HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 February 1979

The SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

CHIROPRACTORS BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Act Amendment,

South Australian Institute of Technology Act Amendment,

Supply (No. 1).

PETITION: CHIROPRACTORS

A petition signed by 974 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to take urgent action in relation to the registration of chiropractors in South Australia under the Act, with particular reference to making provision for payment of accounts by medical benefits funds, workmen's compensation claims, referral of patients, and use of X-ray equipment was presented by Mr. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: DOGS

A petition signed by 66 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Dogs Act to prevent the restraining of dogs on premises by the use of chain, rope, or any other material was presented by Mr. Bannon.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST

In reply to **Mr. WOTTON** (13 February, Appropriation Bill (No. 1)).

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: An amount of $688 712 has been provided for salaries and related payments for the Administration and Publicity Department during 1978-79. In addition, a further $354 088 has been provided for administration and publicity costs. This figure includes advertising, administration expenses, insurances, rates and taxes and general operating costs. It is not possible to ascertain what portion of the Government grant is specifically allocated towards the Administration and Publicity Department because the trust receives other income.

COMMUNITY CENTRES

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (13 February. Appropriation Bill (No. 1)).

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The cost of furniture and equipment for the sporting and physical recreation block at the Parks is $110 000, of which $80 000 in the main is for fixed equipment. The remaining $30 000 is for the purchase of equipment to enable the sports centre to cater for both school and community use. This includes the provision of hire equipment and other items associated with the following sports—Aquatic, Archery, Athletics, Badminton, Baseball, Basketball, Carpet bowls, Cricket, Netball, Rock climbing, Soccer, Softball, Fencing, Football, Golf, Gridiron, Gymnastics, Hockey, Judo, Lacrosse, Padder tennis, Rugby, Squash, Table tennis, Tennis, Volleyball, Testing-fitness, Weight training, miscellaneous items.

No 35 mm cameras are being purchased for the sporting and physical education block. Because Block H. is not yet ready for occupation, this equipment cannot be stored at the centre and therefore is being held at the State Supply store at Seaton. This is normal practice with projects such as this. All equipment and furniture is being ordered through the P.B.D. auxiliary services unit and is within budget estimates prepared three years ago. Despite inflation, there has been no increase in the allocation made for furniture and equipment for the total centre. The cost of furniture and equipment is approximately 7 per cent of the total cost of the project and compares very favourably with institutions providing similar facilities.

BELAIR PRIMARY SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Belair Primary School upgrading.

Ordered that report be printed.

CONTRACTS REVIEW BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together at the conference but no agreement was reached.

QUESTION TIME

BANKING CORPORATION

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to establish a South Australia Banking Corporation or similar body to co-ordinate the activities of the State Bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia and the South Australia Development Corporation, as proposed in the Australian Labor Party's economic policy released last weekend, and will depositors' funds from the Savings Bank of South Australia be involved in the activities approved by the conference? Some three years ago, the Government was questioned by the Opposition on its intentions to set up a South Australia Banking Corporation to co-ordinate the activites of the State Bank, the Savings Bank, and the South Australia Development Corporation, to undertake merchant banking activities, and to finance hire-purchase transactions.

The Treasurer at that time denied that any such plan was in the Government's mind. The Australian Labor Party's economic policy announced at the weekend now encompasses all of the same proposals, and there is renewed concern in the community that the depositors' funds of the Savings Bank of South Australia (now more than $1 000 000 000) may be used in Government merchant banking and instalment credit operations. Several people have said to me about that policy, "Isn't this exactly what you said was being considered some three years ago?" The A.L.P.'s economic policy now confirms that the Government's ultimate intention is to take over the financial institutions of this State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On the contrary, the policy proposals will ensure that State-owned banking instrumentalities will complete with the private banking system in every respect. At present the Government does not plan to set in train the policies passed at the weekend Labor Party convention. I assure the Leader that there is no threat to the savings of South Australians being held by the Savings Bank of South Australia or the State Bank. If the Government plans to take any action on behalf of banks owned by the State, the public will have plenty of opportunity to examine those plans, and will be given all relevant information. I assure the honourable member that the Government will protect people who have savings in those banks.

SEMAPHORE CUSTOMS HOUSE

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Development advise what the Government intends regarding the future use of the old customs boarding station at Semaphore? Constitutents in that area are extremely pleased with progress of restoration and upgrading of the premises, and are interested to know what development is planned for the benefit of the community.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: I am aware of the member's concern for the preservation of historic buildings at Semaphore. The restoration of the old customs house, following acquisition by the Environment Department in July 1976, has been completed and that building can now be used by the community. The Environment Department considered several propositions about the use of the building and it was decided that the old customs house could be used as an art gallery. The ground floor area, with minor modifications, would be extremely suitable for exhibitions of works and for travelling exhibitions arranged by the gallery. It would be the first time that the gallery had moved into the community, although some travelling art exhibitions visit country and suburban areas. An exhibition at Semaphore would be the first in the suburbs of Adelaide.

The State will benefit from having a decentralised extension to the Art Gallery. The customs house could be used for related art activities and, with little modification, could be used by many community groups for other purposes. Such a development would benefit potential tourism, and community activities would be stimulated. If this proposition is brought to fruition, the member for Semaphore and his constituents should be extremely pleased with these developments. Generally, I hope that this action by the Art Gallery is the first such decentralisation move regarding several other institutions within the Community Development Department to extend services to the community away from North Terrace into the suburbs and country regions.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier outline to the House the Government's plans in relation to succession duties, because there is much concern in the community about future policies in this regard? The recent A.L.P. conference endorsed a policy decision that calls for an increase in succession duties on higher inheritances, but there was no mention of any reductions, irrespective of the inheritance.

The new Premier said during debate on the no-confidence motion on Tuesday:

> I can tell the House that there will be no increase in the rates of this tax in the next financial year.

The fact that there is to be no reduction, but that the *status quo* will prevail next year, will come as a bitter disappointment to many people in South Australia when all other States, including the Labor States, have either announced plans to abolish succession duties or have already done so. In fact, the Premier was mistaken when he asserted that Victoria was taking tentative steps towards abolishing succession duties. It has already abolished them, as have Queensland and Western Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Victoria hasn't.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We will argue about that later. My information is that it has. New South Wales is progressively reducing succession duties. It is coming into the second year of a three-year programme to reduce them—Tasmania likewise. It can be asserted without fear of contradition that all of the other States have either abolished succession duties or are abolishing them.

The Premier mentioned spouse-to-spouse concessions and a range of concessions that the Government has made since it came into office in 1970. It must be remembered that the Government increased those taxes and brought in aggregation provisions soon after coming to office. The fact is that there is no help in the case of successions from parents to children. The spouse to spouse concession is a benefit but there is no relief for the next generation. This causes great hardship to small family businesses, the farming community and many others in the State. The fact

that the matrimonial home is protected, and has been for a long time, is of no great benefit to these people. Despite what the Premier has said, there will be adverse effects in South Australia if this duty is continued, in isolation certainly. This will cause more people, particularly in the areas I have mentioned (small business people and farmers; in fact even large business people) to leave this State, as is happening.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I made perfectly clear when speaking in the debate on Tuesday last that I do not intend to increase the rate during the next financial year. I am aware of the hardship that occurs in certain cases in relation to rural and small business people. As recently as this morning I had a discussion with the Under-Treasurer, Mr. Barnes, about this matter. The Government is not only aware of this but is concerned to see that where genuine hardship prevails that something is done about it. It may well be (and I do not want to pre-empt the responsibility of Cabinet) that the Government will do something about this matter during the course of the next session of Parliament.

I want again to emphasise to the honourable member and other members of this House that, if the Government were to abort this particular tax, it would lose $17 500 000 annually to State revenue. Irrespective of what the honourable member says and irrespective of inflation, that amount has fallen over the past three or four years from $20 000 000 to the present level of $17 500 000, so there has been a reduction. I point out to the honourable member that no Government can take a decision to remove this tax without either finding some other source of revenue to replace that $17 500 000 or by cutting services to the extent of that amount in sensitive areas. Cuts would have to be in education, welfare, health, hospitals, etc., or it could be a combination.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What are they doing in the other States?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Other States have their own financial affairs to attend to and no doubt have attended to them. I want to make quite clear to the Deputy Leader that the Government does not intend to take the steps that have been taken in other States. I do not agree with the honourable member when he says that Victoria has taken steps to abolish succession duties; it has not. My information is that that State has certainly abolished them between spouses and surviving children. It has said that it will abolish the tax completely, if possible. What a qualification! The State Government does not intend at this stage to do away with this tax.

SMALL BUSINESS PREMISES

Mr. GROOM: Will the Attorney-General consider investigating certain undesirable practices, which are apparently creeping into the leasing of business premises to small business people, with a view to making appropriate reforms in this area to protect small business people from the oppressive practices of some landlords? It has been brought to my attention increasingly, and I have been shown lease documents, that a few landlords, on the renewal of the lease of business premises, demand from business tenants, often people who have spent many hard years building up a business, that, if they want their lease renewed, they will have to agree not only to the normal monthly rental and, say, renovating the premises by carrying out internal repairs, but these landlords are also insisting on a percentage of the goodwill on the sale of the business.

I have seen agreements which require small business tenants to pay some 10 per cent in goodwill to the landlord. I have seen other agreements which contain clauses requiring small business persons to pay 20 per cent in goodwill. In addition to the goodwill and the rental, the small business people are required to pay a percentage of their gross annual turnover. This morning, I was referred to a case which contains a 2½ per cent requirement for the small business person to pay over to the landlord annually. In addition, these clauses contain provisions requiring the tenant to lodge his income tax return within seven days of its being filed with the Taxation Department. Furthermore, at six-monthly intervals, they are required to lodge their balance-sheets to show what their gross turnover is.

I have seen such cases through my experience in the legal profession, and I am increasingly being shown these documents. The net effect to small business people is that if they do not agree to these terms they will lose their business. In the case of, say, a delicatessen business, which has been built up over many years, if the proprietors do not agree to terms such as these, they must walk out because they do not own the premises; they only own the business. They must walk out with nothing, other than the fixtures, and often the goodwill is the largest component. It is clearly oppressive to small business people to be put in this position because they do not come under the Residential Tenancies Act. If the matter is not looked at it will get worse.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government is well aware of the difficulties that confront small business people in the community in entering lease contracts and other types of contracts. We are particularly aware of the problems alluded to by the honourable member. I can tell him that I will look at this matter further to see what can be done within the existing legislative framework in an attempt to assist small business people in these quite dire circumstances. If necessary, we will introduce further legislation. It is most unfortunate that only this morning the conservative or reactionary members of the Opposition in the Upper House decided—

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Attorney-General is now alluding to a report which has yet to be received from another place and put before this House for further consideration. I ask you to rule that his comments are out of order at this juncture.

