LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 25 August 1992

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

QUESTION ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answer to Question No. 6, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

CARRICK HILL DIRECTOR

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. Why was the recent vacancy for the position of Director of Carrick Hill only 'advertised' internally within the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, and not throughout the public service or more widely?

2. Was the decision to restrict the call for applications the initial preference of the Board of the Trust?

3. What are the terms and conditions of Ms Denzil O'Brien's appointment as Director?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY:

1. The Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage needs to reduce its permanent workforce during 1992-93. The mechanisms open to it are attrition, redeployment and cost effective voluntary separation payouts.

When funded vacant (required) positions become available, the Department, under the provisions of the Government Management and Employment Act, has the authority to transfer employees at the same level as the vacant position without a public service wide call. The Department uses this legitimate facility to either directly place permanent employees, at the level, who are surplus to requirements, or to seek registrations of interest from existing permanent employees already at that level. In the latter case a merit based selection is made from the candidates who have registered.

By offering internal positions to existing employees at the level, the Department's required workforce reductions can be achieved. Further, there are also benefits in terms of flexibility in the workforce and training and development for individuals.

2. The Carrick Hill Trust is not the employer of any individuals. The employer is the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage. The Department has worked within the spirit of the legislation and the administrative framework of the Public Service and the Board has always accepted that was the case. It is important to note that the Carrick Hill Board are delighted with the appointment of the new Director.

3. Ms O'Brien is a permanent employee at the ASO-6 level and is now the Director of Carrick Hill and will remain so until she vacates the position. Her salary and conditions as a permanent public servant have not changed as a result of this appointment.

STATE BANK

The PRESIDENT laid on the table a further report from the Ombudsman concerning the alleged State Bank files.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—

Australian Grand Prix Act—Report, 1991.

By the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. Anne Levy)—

Correctional Services Act 1982—Regulations—Unauthorised Substances Committee.

Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Blood Analysis Hospitals.

Corporation By-laws—Woodville—

No. 16—Liquor Control

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

Naracoorte By-Law No. 5—Dogs.

District Council By-laws—Port McDonnell—

No. 3—Garbage Removal;

No. 4—Caravans and Camping;

No. 5—Animals and Birds;

No. 6—Dogs;

No. 7—Bees.

SASFIT

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney General): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement on SASFIT's investment on the ASER project that is being given in another place by my colleague the Minister of Finance.

Leave granted.

WORTHINGTON INQUIRY

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on the subject of an inquiry into allegations of conflict of interest concerning the Minister of Tourism.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Today in another place the Premier is giving the following ministerial statement. I am repeating it for the benefit of members of this place.

On 16 April 1992 the Government appointed Mr T. A. Worthington, QC to inquire into and report upon allegations that the Minister of Tourism has, or has had, a conflict of interest in respect of the introduction of the Gaming Machine Bills, the Tandanya Development or Glenelg Foreshore Development. This followed a request by Ms Wiese for an independent inquiry to resolve the issues in relation to the introduction of gaming machines and the two developments which had been raised in Parliament during March and April this year.

Mr Worthington's inquiry was directed to establishing the facts surrounding the Minister's involvement in each area. The principles in relation to conflict of interest and the application of those principles to the facts were matters for myself and the Government. To this end the Attorney-General prepared a report for Cabinet on principles relating to conflict of interest. That report noted that the current guidelines for Ministers are inadequate insofar as they fail to sufficiently elaborate all of the circumstances which give rise to conflict situations. On 15 August 1992, Mr Worthington, QC, handed his report to the Government and I now seek leave to table a copy of that report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I also seek leave to table a copy of the report prepared for Cabinet by the Attorney-General, which report was noted by Cabinet on 3 August 1992.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is clear, notwithstanding the disquiet expressed by the Opposition, the Democrats and the media about the alleged narrowness of the terms of reference and the non-coercive nature of the inquiry, that Mr Worthington has had no difficulty in addressing all relevant issues arising out of the introduction of gaming machines and the two developments in question.

The inquiry was conducted over four months. During that time it examined a total of 197 files from various Government departments, councils and business. Mr Worthington conducted 62 formal conferences and counsel assisting the inquiry had a preliminary interview with a further eight persons. There were 31 company searches made and documents from the Minister, the Opposition, the Democrats and other parties were also examined. Advertisements were placed in the *Advertiser*, the *Australian* and the *Islander* advising that the inquiry was seeking relevant information from any party in possession of that information. The result of Mr Worthington's wide-ranging and exhaustive inquiries is a comprehensive document setting out in great detail the Minister's association with the introduction of gaming machines in this State and the developments at Tandanya and Glenelg.

Notwithstanding the exhaustive nature of the inquiry, Mr Worthington has found no evidence that the Minister acted with any impropriety in relation to the areas covered. Mr Worthington found in relation to the Gaming Machines Bill:

> There is no evidence that the Minister took any action or made any decision in relation to the Gaming Machines Bill or related policy issues for an improper motive. In particular there is nothing which indicates that she did so for the purpose of furthering her own or Mr Stitt's personal interests. Having assessed the Minister's credibility on that matter in light of all the evidence, I accept that she did not do so.

In relation to the Tandanya development, Mr Worthington says:

> There is no evidence which suggests that the Minister took any action in relation to the Tandanya project for the purpose of advancing Mr Dawson's interests. The Minister was aware of Mr Dawson's involvement in the project but I am satisfied that there is no basis on which her motives or the motives of her departmental officers for the action taken in supporting the project can be impugned.

Further on he says:

> I have already found that the Minister did not take any action or make any decision in relation to the Tandanya development for improper motives and in particular, she did not do so for the purpose of furthering Mr Dawson's interests.

Finally, in relation to the Glenelg development Mr Worthington says:

> There is no other evidence either in the documents or from those who attended the inquiry which gives rise to any suggestion that the Minister or anyone else in the Government dealt with relevant matters other than on their perceived merits. As in the case of Tandanya I am satisfied that the Minister did not take any action for the purpose of advancing Mr Dawson's interests.

Further on he says:

> I have found that the Minister did not take any action or make any decision in relation to the Glenelg foreshore development for improper motives and, in particular, she did not do so for the purpose of furthering the interests of Mr Dawson.

Although there has been a factual finding of no impropriety by the Minister, it is still for Cabinet to consider whether there have been any conflicts of interest. The report and the principles set out in the Attorney-General's report were considered by Cabinet yesterday. In the light of Mr Worthington's report Cabinet made a determination in relation to each of the matters the subject of the inquiry. In relation to the introduction of gaming machines Cabinet noted the following matters:

- That Mr Stitt had no interest in the company Independent Gaming Corporation Limited.
- That he had not been hired to lobby any person or organisation in relation to the introduction of the machines.
- That neither Mr Stitt nor International Casino Services played any part in formulating the overall policy of the HHIA/LCA.
- That the Minister and Mr Stitt have ground rules about confidential information and that they respected the confidential nature of the Minister's work.
- That the Minister's involvement in relation to the Bill was of a peripheral nature.
- The Bill was the subject of a conscience vote for all members of Parliament.
- That the Minister had not behaved with any impropriety and had not taken any action to advance her or Mr Stitt's interests.
- That to the extent that the Minister and Mr Stitt contributed to Nadine and to other joint expenses they have pooled portion of their funds to support their joint investments and joint lifestyles. Not all their personal income was treated in this way.
- A portion of the income derived by Mr Stitt for the provision of services prior to the introduction of the Bill formed part of the moneys pooled by the Minister and Mr Stitt in the manner and for the purposes referred to by Mr Worthington in section 4 of his report. Mr Worthington found it was not possible to quantify the amounts so contributed by Mr Stitt, because there are no records of the contribution he has made from his personal cheque account to their joint everyday living expenses and because the income received from this source has been mixed with income from other sources before it has been applied to those expenses or paid to Nadine. Cabinet noted that the pooling of some or all two incomes is common practice for any couple (married or otherwise) living together and both in receipt of income.

Based on the above, Cabinet has determined that there was an indirect pecuniary interest and a personal interest which has given rise to a minor conflict of interest. That interest was not declared by the Minister at the time. The conflict was, however, acknowledged by the Minister on 24 March 1992 when she said:

> I indicated on Thursday that I believed Mr Stitt's involvement with the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association was well known among my Cabinet colleagues. I have since learned that this was not so in all cases and, accordingly, with the benefit of hindsight, I believe I should have formally disclosed his involvement to Cabinet.

Cabinet is aware that at least two Ministers, namely, the Minister with the principal responsibility for the introduction of the Gaming Machines Bill, namely, Mr F. Blevins, Minister of Finance, and the Premier were aware of Mr Stitt's involvement with the HHIA/LCA.

Given the minor nature of the conflict, Cabinet would not have required that the Minister refrain from participating in the discussions and decisions being made at that time. This assessment is consistent with Mr Worthington's finding that there was no impropriety on the part of the Minister in carrying out her duties.

In relation to the Tandanya Development Cabinet noted the following matters:

- That Mr Stitt's active involvement ceased in late 1989.
- That the Minister played no part in Tandanya prior to 1989 when Mr Stitt was involved.
- That Tourism SA had only a minimal involvement in the project when Mr Stitt was involved.
- That, when Cabinet was considering the Woods Bagot proposal for the Flinders Chase National Park in 1988, the Minister declared an interest because of Mr Stitt's involvement in what was an alternative proposal involving Paradise Development.
- That the moneys paid to Mr Stitt from Geographic Holdings and Paradise Development were not for services in connection with the sale by the joint venturers to System One. Insofar as those payments represented services to the Tandanya proposal, those services were rendered prior to the end of December 1989.
- That Mr Dawson did not attempt to use his friendship with the Minister to gain any improper advantage.
- The Minister and Tourism SA were active in supporting the Tandanya project.
- Ms Wiese was a good friend of Mr Dawson and she was aware at both Cabinet and departmental level that she was making decisions and taking actions which could affect Mr Dawson's financial interests.
- That the Minister had not behaved with any impropriety and in particular that she had not taken any action to advance Mr Dawson's interests.
- That the Minister did not understand from the guidelines on conflicts for Ministers that declarations were required in matters involving friends. Her interpretation of the guidelines was that they applied to family or business associates. The business relationship between Mr Dawson and her was not of a sufficient nature to give rise to a conflict and therefore he was not a business associate for the purposes of the guidelines.

Cabinet has determined that there was a personal interest which gave rise to a minor conflict of interest. That interest was not declared by the Minister at the time. Because the conflict was minor in nature, Cabinet would not have required that the Minister refrain from participating in Cabinet, nor from carrying out her duties as Minister. Again this assessment is consistent with Mr Worthington's findings.

Cabinet has determined that there was not conflict of interest in respect of the moneys paid to Mr Stitt by Geographic Holdings and Paradise Development. At the time the Minister made any decisions and took any actions in respect of the sale of Tandanya to System One she was unaware that money would be paid to Mr Stitt by these companies. In addition, the money was not for services in connection with the sale of the land but was payment for services provided by Mr Stitt prior to the end of December 1989, a time at which the Minister was not involved in the project.

In relation to the Glenelg foreshore development, Cabinet noted the following matters:

- That Mr Stitt had no interest in Glenelg Ferry Terminal.
- That his involvement in the Glenelg project ceased at the end of 1989.
- That the Minister had no involvement in the Glenelg proposal during 1989.
- That Mr Dawson didn't seek to use his friendship with the Minister for the purpose of promoting his own interests or those of companies with which he was associated.
- The Minister was active in supporting the project.
- Ms Wiese was a good friend of Mr Dawson and she was aware that she was making decisions that affected his financial interests.
- That the Minister didn't take any action or make any decision in relation to the development for improper motives and in particular she did not do so to further Mr Dawson's interests.
- The Minister did not understand from the guidelines that declarations were required to be made in relation to friends.

