LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 8 August 1984

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

QUESTIONS

PAROLE

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Correctional Services a question about new parole laws.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I understand that on 4 July a police officer, Senior Constable 1st Grade Michael Westbrook, suffered a hairline fracture of the skull as a result of an alleged incident at Port Victoria allegedly involving a recent parolee. Senior Constable Westbrook is not expected to be able to return to active duty for another month. I have been informed that one of those alleged to have been involved in the incident was recently released from prison on parole. I have also been given information concerning three other cases which raise serious questions about the application of the Government's new parole laws and the right of the public to protection from hardened criminals.

I am informed that a man named Bromley was sentenced to five years gaol in March 1981 for rape, robbery with violence, common assault, assaulting police and breaking parole. He was released on 4 April this year, but very soon after his release was charged with murder and returned to gaol on 28 April. A prisoner due for release in October, whom I will not name, was sentenced in June last year to 10 years imprisonment for armed robbery. Under the Government's new parole laws he will serve only 16 months, whereas under the previous system he would have served six years eight months, less time off for good behaviour. The third case I raise involves a man named Graham, sentenced in April 1982 to seven years for manslaughter. He was released in April this year, but is now back in Adelaide Gaol for a breach of parole and another offence.

In view of these facts, is the Minister satisfied with the workings of the new parole laws and will he immediately investigate them to ensure that proper protection is maintained for the public? Can the Minister say whether a man alleged by police to have bashed a police officer over the head with a bottle at Port Victoria on 4 July had been recently released from prison under the Government's new parole laws? Is he also aware that a prisoner recently granted parole under the Government's new parole laws now faces a charge of murder; that another prisoner convicted of armed robbery and sentenced to 10 years gaol is due for release in October after serving only 16 months; and that another prisoner, gaoled for seven years for manslaughter but recently released after serving only two years, is now back in Adelaide Gaol for a breach of parole?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have no intention of discussing here matters that are before the courts. It is quite wrong for the Opposition to name people who at present have cases before the courts; any discussion or debate in this place might prejudice their case.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Will you talk about the Blevins early release programme?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would appreciate it if on such a serious matter the Hon. Mr Lucas contained himself. Until people are found guilty by the court they are presumed to be innocent. I do not think even the Hon. Mr Lucas would wish to change that system. I am simply not willing in this place to do anything to prejudice the case of anyone who is before the courts on the side of either the prosecution or the defence.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What about your parole system?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not overly sensitive but if the Hon. Mr Lucas is permitted to interject at will, Mr President, then I am afraid that I will have to respond. The parole legislation passed through this Parliament and, as Minister of Correctional Services, I administer that legislation. There is nothing else I can do or wish to do other than administer the legislation as passed through this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If any honourable member believes that the legislation is not being administered according to the law, they have proper grounds for complaint.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Change the law.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If honourable members who continue to interject believe that it is a bad law, then they are in a unique position—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas can ask a question if he likes.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Such honourable members are in a unique position to do something about it, much more so than any other people in South Australia. I believe that the basis of the parole system is a very proper one and one that I will defend. The length of time that a prisoner stays in prison is now determined by the courts—not by the Parole Board. I do not see how anyone can argue against that principle; certainly, the Government does not and it has no intention to take from the courts the power to determine precisely how long a prisoner stays in prison. Apparently the Opposition does not want that; it does not want the courts to have that power. The Opposition wants the power to be put in the hands of another body; the Government does not. The Government believes that the courts are the appropriate place to determine how long prisoners stay in prison. We will be maintaining that system and we are happy to defend that system.

VICTOR KUZNIK

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Correctional Services a question about Victor Kuznik.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yesterday I asked some questions of the Minister of Correctional Services about one Victor Kuznik, who escaped from Cadell Minimum Security Training Centre in May of this year. I remind the Council that he had been convicted of murder and sentenced in August 1979 for the crime of murder, which resulted from the use of a sawn-off rifle. In the course of answering some of my questions the Minister made available to me an instruction that related to prisoner assessment and security ratings. It was made available on the basis that it was a public document. It was first issued on 9 September 1982 and reissued on 19 October 1983. Among other things it defined the notoriety factor as an indication of the perceived danger to the community that could be caused by the escape of a prisoner committed for certain crimes.

It identifies murder as one of the offences which fall within the 'high notoriety factor' category. Looking at paragraph 3.2.1 of the instruction, I point out that it is clear

that prisoners with a medium or high notoriety factor will be considered for placement in high security institutions and programmes. High security institutions include Yatala Labour Prison, Adelaide Gaol, Women's Rehabilitation Centre, Port Augusta Gaol, Port Lincoln Prison, and Mount Gambier Gaol. The Cadell Training Centre is among those institutions and programmes which are regarded as low security, because they do not provide a significant barrier to escape.

Paragraph 3.4.1, which deals with placement in low security institutions and programmes, provides the criteria for assessment of prisoners serving in excess of 12 months. It states that prisoners serving life or indeterminate sentences where no non-parole period has been set must have completed a period of five years. I remind honourable members that Kuznik was sentenced in August 1979 and transferred to Cadell in January 1984, just over four years after he had been sentenced for the crime of murder.

Was not the transfer of Kuznik from Yatala Labour Prison to the Cadell minimum security Training Centre in breach of the Government's own prisoner assessment and security ratings instruction? If the Minister agrees with that, why did the transfer occur? Was Kuznik granted any remissions of his sentence for the month of May, the month during which he escaped and, if so, how much was he granted and why?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The fact that Mr Kuznik was transferred to Cadell after serving only just over four years of his sentence is not in breach of the departmental instruction. The Government always has the final say.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It's in breach of what is in the instruction.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I informed the Hon. Mr Griffin yesterday, the Government always has the final say. The complicating factor as regards Kuznik was the proposed demolition of C Division at Yatala, where there was a serious shortage of accommodation. The generally accepted rule used by the Government—and previous Governments did roughly the same—is that I believe the average period of imprisonment in South Australia for a prisoner who has been sentenced to a term of life imprisonment is about 8½ years. I think the theory in all penal—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It is mostly a level of about 12 years.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The average is actually about 8½ years, if one takes out one prisoner who was forgotten: I believe that after about 30 years in the system it finally dawned on someone that he was around.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: You've got to allow for those who die while in detention.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thirty-odd years is hardly typical; the average is about 8½ years. The theory on prisoner classifications throughout Australia and the Western world is that, if a prisoner serves behind walls in a secure institution around half the period that he is expected to be in gaol, then one can begin to think about putting the prisoner into low security, thereby giving him more responsibility. At that time, on average, the prisoner has already served more than half his sentence and is then downhill, as it were.

In other words, he has half his sentence in the bank, so we then have to start, as do all Governments, both Liberal and Labor, to resocialise or deinstitutionalise that person by a series of steps. That happens with every prisoner in our system, and as far as I know it has always happened. There is evidence that the term during which life prisoners stay in gaol is increasing slightly. If that is the case (and there is evidence to show that), and when it is fairly conclusive, the period during which a prisoner will have to stay behind walls will also increase and the period of resocialisation will begin later. So there is nothing peculiar about the circumstances surrounding Kuznik. His situation is the same as that of any other life prisoner who behaves himself in gaol. There is nothing new about that treatment. The one complicating factor is the shortage of accommodation at Yatala because of the fire in A division and the proposed demolition of C division.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Was there a remission of sentence?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have no idea whether he got a remission: he might have. But in regard to remission for prisoners who escape, I would like to say that the Hon. Mr Griffin of all people should be aware that the Superintendent of any institution has no authority under the Act to take remission from prisoners who have offended where the prisoners have been charged with that offence and are being dealt with either by the visiting justice or in a court. That is specifically provided in the Act under section 42, I believe, but the Hon. Mr Griffin as a lawyer could well work it out and would recall the issue much more precisely than I. There is no provision. Let me say that, if we are in the business of penalising prisoners for an offence, it seems to me that to charge a prisoner for escaping should incur a penalty that is much more serious than any loss of remission. It is meaningless to say, 'You have lost three days remission this month' or something like that if a prisoner is on a serious charge of escaping from lawful custody. Only yesterday a prisoner was convicted and was given a further eight months in gaol.

First, I assume that everyone here does not want to penalise someone twice for the same offence. We have no power to do that under the Act in any case, nor should we have that power. I would defend our right not to have that power, because it is a basic tenet of justice to penalise a person only once. In any event, either the visiting justice or the courts would have far greater power to penalise than the Superintendent of an institution. Therefore, the prisoner does not gain by not having remission deducted. In fact, he appears elsewhere, and is dealt with much more severely than the Manager or Superintendent of any institution has the right to do.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I wish to ask a supplementary question. If, as the Minister says, the Government has an overriding discretion in respect of the prisoner assessment and security ratings instruction, what are the criteria that the Government follows when it exercises the overriding discretion to which the Minister has referred?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The matter would be drawn to the attention of the Government by the head of the Correctional Services Department, who would discuss it with the Minister. I assume that there is nothing new in that and that it happened during the days of the Liberal Party, as it happened in our day previously and, I assume, has happened as long as there have been prisons and Ministers.

The criteria would depend very much on the prisoner. It would be very difficult to draw up a set of criteria that covered every eventuality because one is attempting to guess what is in the mind of a prisoner, which is always very difficult. Although one does not always know, one may suspect that something is happening in a prisoner's personal life outside that is traumatic and may make a prisoner do something that is out of character with his previous behaviour in the prison. There are sensitive matters of that nature. In the last analysis the Minister, with the permanent head, attempts to do the best possible thing for the community and the prisoner.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: This was your decision. You overrode that one.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Have a look at your dates again.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You overrode this one.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The answer is 'No', only because the member shows his ignorance and does not do his homework. In the last analysis the Minister is responsible for the administration of the Act and in sensitive cases like this the Minister, obviously, would have the last say in discussions with his permanent head and anyone else who is involved, including any parole officer who had been dealing with the prisoner. I cannot give a list of criteria and say that that is it; it is far too complex for that.

YATALA GAOL BREAKOUT

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question concerning the breakout from Yatala Gaol on 28 June.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: This breakout was reported in the *Advertiser* on Friday, 29 June alongside a photograph of the Minister of Correctional Services leaving the gaol. The article states:

> Five prisoners who escaped from Yatala Labour Prison in a daring, carefully planned 20-second breakout yesterday were still free early today. A sixth prisoner involved in the breakout was wounded by a shot from a prison guard and is in the Modbury Hospital. Shots were exchanged between a prison officer in a tower and two occupants of a getaway car, which pulled up suddenly alongside a back perimeter fence about 3.40 p.m. to signal the getaway, which was timed to the split second.

The escape involved the improper use of prison equipment and a shoot-out with prison warders. Yet, I have been informed that the six prisoners involved have been granted the maximum remission on their sentences for June, even though the Act states that such remission applies only if the Director of Correctional Services is of the opinion that the prisoner has been a good behaviour. It has been reported to me that there is resentment and confusion amongst prison officers that such remissions should have been granted.

