LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 28 August 1985

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

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

By Command—

Institute for the Study of Learning Difficulties—1st Annual Report, 1984-85.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Projections show that, by the year 1990, 90 per cent of all new jobs will be in the information sector using computers and related technology. That is just one example illustrating the enormous changes facing the education system, and it is therefore with much pleasure that I table the interim report of the Education and Technology Task Force, which has seriously addressed the issues of technology. The Education and Technology Task Force was established by the Labor Government in March 1984 because we felt the need to review the role of the education system in helping to create a more innovative, technologically competent society.

Our Government was aware that the most successful communities in the technology field were those that had invested heavily in their educational system and had shown a willingness to try new ideas in their education. I welcome the attention given in the report to increasing opportunities for disadvantaged groups, including girls and women.

Among the report's recommendation is a proposal for the establishment of a women's technology centre. It calls for the recruitment of more teachers with technology-related qualifications and recommends that a target be set for the recruitment of women.

The report endorses initiatives already taken by the State Government. They include the Secondary Schools Technology Grant, and the appointment of a person to help parents with the purchase and use of computers. These initiatives, according to the report, should be extended by the establishment of a Technology Education Innovations Fund. Above all, the task force had identified two main ways in which the education system could assist the State in managing its technology-influenced future.

These are, first, to encourage innovation and, secondly, to provide teachers and students with first-hand experience of technology. Other recommendations call for:

- An investigation into the basic skills required by students in the future.
- Two complementary pilot programs to upgrade the quality and relevance of applied maths teaching.
- More emphasis on teacher in-service training.
- Establishment of a mobile information technology workshop to serve isolated areas.
- The Education Department, TAFE, SSABSA and tertiary institutions to ensure that specific vocational courses include study of the effects of technological change.

The Government's release of these recommendations does not, of course, signal their automatic adoption. They address very relevant issues in our society, however, and will be vary carefully considered. I seek leave to table the report.

Leave granted.

QUESTIONS

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the mismanagement of the Lyell McEwin community health service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yesterday, 27 August 1985, the Minister of Health tabled a South Australian Health Commission internal memorandum about financial management problems at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, dated 26 August 1985. It was a memorandum from the Executive Director of the Central Sector to the Chairman of the commission.

The memorandum purports to set out the history of events surrounding the discovery of the Lyell McEwin's financial problems. It says that officers of the Health Commission, Mr P. Lamberts and Mr D. McCullough, unearthed a variety of problems and unsatisfactory matters. These officers were sent into the hospital in August and August/September, respectively.

The memorandum then outlines who the Health Commission advised, clearly implying that it was the action of the Commission which alerted the relevant people to the problems and in the first instance. The memorandum states:

> Clearly, the work of the commission officers in exposing serious matters was instrumental in the preparation of critical reports by the auditor. The objective of the commission was to identify any problems, to report the facts to the appropriate authorities and to undertake whatever remedial action was necessary.

The facts were reported to the Chairman of the board of management; the full board of management; the health unit's auditors; the Chairman of the commission; the commission's audit committee; the Auditor-General and the commission's internal auditor. My questions are:

1. When were each of the above notified of the difficulties purportedly identified by Messrs McCullough and Lamberts at the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service, and by which officers of the Health Commission?
2. In what form was this advice?
3. Why was the relevant documentation related to the notification not tabled?
4. Will the Minister now arrange for the tabling of this information?
5. Was the Chairman of the hospital board and all other people mentioned in the previous question notified immediately the commission became aware of falsification of returns to the commission, that is, to use their own dates, in July 1983?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In other circumstances I would have been very surprised that the Opposition saw fit to box on with this contrived, alleged cover-up. However, the Opposition is made up of desperate men and women. In the circumstances, since most of the egg is on the faces of members opposite, and not a little of it on our afternoon newspaper, I suppose it is hardly surprising. Yesterday I answered in great depth and at great length all of the allegations—the malicious and untrue allegations—that have been made over the past several days. I identified the particular times at which those events occurred. The matter was reported very fairly this morning in the journal of

record—the *Advertiser*. I am very pleased that it is both in *Hansard* and on the public record through our morning newspaper. I have very little to add to that.

I said yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition had shot himself in the foot, that the Opposition had behaved quite disgracefully, and that it is indeed a desperate Opposition when it resorts to the low game it is playing at the moment. It is notable that only one media outlet in the whole of South Australia is taking a particular line. The ABC television news, for example, believes that the allegation has no credence, and it is not running anything about it at all. It is also notable that on the ABC television news last night there was not one word about this alleged scam. No journalist in the employ of any of the other media outlets is taking the matter as other than a very disgraceful distortion of the facts.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Why are there so many Health Commission officers here listening to this?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is a fact that two of the officers who have been so very gravely maligned by the Opposition are in the gallery, not at my request—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Minister not to comment on who is in the gallery.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Do not call me to order, Mr President. How about fixing up the lightweight opposite who raised the matter?

The PRESIDENT: I will fix up the 'lightweight' who raised the matter. I draw the attention of all members to the fact that it is not ethical to mention people who may be present in the gallery.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Mr President, it is also grossly unethical to publicly malign people who have no chance of refuting these allegations. I make one thing very clear to the cowards opposite, to the malicious Opposition members: they will have every opportunity—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I assure the honourable member that I am well under control. I would not change places with the honourable member in the physical or mental sense; I assure him of that. The Opposition will be afforded every opportunity during the Estimates Committee proceedings this year, in this Chamber or in the other Chamber, to personally take up these matters with the officers concerned. At that time the officers will be present in either this Chamber or the other place and the cowards opposite can take up these matters, and they will be refuted personally and directly. I am very—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: They most certainly can. The responsible officers will be able to speak for themselves during the Estimates Committee proceedings in relation to any matters involving financial arrangements, audits, the Lyell McEwin Hospital or any other hospital for which the Health Commission is responsible in this State.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Put them on toast.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The not so honourable Mr Griffin interjects and says, 'Put them on toast.'

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You will put them on toast.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will not put anybody on toast except this disgraceful Opposition! I do not have a Director-General: I happen to have a Chairman of the commission. This is another matter which the *News* journalist quite clearly does not understand and which, apparently, most members of the Opposition do not understand. If members opposite want a return to a Hospitals Department where there is central control of everything, then let them say so.

It was the former Government and its Minister of Health who espoused complete autonomy. They said that nobody should interfere with the autonomy of the hospitals: it was the responsibility of the board of directors and the Chief Executive Officer of each hospital. That was said time and time again by the previous Minister of Health with all the support in the world from the then Premier.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. I ask you, Sir, whether you can direct the Minister to answer the questions that were asked. I am happy for him to go on for a little longer with his diatribe, but perhaps he will eventually get around to answering the questions that have been asked.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. The honourable Minister of Health.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Thank you, Mr President. I have almost finished, anyway. When interrupted I was pointing out that there is a great difference apropos the most recent distortion in our afternoon newspaper published today where clearly the writer, like so many members of the Opposition, does not understand the difference between a commission and a department. There is not central control in the overall sense; it is the flexibility of a commission which makes it worthwhile.

To give honourable members some idea of what the commission has been actively about in undoing the sort of damage done during the time of the previous Administration, I will quote briefly from circular No. 2.4, issue No. 1, dated 29 June 1984 and sent out over the signature of the Chairman of the commission, Professor Gary Andrews. It states:

> 1. Addition to Functions of the South Australian Health Commission under an amendment to the South Australian Health Commission Act, an additional statutory function (responsibility) has been placed upon the Commission.

It went on to quote section 16 (1) *(fa)*, which states:

> . . . to ensure that incorporated hospitals, incorporated health centres and any health service established, maintained or operated by, or with the assistance of the commission, are operated in an efficient and economical manner.

The directive from the Chairman goes on to say, later:

> The commission thus clearly has a responsibility for the efficient and economical operation of both incorporated and non-incorporated health units which receive funding from the commission.

That amendment to the South Australian Health Commission Act was brought into this Parliament by me as Minister of Health in the present Administration. The Chairman goes on to say:

> 2. Copies of Audit Queries to the Health Commission—To assist the commission in the performance of this function, all health units should, within four weeks of receiving from the Auditor-General or an appointed auditor any of the following types of audit queries of reports, forward to the commission a copy of the query or report, together with a copy of the health unit's response thereto:
> - for health units with annual budgets in excess of $12 million gross expenditure—any interim audit report;
> - all units—final audit reports;
> - all units—requests by the auditor for explanations;
> - for units audited by Auditor-General—any further comments or response from the Auditor-General.
>
> 3. Forwarding to the Commission—All such copies should be forwarded to the Chairman, South Australian Health Commission, through the appropriate Sector Executive Director.

In general terms that answers the thrust of the questions. I will now refer specifically to the questions. They are not matters with regard to particular dates and documents about which my knowledge is specific enough for me to be able to answer. Let me say that yesterday I tabled 13 documents of my own volition, contrary to reports that I was forced to do so. On Thursday, as I explained yesterday, my first reaction was naturally one of reluctance to table documents labelled 'private and confidential'.

I would remain reluctant, except in special circumstances, to do so; that was a perfectly reasonable reaction. I did

table them eventually. I thought that the public interest was best served by their being tabled, because of the malicious slurs and libels that were being perpetrated on senior officers of the commission. However, I am not able off the top of my head to answer the question regarding the specific dates, times, and so forth. I will certainly bring back all of those details as soon as I reasonably can.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about mismanagement at the Lyell McEwin Health Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Among the papers tabled by the Minister of Health yesterday was a copy of a letter from the auditor of the Lyell McEwin Health Service (Mr Venn) to the Chairman (Mr R.P. Walter). The last two paragraphs on page 2 of that letter state:

> In summary, the above has resulted in the health service receiving $106 247.16 during the year ended 30 June 1983 to which we believe it was not entitled and that a deliberate falisfication of records was made in order to disclose the actual situation.

It continues:

> Our audit also revealed that two returns were lodged by the health service for the month of June 1983 to the Health Commission.

On page 3, the following statement is made:

> Whilst we are satisfied that, with the exception of the $106 247.16 referred to above, there are no items of expenditure manipulated without the knowledge of the Health Commission during the year ended 30 June 1983, we certainly question the ethics involved of such a practice and to what extent, if any, what these matters are reported to your board.

My questions are:

1. Who prepared and lodged the first return on behalf of the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service?

2. Who asked for the first return to be withdrawn and requested a second return?

3. Who prepared and lodged the second return and who authorised that return?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Those returns were obviously prepared by then senior officers at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Because these strange perverted people of the Opposition seem to be setting man or bear traps with which to chop off their own feet and legs, I will not specifically respond by naming people at this time. I will want to check that very thoroughly, and I will bring back again in the fullness of time a prepared response to the specific parts of those questions.

There are a couple of matters that relate to these questions that I want to make very clear. They relate also to the further allegations that are made in our afternoon newspaper today. They show that like the Opposition, and particularly the Opposition spokesman on health, the writer does not understand how the commission works, and it is worth spending a little time to explain—

The Hon J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: You obviously do not know.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member does not really know at all, so I will spend a little time telling him.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will not say how one of my people described you yesterday—it would be grossly unparliamentary: nor shall I reveal the thoughts that go through my head whenever I look at you.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: A 'drongo' is quite insufficient, and I do not intend to use that term. It would be totally inadequate. As I said yesterday, the Hon. Mr Lucas has very supple loins and he stoops to the gutter frequently. Leaving that aside, the commission operates through three sectors.

They are the Western Sector, the Southern Sector and the Central Sector. Between them, they handle very large amounts of money. The Health Commission budget in the coming year will be somewhere in excess of $650 million. In turn, the sector directors and their officers negotiate with individual health units and hospitals to agree a projected budget for each financial year. Those negotiations are still actively going on through July and August and are very often finalised after the time that the Treasurer presents his Budget to this Parliament.

It would be stretching the bounds of imagination beyond all reason to believe that every one of the 120 or 130 health units or thereabouts, including 81 hospitals—hospitals whose budgets range from well in excess of $100 million, as is the case with the Royal Adelaide Hospital, through to some of our small country hospitals whose budgets would be in the order of $1 million—would come in right on budget. In fact, the health units that you want to have a very close look at are the ones that by magic, at midnight on 30 June of any financial year, are able to pretend that they balanced exactly.