The SPEAKER: The report has more or less finished. The only question is whether the other place decides not to go ahead. However, I should like the honourable Attorney-General to stick to the question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Contracts Review Bill is directly related to the question, because that Bill would have provided relief to people in the circumstances to which the honourable member has referred. The report has been given to the House, and quite clearly the matter is no longer bound by the rules applying under Standing Orders. The Government introduced a measure to this House in November 1977, as a result of an election undertaking that it would introduce a Contracts Review Bill, that it would introduce legislation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General is out of order in answering in that way.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Chair explain in what way I am out of order?

Mr. Tonkin: If you want to disagree with his ruling, do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition is out of order. The honourable Attorney-

General is now using Question Time to discuss a report, and he must not continue in that way.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Then I will continue my answer in another vein. The honourable member has asked whether the Government is interested in introducing legislation to protect the position of people, such as small business people, who are confronted with the situation of having to enter a lease with harsh or unconscionable terms. The Government is very concerned about this matter. We have shown this concern in the past, through legislation that we have introduced. I am sure that, when the small business community in South Australia realises the fate of the legislation, there will be a great outcry about the actions of members in another place. I have no doubt that, when the Bill is reintroduced, members in another place will see the error of their ways. I hope that proper protection can then be provided for the people in such circumstances.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney has moved away once again. Has he finished answering the question?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Sir, the Attorney was reflecting on members in another place, and should withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney should not reflect on members in another place. I must uphold the point of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was reflecting on a corrupt decision, not on them personally.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Attorney should give a proper withdrawal.

Mr. Becker: Withdraw—come on!

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Hanson to order. The honourable Attorney-General should give an unqualified withdrawal.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I did not hear anyone call for a withdrawal, but if you are asking for one, Sir, I am happy to withdraw.

ARCHITECTS ACT

Mr. EVANS: In the absence of the Chief Secretary, will the Premier say what action the Government will take to allow building designers, architectural draughtsmen, and architectural technicians to continue to operate legally after 1 April next?

On 31 March 1977 the then Chief Secretary, the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield, brought in regulations exempting certain people from the provisions of the Architects Act, and those exemptions apply only until 1 April 1979. Subsequently, persons from those professions saw the present Chief Secretary, the Hon. D. W. Simmons. On 15 January 1979, minutes were taken by delegates at that meeting with the Chief Secretary, and Mr. Simmons advised the meeting of the noted loss of a file detected on Friday 12 January 1979. This loss had prevented him from perusing the file during the weekend of 13 and 14 January. He apologised for his lack of familiarity with the subject matter and requested permission for his staff to copy letters between his department and the Building Designers Association and the Institute of Draughtsmen, and from those bodies to the Government, to enable his office to reconstruct the file. Mr. Whittaker, one of the delegates at the meeting, sought confirmation by way of a formal reply to two letters from the B.D.A. to the Chief Secretary's Office. These related to permanent exemption for members of the B.D.A., or an extension of the exemption, if unresolved, by 1 April 1979. The Chief Secretary's reply indicated that exemption from the Act would not be given and an assurance for an extension was not necessary as the matter would be resolved before the present expiry date. As the Chief Secretary guaranteed that the matter would be resolved before 1 April, I ask the Premier what action the Government will take to ensure that these people can operate legally after 1 April.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would appreciate that I am not familiar with the subject. The Chief Secretary did report to me the loss of a file, and I am certain it was to do with the matter raised by the honourable member. As it is now 22 February, I will certainly see to it that the Chief Secretary gives attention to the matter, and I will ask him, if he can, to inform the honourable member on Tuesday next of the action proposed to be taken to avoid the problem to which the honourable member has alluded.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. WHITTEN: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy believe that alternative uses of Cooper Basin liquids other than piping them to Redcliff are viable? Furthermore, if alternatives are not viable, are demands for consideration of them effectively designed to damage further work on Redcliff? Immediately after the Hamer announcement concerning the I.C.I. proposed development, the Leader of the Opposition suggested that liquid should be piped to places other than Redcliff.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter has been raised previously and is absolutely fundamental for the consideration of the Redcliff proposal. The Leader of the Opposition raised this matter specifically in this House on Thursday 8 February, when he asked a question of Mr. Dunstan and called for consideration of alternatives. I have said many times (and I repeat it today for members of the Opposition because I think they have to convince their Leader) that consideration of alternatives is quite inappropriate at this stage. All the studies we have undertaken show clearly that a modified liquids scheme that involves leaving ethane in the town gas and just taking out of the Cooper Basin the l.p.g. and the heavier fractions is not a viable project. The rate of return is far too low for the investment that the Cooper Basin producers would have to undertake to be financed.

It is not even anywhere near the ball park, even with Government provision of infrastructure. If, on the most favourable alternative option, which would be a modified liquids scheme to Port Stanvac (on the studies that have been undertaken in South Australia and by the Commonwealth), that is not viable, it is difficult to see how one could contemplate a pipeline 200 miles longer to Sydney or 300 miles longer to Point Wilson to provide liquids to some I.C.I. project, and produce a viable project. This has been stated any number of times. The Federal members of the Liberal Party understand it but, unfortunately, the Leader does not understand it at this stage.

Mr. Tonkin: That's not true, again, you know.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Why is it that the following question was asked of Mr. Dunstan on 8 February:

> Much as I would desperately like to share the Premier's optimism for the sake of South Australia, it is necessary that we face realities, so that we can take other steps to promote South Australia's industrial development and use Cooper Basin liquids—

Mr. Tonkin: Read the question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has already asked his question. Interjections are out of order.

Mr. Gunn: But the Minister hasn't answered it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The proposition in the question is that Redcliff is in trouble because of I.C.I. and, therefore, we must consider alternatives.

Mr. Tonkin: You won't read the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am willing to read the whole question, but it will not add anything to the sum total of human knowledge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has many opportunities to answer what the honourable Minister is saying.

Mr. Venning: He needs help.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Rocky River to order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader asked:

> How does the Premier justify his apparent optimism that a major petro-chemical plant can still be established in South Australia? The Managing Director of Dow Chemical (Australia) Limited, Mr. Stoker, stated on 20 December 1978 that if the Victorian petro-chemical project started first Dow would pull out of South Australia. The General Manager of Delhi International Oil Corporation, Mr. R. Blair, said that Australia cannot absorb two similar petro-chemical facilities in the 1980's. The announcement made by I.C.I. yesterday covers two plants, one in Victoria and another in New South Wales and today Altona Petro-Chemical Company Limited has announced that its proposed $300 000 000 expansion would now be modified to a $200 000 000 expansion because of I.C.I's proposed activities.

That is the basis of the Leader's question, and then he went on to the things to which I have referred.

Mr. Tonkin: I expressed my concern.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader also expressed his requirement that consideration should be given to alternatives. First, let us deal with the question of alternatives. Great consideration has been given to alternatives and no study known to any of the companies, to the South Australian Government or anyone else has shown up a viable alternative. It is part of I.C.I's tactic with the Federal Government and with people in New South Wales and Victoria to say, "If we go ahead, Cooper Basin liquids won't be wasted, because they can be piped to us and we'll use them at Botany Bay and Point Wilson." That is not on, not because in the worst eventuality we would never agree to it, but simply because it is not viable. The rate of return cannot get anywhere near the kind of ball park that would enable the Cooper Basin producers to invest $150 000 000, which is what they would have to find. The I.C.I. reply on the wastage of Cooper Basin liquids is a phoney reply. The more we promote consideration of alternatives, the more we are playing into I.C.I's hands. That is the fundamental point I want the Leader and the Opposition to understand.

I want the Leader to understand clearly, and say publicly, that a grave danger exists, because of the studies that have been undertaken by the Commonwealth Government, the South Australian Government and the Cooper Basin producers, that, if a petro-chemical scheme based on Cooper Basin liquids does not go ahead, Cooper Basin liquids that are produced as a consequence of producing gas are likely to be flared and wasted. We cannot live with a situation where I.C.I imports naptha to Botany Bay and the liquids in the Cooper Basin are wasted. As the Leader wants me to refer to the whole question, I point out that the idea that Point Wilson will come on stream in 1984 is a furphy.

Mr. Tonkin: Filibustering again.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If we had bipartisan support from the Liberal members of this Parliament led by Mr. Tonkin of the form we had from Federal Liberal members, it would not be necessary to go through this exercise again. That is the score. I am talking to Opposition back-benchers, who should turn around the policy being followed by their Leader and Deputy Leader. Altona cannot go ahead until I.C.I. and Dow have both determined finally what they are going to do.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 125. The Minister, in answering a related question yesterday, took up an enormous amount of Question Time, and he is obviously intending to do so again today.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold that point of order. On many occasions this has happened in this House, and both sides have been guilty.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Altona cannot go ahead until Dow and I.C.I. have determined their final decision, because Altona has to sell its product to Dow and I.C.I. The Leader's remarks on Thursday 8 February regarding Altona making a genuine announcement that it would go ahead is a lot of nonsense. One of the reasons that I.C.I. made its announcement about Point Wilson was that it wanted to frighten off Altona from further work that that company was doing. This Point Wilson business is very much an I.C.I./Altona matter.

Botany Bay does not involve caustic soda. One of the things about Dow and Redcliff is that production of 500 000 tons of caustic a year is involved. The only alternative proposition to that is Point Wilson. I.C.I. has not got available to it the salt supply to make Point Wilson effective. Argument is going on between Esso and I.C.I. regarding Point Wilson or Altona. Let us get these things clear in our minds, and let us forget about the Leader's remarks regarding further consideration of alternatives to Redcliff at this stage, which are designed, even though he may not intend that to be so, to assist the I.C.I. position, but not the position of South Australia as a whole.

OWNERSHIP OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport take the necessary action to ensure that encumbrances over a motor vehicle and its ownership are clearly stated on the registration papers, so that people who drive a vehicle under lease or on hire-purchase are not able fraudulently to sell the vehicle? Mr. Bob Walsh of Hope Valley recently purchased an Alfa Romeo car. The purchase was made privately from a person who claimed ownership of the car, and presented registration papers made out in his name. Some time later, Mr. Walsh was approached by a finance company attempting to repossess the vehicle. The company claimed that the vehicle was being leased at the time of the sale and that the car belonged to the finance company. Mr. Walsh is now faced with the loss of a $9 400 car, with no protection. The person who sold the vehicle has since disappeared and cannot be found.