I am also told that every prisoner in Yatala Gaol was granted the full remission for June, whereas only 27 full remissions were granted at the Adelaide Gaol. Why have the six prisoners who escaped from Yatala Gaol on 28 June been given the full 15-day remission on their sentences for the month of June under the Government's new parole laws?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is a matter within the responsibility of the Minister of Correctional Services and I ask whether he can answer the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am happy to enlighten the Council as to the reasons why the six prisoners who recently escaped from Yatala Gaol got full remissions for the month of June. I think that in my previous response to the Hon. Mr Griffin I stated the reason. However, I am happy to restate it. The reason is that those prisoners were charged with an offence that will be heard in the courts. One was disposed of yesterday and the prisoner was given a further eight months on his sentence for escaping from custody. The Act specifically precludes the Correctional Services Department from penalising a prisoner twice, a principle that I would have thought would be strongly upheld by the Hon. Mr Griffin and the Hon. Mr Burdett at least, who are lawyers.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There is a fundamental plank of justice, as I understand it as a layman, that one does not penalise a person twice. The person is dealt with by the court and even if the matter had been less serious than escaping from legal custody the person would have been dealt with by a visiting justice. In those circumstances the Act precludes the Superintendent of the prison from taking into account any incident that is subject to a charge elsewhere—in the courts or before the visiting justice. The reason really is as simple as that.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: The law is an ass. You want the court to prove that they escaped?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Whether the Hon. Mr Hill thinks that the law is an ass or not is fairly irrelevant. As far as I am concerned as a Minister, that is the law. My obligation is to see that the law is upheld. The Superintendent of the institution is acting completely within the law.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: Was that good behaviour—escaping from prison?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Act specifically states that no incident that has been dealt with elsewhere—for example, in the courts or before the visiting justice—can be taken into consideration when allocating remissions.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Because that is what you enacted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Nobody is arguing about that. I am merely giving the Council the information that the Hon. Mr Burdett asked for. He asked why; I have told him why. He may not like that; if he does not like it, as a member of Parliament he is in a very good position to do something about it, but that is the reason why: because it is the law.

Coming back to the principle of a person being penalised more than once for one offence, I would have thought that that principle was established, hopefully centuries ago. If it is not as long as that it ought to have been. Those six people who escaped will be penalised quite properly by the court. As I stated, one was penalised yesterday; he was given a further eight months in prison. I would have thought that people who wanted strong penalties in this area would much prefer that penalty to the Superintendent's being able to say, 'You have been naughty boys; we will knock a few days off your remission.' I would have thought that a further eight months in gaol would have satisfied even the most penal-minded member of the Liberal Party, but those are the facts.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Sir, a question about answers to questions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: During the break between when the Council rose in May and our starting again on 2 August I have received in letter form a number of replies to questions that I had asked earlier.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You were lucky.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I should add that I have not received an answer to all questions that I asked, but I have received answers to a number of those questions. As I think that these answers would be of interest to others, I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them so that they will be available to anyone who reads *Hansard* as answers to the questions that were asked.

The replies from the Attorney-General were in relation to a question on fingerprints asked on 9 November 1983; apprenticeships, asked on 21 March 1984; Aboriginal employment, asked on 3 April 1983; equal opportunity management plans, asked on 2 May 1984; and one on equal opportunity, asked on 10 May 1984.

Leave granted.

FINGERPRINTS

My colleague the Chief Secretary has provided me with the answers to the two separate issues raised in your question. They are:

1. Disposal of fingerprints and photographs of persons not convicted:

It is standard practice to destroy the fingerprints of persons:

(a) who have been found not guilty of an offence, or

(b) where a *nolle prosequi* has been entered, or

(c) where the charge has been dismissed or withdrawn.

The practice does not extend to photographs, which are retained with the Photographic Section. However, that aspect is currently under review in conformity with the practice for fingerprints.

2. Records kept by Special Branch relating to demonstrators:

Special Branch records information on those people attending demonstrations or elsewhere who fall within the ambit of paragraph 2.3 of the Order-of-Council made 20 November 1980, and appearing at page 1927 of the *South Australian Government Gazette* of the same day.

Paragraph 2.3 of that Order reads:

2.3 The Special Branch of the Police Force shall only gather, assess and disseminate information relative to:

2.3.1.1 Acts of violence, civil disorder or the commission of other offences directed towards overthrowing, weakening or undermining, by unconstitutional means, the Governments of the State or the Commonwealth or any of the processes of democratic government.

2.3.1.2 The promotion of violent behaviour within or between community groups.

2.3.1.3 Threats, menaces or acts of violence against the safety or security of visiting dignitaries or other persons.

2.3.1.4 Acts of sabotage.

2.3.2 Individuals or groups of individuals who may be able to provide information about other individuals or groups of individuals of the type mentioned in paragraph 2.3.1 hereof.

2.3.3 Protecting individuals or groups of individuals whether in formally structured organisations or not who are or can be reasonably believed to be the subject of threats of terrorism or other acts by individuals or groups of individuals of the type mentioned in paragraph 2.3.1 hereof.

As you will appreciate I announced in December 1983 that the 1980 Guidelines to Special Branch will be rescinded and fresh guidelines laid down following receipt of the final Hope Royal Commission report. In June 1984 I announced that Special Branch itself would be disbanded and its essential anti-terrorist functions continued in another form. The new guidelines will be tabled in Parliament and available for public scrutiny.

APPRENTICESHIPS

I have been advised by my colleague, the Hon. T.H. Hemmings, M.P., Acting Minister of Labour, that the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission is at present completing the matching of total numbers of young people who completed 1983 pre-vocational courses with new indentures registered in 1984.

My colleague advises that on information available as at the end of April 1984, 36 females completed introduction to trades courses for girls in 1983; one obtained an apprenticeship immediately and the remaining 35 moved into pre-vocational trade-based courses. Of those enrolled in pre-vocational courses 16 completed the courses and as at 1 April 1984, 10 have gained apprenticeships, one has gained employment in an unrelated area and one is undertaking further study.

Overall in 1984, some 24 graduates of 1983 pre-vocational courses have obtained employment as apprentices in six State Government Departments. Further to this, the Department of Labour recruited an additional 50 first-year apprentices for training at Whyalla in 1983. Of these some 27 were graduates of pre-vocational courses.

Although no State Government Departments have established a quota for female apprentices in 1984, a number of departments do as a matter of policy interview all female applicants for apprenticeship. The departments which have adopted this policy are:

Public Buildings Department

Department of Marine and Harbors

Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Despite a low application rate, a significant number of females have been awarded apprenticeships in Government Departments:

Commonwealth	3	(2 pre-vocational graduates)
State Government Departments	10	(4 pre-vocational graduates)
Statutory Authorities	3	(1 pre-vocational graduate)
	16	

ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT

It is expected that proposals will be put to Cabinet soon on implementation of aspects of the report, including a statement of principles and practices about the employment of Aboriginals in the public sector for adoption by Cabinet.

The Public Service Board, with major responsibility for developing employment opportunities for Aboriginals in the Public Service, has undertaken various initiatives to counteract the under-representation of Aboriginals in the Service. Since NESA was introduced into the South Australian Public Service in 1977, 418 Aboriginals have undergone training (136 of whom are current trainees), and 44 Aboriginal trainees have gained permanent employment in the Service.

The Public Service Board has taken action in the following areas as a direct response to the recommendations of the report:

- Arrangements have been made to effect permanent appointment of Aboriginal officers whose tenure was formerly dependent on continuation of Commonwealth funding; 10 permanent appointments have resulted.
- Provision has been made for voluntary declaration of Aboriginality on a sheet attached to the application for employment form. An explanation of the need for information regarding Aboriginality accompanies the voluntary declaration form.
- In October 1983 and March-April 1984, the Public Service Board conducted special recruitment campaigns to reach Aboriginal school leavers. These affirmative action programmes have resulted in the permanent employment of four Aboriginal people and eight NESA traineeships.
- Selection tests for base grade clerical staff have been reviewed to identify any possible cultural bias.
- On-going educative programmes, addressing the question of cultural difference and its impact on employment, are being developed by the Equal Opportunity Branch, commencing in late July.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

The Departments of Education, Community Welfare, Environment and Planning, and Premier's have prepared a sex by classification profile of their staff preparatory to an implementation of equal opportunity management planning. Equal opportunity strategies are currently being developed in the Departments of Education, Technical and Further Education, Community Welfare and Premier's.

Other departments and statutory authorities will all be expected to complete this type of profile over time, but current focus for implementation of equal opportunity management planning due to resource constraints is restricted to the Departments of Agriculture, Environment and Planning, Education, Technical and Further Education, Premier's and Community Welfare.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

On 10 May 1984 the honourable member asked me a question in the Legislative Council about equal opportunity. Equal opportunity management planning is an integral component of effective personnel management and will be integrated into the corporate management structure on that basis. The future location of the Equal Opportunity Branch of the Public Service Board is intended to be in the Department of Management and Personnel Services.

In the introduction of equal opportunity management planning departments will be assisted by officers of the Equal Opportunities Branch of the Public Service Board and of the Executive Committee of the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel. Departments will be accountable to the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel for demonstrating improvement in the employment position of women, Aborigines, disabled people and people from different ethnic groups; the improvement will also be monitored by the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel of the Public Service Board.

COMMONWEALTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Has the Attorney-General an answer to the question I asked on 22 March about the Commonwealth Employment Programme?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My colleague the Hon. J.D. Wright, M.P., Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour, has advised me that early placement figures for the Community Employment Programme did indicate a lower than desirable participation rate of women. However, because of the relatively low total number of placements at such an early stage, the statistics are not an accurate indication of the success of the programme in this area.

More recent figures on Community Employment Programme placements indicate a significant improvement over earlier figures in the participation rate of women. As at the end of April 1984, approximately 25 per cent of persons placed were women. Unfortunately, more recent figures are not available from the Commonwealth Employment Service. The participation rate is expected to increase with the recent initiatives implemented under the programme.

These initiatives include exemption from the provision of the Sex Discrimination Act in order to enable positive discrimination in favour of women, thus enabling sponsors to develop proposals for the employment of women specifically. Other initiatives include the development of a special subprogramme for the employment of young women within community organisations. It is anticipated that about 65 young women between the ages of 15 and 19 years will be placed under this subprogramme.

Although the consultative committee has not advised sponsors that schemes that employ women will be given priority the programme guidelines do provide that proposals meet certain criteria in respect of the employment of women in order to be eligible for consideration. The consultative committee is required to take into account a number of criteria in recommending funding for projects. The criteria include, amongst other things, priority for projects in regions of high unemployment, employment of the long-term unemployed and those most disadvantaged in the workforce together with community benefit and the opportunity for continuing employment. As a result the merit based recommendations of the committee must be seen in the context of all the established criteria.

COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on 12 April about the Community Employment Programme?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My colleague the Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour, has noted the suggestion that sponsor contribution levels for local government be determined on a sliding scale based on need. However, the Deputy Premier has indicated that provision already exists to waive or reduce the level of sponsor contribution for all sponsors including local government authorities. This has occurred in a number of cases following application from the local government authority concerned.

In addition, the level of sponsor contribution is currently under review by the joint Commonwealth and State Secretariat which administers the Community Employment Programme. It is anticipated that the outcome of the review will be known soon.