Each unit is allocated a global budget, and within that budget they have some room to manoeuvre. They are expected to come in as close as possible to the allocation. It is the nature of the system that, because they are all estimates, by the very nature of the operation, some units come in a little below their budget and some come in a little over their budget. That amount of overspending, on examination, may be validated by the commission or it may not. If it is not—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Well, you spent a great deal of time last year complaining bitterly in the Budget Estimates Committee, that we had not—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In fact, it has a great deal to do with the question.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am trying to explain to the Hon. Mr Burdett and his colleagues—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: You are very trying.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: You are not too good as a comedian, among other things, Mr Burdett. You should not try.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am pleased to hear it. It is of the nature that in the overall management of the sector there will be some overruns and some hospitals that come in under budget. That money is redistributed at the discretion of or on examination by each of the sectors. As I said, the hospital that you really have to look at closely is the one that purports to come in spot on its budget. You know that somebody must have moved some money about if that happened. Last year, quite strangely—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: You are just filibustering again.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No, I am not filibustering at all.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: Of course you are. We have all week, and the week after next, and the week after that.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: And you have the Budget Estimates, too, you cowardly people. With regard to the Health Commission, you are malicious cowards.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You're going purple. Pop another pill.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: 'Pop another pill', the Hon. Mr Lucas said. That ought to be on the record. That is responsible. It is on the record now; I have made quite sure

of it. That is the sort of behaviour that we have come to expect from the not so honourable Mr Lucas. With regard to these budgets, Sir, I am sure that you remember with great clarity that last year during the Budget Estimates Committee proceedings the Opposition made great play of the fact that we had not authorised $1.3 million worth of overspending by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Quite an orchestration went on. Members of the Opposition on that committee, instead of using it for a genuine examination of the affairs of the commission and instead of using the information presented in page after page of detail prepared for this Parliament by the Health Commission, spent all the time in a tirade of abuse on me as Health Minister for not validating a $1.3 million overspending by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Just refer to the record and see what was said over a number of hours—about half the entire time of the Estimates Committee—on the health estimates last year.

The complaint was that the commission and I, as Minister, had not authorised or accepted the $1.3 million overspending. In fact, $600 000 of that overspending was carried forward as a first charge—a penalty if you like—against that hospital's budget for 1984-85. That is the sort of responsible management we are getting under the present administration; that is the sort of responsible management we get in the Health Commission. I am pleased to be able to tell the Parliament and the South Australian public today that, as a result of that initiative and actions taken last year, about which this desperate Opposition carolled, carped and complained so bitterly, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital this year came in on budget. That is responsible administration.

However, there is nothing unusual about a hospital having an overrun of $106 000 in an overall budget of, say, $12 million, validated as expenses necessarily incurred. The difference—and this is the significant difference—is that in the case of the Lyell McEwin Hospital in that particular year—and it was during that particular year that the Hon. Mrs Adamson was Minister of Health—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: What, April, May, June 1983?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No. It was 1981-82 and 1982-83 and years prior to that. The internal auditor unit's report shows that those irregularities had been going on to a greater or lesser degree at the hospital since 1978. It was as a result of actions that I took within seven months of becoming Minister, and that the commission took immediately on being apprised of the difficulties by the then external auditor, Mr Venn, that these matters were put to right. They went on consistently during the entire three years and two months of the previous Government.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: I don't think you understand it.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I understand it very well. All these problems have been—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: 1982-83.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We came to government in November 1982. The report referred to things that had taken place previously. I do not have to go through this at any great length because anyone with reasonable intelligence can understand the time sequence and that all these matters were addressed and corrected during the time that I was Minister of Health. They went on untrammelled without any interference during the three years and two months of the previous Administration, during the time of the previous Minister.

Let me return to this $106 000. In a budget of $12 million it would not be exceptional for an amount of that order of percentage to be validated by the commission as expenses necessarily incurred or an unavoidable overrun in the normal course of events.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: The report says that it is a deliberate falsification.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: For goodness sake, shut up you silly old man, and let me get on with it. The difference is that in this case there is no doubt that there was falsification by the hospital administration. That has never been contested. As to who prepared and lodged the return specifically and who asked that the first return be withdrawn and so forth, as I said, is detail that is not immediately at my fingertips. Because I do not wish to be placed in any sort of contrived traps by the desperate men and women of this Opposition, I will bring back the specific details that are required before the week is out.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: My colleague, the Hon. John Burdett, has already referred to a report by Mr D.G. Venn, the auditor of the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service, sent by him to the Chairman of the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service. My colleague has referred to certain paragraphs in that report. However, the last page of the report states:

> In our opinion, it is apparent that the South Australian Health Commission, for whatever reason during late July 1983, decided to advance additional funds to the hospital and that, in order to provide correct documentation, an amended monthly return had to be lodged.
>
> The amended return lodged late July 1983 disclosed an amount of $148 951.06 greater than that for the original return. A letter dated 1 August 1983 issued by the South Australian Health Commission specifically refers to an amount of $148 951.06, *viz.*, being funding of $148 951.06 adjusted by $22 643.23 credit for the canteen receipts which we adjusted when making the May revenue adjustment and which you adjusted in June.
>
> Whilst we are satisfied that, with the exception of the $106 247.16 referred to above, there are no items of expenditure manipulated without the knowledge of the South Australian Health Commission during the year ended 30 June 1983, we certainly question the ethics involved of such a practice and to what extent, if any, these matters are reported to your board.

It is clear that an amount of $148 951.06 was credited to the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service late in July 1983. We are advised that the author of the letter indicating this credit was the person who was sent to the hospital to investigate the alleged financial mismanagement in the same month. The figure of $148 951.06 equalled the difference between salaries actually paid to registered nurses and the salaries allegedly paid on a falsified return. According to an internal memorandum of the Health Commission, the commission knew of this falsification in July, yet appears not to have questioned the additional credit. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister table the letter forwarded on behalf of the Health Commission to the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service, indicating that the credit would be made, and the copies of any internal authorising memoranda between relevant officers of the Health Commission approving such a credit?

2. Does the Minister acknowledge that there appears to be a conflict in the situation because the person authorising the payment of the additional moneys was in fact the very person sent by the Health Commission to investigate the financial mismanagement of the hospital?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: There is no apparent conflict at all. In terms of taking up time or otherwise, I am prepared to hang about for as long as the Opposition want to try and stir. It is quite extraordinary that my predecessor, the member for Coles (Hon. Mrs Adamson), absolves herself from all the problems that went on for the three years and two months during which she was Minister by saying that she was unaware. Apparently, in that case, the Westminster

tradition does not apply. It was perfectly all right for her to be ignorant of what was going on under her nose.

Whatever my strengths or weaknesses may be in other areas, I have prided myself consistently on my administrative skills as a Minister. It is no secret that, during the period I have been Minister, the administration of the commission, in particular, and the administration of the health services generally, has been very much more tightened up.

Indeed, we have had complaints on occasions that both the Chairman and I tend to be centralists. I make no apology for that: I have always made it very clear that I am scrupulously careful with other people's money. I have always held the view that whether or not I was careful with my money was nobody's business, but on the question of the application of taxpayers' funds I have been scrupulously careful to demand accountability at all times, so much so that in February 1983, within weeks of my becoming Minister, I first questioned the whole notion of boards of management of hospitals and health units being autonomous. They had been led to believe during the previous Administration that they were very much masters of their own destinies—that, provided that it was not drawn to anybody's attention, what they did with the money within the global budget was very much their own business. We changed that right around. We even amended the Act, as I said earlier during Question Time, to ensure that there was a maximum amount of accountability.

Again, with the sectors we acted to overcome what was potentially a loose canon effect. As you know, Sir, we had substantial inherited difficulty in the Western Sector, for example. That is well known and has been referred to in this place before. We had substantial difficulties with the Health Promotion Unit, and that saga is well known. The Minister's appointee to this unit, which she created as her personal pride and joy, had virtually no financial management skills at all. That has also been cleaned up.

I have spent almost three years diligently picking up the pieces and fixing up the financial problems and the potential financial problems that had been created by the actions and the philosophy of my predecessors in the Tonkin Government. Now, by some sleight of hand, and with a little help from the afternoon newspaper—no other media outlets or journalists, as I said—the Opposition is indulging in this most extraordinary contortion to try to lay all of the blame for all of the mismanagement at the Lyell McEwin Hospital—about which the Hon. Mrs Adamson said she knew nothing and therefore absolves herself—which the internal auditor said plainly in a document that I tabled had gone on for years, back as far as 1978, and went on continuously during the period in which the Hon. Mrs Adamson was Minister of Health.

That came to an abrupt halt when we received the report of the external auditor in June 1983. We did not fix everything up at once. It is probably fair to say that things at the Lyell McEwin even now are not perfect, but we have diligently gone about the business of creating order where chaos existed previously. The fact that the officer who is being slurred by the former Attorney-General, the Hon. Mr Griffin, went in—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member did not name him, but everybody in the commission and in the health sector would know very well to whom he was referring.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It was not a slur.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: There is a slur, indeed. The honourable member is asking about an apparent conflict of interest concerning the Financial Director of the Central Sector being sent specifically and very quickly to fix up the mess at the Lyell McEwin Hospital in July 1983 and at the same time validating an amount for payment. There is no conflict of interest. Apropos of whether or not he is libelling the person—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I am not libelling him at all.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member should repeat his question outside the Council.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Would the honourable member be prepared to repeat that question in those terms outside the Council? It would be libellous if it were repeated outside, and the Hon. Mr Griffin comes in here, with his desperate colleagues, maliciously maligning senior officers of the Health Commission and making allegations that in other circumstances outside coward's castle would be libellous, and he is not prepared to repeat them outside. I rest my case.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: He can ask a supplementary question.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have the Hon. Mr Lucas on his feet.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: So am I. The Hon. Mr Griffin asked me a question. He asked me whether I was going to see the *News* and I think that I should reply.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is out of order. The Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, I do not know whether you heard me over the din from the Minister, but I will repeat myself. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yesterday I raised the matter of the doctored internal audit unit report that the Minister tabled in this Council last week. That document had been doctored in that all of the appendices containing critical allegations of financial mismanagement had been removed. The Minister, having been caught out, said, 'I did not remove the appendices.' However, he went on to admit, 'I did not see fit to table them,' referring to the appendices. The latter statement from the Minister clearly indicates that it was a deliberate decision of his to table a doctored document and keep that explosive information in those appendices from the public last week. That is the first example of two to which I want to refer of an attempted cover-up by the Minister. I am not referring on this occasion to officers.

The second example relates to the document, 'The internal memorandum to Professor G. Andrews, Chairman, Health Commission, entitled "Lyell McEwin Health Service—financial management problems"', signed by Mr McCoy, Executive Director, Central Sector.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Dr McCoy, if you don't mind.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He is not listed as 'doctor' on the bottom. The Minister can speak to him about that if he has incorrectly labelled himself. That is his problem, not mine. That memorandum was tabled by the Minister in this Council yesterday. The document, on page 2, states that the actions taken by the commission were as follows:

1. August 1983: secondment of Mr Lamberts full-time to the Lyell McEwin Health Service;
2. August/September 1983: secondment of Mr McCullough on a half-time basis to supervise the investigation.

Those dates, contained in that memorandum that was tabled by the Minister specifically indicate August for Mr Lamberts and August/September for Mr McCullough.

You will recall, Mr President, that yesterday the Minister, through his inexperience in the Council, was trapped into tabling his own file on this matter. Amongst the documents in that file, which are now publicly available, was a memo to the Minister from the same Mr McCoy.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Dr McCoy.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He is still referred to here as Mr McCoy. This memo was not tabled by the Minister in the Council yesterday. It is a four-page document, and I want to refer to one aspect of it that was not tabled by the Minister yesterday. On page 2 it says that in July 1983 Mr McCullough, Director, Administration and Finance, Central Sector, was seconded on a half-time basis for six weeks to assist the health service with financial management. In July also, Mr Lamberts, Finance Officer, was seconded to the health service to assist with bank account reconciliations.

That document, written by Mr McCoy, was entitled 'To the Hon. Minister of Health' and dated 22 August. Four days later—as I indicated, that document was not tabled by the Minister—we have a document from Mr or Dr McCoy on 26 August, not to the Minister now but to the Chairman of the Health Commission.

There are significant alterations in the timetables and the dates between the two memoranda. I will be asking the Minister why the memo of 22 August, which was sent personally to the Minister, was not tabled, and why was a new memo dated 26 August—to Mr Andrews and not to the Minister—tabled with altered dates? One might not be concerned about perhaps a month here and there; however, in July there was quite some action in relation to the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Health Commission. During that period, as was indicated in earlier questions, false returns were submitted to the Health Commission by the Lyell McEwin Hospital. On 25 July verbal advice was given by the Health Commission in relation to additional funding of $190 000. A letter dated 1 August from Mr McCulloch officially advised of that allocation.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Question!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The honourable member can call 'Question' if she likes, if she wants to hide it. It is clear, first, that a doctored document was tabled by the Minister last week (and he has admitted responsibility); and, secondly, now he will not table a document with a July 1983 date listed as to when the officers went into the Lyell McEwin. Then, he has tabled a document with the date altered to August/September to remove the officers from the critical July period. In those two instances it is clear that it is the Minister himself who has been involved in an attempted cover-up of this matter.

My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Does the Minister now accept full responsibility for tabling the doctored internal audit unit report of last week?

2. If not, if the Minister wants to share the blame with someone, will he advise the Council which ministerial or departmental officer removed the appendices to that internal audit report before it was tabled last week?

3. Will the Minister explain who altered the dates in the memos of 22 August from Dr McCoy to the Minister and in the final memo of 26 August to the Chairman of the Health Commission?