The Consumer Transaction Act does not grant any protection, as the original leasing agreement was more than $10 000. Incidentally, the answer to "What's Your Problem" in the *Advertiser* of 14 February this year was incorrect, as it did not reveal the limited application of the above Act. The inclusion of encumbrances over the vehicle and the ownership of the vehicle on the

registration papers would protect a large number of people, like Mr. Walsh. I point out to the Minister that, although I have written to him about this matter some time ago, I have not received a reply, so I am asking this question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the matter is subject to correspondence, I shall be pleased to check and get the details with which the honourable member provided me. Initially, we will look at the points he has raised today to ascertain whether there are grounds for a change in existing policy. I think it is fair to inform the honourable member that the question of the title to motor cars has been looked at on a number of occasions, and it has always become abundantly clear that, without an enormous organisation being set up to register titles (in fact, it has been suggested that something of the level of the Torrens title system as applies to land would be required), it would be quite an impossible situation.

What many people intend to do is accept the registration paper as proof of ownership when, in fact, it is merely proof of registered ownership, which is a totally different situation. If previous information I have been given is still accurate (and I have no reason to believe that it is not) I do not think that the Opposition would be very kind in its comments if we brought forward legislation to set up an organisation to register title, bearing in mind some of the rude comments we heard in this House in recent days.

Mr. Dean Brown: I didn't make any.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member did not make any, because I do not think he was involved in any of the debates in which I was involved. I will look into the matter to see whether there is any changed circumstance, and provide a reply to the honourable member in due season.

FULHAM GARDENS BUS SERVICE

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Transport tell me whether a firm date has yet been set for any changes that may take place to the Fulham Gardens bus service? The Minister is aware of my constituents' interest in this matter, particularly since the development of the Kidman Park Estate and the establishment of the Target store on Tapley Hill Road. A considerable number of people have been seeking an extension of the existing service, particularly towards the Henley Beach area, from those districts. I know that consideration has been given by the authority to improving services in that area, and I would be grateful for any information the Minister can give.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can give joy to the honourable member, who has persistently sought improvements in this area, by telling him that the bus service alterations to meet the request that he has persisted with will come into operation on Sunday week, 4 March. The alteration proposed is to bifurcate the existing Fulham Gardens bus service. That service will follow the existing route to Ashley Street, Torrensville, then via Garden Terrace and Pierson Street, Lockleys, along Findon Road, returning to the existing route along Valetta Road to the Fulham Target store; then via Tapley Hill Road, Cheadle Street, North Street to Military Road and Main Street, Henley Beach. The other leg of the bifurcated service will follow the existing route along Hartley Road, to Valetta Road, then via Marlborough Street, East Terrace, North Street, to Military Road and Main Street, Henley Beach. All in all, it will be about a 20-minute service, and the rearrangements to this service adequately meet the requests the honourable member has put forward on behalf of his constituents.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Premier obtain a report on the transport of tuna from South Australia to Victoria and inform this House whether such actions are detrimental to the fish processing industry in this State? I have been contacted by a number of employees at the cannery at Port Lincoln who have expressed concern that fresh tuna are being loaded on the wharf and road freighted to Victoria on Victorian transports. The people concerned believe that every truck load of tuna that leaves Port Lincoln means the loss of several days work for the cannery. I have also been given to understand that only limited tonnages of tuna are on store at Port Lincoln. As we are nearing the end of the tuna season, work could soon cease. The Premier would be aware that the tuna season could end this week, or it may go for another month, which is the nature of the species. My constituents are of the opinion that these actions are damaging to the continuity of employment in the processing industry.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can understand the concern expressed by the employees and referred to by the honourable member. I will obtain a report on whether tuna is being transported from South Australia to Victoria. Quite frankly, however, even if that report reveals that this is the case, I do not know what steps the South Australian Government could take to prevent it from happening. The honourable member will appreciate the difficulty—that it must be the marketing forces that are leading to this situation. However, I will certainly ask the appropriate authority to check it out and furnish me with a report, or otherwise to see whether I can confirm the matters raised by the honourable member.

INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE CHILD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare inform the House about the availability of special grants to help community groups stage events for International Year of the Child? Recently, I noticed details of a grant to an organisation in my electorate, and I would appreciate knowing whether these grants are still available.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Like the honourable Minister for Transport in a previous answer, I am glad to be able to bring forward a joyous answer to the honourable member. Grants are available from the I.Y.C. Grants Committee for community groups that require small-scale funding assistance with projects that they are hoping to stage as special activities during International Year of the Child.

Applications for the second lot of grants opened just over a week ago, and they will remain open until 11 April. An amount of $10 000 has been made available on this round and in most cases grants will be limited to a maximum of $300 to provide assistance and not necessarily to cover the total cost in the very worthwhile activities which are being promoted for International Year of the Child. The application forms for the grants (this is probably of interest to the honourable member and other members) can be obtained from any local government office, or from the State I.Y.C. unit at 50 Grenfell Street, Adelaide.

At this point I pay a tribute to local government throughout South Australia, because right from the beginning, in relation to my duties as co-ordinating Minister for International Year of the Child (which began last year), I am happy to record that excellent co-

operation and participation have been obtained from local government almost universally throughout this State. Not the least of the activities which local government accepted as a responsibility was to send representatives to a seminar held at Burnside. That seminar was held late last year during the organising year for International Year of the Child. The enthusiasm which was engendered at this seminar has been taken back to the local government areas, and the reports I am receiving from the Secretariat, which is in my department, connected with the International Year of the Child promotion are such that I am very pleased to commend local government for this activity.

For the first lot of grants, 93 applications were received from all parts of the State, 26 were adjudged successful by the International Year of the Child Grants Committee, and the amount disbursed on the first round was $7 450. Some of the applications were outstanding—in the sense of merit, rather than failing to arrive—but others failed to meet the criteria outlined by the committee, which, briefly, looked towards innovation in respect of projected projects, direct benefit to children, and, hopefully, reference to one or more rights of the child as expressed in the United Nations charter.

NEAPTR

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I should address my question to the Premier, although he may allow the Minister of Transport to take it. However, I shall address it to the Premier. Is the Government firmly committed to the route of the l.r.t. system along the Torrens Valley from Tea Tree Gully to Adelaide as it passes through St. Peters? The question is supplementary to a reply I received from the Minister of Transport last Tuesday to a Question on Notice, when the Minister said that the decision to go ahead firmly with this light rapid transit project along the Torrens Valley had been made by Cabinet on 12 February. He also said it was going to come out of normal Government funds. There was no suggestion in his answer that the Commonwealth was to come to the party. That was the answer I got on Tuesday, and I had seen a report of some remarks by the Minister of Transport in the *Advertiser* on 14 February, no doubt following the decision, in which he said, in part:

> The route favoured by the Government crosses the River Torrens seven times as it travels from Tea Tree Gully along the old Modbury corridor, through St. Peters and Walkerville, and into the city along King William Road.

The Minister said:

> The final route from Portrush Road to Park Terrace and into the inner city should be decided in consultation with the councils concerned.

There is a further report of the anger of the Mayors of St. Peters and Walkerville. The next day the Director-General of Transport seemed rather to correct the Minister, because, as reported on 15 February, the Director-General stated:

> The l.r.t. route from Tea Tree Gully to the city was not negotiable in the suburbs, Dr. Scrafton said yesterday. He said there would be discussions with suburban councils on minor details of alignment, but the Government would not entertain any major changes in the route.
>
> We will look at moving the alignment a few feet here and there, but we will not discuss changing the route in any major way, such as shifting it from the Torrens Valley to Payneham Road. The planning is finished in the corridor.

Then he talked about the city. The Liberal Party apparently accepts the route—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir, I've just—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question, and I hope he will cease.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Parliamentary Party passed a resolution on 14 February. The only thing that its members criticised was the way in which the route came into the city. Obviously, the Labor Government and the Liberal Party are at one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I defer to you, of course, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not continue in this way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask whether the Government is in fact as firm as Dr. Scrafton apparently thinks it is, as it goes through St. Peters, or whether there can be room for more than a few feet one way or the other for adjustment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Transport.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You're letting him take it?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He'll handle it very well, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is out of order, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If I was as uncharitable as is the member for Mitcham, I would now be thinking that this question was prompted because there is a Norwood by-election and he is trying to get himself off the hook for the scurrilous attack he made on the former Premier. I hope I am not that uncharitable. The honourable member referred to the question that he put on notice when he asked: "When will the Government make a decision?" He was informed that the decision had already been made. When the Government made that decision, I announced that the decision to adopt the recommendations within the e.i.s. had been accepted by the Government, with the exceptions of entry into and passage through the City of Adelaide, and that the Government believed that further discussions ought to take place with the city to determine whether an arrangement could be reached that would not cripple the proposed l.r.t. system and at the same time would meet with the pleasure of the city fathers. The Cabinet also said that the decision contained in the e.i.s. relating to at-grade crossings ought to be subject to further discussions with the Highways Department, the Road Traffic Board and the local government bodies concerned to decide whether economic considerations ought to be given less weight than they were or whether it was preferable to give more weight to the freer flow of traffic by putting in grade separation at the major roads. They were the two areas of further negotiation. We are in the process of appointing a preliminary design team, some members of which are already appointed, which has the responsibility of determining the final alignment in consultation with the local government bodies and—

Mr. Millhouse: You—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:—other interested groups in the area to decide whether it should go a few metres to the left or the right, or to the north or the south, as the case may be. Basically, the route along the Torrens Valley has been resolved.

I would have thought that even the honourable member would understand that without having to ask the question. Clearly, he is trying to get some information so that he can try to do his little bit of muck stirring in Norwood, as he consistently does.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr.

Speaker. I ask the Minister withdraw his reference to "muck stirring". He knows that I am completely against the whole l.r.t. scheme, but he makes the insinuation that I am muck raking in Norwood, and I ask that that be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

TOURIST SIGNS

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the proposed removal of tourist signs at present erected in areas under the control of councils that are members of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation be reconsidered by the Highways Department? The Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation consists of five councils, portions of four of which are in my district. These signs direct people to wineries and other places of recreation and entertainment. Today, I was asked by the Executive Officer of that organisation to see whether the matter could be reconsidered by the Commissioner of Highways.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question of signs in Southern Vales has been a matter of concern for some time. I think it was about two years ago that the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport and I, together with officers of our departments, met with the local government body and representatives of wineries in the area to try to find a solution to the problem of strangers in the area trying to find the many very pleasant wineries in the district. I do not think that the complete answer has yet been found. I am in sympathy with the desire of having better signs in the district, but I am also conscious that we do not want to have a countryside littered with too many signs. We need a blend in this matter, and hopefully the matter can be resolved. Certainly, I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with the Commissioner of Highways.

ESTATE DUTY

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered assuming State responsibility for any reassessment of property valuation when the valuation filed with probate documents is deemed by the State Commissioner of Taxes to be unsatisfactory? At the present moment, if the State Commissioner of Taxes in the succession duties field deems that a property is not properly valued when that valuation is forwarded with the probate documents he calls on a Commonwealth valuer to determine a value for the property. Thus, the executors become involved in an exercise with the Commonwealth, even though the Commonwealth has no jurisdiction nowadays in respect of probate or estate duties.