HUMAN EXPERIMENTATION

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about human experimentation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: In the recent National Health and Medical Research Council report the N.H. & M.R.C. does not recommend a central register involving the use of human tissue. Where funding of research is from the N.H. & M.R.C. such research is readily identifiable in N.H. & M.R.C. records, but there appears to be a lack of information where funding is provided by other bodies. Where institutions have established ethics committees, the council has asked them to maintain a register of all research projects involving human experimentation.

Are there any research establishments in South Australia that do not have ethics committees and therefore are not maintaining registers on human experimentations? If so, will the Minister and the Government take steps to ensure that such committees are established and that such records are maintained?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: To the best of my knowledge there are no such institutions that do not have ethics committees, but I would not like to stake either my life or my reputation on the total accuracy of that statement. I am very pleased that the honourable member has raised this matter, and I will certainly ensure that a complete round-up is done of any health unit in the State or any institution under the direct or indirect control of the Health Commission that should have an ethics committee but does not have one. If, in the unlikely event that there are any, I will certainly ensure that they go into place forthwith.

I would further add that there is some concern about the current operation of ethics committees for two reasons. One specific reason is that it has been suggested that there should be some lay or legal representation on ethics committees, particularly in our major hospitals. The other is, of course, that if one leaves the regulation of experimentation (particularly where that might extend into human experimentation) purely to local ethics committees there is always a chance that they may possibly act without due regard to what is acceptable, in some areas, to the community at large.

So, while I have no wish to be repressive in any way, science has always advanced on the frontiers of the sharp edge, as I am sure the Hon. Mr DeGaris knows. There has been a succession of people from Galileo onwards who were reviled for being ahead of their time. While I have no wish whatsoever to stifle that sort of thing, where they are operating in some of the very sensitive areas of contemporary medical science it may well be desirable that it should not be left entirely to the medical scientists themselves.

COURTS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General about courts administration.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am advised that on 17 July the jury hearing a murder case in the Supreme Court inspected the scene of the alleged offence at Royston Park. I am informed that the jury was driven to the scene in a mini bus but that the accused person was transported in a hired, chauffeur driven Mercedes Benz. This inspection received wide media coverage, and a number of people have complained to the members of the Opposition after seeing on television the accused person arriving in a chauffeur driven Mercedes Benz at the scene of the alleged offence. Quite rightly, these people want to know why a more economical form of transportation could not have been used in this instance by the Courts Department. As the Courts Department comes within the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General,

will the Attorney investigate and bring back a reply (unless he may already have the information) as to why—

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Attorney could even have done it. Can he explain why a hired, chauffeur driven Mercedes Benz was used to transfer the accused person to the alleged murder scene during a recent jury inspection of the site?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Opposition must be completely bereft of any positive contribution to make to the affairs or policies of this State if all it can—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not at the least bit embarrassed. If all the Opposition can do is raise questions such as this in Parliament—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Are you denying it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will answer the question for the honourable member. All I say is that I should have thought he would have had better things to do with his time. I am astounded that this matter seems to have raised such a great interest among honourable members opposite. I understand that in another place they even wasted the time of the House of Assembly this morning by asking the Premier, no less, about this topic. All I can say is that the honourable member must be running out of things to do.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You must have plenty of money.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Do you think it is a good idea?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas has asked a question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The first thing that needs to be said is that whether a judge decides to go on an inspection is a matter for the judge.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member knows as well as I do, having been responsible for the administration of the Courts Department, that the responsibility for a trial is under the authority of the presiding judge. The Hon. Mr Griffin knows that as well as I do.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The question of transport to a view is a matter for the judge. It is his responsiblity in the final analysis.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Then the honourable member apparently does not understand the judicial system. I should have thought that, after four years at law school, two years as an articled clerk, several years in practice and some years in this Chamber (including three years as Attorney-General), he would understand the constitutional system of this State, that the Judiciary is independent of the Government, and that it is the judge who has the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of a trial. It may be that the administrative arrangements are carried out by the Courts Department, but the fact is that the ultimate responsibility rests with the judge. I understand that for this view the jury went in a mini bus, the judge went in a hire car and the prisoner went in a hire car.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The fleet from which the Courts Department traditionally hires happens to be a Mercedes fleet.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Do you think that is a good idea?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: This company has given the best price for this sort of—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Is a Mercedes cheaper than a VW?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Apparently it is.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Come on!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council should hear the explanation.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I said before, if this is all that Opposition members have to question the Government about, then it absolutely astounds me that they have to be concerned about a judge going on a view in a hire car. The judge needs a separate—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Is this the official policy limousine left?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Obviously Opposition members do not want the answer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I desire to ask a supplementary question.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Are you going to listen this time?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We are always listening but we are not getting any answers—that is the problem. Will the Attorney-General investigate and bring back a report to this Council as to why a hired, chauffer driven Mercedes Benz was used to transport the accused to the scene of the alleged murder? Secondly, seeing that this is evidently the Government's policy, will the Attorney bring back for this Council information as to how the hiring of Mercedes Benz limousines is the cheapest form of transport as opposed to various other forms of transport offered by many other hire companies (I will not mention any particular companies), and why the Mercedes Benz contract that he has is cheaper than other forms of hire car transport?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I hope the honourable member is going to shut up, because I was in the process of providing him with the answer. However, his continual chatter, apparently with your approval, Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: It was not really with my approval at all. Do not bring me into it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Then perhaps you might take some action, Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: I will take the appropriate action.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: —to enable me to provide the Council with the information that the honourable member has requested me to provide on this matter that is of such of monumental importance to the—

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Why don't you? You have been treading water for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have merely been attempting to answer interjections. If honourable members want a report, I am willing to give them a report on this very imporant topic which is of such great concern to the honourable member opposite. As I said before, when a judge decides to go on a view, it is the judge's responsiblity ultimately, as he is in charge of the trial, to make the arrangements.

The arrangements are facilitated by the Courts Department. When a prisoner is taken on a view it is necessary to provide a driver, because the Correctional Services Officer, and there may be more than one, is present in the vehicle only to look after the prisoner. First, a car with a driver is necessary.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: What's wrong with a paddy wagon?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Obviously, the honourable member knows as much about the legal system as the Hon. Mr Griffin—which is nothing. Clearly, it would be prejudicial to a fair trial if a jury sees a prisoner being carted in and out of a situation in a police paddy wagon. A prisoner is presumed innocent until proven guilty following a trial. The honourable member's suggestion is potentially prejudicial. That is the view—and I believe it is a reasonable view—of the Judiciary; that is, it is potentially prejudicial to have a prisoner carted to and from a view in a paddy wagon.

As I have said, first, a driver is necessary—that should be accepted. Secondly, the judge must go with his staff and,

once again, a driver is obtained for that purpose. Thirdly, the jury travelled in a mini bus. I understand that all three vehicles were hired from the same firm. As I have said before, the Courts Department traditionally hires a Mercedes fleet. The information that I have been supplied with today is that the Sheriff has advised the Director of the Courts Department that, despite what some people may think about Mercedes, this company can provide vehicles with drivers for the equivalent of the cost of a taxi or less. The company has given the best price in the past; I assume that also occurred when the Hon. Mr Griffin was Attorney-General and responsible for the Courts Department. As far as the Courts Department is aware, the company can continue to provide the best price for this service.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Compared to what—Rolls Royce?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Is the Hon. Mr Lucas just unusually thick or is he deaf? I answered that question by saying that apparently this company can provide a vehicle with a driver for less than the cost of a taxi. As far as the Courts Department and the Sheriff are concerned, this hire firm can provide the cheapest price for this transportation. Given that three vehicles are involved, it is considered to be more cost effective to hire them all from the one place rather than attempting to obtain one or two vehicles and drivers from the Courts Department and then hire a mini bus somewhere else (apparently mini buses are not available from the Courts Department). In terms of this magnificent 'Mercedes-gate' that the honourable member has introduced into the Council (wasting the time of Parliament for a good bit of the afternoon), that is the explanation. I believe that my explanation should satisfy even the fairly obtuse honourable member opposite.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about statutory authorities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In recent years concern has been expressed by both this Parliament and the community at the plethora of statutory authorities, their administration and reporting standards. Information about a number of statutory authorities is contained in the Auditor-General's Report and in annual reports tabled in Parliament or forwarded to the relevant Minister. Some statutory authorities are not obligated to report either to Parliament or to a Minister.

There is no one source for basic information relating to statutory authorities. Honourable members often use Question Time to obtain this basic information. In many cases, even though the questions are generally straightforward, it takes weeks, sometimes months, to obtain the replies. In view of the importance of this subject it would seem appropriate for the Government to consolidate basic information about statutory authorities and publish it at least annually. Will the Government consider consolidating and publishing information relating to statutory authorities in South Australia, including the names of members of committees or boards, the duration of their appointment, the remuneration paid, the number of meetings held, and the date of publication of their annual reports?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The question of statutory authorities and the surveillance of them is being looked at by the Joint Select Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedure of Parliament which, unfortunately, has not been proceeding with any great rapidity. It is interesting to note that, despite the fact that the Committee has existed for some 18 months now, not one submission has been provided by Liberal members in the House of Assembly, despite the fact that the request was made over 12 months ago. They seem not to be interested.

I understand that honourable members opposite in this Chamber have put in a submission. I am not criticising them. I am saying that the Liberal members in the Lower House have done absolutely nothing in response to the Joint Select Committee and in response to a comprehensive research paper that was prepared to give some guidelines and some suggestions as to how the Committee system of Parliament can be improved. The question of the surveillance of statutory authorities is one matter that is being considered by the Committee. I can only suggest that the honourable member's suggestions can be considered in the context of that Committee.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: You don't have to have a Committee.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, but if there is a Committee to look at statutory authorities, as has been suggested, it could consider the reporting mechanisms that are most desirable and efficient. I will consider the honourable member's proposition and bring down a reply.

FREEHOLDING OF LAND

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about freeholding of land.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: At present a landholder who wishes to transfer leasehold land to freehold may make payment for that freehold land over a period of five years. The purchase of the land has in the past taken place on the assumption that the land could be developed into a viable economic unit. Accordingly, payment over a period of time (such as five years) was reasonable, as the earning capacity of the land would grow during this period. Now, the imposition of native vegetation clearance controls will jeopardise some farmers' carefully made development and financial plans.

Although the imposition of the controls can make some previously viable projects uneconomic, the Government is still requiring those landholders freeholding land to make the regular five annual payments. A Government decision to ban scrub clearance could jeopardise the development of an area, yet the Government is still expecting land purchasers to pay the full freeholding fee. This is clearly unfair. If an area of land can no longer be cleared and, as a result, a farm loses its viability, it is wrong to expect market prices to continue to apply to the entire area sought to be held freehold.

Purchase prices were agreed on the basis of future development potential. If this is thrown into doubt by any arbitrary Government decision, the terms of payment and the amount to be paid should be reassessed. Therefore, will the Minister of Agriculture, as the Minister responsible for the well-being of South Australia's rural community, make immediate representation to the Minister of Lands so that this unfair scheme can be reviewed?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It seems to me that the matters referred to by the Hon. Mr Dunn quite properly fall within the portfolio area of the Minister of Lands. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply if it is possible to do so.

SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I have a feeling of deja vu when I stand in this place in regard to this matter, because it seems to be a continuing problem and a very big problem for the Government and for other people to agree upon. It is amazing that in this day and age one of the major products of South Australia, red meat, still cannot be sold on Thursday nights, Friday nights, and Saturday mornings unhindered by Government regulation. But that is the situation. Red meat can be sold in butcher shops either on late shopping nights or Saturday mornings, but not both, and that seems to be an impossible situation for this Government to resolve in its own mind. I find that somewhat staggering.

This is the third occasion on which the Liberal Party has proposed changes to our restrictive and increasingly absurd red meat trading hours legislation. I need hardly recap to the Council the reasons why we believe change is necessary. The first time I introduced such a Bill it took from August to November for members opposite combined with the Democrats to decide that it was not acceptable to have unhindered trading of red meat on late shopping nights and Saturday mornings. We then reached the rather ridiculous situation that we now face, where red meat can be sold on either late shopping nights or Saturday mornings, but not both.

Suffice to say that, within the general shopping hours that apply, all products should be freely available. No single product should be subject to some form of perverse protection. Consumers should have freedom of choice. Late night trading is increasingly popular. Consumers demand it. Indeed, in another place this morning the Leader of the Opposition tabled a petition in support of what we propose. That petition was signed by an enormous number of people, 17 436 South Australians, in three weeks. If the Government wants 100 000 signatures, all it has to do is to let us know, and there will certainly be no trouble getting them. There is no person in this State, I would say, except perhaps a few butchers and a few trade unionists, who would not agree with this proposition. People can buy almost any product on either Thursday or Friday nights and Saturday mornings—but not red meat. Why not? It just seems to defy all logic.

Following changes proposed by the Australian Democrats during the last session, the absurdity of the restrictions has been heightened. Now butcher shops can be open on a late shopping night or a Saturday morning, but not both. This is causing widespread confusion and, as an exercise in logic, it is patently absurd. I would urge honourable members to respond to community wishes for more flexible butcher shop trading arrangements by supporting this Bill. In my opinion the opposition to this legislation comes from a very small and self-interested group, certainly not from all butchers. In particular, it comes from a self-interested group in the trade union movement. We should have the courage to tackle this matter.

With the change in currency values between our country and New Zealand, I predict that we will see a very farcical situation arise in which New Zealand meat will be brought here in a frozen form. And let me say that the freezing process in New Zealand is carried out in such a way that the exported meat is excellent. Because the meat is frozen it will be possible to sell it both on late trading nights and on Saturday mornings, whereas the meat produced here in South Australia cannot be sold at both those times in a given retail outlet. One will be able to obtain only New Zealand meat on the off night or the off morning.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I hope the meat is not off.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It would be off as far as we are concerned. Is it not ludicrous that, in order to obtain the meat that they need to sell, and so that they can sell meat on late trading nights and Saturday mornings, retailers will have to go to New Zealand to get meat and bring it in in a frozen form because our good, fresh meat cannot be sold? There is one way to cure the situation, and it can be cured this week or next week—it can certainly be cured within the month, before the lamb season starts again. I stood in this place last time and said, 'Let us do this before the lamb season starts so that people can sell their product this season.' I predict that, unless there is some common sense, we will find the same thing happening next season. I will be standing up saying the same thing again, pleading with the Government to let producers in this State sell their product. I hope that that does not happen.

The disinterest of this Government in the problems of the rural community and the disinterest of the other Party (although I give credit to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan and the Hon. Mr Milne for supporting me in this late night shopping proposal in the February session, and I trust that that will happen again) must cease. I would like to see a change of heart by the Government, because, after all, the Government must support this Bill in the House of Assembly before it can pass. The Government must show the producers of this State that it has their interests at heart, that it is interested in the problems of the farmers and consumers, particularly those who work during the week and wish to take advantage of the availability of this product for their family. I urge honourable members to support this measure very promptly. It should not require a lot of debate; in fact, the Bill could be passed this afternoon, because we went through the whole process once before. But, if members require time to consider it, let us debate the matter next week and get it out of the way.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on an impassioned and constructive speech on this matter. I agree entirely with what he has had to say. I believe that further steps can be taken to free up the trading of fresh meat, and therefore I consider that there is scope for completely deleting any restriction on the sale of fresh red meat as provided under the Act.

I think that we can go even further than the Bill that is currently before us in removing any discrimination against fresh red meat as it is offered for sale to consumers in South Australia. Certain small sections in the community have put forward several reasons why this reform should not be put in place. Some anxiety has been expressed by butchers. The Democrats believe that there will be an increase in employment in the trade if the hours are extended. Approximately 90 shop butchers who are registered as unemployed in the metropolitan area would be likely to obtain jobs once the hours were relaxed.

There are other factors involved. I inform honourable members that the producers have gone to enormous lengths to promote the sale of the product. I have been advised that butchers and retail operators have contributed more than $860 000 for a lamb promotion campaign this spring and that in excess of $7 million is being spent this year by producers to sell the product. When producers are going to such an extent to provide and market a product, it is hardly fair that they are hamstrung by petty restrictions on the hours during which the product can be sold.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: The record of the Democrats has been that any restriction on the sale of fresh red meat

is regarded as petty and quite unacceptable. In May 1983 I introduced the first Bill, which was aimed at completely lifting any restriction on the sale of fresh red meat and deleting it as a term of reference in the Act. It is my intention to attempt to do that again. I feel that the Hon. Mr Cameron and I are allies in this. I indicate that I do not feel that there is any antagonism between his intention and that of the Democrats. I hope that the Government has now gone through a long enough period of testing, that it is impressed by the public response, and that it can see how well the marketing of fresh red meat at late night shopping venues is received. I believe that the vast majority (if it is not their unanimous opinion) of politicians elected to this Parliament, both in the other place and here, think that there should be a lifting of restrictions on hours for the sale of fresh red meat.

We have been dictated to by a small group in one union. It is about time that the Government showed that it is not being wagged by the tail of one union. The Government is elected to put into effect the necessary legislation to implement the wishes of the people of South Australia. It is time that the Government showed enough guts to put into effect legislation which is so strongly supported by the people of South Australia and which is patently unfair, discriminating as it does not only against the product but also against the consumers and producers. There is not a vestige of logic behind it.

In speaking to this Bill, I indicate that the Democrats have strong support for the intentions of the Hon. Mr Cameron but believe that the Bill does not go far enough. It still restricts the sale to within certain hours. It is my opinion that we should go further and completely lift any restrictions so that fresh red meat can be sold without any hindrance and in open competition with its competitors. Therefore, the Council will notice that I have a similar Bill on the Notice Paper that will come forward shortly.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977. Read a first time.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill provides for the repeal of section 53 of the Prices Act, 1948. Section 14 of the principal Act empowers the Governor to proclaim specified goods and services to be declared goods and services. Sections 21 and 24 empower the Minister of Consumer Affairs to fix and declare maximum prices at which declared goods and services may be sold or provided. Sections 22a and 22f empower the Minister to fix and declare minimum prices for wine grapes. Section 53 of the Act provides that these powers and the orders made in pursuance of them expire on 31 December 1984. From 1949 to 1978 section 53 was amended annually to extend for a further year the period for which declarations made under the abovementioned sections would remain in force and during which further declarations could be made. In 1978 the section was extended for three years and, similarly, in 1981. It is significant to note that at no time during the 34 years since the Act was passed has Parliament rejected a proposal for extending the operation of these powers.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: Have you got a copy of this?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, when I have finished. It is also significant that Parliament has increased rather than decreased the period of operation.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Is this a new practice? You haven't got the copies.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, I have. They are here. In these circumstances, it seems quite unnecessary to retain the provision requiring triennial reaffirmation of these powers. After all, it is always open to Parliament, by a subsequent Act, to repeal them or suspend their operation. Furthermore, the removal of section 53 will avoid the risk that some future Bill to extend the time limit in the section may not be passed before the deadline by virtue of the ever increasing volume of business considered by the Parliament. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 53 of the principal Act which provides that the price control provisions of the principal Act shall cease to have effect at the end of this year.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Family Relationships Act, 1975; and to make related amendments to the Adoption of Children Act, 1966, the Community Welfare Act, 1972, and the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1940. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill will ensure that a child conceived following use of fertilisation procedures of artificial insemination by donor and *in vitro*—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: Have you a copy of the explanation?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have it here.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Well, then hand it over.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Do you want me to walk over and give it to you? The messenger has just arrived so that I can give it to him. I will give it to him.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: You should have called him earlier.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Honourable members opposite are unusually difficult to get on with today, Mr President, for some obscure reason. They must be having troubles in their Party room. I wonder whether there is a leadership challenge. It could well be that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who sits opposite is under challenge.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I rise on a point of order. What has this got to do with the matter at hand?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It has got absolutely nothing to do with the matter at hand. It is like honourable members'

interjections for most of the day, including those of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Attorney-General to proceed with his second reading explanation, permission for which has been granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member seems to have an obsession today.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: We want to know where we can hire those cheap Mercedes.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will tell you. I will give you that information. I am very happy to do that. The Hon. Mr Griffin is responsible for it.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: What did he have to do with it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He was the Attorney-General. He appointed Mr Geoff White.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Attorney-General to come back to the business of the day and stop this damn nonsense.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He is responsible for bringing in these cost effective measures, including the hiring of Mercedes.

This Bill will ensure that a child conceived following use of fertilisation procedures of artificial insemination by donor and *in vitro* fertilisation using donor gametes will be the child of the couple who have consented to the procedure and that other legislation will reflect the same position.

For about 15 years the practice of artificial insemination by donor has been used as a means of overcoming infertility. The law has failed to respond to this development and continued to treat the genetic, or biological, father as the father, for the purposes of the law, of any child who resulted from the use of this procedure. It is plain that the social husband within a couple which takes advantage of this procedure should be treated for all purposes by the law as the father of the child.

The problem created by the failure of the law to keep pace with developments in medical science was first addressed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General in November 1977. The deliberations of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General in respect of the status question had almost been finalised when the practice of *in vitro* fertilisation developed to the extent that successful pregnancies were beginning to be achieved. The Standing Committee considered it appropriate to incorporate within any legislation provisions which dealt with the status of children resulting from the procedure of *in vitro* fertilisation.

This amendment to the Family Relationships Act, now before the Council, deals with the status of children born either as a result of the use of artificial insemination by donor or as a result of the use of *in vitro* fertilisation procedures. This Bill deems a child born following IVF or AID procedures to be the child of a married couple or a couple living as husband and wife in a genuine domestic relationship. In relation to the position of the husband, the Bill states that he must have consented to the procedure. Furthermore, any woman who gives birth to a child will always be the mother of that child, notwithstanding that the ovum may have been donated by another woman. The Bill provides, in relation to a child born following use of donor gametes, that the donor is not the parent of the child.

The Bill confers legitimacy, for the purposes of State law, on children who are the product of the donation of ova. In this respect, this legislation is in line with the Victorian Status of Children Act but is in advance of the Artificial Conception Act 1984 passed by the New South Wales Parliament, which deals only with children born as a result of donor semen, whether the semen is used as part of an artificial insemination procedure or as part of an *in vitro* fertilisation procedure.

There have also been developments recently at Commonwealth level in respect of these issues. The Family Law (Amendment) Act 1983, which came into force in November 1983, added section 5A to the Family Law Act. That section deems children born of donor semen or embryo transfer to be the children of the husband and wife who have achieved pregnancy by use of the donated semen or embryo transfer. As honourable members will appreciate, the Commonwealth provision, because of limitations in respect of Commonwealth power, does not cover children conceived as a result of donated semen or embryo transfer who are born into a *de facto* relationship.