4. Did the Minister approve of the alteration of those critical dates in the memos?

5. What was the reason for the alteration of the dates in the two memos from Dr McCoy?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Lucas, in his perverted, personal pursuit of the Minister of Health, seems to be losing his reason.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He's also losing his manners.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: He has not had any manners for a long time, so at this stage he has little to lose. The Hon. Mr Lucas joins his colleagues opposite in making an absolute fool of himself. Quite frankly, to dignify those questions by attempting to specifically answer them is below my position. It is quite crazy in the extreme and reprehensible (if one takes the worst face) for the Hon. Mr Lucas to suggest that someone altered the dates. I have tabled all of the documents, of my own volition.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You haven't. You've been caught out.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The man is so foolish that I do not think I should waste the Council's time. However, while I am on my feet I make it clear that I have no intention of responding to the question, 'Who altered the dates?' I will not dignify that question with a response. It is a scurrilous allegation, and it is totally untrue.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It shows an ignorance of the way things operate. It also shows that the Hon. Mr Lucas, in his perverted, personal pursuit of me, has lost not only his reason but his honour, his decency and any trace of ethics that he ever had. I refer to the question of libel, as raised by the Hon. Mr Cameron a moment ago when he interjected and asked whether I intended to sue the *News*: most certainly not, because at this point I have not been libelled. I have not taken a legal opinion on it, and I have never initiated such opinion. The commission itself, and its senior officers (including the Chairman), believe that the Health Commission has been libelled. That is a matter of record.

Yesterday I tabled the Crown Solicitor's report in which Mr Selway, on behalf of the Crown Solicitor, states that he believes that the Health Commission has been seriously libelled. I understand that both the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission and a senior officer of the Crown Solicitor's Office have written to the afternoon newspaper seeking a retraction. In the event that a suitably, prominent retraction and explanation are not forthcoming, I am further informed that it is probable that legal action will commence. I make it crystal clear that, in the event that that happens and damages are awarded as a result of a libel action, they will not accrue to any individual whatsoever; they will go to consolidated revenue. No individual will benefit financially in any way from an action taken by the Health Commission against the *News*.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I really think that the Minister is replying to an interjection and not to the question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am indeed—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Although I have no jurisdiction over the way in which Ministers answer questions, I think the Minister has strayed from the question asked by the Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: You do have discretion and control over interjections, Mr President. As I have said, the innuendos contained in the questions are so scurrilous, disgraceful and disgusting that I do not intend to dignify them with specific replies.

ETSA TARIFFS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief—far too brief—explanation before asking the Minister of Labour, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about ETSA tariffs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It has been drawn to my attention that women's shelters in South Australia are not being charged domestic rates for electricity. I am sure that every-

one would be aware that each women's shelter functions very much as a household and that they contain a certain number of people. In fact, in many women's shelters two or perhaps three families share a building for which an electricity tariff is charged. Because they are single parent families, it does not mean that women's shelters contain very many more people than would be found in a domestic household. Domestic households are charged electricity on the M tariff, but apparently the Electricity Trust has decided that women's shelters should be charged electricity on the S tariff, which is the tariff applicable to boarding houses, hotels, motels, and other similar profit making institutions.

I understand that electricity charged on the M tariff is cheaper if consumption is less the 4 000 kilowatt hours. However, if consumption rise above 4 000 kilowatt hours during a consumption period the S tariff results in a cheaper account. Most of the institutions on S tariff consume far more than 4 000 kilowatt hours in each period, so it is to their advantage to be on the S tariff.

However, women's shelters do not consume anything like 4 000 kilowatt hours of electricity during each period of consumption and, as a consequence, would be charged much less if they were on M tariff. Putting such shelters on S tariff penalises them, forcing them to pay more for their electricity than comparable households throughout the State. I understand that the Gas Company does charge women's shelters—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw attention to the time. The honourable Minister of Health.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the hon. Miss Levy, who was denied the opportunity earlier, to conclude her question and receive an answer.

The PRESIDENT: Is the motion agreed to?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No.

The PRESIDENT: If there is a dissentient voice there will need to be a division. I did not hear such a voice, so will whoever called 'No' please indicate, and there will then be a division.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Mr President, clearly the Hon. Mr Lucas called 'No'.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Does the Minister wish to continue until someone is named, or does he want the division to take place?

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (14)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G.L. Bruce, J.C. Burdett, M.B. Cameron, B.A. Chatterton, J.R. Cornwall (teller), L.H. Davis, M.S. Feleppa, I. Gilfillan, K.T. Griffin, Anne Levy, K.L. Milne, R.J. Ritson, and Barbara Wiese.

Noes (3)—The Hons R.C. DeGaris, C.M. Hill, and R.I. Lucas (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—The Hons C.W. Creedon and C.J. Sumner. Noes—The Hons Peter Dunn and Diana Laidlaw.

Majority of 11 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Miss Levy.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Thank you, Mr President. I thank the Council for permission to finish my question. I think that I had reached the stage of pointing out to the Council that women's shelters are charged for electricity on the S tariff—the tariff used for large institutions such as hotels and motels. They are not able to use the M tariff, which is the normal domestic tariff charged to consumers in this State, even though their consumption is far more similar to that of domestic consumers than it is to large institutions such as hotels and motels.

I was also pointing out that the Gas Company, unlike the Electricity Trust, charges women's shelters the domestic rate.

I further acknowledge that the Minister has no power to direct ETSA in terms of tariffs, but I am sure that ETSA will listen carefully, should he recommend certain action to it, without of course being bound to follow his recommendations. Therefore, will the Minister use his good offices with ETSA to see whether it will consider allowing women's shelters to be charged their electricity on M tariff rather than S tariff in view of both the consumption patterns by women's shelters and the necessitous circumstances of all inhabitants of women's shelters, as this will ease the burden of electricity prices for women's shelters?

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

LISTENING DEVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Listening Devices Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In April this year at a drugs summit the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the States, including the South Australian Premier, indicated that they would co-operate to give State Police Forces power to tap telephones as a useful tool in the fight against drug traffickers. This was a major initiative to have come from this drugs summit.

Immediately after the announcement was made of the decision of the drugs summit, I indicated publicly that the Liberal Opposition would facilitate consideration of whatever legislation was necessary to allow telephone tapping by State police, subject to judicial supervision. The State Attorney-General was not so clear about the drugs summit and on 4 April 1985, when asked a question in the State Parliament, he indicated that he understood that the decision which had been announced by the Prime Minister was an 'in principle' decision but had to be referred to the Standing Committee of Attorney's-General for clarification and development. I remarked at the time that, if that was the position, the Prime Minister and Premier had misled the public into believing that the initiative was almost immediate.

In May, the State Attorney-General continued to be somewhat ambivalent about what the South Australian Government may do with respect to telephone tapping. On 15 May 1985 the Federal Attorney-General reiterated his Government's preparedness to allow State police to tap telephones in the fight against drug trafficking but indicated that at that time no State had applied for those powers to be granted to it. If a State applied for these powers, they would be granted.

On 16 May the State Attorney-General again refused to commit himself and the State Government to applying to the Commonwealth Government for telephone tapping powers for South Australia.

On the one hand, the Premier makes public statements about his earnest desire to fight drug trafficking, but, on the other hand, he has not done anything to request the power from the Commonwealth nor taken any other action to demonstrate that he is really serious about the police having this power. Surprisingly, there is no reference in the Governor's speech that the Government would apply to the Commonwealth for the power to tap telephones for South

Australian police or introduce legislation in this session to achieve that objective.

The problem is serious. In 1983-84 the total number of drug offences in South Austarlia reported to the police, or becoming known to them, increased by 37.6 per cent over the previous year; the rate per 100 000 of population increased from 371 in 1982-83 to 506 in 1983-84. In the area of selling drugs or possessing them for sale, there was an increase from 280 to 367 (or 31.07 per cent) from 1982-83 to 1983-84, and in making or cultivating drugs an incease in the same period of 53.55 per cent. The increase in offences of selling or possessing heroin for sale more than doubled from 11 to 26, a 136 per cent increase. Something has to be done now.

In view of the present Government's indecisive attitude and the desire of the Liberal Party to reflect community opposition towards this vicious activity of drug trafficking, I introduce this Bill to amend the Listening Devices Act. Obviously, when telephone tapping is exercised by State police, the power will have to be conferred specifically by the Commonwealth, but the amendment to this legislation puts State police in a position where they are able to exercise power to use listening devices upon the authority of a judicial warrant. Concurrently with this Bill being introduced, a notice of motion has been given so that Parliament can express its desire for the Commonwealth to grant powers to State police to tap telephones. This should overcome the State Government's reluctance to request this power.

Provision is made in the Bill for the use of listening devices during investigations into breaches of Commonwealth, Territory or other States' laws (as well as South Australian law) involving the importation, exportation, distribution, sale and possession or use of psychotropic drugs. This is particularly important because such offences go beyond State boundaries and frequently, if not always, involve the breach of the laws of the States, the Commonwealth and Territories. The Liberal Party proposes that the Attorney-General will periodically report to Parliament on the numbers of judicial warrants issued in order to ensure proper accountability. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 includes a definition of 'judge' and of 'prescribed offence'. 'Prescribed offence' is an offence against the law of the Commonwealth, or of a State or Territory relating to the importation, exportation, distribution, sale, possession or use of psychotropic drugs.

Clause 3 inserts a new section 7a which is in addition to existing provisions relating to the use of listening devices. Where there is reasonable cause to suspect the commission of a prescribed offence and there is a reasonable possibility that evidene of the commission of that suspected offence could be obtained by the use of a listening device, a judge may issue a warrant to a State police officer for that purpose.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATURAL GAS PRICES

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. K.L. Milne:

1. That a select committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon—
   (a) the current contractual agreements for the pricing of Cooper Basin gas sold to South Australia and New South Wales;
   (b) the desirability of establishing a single price formula giving rise to the same well-head price for gas sold ex Moomba to South Australia and New South Wales;
   (c) the role for Government action in the event of large price increases which are relevant to economic stability and growth in the State;
   (d) the determination of a price formula that adequately protects the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the South Australian Gas Company and other major gas consuming industries, present and future;
   (e) the Cooper Basin (Ratification) Act 1975 which covers the endorsement of the rights of the producers to enter into sales contracts and to report on the continuing obligations of the Government to preserve the agreements for the sale of natural gas endorsed by the Act;
   (f) the impact of Commonwealth powers over gas supplies and sales, natural gas being a petroleum product;
   (g) alternative sources of energy and methods of conserving energy; and
   (h) any other related matters.

2. That in the event of a select committee being appointed, it consist of six members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at four members and that Standing Order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the Chairman of the select committee to have a deliberative vote only.

3. That this Council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the Council.

(Continued from 21 August. Page 428.)

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In speaking to this motion which has been moved by the Hon. Mr Milne, I am sure the members of this Council are aware that the Hon. Mr Milne has demonstrated a considerable interest in matters associated with the price and supply of gas from the Cooper Basin to the Adelaide market. His concerns on this very important matter date back quite some time. I think I could honestly say that his interest in this matter in this place and the period of time over which he has been pursuing it have been exceeded only by the interest and concern of the Government.

Shortly after coming to office, my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy in another place recognised that a comprehensive assessment of the State's energy needs was required. He established the Advisory Committee on Future Electricity Generation Options which has subsequently become known as the Stewart committee. Among a number of other important matters, the Stewart committee was asked to consider the future availability and pricing of natural gas supplies to South Australia. It was also asked to consider other electricity generation options in the light of the desirability of reducing South Australia's dependence in the long term on natural gas as a fuel for generating electricity.

This later objective of the Stewart committee came from a longstanding concern about the extent of available reserves in the Cooper Basin and a very complex contractual situation which posed difficulties of a continuing nature in respect of gas supply and price. The Stewart committee handed down its main report in April 1984, and the Government immediately released that report. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Milne is well aware of it. This report included a substantial body of information on the question of gas supply and availability, and that information has of course been a matter of public record ever since that time. The problems were very clearly identified in the report.

At that time the Torrens Island power station was producing 81 per cent of the State's electricity using natural gas as a fuel. Securing an adequate supply of gas to ETSA at an acceptable price to obtain maximum economic utilisation of the Torrens Island power station was considered the most important factor in minimising the cost of electricity for the foreseeable future. It is a great pity, and something the consequences of which every South Austra-

lian has had to bear over the past three years, that the former Minister of Mines and Energy in another place during the last months of the previous Liberal Government did not recognise the importance of this fact when he signed what has become known as the infamous Goldsworthy agreement.

This agreement, which expires at the end of this year, raised the field gate price of natural gas by some 165 per cent. Let us never forget that Goldsworthy agreement and its role in the matter of gas and hence electricity prices. That contract, which was freely entered into by the previous Liberal Government, has proved to be one of its worst legacies and has been the single most important factor contributing to increases in electricity tariffs over the last three years. This Government has not only arrested those increases but also now, for the first time, has achieved a tariff cut.

The price problems created by the Goldsworthy agreement are compounded by the complex contractual situation which prevails. The Cooper Basin producers have gas contracts with both the Australian Gas Light Company to supply the Sydney market and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia to supply the Adelaide market. The current PASA contract expires in 1987 and, under the present arrangements, there is an order of priority for satisfying the two markets. Before PASA can be offered gas for its contract under the PASA Future Agreement commencing in 1988, the Australian Gas Light Company's requirements to the year 2006 must be determined as being available. I am sure that most members are aware of these contractual situations.