The position becomes even more difficult in that, if the Commonwealth valuation is not similar to the valuation which has been presented by the estate, the person is refused the opportunity to have the papers processed in any part or on an interim basis, so it falls outside the six-month period of grace before interest payments become due and payable. Further, should the valuer employed by the executors fail to agree with the Commonwealth valuer, the only course of action open is to accept another valuation made at the estate's cost by a person who is determined by the Commissioner of Taxes. It becomes a *Catch 22* situation and a messy one, particularly where the person is having to visit Commonwealth and State offices, even though it is only a State matter and the Commonwealth office is being used perhaps as a convenience, or shall I say as a convenient convenience. I believe that the purpose of my question has been explained fully and that the Premier will see the need for possibly a reform to bring the matter totally within the ambit of the State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly ask the appropriate officer to examine the points raised by the honourable member. It seems to me that the valuation by the Commonwealth would be an attempt by the State authorities to demonstrate that an independent valuation was being made rather than having a valuation by the State valuer, and then comparing that with the valuation of the independent valuer employed by the estate. That may be the reason behind it. If that is the case, that could be overcome by the employment of a valuer independent of Government service. I take it that the main reason for asking this question is the length of time that is likely to elapse as a result of that procedure being followed and that that could put people out of time. I assume that is the main concern of the honourable member. I will bring down a reply as soon as possible.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Pensions Act, 1971-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is, in a sense, consequential on the Bill to amend the Superannuation Act, 1974-1978, which is currently before this Parliament. The purpose of that amendment was to enable pensioners who were in receipt of entitlements from the superannuation fund to renounce all or part of cost of living increases from that fund where their retention would jeopardise entitlement to fringe benefits associated with Commonwealth pensioner status. This Bill provides for a corresponding amendment to the Police Pensions Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 34 of the principal Act, which deals with the adjustment of pensions payable under that Act. This clause inserts new subsections numbered (8), (9), and (10). The proposed subsection (8) provides that where, in the opinion of the Minister, a person in receipt of a pension would be prejudicially affected by an increase in pension under the principal Act, the Minister may determine that no such increase be granted, or that a lesser increase be granted. Proposed subsection (9) empowers the Minister to revoke any determination made under subsection (8), and proposed subsection (10) provides that a determination made under subsection (8) shall be disregarded for the purpose of calculating a spouse's pension or other benefit payable under the Act, with the exception of a payment on resignation under section 43 of the principal Act.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amendment the Superannuation Act, 1974-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill.

The purpose of this short amending Bill is to enable pensioners who are in receipt of entitlements from the Superannuation Fund to renounce all, or part of, cost of living increases from that fund where their retention would jeopardise entitlement to fringe benefits associated with Commonwealth pensioner status.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 98 of the principal Act, which deals with the adjustment of pensions payable under that Act. This clause inserts new subsections numbered (9), (10), and (11). The proposed subsection (9) provides that where, in the opinion of the board, a pensioner would be prejudicially affected by an increase in his pension under the principal Act, the board may determine that no such increase be granted, or that a lesser increase be granted. Proposed subsection (10) empowers the board to revoke any determination made under subsection (9), and proposed subsection (11) provides that an increase which is not paid as a result of the operation of subsection (9) shall be taken into account as if it had been paid in calculating any other pension payable under the Act, with the exception of a payment to a legal personal representative, under section 81 of the principal Act.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Film Corporation Act, 1972-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a first time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill.

The principal object of this Bill is to widen the powers of the Film Corporation in relation to the financing of films. It is desirable that the corporation should have full power to invest money in films of which it is not the producer, to participate in schemes of various kinds for the financing of feature films, and to lend moneys in relation to films that the corporation itself proposes to produce. In its efforts to attract film producers to this State, the corporation needs to advance production moneys, upon proper commercial security, with the end in view of giving employment opportunities to South Australian technicians in this industry. The Bill also seeks to give the corporation the power to invest in short-term investments any moneys that are not immediately required for the purposes of the Act. Most statutory bodies have this power.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 gives the corporation the specific function of promoting and participating in schemes for financing film production. Clause 3 specifically empowers the corporation to lend moneys to any person for the purposes of film production. Clause 4 empowers the corporation to invest any moneys not immediately required, either on deposit with the Treasurer, or in any other form of investment that the Treasurer may approve.

Mr. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Gas Company's Act, 1861-1952. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I do not propose to go through the second reading explanation, but I point out to members that this Bill, because it amends what is, in effect, a private Act, must be referred to a Select Committee, and will be subject to detailed consideration by that Select Committee. It is important that the Select Committee be appointed this afternoon so that it can report next week, and the matters involved in the Bill can be concluded before the end of the session.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The SPEAKER: Order! As an exception has been taken, the honourable Minister must read the second reading explanation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members will be aware of the attempts that have been made by interests outside South Australia to gain control of a number of South Australian companies. Over the last few months, outside interests, mainly associated with Mr. Brierley, have been actively involved in purchasing shares in the South Australian Gas Company, and now have a substantial shareholding in the company.

The South Australian Gas Company is a public utility and operates under its own special Act of Parliament. It has granted to it by the State an exclusive franchise to distribute and supply gas dating from 1861. Over that period, the South Australian Gas Company has developed into a highly efficient company which has served the interests of South Australia, and in particular Adelaide, very well. Its administration and distribution costs are such that per unit of gas sold they are the lowest in Australia.

The form of the South Australian Gas Company's Act and its subsequent amendments have always recognised that the monopoly franchise granted to the Gas Company by the Parliament gave Parliament, acting on behalf of the community, a right to be concerned at the matter of control of the company. For example, the 1861 Act imposed a scale of voting on shareholders which limited the maximum number of votes that any shareholder could exercise to seven. This provision was amended in 1874 to provide no maximum but a scale of voting which weighted very heavily the small shareholdings as against the large. The 1874 provision has been unchanged to this day. Arrangements such as this are features of all gas

companies which have, in Australia, similar franchise to that of the South Australian Gas Company.

For example, the Queensland Parliament has limited the voting power of shareholders of All Gas Energy Limited (those amendments were introduced in the Queensland Parliament only a few years ago). In New South Wales, shareholders of A.G.L. and North Shore Gas Companies are limited as to the size of their holdings, while the Newcastle Company places a restriction on the number of votes that can be exercised by any one shareholder.

I should make clear that it is not acceptable to the Government of South Australia, to those who are presently involved as Directors of the South Australian Gas Company, and I believe to the community as a whole, that a person such as Mr. Brierley should be permitted, in effect, to control the franchise granted by Parliament to the Gas Company.

I am informed that Mr. Brierley already has control of gas supplies in Auckland and in Hobart and is currently attempting to gain control in both Newcastle and Adelaide. The purpose of this Bill is to prevent Mr. Brierley's objectives (or for that matter anyone else's) from being achieved and to introduce provisions which will enable the South Australian shareholders of the Gas Company to continue electing Boards of Directors such as those that have controlled the Gas Company in the past and co-operated so effectively with all Governments, irrespective of their political complexion.

The Bill, as it is framed presently, provides for a limitation on shareholding so that no individual shareholder can hold more than 5 per cent of the shares. The only current shareholder that this provision would affect will be Mr. Brierley and, if Parliament concurs with the restriction, Mr. Brierley will be required by law to divest himself of any excess shares above 5 per cent.

In addition, the Bill contains a provision that limits the voting power of any one shareholder to five votes. It is also designed to ensure that control cannot be obtained through the device of inducing associates of a shareholder to buy shares, thus forming a group. Where a group of associated shareholders is declared, then that group can exercise only five votes. I emphasise to members the special nature of the South Australian Gas Company, its monopoly position and its status as a public utility. The Government and the community must be satisfied that those who exercise control in the Gas Company are people who will act in the best interests of the community. The Government is not at present satisfied that Mr. Brierley fulfils that condition.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enacts new section 5a in the South Australian Gas Company's Act. New subsection (1) provides that no shareholder, and no group of associated shareholders, is entitled to hold more than 50 per cent of the shares of the company. New subsection (2) defines the circumstances in which two or more shareholders are to be regarded as a group of associated shareholders. New subsection (3) is an evidentiary provision. New subsection (4) limits the number of votes that may be cast on any question arising at any general meeting of the company by any single shareholder or group of associated shareholders. New subsections (5), (6), (7) and (8) enable the directors or secretary of the company to obtain information for the purposes of determining whether a shareholder or a transferee of shares is a member of a group of associated shareholders. New subsection (9) enables the Minister to require a shareholder to dispose of shares where he or a group of associated shareholders hold more than the permissible maximum number of shares. New subsections (10), (11) and (12) deal with the consequences of a failure on the part of a shareholder to obey a requirement under subsection (9).

These provisions result in the Registrar of Companies disposing of excess shares and ensuring that any moneys realised from the sale of forwarded shares shall, after deduction of the reasonable costs of the forfeiture of sale, be paid to the shareholder from whom the shares were bought. There is no provision in the Bill that would enable the Government to collect shares and hold them in the Government's name. They have to be sold to the general public. The Bill must go before a Select Committee and to facilitate this process and to ensure that the Select Committee will have time to deal with this hybrid Bill, I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the second reading debate to be continued forthwith.

Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I want to make clear at the outset that the Opposition would not agree to such legislation as presented in any other circumstances if it applied to a private company other than the South Australian Gas Company. I am always conscious of the need to preserve freedom in the market place. To enable members to study the Bill, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for a variety of amendments to the principal Act. The most prominent of these are, first, the enactment of a new section empowering the commissioner to remove unattended vehicles from roads declared under the principal Act to be controlled-access roads, secondly, the enactment of provisions which will enable the titles of land comprising roads closed under the principal Act to be consolidated with the titles of contiguous land, and thirdly, the recasting of parts of the existing section which authorises the payment of moneys out of the Highways Fund. The Bill also deals with other matters, including the delegation of the commissioner's powers and functions, the recasting of the provision relating to the deputy commissioner and the substitution of Ministerial consent for the approval of the Governor in the disposal of land held by the commissioner.

The authority to remove unattended vehicles is similar to the existing police and local government powers in this area. However, the latter, at least, are only operable in local government areas; consequently, it is considered desirable that the commissioner should be vested with power of his own. The proposed provisions relating to the consolidation of titles are the same, in substance, as existing provisions in the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, 1932-1978. In many cases, however, the commissioner chooses to exercise the right of closure contained in the Highways Act, as this, unlike the parallel procedure in the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, does not necessitate local government approval. Consequently,

there is a need for consolidation provisions in the principal Act.