Cabinet has determined that there was a personal interest which gave rise to a minor conflict of interest which was not declared by the Minister at the time.

This conflict was minor in nature and Cabinet would not have required that the Minister refrain from participating in Cabinet, nor from carrying out her duties as Minister. Once again this assessment is consistent with Mr Worthington's findings.

Therefore, Mr President, Cabinet has determined that the Minister has had a minor conflict of interest in relation to the introduction of gaming machines and her friendship with Mr Dawson. Given the nature of these conflicts, the fact that had they been declared Cabinet would not have required the Minister not to act, the Minister's understanding of the guidelines, the ambiguity of those guidelines and the finding by Mr Worthington that the Minister has not behaved with improper motives, Cabinet has determined that no further action is required in relation to this particular matter.

The Minister stood aside from her tourism portfolio on 23 April and has suffered significantly through a detailed examination of her private affairs on the basis of allegations which have been found to be substantially without foundation, her integrity has been upheld and no impropriety has been found. In these circumstances Cabinet has determined that there is no impediment to her resuming her duties in tourism at the earliest opportunity.

However, the Government has determined that more specific guidelines should be prepared for Ministers, members of Parliament and public servants. It is clear that the current guidelines for Cabinet members, members of Parliament and public servants are inadequate. There is a need for considerable elaboration of the guidelines because of the wide variety of circumstances which have the potential to produce a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest and the increasing importance attaching to this issue in government and

other spheres compared with some years ago. To this end:

- A code of conduct will be prepared for incorporation in a Cabinet handbook.
- A code of conduct will be prepared for all members of Parliament and referred to Parliament for its consideration.
- The Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983 will be amended as announced in the Governor's speech to Parliament this year.

Finally, I wish to advise the Council that the total cost estimate for this inquiry is $505 000.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL COMPUTERS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Education a question about library computer systems in South Australian schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Earlier this year, and again two weeks ago in this chamber I raised the issue of library computer systems in South Australian schools. I queried the fact that the cost of software for the Dynix system had been grossly inflated due to the Education Department's policy of charging schools a fee of between $1 500 and $9 000 for the software, even though the department had fully repaid the original cost of the software. Subsequently, the department issued a statement indicating that it had discontinued charging schools for Dynix software as of 1 July 1992. However, it appears that this belated act of generosity was tempered by the continued charging of a fee for Book Mark software (which also rises $200 next month) and an unheralded announcement by the department in May, advising schools that as from 1 July they would have to pay a fee for any support that they obtained from the Orphanage Teachers Centre.

This means that if teachers or librarians at a school, already using Book Mark or Dynix computer systems, want any assistance relating to library computer problems, either by telephone inquiry, fax, modem or visits to the school by arrangement, they will be billed at $80 an hour, or part thereof, for a service previously they had obtained for free. The memo to schools, signed by the Director-General of Education, Dr Eric Willmot, indicates that the average school will need to budget an extra $800 in the first year. This advice to schools, that they had suddenly been presented with an extra expense for a service formerly obtained for free, came like a bolt from the blue. School staff have told me that there was little, if any, consultation with schools. Also, it is an impost that comes on top of expenditure of about $30 000 to $35 000 for the Dynix system, and training of staff in the use of that system works out at about $1 000 per operator. Many schools quite simply cannot afford the extra impost.

Some schools are dismayed that not only have they just outlayed up to $9 000 on a charge for Dynix software (which has now been removed) but also they will now be hit by this additional charge of $80 an hour for support. In their view the inequity of this arrangement is quite clear. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Why did the Education Department move to impose the $80 an hour support charge to schools without any consultation with schools? Does this signal a move to charge schools for other general computer support?

2. Why has the department decided to continue charging schools for the supply of Book Mark software and plan to increase the fee to $500 from next month, when it recently scrapped the Dynix fee?

3. Will the Minister outline what consideration has been provided to schools to meet the $80 an hour computer support fee from their forthcoming budgets, and how are they to fund this charge between now and when they receive their budgets?

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

GOVERNMENT TENDERS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of State Services a question about buying Australian.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The *Advertiser* this morning carries a disturbing story that Australian firms have been denied a contract to supply protective clothing for firefighters in favour of United Kingdom produced clothing. The report quotes the Minister as saying that after making a decision to buy Australian made clothing the State Supply Board changed its decision on the basis of an occupational health and safety issue. What she does not say is that the United Fire Fighters Union imposed bans and limitations on 30 July 1992 and that this was the real reason why the board hastily changed its mind on the next day, 31 July. The facts, briefly, are as follows: the Supply Board called for tenders for the supply of over-trousers for firefighters. Three Australian firms and two providers of overseas manufactured clothing submitted tenders. The Australian manufacturers met the requirements specified in the tender papers. The technical contact person named in the tender documents is a person in the Metropolitan Fire Service who is also on the executive of the union and had previously expressed an interest in the United Kingdom product. The reason given by the State Supply Board for not awarding the tender locally was that it did not meet whole garment testing requirements, but this was not a requirement of the tender which was for only the over-trousers.

There is no Australian standard at the moment. Although there is a draft being considered at the moment, this is not available publicly as I understand it. Local tenderers were not informed of any change in the specifications and given an equal opportunity to meet the additional requirement. The United Kingdom price was not the lowest tender. Nine paragraphs of the South Australian tender specifications were identical to nine paragraphs in a 1991 tender document for the provision of firefighting gear to Malaysia. The United Kingdom company assisted Malaysia in writing its tender

specifications and the implication is that it played a large part in writing the documents in South Australia for a tender which it subsequently won.

Local Australian firms are angry at the change in requirements for the tender after the tender was closed. The cost of tendering was high for one of the tenderers. I am told that the cost, which included testing, was about $12 000. They are of the view that they were not being treated fairly by the State Supply Board and cannot understand why the Government is not honouring its statement in the tender documents that an Australian manufacturer would be preferred. They are particularly concerned that as part of the textile, footwear and clothing industry, which is presently being hammered by tariff cuts, they are trying to go hi-tech and become competitive and, when they do, they still cannot win because of systematic bias against local firms.

The way the board handled this case bears some similarity to the case of razor wire which I raised last year. In that instance, a tender was called for razor wire (or tiger tape) for Mobilong Prison. An Australian company tendered for BHP produced wire in accordance with the tender documents. That tender was awarded to a supplier of United States made wire of different specifications from that required in the tender. The local company was not informed of the change in requirements and given an opportunity to provide a price in that instance. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Does the Minister regard it as fair for a specification to be changed for one tenderer without giving other tenderers an opportunity to meet that changed requirement?

2. Why did the Government buckle in the face of the union bans and limitations?

3. Why is the Government not serious about buying Australian where tenders are lower than overseas tenders and meet all the requirements of the tender documents?

4. Did the United Kingdom company, or anyone acting on its behalf, play any part in the preparation of the tender documents and specifications?

5. Can the Minister identify the price at which the tender was finally let?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I would like to emphasise that the State Supply Board and the Government most certainly endorse a policy of buying Australian whenever that is possible. In fact, we have a general preference agreement, which provides a financial preference for goods that are sourced in either Australia or New Zealand. Because of an arrangement between the Commonwealth Government and the New Zealand Government, New Zealand is part of the common economic zone and a financial preference applies to any goods that can be sourced in Australia or New Zealand.

With regard to the particular over-trousers to which the honourable member refers, State Supply has indicated to me that it is satisfied that the specifications for these over-trousers included the fact that there had to be proof that the clothing had been tested against fire as a whole garment. The board certainly understands that that was clear in the specifications. Regrettably, no Australian company could produce a certificate of proof in terms of a test against fire as a whole garment. The State Supply Board, in consultation with the Metropolitan Fire Service, felt that it could not accept a tender that did not have this safety proof. One can well understand that the Metropolitan Fire Service wishes to have this proof of fire safety for any garments that it provides to its workers, particularly given the most unfortunate incident that occurred about three years ago, when a fireman was badly hurt as a result of the clothing that had been supplied.

The Metropolitan Fire Service insists that for safety reasons this proof of fire testing as a whole garment is required for any protective clothing provided to its personnel. I imagine that everyone present would agree that fire safety must be paramount for garments supplied to members of the service. As I said earlier, the State Supply Board, certainly wishes to encourage Australian industry and to buy Australian whenever possible. In this particular instance, the over-trousers are required urgently and an order for 1 000 pairs of trousers was placed with a British firm, which was the only tenderer that could supply the garments with the adequate proof of fire safety. The cost of these garments is about $300 000. However, I should indicate that the total garment requirement for the Metropolitan Fire Service will total more than $2 million.

The State Supply Board is consulting with manufacturers and relevant bodies in Australia prior to the tenders being issued for the other garments—by far the majority—so that the Australian manufacturers will be able to meet the safety specifications that the service insists upon. It has delayed placing the other tenders so that the Australian manufacturers will be able to meet the specifications, and the Metropolitan Fire Service is prepared to wait some time for the other garments so that they can be sourced in Australia. In that way the manufacturers will have the time to be able to provide the necessary proof of fire safety for those garments.

That indicates quite clearly that the State Supply Board certainly wishes to buy Australian, gives preference to Australian manufactured goods and will work with manufacturers to enable them to meet the necessary specifications. I stress again, these specifications are necessary for fire safety reasons for our fire service personnel who are working with fire and who need proper protection in terms of protective clothing before they can do so with any degree of safety.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As a supplementary question, will the Minister give a commitment that in relation to future tenders there will not be a change of specification after the tenders have closed without all tenderers being given an opportunity to meet that changed specification? Will she also obtain the information upon which the State Supply Board relied in asserting that the testing requirement applied not only to the over-trousers but to the whole garment?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will certainly seek that report. I have not seen the detailed document myself, but I will certainly obtain it. I presume that if it is bulky the honourable member would be happy for me to table it rather than have me read it out. With regard to the honourable member's other question, it is not the practice of the State Supply Board to alter specifications unless it is absolutely necessary to do so because of changed requirements. It is certainly not the practice of the State Supply Board in any way to favour one firm over another, either a foreign company over an Australian

company, or one Australian firm over another. I do not imagine for a minute the State Supply Board will alter that practice.

STATE THEATRE COMPANY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage a question about the State Theatre Company.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: A senior officer employed by the State Theatre Company has reported to me that the company's operating deficit last financial year was $500 000 and the year before it was $361 000. I understand that the company proposes to cover its latest loss by redirecting funds now held in a reserve account, leaving the reserve account almost bare.

The company's financial status is a worry and so are the implications for artistic policy and programming. With few reserves plus an imminent Government funding cut of about $150 000, the company will be reluctant to meet its charter to program new, generally non-commercial Australian productions. It will also have difficulty fulfilling the Government's priorities of access and equity. The Artistic Director, Mr Phillips, has suggested that the company's problems stem from the stress of the recession on individuals, Government and corporations. That may be so, although I note that the recession has not had the same impact on the production of *Phantom of the Opera*, which has been playing to full houses in Melbourne for almost one year.

Meanwhile, it has been suggested to me that part of the State Theatre Company's problems stem from production costs, from overtime payments to actors that exceeded budget and from decisions to employ interstate rather than local actors for major roles, thereby forcing the company to pay a higher fee plus heavy living-away-from-home allowances.