At the time that the Stewart committee reported, reserves based on a producers forecast for September 1984 inferred that under such arrangements there was only one to two years of full gas supply for PASA after 1987, with a partial supply for a number of years thereafter. That was a reserve situation which could not exactly be described as being satisfactory. In addition, the Stewart committee identified certain deficiencies in the PASA Future Requirements Agreement as far as this State is concerned. In particular (and I would like to quote from the report), it states:

> Contains clauses which now make it virtually impossible for ETSA to plan for the future use of such gas for electricity generation and in particular for base load power. These clauses, originally designed to protect the reasonable interests of both the producers and PASA, now disadvantage South Australian consumers.

Under the contract, PASA is required to give first right of supply of gas to the Cooper Basin producers, yet the producers can offer gas in small volumes throughout the contract without providing long-term lead time advice on supply, with PASA being required to take a minimum of 80 per cent of the annual contract quantity of 100 petajoules if it is available. This makes planning very difficult and entering into alternative supply arrangements, if gas is not available for a period, commercially very risky.

In addition, PASA is required to accept gas offered at a price up to 10 per cent above that of fuel oil, subject to price arbitration. This is an indication of how a contract can become outdated, when one recognises that Torrens Island was originally planned as an oil-fired station and that 10 per cent above fuel oil was a reasonable price ceiling, pre-OPEC.

The Stewart committee also considered three main possibilities for dealing with the question of supply. These were, first, to implement a gas-sharing arrangement with AGL; secondly, to obtain supply from the Queensland section of the Cooper Basin; and, thirdly, to build a major new pipeline and obtain supply from Bass Strait. Naturally, all these possibilities or any one of them would require some revision of the existing contractual arrangements.

The Stewart committee concluded that all these options should be pursued. It recommended gas sharing, renegotiation of the PASA Future Requirements Agreement and seeking alternative sources of supply. In the event that a satisfactory solution might not be achieved from amongst these options, the Stewart committee recommended that planning proceed for the partial conversion of Torrens Island to black coal so that it could be implemented in the shortest possible time if that became necessary.

The Government accepted the recommendations of the Stewart committee not only on gas but on important developments such as interconnection with the Victorian and New South Wales electricity grids and the development of a new local coalfield. The Minister of Mines and Energy in another place established the Future Energy Action Committee to oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the Stewart committee. The Government's success in these initiatives, with the signing of the interconnection agreement in February and the announcement of the proposed joint venture on Sedan and Lochiel between ETSA and CSR last month, is a matter of public record.

The Future Energy Action Committee has had the carriage of the gas negotiations not only with South Australian producers on the renegotiation of the PASA Future Requirements Agreement but with producers in south-west Queensland and Esso/BHP in respect of the possible sourcing of gas from Bass Strait. These negotiations have apparently now moved to a higher level. I understand that the Government, quite rightly, has no intention of discussing any of the details publicly while the negotiations are in progress.

I am sure all honourable members will appreciate that that is simply not the way one conducts a complicated and important commercial negotiation between two parties as a matter of good faith. It is apparent that, with the preparation and release of the Stewart report, the Government has approached this very difficult problem in a planned and logical manner and put all the facts before the public. The Government is obviously strenuously addressing the major problems at this time.

The Hon. Mr Milne has incorporated a number of ancillary matters in his motion which are also of great importance. As I would like to discuss these matters at another time, I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FOREST RESERVE

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. J.C. Burdett:

That the proclamation under the Foresty Act, 1950, concerning resumption of forest reserve, Section 665, Hundred of Adelaide, County of Adelaide, made on 16 May 1985 and laid on the table of this Council on 6 August 1985, be disallowed.

(Continued from 14 August. Page 250.)

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I oppose this motion. On going through the material and looking at what has been presented to the Parliament, it would appear that there is a fair amount of confusion by Opposition members because it is certainly becoming a political issue amoungst them.

The reasons for the resumption of this forest reserve are quite clear and have been stressed by the Minister in his statements on the matter. There are three main reasons: first, that the forest operations on this land are not economic; secondly, that the area is small and is isolated from major forestry areas and, therefore, it is difficult logistically to be managed by the Woods and Forests Department for any other purpose; and, thirdly, that the area is now surrounded by urban development and is unsuitable for any forest operations because of the inherent fire risk.

The Hon. Mr Burdett seemed quite confused over this problem. The question of whether the land remains as a forest reserve has little to do with the Government's attempts to determine an acceptable future for the land. In fact, the Hon. Mr Burdett seems to have had a very hazy briefing on it. He indicated that the Hon. Mr Brown had gone through the exercise and seemed to be part of an attempt in the other place to discredit Mr S.G. Evans. Mr Evans has, for many months, been pursuing this issue long before the Hon. Mr Brown was involved in it. In fact when Mr Abbott became Minister, Mr Evans raised this matter with him. From correspondence before me, I see that this matter has been raised over a period of many months and indicates the deep concern of Mr Evans for the area and the people in it. On 14 August Mr Evans wrote to the Minister (Hon. R.K. Abbott) stating:

Dear Mr Minister,

On Monday 12 August at a very large pubic meeting of concerned Hawthorndene citizens I was requested to make the following points to you.

The meeting strongly supported the view that to remove any of the pines from the Blackwood forest before a committee reported on the future use of the land was unacceptable.

It was stressed in the strongest terms that the community could not accept having the trees removed, not knowing the future use of the land.

The senior local fire officer reported to the meeting giving an indication some fire fuel other than growing trees could be removed from the area to make it less of a fire risk.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: The Hon. Mr Abbott, in his ministerial statement, said the trees would be removed.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: No, he did not. I will quote the ministerial statement in a few minutes. The letter continues:

In fact the mood of the meeting was such that there was anger that proper fire care had not been carried out before.

I must mention to you that the community gave a clear indication that they are prepared to cooperate in considering the land's future. Of course, there are at present a wide divergence of views from some wanting the trees to stay to some asking that they be removed.

I am positive if any of the trees are removed before a representative committee is formed and has had a chance to report that the climate will develop to one of hostility.

So please could you give me a quick and clear answer to the community request that all the matters related to the Blackwood forest including the issue of the pines be left to your joint commitee?

The reply states:

Dear Mr Evans,

In reply to your letter . . . concerning the Woods and Forests Reserve at Blackwood, I refer to my ministerial statement made in the Lower House on 6 August 1985, and provide the following information.

The Woods and Forests Department has established that:

- forest growth on this site was uneconomic;
- there are substantial problems associated with forest protection due to its urban location.

As a result that department has deemed the property to be surplus to its requirements and has taken action for its resumption as a forest reserve.

Both the Woods and Forests Department and the Country Fire Service have identified the high fire hazard which this land in its present state represents to the surrounding urban development.

As the agency that deals with the disposal of surplus Government property, the Department of Lands has catalogued the community and other interests (including the possible establishment of an independent school) which have been expressed in the property and has nominated various options—purchase for open space by Council or multipurpose development—for its future use.

Having regard to all of the foregoing advice and information, I have requested the Department of Lands to liaise with the City of Mitcham in setting up a small committee to investigate and report on the various options for the future use of the land. The committee is to comprise representatives of the Mitcham council, departmental officers (Lands and Environment and Planning) and strong representation from community interests.

In reply to your further letter of 14 August 1985 I am prepared to delay the clearance of the pine trees.

If that is an indication from the Minister that the trees are going to be cleared, as the Hon. Mr Burdett interjected, I cannot see where he is getting his facts from. The reply continues:

As such deferment may leave the pine trees in situ during the coming summer period depending upon the speed with which the committee works it would be appreciated if you would contact the senior spokesperson for the community and request that he contact the Director of Lands to discuss the formation of the committee.

A notice, marked for the attention of Tony Cole and addressed to the Director, Woods and Forests Department, dated 15 August, states:

Dear Sir,

re Blackwood Forest Reserve

As you are aware the Department of Lands has commenced the disposal process in respect of the above land.

In accordance with undertakings given by the Minister of Lands a committee comprising local government and departmental officers together with community representation will consider the future use of the land and report to the Minister.

As this activity may take some months it is requested that the Woods and Forests Department continue its maintenance and fire protection procedures over the land until such time as it has been disposed of or transferred to alternative management.

Your cooperation in this matter will be appreciated.

It seems that the trees are not to be cleared at this stage and there is an ongoing thing. The local member, Mr Stan Evans, has been involved in this issue since early this year and has been in continuous contact with both the previous and the present Ministers of Lands. That is indicated by those recent letters that I read. The mechanism for community consultation on the future use of this land was agreed by the Minister and Mr Evans well before the Hon. Mr Brown and the Hon. Mr Burdett in this place arrived on the scene.

The Hon. Mr Brown has quite a reputation as a claim jumper, and apparently the Hon. Mr Burdett supports this. There is some confusion in the suburb as to who exactly is the member up there. In the local paper the Hon. Dean Brown is making capital and advertising himself very profusely in the area as 'Dean Brown, MP'. Alongside him, Mr Stan Evans is also advertising very profusely in the area as the member representing the area. There is evidently quite a deal of political lobbying going on in the area. The Hon. Mr Brown is just getting in on a matter that Mr Evans has pursued very arduously and continuously for some months.

Correspondence from the member for Fisher, Mr Evans, in June asked for assurances of community consultations and the setting up of a committee. Several meetings since then have agreed to that course of action. Public meetings had been called by Mr Evans to discuss these matters. Even here, the Hon. Mr Burdett has been badly briefed and has misquoted the resolution passed by those meetings. The meeting on 12 August resolved not simply that the pine trees should not be removed, but that no pine trees should be removed until a representative committee was appointed and could report on this issue. The Government readily agreed to defer any clearance of trees until such a report had been completed.

Since the public meeting on 12 August there have been subsequent meetings of a subgroup to nominate a group of about 11 people to work on the review committee along with the representatives from Mitcham council and the Departments of Lands and Environment and Planning. This group will start work soon so that a strategy can be developed on the future of the pines because of the fire danger that they constitute in their present condition. Fire danger is an important question, and action is needed before the end of spring so that the area can be made safe for the coming summer. In fact, intense community reaction about fire danger was the reason why the planting of the pines

ceased after the initial area of 3.5 hectares was planted in 1971.

The Government, in conjunction with the local member (Mr Evans), the Mitcham council and representatives of the local community, will report on the future use of the land. Even when this review process is completed, there will be further chance for community involvement because of the Planning Act requirements for any change from its present zoning of special uses. The current cooperation between all parties involved in determining the future of this land is not in any way aided by the motion that the Hon. Mr Burdett has put to this Council.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: I have not got a motion.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: The honourable member has a motion for disallowance of the proclamation. In fact, his motion would have the opposite effect. If the resumption of this land as a forest reserve is disallowed the land will remain under the control of the Woods and Forests Department. Having determined that the current growth is uneconomic, the department would be obliged to harvest the plantation as it stands to cut its losses, to gain what revenue is available from the present timber and to reduce the severe fire risk for which the department could be held responsible.

If the motion of the Hon. Mr Burdett is agreed to, it will be a clear indication that this Council wishes the Blackwood land to remain under the control of the Department of Woods and Forests, with all that that entails. To meet its responsibility, the department would have to harvest the pine plantation and deal with the land in ways that would preclude the present level of public consultation.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: The committee could then operate.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: It can still operate, and it can now if this proclamation goes through.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: No, it will not make any difference, because the Minister has already given the assurance that there will be no use or change of use of that land until the committee has reported. It will not operate under the Department of Woods and Forests: it will have to go out of that department. If it stays with the department, it will have to be operated as a pine plantation.

Of the 11 members on the committee that has been formed and asked to give an opinion, the first two are community members; the third is an independent secondary school teacher; the fourth is a Catholic primary school teacher; the next is a community member, a landscape architect and husband town planner; the next is a community member, with special interests in recreational horseriding; the next two are community members; the next is a community member and coordinator of a group; the next is a community member who is involved with the CFS; and the other lives near the area and is a councillor for an adjacent ward. So the involvement of that committee takes into consideration all points of view from that area.