The provisions concerned with the disbursement of moneys from the highways fund have been partially recast for two main reasons; to provide a rather more flexible formula to cover payments relating to road safety, and to remedy a possible flaw in the existing terminology which may, strictly, require Parliamentary authority for those payments, and also payments relating to the operation of ferry services. In addition, a small paragraph has been inserted to ensure that authority exists to make payments for administrative cost of functions carried out by the commissioner otherwise than under the principal Act. The commissioner's participation in certain local government drainage programmes and the maintenance of the River Torrens make this provision desirable.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enacts a new section numbered 12a which enables the commissioner to delegate his powers and functions to any officer of the Highways Department. This provision validates delegations which the commissioner may have made prior to these amendments coming into effect. Clause 3 substitutes a new section 13 for the existing provision in the principal Act, relating to the deputy commissioner. The old section provided for the appointment of a deputy only in cases where, for various reasons, the commissioner was unable to perform his duties. The proposed section establishes a permanent deputy commissioner who, in addition to his other duties of office may perform the duties of the commissioner in the latter's absence.

Clause 4 amends section 20 of the principal Act, which provides, *inter alia*, for the disposal of land vested in the commissioner. This amendment substitutes reference to the approval of the Minister for the existing reference to the consent of the Governor. Clause 5 inserts a new section numbered 26e into the principal Act. This section empowers the commissioner to remove vehicles from controlled-access roads if they are left unattended for twenty-four hours or more or if they are in a position that is likely to obstruct traffic or cause injury. This provision also requires the commissioner to give notice of removal to the owner of a vehicle which has been removed, and if the owner does not claim the vehicle, the commissioner may sell, or otherwise dispose of it.

Clause 6 effects a minor amendment consequential on the amendments contained in clause 7, which inserts new sections numbered 27ad, 27ae, and 27af into the principal Act. These sections provide for the consolidation of titles of land comprised in roads closed under the principal Act and contiguous land. Section 27ad sets out the procedure to be followed in cases where the titles are to be consolidated at the instigation of the commissioner, while 27ae deals with the situation where a registered proprietor of two adjacent areas of land, one of which was a road closed under the principal Act, applies for consolidation himself. Section 27af provides that, on consolidation, the closed road shall be deemed to be merged with, and have the same identity as, the contiguous land.

Clause 8 amends section 32 of the principal Act, which is concerned with the payment of moneys out of the Highways Fund. This clause re-casts paragraphs *(l)*, *(m)*, *(n)* and *(o)*, and inserts a new paragraph identified as *(p)*. Paragraphs *(l)* and *(m)* deal with payments in respect of road safety. In the existing provisions, the moneys payable ought, strictly, to be appropriated by Parliament; in the proposed amendments the Treasurer will simply certify the amounts due. Paragraph *(l)* has also been redrafted so that the maximum amount available for payment is expressed as a percentage of the amounts received by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles for the issue of drivers' licences. The old provision referred to a particular amount of money for every licence issued. This is unsatisfactory, as it requires amendment if licence fees and the duration of licences are altered, as they were in 1976. The new provision is to have effect back to the first of July of that year. Paragraph *(n)* which deals with payments for the provision of ferry services, has been amended so as to delete the existing requirement for appropriation by Parliament and the new paragraph *(o)* which is concerned with payments for traffic control devices, is now expressed in terms which more closely follow those of a related section in the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1976. Paragraph *(p)* permits payment to defray the administrative cost of functions carried out by the commissioner otherwise than under the principal Act.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Railways Act, 1936-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This small amending Bill is, in a sense, consequential on the Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1975, which is currently before this Parliament. The purpose of this Bill is to amend section 84 of the principal Act, which deals with the disposal of surplus railway land held by the State Transport Authority. At present such disposals require the consent of the Governor. In the light of amendments to the corresponding provisions of the Highways Act, it is proposed that Ministerial approval be substituted.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 84 of the principal Act by substituting reference to the "approval of the Minister" for the existing reference to the "consent of the Governor."

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 11 to 13 (clause 3)—Leave out definition of "electoral candidate".

No. 2. Page 1, line 16 (clause 3)—After "the recipient's family" insert "or the estate of a deceased member of the recipient's family".

No. 3. Page 1, line 16 (clause 3)—Leave out "or from public funds".

No. 4. Page 2, lines 10 to 13 (clause 3)—Leave out definition of "person to whom this Act applies".

No. 5. Page 2, lines 14 and 15 (clause 3)—Leave out "two hundred dollars or such amount as may be prescribed" and insert "four hundred dollars".

No. 6. Page 2, lines 18 to 23 (clause 3)—Leave out definition of "relevant day" and insert definition as follows:

' "the relevant day" means the thirtieth day of September in each year:'

No. 7. Page 2, lines 24 to 31 (clause 3)—Leave out definition of "return period" and insert definition as follows: '"return period" means any period of twelve months expiring on the thirtieth day of June:'

No. 8. Page 2, lines 35 to 43 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert subclause as follows: "(2) The Registrar shall be an officer of Parliament."

No. 9. Page 2, line 44 (clause 5)—Leave out "person to whom this Act applies" and insert "Member".

No. 10. Page 2, lines 45 and 46 (clause 5)—Leave out "containing prescribed information relating to" and insert "disclosing".

No. 11. Page 3, lines 4 to 13 (clause 5)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

(b) Any body (whether corporate or unincorporate) formed for the purpose of securing profit for its members in which he or a member of his family has a share.

(c) Any trust under which he or a member of his family is a beneficiary.

(d) Any official position that he or a member of this family has in any body (whether corporate or unincorporate) formed for the purpose of securing profit for its members.

(e) Any proprietary interest that he or a member of his family has in any real property (not being his ordinary place of residence); and

(f) Any fund in which he or a member of his family has an actual or prospective interest to which contributions are made by any person other than the member or a member of his family.

No. 12. Page 3, lines 16 to 28 (clause 6)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert subclauses as follow:

(2) No disclosure of the contents of the register, or of information derived from the register or any return, shall be made otherwise than in accordance with this section.

(3) The Registrar shall, at the request of the Speaker of the House of Assembly, permit the Speaker to inspect so much of the register as relates to members of the House of Assembly and shall, at the request of the President of the Legislative Council, permit the President to inspect so much of the register as relates to members of the Legislative Council.

No. 13. Page 3, line 29 (clause 7)—Leave out "person to whom this Act applies" and insert "Member".

No. 14. Page 3, line 35 (clause 7)—Leave out "thousand" and insert "hundred".

No. 15. Page 3, lines 38 and 39 (clause 9)—Leave out "such regulations as are contemplated by this Act, or as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of this Act" and insert "regulations prescribing forms for the purposes of this Act".

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

Members in another place have proposed that electoral candidates should not be included in the Bill. The Government believes that it would be unfair and unreasonable to place a member of Parliament at a disadvantage when contesting an election, he having disclosed his financial interests, if the candidate standing against him was put in a position where he did not need to comply with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the amendment made by the other place, which I think is reasonable. This legislation requires members of Parliament to disclose their interests because they may be influenced improperly in their decisions in Parliament. An electoral candidate cannot be influenced properly or improperly by his pecuniary interests in standing as a candidate. There is no basis to the Attorney's argument.

The disclosure of interests by members of Parliament is supported by the Opposition, because members should not be influenced in their decisions because of their pecuniary interests. However, there is no sense in candidates disclosing interests. A person may wish to stand for Parliament and, if he is obliged to declare his pecuniary interests and is not successful in his attempt to win the seat, his business competitors and other people might take advantage of the disclosure that he had been forced to make simply because he wished to represent an electorate of the State.

I believe that that is an unfair and unreasonable requirement, and it achieves nothing. Legislation is valuable and justified only if it achieves something. How on earth can asking a candidate to disclose his pecuniary interests have any influence at all on the proceedings of this place when he is not even a member?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe that the Attorney's argument gives the lie to the rationale he advanced to justify the Bill. Here he is claiming that it could be unfair to a member of Parliament to have to declare his interests. The whole purpose of the Attorney's Bill is to assure that the affairs of a member are known so that there can be no conflict of interest. If there is any unfairness, the member would have some interests of which he is not proud. If all is above board, there can be no way in which there can be any disadvantage to any member of Parliament having to disclose his interests. The second point to which the Leader referred was particularly valid. The whole idea was that there would be no conflict of interest if a person is a member of Parliament. A candidate is not a member of Parliament. The Attorney knows that, and his argument is complete nonsense.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 3 to 7:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 3 to 7 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 3 is intended to delete the words "or from public funds" from the definition of "financial benefit". We believe that financial benefit quite clearly flows to a member if he gains a benefit from public funds and that therefore it should be included in the definition of "financial benefit".

Amendment No. 4 seeks to delete an electoral candidate. As the House has already dealt with that matter, that amendment should be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 5 proposes that the prescribed amount should be $400 and not $200 "or such amount as may be prescribed". We believe that "prescribed amount", the maximum amount under which gifts and the like do not have to be disclosed, at $400 is too high. Also, fixing that amount and failing to allow for variations for inflation and the like seems to be quite unreasonable. The flexibility that the power to declare the amount by proclamation gives should be written into the Bill.

Amendment No. 6 seeks to delete the words "electoral candidates" from the Bill. That is consequential on the disagreement to the first amendment.

Amendment No. 7 seeks to make the return period 12 months instead of six months. I oppose that, because I believe that, if the register is to have any validity, it must be kept reasonably up to date, and six months is a

reasonable period in which members should make declarations.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 8:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 be agreed to.

This amendment seeks to ensure that the Registrar shall be an officer of the Parliament. I have no strong objection to that. I think that the flexibility contained in the measure before was desirable. I think I stated in the second reading debate that it was the Government's intention to appoint an officer of the Parliament. If members in another place want to write that into the legislation, I have no strong objection to that.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 9:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 9 be agreed to.

This amendment is consequential on the proposal of another place that amendment No. 1 should stand—that electoral candidates should be taken out of the legislation. The House having disagreed to that amendment, it should now disagree to this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 10 and 11 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 12 to 15:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 12 to 15 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 12 is designed to delete clause 6 (2), (3), (4), and (5). This is probably the nub of the measure. Unlike their counterparts in the Liberal Party in Victoria, members opposite apparently believe that there should be secrecy in these matters. The proposal in this amendment is that the register should be a secret document made public only to the Registrar and the Speaker or President. The Government believes that that is completely unacceptable. The fundamental principle of this legislation is to demonstrate to people of South Australia that we, as members of Parliament, in our financial dealings and the way we deal with the finances of the State and our affairs in conducting the business of the House, are beyond reproach. The only way to demonstrate that is to have a financial register which is a public document.

We are at one with the Victorian Liberal Government in this. We believe it ought to be a public register. I would like to hear reasons why members opposite disagree with their Victorian colleagues about this matter, because the Victorian Government has already clearly stated that its register will be public. I think that on 28 February the register will be completed for the first time and made available to the public. Somebody in the Opposition just mentioned that he was concerned about information leading to the disclosure of the place of residence of the member. He may notice that I have accepted a proposal by the Upper House that a member does not have to disclose details of his ordinary place of residence. That should go some way towards overcoming that difficulty.