There is speculation already that the State Theatre Company will have to curtail its forthcoming season, both with respect to the number of plays and the length of the season. This is a concern given that, due to funding constraints, the program for this year featured one production fewer than originally planned. On 31 October last year I asked the Minister questions about the financial circumstances of the State Theatre Company. Her response was, 'The company has planned a somewhat more careful program for 1992 . . . which demonstrates responsible management by the State Theatre Company board.' Therefore, I ask the Minister:

1. Does the Minister continue to have full confidence in the board of the State Theatre Company?

2. As I know that the Chairperson, Ms Rosemary Wighton, is canvassing the possibility of resigning her position, will the Minister confirm whether she has discussed this possibility with Ms Wighton or sought Ms Wighton's resignation?

3. Is the Minister satisfied with the progress being made by the State Theatre Company in implementing the recommendations of the recent review of that company?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is amazing how Opposition members like to knock something that is successful. We have an outstanding theatre company in this State which has provided the most wonderful productions and entertainment for the benefit of South Australia; yet all Opposition members can do is knock, whinge, complain and cry doom and gloom. The State Theatre Company is something of which we can all be proud, and I hope that all associated with the company realise that the Government and the vast majority of South Australians, if not the Opposition, have confidence in them, respect the work they do and appreciate the wonderful contribution they make to the cultural life of this State.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Of course I have confidence in the board of the State Theatre Company of South Australia. The company is not alone in having had declining box office and declining receipts in the past 12 months. Only yesterday I opened a conference of people from arts centres around Australia. All 79 of the people at that conference agreed that box office has fallen in these difficult times, so it is not the State Theatre Company alone that has had a fall in its box office receipts. I think it applies pretty well generally across all arts organisations from one end of the country to the other. There has certainly been a fall-off in box office and sponsorship for the company but, as I said, it is not alone in that.

In the past, the State Theatre Company has managed its affairs so well that it has had considerable reserves, which are held against difficult times. Any difficulties that it has this financial year will be covered by its reserves, and the company does not need to come crying to Government or anyone else. It is not crying doom and gloom. Indeed, thanks to its very prudent management in the past, it can cope with the difficult times that the recession has brought.

I stress again that I have confidence in the board. The honourable member asked me a question regarding the Chair of the board. I have had discussions with the Chair regarding the situation at the State Theatre Company. I hope that I will be able to have other discussions with her and other members of the board. We are monitoring the situation there and have offered to provide any assistance we can to help State Theatre through a difficult period. As I stress, it is a period that is difficult not only for the State Theatre Company but for all arts organisations. The Chair of the board has not indicated to me that she has any intention of resigning from the board, and there is no reason whatsoever for her to do so.

With regard to the honourable member's third question on the implementation of the review reports, I stress again that officers of the department and I are in contact with the State Theatre Company and are offering whatever assistance we can, if it wishes to receive that assistance, in its planning and in ways to cope in these difficult economic times. I repeat that I have every confidence in State Theatre, and I regret very much that statements such as those from the honourable member can only have a detrimental effect on the morale and confidence of all members of the company who are working very hard to provide the wonderful entertainment and cultural activity that they do for South Australia.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs, soon to be reappointed Minister of Tourism, a question on the subject of conflict of interest and ministerial propriety.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: In February, three weeks before he asked a question in the Council on 19 March, the Hon. Mr Elliott reported that he had had a private discussion with the Minister of Tourism about rumours of conflict of interest because of her relationship with her partner Mr Jim Stitt. In his question of 19 March the Hon. Mr Elliott stressed that he was confident that the Minister was guilty of no impropriety. Can the Minister advise the Council whether the Worthington report substantiates the Hon. Mr Elliott's confidence in her? Can she comment on the appropriateness of the Hon. Mr Elliott's continuing to question the propriety of her resuming the Tourism portfolio before he has even read the report?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I would like to throw some light upon the issues that have been raised by the honourable member, but before I answer his questions specifically I would like to make a few reports about the Worthington inquiry itself and some of its findings. You Mr President, will recall that this inquiry was established some four months ago and that the inquirer decided that, in the interests of proper scrutiny of the issues that had been raised in this and another place over a period of a couple of months, it would be desirable to call for submissions and information as widely as possible. To that end, advertisements were placed right around Australia, inviting anyone and everyone to come forward with any information that they might have about me and about anyone of the terms of reference into which Mr Worthington was inquiring.

Out of that extensive advertising, 62 people came forward and gave evidence. Amongst the people with whom Mr Worthington had discussion were members of Parliament, and amongst them were people such as the Hon. Mr Elliott, the Hon Mr Gilfillan, the Hon. Mr Davis, the Hon. Mr Griffin, the Hon. Mr Lucas and Mr Matthew in another place, who all, under the cloak of anonymity, were able to come forward to Mr Worthington and put to him any ideas, leads, rumours or anything else which they had picked up and which might be of some assistance to him in his inquiry.

On the basis of all that information—the advertisements and the publicity that surrounded the questioning in Parliament—anyone who has anything to say about any of these issues has now had ample opportunity to do so. After that four month extensive scrutiny of my personal life, my private affairs, my professional life, the personal life of my partner, his business interests and the personal and professional affairs of our friends and other people with whom Jim Stitt does business, we have a report that has indicated that in no way, shape or form, have I, during the course of my ministerial duties and in relation to the matters that were under investigation, behaved improperly.

I might say that that scrutiny of my actions and my performance goes back over a period of five years. Five years is the period of time that Mr Worthington was inquiring into my ministerial conduct and the performance of my duties. He has found that there has been no improper conduct with respect to those matters that have been under scrutiny.

I would like to ask whether other members of Parliament in this Chamber and in another place who ever had the misfortune to be the subject of such intensive scrutiny would come out with a clean bill of health in such areas, as I have. I think not, and I think that, if a number of people in this Parliament were subjected to such scrutiny, we would find that their business interests and personal behaviour would not be found to be as appropriate as mine have been found to be during the course of this inquiry. I might say that I am not one of those members of this Parliament who have hidden their financial interests and other matters behind family trusts, as have some of the people who were directing questions at me during the course of the past few months. All my affairs, my business arrangements and anything else that anyone wanted to inquire into have always been on the public record for the scrutiny of anyone, but some of the people who were asking me questions certainly have not behaved in the same sort of way.

A reading of the Worthington inquiry report will show that Mr Worthington has indicated that some of the information that was provided to him was nothing more than hearsay upon hearsay and, in some cases, nothing more than rumour. I suggest to the Council that the questions which were asked in this place and which led to this inquiry were in the same category. Most of them were rumour, innuendo and hearsay. Most of the documents that were tabled in this place were documents that were fraudulently obtained or stolen, and they were used in this place by members of Parliament.

I do not know whether members of Parliament were involved in the improper activity that led to such information finding its way into the Parliament; nevertheless, those documents, which were private documents, were used as the basis of questions by people in this Chamber and in another place. On top of that, there were the rumours which are abroad in Adelaide every day of the week about people in public and business life and which were peddled in this place uncorroborated. Uncorroborated rumours and hearsay which were peddled here and which were examined by Mr Worthington in most instances were found to be of no consequence and no relevance to the matters under investigation.

I believe it is grossly irresponsible that members of Parliament would pick up and run with such information provided to them by people who have a personal grudge, a personal vendetta or a personal vested interest in the outcome of some of the issues that have been under scrutiny, but that is what these members of Parliament who have been sitting in judgment on me in this place during the last few months did. They took that information from people with very suspect motives and brought it into the Parliament with no regard whatsoever to the damage that would be done to individuals in the process.

Turning to the questions that the honourable member has asked, I indicate, first, that I thought that it was

rather improper at the time (and I would like to say so now) that on 19 March the Hon. Mr Elliott would have reported to the Parliament on a private discussion that he had had with me concerning matters that later became the subject of inquiry in Parliament. It is quite improper, without first checking with the individual concerned, for any private discussion to be disclosed in Parliament, but we have seen this sort of thing happen before, and I guess, with the sort of people whom we are dealing with in this Chamber, it will not be the last time we see it happen.

However, the Hon. Mr Elliott talked then about the rumours that were going around about improper conduct or about the possibility of a conflict of interest with respect to these matters which later became the subject of an inquiry. I refer members to the parts of the Worthington inquiry report to which the Attorney-General referred earlier in his statement and which show quite clearly that, on all the three matters that were the subject of the inquiry, Mr Worthington found that there had been no improper action. Rather than reading those quotations again, I would invite members to read the Worthington report and the conclusions he reached with respect to those matters.

As to the performance of the Hon. Mr Elliott during the past couple of days, in seeking every opportunity to talk with the media about his views on what should or should not happen to me, following the release of the Worthington inquiry report, I can only say that I think his behaviour is quite abominable—that, even before he has had the opportunity of reading the report and learning what the facts in these matters might be, he should be running around and giving interviews to national newspapers, and anyone else who cares to listen, suggesting that regardless of the outcome of the Worthington inquiry I should not be allowed to resume my duties as Minister of Tourism. Well, that is preposterous. It is quite preposterous, and no reasonable-minded person would agree with such a stance.

Mr Elliott in his interviews with the media in the past 24 hours has talked at some length about the possibility of conflict of interest with respect to my duties and the work that is done by my partner, and he indicates that it is not proper that I should hold a portfolio if my spouse works in the area. Can I point out to the honourable member and to other members in this Council that the first thing they will learn, on reading the Worthington inquiry report, is that when my partner was involved in two tourism developments, which were actually two components of one development, I had no role to play at all. There was no role played by me with respect to those developments at that time and, subsequently, when I did play a role with respect to those developments Jim Stitt had no role at all. He ceased to have any involvement in the Tandanya and Glenelg foreshore proposals at the end of 1989. So, I think that honourable members should not go out shooting off their mouths about what ought and ought not to happen before they learn the facts about what has happened with respect to those developments and who has been involved with the various aspects of decision-making relating to them.

I believe that the actions of members of Parliament and the scurrilous attacks that have been made on me during the past few months, which, in effect, are nothing more than an extension of the personal attacks that have been made upon me by some members of the Parliament over a period of many years, will inevitably have done my standing and reputation some damage within the community, even though the Worthington inquiry finds that I have not behaved in an improper way. But if you throw enough mud some of it sticks, and inevitably some of that mud will stick on me. I think it is quite appalling that that set of circumstances should have been created by people who have used information improperly in this place. But, Sir, I take some comfort from the fact that at the end of the day it will be those who have mouthed these scurrilous attacks upon me for whom the lasting damage will be done.

WORTHINGTON INQUIRY

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs—and soon to be the reappointed Minister of Tourism—a question about political lobbying.

Leave granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Well, you are not quick enough on your feet, are you?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Pickles was the only one on her feet.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: On 24 March the Hon. Mr Davis questioned the Minister of Tourism about when she first became aware that Mr Jim Stitt was acting as a political lobbyist for interests wanting to see poker machines introduced in South Australia. Can the Minister now advise Mr Worthington's findings on that matter? Is the Minister in a position to advise the Council as to whether there may have been other vested interests involved in the political lobbying process?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This has been one of the allegations made about my partner that has been around for quite some time, and one of the most frustrating aspects of the past few months for me has been that, even though I was able to produce evidence when the questions were first asked of the fact that Jim Stitt was not employed by the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association as a lobbyist, it has been virtually impossible for me to get that message through to the public, because, for one reason or another, members of Parliament have continued to peddle the information regardless of the facts and some sections of the media have chosen to continue to repeat the allegation without repeating my denial of it and the information that was provided which would suggest it was not so. So, I now invite honourable members and members of the media to study the Worthington report on this matter. If they do so they will find that Mr Worthington indicates quite clearly that Mr Stitt was not employed to engage in lobbying activities.