The Bill presently before the Council does confer protection on children born within an established *de facto* relationship. The approach of the standing committee was that any legislation should relate to married couples or couples in genuine domestic relationships living as husband and wife. This recognises the value of providing a child with parents who carry the responsibility for the emotional and physical growth and development of that child.

The Commonwealth Family Law Act does not deal generally with the subject of legitimation of children of a marriage. That subject is dealt with by the Commonwealth Marriage Act 1961, Part VI. The Commonwealth Attorney-General has introduced legislation to amend Part VI to clarify the legitimate status of children born as a result of certain medical procedures (defined as AID or the transfer of an embryo into the womb) where the laws of a State or Territory make provision for the parentage of these children. The Marriage Act Amendment Bill provides for legitimacy in three separate cases: where the sperm is donated, where the ova is donated or where both sperm and ova are donated, provided the State law recognises the legitimacy. Other legislation in South Australia requires amendment to reflect the same approach to parenthood and legitimacy of these children as expressed in this Bill, and the necessary amendments are contained in the schedule to the Bill. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends that section of the principal Act that sets out the arrangement of the Act. It is proposed that a new Part IIA be inserted in the Act, relating to the status of persons who have been conceived following medical procedures.

Clause 4 makes two amendments to the definition section of the principal Act. The definition of 'child born outside marriage' is no longer appropriate in its present form as it refers only to children born as a result of sexual relations. Obviously, children are now being born by conception through other means. The definition of 'father' or 'natural father' will provide particular assistance to the operation of section 6 in respect of children born through artificial conception.

Clause 5 proposes an amendment to section 8. This section provides that, in the absence of proof to the contrary, a child born to a woman during her marriage, or within 10 months after the dissolution of the marriage, is to be presumed to be the child of her husband. It is appropriate that the operation of this section be made subject to the provisions of the proposed new Part on artificial conception.

Clause 6 provides for the inclusion of a new Part IIA, concerned primarily with the relationships that arise when a child is born by virtue of artificial conception. Proposed new section 10a provides the definitions necessary for the operation of the new provisions. The definition of 'fertil-

isation procedure' refers to the processes of artificial insemination and *in vitro* fertilisation, these being the processes to which this Part will have application. References to the terms 'married woman', 'wife' and 'husband' are also necessary. In this Part, a woman who lives with a man on a genuine domestic basis as his wife will be referred to as a 'married woman'. The significance of this reference is that the 'husband' of such a woman may, under this measure, be considered as the father of her child born through artificial conception. If a married woman has a lawful husband and another 'husband' within the meaning assigned by this Part (being a man with whom she lives on a genuine domestic basis as his wife), that other husband shall be considered as the husband for the purposes of this Part to the exclusion of the lawful husband.

Proposed new section 10b provides that the Part applies to fertilisation procedures, whether carried out before or after the commencement of this Part. In addition, for the purposes of the laws of this State, the Part is to apply to all children, whether born before or after the commencement of the Part, and whether within or outside the State. New section 10c provides that a woman who gives birth to a child is the child's mother, notwithstanding that the child was conceived from an ovum donated by another woman. This provision settles conclusively the issue of the maternity of a child born through artificial conception.

New section 10d relates to the paternity of children. It provides that where a woman is married her husband may consent to her undergoing a fertilisation procedure and will then be considered to be the father of the resulting child. It may be noted that the provision is directed to people who are within the definition of 'husband' and accordingly does not relate to a person who is not living with the woman on a genuine domestic basis as her husband; nor does it relate to a lawful husband if another man is living with his wife. New section 10e clarifies in all respects the status of a donor of gametes used in fertilisation procedures by providing that such a donor is not a parent of any children born as a result of the use of those gametes.

Clause 7 proposes that section 11 of the Act be amended so that the relationship of putative spouse will arise between two people if one is the mother of a child born through artificial conception processes and the other is the father by virtue of the proposed new Part IIA. The section presently recognises the relationship of putative spouse if a child has been born to the couple, and the amendment provides consistency in relation to children conceived by artificial means.

Clause 8 refers to consequential amendments to the Adoption of Children Act, the Community Welfare Act and the Guardianship of Infants Act to revise the definition of 'child born outside marriage' appearing in each of those Acts. This is necessary as each Act contemplates only the birth of illegitimate children through sexual relations. The Schedule effects the consequential amendments that have been mentioned above.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 43.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech and will say a few words about some matters that have arisen as a result of the recent ALP conference. I had hoped to be standing here today congratulating the Government and the Labor Party on a move that would have been of great assistance to South Australia; that is, that they had cleared up the total hypocrisy of their uranium policy. However, what they have done is compounded it. The Attorney-General frowns. I can well understand that, because I understand the embarrassment that a man such as he, who has a conscience, must feel having to support this policy.

I have no choice but to say that Labor members of the Government in this State would have to be the greatest bunch of hypocrites who have ever been in Government in South Australia. That is not a light thing to say, but that is the situation, because they have compounded what has been a very stupid situation in relation to the uranium industry in South Australia by confirming their stance for at least another two years. By having this stupid policy one mine is able to proceed while others are to be totally closed down for that period of time. How on earth the Attorney-General can stand up in this State and claim to have any degree of honesty in relation to this subject is quite beyond me.

Resource development remains an item of crucial concern on the South Australian scene. During the recess Australians have witnessed the machinations of a biennial ALP National Conference. The problem with that conference, and the problem we now have in this Parliament, is that we do not know who belongs to what part of the Labor Party. I wonder who we have in this Council. I think that the Hon. Miss Levy is now clearly identified as a member of the left wing of the Labor Party—one faction—so we have one faction in this House.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Is that the 'left' or the 'centre left'?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is the left, I understand, which is surprising as she always seemed such a nice lady, but she is in that group within the Labor Party that has caused so many problems in this State. I regret that, because I think that it is a pity that a person of her obvious intelligence should take that line, but that is her decision. I am not sure where the rest stand—I am not at all certain of the Attorney-General's position. I think that the Hon. Mr Blevins is also allied with the left wing. I think that he is probably one of the people responsible for the present situation relating to uranium, although I do hear that he is the person who gained the numbers for the Premier in order that this policy of expediency could finally come to pass.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Not much principle in it, is there?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: None whatsoever, not one ounce of principle. It makes one wonder how one can trust this Government on other matters. It was a conference which some observers alleged represented a great victory for Mr Hawke and Mr Bannon on the issue of uranium. It may have been some internal win for Mr Hawke and Mr Bannon within the ALP, but there is little joy in the outcome for the people of South Australia. Two potential long-term job creating projects, namely, mines at Honeymoon and Beverley, remain condemned, victims of ALP double standards. What an extraordinary situation when a group of 99 people, the majority of whom are not in any way answerable to the Australian people and committed instead to one of three factions within the Government, should be allowed to determine the policies which will govern this country. What sort of a democracy do we have? Listening to the conference made one wonder just how much input the ordinary citizen has into the policies of the ALP. Regardless of what Bob Hawke or anyone else says, it is the decision of 99 people which will determine the policies of this Government.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Faceless men.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is right, it is exactly the same as the past; absolutely nothing has changed. The faceless men and women are the people who made this

decision. The Hon. Miss Levy is not faceless; she is quite attractive, in fact, but she is one of those people who sits there and really has not much input into such decisions. On the infamous uranium debate, the margin was 55 to 44 in favour of the absurdly narrow but nevertheless partially pro-uranium policy. If five people at that conference had changed their minds and sided with the socialist left the entire direction of our country could have conceivably changed. In other words, the Australian people could, in two years time, be faced with absurd socialist policies with just a 5 per cent swing in the delegates from moderate to, what do they call them, the 'centre left', to the left.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Mr Hayden's group.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, Mr Hayden's group. This is notwithstanding the fact that the policies promoted by the left are totally out of touch with reality and popular support. This is no more evident than in the area of uranium policy. I am sure many members opposite must cringe in embarrassment when they hear mention of the ALP's so-called new policy. Just a few years ago we witnessed in this place the political crucifixion of Norm Foster because he was prepared to stand up for South Australia and for reality. Norm Foster knew of the benefits to South Australia of Roxby Downs because he sat on a committee with me and other members and listened carefully to the evidence given. He was very anti-uranium when he started on that committee but at the finish he was pro-uranium. Why? Because he was prepared to listen with an open mind to what we were told.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Stuck by his principles.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, he stuck by his principles. He realised in the end that what was being promoted by the ALP was a lie, and he said so with his feet and voted for Roxby Downs. Every other member opposite voted against it at that time.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: And they kicked him out.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is exactly right—they kicked him out! He was prepared to withstand public vilification by his so-called colleagues to ensure that Roxby Downs went ahead with all its benefits for South Australia. The three men who now sit on the front bench opposite led the attack against Mr Foster on that occasion, in some ways in a most unparliamentary way. It was unparliamentary, in my opinion, questioning, as it did at one stage, Norm Foster's mental capacity and his loyalty to his Party. Now they are happy to reap the benefits of Government which have largely resulted from that commitment by Norm Foster to Roxby Downs so that it could proceed. There is no member opposite who would deny that if Norm Foster had not shown a bit of principle they would not be in Government now—he was the person who got them out of their difficulties.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: He was on a committee that we didn't have the pleasure of being on.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I agree with that, but it is a pity that the honourable member did not listen to the evidence because it was brought into this House by the trolley load and the honourable member was able to read it. The Hon. Dr Cornwall was on the committee, and I know for a fact that he agreed with Norm Foster, but nobody listened to him. Therefore, he was prepared to lose his integrity, but Norm Foster was not, so he was crucified and the Hon. Dr Cornwall went on to become a Minister. I know which member I believe acted with integrity on that occasion because one person went backwards on what he had heard and what he knew to be right and the other did not. Now the total reverse has occurred and everybody on the ALP side is clamouring to be on the side of the pro-Roxby Downs group, but they are still anti-uranium. One of these days the press in this State will start looking a little deeper into this subject and perhaps taking this Government apart for the absurd situation that now exists in this State. We do not have a very investigative press because it has certainly let the Labor Party get away with murder so far on this subject.

I previously expressed my astonishment that on the one hand the ALP is willing to allow Roxby Downs, potentially the world's largest uranium mine to proceed. On the other hand, it bans other uranium mines in this State and says that they are nasty things and we cannot have them. I have to give credit to the Australian Democrats and the Hon. Mr Gilfillan because there is one thing about it: the honourable member has been consistent, and one has to give the Hon. Mr Gilfillan credit for that. Indeed, I regard him as having a level of honesty that far transcends that of any member opposite, because he has stuck to his guns. He knows that this is an absurd policy. I do not agree with the honourable member: I believe that the honourable member is being very negative in regard to this State but, nevertheless, he is sticking to his principles and that, in itself, is of some credit to him. The situation confronting this Government is absurd. We have the Government pretending that it is anti-uranium mining, yet at the same time it allows a mine that could probably provide a third of the world's potential uranium demand to proceed while at the same time cancelling other mining projects.