If this proclamation is disallowed, as the Hon. Mr Burdett seeks, it would mean that this Council has given a clear expression that this House of Parliament does not want this to proceed and be proclaimed.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: At this time.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: At this time, but—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: It does not matter. Eventually, it will have to be proclaimed for the committee to be able to do anything with it. We are saying that if this proclamation goes through it should not jeopardise in any way whatsoever the citizens' rights in the area to get together and—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: The Minister has given an assurance already in the letter to Mr Evans. Mr Evans is happy with the assurances. He has helped form this committee, which is prepared to negotiate on the use of the land.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Burdett can reply to all of this when he has the opportunity.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: The Government sees no problem whatever with this proclamation going through in its present form. In fact, it considers that the community involvement is vital if the proper use of the land is to be maintained after it comes out of the Woods and Forests Department. The motion moved by the Hon. Mr Burdett is premature and not necessary. It could give a false impression that this land will stay as forest land, which is not its intent and is not even what the public in the area wants. I ask the Council to support the Government and to oppose the motion.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I remind the Council that this Bill is in many ways substantially similar to a Bill which was introduced in the last session and which lapsed. Its main aims are still principally the same. However, there is some rather appropriate relevance to it currently because the report, 'Bushfire Prevention and Electricity Distribution', which has been tabled and is available (the chairman of the group was Keith Lewis), has made some specific recommendations for changes in the Act. It reflects to a large extent the concern of everybody in South Australia for ETSA to have the proper access to make its lines safe, but to do so in a proper manner, and generally to regulate for that. The recommendations in this report will be significant as regards proper legislation for the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

Therefore, it is significant that two of the major recommendations in the report are already contained in the Bill. The first is that the trust have the right to remove vegetation (tree lopping, as it is sometimes called) to ensure the safety of wires and cables. That is covered in new section 41 (1) *(c)*. The second important recommendation allows the trust to disconnect power in circumstances where it is likely to be a danger, particularly in relation to fire. That is also dealt with in new section 41 (4), which gives the trust power to actually disconnect, discontinue or interrupt the supply of electricity where appropriate. I think that that is a good start.

There are several other suggestions in the report which could be adapted as amendments to the Bill and possibly developed as regulations. I urge the Council and the Government to regard the Bill as a very appropriate vehicle to bring in as rapidly as possible the recommendations contained in the report. I think it is essential that the recommendations are incorporated in legislation and are implemented before the next fire season. Unfortunately, as often happens, the very good work of reports can be stalled and put on the backburner at certain times, particularly when an election is in the wind. I urge the Government to take the Bill very seriously, in particular at this moment from that point of view. I am sure that I would have received a clearer indication of the Government's view if

the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne) had not been suffering so unfortunately from a long and protracted illness.

I urge the Government to take this Bill seriously because it is a substantial improvement on the way that the Electricity Trust could be managed and run in South Australia. I had one other cause to look at tree lopping as it affects other legislation before us, and I refer to the Native Vegetation Management Bill. I have been advised by the Parliamentary Library, following consultations this morning, that clause 20 of the native vegetation legislation allows for exemptions in prescribed circumstances. I have been advised that draft regulations will specifically exempt ETSA. The advice from the Parliamentary Library states:

> The regulations, made pursuant to clause 20 of the Bill, contain a number of exemptions. The two which are relevant to ETSA read as follows:
> - where clearance is incidental to building, repair or maintenance work of the Crown or the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
> - where the purpose of clearance is to prevent or reduce the risk of personal injury or damage to property where the nature and extent of the clearance is reasonable.
>
> It would thus appear that ETSA will not be obliged to comply with the provisions of the Native Vegetation Management Bill, provided its activities fall within either of the categories above, that is, clearance incidental to building, repair or maintenance work, or reasonable clearance for the purpose of reducing risk of damage to person or property.

I am not happy with that, although I realise that it is still in draft form. I do not believe that there should be any exemptions other than the most essential exemptions from the provisions of the Native Vegetation Management Bill after so much work has gone into such an important piece of legislation.

I can see no reason why ETSA should not comply. It will have plenty of time and opportunity to comply with reasonable requirements in the Native Vegetation Management Bill. Those members deliberating on that Bill will realise that it contains specific reasons and purposes whereby ETSA can seek permission. I do not doubt for a minute that ETSA will be treated very sympathetically and encouraged to do any important work. I think it is very dangerous to create the precedent that any group or authority should be given an automatic exemption from the provisions of the native vegetation legislation.

I will deal quickly with the Bill in detail because I doubt that honourable members would recall its major thrusts. As I have said, much of the detail in the Bill involves consolidation of other Acts. The Bill now before the Council has been arrived at following quite lengthy informal consultations with ETSA. I am very grateful to ETSA, which has made its personnel available to me for discussions, and it has also entered into quite detailed correspondence on several points. Much of the Bill comprises good legislative housekeeping for ETSA, at ETSA's behest.

A significant provision of the Bill is the retiring age of 65 years for members of the board. I remind honourable members of a substantial change to place the trust under the direction and control of the Minister. There are substantial additions to the functions to give the option of using naturally occurring energy sources for the generation of electricity, plus the opportunity for ETSA 'to encourage consumers to use electricity efficiently'. Quite obviously, that embraces conservation. Those members who will be looking at the Bill in some detail will note that it contains additions to my earlier Bill introduced in the previous session. The first is the addition of new section 36 (2) *(e)* and (3).

The Hon. K.L. Milne: What do they say?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: They add extra power, at ETSA's request. New section 36 (2) *(e)* provides:

> Do any other act or thing that is necessary for, or incidental to, the efficient discharge of its functions.

ETSA requested that provision so that it would have full authority in relation to the provision of electricity to consumers in South Australia. New section 36 (3) extends the ability for the trust to lend money, provide financial accommodation, borrow money and delegate any of its powers or functions to any person. I believe that those provisions will make it easier for ETSA to do its job with confidence.

New section 38 (1) deals with the fixing of terms and conditions by way of discrimination between consumers, as follows:

> Except to the extent authorised by this or any other Act the trust shall not, when fixing the terms and conditions on which it will supply electricity to a person, discriminate against that person in relation to any other person supplied in similar circumstances.

During the Committee stage I intend to amend that to insert the word 'unfairly', so that it will read 'unfairly discriminate'. That amendment is on the advice of Parliamentary Counsel and at the request of ETSA. New section 38 (2) contains specific wording to allow ETSA to provide power to a consumer through transformers which may be placed on another consumer's property.

It may sound like technical detail, but ETSA has persuaded me that it has problems and that it would be a lot simpler if this were clearly spelt out in the Bill. New section 39 (2) states:

> The trust may, with the consent of the authority in which the control or management of the street or road is vested, erect poles (or other structures) and lights for the purpose of lighting the street or road.

The Bill also inserts a new section 40 in the Act in relation to the removal of wires and cables from properties. This clause provides ETSA with more security, because its apparatus cannot be interfered with. Also, the owner may require ETSA to remove wires, cables, conduits or apparatus after paying the trust the cost of removal and the relocation of those wires and cables. The other two significant points relate not so much to clauses in the Bill but to my intention during the Committee stage to further implement the report on bushfire prevention in connection with electricity distribution and possibly to give this regulatory power. However, that has not been developed sufficiently at this stage to present it to the Council. The cooperation I have received from ETSA indicates that it considers most of the material in this Bill long overdue. From that point of view I believe that substantial parts of the Bill should be accepted by this Council without dispute.

There are significant reforms in the Bill. One major reform places ETSA under the control and direction of the Minister. There have been experiences in other States that are relevant. It was mentioned in the New South Wales Parliament, when a similar matter was being discussed, that there is a belief that electricity planning and supply is the work of engineers and technical experts. I believe that that is a short-sighted and deficient description of what should be the planning and distribution of electricity in today's circumstances. The New South Wales Government substantially questioned that approach, and has the following section in its Act controlling the electricity authority:

> In the exercise and discharge of its powers, authorities, duties and functions, the commission shall be subject in all respects to the control and direction of the Minister.

Honourable members will recognise that that is almost identical to the clause in the Bill before us dealing with control.

One of the reasons why I believe it is important that there be substantial and clear sighted thinking given to the role of ETSA and to the encouragement of conservation in the use of electricity is that the conflict between conservation and promotion of use seems to crop up with remarkable regularity. In New South Wales an anomaly appeared when

they were funding a campaign for conservation of electricity while at the same time the commission was funding a promotion for greater use of what it described as a 'cheap and abundant resource', so there is this dichotomy between the motive to conserve and the motive to use power.

One of the pressures causing promotion to use is the fact that many States of Australia now have an over-capacity to produce electricity and are embarrassed by that situation. This is a result of inaccurate forward planning some years back and a gung ho enthusiasm to put millions of dollars into new power stations. This is now backfiring, leaving the embarrassing dilemma of over-production of electricity.

In Victoria the Minister (Hon. Robert Fordham) in charge of energy and its use is urging increased efficiency of electricity production, distribution and use. It is the key word 'efficiency' which is in the Bill and which is the word that can so effectively be used to pressure for conservation in the use of electricity and for cost-conscious and resource conscious production. In Victoria it has developed to the point of an energy action group promoting conservation and wiser use of electricity; it is being funded by the State Government and the Victorian Electricity Authority.

I believe that there is scope in all of the electricity commissions throughout Australia for the Federal Government to provide a coordinating umbrella, organisation or structure, not so much to control but to allow for interstate discussion of particular energy needs and to help work out ways of cooperation. It seems quite fatuous that we have a cut-throat competition between the States about the use and provision of power. I do not believe that anyone benefits in the long run in such circumstances.

So far as the Minister having control is concerned, it is quite apparent to anyone observing what happens to ETSA and its tariffs in South Australia that there is substantial Government control of ETSA now. I think it is a very thin front that is put forward portraying ETSA as a separate and autonomous entity. There is no doubt that, whether the Minister or the Government has control of ETSA from day to day, it is the control of tariffs and the taxes and charges imposed on ETSA that really determines the macro control and direction of ETSA.

I believe that the clause in the Bill to formalise such a situation would result in little alteration to the way in which ETSA is currently managed. I have statistics showing State Government taxes and charges relevant to this matter, so honourable members will be able to see how significantly the Government benefits financially through taxes and charges on ETSA. On the other side of the coin, the Government also has the ability to control tariffs.

I have the figures for State Government taxes and charges imposed on ETSA for the years 1981-82, 1982-83 and 1983-84 respectively, as follows:

Item	1981-82 $'000	1982-83 $'000	1983-84 $'000
State levy (5 per cent of income)	14 810	20 366	22 366
Payroll tax	4 854	5 708	6 101
Land tax	414	443	488
Coal royalties	573	573	508
Stamp duty	694	240	237
Vehicle registration	156	175	187
F.I.D.	—	—	72
Additional charges on Treasury loans	—	—	8 800
Guarantee fee on borrowings	—	—	3 454
Totals	21 501	27 505	42 213

This is described officially as 'an increase in interest to current market rates'. Actually it is a unilateral abrogation of an agreement under which ETSA had borrowed from the State Treasury funds which were part of Commonwealth loans to the State, and it agreed to pay the Treasury interest at a rate .5 per cent higher than that which the State was paying the Commonwealth.

As there had been no increase in the rate being charged on these moneys by the Commonwealth, the increase applied by Treasury was a direct tax on ETSA. The guaranteed fee on borrowings was an additional $3.454 million in 1983-84. In summary, the totals of those taxes were:

Year	Amount $
1981-82	21.501 million
1982-83	27.505 million
1983-84	42.213 million
1984-85	not available

I highlight the increase in 1983-84 and, because I cannot get 1984-85 figures, it is impossible to give an estimate of the situation. All honourable members would know that ETSA had a very substantial deficit of nearly $8 million in 1983-84 because of the squeeze on the tariff not allowing ETSA to cover its costs.

I estimate that there will still be a deficit for 1984-85 of marginally less than the $8 million of 1983-84 (we do not know), but it is almost certain that there will be a massive deficit again in 1985-86—probably about $8 million because of undertakings by the Government that tariffs will be kept at a certain level. There may be good reasons for tariffs to be kept at a certain level, provided that it is done on a deliberate basis with a full awareness that the deficit will need to be covered sooner or later. Someone has to pay for the fact that we are having cheaper power in the next 12 months and the 12 months after that and that we have had cheaper power over the past 12 months.

Apart from that point, the real issue is that the Government has substantial control over both ends of the ETSA budget. It pushes up the charges and taxes so that they take a bigger grab from it and then keep down tariffs so that ETSA cannot recoup. It is sensible to recognise the control that a Government has over ETSA and to provide in the Bill that it has it.

The final point I would like to make in detail concerns the clause dealing with tariffs, because it is an interesting concept. There is a two-part tariff. New section 42b provides:

(1) Amounts charged for the supply of electricity under this Act shall consist of—

(a) a rent in respect of wires, cables, conduits and apparatus used to supply the electricity; and

(b) a charge based on the quantity of electricity supplied.

I want to give some justification for that, because it is a very significant provision of the Bill and a significant development that must take place in the way in which South Australian consumers are charged for electricity if we are to have any rational use of it. I am encouraged to do this because ETSA itself has recognised this principle of a two level tariff in the document 'Energy Management Manual',

which it has developed and promoted. This excellent work recommends ways of conservation and more efficient use of power. In chapter 6 is the section 'Maximum demand tariff', which states:

A maximum demand tariff is divided into two charges:

- a maximum demand charge based on the maximum demand in kW for the period of the account (usually a month) as measured on a maximum demand meter
- and an energy charge based on the energy consumed in kWh for the account period.

When a maximum demand tariff is in operation every effort should be made to reduce and control maximum demand. This can be done manually, or by automatic microprocessor control. A simple alarm which sounds when the maximum demand exceeds a certain limit so that non-essential plant can be switched off is useful for a non-automatic system.