He says, amongst other things, that both Mr Basheer and Mr Horne of the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association made it clear to Mr Stitt that he would not be involved in any lobbying activities, whether with public servants or with politicans, since any lobbying was to be done by the office bearers of the HHIA/LCA and Mr

Horne. He says that neither Mr Stitt nor International Casino Services played any part in formulating the overall policy of the HHIA/LCA in relation to gaming machines, since this had already been formulated by those bodies. He says that, apart from two isolated incidents, the evidence is overwhelming that Mr Stitt had no contact with politicians or public servants in relation to gaming machines.

He goes on to name the key figures who were involved in the preparation of the gaming machines legislation, and what he says here is that Mr Blevins, who was the Minister responsible for the drafting of the Bill, said that Mr Stitt never attempted to engage him in conversation about poker machines. Mr Hill, from Treasury, said he had never met Mr Stitt and had had no contact with him, and he was one of the officers who had a key role to play in the drafting of the legislation. He said, in addition, that he does not even recall Mr Stitt's name being mentioned to him during the time of his involvement. Mr Pryor, who is the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, and who also played a role in the preparation of the legislation, indicated that he had met Mr Stitt on only two occasions at social functions and he had never had any conversation with Mr Stitt about gaming issues or the legislation. Mr Fioravanti, from the Lotteries Commission, said he had neither met with nor spoken to Mr Stitt. Mr McDonald, who was then the Chief Executive Officer of the Casino, who had some input into Government thinking on the drafting of the legislation, indicated that he had had no discussion about gaming machines and was not aware that Mr Stitt had anything to do with any matter involving gaming machines—and the story goes on.

There are numerous people whom one would expect to have had some knowledge of lobbying activity if there had been any, and there was none suggested. In fact, Mr Worthington pointed out that, although there had been extensive publicity about the terms of the inquiry, he had received no representations from any member of Parliament who had indicated that they had been approached by Mr Stitt in relation to the Gaming Machines Bill or the policy matters leading up to it.

Sir, I hope that at last—now that the Worthington inquiry has had the opportunity of speaking with anyone and everyone who had any role to play in this matter—the message might get through to the public that there was no lobbying activity that Mr Stitt was engaged to undertake, and that Mr Worthington has found that that was not so.

MOUNT BARKER FAMILY HOUSE

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Family and Community Services a question about Mount Barker Family House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Funding for Mount Barker Family House has been cut significantly by the Department for Family and Community Services. For the past seven years Mount Barker House has provided a unique service for members of the hills community including day care and vacation child-care, a support group for women with drug and alcohol related problems, financial counselling and career advice. Other important organisations depend upon the house to facilitate meetings at its premises. Examples include Alcoholic Anonymous, Town and Country Community Access (which is an organisation enabling people with disabilities to become involved in the community), and the Adelaide Hills Domestic Violence Action Group.

In addition, the family house is closely connected with other community organisations such as the Hills Childhood Development Program, the Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service, the Mount Barker Women's Health and Wellbeing Group and the Crime Prevention Board. In letters to the Executive Officer of FACS, all of these organisations and more have stressed the vital role the family house plays in the Mount Barker community. These organisations commend the family house for its supportive and open environment.

In July this year the family house was informed by FACS that as it is situated in an area of 'relatively low disadvantage' it must apply for the equivalent of half-time funding for 1993, and a maximum of $8 000 in 1994. Such a cut in funding seriously jeopardises the continuation of the services which are unavailable elsewhere in the community. People in the Mount Barker community are disadvanted by distance from Adelaide and an inadequate public transport system. This leaves members of the community who do not own or have access to vehicles isolated from necessary services.

Mount Barker has also been identified as a high growth area in the State, and the district falls within the highest bracket for percentage of families which have a sole parent (14-30 per cent). This indicates the absolute necessity for high quality child-care facilities. My questions to the Minister area:

1. On what basis was the funding assessment for the family house made?

2. Was the fact that services provided by the family house are unavailable elsewhere in the area taken into consideration, especially given that Mount Barker has been identified as a high growth area?

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Local Government Relations a question about local government grants.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I thank the Minister for Local Government Relations for sending me a copy of the recommendations of the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission for the distribution of the Commonwealth general purpose grants to councils for 1992-93. In the Minister's letter she says:

The total allocation for South Australia is $80 739 236. This has two components: general financial assistance of $62 486 995, an increase of 2.14 per cent over the 1991-92 figure; and identified local road funding of $18 252 241, an increase of 2.91 per cent over the 1991-92 figure.

On checking these figures with the figures of last year that were in the *Government Gazette*, and in fact the Minister's letter of last year, my calculations, based on the 1991-92 allocation of $61 938 434, show an increase in general financial assistance grants of .89 per cent and not 2.14 per cent as the Minister said in her letter. I also found that my calculation for local road funding, based on the figure $17 956 046, showed an increase of 1.65 per cent and not the 2.91 per cent that the Minister indicated in her letter.

The total allocation to councils, including financial assistance grants and road grants, from 1991-92 to 1992-93 was an increase of 1.05 per cent—putting road funds and general assistance grants together—which is another year of a real dollar decrease to local government. Will the Minister explain what formula was used to arrive at the percentage increases that were shown in the letter for the general financial assistance and local road funding grants? If there is a discrepancy in the percentage, will the Minister notify councils of this? I also notice that several newspapers have repeated the Minister's percentage increases.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will certainly be happy to obtain a report and get back to the honourable member. I am sure that he will appreciate, I could not possibly hope to deal with these large and numerous figures, which he has bandied around, without a bit of detailed study. However, I point out that the figures at the end of the financial year are not necessarily exactly the same as those at the beginning of the financial year because adjustments are made during the year for inflation. It may well be that at the beginning of the year a certain inflationary figure was presumed and, as we know, thankfully, inflation has been falling, so the expected inflation not occurring may have altered the actual figures from what had been estimated at the beginning of the financial year. Whether or not that is responsible for the figures that the the Hon. Mr Irwin has quoted I do not know, but I will certainly obtain a report from the Grants Commission and bring the information back to him.

URRBRAE HOUSING COOPERATIVE

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Housing and Construction a question about the Urrbrae Housing Cooperative.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Urrbrae Housing Cooperative (formerly the Urrbrae Housing Association) which has now become a cooperative under the present legislation has, for some time, been providing accommodation to its tenants who are also its members. About 12 months ago many of the members of the previous board were removed in one way or another and there was a new board. This caused great dissatisfaction amongst many of the tenant members who complained to the Housing Trust on various occasions and have at no time received any kind of satisfaction.

A letter from a Mr Brian Devey of BDO Consulting (although I think he might have been writing in his personal capacity on many of these occasions) directed to Ms Carmel O'Connell, Housing Trust representative, South Australian Housing Trust and dated 2 March 1992, brings matters to a head as follows:

> On Wednesday 26 February 1992. I attended a special general meeting of members of the Urrbrae Housing Association at the Mitcham Uniting Church hall, as a non-tenant member of the association.
>
> The meeting was convened at 7.30 p.m. and, other than board members, all tenants attended or conveyed apologies. Copies of the minutes of the meeting are enclosed for your information together with various supporting documents referred to in the minutes.
>
> As Acting Chairperson of the special meeting, I investigated its constitutional standing and formed the view it was a properly constituted meeting. It is on that basis that I am directed to write to you now.
>
> Various matters now require attention following the special meeting, in particular, a unanimously supported motion of no confidence in the present board and a call for its immediate removal (voluntary or enforced) from office.
>
> Further, it is extremely concerning that an independent auditor's report containing various allegations of impropriety by individuals was circulated by the board with no accompanying explanatory notes. This clearly amounts to defamation.
>
> Finally, several board members appear to be operating outside accepted guidelines and are intimidating and threatening tenants with respect to rent payments.
>
> The matters referred to herein are, I believe, extremely serious and warrant immediate attention to secure the future interests of the Urrbrae Housing Association.
>
> I look forward to an early response. In the event that clarification is required, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I might add that, notwithstanding a unanimous motion of no confidence, the board is still there; it did not remove itself. On 16 March Mr Devey wrote to two of the tenants and indicated that he had attended a meeting with senior Housing Trust officials on Tuesday 10 March and that they were aware of the recent difficulties and would be putting to the board some mechanisms for remedy. In another letter to tenants dated 18 June 1992 Mr Devey stated:

> Further to my previous letters to you, I am pleased to advise that, although not a great deal may have been seen to have occurred, a significant amount of progress has in fact been made. At a board meeting held yesterday evening I was appointed as a director of the Urrbrae Housing Association and will, in the short term, be assuming the role of Treasurer.

I will not read the rest of that letter. In a letter which Mr Devey wrote dated 25 June, a week later, to some of the tenants, he stated:

> Further to my letter dated 18 June 1992, I wish to advise that I have resigned from the board and also as Treasurer of the Urrbrae Housing Association Inc.

So, a week after that hopeful sort of letter he resigned. I believe that an annual general meeting is due to be held in two days. However, in the meantime, the tenants who have been complaining and who unanimously voted to remove the board—which did not happen—have been distressed by the actions of board members and by the fact that their rental has been increased by the board, they believe unjustifiably. Will the Minister hold, or call for, an investigation into the affairs of the Urrbrae Housing Cooperative?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: First, I thank the honourable member for reinstating me to my position. I undertake to refer his questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

WORKPLACE REGISTRATION

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Has the Attorney-General an answer to a question I asked on 6 August? I have no objection to that answer being incorporated in *Hansard*.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Minister of Labour has provided the following response:

1. WorkCover currently has 21 274 monthly employers who are expected to pay the registration fee in July. Although not specified in this question, approximately 35 000 annual employers pay the fee at the completion of each financial year.

2. WorkCover collected $284 450.06 on behalf of the Government during the month of July.

3. Due to the constant changes in actual registration numbers during any financial year, WorkCover advises that 56 245 employers were registered as at 30 June 1992.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BUREAU

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I believe the Minister for Local Government Relations has an answer to the question I asked on 13 August regarding the former Local Government Bureau.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to have the answer inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

When the Local Government Services Bureau was established on 1 January 1991 there were some 85 staff at the Bureau.

When the Bureau closed on 30 June 1992 there were 40 staff who were required for the ongoing function to support public libraries throughout the State—now known as PLAIN (Public Libraries Automated Information Network) Central Services. This Branch is now a component of the Libraries Division of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage.

I have been advised that there are currently only three of the former Bureau staff who are awaiting re-deployment in the public sector. I can also assure the honourable member that those three staff are gainfully employed whilst they await suitable temporary or permanent re-assignment in the public sector.

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I move:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the Hon. G. Weatherill on account of illness.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (ROAD BLOCKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 33.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Opposition supports this Bill. It recognises that the extension of the provisions of the Summary Offences Act, which presently allow road blocks for the purpose of apprehending a person who might be illegally using a motor vehicle, is an additional aid to police in the apprehension of offenders. One recognises that potentially this power can be controversial. However, the Opposition believes that there are reasonable safeguards to ensure that the use of the power should not become controversial.

Section 74b of the Summary Offences Act allows a senior police officer, that is, a police officer of or above the rank of inspector, to authorise a road block at a particular place if the senior police officer believes on reasonable grounds that the establishment of a road block at a particular place would significantly improve the prospects of apprehending a person suspected of having committed a major offence or who has escaped from lawful custody.

That section is to be expanded to include the power to establish a road block where a person is suspected on reasonable grounds to have committed an offence against section 86a (1), of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which relates to illegal use of a motor vehicle.

At the present time the definition of a major offence is one that would attract a maximum penalty of life imprisonment or imprisonment for at least seven years. The safeguards that were put into the legislation when we considered section 74b—and that was only last year or, perhaps, the year before, but certainly within the past year or two—provide that the authorisation continues for only 12 hours but can be extended by a magistrate for a further period not exceeding 12 hours. A written record must be kept of the authorisation, and that report should include the place at which the road block was established, the periods for which the authorisation was granted or renewed and the grounds upon which the authorisation was granted or renewed.