Amendment No. 13 relates to whether the Bill should cover electoral candidates or not. I propose that that amendment should be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 14 proposes that the penalty under this legislation should be $500 instead of $5 000. This Bill should mean something, and therefore should have teeth. Any member of this place who was confronted with a $500 fine would not be confronted with any sort of deterrent at all. Any member of this Parliament could easily and well afford to pay a $500 fine. It would be little or no deterrent at all, and I believe the penalty should be more realistic. When it is considered that it is the maximum penalty, $5 000 is a very reasonable amount in all the circumstances.

As to amendment No. 15, the Parliamentary Counsel drafted the proposal relating to regulations (clause 9) in the normal manner. That clause provides:

The Governor may make such regulations as are contemplated by this Act, or as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of this Act.

That is a normal provision put into Acts. For some reason members of the Legislative Council have been very sensitive to this matter, and they have sought to replace this provision by simply providing:

Regulations prescribing forms for the purposes of this Act.

In other words, they are not permitting any sort of limited regulation-making power. As with other legislation, it is desirable and necessary to have regulation-making power to provide for the administrative arrangements necessary to carry the Act into effect. Therefore, the Government proposes that amendment No. 15 be disagreed to.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to speak to amendment No. 12 specifically. As I have said before, I believe that members of Parliament have an acknowledged responsibility to declare their financial interests and to make quite certain that not only are their decisions taken without being influenced by personal and pecuniary interests but also that they are seen to be so taken if necessary.

Although the right of privacy of members of Parliament is very seriously affected by their position as members of Parliament, they, with their families, are entitled to some elements of privacy, reduced though they may be because of their public position. The Attorney-General's remarks come very strangely from somebody who advocated this very system himself. The Attorney-General's Party made submissions to the Joint Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament on this very matter, some time before he hurriedly introduced the first Bill into this House. I support amendment No. 12.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Tell us why you do not support your Victorian colleagues.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not think our Victorian colleagues come into it. What they decide is their own affair. What this Parliament decides is its own affair. What made the Attorney-General change his mind?

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14 and 15 was adopted:

Because the amendments would destroy the intention of the policy underlying the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14 and 15, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the disagreement to the amendments of the Legislative Council be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Becker, Duncan, Hemmings, and Klunder.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 9.15 a.m. on Monday 26 February.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

NORTH HAVEN TRUST BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 2829.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): We support the proposal for this Bill to go to a Select Committee. I was fortunate to be one of the persons on the original Select Committee that looked at the proposal to establish North Haven as a residential development. At that time, there was some public outcry about the environmental effect that this development would have on the area. Some people argued that several very special species of birds that only frequent that area would be affected. Another person turned up with a goanna which he admitted came from St. Kilda and not from the North Haven area, although he thought it used to inhabit the area. Another person came forward with a snake. I am not sure where it was caught, but it was not very pleasant to have it at a Select Committee meeting, and, even though it was in a jar, it was very much alive.

Since that time, the project has proceeded reasonably well. The developers had some initial difficulties because of the massive escalation in costs that arose during the 1972-1975 period. There have always been great difficulties in developing boating facilities and the marina. The Government, local government and the developing organisations have not been able to proceed in the way most of us envisaged they would be able to do, to create the facilities that we know the boating community in Adelaide needs.

There is a drastic shortage of boating facilities in South Australia. Loading ramps are very scarce for people who want to use pleasure craft for cruising, fishing or sailing. There is no doubt that the recreational boating people of South Australia constitute one of the groups that have been neglected.

Referring this Bill to a Select Committee will give both sides of the House an opportunity to discuss the desirability of having an authority to control a marina, with other experts in this field to establish whether it is a good idea. Personally, I cannot say at this stage whether I support placing a marina under the control of an authority. The evidence that comes before the Select Committee should be interesting. It seems to be the Government's attitude to move towards having authorities at every opportunity.

One of the reasons for that is the Government's desire to have as much borrowing power as possible. Every time the Government borrows $1 000 000, whether annually, bi-annually, or tri-annually for any of these projects, the actual interest debt is not paid by the authority: it has to be met by the general taxpayer from general revenue. This will happen, unless we state that it will not happen in relation to a particular venture, and we then put on the authority the cost of interest due on any Loan moneys involved. Perhaps the members of the Select Committee can look at that suggestion to establish whether, in setting up an authority, we give it an opportunity to borrow, but at the same time say to it that the general taxpayer should not be expected to carry the interest burden. I do not know what the attitude of the Government will be on this project.

If this Select Committee results in a significant increase in boating facilities in South Australia it will be a good move, so long as the debt that we place on the general taxpayer does not become so prohibitive in the long term that we cannot afford to buy the boats to enjoy the pleasures that the marina will provide. Not only boating facilities but also other facilities can be created around an area such as this.

I support the proposal that the Bill should go to a Select Committee. I do not think that the second reading explanation contained a great deal of information that will help in making an assessment of the end result. It would have been better had the Minister given substantial information on the progress of the project in the developmental area of houses, allotments, and reserves. If there have been problems, we are entitled to know, but we have not been told that there have been problems of any significance.

Some questions have been asked, and answers have been given explaining at least some of the problems. I hope that, in replying later, the Minister will not hide from Parliament where the failures, the faults, or the disappointments have been in the North Haven project. I hope that he will tell us, so that people will know why, when we have set up such a project, it has not gone ahead as speedily as was expected. The project is not a bad one. Allotments and houses have been satisfactory, and the environment is a good one in which to live, but some problems have occurred, perhaps in creating the marina as we would have liked to see it develop. I support the Bill so that it can be referred to a Select Committee and I shall be interested to read the report of that committee.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Bannon, Chapman, Olson, Russack, and Whitten; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 28 February.

Later:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): By leave, I move:

That Mr. Mathwin be substituted for Mr. Russack as a member of the Select Committee.

Motion carried.

APPEAL COSTS FUND BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 February. Page 2442.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Bill implements the thirty-first report of the Law Reform Committee, and I express some pleasure that the Government has introduced it. The Government has a shocking record in the matter of implementing the recommendations of the Law Reform Committee, although this is the third recommendation to be implemented in this session. Overall, South Australia has the worst record in the Commonwealth for the implementation of recommendations of a Law Reform Committee.

When I introduced a private member's Bill to give partial effect to one of the recommendations of the Law Reform Committee in relation to trespass I received a bland reply from the Attorney-General to the effect that

he was not willing to make these minor amendments to the law of trespass, because he intended to implement the recommendations of the Law Reform Committee, he hoped during this session. He has very little time left in which to do it during this session, and I am convinced that he was fobbing me off, because he did not want the Opposition or me to get credit for reforming the law to any degree. The problem for us to solve will be with us in a month or so, and there will be cold comfort for those concerned. The Government has been sluggish, looking at the Australian scene, in implementing recommendations from law reform committees and commissions. The thirty-first report was made on 18 January 1974, so it has taken the Government more than five years to implement this recommendation. The report is not long, nor is it complicated, consisting only of six pages, and mainly comprising a discussion of the Tasmanian Appeal Costs Fund Act, 1968. The implementation of this recommendation was not breaking new ground. There was a precedent to work on, complete with judgments on the Act by the court, so the drafting would not have been a serious problem.

However, after five years, the Bill is here at last. I shall briefly quote from the report of the committee, the signatories to the report being the Hon. Mr. Justice Zelling, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Keeler, Mr. Justice Cox, and Mr. (now the Hon.) K. T. Griffin. The report states:

> We have no doubt of the justice of such legislation and have no hesitation in recommending the reform of the law to give effect to it.

There is discussion of the Tasmanian Act, and the only material way in which the current legislation would vary from that is in relation to the financing of the fund.

The Bill follows the recommendation fairly faithfully. The provision for excess funds to be applied for the purpose of providing legal assistance, funding research with a view to reforming the law, or for any other purpose, as approved by the Attorney-General, seems novel, but I do not think we can object to it. I refer to page 4 of the report, paragraph 3. The report notes that the resources for the fund in Tasmania would be likely to be less than those available under this Bill. Members who have studied the Bill will see that the Government proposes to set aside a percentage of the moneys taken by way of fines over a prescribed period. The Auditor-General's Report reveals that the amount of money coming to the Crown through fines is considerable, running into millions of dollars. The source of the funds and the percentage is not spelt out but, if a percentage of the fines is available to the appeals fund, the reservoir is fairly full.

That is not the case in Tasmania, where funds are likely to fall short of the demand. They place on top of fines a charge of 10c, as outlined in the report, to go into the fund. In the case of a short-fall, people were to be paid out on a percentage basis. If the sum in the fund does exceed the demand on it in any one year, the excess would be applied to the payment in past years.

I think some consideration could well be given to the possibility of surplus money in the fund, if it is more than sufficient to cover the demand in any one year, being used for another year to pay any unsatisfied claims from previous years. That matter deserves consideration. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Costs."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Minister know whether any consideration was given to including a provision to cover the situation in any year when the fund did not contain enough money to satisfy claims and costs, by using a surplus from some other year. Retrospective payments could then be made to litigants whose claims were not satisfied in an earlier year. This condition applies in Tasmania, and the deliberations of the Law Reform Committee were largely based on evidence obtained from an examination of the Tasmanian legislation. Perhaps the Government is confident that the fund will be kept topped up because the source of funds for the appeals is a percentage of fines and the reservoir available would be larger than the 10c added to fines in Tasmania.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development): I cannot answer specifically on that point. Clause 6 provides for the Treasury to pay into the fund amounts that are determined by the Attorney-General of a prescribed percentage of the revenue derived during a period specified by the Attorney-General. That period as well as the percentage could be variable and could be adjusted. I imagine the Attorney-General would have in mind monitoring the fund closely and would know some time in advance whether it would be adequate. I believe there is enough flexibility in the provisions for that.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2), 1979

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 February. Page 2639.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): The Opposition is not happy about this Bill which contains provisions that do not endear themselves to this side of the House. In his second reading explanation the Minister states:

> The principal object of this Bill is to clarify and amplify the regulation-making power that was inserted in the Local Government Act in 1978, relating to the parking and standing of vehicles. Over the past months, the regulations for this purpose have been drafted and it has become apparent that certain of the heads of power set out in new section 475a of the Act should be expanded so that all necessary points can be covered by the regulations.

It is obvious from that statement and the Bill that an error, an oversight or neglect in some way has necessitated the introduction of this Bill. The Opposition is particularly concerned about the retrospectivity that could be involved. I have tried to investigate all aspects of this Bill, and I believe that a technical oversight may have necessitated the clauses, particularly clauses 8 and 9.

In his second reading explanation the Minister states:

> Clause 8 provides a solution to a problem that arose out of the two amending Acts of 1978. Section 679 of the principal act was enacted by the Local Government Act Amendment Act, 1978, in a form that included an incorrect passage.