People overseas must wonder what is going on in this State. They must wonder what sort of people we are to allow this position to remain. It is absolutely ridiculous. More than that, it is very negative in regard to the welfare of this State. Little wonder that the dedicated leftwinger is totally opposed to uranium, and is totally disillusioned. One thing about the Hon. Miss Levy: one cannot call her a dedicated left wing member, because she has not shown the same level of commitment as have others. Any honest member opposite surely must be shattered by the ALP's hypocrisy in this matter. Let me now look at the history of this Government's uranium policy. Some misguided commentators have congratulated the ALP for what they describe as its realistic policy. These people—and I refer to some prominent business leaders amongst this group—have absolutely been conned by this policy. The reality is that the ALP policy is absolutely hypocritical.

I do not know how the Attorney can sit comfortably in his position as Leader of this Council in a Government that supports the world's largest uranium mine and at the same time denies any opportunity for anyone else to get a mine up and running, especially one mine in particular that has on it a pilot plant all ready to go, yet it is sitting in mothballs. On 7 February 1979, the Attorney stated:

> When dealing with the safety there have been two matters to which the Labor Party . . . in 1977 had particularly directed their attention. The first is the increased risk of a nuclear war and the proliferation of nuclear weapons that may encourage that increased risk, and the second issue is the question of the disposal of radioactive wastes that are left after the generation of power in a nuclear power station or what is left after reprocessing. The policy of the ALP, formulated in 1977, makes specific reference to both those factors, and the Labor Party will not change its policy until it is satisfied that those problems have been solved.

I emphasise that last sentence. What are the changes that now satisfy the ALP and the Attorney-General? I have always been satisfied myself that those safeguards and controls exist—the ALP has not. What have been the steps that have taken place that have put the mind of our previously conscience-wracked Attorney at ease, to the point where he now is a very great exponent of Roxby Downs whilst still knocking out any other uranium mines? Reinforcing his concerns highlighted above, the Attorney went on to state:

> It is not just emotional nonsense . . . the Opposition has not provided one jot of evidence that any of those problems concerning proliferation have been solved. Until it does I will not change my mind.

What has happened to force the Attorney to change his mind about changing his mind? That was his position in 1977.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That's about 10 years ago.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Attorney forgets very easily, but some of his supporters will not forget so easily. There were people marching in the street, and the Attorney was amongst them in the past on behalf of the anti-uranium lobby.

The Hon. C.M. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is right. I do not blame them. The worst factor confronting them is the absolute hypocrisy that now exists in regard to this matter. What has happened to force the Attorney to change his mind about changing his mind? That is what has happened. He has changed his mind about changing his mind. I suggest that that little word 'expediency' has crept into his argument: political expediency.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I might have suggested the word 'pragmatic'.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: No, it is expediency. 'Pragmatic' is a different matter which would have come into it earlier. Now it is expediency. Certainly, the Premier, Mr Bannon, and the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, have unashamedly admitted, indeed argued that the life of a Labor State Government is at issue. At the ALP Conference it was put very bluntly, I understand. Mr Hawke warned the delegates that if Mr Bannon was repudiated by a negative vote then his Government would be destroyed. Mr Bannon made it clear that his concern was all about votes: not about principles but all about votes. He said, 'We will knock out everything else but you must let us have Roxby Downs. We will not let Honeymoon or Beverley proceed. We will pander to you in the Left a little, but we will not cancel Roxby Downs. We have to let that proceed because, if we do not, we will lose the election. That is the situation.' He referred to polling that showed that the main erosion—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: We are a banana republic in relation to this policy. He referred to polling that showed that the main erosion of ALP support, because of anti-uranium stands, had been in the traditional blue collar area. One thing about the blue collar people, the ordinary people of this State, is that they are not stupid. They do look upon uranium as an essential requirement to the development of this State, and they have shown it in polls. Therefore, once the polls showed that it was all okay the ALP said that it had better do something about it. It said, 'We will let them have a little one and they will think that we are pro-uranium. We will leave a couple out of it and they will think that we are anti. In that way we may be able to sit on the barbed wire fence.'

It becomes uncomfortable and it will become more uncomfortable. He went on to way that the ALP had lost votes in the blue collar area and in return the ALP had picked up a few trendies, a few white collar workers with secure jobs who wanted to keep uranium in the ground. They are the very people who, over the past 10 years, the ALP has been wooing by pretending to be anti-uranium. The ALP is now calling those people 'trendies', calling them names, in order to try to get the support of the left wing.

Many of the so-called trendies might end up supporting the Democrats at the next election, the way the ALP is going. The Government might get a surprise. Even some of those trendies might see that the Liberal Party has the best policy on this matter, a policy to be clear, above board and pro-uranium mining. The Premier acknowledged that he would not be in Government if it were not for the fact that he was able to give a Roxby Downs guarantee at the last election. The only reason he was able to do that was because Norm Foster got him out of his trouble, the man who had been crucified by the ALP at that time and ever since. While I suppose we should experience some satisfaction that the pro-Roxby Downs stand has been taken, it is very much a matter of regret that the decision is based on total political expediency, rather than on principle. It is a stand which contrasts significantly with earlier statements by the Attorney-General in the Roxby Downs debate, when he stated:

> The speeches of many honourable members opposite echo the same sentiment, namely, that the opposition to Roxby Downs is all political—that somehow politics is to blame for the defeat of this Bill. These sorts of statements completely cheapen the argument. It is probable that in pure political terms the Labor Party would be better off letting the Bill pass in its present form. However, the Labor Party will only pass the Bill if it is heavily amended, because we believe there are still outstanding moral issues, particularly relating to weapons proliferation, but also general safety, which remain unresolved. I therefore resent the denigration . . . of people's motives on this issue and the dismissal of the arguments as purely political as if that could consitute any answer to the concerns which many people in the community and the world hold over the uranium issue.

I remember that the Attorney-General was very emotional at that time. When he made that statement I thought to myself, 'I do not agree with him, but he is an honest man. He is standing up there and he really means this—it is a real feeling from deep within.' However, it did not take long for that to disappear. The Attorney-General has gone down a long way in my estimation following his handling of this matter.

It has been no trouble for the Attorney-General to pull his feet to one side and step over to the other side of the fence—or perhaps I should say to the middle of the fence. That is a great shame, because there were a lot of people in this State and in the Liberal Party who believed that the Attorney was a man of principle and a very honest politician. That has now gone—it is finished. When the Attorney-General now rises in this place and makes emotional speeches we will look a long way behind him to see whether or not he means what he is saying. I will now find it very difficult to believe what the Attorney is saying, even if he has tears in his eyes.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I see; the moment has passed and the Attorney can now jump over. We now see the contradiction between that statement from the Hon. Mr Sumner whilst he was in Opposition and the action of the ALP once it assumed Government. To say the uranium issue has now subsided is a folly. Noted left winger Peter Duncan has (with apologies to General McArthur) said, 'We shall return.' His goal is to reverse the policy in just two years time. In the meantime, Young Labor, CANE and sundry others will yet again attempt to blockade Roxby Downs.

This action from amongst the Labor Party's own ranks creates uncertainty and scares off investors and potential developers. The problems are exacerbated when the uncertainty of the policy is coupled with its inconsistency. Defying science, the ALP categorises uranium according to degrees of political expediency.

Uranium now has not only chemical properties but also political properties. Its political properties now vary according to the amount of copper that it contains. It is a very interesting subject and one that some young political graduate seeking to do a doctorate could look into. In fact, it could be done by someone doing a science course and someone doing a politics course. They could both get their heads together and work out just what properties uranium now has. I have said it before and I will say it again: there are now several different types of uranium, depending on when the ALP holds its conference.

If uranium is found before an ALP conference, provided the Labor Party has been in Government for long enough, it can be mined. However, if the ALP is elected to government after a conference it is too late because the uranium is then dangerous, subject to proliferation; it creates all sorts of problems at power stations, and the waste products become nasty. Of course, there is also the other type: if the uranium contains enough copper, it can still be mined. Frankly, I am a bit confused about this question from the Australian Labor Party's point of view. If I am confused, I can assure the Council that the rest of the population are, too, as are people overseas who are thinking of investing in this State. Overseas investors must wonder just what type of situation they will strike in our industries when they see what the ALP has done on the uranium question.

Anyone who was thinking of exploring in this State will not now take the drill out of their shed. Why on earth would anyone put a drill into the ground when they know that if they strike uranium (which is very likely in the north of this State) they will not be able to mine it? One is banned from mining uranium when it is not found soon enough after an ALP conference or if it does not contain enough copper. That is absolutely ridiculous. This is something that the press in this State should take up, because it is hurting South Australia.

At Honeymoon, we have a mine that is ready to go, everything having been spent on it, but it is in mothballs. At Beverley, we have a huge deposit which is very easy to mine and everything is set to go, but nothing is being done about it. We are letting the Labor Party get away with this hypocrisy. I have now said enough about this subject, but it will be brought up again and again. I assure the Attorney-General that his attitude to this matter has caused much dismay from people who, as I said before, believed in the past that he was an honest man.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What about all the things you said about Dr Eastick and the Liberal Party when you were in the Liberal Movement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. K.L. Milne): Order!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: From what he is saying, I think the Attorney-General is a member of the Centre Left. I always thought that he was a bit of a right-winger, but I now think that he is in the Centre Left. I wonder what it feels like to be a member of a Government with three factions behind you, not knowing which way each one will go on any subject.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: He doesn't know which one he's in, anyway.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: No, he is probably an amorphous member who shifts about.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Attorney is like a bit of jelly. However, that is getting away from the next subject that I wish to discuss.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What about the DeGaris faction?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: As the Attorney knows, the Hon. Mr DeGaris is a very good and worthwhile member of this Council.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: One thing about the Attorney-General is that whenever he becomes uncomfortable he always tries to throw what I will call a bit of manure at people. One can always tell when the Attorney's conscience is hurting him. I did not think that he still had one. I must have upset the Attorney when I said that I used to think that he was an honest man but that I am now not at all certain of that because of what he has done in relation to uranium. I accept that I have hurt him. I hope it hurts him enough so that the next time something like this comes up he is honest. I would appreciate that. Basically, the Attorney is not a bad fellow most of the time. The Attorney has shifted just a little towards the dishonest side of politics, and that is a pity.

The next subject that I will discuss does not affect many people. I have already spoken on it publicly and I now raise it here, because I think it should be raised in this Council. The people involved live in a very isolated area. I refer briefly to the question of mail runs in the Far North. While it is not necessarily a subject that affects this Parliament or this Government financially (although I believe there is some input from the State Government), it is nevertheless a matter of great importance to the few isolated families who live in the area. These people provide a very good service to other people in the State who visit the area. Anyone who goes into the Far North, particularly the channel country, would know that these people are very hospitable, very generous and are prepared to assist people in trouble. These people have received mail deliveries ever since they settled in this area.

In the early days mail was delivered by stage coach. These days one wonders how a stage coach ran along the Birdsville Track; nevertheless, that happened and the people obtained their mail in that way. Until 1974 the mail was delivered by truck, but that service was altered as a result of the floods when it was no longer possible to use that method to get the mail through. As a result, a mail plane service was commenced to the area to deliver mail to the stations; the service was not commenced to deliver freight or anything else. The service was commenced purely to ensure that the people received their mail. At that time it was accepted that the people were entitled to a free mail delivery service. Recently, the people were told that their mailbags were no longer to be considered mailbags for the station but, instead, they were to be community mailbags. This means that any person can have mail sent to the stations in question where it can be picked up, or they can deliver mail to the stations.