A report is also required to be made every three months by the Police Commissioner to the Minister relating to the number of authorisations granted and the details of which a record must be kept—that is, the details to which I have just referred. The Minister must cause copies of that report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within seven sitting days after receipt of the report if Parliament is in session and, if Parliament is not in session, within seven sitting days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

The powers of police at a roadblock are quite broad and, quite understandably, have some sensitivity about them, but the Council for Civil Liberties, as I recollect, went along with the earlier provision for roadblocks and I have not had a response from it in relation to this Bill. There are some misgivings about roadblocks for the purpose of stopping car chases. Car chases are controversial in themselves, particularly when innocent bystanders are injured or killed. They are also controversial in relation to the death or injury of those who might be in the car that is being chased. I suppose that the police are in a position where they cannot really win. On the one hand, if they chase and death or injury is caused, they are criticised for not breaking off the chase earlier. On the other hand, if they do not give chase, they are accused of not enforcing the law in relation to motor vehicles or vehicles that are used illegally, in relation to which there is a fairly high profile in the community. It is a no-win situation.

When the Attorney-General announced the intention to introduce this legislation, I noted some public comment in the media which expressed reservation about the proposal. I did not express reservation about it, and the Liberal Party accepts that it is an important extension of

the powers of police directed to a specific purpose. However, I would like the Attorney-General to give some response, if possible, to the guidelines that may be applied by the police to the establishment of roadblocks in the instance of an illegal use of motor vehicle offence being detected, whether it is intended that motor vehicles or some other device will be used to establish the roadblock, and in what sort of circumstances the police would be likely to establish the roadblock.

I suppose it is very difficult to give a specific answer because each case must be determined on its merits. However, there may be some guidelines and, if there are, I would certainly welcome receiving them or an indication of what they are. I recognise that there might be some aspects of that which are operationally sensitive if released publicly and I will respect a decision in that light. However, I think that if we, as members of Parliament, are informed of the guidelines that will apply in these cases, it will be helpful because there is the question of what happens to innocent bystanders who might be more likely to be injured or suffer death as a result of a roadblock than in other circumstances of a police chase. I presume that, in those circumstances, if someone is injured or death is caused and that person is an innocent bystander, although it is not much consolation to that person or to the family of that person, if negligence can be established, damages may be paid. I regard that as a secondary consideration to the primary concern, and that is as to what steps will be taken to endeavour as much as possible to protect innocent bystanders from injury or death or other damage to property.

The Police Association, to which I referred the Bill, indicated that it was in support of it. It said also that an occupational health and safety issue is involved, particularly its being safer to set up a roadblock than to continue a high speed chase. The Royal Automobile Association was the other body that responded to a request for a comment, and it also has no difficulty with the Bill. We indicate support for the second reading and hope that, at the appropriate time, we will receive some information in response to the matters to which I referred in my speech.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I indicate Democrat support for the Bill. For some time I have believed that the high speed chase procedure is fraught with dangers that are out of proportion to the potential achievement of such measures and this seems to be a practical way of substantially reducing those high speed chases. I also believe that experience may—I hope will—improve the efficiency and safety of establishing roadblocks under the circumstances that occur from time to time. I will leave that to the evolving process of developing the guidelines and introducing the technology that will automatically be put in place.

I have only one question that I ask the Attorney-General to address if he has not thought to do so already. If vehicles which are stopped in a roadblock and searched are found to have evidence of some minor offence, I am unclear whether the police can act on that evidence to lay charges, although they do not relate in any way to the purpose of the roadblock. I would like some further explanation of that because this Bill will provide for a vehicle to be stopped at a roadblock for a motor vehicle offence. If drugs or allegedly stolen property are found inadvertently in the vehicle, will charges be laid? I would like that matter to be clarified for my interest and that of others. The Democrats support the basic purpose of the Bill and we hope fervently that it will dramatically reduce the risk to police officers, to bystanders, to the often innocent other road users and to the offenders themselves. We wish the results of this Bill well in achieving those purposes and we support the second reading.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUMMARY PROCEDURE (SUMMARY PROTECTION ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 34.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Liberal Opposition gives cautious support to this proposition, cautious only because it is a novel approach to allow a magistrate to make over the telephone an order which has the effect of affecting the liberty of the citizen and, more particularly, for a citizen to be detained by police without warrant for a period where the police are awaiting a telephone order from a magistrate. One has to be very careful about acting in those circumstances but, if adequate safeguards are in place, we can go along with the proposition for the procedure set out in the Bill.

I will outline some of the proposals for safeguards which I think ought to be considered and which, after a response from the Attorney-General, may well be the subject of amendment from this side of the Chamber. What the Bill seeks to do is to amend section 99 of the Summary Procedure Bill, which was formerly the Justices Act. That section establishes a procedure by which orders to keep the peace may be obtained from a court, where a person has caused personal injury or damage to property and the defendant is likely again to cause personal injury or damage to property or there is the threat of such injury or damage or the defendant or potential defendant has behaved in a provocative or offensive manner which is likely to lead to a breach of the peace, and the defendant is likely again to behave in the same or similar manner.

Section 99 was revamped when I was Attorney-General and it was revamped only last year, I think, when the Attorney-General brought several changes before the Chamber and we supported those. This is a further revision of the procedure in section 99. Section 99 deals not only with domestic disputes but also with wider disputes relating to keeping the peace. It has to be remembered that the proposition in the Bill before us is not limited to domestic violence, although that is the primary reason for the Government's proposing the changes. However, it also extends to other areas of breaches or potential breaches of the peace.

The procedure under the present section 99 is that a complaint is made; it may be made either by a police officer or by a person who is under threat or the subject of the violence. An order can be made by the court in the

absence of the defendant if the defendant was summoned but failed to appear or even in the case where the defendant is not summoned to appear. In that latter case the defendant is required to be summoned to appear before the court to show cause why the order should not be confirmed. The order is not effective after the conclusion of the hearing to which the defendant is summoned, unless the defendant does not appear at that hearing in obedience to the summons and the court confirms the order. The court can make an order restraining the defendant from entering premises, or limiting access to premises.

A person who is served personally with an order but who subsequently contravenes or fails to comply with an order is guilty of an offence which must be prosecuted and, if convicted, that defendant is liable to be imprisoned for a term not exceeding six months. Where a police officer has reasonable cause to suspect that a person has committed an offence, the person may be arrested and detained without warrant and must be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction no longer than 24 hours after the time of the arrest. The Bill seeks to interpose a step so that, if police attend a domestic disturbance at night, for example (and remember, it is not just limited to domestic disputes), they will be able to apply to a court which is, according to the Attorney-General, likely to consist of a magistrate rostered on duty for emergency applications, and the application will be for a restraint order. The application may be made by telephone but also by any other telecommunications device and that will enable applications to be made by emergency radio. Under the proposal, the magistrate will satisfy himself or herself as to the officer's identity and then satisfy himself or herself that it is an appropriate case for the granting of an order.

If the magistrate decides that an order should be made, the magistrate will dictate the terms of the order over the telephone to the police officer who, as I understand the procedure, is to transcribe the order on to a form in accordance with the magistrate's directions, and when completed the form is to have the status of a court summons and order, which can be served on the respondent. If the respondent refuses to remain at the premises voluntarily, the Bill provides that the respondent may be detained until the telephone application for a restraint order has been finalised. If the order is made, the respondent will be served with the order immediately, thus overcoming the problem in the past that an order is not enforceable until it has been served on the respondent. The Government proposes that the restraint order made in this way will be subject to confirmation by a court hearing.

The power to make an order on the telephone is permitted by some legislation that we have passed, but it mainly relates to telephone interception and the making of an order for the issue of a warrant by telephone. I do not know of any instance where a formal court hearing is held or may be held over the telephone in circumstances where an order similar to the orders proposed under this legislation can be made. As I indicated, I have some misgivings about the procedure and the potential for orders to be made improperly, but I think that, if some safeguards can be imposed, that will be of assistance. I would suggest that an audio recording of the conversation with the magistrate ought to be made and returned for subsequent production in formal court proceedings. That is akin to a transcript.

I recognise that keeping a transcript in those circumstances is not possible, but I would suggest that if a magistrate is on call the magistrate ought to be equipped with a telephone recording apparatus which can record the conversation and be available for future production in formal court proceedings, to enable the telephone proceedings to be subject to scrutiny, remembering that telephone proceedings are not to be open to public scrutiny. It is not a formal court proceeding and those proceedings ought to be the subject of review.

Because of the pending attendance upon Her Excellency the Governor, I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The PRESIDENT: I remind honourable members that Her Excellency the Governor will receive the President and members of the Legislative Council at 4.15 p.m. today for the presentation of the Address in Reply. I therefore ask all honourable members to accompany me to Government House.

[*Sitting suspended from 4 to 4.50 p.m.*]

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that, accompanied by the mover, seconder and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to Her Excellency the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech adopted by the Council on Thursday 20 August, to which Her Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

Thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the fourth session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

SUMMARY PROCEDURE (SUMMARY PROTECTION ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page ???).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Prior to the adjournment I was suggesting that some record be kept of the conversation between a magistrate and others, such as police officers and other officers, prior to making the restraining order, so that there is a record that can be produced in the formal court proceedings that might follow, remembering that a telephone conversation is limited. It is not a public forum and it is not subject to public scrutiny, and I think it ought to be. I would not expect the magistrate on duty to be provided with

telephone recording devices that would enable the conversation to be recorded. The second point that I want to make, which I think needs to be made at this stage, is that where an order is being sought by telephone or telephone communication device there is a provision in the Bill that the defendant be detained for the purposes of enabling the order to be made, and then service of the order is to be made on that person. That has the advantage that, if the order is subsequently breached, the penal provisions of the section come into operation. It seems to me to be wrong that there be power to indefinitely detain the person. I think there ought to be some time limit on it, otherwise it has the potential for abuse, whether deliberate or inadvertent, and I think that is quite inappropriate. I suggest that a one hour time limit would be an appropriate period within which the order can be made by the magistrate. If it takes longer than that, and the person who is to be the subject of the order leaves, it would seem to me that that immediately removes the problem of potential continuing disturbances.

The Attorney-General said in his speech that the procedures would still allow for a confirmatory hearing. I had difficulty discerning that from the drafting, because, once the order is made and it has been served, I suggest that under the present structure of the section there is no need for a confirmatory order to be made. The confirmatory order is only in those circumstances where an order is made but it is not served on the defendant and the defendant, even if subsequently, has not had an opportunity to make representations to the court in relation to the making of an order and, if the order is to be made, the nature of that order. I therefore think there needs to be a specific provision in the section which requires a confirmatory hearing, and I would suggest that a reasonably short period of time—something like seven days or even shorter—within which the confirmatory hearing must be held would be appropriate.

I say a specific period, because I think that, if it is left to be an unlimited period, the tendency might be for the court not to treat it as a matter of some urgency, and where a telephone order has been made and it has not been in open court the parties have not had an opportunity to make proper representations, even to get legal advice. If a restraining order is made which does affect the liberty of the citizen, and may even prevent the defendant from going back onto the premises in which he or she may have an interest, it is imperative that the order be reviewed promptly and that the court be given the message that this is an issue of significant priority. I think that even seven days is too long, but it may be that anything shorter is impracticable. But I would certainly welcome a response from the Attorney-General on that matter. I do not think we can afford to allow the period within which the matter must come back to court to be without some limit on it.