That is the point I am making. Someone who was responsible for the oversight and presentation of this Bill allowed it to be introduced in an incorrect and imperfect form, and it is therefore necessary to introduce this present Bill.

The Minister also states:

> This passage was deleted by the Local Government Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1978, but unfortunately this latter Act came into operation several months after the first amending Act. This clause provides that the amendment so effected shall be deemed to have come into operation at the same time as the commencement of the first amending Act.

That is the part that is abhorrent to us. When making

inquiries about this matter, I was told that the section in question was in a Bill which was assented to on 6 April 1978, and the other Bill was assented to on 27 April 1978. There must be a discrepancy between those two dates in relation to this clause. The amending Bill which was proclaimed on 27 April 1978 repealed certain sections of the principal Act, and nothing was done about this until 8 June 1978, and clause 8 of this Bill endeavours to overcome that particular problem.

Another problem relates to clause 9. It is somewhat difficult for a layman to understand the intent, but the second reading explanation possibly assists. Clause 9 provides that the repeal of a by-law does not affect a resolution passed under the repealed by-law where the substituted by-law has substantially the same provisions as the repealed by-law. I suspect that the by-law had to be repealed and a new one introduced. According to the second reading explanation, the new by-law will be substantially the same in its provisions as was the old one. Clause 9 provides:

> The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 672 thereof:
>
> 672a. Where a by-law, whether made before or after the commencement of the Local Government Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1979, repeals a by-law, or a part of a by-law, that provides that a council may pass a resolution for any particular purpose, and the repealing by-law contains provisions substantially corresponding to those of the repealed by-law—

That softens the blow of retrospectivity, because it covers a short time, as I see it, from 27 April to 8 June. The retrospectivity provision in clause 9 means that the intention of the present provision remains the same as in the previous Act. There are one or two other problems in the Bill. The second reading explanation states:

> Further consideration has also been given to the question of who should be liable for parking offences. At the moment, the Act provides that the owner of a vehicle is the person presumed to have parked the vehicle contrary to the Act. Difficulty has often been experienced in obtaining convictions, for it is only too easy for the owner to deny the allegations and, in the absence of any other evidence, he is then acquitted. The Bill provides that in every case, the owner and the driver will each be liable for the offence. The regulations will provide a defence for either the owner or the driver in the case where the other of them has been convicted of the offence.

I expect that the final sentence I have just read makes it possible for one or the other to pay the fine. I will ask the Minister to clarify the situation in Committee

I express the deep concern of the Opposition, because of the mistakes caused by the maladministration of those responsible. This is not the first time this has happened. I recall only recently that a Minister of the Crown in South Australia said to the public, "That was a mistake. I'm sorry." Great difficulties have been caused to local government and those responsible for carrying out what the Bill provides. Councils have been placed in an embarrassing position, because of the Government. The Government must be reprimanded and challenged to explain why these things have happened.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I move:

> Page 1, after line 9—Insert subclause as follows:
>
> (2) The Governor may in a proclamation made for the purposes of subsection (1) of this section, suspend the operation of any specified provisions of this Act until a subsequent day fixed in the proclamation, or a day to be fixed by subsequent proclamation.

My amendment provides (it is not clear in the drafting) that the Bill may be introduced in stages by virtue of proclamation. Where the new regulations are not complete, the old by-law making powers may continue until they are complete.

Mr. RUSSACK: On checking through Bills passed in 1978, I noticed that many of the provisions contained therein were proclaimed at different times.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3—"Governor may make regulations under this Part."

Mr. RUSSACK: Paragraph *(i) (ja)* states:

> providing that the owner and the driver of a vehicle that was parked or was standing in contravention of the regulations under this Part shall each be guilty of an offence and liable to the prescribed penalty:

Is it possible for the owner and the driver to be fined for the one offence, or does it mean that, if one cannot be found, the other is liable?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer to the question will lie in the regulations. The whole of the Bill has been made necessary because, in drafting the regulations, it was found that the amendment did not take care of the whole matter. Proposed regulation 24 deals with exemptions. For instance, paragraph (6) exempts a person from these regulations if that person is the owner of the vehicle which at the time was in breach of the regulations and this occurred while the vehicle had been stolen or illegally used. The matter will be taken care of in regulations. I am reading the regulations which are being drafted and which will take care of the question. There will be no question of a double penalty.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Evidentiary provisions."

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

> Page 3, line 5—
>
> Delete "a person parked".
>
> After "vehicle" insert "was parked or was standing".

This wording will achieve uniformity of expression through the Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Interpretation."

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

> Page 3, line 31—After "Trust" insert ", or vested in, or under the control of, the Board of the Botanic Gardens, that lie within the area of the Corporation".

This clause will cater for the situation in relation to the Botanic Park. Control is vested in the board and it is desired that parking provisions should be supervised by the City of Adelaide. The council agrees to this, as does the Botanic Gardens Board.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Application of by-laws."

Mr. RUSSACK: This clause concerns the Opposition. Can the Minister explain the implications of the clause? What circumstances surround it, why is it necessary and what will be its effect?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The explanation is very involved. Section 686 of the principal Act which was repealed in 1978 by Bill No. 32 of 1978 and which was effective from 27 April 1978 contained subparagraph (4), which provided that the section should apply to any by-law made under subdivisions (i) to (x) of paragraph (47) of section 667 of under paragraph (27) of section 669.

Section 686 was replaced by new section 679, which

provided "any by-law to which this section applies". No subsection (4) was inserted in the new section 679. Subsequently, in Bill No. 33 of 1978, the words "to which this section applies" were repealed, and this became effective on 8 June 1978. Between 27 April 1978 and 8 June there was a hiatus on the application of council by-laws and the resolutions passed by councils under these by-laws. The effect of the now proposed amendment to section 679 is to ensure that there is no doubt that the original provisions as proposed applied as from the date of proclamation, that is, 27 April 1978.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Goyder did not get up and I suppose he was pretending that he understood the explanation and took it in, but I am sure that I did not understand it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He probably did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe he did, but when the Minister gabbles something that has been written down and is as complicated as his answer was, it is impossible to understand what it means. I am not prepared to support the explanation. I do not like retrospective legislation at any time.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In its terms it is retrospective. New subsection (4) provides:

> (4) This section, as amended by the Local Government Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1978, shall be deemed to have come into operation on the twenty-seventh day of April, 1978.

What could be more retrospective than that? We are taking it back to 27 April 1978. The explanation that the Minister gave, if one could spend half an hour following it through, may be perfectly proper but there is always a problem when this sort of thing is done that there may be effects which cannot be foreseen, which are unexpected and which are completely unjust to individuals. Parliament should not do this, especially when it is a result of the Government's mucking up its own legislation in the previous session, and not being able to get it right. The Local Government Act is a mess. In the 1950's the late Chief Justice described it more as a junk heap than anything else. This Government has repeatedly said that the whole thing would be rewritten, but it has never been done, and the Act is becoming more and more complex as it goes along.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member please get back to the clause?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose this clause because the explanation cannot possibly be accepted without time given to digest it. Even if it is correct, there may be unsuspected consequences that will lead to injustice for some people. This has been brought about by the Government's own ineptitude, and Parliament should not supinely let the Government get away with the action it proposes, that is, to make the Bill retrospective.

Mr. RUSSACK: Unlike the member for Mitcham I do not have a legal mind, but I have made inquiries. I understand that there has been a mistake made by the Government, and this clause is an attempt to remedy that error. However, I am not aware of any possible implications or unseen difficulties. The Opposition would have to oppose this provision unless the Minister were prepared to report progress so that further examination could be made.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I said in the second reading explanation (and I said this in 1978, too), the Government is trying to make the task of policing parking regulations much simpler for the motorist and local government. The actions taken in 1978 have proved not to be incomplete, and the regulations—

Mr. Millhouse: Incomplete, you mean.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not need despicable members to assist me.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister must not reflect on members in that way. I ask him to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: How am I reflecting on the member for Mitcham? After what he did, he is despicable, but I withdraw.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point or order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has used the word "despicable" of me and I ask that that be withdrawn.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I used the word and I withdrew it. The honourable member cannot hear; unfortunately, he suffers from deafness as well. I am anxious to see that this Bill is passed for the benefit of the public, the motorist and local government.

Mr. Millhouse: How do we know you've got it right?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must cease interjecting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I appreciate the problem that the member for Goyder has raised.

I am prepared to report progress to enable members to study the explanation, but I hope that when we come back to it on Tuesday it will get expeditious treatment so that this and other legislation can go through both Houses before we rise.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

> That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion)

(Continued from page 2926.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As I said at the outset of this debate, the Opposition would normally not countenance a Bill such as this if there were not some particular circumstance relating to the South Australian Gas Company. As it is, I regard it with considerable concern because of the provisions it contains. It does represent some interference with the rights of individuals to trade in a free market situation, according to the memorandum and articles both of the company and of the Stock Exchange. I must make it absolutely clear that the Opposition is totally committed to the system of free enterprise. Some aspects of this Bill and of the South Australian Gas Company must be taken into account and must balance our thinking on this matter.

The matters that are said to single out the South Australian Gas Company for special consideration are set out in the second reading explanation. The fact that it is a public utility and is providing an essential service and an essential commodity to the community under its own 1861 Act of Parliament, and the fact that the Act grants it the exclusive right and reponsibility to distribute and supply gas adds up to an overriding factor which must be taken into consideration. There are other factors that are not mentioned in the second reading explanation; that is, the influence that the Treasury has on the distribution of dividends of the company and on the price of gas.

One cannot gainsay that the Government, on behalf of the people, has a definite influence on the affairs of the Gas Company. The circumstances surrounding the

introduction of this Bill are well known, I would suspect to all members. Indeed, it was not a surprise to find that notice was given yesterday and that we are considering the Bill in a somewhat urgent fashion today. I am surprised that it was not brought in earlier, because it has, as we all know, followed a raid on the South Australian Gas Company shares, a raid which occurred and has been occurring for at least three weeks. I understand that that raid has now stopped and that the situation is under control.

It was a matter that caused the directors of the South Australian Gas Company considerable concern at the time it was occurring. There was a buying up of Gas Company shares. The origin of that demand was finally traced to Mr. Brierly, who is well known and variously described as a "shrewd businessman", as a "director of a number of companies" and by some people as "an acknowledged market raider". Whatever that may be, I am not prepared to comment. He has certainly been operating within the rules and conditions set down, and one cannot blame him for that if one believes in the free enterprise system. Again, that overriding factor of a company involving a public utility and the supply of an essential commodity must be taken into account.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, you'll be wanting to nationalise it next.

Mr. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham may advocate nationalisation of the Gas Company if he wishes.