So, each mail bag is a community mail bag; in other words, each of those stations has now become a semi-post office. That is an important question, because it means that station owners are in fact receiving mail for people travelling in the area and from people travelling in the area, and they provide a communication service to people who are on holidays in those rather outback areas. So, communication is provided.

The station owners also have radio phones, but not in the sense that there is direct dialling: most of those stations have two-way radios, so they are not private phones in the real sense of the term. Because the phone service is vital, the station owners must provide a public phone service. Any person can receive a call or make a call at those stations. That is a requirement on those people—they provide that service. They also provide rescue services, and anyone who has been in trouble in the North would know that those people are available and would never refuse to assist a person in trouble. Let me say that many people who go to those areas get into trouble, and it is surprising how much trouble they can get into because of lack of knowledge of the country. People go up there without enough petrol, water or food, and they encounter all sorts of problems. That is not true for every person, but plenty of people go to those areas unprepared and not understanding the country.

The only communication that the station owners have with the outside world, apart from the phone, is a mail service on a weekly basis. Once a week the plane lands and the people receive their mail. They also receive mail for anyone else: it is sent to the station, and mail is also sent out from the station. Obviously, when the mail plane comes, if supplies are needed urgently, they are brought in on the mail plane—and the people pay for the freight. That is a different part of the service altogether and it has nothing

to do with the mail. That is their own private arrangement with the person providing the plane service. Passengers use the plane service, and I understand that the operator is now advertising that service as a tourist run under the slogan 'Come on the channel mail run around the stations'. That is probably a good idea, except that it is a little galling for the people who live in those areas, because they are now being asked to pay for the mail that they receive.

The weekly mail is the only way in which the children in those areas can get schooling. Every week correspondence lessons arrive and the lessons for the week before are sent back to the Correspondence School. Let me tell members that it is not a very satisfactory form of education for children, but the people do the best they can with it. It is extremely difficult to teach a child by that method. In most cases station owners must provide a governess for their children, and that is not cheap—about $120 a week just for the wages for a governess. That expense is not subsidised to any great extent.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Or they can send them to a private school.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, and I will come to that. The Correspondence School service is satisfactory only until the end of primary education, because very few governesses are able to teach the better subjects. Certainly, the mothers cannot do that: it is not possible.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The better subjects?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is the wrong word—I mean the subjects that children must do for Matriculation standard once they get to high school.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You did say 'better'.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am sorry: I did not mean to say that. It was a slip of the tongue.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Another one!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Well, I have not had any slips apart from that one. This is a serious subject. Those people must send their children to school in other areas when they reach grade 7, or even before that. Normally the children must go to a major country centre or the metropolitan area. They have to board at a private school or they must find other board if they go to a high school, and that is not cheap. While some assistance is given, it certainly does not cover the full cost. However, schooling is compulsory and those people certainly want their children to receive a decent education. But it is another cost.

People in those areas accept their isolation: they accept that they live in an isolated area and that they must pay for all these things. They do not complain about it. They ask for Government assistance from time to time, but nevertheless they accept that they have to pay for their own freight. Those people on stations in the channel country are going through a very difficult time at present, because the stations have been de-stocked because of disease eradication programmes, and many of those people will not have income for three years. They will be going through very difficult times. It is very difficult country in which to run stock and to muster. If station owners run into further disease problems it will mean that they will be wiped out again in terms of their income. I can well understand why many of them are putting their stations on the market—they have had and are having a very difficult time indeed.

But they accept all those things and all the problems; they are a very non-complaining group of people. They provide services to the community and to people who go to those areas; they act as guides to people who have difficulties when they get there; and they look after historic areas. It is just not possible for the Government to provide the personnel required for that job. Those people keep the areas clean of rubbish, and let me tell members that the tourists are certainly not prone to keeping their rubbish in their vehicles—they spread it around. But on top of all that, these people have been asked to pay $10 every time the plane lands with their mail. Well, I think that is something that should be reviewed by whoever made the decision. I am not pointing the finger at any one person or at any one Government, because it could well be that the previous Government made the decision—I do not know. But whoever made the decision should be asked to review it.

The Hon. Anne Levy: It was certainly not the State Government.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I understand that the State Government was involved through representatives. There was a meeting, a decision was made, and the State Government was involved.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: Do you mean that a station owner must pay $10 although there is mail for other people in the bag?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is exactly right: that is what happens. They pay $10, but, because it is a community mail bag, other people can receive and send mail. That could well be Government—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Is that the 'user pays' principle?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: No, it is not, because the user is not paying.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: Some of the users are not paying.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: One of the users is paying. Innamincka Station is to pay $10 for the mail bag, but the Innamincka store, which is supposed to be a public post office, will not pay. When the plane lands it drops both mail bags at the same point. That is not the 'user pays' principle but discrimination against a person who lives at a station eight miles from the town.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: They are not supposed to charge the others, are they?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: They charge the station.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: But not the other users?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: No. That would be impossible. I believe that that situation should be reversed as soon as possible. Certainly, from listening to the people in those areas, I believe that they feel so discriminated against that they will just not pay. I would not be surprised if the plane does not have to land anywhere because these people are so cross about this imposition. The worst thing is that it was imposed without discussions with the people involved. They were not told of the proposition. One week the plane landed and they were told, 'As from next week you will be paying $10 every time the plane lands.' There was absolutely no information provided.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: What plane is it?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Port Augusta Air Services.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: Then it is a State decision?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: No, that is not fair. I gather that it was a decision of the Department of Aviation following a meeting of representatives of the State Government, the Federal Government, and various departments. Highways Department camps get their mail from that plane in those areas or they get their mail from the station mail bags—but people at those camps will not pay whereas the people on the stations will have to pay. Those people are supposed to have five kilograms of freight free as a result of the $10 charge, but they do not want that. They are not interested in that, because five kilograms would not cover the lettuces for the next week. It is ridiculous. It is supposed to be a give-away thing that they will get five kilograms free. But the way in which stations operate these days does not take into account a five kilogram load, because they have coolrooms and freezers and they obtain supplies in bulk, keeping them for a long time.

I ask that the State Government—and I have asked this question of the Attorney previously—take whatever steps are required to have this intended charge reversed in this State. Few people are concerned with this charge but, never-

theless, they are very generous, well meaning people who provide a very good service to anyone who goes up North.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: Do you know how much it will amount to for each person per annum? Is it about $500?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It is $520 per annum, and at the moment that is a lot of money to these people.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: For six stations?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes. It is a lot of money to those people as you, Mr President, would know.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: The amount of $3 000 over a year for the civil aviation people is peanuts.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I think that there are more than six stations; probably 15 stations are involved. But it is still ridiculous. These people fear not the $10 but what will happen in the future. We have all watched Governments put on fees. Once a fee is set it is not very high in its first year, but the second, third and fourth years is where the trouble begins. These people are determined, and the situation will arise where they will not accept their mail. They will be totally isolated as they will not accept this impost.

These people had to build their own airstrips, which anyone can use. They do not stop people from using them and keep them up to standard—a very good standard indeed. I recently landed on one of these airstrips, and it was well maintained. Then, these people are asked to pay for their mail. If a visitor to the North is injured anywhere in the bush and has to be taken out by the Royal Flying Doctor Service, the airstrips are used. No charge is put on that. What are these people expected to do? From now on these people will say that if a person is going to use their airstrip that person will have to pay for it because they must recover the money that they are being forced to pay. That situation could well arise, but these people would not want to do that. I ask that the Attorney take up this matter with his Federal colleague to see whether anything can be done about it.

The Commonwealth member for Grey feels the same way as I do and has taken whatever action he can take on this matter. I ask that Government members get behind him, the member for Eyre (Mr Gunn) and you, Mr President, who have been involved in this matter, to try to have this decision reversed.

The PRESIDENT: I got them the service in the first place.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is right. I am fully aware of that, and it is a credit to you, Mr President, that that occurred. The service should continue, but on the same basis as when it was first set up. It is a mail run to which freight and passengers have been added; it is not a freight and passenger run to which mail has been added. An attempt is being made to change that and it is not correct.

I have also raised previously in this Council the problems that are now facing station owners and people who are interested in keeping areas of historic interest in reasonable condition. This problem is becoming larger because four-wheel drive vehicles are now freely available in the community and more are being purchased every day. In recent years four-wheel drive vehicles have had the biggest rises in new car sales. People are going to the North for weekends and holidays as it has become easier to get to those areas because of better roads. For instance, the Stuart Highway is now almost complete to Coober Pedy and it is very easy to get up there. The main road to Leigh Creek and Lyndhurst, I understand, is sealed and it takes only about seven hours to get to that area. From there one can branch out to anywhere in the North.

This is causing an enormous rise in the number of tourists going into the area. The majority of tourists are responsible but, unfortunately, perhaps 10 per cent are extremely irresponsible and will not understand what they are doing or the problems that they create for the area. These people arrive with their newly purchased chainsaws itching to try them out and demonstrate their macho behaviour to their spouse, children or girlfriend. The result in some areas where there is some historic interest, such as at Bourke's tree at Innamincka, is horrific. There are few trees around that particular tree that are not severely damaged by chainsaws. This damage is almost irreparable, as it will take 50 to 100 years for damage that has now occurred to rectify itself through nature.

These tourists seem to have been born without legs. They drive right in alongside this tree and peer out the window at the writing on the plaque. They then attempt to drive off, and at least half of them get bogged trying to get away from the tree. The area is very sandy and the end result is that the area looks like a ploughed paddock. These people then camp within 50 metres of the tree on the bank of the river and immediately look around for firewood. When they cannot find any, out comes the chainsaw and away they go. If one went up there now trying to get a load of firewood one would not find a stick within 300 metres of the tree because it has all been chopped up.

In that area there are other significant items that should have been left alone. The owners of Innamincka station have done the best they can. They have fenced the area innumerable times but, as soon as a four-wheel drive vehicle arrives at a fence, out come the pliers or else the fence is bashed down. No fence has lasted more than six weeks in this area. It is only 400 yards to walk to the tree but, obviously, that is too far for these people so they knock down the fence and away they go. The owner of the Innamincka store (Mr Mike Steel) has done an excellent job with rubbish collection, but it is almost beyond him now because so many people are leaving rubbish around. It is beyond his capacity to handle this as on a voluntary basis he not only cleans up this area but also looks after other areas near there including the big tree.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: Are there proper notices displayed?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The notices last about as long as the fence. That is the problem. Once some people get into the bush they seem to believe that everything belongs to them and do not understand that they should leave things alone. In no way do I reflect on anyone in the National Parks and Wildlife Service up there. They are responsible people and do the best they can. They work out of Leigh Creek and it is very difficult for them to cope with their workload. Of course, not all areas are in the national park, nor should they be. I do not think that that is necessary. Those officers do not have the necessary powers to cope with people doing these things outside a national park. Also, station owners do not have the capacity or disciplinary powers to do anything about people misbehaving on their stations. So, people who know what is going on in the area and know their rights just laugh at anyone who attempts to discipline them.