I also think we have to recognise that, where a person has committed an offence, the person may be arrested and detained without warrant, but must be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction within 24 hours after arrest. I am not putting it into the same category as that, but I think that reflects an urgency and a priority which ought to be given and which ought to be applicable similarly to the confirmatory hearing, and there ought to be a specific requirement for a confirmatory hearing to be made.

The concept of emergency radio being used is of some concern, unless magistrates on roster are also supplied with radios which link into the police radio system. The concern I have is this: unless the magistrate is equipped with a radio or some device which gives access to the immediate discussion as to the order which should be made it seems to me that it will then be a second-hand communication of the facts and a second-hand application for the order. It may be that the telecommunications industry is so sophisticated that a police officer on emergency radio can link into a telephone and that all of the conversation will be handled directly by the police officer and magistrate, but I would like some clarification from the Attorney-General as to how that is to be handled. I also have some concern about the definition of 'telecommunications' being inserted so that it will include facsimile communication.

I have no difficulty with the application being made by facsimile and the order being transmitted by facsimile, but if it were to allow the information upon which the police officer relies for the order to be communicated by facsimile so that there is not a personal exchange verbally between the magistrate, the police and the defendant, then I think that devalues the process. Obviously, a facsimile cannot communicate anything other than the written word, and I do not believe that in the circumstances in which the orders are to be made that is adequate. We must get as close to a real life court application as it is possible to achieve over the telephone.

I referred the Bill to a number of women's shelters for some advice, particularly because they will have the most experience with the application of the proposals therein. They do not have any difficulty with the proposition, but they do say that they had some discussion with the Attorney-General in May this year. They wanted to make it possible for the community to see that the laws actually protect victims of crime by introducing tiered penalties that become more severe with second and subsequent breaches of restraining orders, and they wanted to see an increase in the term of imprisonment and fines for breaches of restraining orders.

As I understand it, the Attorney-General indicated that he intended to examine penalties and raise the issue during the September session of Parliament, but they have not had an indication that he has examined the issue of penalties which they discussed with him, and I think it appropriate that, in the context of this Bill, some information be given as to the consideration which he has given to that issue.

The women's shelters make the point that they see some 4 000 women and children per year and, because of that, the issue of penalties is paramount if safety is to be addressed. That is particularly the case in matters of access and custody, where men continue to harass women. They argue that unless penalties are tiered and enforced the legislation through omission continues to condone domestic violence, and the restraining order remains the poor cousin of a criminal assault charge. They argue that breaches of a restraining order should incur penalties that are comparable to assault penalties.

I am not sure that I altogether agree with that because they are two different offences, but one can see some

merit in their argument for tiered penalties. They say that, unless there are some amendments to toughen up the penalties the amendments will remain ineffectual and the problem area will remain unaddressed. They also say that the amendments really increase or clarify police powers but do not provide victims with increased protection or address the penalties presently passed by magistrates or judges. They make the point that penalties for inflicting harm upon animals are more harsh than those for breaches of restraining orders.

They also make the point to me that women's shelters work with other agencies for a non-violent society. They do this through community education, raising public awareness and supporting a change in attitudes that perpetuate and condone violence towards women and children, and say that until the message of non-violence has spread through society and been internalised by all it is imperative that the law is swift and just in supporting women and children with legislation that invokes realistic responses to violence. That is the response I received from the women's shelters.

What I would like to raise for consideration is the possibility of making the maximum penalty still six months for a first offence for a breach of a restraining order and considering something like nine months for a second or subsequent offence, again as a maximum penalty and as an indication to the courts that second and subsequent breaches are to be regarded seriously.

The Bill refers to two other areas. It provides that a court must make an order in relation to the forfeiture or surrender of a firearm after considering whether it is appropriate to make one or more of a number of orders which are specified in the Bill, and that is based upon an expressed intention in the Bill that the court should, when exercising its powers under the section, take any action which is reasonably available to it to avert or minimise any risk of a firearm being used as an instrument of violence.

I propose supporting that proposition, but the way in which the provision is drafted leaves, I think, some matters open for debate. I think the element of discretion in the courts should be reinforced. It may be that the Attorney-General can also indicate the reason why this clause was drafted in the form in which it appears in the Bill, because it is a form of drafting which I think is relatively new.

The only other matter is that it allows the interstate registration of restraining orders, and I do not see any difficulty with that. I have sent the Bill to members of the legal profession and, although they have not yet provided any responses, it may be that by the time we get to the Committee stage I will have them. They may raise other issues which I can take up at that point. Subject to those matters, I indicate support for the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (EMPLOYMENT OF JUNIORS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 August. Page 53.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Liberal Opposition indicates that it is prepared to support this Bill. We recognise that there has been a lot of concern in the community, particularly among employers, that the passing of the age discrimination section of the Equal Opportunity Act has created problems in the employment of young people, particularly where awards allow so-called youth wages, that is, wages less than the full adult wage, to be paid. I suppose that in discussions with employers, both large business and small business, this is one of the major issues which is focused upon more than any other in the area of employment opportunities, apart, of course, from taxes and all the other Government charges which impinge upon employment generally.

The age discrimination legislation was enacted with a view to eliminating discrimination on the basis of age, whether in respect of an older or a younger person. At the older end of the range there is certainly a concern within the community, particularly in times of high unemployment, that someone who might be 40 or 50 years of age and retrenched is less likely to get a job than someone in his or her 20s or 30s, even though the older person had wide experience and was equally qualified to perform the responsibilities of the job for which applications were sought.

At the other end of the scale, there was a concern that young people were being laid off as soon as they reached the age of 18 years because at that point they would have to be put on adult wages. Therefore, there was discrimination against younger people on the basis of age. However, in a time of very serious unemployment and very difficult economic conditions, employers have complained that this provision of the age discrimination legislation causes them more cost and difficulty than it is worth to employ a younger person, particularly where the law presently allows employment of young persons at less than the full adult wage. The argument is that if the law allows that through industrial awards then employers ought to be able to advertise for and engage applicants on the basis of age in accordance with the provisions of the award.

One small business person wrote to me to say that he is absolutely fed up with the way the law constrains him in employing anyone. He works in a business that was established by his father in 1920. He now has his two sons working with him and he has employed 45 to 50 people. Today he employs only seven or eight people. He says that having been proudly South Australian all that time lately one cannot help saying, 'What the hell, I will wind it up.' He refers particularly to health, safety and welfare legislation, and superannuation guarantee legislation, along with payroll tax and the age discrimination legislation—all of which add burdens. He says that he would employ a 16-year old or 17-year old to learn a particular skill on computers, but he cannot advertise for someone of a younger age to undertake that training. He also says that he would want to spend about $15 000 or $20 000 on training, but with the various restrictions that are in place he will just forget it until a good young person walks in the door.

Members of Parliament hear that criticism on a regular basis. Given the current climate and the fact that

industrial awards or agreements allow the payment of junior award rates of pay, the Opposition is prepared to support the Bill. I understand that the Government is proposing an amendment to redraft the provision in some respects. In correspondence to me, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry says that it supports the general policy intention of the Bill. It has some doubts as to whether the proposed amendments really achieve the purpose for which they were designed. It has taken legal advice and says that, in order to make it absolutely clear, it would be necessary to add a further subparagraph to become subparagraph *(c)* of section 85f as follows:

or *(c)* the advertising of the availability in employment in accordance with subparagraphs *(a)* and *(b)*

The Chamber says that, whilst it may be implicit in the legislation that it can so advertise, by reading the amendment to section 85f in conjunction with a later section (I think it is section 103, and I intend to agree with the advice) it is a little obscure and will need to be amended to put the issue beyond doubt.

The only other matter I raise for consideration in relation to the Bill specifically is that it deals only with industrial awards or agreements under the Industrial Relations (South Australia) Act 1972. It may be that there is some technical reason why it does not also apply to Commonwealth awards. I have not had an opportunity to pursue that issue, but unless there is good reason for omitting reference to Commonwealth awards it would seem to me that they ought also to be encompassed by the legislation.

There is only one other matter of a more general nature that I wish to raise and that relates to the abolition of the retirement age, which will come into effect relatively soon. This was raised in relation to secure tenure of employment. Again, because it was raised with me only yesterday, I have not had time to pursue the matter and there may be an easy answer to it. However, I raise it so that the Attorney-General may give some consideration to it. In relation to secure tenure in tertiary institutions, and other institutions there is a concern that the implementation of the provisions that abolish the retirement age will have the effect of extending that tenure without the tenure being subject to review, much as a contract is subject to review at the end of its term. That issue causes concern to some institutions, and I think it is important that it needs to be addressed. I would appreciate it if, in responding, the Attorney-General could give some consideration to the issue. Apart from that, I support the second reading.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMERCIAL LICENCES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 171.)

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Consumer Affairs): I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate and I take this opportunity briefly to clarify for the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr Elliott two points that they raised on behalf of the Motor Trade Association. The Hon. Mr Burdett stated that the Motor Trade Association had not been consulted on this Bill. However, I point out that that is not correct. The substance of this Bill has been the subject of much discussion with industry over the past two years.

Industry associations such as the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, the Consumers Association of S.A., The Credit Reference Association, the Australian Finance Conference, the Security Institute of S.A., the Security Industry Association and the Institute of Travel and Tourism, to name but a few, as well as the Motor Trade Association, have had the opportunity to comment on this Bill and previous drafts of this Bill.

The two issues that the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr Elliott raised concerned the effect of this Bill on the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act. This Bill, for all occupational licensing Acts, seeks to correct an anomaly regarding the suspension of licences. In dealing with a case on behalf of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs regarding the prosecution of a second-hand motor vehicle dealer who was operating whilst under suspension, the Crown Solicitor advised the Commissioner that, because of a technicality in the legislation, the Commissioner had no power to prosecute a licensee for operating whilst under suspension. As this clearly was not the intention of the legislation, it was advised that this anomaly be corrected in all occupational licensing Acts except the Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act, where this anomaly does not exist. I am sure that all members would agree that it is necessary to immediately correct this error in legislation and would not agree with the Motor Trade Association that this matter be dealt with for all other industry groups and exclude the second-hand motor vehicle dealers.

The second issue that the Motor Trade Association raised is the ceasing of the practice to advertise those licensees whose licences are suspended for failure to lodge annual returns and pay an annual fee. The Motor Trade Association makes the point that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles relies on the fact that dealers quote their licence number when obtaining exemption from stamp duty on transfer of a motor vehicle into their name. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has advised that dealers are obliged to quote their licensed vehicle dealer number in a statutory declaration, which they complete when applying to transfer a motor vehicle into their name.

The Registrar does not rely on suspensions being published in the local press and was not aware that such suspensions were published. However, from time to time a copy of the register of licences for second-hand motor vehicle dealers is made available to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Discussions with the Registrar have brought an agreement between the Registrar and the Commercial Registrar that the Commercial Registrar will provide the Registrar of Motor Vehicles with a list of those licensees whose licences have been suspended for non-lodgment of an annual return and payment of the annual fee if the Registrar so requires. I do not see the necessity of enshrining this administrative practice in legislation.

Another point that both members raised on behalf of the Motor Trade Association was the association's desire

to also receive a list of those licensees who have been suspended for non-lodgment of their annual return and non-payment of the required fee. Once again, the Commercial Registrar has advised that she is willing to provide the association with a list of those licensees in the same manner as would be provided to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. This has already been communicated to the Motor Trade Association. I must point out that, from discussions with the Motor Trade Association, it appears that it does not in any way use the information that is currently published in the newspaper. However, the association advises that it may in future use that information in some way to advise its members of persons whose licence has been suspended.