Mr. Millhouse: No. You're getting pretty close to it, though.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham should not interject.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not believe that that is so. I believe the member for Mitcham would be most unpopular if he suggested that. I was disturbed to read in the daily press some days ago of the provisions of this Bill, because the Minister announced quite clearly what he had in mind; that he would, in fact, be limiting the shareholdings to 5 per cent and therefore the voting capacity of shareholders. I was even more surprised when I learned the Minister had made that announcement in the press without having had any consultation with the directors of the Gas Company or the Stock Exchange of Adelaide. I hope that he has consulted with them since, although I have not checked recently to find out whether he has or not. I hope that he has consulted with the Stock Exchange and the Gas Company directors to make sure that what he is proposing is in line with what they have in mind to protect this operation.

I can understand their concern. They are concerned about the proper running of their company and that a monopoly situation does not develop in the hands of a private individual. The basic discussion surrounds the question of the extent to which a Government should intervene by legislative means to protect what is a public utility. Obviously, some protection is necessary when a public utility (and a monopoly) is involved, and community interests must be protected, but there is certainly no case whatever for the suggestion the member for Mitcham has put forward that the Gas Company should be nationalised. There is some doubt in my mind that the proposed legislation is the best way of achieving the desired end.

I refer to clause 2, which is the basic clause of the Bill, and to the various subclauses, particularly those relating to associates of shareholders and the definition of "groups" as a group of associated shareholders. I believe it will be extremely difficult to determine exactly what constitutes a "group" in this instance if people are so determined to maintain a thrust, a pressure, to take control of the Gas Company's operations. They could still do so in spite of the provisions of the Bill. It would be difficult; they would have to use devious means indeed, and they would be breaking the law, but it is not impossible that they could in fact control the company. It may be that this is the only course open to us. If that is so, this is all we can do. I think it is a good thing indeed that the Bill is going to a Select Committee so that these matters can be investigated further.

The other question that must be raised is whether or not there is any justification for limiting the shareholdings of investors, because one of the fundamental principles surely must be that people in the open market place trading in Gas Company shares under the memorandum and articles of that company and under Stock Exchange requirements not be subject to limitations being placed on their shareholding. It may be necessary to place a limitation on their voting powers in these circumstances, but I wonder whether we are justified in limiting the amount of their shareholdings.

The Bill gives considerable powers to the directors in respect of the definition of a "group". That also may be necessary, but I am pleased that the Bill is going to a Select Committee to allow the matters to be investigated more thoroughly. Indeed, by sending it to a Select Committee we can make certain that the views of the company, the shareholders, and the Stock Exchange can be put forward for the ultimate consideration of this House. Accordingly, I support the second reading of this Bill to allow its referral to a Select Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Leader knows that I did not, by interjection, advocate the nationalisation of the Gas Company. My interjection was directed to him because the way he was speaking would give justification for nationalisation of the company. He apparently thinks that, if a company is a public utility, that justifies Government interference in it. I would not go as far as that, and I was surprised that he did. That is why I interjected as I did.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In some things you are a very conservative gentleman.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe in some things I am very conservative. I was very surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition conned to the extent that he was, because the very arguments he used to justify this Bill could be used to justify the nationalisation of the show. I say no more about that matter.

I did not appreciate the way this Bill was introduced by the Minister, who asked leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* straight away, with the intention of going on with the second reading debate before we had even heard it. When I objected, I heard some members on the other side call out that I was a little flea, or something. However, I do not regret having done that at all. If the proceedings of this place are to be reduced to a farce, that is the best way to do it—not give members a chance to read the explanation of a Bill but to say we are going straight on with the second reading debate immediately.

Having had that little gripe, I turn to the Bill itself. As I understand it, the object of the Bill is to preserve the direction and control of the Gas Company in the same hands as it is in now. Just what the wickedness of Mr. Brierley may be has not been disclosed. The idea behind this Bill is to keep him out. At this stage, I should offer congratulations to Mr. Brierley, because this is the second Bill in this session that has been rushed through in an attempt to stop him from gaining control of a company. Before Christmas we had the Executor Trustee and

Agency Company being preserved, because of Mr. Brierley's so-called depredations. Now we have the Gas Company. Whether he is good, bad or indifferent, at least he has some influence in this place.

About a week ago I was involved in a trial in the courts, and Mr. Brierley figured very prominently for these same reasons. He is a person of some influence. Nothing has been said: it has simply been assumed that his control would be less desirable than the control held by the present board of directors. Whether that is so or not, I do not know. We have heard that he already has control of a number of gas undertakings in other States, but we did not hear of any dire consequences from it.

At the present time I am not very happy about the board of directors of the Gas Company. Because I am not very happy with them, I am not very keen on supporting the second reading of this Bill, to preserve them in the *status quo*. I want to relate an incident that occurred some time in the last few weeks which has made me very angry with the Gas Company and its directors. The background to this incident occurred some time in 1970, and I am not sure of the exact date. Mrs. Anna Katarshi, a lady in her mid-fifties at that time, and a friend of hers, one Sunday morning were peacefully walking home from church along a footpath in one of the near western suburbs, somewhere around Mile End. As she stepped over a manhole, it blew out and she and I think her friend as well suffered grevious injuries.

I have seen photographs of Mrs. Katarshi. She came to see me a few months ago, accompanied by Father Czechowicz, and asked me for help. One of the photographs she brought showed her with her husband, taken at a wedding anniversary or something, and they depicted her as an ordinarily attractive woman for her age; quite pleasant in appearance. Another photograph showed the appalling and shocking burns and injuries she suffered to her legs as a result of this accident. I cannot imagine a more pathetic sequence of events. She was a lady from Poland who came out to Australia as an immigrant with her husband and, I think, her family. She was peacefully walking home from church along a footpath one Sunday morning when a manhole blew out. She suffered the most unfortunate injuries (and I cannot put them any higher than that for the moment), and she now finds that she can get no redress at all.

She took Supreme Court proceedings against the Gas Company, but they have never come to trial. I have seen an opinion given to her by senior counsel and I have looked at the papers on this matter, and I must agree that it is impossible for her to prove negligence against the Gas Company, although it was pretty obvious, if not conclusively shown, that it was the Gas Company's gas which caused the blow-up that caused her injuries. Negligence cannot be shown, because these things can sometimes happen without the negligence of anyone, so she has no remedy and can get no redress whatever. She has acknowledged that she cannot succeed in her action. She has been advised of this and at the moment she has no intention of proceeding with it, because she simply cannot prove negligence against anybody.

There is some vague suggestion that the gas might have been methane gas put out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but that is not supported at all. There is really no doubt at all that this accident was caused by a Gas Company installation, and the reticulation of gas along that street. There may be 1 per cent doubt, but no other doubt at all. Because no negligence can be proved, this poor unfortunate woman can apparently receive nothing.

There has been some publicity about this matter before. She came to me with Father Czechowicz in the hope that I might be able to do something to help her. The day before Parliament started sitting in February I went to see Mr. Burnside, the General Manager of the Gas Company (whom I have known for a long time), to ask whether, as a matter of grace, the Gas Company might give her just a few hundred dollars for the distress, disfigurement, pain and suffering that she has undergone since this unfortunate accident occurred. But not on your life—no fear; they were not going to give her a penny.

When I returned to my chambers I made some notes of the conversation I had with Mr. Burnside. I have since sent those notes to Mr. Burnside, and he has checked them. I propose to read out the relevant part of these notes. My notes show that a conversation took place on Monday 5 February between Mr. Burnside, Mr. Ward (the Secretary of the Gas Company) and myself.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the story recounted by the honourable member to the House and the document he is now reading are the basis of his objection.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My very word they are because, as I understand it, Mr. Burnside and Mr. Ward are acting under instructions from the board of directors. I showed Mr. Burnside the photographs I have already mentioned. Members can look at these photographs if they like, because they are in my office. I asked Jim Burnside whether they moved him at all. He said that they did as a human being, but he had a business to run and must be governed by commercial practicalities. He said that, as their public risk insurers had refused the claim and had subsequently been successful in a court action, he should support the insurers' opinion. That is incorrect: the action has never come to trial. In effect it is right, but the court has made no decision on this matter. Otherwise, he felt that the company could be faced with increased premiums in the future. On questioning, I found that he had not checked this with the insurance company, although he had discussed it with the company's solicitors and brokers. He declined to take it up with them to see whether or not this would happen. He seemed to be under the impression that there was some doubt originally whether it was natural gas that caused the explosion; rather, it may have been methane gas released by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

I replied that, on what I knew of the facts, there was no doubt that it was Gas Company gas, but the problem was to show negligence against any servant of the company. He was not convinced on this point. Whatever I said, he was not going to change his attitude. I explained that an *ex gratia* payment would not involve any admission of liability, rather that the wording (of any release or acknowledgment of payment by the unfortunate woman) would make it clear that there was no admission of liability. This made no difference.

The notes say that I expressed very great disappointment that that was his attitude and that of the board of the Gas Company, and I said that I would take the opportunity, if this Bill were brought into the House, to canvass these matters publicly. I said several times that it seemed to me to be absolutely wrong that an inoffensive woman walking home from church should be blown up and should get absolutely nothing for it. It made no difference at all.

I cannot believe that a group of human beings who are the Directors of the Gas Company should be so utterly hard-hearted. There is no suggestion that the payment of a few hundred dollars to her as an *ex gratia* payment would involve the admission of any liability; indeed, it would be made without an admission of liability. But that in our

community people—I believe the Government and the Minister knew about this before I raised it this afternoon—should be content to allow this sort of thing to happen, that this woman should in these circumstances suffer injury and get no compensation from anyone, is utterly wrong.

I do not believe that it would send the Gas Company bankrupt if it made a small payment to this woman as a token of regret for what happened—not with any suggestion of liability on the company's part. They are not going to do anything. It does not matter a damn to them. They have a business to run. I do not agree with that attitude, and I hope other honourable members do not agree with it. I am surprised that members on the Government side would allow this sort of thing to happen and apparently take no action. If, in fact, in the 1 per cent chance it was the Engineering and Water Supply Department that caused it (and I do not believe that for a moment), why does not the Government take some action to pay something? This is a disgraceful thing. When I told Anne about this, I said that if we had the money I would pull out our gas stove and get an electric one. I was so angry about the whole damn thing.

I protest about it, and here today, in this Bill, we are taking action to interfere, as the Leader of the Opposition said, with market forces, to protect these people who say they have a business to run and who do not care a damn about a woman who was injured in this way. That is all the protest I can make. I can only hope that the Minister, at the very least, will discuss the matter again with the Gas Company and that there may be some melting of the hardness of their hearts, because it is certainly justified. If any honourable member on this side is interested in this and would be prepared to help me to get some justice for this unfortunate woman, and if he would like to see the papers and the photographs I have, I will be only too happy to show them.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Goldsworthy, Harrison, Hudson, Simmons, and Venning; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 28 February.

DOG CONTROL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 27 February at 2 p.m.