There is already in ETSA's own documentation a clear recommendation of this two part tariff. I would like to justify even more strongly the question of the two part tariff, and I apologise to the Council if it takes a little time. However, it is so important because, if we are to have reasonably priced power in South Australia, it is essential that it be offered to consumers in a way that encourages conservation and not flagrant waste and misuse.

The capital cost of large power stations is enormous. Because electricity cannot be stored, these stations are required to meet peak demand even though that peak may be reached only occasionally. It is the high cost of new power stations, together with the high cost of capital interest rates which lie at the core of the increasing cost of electricity. To provide one watt of new generating capacity cost ETSA between $1 and $1.50. Consider the owner of a new home contemplating the purchase of a cooking stove, a totally new stove causing new consumption. Gas or electric stoves cost much the same to the consumer but the electric stove may use electricity at a rate up to 8 000 watts. If the home-owner purchases an electric stove, he will not pay the $8 000 to $12 000 which will be needed to purchase the generating equipment needed to generate the electricity that his stove will consume. No such heavy capital demanding infrastructure lies behind the purchase of a gas stove. One can imagine which stove the customer would buy if he had to pay the total capital cost associated with a choice for an electric stove. That would be whatever the price the stove was plus the capital cost of $8 000 to $12 000. But instead, at present, the largest part of the cost is not borne by the customer at the time of purchase, but is spread on to all electricity consumers so increasing the price to all. Twenty per cent of all electricity used in South Australia is used for cooking; plus a percentage used for water heating. So, it is a significant part of our electricity requirement. As already indicated, using electricity for these purposes neccessarily wastes two-thirds of the energy in the gas used to generate the electricity, because gas is used to produce about 80 per cent of South Australian electricity. It is far more efficient that it be used directly for heating. Using gas would save the capital cost. Incidentally, about two-thirds of the energy in the gas is usefully employed compared to only one-third in the case of electricity.

One of the reasons why solar hot water systems are not more widely used is obviously that those who have electric hot water systems do not have to pay for the capital cost of the power generating equipment which, in the case of a hot water system, could be $3 000 to $4 500. So, the whole point of this tariff adjustments is to recognise that we are not paying for the cost of producing electricity for all the appliances when we pay the price in the shop.

In fact, all the other consumers of South Australia are subsidising it. It is very unfortunate that this is not reflected in some way or another, because I believe that it would entice many people to be much more selective in the appliances that they buy. There should be much accurate recognition of the actual performance of electrical equipment and some acknowledgement of the increased loading on a house in a total peak demand that results from purchasing that equipment.

If this recommended method of charging the two-level tariff is applied, the encouragement for householders and industry to keep down their peak loading will be very significant in a financial way. That will reduce the pressure for increased power stations to be constructed in South Australia, and it is common and easily understood logic that that would automatically spill back into cheaper rates for all consumers in South Australia, as well as show some sensible responsibility for the use of a non-renewable source, either gas or coal.

I recommend the Bill to the Council for its earnest consideration. I indicate that I hope to move minor amendments in Committee; that I will be inviting amendments from ETSA; and that I hope to have those amendments ready to introduce in Committee. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals the Electric Supply Company's Acts, 1897 to 1931. Clause 3 limits the aggregate of the periods that future members of the Trust may hold office to nine years. Clause 4 requires a member to retire on attaining the age of 65 years. Paragraph *(b)* inserts a transitional provision that excludes current members of the trust from this requirement.

Clause 5 makes the Trust subject to the direction and control of the Minister administering the principal Act. Clause 6 repeals subsection (2) of section 22. Clause 7 repeals Part III of the principal Act. This Part provided for the transfer of the undertaking of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company Limited to the Trust and for related matters. The Part does not have a continuing operation and may be safely removed.

Clause 8 replaces section 36 to 42a of the principal Act with new sections that comprehend the substance of those removed and the substance of The Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Acts 1897 to 1931 which were incorporated into the principal Act by section 36. New section 36 sets out the functions and powers of the trust. Section 37 provides a power of compulsory acquisition. Section 38 is a prohibition against discrimination by the trust. However, subsection (2) allows discrimination to the extent set out in that subsection. Section 39 sets out powers of the trust in relation to the installation of wires, cables, etc. and lights in streets and roads. Section 40 makes provisions relating to the removal of wires, cables, etc., from land. Section 41 sets out powers of inspection. Section 42 makes it an offence to divert electricity. Section 42a constitutes certain offences. Section 42b sets out the basis for charging for electricity.

Clause 9 amends section 43 to enable the trust to make grants of money under this section for certain purposes. Clause 10 provides for summary offences.

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

HISTORIC STABLES

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I move:

That this Council condemn the Deputy Premier's decision to secretly destroy the historic stables at Yatala Labour Prison which is contrary to recent written assurances given to interested parties

by the Deputy Premier and which also ignores the fact these stables were on the Register of the National Estate and the State Heritage Register.

In 1986 South Australia will celebrate its jubilee. It is a time when we can remember with gratitude the foresight of Colonel Light, who laid out this city, and when the people of Adelaide can reflect on the heritage of the City of Adelaide. It is also a time when the many country communities can indulge in remembering their rich past. It is a time, fortunately, when people become conscious of their heritage.

However, the heritage that is South Australia's should be revered not only in a jubilee year. It is important that this community understands that heritage, once demolished, cannot be recreated. This Labor Government, which launched its environmental policy in the vineyards at The Grange just seven kilometres to the east of Adelaide, and then presided quite happily over the destruction of those historic vineyards, has a lot to answer for when it comes to matters of heritage.

The motion on the Notice Paper today completes a triella of sad events in the heritage area. We have the undignified spectacle of a Government having boasted that it would save The Grange vineyards, through launching its policy in those vineyards, and then allowing the destruction of the vineyards. Then we have Yatala A Division, the Rolls Royce of colonial buildings, the largest colonial building in Adelaide, and certainly one which was admired by all people with any knowledge of quality and history in colonial buildings in South Australia. It was destroyed in February 1984.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: It may well be, as the Hon. Mr Bruce interjects, a building that not many of us got to see. However, that is not the point. It was a fine building and it was destroyed. In fact, the cost of destruction was more than the cost that would have been involved in securing the building from the elements. Now we have the third aspect in this triella of heritage tragedies, that is, the secret destruction of the historic stables at Yatala Labour Prison.

These stables are described as newer stables. They were built by prisoners in 1874 in stone with brick quoins and a hip roof. The stables had a colourful history. They housed troopers and horses in the early days, and more latterly they have been used for the storage of old machines and other equipment. However, contrary to all the advice that the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood) gave to the Enfield and Districts Historical Society, which had a particular interest in the preservation of those stables, the stables came down in mid August in secret.

I will now read a letter from the Hon. Dr Hopgood in response to Mrs M.A. Thorndike, Secretary of the Enfield and Districts Historical Society, who had written inquiring as to the future of the stables at Yatala. In a letter dated 16 November 1984, the Hon. Dr Hopgood stated:

Dear Mrs Thorndike,

Thank you for your letter of 24 October 1984 regarding the old stable at Yatala. As you are probably aware, it is the intention of the Department of Correctional Services to create a wide security area completely around the perimeter of the gaol. It has been agreed with that department that the old stable shall remain, and security measures have been designed to allow this to happen.

The old stable will shortly be made safe, both from the weather and to ensure that it does not become a security risk. Essential restoration work will be carried out, particularly to the exterior of the building, and will include repairs to the roof, repointing of the stonework and the repainting of the timber work.

This work will certainly ensure that the stables are retained in good order, and will be not lost to the City of Enfield. Thank you for your society's concern in this matter.

Yours sincerely, Don Hopgood, Minister for Environment and Planning.

There is nothing ambiguous about that. It was an unqualified statement of support for the Enfield and Districts Historical Society's concern for the preservation of those stables.

One should have remembered that we were dealing not only with a person who is now Deputy Premier but also a person whose integrity in heritage matters had been made at least suspect when one goes back to the debate on the Yatala A Division debacle. Dr Hopgood privately, in discussion with members of the Enfield and Districts Historical Society, and again in public, admitted that when the Yatala A Division decision was taken, the Cabinet had requested that he delist Yatala A Division before demolition, remembering that Yatala A Division was on the State Heritage List and on the register of the national estate, as indeed were the stables.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Perhaps the Hon. Dr Hopgood did not know that it came down.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I think he did. The Hon. Dr Hopgood said that although Cabinet had requested he delist Yatala A Division before demolition, he had advised against this, because to have done so would have been to deny Yatala A Division's heritage value. So they delisted the building only out of respect to its heritage value once it had been demolished. What an incredible pantomime that was. Of course, we had a similar exercise in this latest fiasco.

I was dismayed that the newer stables were demolished. I was told by someone in a position to know that he had heard on good authority that these stables were to be demolished. I contacted a member of the Enfield and Districts Historical Society and mentioned this point. I made my own inquiries with people who should have known about this. There was a veil of secrecy on the matter; denials were made that anything was happening; people did not know about it. So, in secret, these stables were destroyed. The lack of candour and integrity about the Government's handling of this matter is what distresses me most. In November 1984, and again to some people at least verbally this year, the Government gave a firm commitment that the stables were not a security problem, that they would be maintained and made secure. However, they were destroyed.

The newer stables are located on the northern side of the Northfield Security Hospital between the outer perimeter fence and the main prison wall in what is euphemistically described as the 'sterile zone'. On any diagram it is not near the main security area where prisoners are held. I cannot accept the argument that it was necessary to knock it down for security reasons. I would have thought that technology had advanced to the point where it could have been made safe and would not have jeopardised security. The only argument advanced by the Minister in defence of his position appeared in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 17 August, as follows:

Dr Hopgood said there had been concern that the stable could have been used as a refuge area if a prisoner had got over the main wall and into the 'sterile zone'.

I do not accept that as an argument. I do not believe that there was no way around the security problem which is alleged to have been the reason for the demolition. Certainly, it is true that the Public Works Standing Committee looked at this matter as far back as September 1983 and took the bulk of the evidence relating to the security at Yatala in September, and I think again in early March 1984.

I would be interested to know whether the Public Works Standing Committee ever received information from the Minister for Environment and Planning. Did that committee ever see the letter dated November 1984 addressed to the Enfield and Districts Historical Society? Did it ever get a firm view from the Minister as to what was or was not possible? Was it not possible for that perimeter wall to have been adjusted to take into account the heritage value of the

stables? What has happened is that the newer stables have not been demolished in what can only be described as a delightful way of overcoming the Government's clear lack of candour in this matter.

The Hon. Frank Blevins in answer to a question about the historic stables recently in this place said that they had not been demolished. He stated:

I point out that it was done very carefully and sensitively: it was photographed and marked. It has all been stored for future use.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It's all been knocked down.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was dismantled rather than knocked down.

The *Messenger* of Wednesday 21 August 1985 puts the lie to that argument. Its front page carries comments by the Enfield and Districts Historical Society about the demolition of the stables being an act of historic vandalism. Mr Dennis Robinson, a spokesman for that society which fought so hard and long, sadly without success, to preserve Yatala A Division, has again seen its efforts amount to nothing with respect to the stables and in the *Messenger* said:

he had lost most of his faith in the present State Government through the demolition.

'Anything the State Government put into writing you think you could trust,' Mr Robinson said.

He said pulling down the stables was a panic move by the State Government.

'It had to be as the stables were on both the National Estate Register and the State Heritage Register,' he said.

He said the Government had said it would re-erect the stables on another site in the complex.

'That's not history. The whole situation is ridiculous.

'We can't say enough to show our disgust.'

Mr Robinson has also been joined in his condemnation of the State Government by the South Australian Conservation Council executive officer, Marcus Beresford, who said that he was—

'absolutely outraged' by the decision.

'After the State Government demolished Yatala's A Division I didn't think they would have the nerve to do it again.'

These are key people in the heritage area. That is what they think of the Government's decision.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Are these people from Enfield?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Yes, Enfield and the South Australian Conservation Council.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: It is a Labor area down there.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: That is right. No doubt there will be a swing in Enfield, as in other areas, at the next election. Members opposite should know that the Enfield and Districts Historical Society is a strong and vibrant movement. Certainly, I have no doubt that many of its members were Labor supporters. There are at least 60 or 70 members attending each meeting, and one can be sure that the wanton demolition of the newer stables at Yatala will be the first item on the agenda at its next meeting.

It gives me no pleasure to move this motion. I move it in sadness, as much as anything else. I do not accept the proposition that the destruction of the stables was necessary for the security of Yatala A Division. I do not accept that there was no other way. The Minister, in November 1984, was of that view. He did not believe that it was necessary to knock them down. Therefore, I move the motion and seek the support of the Council in condemning the Government on this wanton and secret destruction of the newer stables at the Yatala Labour Prison.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I support with enthusiasm the motion moved by the Hon. Legh Davis. The historic two-storey stables were built by prisoners in 1874. The book *The Heritage of Australia, The Illustrated Register of National Estate,* published in 1981, described the stables as being of stone construction with brick groins and a tipped roof. These characteristics served to ensure that the stables at Yatala Labour Prison were listed on the Register of the National Estate and the State Heritage Register.