I see some risks associated with that practice as some suspended licensees may subsequently lodge their annual returns, pay the required fee and have their licences reinstated. The Commercial Tribunal register is the most up-to-date source of information concerning the status of occupational licences, and it would be far preferable for any person who has doubts concerning the status of licensees to make a telephone inquiry to the tribunal and not rely on published information.

Under the proposed amendments, suspensions resulting from disciplinary action rather than non-lodgment of an annual return will be published in the newspaper. It would seem to me much more important that dealers be made aware of those licensees who have been disciplined for improper conduct rather than those dealers whose licences have been suspended for non-lodgment of the annual return. It is also the case that some licensees who wish to leave an industry choose not to lodge annual returns and pay the annual fee and consider that, by doing so, their licence ceases. That is correct, of course, as the licence is at first suspended and later, after a period, the licence is cancelled. However, there is initially no way of differentiating between those who are simply late in lodging a form and those who deliberately choose not to continue with their licence for whatever reason.

Should the Motor Trade Association wish to publish information concerning licence suspension for its members—and I understand that its members constitute approximately 40 per cent of licensed dealers—it will need to ensure that it does so in such a way that does not impugn the character of those licensees whose licences have been suspended and it must be prepared to publish the lifting of suspensions. In any event, as I have said, the Commercial Registrar has advised that she is happy to provide the Motor Trade Association with the list of those licensees whose licences have been suspended for non-lodgment of the annual return and non-payment of the fee. This can be done administratively, and to enshrine it in legislation would seem to me to be unnecessary.

The Commercial Registrar is a statutory officer and I would have thought an agreement with the statutory office of the Commercial Registrar, who is an officer of the Commercial Tribunal, whose responsibility it is to license persons in certain occupational groups, would be sufficient for the Motor Trade Association. Writing such an arrangement into legislation allows no flexibility and means that, whenever change is required, the process of introducing a Bill to amend the legislation will be necessary. Even prescribing this in regulations is an unwieldy process and, given the latest changes to the Subordinate Legislation Act, it would mean long delays before changes could be effective.

The Motor Trade Association requests that clauses 17 and 18 be excluded from the Bill. For the reasons that I have outlined, I do not support this. I feel that second-hand motor vehicle dealers should be in the same position as all other licensees and I see no reason to make an exception in their case. I am aware that discussions are going on between the Motor Trade Association and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs regarding other changes to the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act. However, I am advised that these discussions are continuing and any amendment would not be ready for Parliament to consider before the autumn session. I do not consider it necessary or desirable for the provisions of this Bill to be deferred until that time. I commend the Bill as it stands to members of the Council and again thank members for their contribution to the debate.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—'Duration of licences.'

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: At this stage I oppose clauses 17 and 18, but seek the Minister's response to some matters relating to this. The Minister said in her reply that all the organisations concerned had been notified. My information was very clear that none of them apart from the real estate industry—certainly not the Motor Trade Association—had heard of the Bill or of the move. That was simply my information. In her reply the Minister said that there was no reason why the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act should be excluded. There certainly is a reason and that is because of the stamp duty situation, which does not apply to any of the other occupations.

The position in regard to second-hand motor vehicles is that second-hand motor vehicle dealers are exempt from stamp duty on their purchases, on the basis that they are stock in trade and, in order to get their exemption, they quote their licence number. That is the reason. In her reply, the Minister also said that anyone could inquire whether or not a second-hand motor vehicle dealer was currently licensed. I raised that with the Motor Trade Association and I was told, 'Fine, but there are lots of them, and how do you know whom to inquire about?' As I understood the Minister (and this is the crux of it), she gave an undertaking that, when a second-hand motor vehicle dealer had his or her licence suspended through non-payment of fees, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the Motor Trade Association will be advised of that fact. When he spoke on Thursday, the Hon. Mr Elliott asked for this undertaking, as I understood it and, if the undertaking is satisfactorily given, I am prepared to accept that and I am prepared not to move the amendment.

The undertaking I understood he was asking for was one of the options given by the Motor Trade Association in the fax which it sent to me and which I gave Mr Elliott to look at; one was to exclude it from the legislation, which I have done in the amendment that is on file, because I felt it was the neatest way of doing it. The other alternative it posed was that it be notified

within seven days. As I understood his second reading speech, the Hon. Mr Elliott was leaving his options open but was saying that he would be satisfied with that sort of undertaking. I would be, too, and I have spoken to the Motor Trade Association since Mr Elliott made his speech and it has said that it would be satisfied with that kind of undertaking. I said that there ought to be a time limit on it—within seven days, or whatever period is appropriate—but I do not think it should be open ended. If the Minister is prepared to confirm that she will undertake that the Commercial Tribunal will notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the Motor Trade Association within seven days of what had been called 'routine suspensions,' which are suspensions for non-payment of fees, I would be prepared to accept the undertaking and in that event I would not move the amendments that are on file.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As I understand that the Minister has given that undertaking, I would also hope that it might be on a weekly basis. Perhaps we should go just a step further, in that it really should be an update and, if suspensions are removed, any notification should not be a notification of suspensions, but also of removal of suspension otherwise, when Motor Trade Association members consult the list, they might not realise there has been a change in the list which would cause some complications from time to time. So, an updating would be necessary, not just notification of suspensions.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Certainly, in my second reading response I have indicated that it would be possible for lists to be provided to appropriate organisations and, just to reinforce that point, I would like to read from a letter that has been provided to me by the Commercial Registrar and which is dated 20 August. It reads:

> Dear Minister
> I am pleased to advise that should public advertising of automatic suspensions cease the Registry would still be in a position to provide lists of those automatically suspended to appropriate persons or bodies. It is not necessary to have this administrative act in the legislation as such.

So, we have the word of the Commercial Registrar that such information will be provided to those bodies that wish to receive it. It was not drawn to my attention prior to this debate that there might be a request for a time limit to be placed upon the provision of this information. Although I am not aware of any reason why such information should not be provided within seven days, before I give such an undertaking, I would like to check on that matter with the Commercial Registrar, just to be sure there is not some administrative or technical reason why that undertaking would be difficult to fulfil. However, from my perspective I can see no problem with it, as long as it is possible to do it administratively. However, I would like to check that with the Commercial Registrar before I make such an undertaking.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I am happy with that. I cannot see that there would be any difficulty, because they are advertised within quite a short time at present, but perhaps the Minister might be prepared to report progress until she can get that information.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I would be prepared to do that.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ADELAIDE WARDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 79.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Liberal Party supports this Bill, which seeks to amend the Local Government Act with respect to specific provisions about the wards and representation of the City of Adelaide. Adelaide City Council ward boundaries have remained unchanged since 1874. I note that in that year the city was divided into six wards which still exist and which are named after the first six South Australian Governors: Hindmarsh, Gawler, Grey, Young, Robe and MacDonnell. One could possibly argue on heritage grounds that it would be unwise to address any matter that would seek to change the historic nature of the wards and representation on the Adelaide City Council. The council, however, has been required under the Local Government Act to complete a periodic review of its representation and ward boundaries. The report arising from the review recommends changes to both ward names and boundaries and a report from the council is currently before the Local Government Advisory Commission, notwithstanding the fact that in the last session this Parliament approved the repeal of the commission in place of the Electoral Commission looking at all such matters.

There was a qualification in that Local Government (Reform) Amendment Bill which allowed the commission to complete a report arising from a periodic review, and the Adelaide City Council did opt for this process. So we now have the Adelaide City Council's periodic review recommendations before the Local Government Advisory Commission. I understand that the commission has been monopolised by the issues of boundary changes and the amalgamation processes dealing with Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide and Woodville, but is likely soon to get on to this issue of boundaries in relation to the city of Adelaide. However, notwithstanding what the commission might recommend in terms of boundaries and representations, there is a provision in the Local Government Act (section 850) which reads as follows:

> The wards of the city and their respective names and boundaries as they existed immediately prior to the commencement of this Act continue to be the wards and the names and the boundaries of the wards respectively.

It is this section 850 that the Minister is seeking to repeal. She is also proposing a transition provision which would allow the wards of the city of Adelaide immediately in existence before the repeal of this section to continue in existence until such time as the commission has met and made its recommendations. I have received representations from the City Manager on behalf of the members of the Adelaide City Council. The correspondence expresses some surprise that this Bill has been introduced at this time. The City Manager suggests that it was a little premature, because the council was to consider this amendment at a forthcoming meeting. The City Manager also expressed some surprise not only at what he deemed to be the premature introduction of this Bill but also at one aspect of the amendment to be inserted.

In her amendment the Minister has suggested the words 'subject to the qualification', four words which address the fact that the city of Adelaide boundaries would remain in existence subject to the qualification that the wards may be altered or abolished pursuant to the recommendation of the commission. The Adelaide City Council would like the words 'subject to the qualification' deleted and inserted in their place the words 'until such time as'. It is probably a pedantic argument between lawyers. My own reading of the situation is that, essentially, they mean the same thing but I do respect the fact that the Adelaide City Council has requested this amendment upon receiving legal advice. I am also conscious that the Bill that we are addressing as members of Parliament does relate to the city of Adelaide and not other local council areas, and therefore I believe that the city of Adelaide's views should be respected in this matter.

I am aware that the issue concerning boundary changes and representation has been a quite controversial one within the council itself. I do not intend to enter the debate concerning either side of the arguments, but certainly a number of councillors and people within the business community—and including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry—would very much like to see a council that represents simply the central business district and not include the residential wards of MacDonnell and Robe in the North Adelaide area.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What about Grey and Young in the city—residential?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, that is right; but the submissions from the business community that I have read, including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, suggest that MacDonnell and Robe in North Adelaide should be merged or amalgamated with Walkerville. The city of Adelaide has not adopted those recommendations. It has sought to keep together as one the city as we know it today, including those residential wards in North Adelaide. It has, however, recommended that the representation be reduced from 19 to 16. That would mean the loss of one aldermanic position and two councillors, because they recommend that the wards of Hindmarsh and Gawler should be amalgamated. It is a controversial matter in terms of the representation and ward structure, because it is a fact that the commercial sector in the city certainly pays the highest proportion of rates. This matter is equally controversial, because that commercial sector in the Gawler and Hindmarsh wards has well under the representation of the residential wards. Gawler at this time has some 916 individuals on the role; Hindmarsh, 1 626; Grey, 2 239; Young, 3 466; Robe, 3 414; and MacDonnell, 3 199. So it is quite clear that, in terms of the commercial sector in the Gawler and Hindmarsh areas of the council, we do not see a situation of one vote, one value. I am conscious, however, that those two sectors provide the bulk of the rates within the city.

So it is a controversial issue; it is one that the council, by majority vote, has determined; and it is one that is now before the Local Government Advisory Commission. The Party and I accept that when the Local Government Advisory Commission makes its recommendations it may either support the status quo, move for adoption of the council's recommendation, or move for an amendment of the council's recommendation. This Bill does not reflect on any of those options. It is simply technical in nature and does facilitate the recommendations from the Local Government Advisory Commission. I indicate on behalf of the Liberal Party that we support the Bill and that we will be moving that one small amendment.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I rise to support the Bill. I see it as a sensible facilitating measure of not profound significance, and it does not pre-empt the determination of the commission. For that reason I do not intend to extend the debate into much wider areas of significant local government reform which have been on the horizon or getting even closer to the horizon for some time.

While I am addressing the second reading, I think it is important to observe that I have been approached with a request to move an amendment to this Bill which would virtually abolish aldermen positions after the next election. The thrust of this has come from the previous deputy mayor, Henry Ninio, who has quite openly been campaigning for a change in the structure of the council, and I have been interested to hear what argument he has had to put up for it. Suffice to say that that is the intention of his representation to me, but I am not prepared to consider an amendment of that nature in this Bill.