The time has come when this matter has to be thought through very carefully and decisions have to be made about the way in which we can institute some procedures whereby local responsible people—either station owners, storekeepers or possibly people who are running safaris and are in the area constantly—have some disciplinary and reporting powers so that something can be done to stop people knocking this area about.

The North of the State is very beautiful and we should all be proud of not allowing it to be knocked about. I know that everyone will not agree with me, but we may have to come to the stage where chainsaws are banned in areas of the State outside the hundreds. This would be unfortunate, but we should get to that stage—

The Hon. K.L. Milne: We should do it along the River Murray also.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is right. The banks of the Murray have suffered the same fate. People on houseboats, when they do not have firewood, get off the boat and chop down everything in sight to get firewood. Serious consideration should be given to banning chain saws other than for the purposes for which station owners use them.

Frankly, there is no need for them to take them. If they cannot find an area in which to camp up there where there is firewood, there is something wrong with them, because I have been in that area a number of times and there is never a problem. If they are going to go into an area where firewood is a problem, let them take a gas fire. That is not difficult. A small gas fire is no problem to take. There should be absolutely no need for anybody to take a chain saw beyond Leigh Creek, or even further back than that. Even the Flinders Ranges have suffered the ravages of these small chain saws that are being sold by the thousands. If one goes into the Flinders Ranges and looks at the areas that have not been visited very much and then looks at the areas that have, one will see the difference.

The Hon. K.L. Milne: I think that it is urgent.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, I do, too. Every season that passes will make it worse. The worst feature that will happen—and it is probably of great benefit to South Australia—is that a film will be shot on the expedition of the famous Burke and Wills. I am not sure whether they were the best explorers or the worst; that will be the subject of the film. Once that occurs, the interest in Burke and Wills and in the area of Innamincka, for a start, and certainly in most of the North will be enormous. I predict that we will see a quadrupling or more of the visitors in that area. When that happens, God help the area, because it really will be pounded to death unless we institute some disciplinary procedures and powers for the sake of the people who love the area, live there and have its interests at heart.

I could say a little about the Hon. Gordon Bruce's interjection about Kingston. If the Hon. Gordon Bruce cannot see a difference between the uranium mining areas and the Kingston coal deposits—

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: I can see a difference. I just asked what your attitude would be if it were uranium instead of coal.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I would still be against it because it is another matter altogether down there. If uranium were there, the water would not be any good because it would be full of the elements that would be absolutely harmful to stock and pastures. So, it is not a matter that would arise.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: You can eat the stuff; it will not harm you.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: But not in that form which they find it up north. At Honeymoon the water underneath is too full of the salts of the worst forms found in uranium to be drinkable. So that is a problem that will not arise and has not arisen, but if the Hon. Gordon Bruce wants to argue any time, publicly or privately, about the Kingston coal deposit I will be quite willing to do so because it is an area about which I have some understanding and in which I have done some work.

I still have some very severe reservations about the announcement the other day because that water down in the South-East is the most valuable asset that we have. It is the reason why we are drought proof and why we are so uptight about anything that would cause a problem to it. If any Government ever stepped into the approval of the mining of that coal without our being fully aware of the safeguards that would prevent damage to the underground water table, Eureka Stockade would have nothing compared with the problem that one would strike in the South-East.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and trust that the Government will take into account what I have said about its uranium policy and try to see whether there is some way that it can hold a special meeting and try to clear up the hypocrisy that it is now showing to the general public.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I, too, rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's opening Speech and thank His Excellency for the manner in which he performed the opening ceremony. I express my sympathy to the members of the families of Harry King, Howard O'Neill and Claude Allen on their passing. I did not serve in the Parliament during the time of Harry King, but I did during the time of Howard O'Neill and Claude Allen. Both were respected Parliamentarians.

I was in close association with Claude Allen during his time of holding the seats of Burra and Frome, and during that association with Claude Allen I had the highest regard for him. No member of Parliament has been more highly respected in his district, which covered a large slice of the State.

In the opening Speech reference was made to the past year being a time of recovery in South Australia. It mentions that the Government has been pleased to note the signs of renewed confidence in South Australia. Also, reference is made to the Government's concern that the recovery is uneven and fragile. While things have improved in South Australia, there are certain economic improvements in one or two areas that need special mention. The rural improvement, of course, as it always does, marks the turning point. Good seasons in the rural sector are always catalysts to an improving economy, but one of the satisfying results this year is the marked improvement in the agricultural machinery manufacturer, Horwood Bagshaw.

It is always sad when a long established South Australian business finds itself in difficulties, particularly when that long established business has close ties, both in its sales and manufacturing, to the rural sector. The recovery of Horwood Bagshaw in the past 12 months is good news for this State. For example, the total number of direct and indirect employees at Mannum was down to 42 in April last year, while in April 1984 the number of employees had risen to 200 in that country town. Net sales by Horwood Bagshaw rose by 40 per cent in 1983-84, and on present predictions will rise again by approximately 100 per cent in 1984-85.

In 1983, 42 harvesters were manufactured in Mannum; that has risen to 225 in 1984 and a predicted 350 will be built in 1985. Horwood Bagshaw is the only Australian-owned manufacturer of harvesters. In 1985 it should be able to command about 25 per cent of the Australian harvester market.

This recovery in Horwood Bagshaw deserves congratulations to those who are involved because this branch of the Australian manufacturing industry has really been led from South Australia. Part of the recovery has been due to the work of the Industries Development Committee of this Parliament, which supported the application of Horwood Bagshaw last year for a guarantee facility at a time when the level of employment was at its lowest point. That guarantee has contributed to the recovery, together with improved management of one of South Australia's important industries.

A 40 per cent increase of sales in 12 months and a multiplication of five in the number of employees, particularly in a decentralised industry, deserves our comment. Although reference was made in His Excellency's Speech to the point that recovery was uneven and fragile, the Horwood Bagshaw story appears this year to be a strong and vigorous one, and that is good news for South Australia.

Paragraph 9 of the opening address deserves some comment. I quote:

My Government believes that central to the good government of the State is the effective provision of constitutional and electoral laws which allow for the full expression of the will of the people and for the election of a Government which can be effective.

I do not wish to speak at any great length in this debate on that point in this opening address as there is no doubt that we will have to do that at a later stage during the session. The address refers to the 'full expression of the will of the people'. I point out to the Council that only the Legislative Council in its voting system allows for the full expression of the will of the people. The full expression of the will of the people cannot be provided in single member constituencies. Therefore, I find the statements following that in the opening address quite peculiar—to change the Constitution Act that affects the House that alone provides for the full expression of the will of the people.

Since 1960 there have been nine elections in South Australia in which three results have permitted a vote of less than 50 per cent for a political Party to win a majority of seats. I pose the question, 'What does the Government mean when it uses the phrase "full expression of the will of the people"?' I know that it does not mean that a new electoral system providing for a majority vote only to gain a majority of seats will be provided. I know that it does not mean full representation of minority groups. Therefore, what does it mean? Perhaps the question is answered in the phrase 'for the election of a Government which can be effective'. To explain what they mean by 'the election of a Government which can be effective' the opening address states that to be more effective the Constitution Act will be amended in four ways: first, for simultaneous elections; secondly, for a minimum Parliamentary term of three years; thirdly, a maximum term of four years; and, fourthly, the removal of the Legislative Council's power to block Supply. Therefore, for the election of a Government that can be effective the Government proposes four constitutional changes.

The first change proposed is for simultaneous elections. I point out that we already have simultaneous elections in South Australia. Because of the way in which the opening address is drafted, one would assume that we do not have simultaneous elections in this State. What the Government is suggesting, of course, is that when the House of Assembly decides to go to an election the Legislative Council will also go to an election, irrespective of the length of term those Councillors up for election have served. That proposal cuts across a fundamental principle that has served this State well over a very long period, and any proposal to change that principle needs to be viewed with extreme caution.

The second proposal is to provide for a minimum Government term of three years. This is related, of course, to the third proposal of a maximum term of four years. Generally in the republican systems fixed terms of Parliament are used, but the British system uses the maximum term only. In Australia we have followed the British model. The great authorities on the British and American constitutions, Walter Baggot and Woodrow Wilson, supported the view that it should be possible for the Lower House to be dissolved at any time; the fact that the Executive can appeal to the electorate is one of the great strengths of the British system as against the American system.

However, in the proposal suggested by the Government we have the peculiarity of a fixed term of three years in a four year Parliament. With any provision for a fixed term the Executive becomes more entrenched because it would not be subject to any threat of being accountable to the Parliament, except at the end of a fixed or minimum term. At the same time, the minimum term proposal does not prevent the artificial engineering of an early election if the Government desires it. This engineering technique was used in West Germany in 1972 and 1982 to force an early election in a constitutiont that has fixed term Parliaments. In South Australia we have passed through a decade of early elections—in 1970, 1975, 1977, and 1979—four elections when three would have normally occurred.

I point out that in the whole of this century we have had one election more than would have occurred normally. This is hardly a case for a constitutional change to prevent too frequent elections. One would consider that the reasons behind the proposals are probably different reasons from those that may be advanced—that it is to prevent too frequent elections. On the question of fixed terms, I would hope that the State Government follows the decision of its Federal brothers and drops the idea of a referendum for fixed term Parliaments. As I have pointed out so far, it does not deny the ability of a Government to engineer an early election if it so desires, but it entrenches still further the Executive and reduces the ability of Parliament to insist upon Government accountability.

As for the proposal for a four year Parliament, I have never been impressed that the advantages put forward by its advocates will produce those results. If four year terms will produce more effective government than three year terms then would six year terms, improve the effectiveness still further? Exactly where do we draw the line on this question of effective government so far as as term of a Parliament is concerned? Once in our history we did move to five year terms with the same arguments put forward as we see today. After one term of five years we returned very rapidly to three year Parliaments. I do not see any advantage to the State in four year Parliaments. Nevertheless, I understand that there is considerable pressure coming through in support of four year Parliaments.

The fourth change proposed by the Government is the removal of the Constitutional power of the Legislative Council to stop Supply. In the 138-year history of the Legislative Council, Supply has never been stopped by this Council. The proposal to remove that power because the Council has never used it must be rejected as quite illogical. The power is there for a reason and the use of that power may at some time in the future be necessary. I sincerely hope that such a circumstance will never eventuate. As far as the power to reject Supply is concerned, there is one change that I believe should be made; that is, that if the Council does reject Supply then one-half of its members should also face the electorate, irrespective of the time that they have served.

In the defeat of Supply, the Council should be accountable to the electorate in the same way as the House of Assembly. As the Supply Bills are the only Bills through which, if defeated, the Council can force an election, then it is reasonable that the Council should face that election. Having dealt briefly with the four constitutional proposals, one now needs to examine quickly the overall effect those four proposals will have if they are written into our Constitution Act. The first effect will be to entrench the growth of Executive power. Secondly, they will reduce the powers and functions of this Council. While each proposal has its effect on its own, it appears to me quite clearly that the reason is not to enhance the standing of Parliament nor to increase the effectiveness of Government but to change the structure of power in our Parliamentary system. Of course, that cannot change without the approval of a referendum, a course that I hope some members in this Council now appreciate. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 9 August at 2.15 p.m.