Few buildings in South Australia, as certainly the Minister of Correctional Services should be aware, have received such high distinction in heritage terms. Whilst the stables were an important heritage item in their own right, the fact that they were, until recently at least, one of eight buildings in the Yatala complex to share the status of being on both registers reinforced their significance and value. Today, few of these buildings remain standing.

In addressing this motion, I am reminded of a resolution that I moved in this Council on 28 March last year in relation to A block at Yatala. A block also enjoyed the distinction of being on both the national and State heritage registers. The resolution that I moved at that time stated:

That this Council registers its strong objection to the manner in which the Government used section 6 of the Planning Act to achieve the demolition of A Division, Yatala Labour Prison. And further that this Council believes the Government's action not only amounted to a grave misuse of the provisions of the Act but, by circumventing the Heritage Act, has set double standards for the community.

That resolution was passed by this Council following a division on 2 May 1984. At that time I did not conceive that it was possible that within 15 months circumstances would arise that again would force this Council to focus on the Government's blatant and offensive disregard for the provisions of the South Australian Heritage Act and the registered heritage items at Yatala. Nor did I conceive that the Government would have the audacity to demolish the stables, using section 6 of the Planning Act—the same provision that it employed to demolish A block.

As an aside, I note that the Government's key role in this whole sordid affair can be seen in context when one appreciates that on 8 August this year, only a few hours after the clandestine demoliton of the stables, the Government saw its way clear to revoke the proclamation of January 1984, which had provided the Government with the means to exempt itself from the provisions of the Heritage Act. This hypocritical action, however, is not the only offensive aspect of the Government's action in relation to the demolition of the heritage stables at Yatala. The Government was very well aware of the community concern for the fate of the stables.

As the Hon. Legh Davis noted in moving this motion, the Honorary Secretary of the Enfield and Districts Historical Society had written to the Minister for Environment and Planning on 24 October 1984 seeking the Minister's assurance that the stables would be retained in good order and not lost to the city of Enfield and this State. The society received the unqualified assurances that it sought in a letter from the Minister dated 16 October, to which the Hon. Mr Davis has already referred.

Notwithstanding these unqualified assurances contained in the Minister's letter some nine months ago, the stables have been demolished. Perhaps considering the association of the Minister for Environment and Planning and of the Government with the demolition of A block, the destruction of the Grange Vineyards at Magill, the development of the ASER project, and the untenable behaviour of some officers in administering the native vegetation controls in the State, the demolition of stables should come as no surprise. The Minister and the Government, however, never seem to learn from their mistakes.

The Hon. Dr Hopgood's letter to the Enfield and Districts Historical Society, to which I have just referred, highlighted work being undertaken by the Department of Correctional Services at Yatala to create a security area around the perimeter of the gaol. This work, as I indicated when I

moved the Yatala A Division resolution last year, has the support of the Opposition as necessary to ensure that Yatala operates effectively and efficiently as a high security gaol.

The plans for the security area are based on the recommendations of a task force that reported to the Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services in August 1983 following the fire at A Division. It is most important to know that the task force, in drawing up the master plan, did not see the need for, nor recommend, the demolition of the stables. The task force did not recommend this course of action even though it was fully aware that the stables were inside the proposed security area around the perimeter of the gaol and saw the need for and recommended the demolition of 17 other structures, including two buildings beyond the stables and the proposed security area. The task force, which throughout its investigations was justifiably obsessed with security, did not see the need to demolish the stables on security grounds or on any other pretext.

Clearly, the Government shared this view in 1983 when it accepted the task force's recommendations, and again in 1984 when the Minister for Environment and Planning wrote to the Enfield and Districts Historical Society. In 1985, however, it has changed its mind and sought to justify the demolition on the ground that the stables presented a potential security hazard. The Hon. Dr Hopgood, in an unconvincing endeavour to explain the Government's wilful destruction of the heritage stables, is quoted in the *Advertiser* on 17 August as follows:

> Dr Hopgood said there had been concern that the stable could have been used as a refuge area if a prisoner had got over the main wall and into the sterile zone.

Considering the recommendations contained in the task force's master plan, which was supported by the Government and the Minister for Environment and Planning as recently as late last year, I cannot accept the Minister's lame excuse that the stables suddenly became an uncompromising security hazard one year later. The Minister and the Government have presented no assessment to support this new view. If, indeed, after reassessment, the stables had been seen to present a security hazard of such proportions as to warrant demolition, surely the Government should have had the confidence and integrity to explain this change to the public. Certainly, neither we in this Parliament nor the public have been paid this courtesy.

For people, including me, who are keenly interested in the preservation of our built heritage, the actions of the Queensland Government in demolishing the Bellevue Hotel in Brisbane in April 1979 has been a focal point of our concerns. That building was demolished in the middle of a Sunday night. Like the stables at Yatala, that hotel in Brisbane was registered as an important item of heritage value. The underhand manner adopted by the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Correctional Services in the demolition of the stables at Yatala is on a par with the deceitful approach adopted by the Queensland Government in 1979 in relation to the Bellevue Hotel.

The President of the Enfield and Districts Historical Society, Mr Derek Robertson, aptly described the State Government's actions as historical vandalism. The subsequent endeavours by the Minister of Correctional Services in this Parliament to dismiss community concern by simply arguing that the Government was dismantling the stables simply adds insult to injury. Certainly, such arguments are testimony to the fact that the Minister has no appreciation of heritage or of the integrity of heritage buildings. His arguments are an insult to the members of the Enfield and Districts Historical Society, to the Enfield Council and to all who are genuinely and conscientiously concerned with the need to preserve and to conserve our built heritage.

In passing, I notice that the Minister has time to read the newspaper, but I recommend to him another item of reading in the near future. I hope that he will find time to read and to reflect on the excellent publication *Lost Adelaide*, a photographic record by Michael Burden.

Indeed, when considering the prominent role played by the Minister for Environment and Planning in this whole sordid affair of the demolition of the stable, I would like to think that he, too, may read and reflect on this book. Michael Burden commences his introduction with the following quotation:

> The architecture we have inherited does not in fact belong to us or to any other generation. It belongs to those who built it and those who come after us, ourselves being leaseholders merely, whose task is to conserve and to hand over . . . I am therefore at a loss to imagine what sort of account those of the mid-twentieth century will be able to give of their stewardship.

Mr Burden then states:

> These words were written by Geoffrey Fletcher in 1969, in his book *Changing London;* they are equally applicable today to the city of Adelaide and its inhabitants. Although preservation and conservation are now important aspects of our way of life, it cannot be emphasised too strongly that time is limited: each historic building demolished is dismantled and more efforts must be made now to reduce the losses among the ever dwindling numbers of historically and architecturally important buildings.

I strongly maintain that, if we in South Australia are to be successful in relation to the preservation and conservation of our dwindling stock of historically and architecturally important buildings, and if we are to be successful in educating the community to respect the integrity and value of our increasingly limited stock of built heritage items, the Government must take a lead and set a most positive example and be seen to be upholding a high standard for others in the community to follow.

In my opinion, the Government cannot afford to and should not thumb its nose at the very heritage measures and procedures that it expects the rest of the community to follow. Nor can the Government afford to make a farce of the Heritage Act—the only measure in this State that has the capacity to safeguard our significant heritage items. In respect to the demolition of the stable at Yatala, I believe that the Government has committed both offences. For this reason, I believe most strongly that the Government deserves to be condemned. I support the motion.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I support the motion. I speak in the debate now because I will not be in the Council next week when I presume the Minister will speak to it. I have had an intimate knowledge of the subject of the debate over the past couple of years because from time to time during that period the issue has arisen before the Public Works Standing Committee, of which I am a member. I will stand corrected if the Minister can produce evidence to the contrary, but I do not think that the matter was ever raised formally, that is, in a written submission from Department of Correctional Services officers when they gave evidence on projects such as security arrangements at Yatala in regard to the perimeter fencing, the Northfield Security Hospital, and so on. However, it was certainly raised by them verbally when they were before the committee.

The matter was also raised by correctional services officers and discussed at some length, I recall, on one occasion at Yatala when the committee was on site during an inspection. I can recall the Chairman of the committee on that occasion asking committee members about their feelings in regard to the stable. I can clearly recall saying that I was against its demolition. I can also remember long discussions with officers from the Department of Correctional Services in the committee room. Those discussions included the possibility that the building could be rebuilt elsewhere if it

had to be demolished. The discussions centred mainly on the possibility of the stable being demolished and rebuilt outside the perimeter fence at Yatala.

I can recall the recommendation of the heritage architect that there was a need, if the stable was to be rebuilt, for that to occur in the vicinity of Yatala Labour Prison, because the same stone work could be found in both the stable and some of the prison buildings. From a heritage point of view, I think that was a very good point. The discussions included the Enfield Historical Society, which made its voice heard when the whole question of possible demolition was mooted. I can even recall mentioning to an office holder with the Enfield Historical Society at a public function in the Enfield Community Centre that the matter was being discussed actively by the Public Works Committee. I suggested to this gentleman that the society certainly should be in contact with the Government and should maintain discussions with it.

Those wide ranging discussions also included the possibility of prison labour being used not only to demolish the stable but to transport the stone to wherever the building could be re-established. I had in mind a site fronting Grand Junction Road on the southern side of the Yatala Labour Prison complex. The points canvassed for and against the use of prison labour included the difficulties envisaged by some officers and the possibility that prisoners might become involved voluntarily and have that fact recorded on a plaque for people to see in the years ahead.

I can also recall the very clear and strong evidence given to the committee that the Department of Environment and Planning would never allow the demoliton of the stable. As I recall, a letter was produced by officers from the Department of Correctional Services and tabled as part of the evidence. That letter would still be on file, to the effect that the deparment would not stand for the demolition of the stable. The officers indicated in their evidence that they felt that nothing could be done because of the opinion from the Department of Environment and Planning: that is, nothing could be done irrespective of the Public Works Committee's decision on this issue. It came as a great surprise to me to hear the news that the Department of Correctional Services (and the blame must rest fairly and squarely with the Minister, because he is responsible for the department) apparently went out rather furtively at night and demolished the building.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: At 7 p.m.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I am informed at 7 p.m.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Officers from the department did it with the Minister's complete approval, and that cannot be denied.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The difference between the Hon. Mr Hill and me is that I would not attempt to deny it; I would stand up and cop it. The Hon. Mr Hill is not prepared to do that.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I am expressing my point of view and my concern for this matter.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. HILL: That is not correct. I am hoping that when the Minister replies he will announce a plan that has not yet been announced that the stonework and all the items from the demolished building have been marked, are stored and are being retained: that he, or his colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, has a plan for the ultimate reconstruction of this heritage item. If that is the case (although I see no reason why the demolition should have taken place after dark) then I can well understand the Minister's decision to demolish.

I think that it would be in his interests, and the Government's interests, if such a plan was in train, for it to be announced as quickly as possible. I thought that I would make my position clear with regard to—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You can't even keep a straight face.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I am smiling because I think that the Minister has up his sleeve the plan to which I have just referred. I think that it is proper that I should mention the general discussions that have taken place in regard to this matter. The point made from time to time in the Public Works Committee over the past couple of years related to an ultimate scheme of reconstruction, if, because of security, the building had ultimately to come down. I ask the Minister to disclose in his reply what future plans he has for this project, because there is no doubt that it was a heritage item of considerable merit and there is no doubt, also, that it did present a security danger. However, when such situations occur, Governments, irrespective of their political colour, should bend over backwards to find some compromise or means by which heritage items can be retained and respected while at the same time remembering that, when it is absolutely necessary, they might have to be dismantled.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendment:

Clause 2, page 1, line 25—After 'expressions' insert ' "Australian Grand Prix", "Adelaide Grand Prix",'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

It is very firmly the Government's view that there has been insufficient protection given to two names associated with the Grand Prix—those appearing in the schedule: 'Australian Grand Prix' and, 'Adelaide Grand Prix'. During the second reading and Committee stages of the debate on this Bill when this Bill was before the Council I pointed out that the fact that these names were not protected in the initial Bill was possibly an oversight or an error of interpretation of what was supposed to be protected and that it ought to be corrected.

It seems perfectly reasonable to the Government that, when people refer to the Adelaide Grand Prix or the Australian Grand Prix with the intention of making some financial gain, arrangements should be made with the promoters. That is a standard procedure; it is nothing new. I think that all we are debating is which particular words should be protected. I point out that we are talking using these particular words in association with events that will take place early in November in the eastern part of the centre of Adelaide, so it seems to us perfectly reasonable that people should have to come to some arrangement with the promoters of the event if they wish to take that course.

More particularly, the words 'Australian Grand Prix' refer, I am given to understand, to the premier motoring event that takes place each year in Australia. The right to use the words 'Australian Grand Prix' is conferred by the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport. I will read into the record, for the information of the Committee, a telex from the Chief Executive Officer of the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport, which states:

The Confederation of Australian Motor Sport is the organisation appointed by the Federation International de l'Automobile (the FIA is the only international sporting power governing four

wheel motor sport) as the controlling body of motor sport in Australia. We hereby confirm the motor racing event titled 'Australian Grand Prix' can only be held once per year in Australia and is sanctioned only through the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport. This sanction has been granted to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board whilst a formula one event is being promoted by that board.