A paper was prepared by Dr Dean Jaensch, Reader in Politics at Flinders University, relating to the changes (some would call it reforms) which could be proposed for the Adelaide City Council, and I will refer briefly to that. The composition of the council and the method of election were matters upon which he was asked to concentrate specifically in this paper. In relation to the recent Periodic Review of Elected Representation (1992) he states:

> Under section 28 (1), the purpose of a periodic review is to determine:
>
> Whether its electors [Adelaide City Council electors] would be more adequately and fairly represented if—
>
> *(a)* some change were made in pursuance of this part in the composition of the council;
>
> *(b)* in the case of a council whose area is not divided into wards—the area were divided into wards;
>
> or
>
> *(c)* in the case of a council whose area is divided into wards—the area were redivided into wards or the division of the area into wards were altered or abolished.
>
> This section raises at least four issues of political representation:
>
> (a) the composition of the council;
>
> (b) the structure of the council;
>
> (c) 'adequate' representation of electors;
>
> (d) 'fair' representation of electors.

The paper deals with the numbers of people who should be elected to represent the voters, the electors and the council, and from the one mayor (who is currently elected at large), six aldermen (who are currently elected at large), and 12 councillors (who are elected from two-member wards) the position Dean Jaensch comes to is 12 members of the council and a mayor elected under the Hare-Clarke system from a single electorate. In relation to the purpose of one-vote one-value I quote from his paper:

> To guarantee one vote, one value the council's area should be designated as one electorate, with all elections based on the entire enrolled population. That is, the mayor and councillors would have the same electorate. This would result in absolute

and permanent one vote, one value. It would guarantee an 'arithmetic fairness' in the electoral system.

This paper is available, and I would be happy to make it available to members who wished to see it. I find the general principle attractive. The Democrats have always espoused the principle of proportional representation, and a Hare-Clarke system as such as is used in Tasmania is our preferred method of election.

There are various arguments which I think must be properly and responsibly addressed in any change such as the typical one that, by moving to one electorate, you lose the localised representation. Dean Jaensch, in his paper, makes the point (again with which I agree) that people who stand to represent a particular area or particular interests in this system will have every opportunity of acquiring enough votes to get a quota and, having got a quota, they would then be duly elected so that there can very well be a mixture, and a proper mixture, of area representation and particular interest representation.

I conclude by indicating that I believe it is correct to look at what is an appropriate substantial reform of the structure of the Adelaide City Council. I remind members that some months back I did recommend that there be a wider plebiscite for the Adelaide City Council because it really is the core of the whole of the metropolitan area of Adelaide. In fact, one could argue, because of its role as the capital of South Australia, there should be representation in that central business district: in the central congregation of so many important entities of South Australia there should be representation on that council from the total area of the State.

Although I did not go into specific detail as to how that could be achieved, I did suggest that there could be elected positions on the council from local government zones or regions. I think it is clear now that the evolution of local government will see the congregation of local governments into bigger, more cooperative entities. Whether they result in mergers or in quite intricately cooperating coalitions I cannot say. However, I think that as the centre of the city and the city proper is so significant for all residents in South Australia, particularly those in the metropolitan area, there is an argument that there should be, by some form of democratic process, representation on the council from people who are outside the actual geographic boundaries of the area that the Adelaide City Council currently embraces.

I felt that those matters were sufficiently significant to warrant my raising them in my second reading contribution. However, the scope of the Bill does not invite that form of amendment to be moved, so I do not intend to take up the challenge to open the boundaries and stir up the local government pot to that extent. I indicate that the Democrats support the Bill.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for Local Government Relations): In closing the debate, I would like to thank members for their support of the legislation. I will make a few comments on their contributions. The Hon. Ms Laidlaw spoke of the LGAC being responsible for reviewing the results of the periodic review which the Adelaide City Council has undertaken. She said that this was despite the fact that the procedure for review of such periodic reviews was altered in the legislation before this Council earlier this year. Whilst that is very true, there were transitional provisions which enabled any council that had undertaken its review before 30 June this year either to have the review considered by the LGAC or to follow the new procedure of referring it to the Electoral Commissioner. It was the Adelaide City Council itself which adopted one of those options available to it, as it had completed its review before 30 June; it chose to have the periodic review considered by the Local Government Advisory Commission.

Whilst obviously I in no way influenced its choice on this matter, it will mean that the Local Government Advisory Commission will have reviewed the periodic review for every council but one in this State, because the Adelaide City Council is the last council bar one that has been granted an exemption to undertake its first seven yearly periodic review and have that review considered by the Local Government Advisory Commission. So, in some ways, one can say it completes the circle very nicely.

Of course, the Bill before us arises from a request from the Adelaide City Council itself. I must express surprise that the Chief Executive Officer of the council has expressed surprise that the Bill is before us. Not only has the Bill been brought in at the request of the city council but discussions certainly have taken place between my officers and officers of the city council. Furthermore, I wrote to the Lord Mayor several days before the Bill was introduced to inform him that I would be introducing it at the earliest opportunity to comply with the wishes of the Adelaide City Council. Perhaps that letter had not been viewed by the Chief Executive Officer when he expressed his surprising surprise.

There is mixed legal advice whether this Bill is necessary at all. It occurs in that part of the Local Government Act that refers specifically and only to the City of Adelaide. The particular clause—section 850—was inserted into the Local Government Act in 1881. It is the view of some lawyers that it is a transitional provision only that was to apply from the amendment, which was brought in in 1881. In consequence, it did not prevent the ward boundaries being changed. However, other legal advice suggests that perhaps it could be regarded as something more substantive than a transitional provision and in consequence could prevent any change of ward boundaries occurring. Certainly, not wishing to try to arbitrate between legal opinions or to have legal arguments whether a change of ward boundaries were possible, I thought it highly desirable—as did the Adelaide City Council—that this clause be repealed to put it beyond all doubt that, under part II of the principal Act, ward boundary changes are possible for the City of Adelaide. I stress, as have other speakers, that this in no way implies approval of any ward boundary changes that may or may not occur. It is merely ensuring that if the Local Government Advisory Commission recommends a change to ward boundaries it puts beyond doubt that legally the change can occur.

I should also perhaps point out that the periodic review is concerned not only with the ward boundaries but also with the size of the council. It is worth noting that the council currently has a smaller elector to council member ratio than other metropolitan councils. Even the suggested change to a council of 16 members will still mean an

over-representation within the City of Adelaide, compared to that which applies in other councils in the metropolitan area. I presume it is for that reason that in his paper Dr Dean Jaensch proposed a council of 12 or 13 members to make the ratio of members to electors closer to that which applies in other councils in the metropolitan area.

However, I certainly do not want to get involved in arguments relating to what boundaries should or should not be, whether there should or should not be aldermen, or whether there should be wards or councillors elected at large. While I have a view on this matter, I think my view probably relates more to my capacity as a ratepayer of the City of Adelaide.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Is that a conflict of interest?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That could perhaps be regarded as a conflict of interest, which I share with the shadow Minister. However, I would have thought that our status as ratepayers of the City of Adelaide did not create a conflict of interest that would in any way influence our behaviour or voting on the Bill before us. I am certainly glad that I declared my very distant conflict of interest due to my ratepayer status. I certainly note that the Hon. Miss Laidlaw did not declare her similar trivial conflict of interest.

I will speak to the amendment that the Hon. Miss Laidlaw will move in Committee so that it will not need to be further debated and we can speed up the process of the Council. I feel in this respect that both the Hon. Miss Laidlaw and I are perhaps pawns in a game between lawyers. To my non-legal mind there is no difference whatsoever in meaning between the two versions of the transition provision. The wording of the amendment that the Hon. Miss Laidlaw has on file is the wording that was supplied by the legal adviser to the Adelaide City Council. I point out that that legal adviser is not a parliamentary draftsman, and our parliamentary draftsman has used the same form of words that are used in all transitional provisions that occur in any legislation that has transitional provisions.

He has been perfectly consistent in the wording that he has chosen. However, the wording in the amendment to be moved by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw is provided by another lawyer and, as I say, I fail to see that there is any substantive difference between them. It has been suggested that the wording proposed by the city council lawyer is more substantive than that provided by Parliamentary Counsel and that makes the clause less of a transitional provision. It is a transitional provision only that is intended. I do not want to have an argument about this matter as it seems to me that both wordings will achieve the same thing, and everyone is agreed that the end is a desirable one. I thank members for their support for the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Transitional provision.'

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Before I move my amendment, I should record that I am a resident of Lower North Adelaide and a ratepayer within MacDonnell ward. I do not see that I have anything to gain from this measure, nevertheless. I move:

Page 1, lines 17 and 18—Leave out 'subject to the qualification that' and substitute 'until such time as'.

I gave the background to this amendment when speaking at the second reading stage and the Minister has also outlined some thoughts on the amendment. It is my view that the wording that I have moved, which has been supported by a full meeting of Adelaide City Council, puts beyond doubt what is meant by this transitional provision. I believe that it is most important that, in a council where there is heightened feeling about proposed changes to representation and wards, council members believe that there is no ambiguity in this provision. If there is any ambiguity, having seen the record of the council in recent times, anything could happen when the Local Government Advisory Commission makes its recommendations. It is for that reason, because council has sought it, that I move the amendment. We are not sure what mischief could be on the horizon in any circumstances. It is a narrow argument, and I concede the Minister's point in that regard.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the amendment. Before dealing with the details of it, I point out that I was most interested in what the Minister said in her second reading reply about section 850 and the time when it was enacted. My understanding of the golden rule of interpretation of statutes is that they be interpreted according to their plain, literal and grammatical sense and the sense of the words. The section reads:

> The wards of the city and their respective names and boundaries as they existed immediately prior to the commencement of this Act continue to be the wards, and the names and boundaries of the wards, respectively.

My view is that we should read that as it says so that it is not transitional, it is absolute. I agree with what the Minister said, namely, that when there are two different legal interpretations, it is perfectly simply to clarify it, which the Bill does.

I support the amendment moved by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw to leave out 'subject to qualification that' and substitute 'until such time as'. I acknowledge what the Minister said that this is the standard wording in all transitional provisions used by Parliamentary Counsel and I respect that. I also agree with the Minister that the amendment is more substantive but I suggest that that is preferable and, really, it is also equally transitional because, once it has happened, that is, once other boundaries have been established, that clearly cuts off the transitional part of it. It appears to me that, with 'subject to the qualification that', there is a problem as to when is the qualification resolved. The amendment moved by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw is much more satisfactory but I also agree with the Minister that it probably does not matter very much. However, I support the amendment.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I indicate formally that I accept the amendment, even though I am tempted to oppose it on the basis that Parliamentary Counsel's usual transitional provision would probably be better in this Bill so that it is consistent with all other legislation in which there are transitional provisions. However, I do not want to get caught up in arguments between lawyers who, I think, may be using us for their own purposes. I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMERCIAL LICENCES) BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page .)

Clause 17—'Duration of licences.'

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: When the Committee last sat I was asked by the Hon. Mr Burdett whether it would be possible to give an undertaking that lists of licensees who had been deregistered would be provided to interested bodies within seven days. I undertook to make some inquiries to ensure that there were no technical or administrative problems with giving such an undertaking, because I could certainly see no difficulty with the idea in principle. I have subsequently made those inquiries, and I am informed that it is quite feasible to provide such information on a weekly basis. I therefore give the undertaking that such information will be provided on a weekly basis to those organisations that wish to receive it.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: On the understanding (which, I take it, is included in what the Minister said) that the interested bodies would include the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the Motor Trade Association, I accept the undertaking.

Clause passed.
Remaining clauses (18 to 20) and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with amendments.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.27 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 26 August at 2.15 p.m.