, questions of enforcement become important and the question of specific deterrence arises after apprehension.

I wish to acknowledge some gratitude to my colleague, the Hon. Miss Diana Laidlaw, who raised this element in debate. At the same time, I express concern at her partial advocacy for interlock devices to prevent, in a mechanical sense, drivers from starting their car if they are above the limit. It sounds like a good idea until you think further about the physiology and behavioural aspects of some drinkers.

In the first place, although the instruments may be quite accurate in the scientific sense of measuring the alcohol in the expired air, in fact, if one understands respiratory physiology, one can vary the alcohol in the expired air quite a bit with different breathing techniques. Thankfully, this is not understood widely in the community but, nevertheless, with an interlock device on a car one would naturally think carefully and wonder how the thing works and how one could beat it.

Of course, the other problem is the question of absorption of alcohol. Absorption can occur from the stomach into the bloodstream sometime after the last drink has been consumed, and so a device set at a .08 limit might happily allow the person to start the car with a measurement of .06, thus giving a false sense of security. However, 15 minutes down the road, the alcohol is absorbed and distributed around the body. The blood alcohol rises and a crash occurs.

The problem of treating or dealing with recidivist drink drivers, particularly those guilty of the greater offences above .15, is not a problem to be dealt with by fixing a device to a car. What if they have two cars? Do they have a licence to drive only car A? There are many practical problems in linking the return of the licence to a mechanical device for one particular car.

The problem is that there is a group of people in the communituy who drink not socially but aggressively and destructively. They do not have four or five drinks over three hours and toddle home with a blood alcohol level of .04 and falling. They have 15 or 20 drinks; they drive aggressively and less carefully when in that condition. As a small group they contribute enormously to road deaths, and in South Australia when a person commits a subsequent greater offence this State already deals with the matter by trying to identify them as members of this group with that sort of drinking pattern.

The probabilities of being caught twice for a greater offence are quite low, and it is likely that people who are apprehended in this way are behaving like that almost every night of the week. It is a small group of drivers, but this group contributes to the majority of accidents. The solution to the problem is not related to monetary penalties. The solution is related to identification of such people and preventing them from driving at all until they can demonstrate that the problem has gone away, and not just until they can demonstrate that they can get a mate to blow into an interlock device and start their car for them.

Presently, our medical drug and alcohol clinics, which receive people like this referred to them by the courts, can easily determine whether a person is still drinking or is teetotal. That is done by biochemical tests that demonstrate enzyme changes that the disqualified driver cannot conceal. The disqualified driver cannot avoid detection of those changes, which indicate that he is still drinking.

The practice of continuing the licence disqualification indefinitely until the person has demonstrated satisfactorily to the medical experts in this field that he is no longer a person with a drinking problem is the proper way to go. I believe that the law in this regard in South Australia is satisfactory. The problem we still have is detection and enforcement levels. It costs the Government nothing to get out the legislative pen and write .05 instead of .08 or increase penalties, fines or the period of disqualification, but it costs an awful lot to increase police recruitment and deployment to a level that can really and meaningfully identify this small group and get them off the roads, unless they are able to respond to treatment and change their ways. I would be alarmed if South Australia adopted the interlock devices.

Of course, an additional problem with them is that they only measure the level of blood alcohol: they do not measure the driver's ability. Whilst any alcohol slightly impairs, we have to ask the question: what does it impair? It impairs the pre-existing level of driving skills. It is possible for a person who is not a skilful driver in any case to fall below an acceptable level of driver skills, well below the legal limit, and that is still an offence. The offence of driving under the influence of alcohol regardless of the blood limit applies.

However, someone who has had five quick drinks and who was .07 would be able to start his car. Practically and at law he may be sufficiently influenced for it to be illegal for him to start the car, but the fact that the device allows him to start the car at that level is some sort of mechanical blessing upon his actions.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: What if the device is set at .01 with hardly any alcohol allowed as a condition of relicence?

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: If you mean .01, that is the one drink level.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: That has been tried in California and will be in practice in Victoria.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: It is up to each State jurisdiction to determine the setting. If a person has this alcohol problem and recurrent convictions for the greater offences, it is really playing at the edges to do even that. They should not have their licence back until they have demonstrated that they are teetotal. They may choose not to be teetotal and take taxis everywhere and not get their licence back. This is the sort of halfway house.

I see many problems with it. Again, it costs the Government nothing because it would impose the cost of the instrument upon the motorist as a sort of additional fine. I do not think there would be much of a secondhand market in them; we would not see them advertised in the back pages of the Saturday *Advertiser*. I still express concern that every halfway house that is proposed avoids the difficult question whether we as a community will write the cheque for a greatly increased effort at detection and enforcement. Are we going to identify the people with such an alcohol problem absolutely by biochemistry and give them their licence back only when they are proved to be teetotal,

instead of perhaps letting them on the roads with a device and still with their problem?

Ideally, we should take the more expensive route and increase the enforcement and detection of that group. Having said that and having recognised that this Bill does not do that, nevertheless I support the Bill for the little that it does do.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Driving under influence.'

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I appreciate that the Minister may not have information to hand to answer my question, but the Hon. Mr Dunn and others of my colleagues have expressed concern about the rise in these penalties and have questioned not only the wisdom of the move but also expressed some scepticism about the Government's intentions and the belief that they will be used simply as a fund raising initiative. Have estimates been undertaken by the Department of Transport on how much money may be raised from increases in fines based on past drink driving offences? Will the Minister at some stage advise whether the money will simply go into general revenue or whether higher allocations are to be provided for road safety measures, including funding for the police to provide further random breath testing units within metropolitan and country areas.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not have that information available at the moment. I will certainly undertake to get it for the honourable member as soon as possible.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DA COSTA SAMARITAN FUND (INCORPORATION OF TRUSTEES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 February. Page 472.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill, which enables public hospitals, including country hospitals, previously excluded from receiving funds from the trustees, to now be included. The Da Costa fund, established at the turn of the last century from a bequest of Louisa Da Costa, last year gave out about $100 000 in benefits. Funds were initially provided for the relief of convalescent patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and in recent years, following amendments, that benefit scope has been widened and extended to patients of the Queen Elizabeth, Flinders Medical and Modbury Hospitals. A large part of the fund last year was given to worthy organisations such as Wheelchair Sports and more than 300 patients were individually helped. The trust has sufficient funds to help a wider range of patients in both metropolitan and country areas. For that reason it wants to broaden its scope. The trustees have indicated that the hospitals they have in mind assisting at this stage include the Whyalla, Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, and Berri Hospitals as well as the Lyell McEwin Health Service and the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children. For those brief reasons, on behalf of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council, I wholeheartedly support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I wholeheartedly support the second reading of the Bill. I notice from the list of hospitals to be included in the benefit from the fund the exclusion of the Kangaroo Island Hospital. I only became aware of that this morning, so I have made direct contact with the Island hospital and asked it to inform me whether it would like me to move an amendment requesting the Government to include the hospital in the list. I ask the indulgence of the Council to stand the Bill over until we resume and therefore seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 20 March at 2.15 p.m.