It is clear that the owner (if I may put it that way) of the title 'Australian Grand Prix' is the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport, which has chosen this year to allow the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board to use that title. Given that that appears to be the position, I have no reason at all to doubt that Mr J.A. Keefe, Chief Executive Officer, Australian Confederation of Motor Sport, is in any way going beyond his legal right in conferring that title on the event in question. I can see no argument at all why the intellectual property rights should not be protected for the Australian Formula One Grand Prix.

There is no doubt that the Adelaide Grand Prix is the same event as that to which I referred earlier. It is the event that is to take place in the eastern part of the centre of Adelaide early in November. The Government believes that it is perfectly reasonable that the words 'Adelaide Grand Prix' should also be protected. It is in the interest of business in this State and in Australia generally to have these names protected. It means that business can enter into arrangements with the promoters of events for exclusive use of these words in a promotional way. I am not talking of someone in a newspaper referring to the Adelaide Grand Prix that is occurring or saying that the road surface has some minor problems in connection with the Adelaide Grand Prix. If anyone raised that they would be extrapolating to the ridiculous.

That is not the intention of owning the words 'Adelaide Grand Prix'. The intention is clearly to enter into arrangements with private entrepreneurs who may wish to manufacture particular items and to have some exclusive rights to do so. That is a perfectly legitimate form of business: franchising is perfectly legitimate. The firms entering into these arrangements with the Adelaide Grand Prix Board are highly respectable and responsible firms that enter into such agreements all the time. I see no reason why they should not be protected. It is a perfectly normal business arrangement. Such arrangements are entered into every day.

I stress that the Government is not in any way attempting to stifle the newspapers, radio or television referring in a news broadcast or whatever to the Adelaide Grand Prix. It is not that at all.

It applies only when the words are being used in the context of franchising goods, merchandise and the like. Therefore, I urge the Committee to support the amendments moved by another place.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Opposition opposes the motion. The Opposition does not believe that there is any merit in giving further control to a Government agency over names that might be used in relation to the Grand Prix. We have already conceded that the expressions 'Australian Formula One Grand Prix' and 'Adelaide Formula One Grand Prix' should be preserved for the board. We have also agreed to 'Formula One Grand Prix', 'Adelaide Alive', 'Fair Dinkum Formula One', and 'Adelaide Formula One', on the basis that 'formula one' is a special category of cars embarking on a grand prix race in Adelaide, Australia.

However, when it comes to terminology like 'Australian Grand Prix' and 'Adelaide Grand Prix', I find it impossible to find a logical argument to establish that there is any proprietary right attached to those names. 'Adelaide' is the name of the city, and 'Grand Prix' is the name of a race. Everyone ought to be able to refer to that race as the Adelaide Grand Prix, whether they stick it on T-shirts or put it in the newspapers.

In regard to the Australian Grand Prix, I would dispute that in law the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport has any proprietary rights in that name. The fact is that, if that is asserted, let the confederation take its action under the Trade Practices Act or common law, where it might allege a passing off action.

In my view and on the advice that I have received, it will not get off the ground: there is no passing off when anyone else decides to use the words 'Australian Grand Prix' or, more particularly, 'Adelaide Grand Prix'. It is the height of bureaucratic possessiveness to seek to encompass these names 'Adelaide Grand Prix' and 'Australian Grand Prix'.

I refer to the commercial activity. Of the licensees whose names were notified to us in the document tabled by the Minister last week in this Council, apart from Australia Post, which is Australia-wide and which has the right to publish souvenir envelopes, 17 South Australian businesses have been granted licences to manufacture items under the auspices of the board, and 14 interstate firms are so licensed. The major licensees are from interstate; for example, Australian Consolidated Press—part of the Packer group—is given the right to do the official race preview and the official race programs. Channel 9 has the television rights, and PBL Marketing is a Packer subsidiary, as is Australian Consolidated Press.

The Packer organisation has all this neatly sewn up without any tenders having been required for the granting of these licences. The same applies to the other licensees, whether they are South Australian or interstate there has been no tendering. In fact, the majority of the material that will be produced under the so-called licence will be produced interstate.

I have received calls from a number of people saying that they have applied for licences but have been told that they will not be accepted and that no more licences will be granted. They have offered to pay a licence fee and a royalty. One person who manufactures T-shirts has doubled his work force from four to eight to cope with the rush. However, as a result of the threats made the week before last by the Executive Officer of the board (Dr Hemmerling) in the press, he is now in trouble with his bank and has had to sack four people. I received a call from a jewellery manufacturer who said that, even before PBL was involved, he had applied for a licence but was told that there would be equal opportunity for all South Australian companies to be involved. In fact, only one manufacturer in that area has been granted a licence.

This person said he would like to pay a licence fee. He could sell thousands of teaspoons and items of jewellery. He totally supports the Grand Prix and tourism, because it is the key to his business. He sells nationally and employs four staff and, if he got a licence, he would put on an extra two workers to cope with the rush. However, he has been denied a licence.

Another person has been asked to supply souvenir shops, which he does as a matter of course in his business. He wants to use a photograph of Adelaide and put 'Adelaide' on it with the words 'Grand Prix'.

This gentleman approached the Grand Prix office and was told 'No go'. A major manufacturer of T-shirts has been turned down, even though last week he was led to believe that the board would reconsider his application. In fact, out of the goodness of his heart, he made available to the board some 20 different designs on T-shirts because he thought, 'Let us be open about it and let us see if I can really establish a good relationship and get a licence.' He

was happy to pay the royalties and the upfront licence fee. But what did he find?

On Thursday last week this man was turned down because PBL had come over from Sydney and said, 'We don't want to talk to him'. When he sent his secretary around to the Grand Prix office, what did he find but the Grand Prix office staff out with their cameras photographing all his designs. His secretary immediately picked them up and took them away, but quite obviously they did not have much respect for his openness.

In the *News* on 23 August, we have a double page spread which states, 'Your easy to follow family guide to the Adelaide Grand Prix spectacular'. Adelaide Grand Prix! We have the *News* with its own logo; on either side is the laurel wreath with the word 'Adelaide', a formula one car and then 'Grand Prix'. That has been used for a commercial purpose. Is the Government or the board suggesting that that will have to be licensed? Even in today's—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The board will have the power to do it under the Bill. In today's *News,* there is an advertisement—I do not know exactly what it means—but it says, 'Ed. I must capture the action at the first Australian Grand Prix. What SLR auto focus system should I use? Signed "The Revcounter".' Obviously that is a preliminary advertisement for a promotion for a single lens reflex camera, but it is using the words 'Australian Grand Prix' in the advertisement. The Government's amendments will seek to place an embargo on that unless it is licensed. I find that extraordinary.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It would be if it were true.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is true. That is what will have to be licensed.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You just don't like the Grand Prix.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do like the Grand Prix. I have supported it. The Government has supported half a dozen amendments which I have proposed to this Bill. I am saying that I think it is the height of absurdity to seek to proscribe, particularly retrospectively, or even at all, the use of the words 'Adelaide Grand Prix'.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: There is no retrospectivity.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is retrospective now. What the Minister is saying is that the Government and the board want to prevent the use, even on postcards and T-shirts, of the words 'Adelaide Grand Prix' unless a licence fee is paid. The people who want to do this cannot get licences because PBL Marketing, the Packer organisation in Sydney and the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board says, 'We are not issuing any more licences'. So much for South Australian business being involved in this great money spinner.

I would suggest that, if these people were licensed, there would be as much, if not more, returned to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board by allowing this universal licensing system and involving South Australian business than giving monopolistic franchises particularly to interstate manufacturers. That is all that my voice will allow. I oppose most strenuously the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I wish for several reasons to spend a few moments opposing this amendment for several reasons. I think it is very anti the promotion of the Grand Prix, and I hope that all the efforts of the Grand Prix Board and the Government are spent in promoting something that we have been very fortunate to get. It will be of great benefit, I believe, in the long run to the promotion of South Australia as a place on this earth.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Where else would it be?

The Hon. PETER DUNN: What you are doing is stopping anyone else from advertising the fact that there is an event here.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: No, we're not.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Yes you are. By prescribing this, you will successfully stop most people from using those words on a postcard, or in a paper, or from using them liberally as you would expect them to do. The words 'Grand Prix' mean 'grand prize', if I have any knowledge at all of the English language. There are grand prizes not only in motor car racing but also (and I daresay the Minister understands this) in tennis and in horse riding. These terms are used quite frequently in those sports. What is to say that we cannot have an Adelaide Grand Prix for tennis?

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Exactly. What you will do is successfully stop anyone—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: No, you're not.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Oh, yes, you are.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Ask Trevor Griffin. Don't take it from me. This is in relation to the events that are taking place on 3 November in the eastern part—

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Then let us be specific with this. We have already said, 'Use Formula One Grand Prix', and we are doing that. But, if we begin to use a broad brush approach and say, 'Adelaide Grand Prix' or 'Australian Grand Prix', there are a number of Australian Grand Prix and I can see lawyers having a field day.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You don't know what you're talking about.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has a job to hear.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I do not think that the Minister wants to listen. He just wants to talk everybody down. The fact of the matter is that, if we are specific and talk about the Formula One Grand Prix, this legislation as it left this Council covered all that. If the Chairman wanted to run a Grand Prix at Kimba and to call it the Australian Grand Prix for hunting, he would be entitled to do that, and the misconception that that would incur would—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It wouldn't do anything.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: It would be quite incredible. I believe that this amendment merely confuses the whole issue. There is a very clear definition of what it is about under the legislation as it left this Council, namely, that it is the Australian Formula One Grand Prix.

The words 'Formula One' are most neccessary to identify what will happen in Adelaide early in November. However, by adding this broad brush approach, we will merely confuse the whole issue, and I make that quite clear. The interstate companies have a lot of the promotion and, as last night's *News* indicated, something like 60 per cent of the clothing which will have the identification of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix is coming from interstate.

That indicates to me that we are cutting out a number of South Australian companies that may wish to use it as an identification. If, for instance, it gets confused with some other event that may be called a Grand Prix, so what? Why restrict them? Where is the free enterprise? This will merely restrict any local manufacturer who may wish to put 'Adelaide Grand Prix' or 'Australian Grand Prix' on his jumper to identify the fact that he supports the event or would like to sell an article in that light, and that is all.

This Government is endeavouring with this legislation to restrict those people entirely and that is quite unfair. The Minister read out a telegram from CAMS saying that they run only one grand prize for the year. That is quite true. However, as I have demonstrated, there are other grand prizes for other events that can happen—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That has nothing to do with this. If you sit down, I will tell you.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The Minister has not told me yet. He has not demonstrated to me yet—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Why did the Minister not demonstrate it in his second reading?

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Well, ask Trevor.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: If I have to get my own colleague to demonstrate it, that shows me that the Government has no idea what this legislation is about, and the sooner we reject the amendments that have been brought in from the Lower House, the better it will be.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would much rather that the Hon. Mr Dunn had spoken to the Hon. Mr Griffin before he wasted our time. The way we are going will probably cause us to come back after dinner. The fact is that if a prominent South Australian wishes to run a grand prix for lizards like the very famous and popular one at Kimba, then there is nothing to stop that person doing that. If the words 'Adelaide Grand Prix' or any other words are specified in this Bill, they relate only to the event taking place on a certain day in November.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: You don't even know that.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cannot remember. Motor racing is not my thing. I would sooner go to Kimba for the lizards race. The name 'Adelaide Grand Prix' relates only to the event in November. For example, I am sure that there are grand prix models of bicycles—the fancy bikes that kids have these days—and that does not come under the ambit of the Act. It has nothing to do with it—nothing at all. If the Adelaide *News*, or any other newspaper, wants to advise people about the Grand Prix, the Adelaide Grand Prix, or whatever, it is not caught in any way by the legislation.

Whether or not the honourable member agrees with certain sets of words is a fair enough debate. But, at least he should first talk to the person in his Party who has some understanding of these things so as not to waste the time of the Council. If the honourable member does not agree with 'Adelaide Grand Prix', that is one thing. However, to suggest that the President of this Council, running his grand prix event in Kimba, is somehow caught by the legislation is plainly incorrect. I can see that no matter how long I stand here the Hon. Mr Dunn will not believe me. Will he please talk to the Hon. Mr Griffin, who will be able to put his mind at rest—that the lizard grand prix at Kimba is not covered by this particular legislation.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: They are your words, not mine.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is what you were referring to. I am merely trying to make the point that all these things refer only to that particular event at that particular time. They have nothing whatsoever to do with an equestrian event at Gawler that is called a grand prix—nothing at all. If the honourable member does not agree with the words, that is one thing. However, to suggest that the measure covers a grand prix for motor cycle riding, horse riding or anything else, is not right—it does not: it cannot.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Who will be the arbitrator?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: One does not need an arbitrator: it is in the legislation. The words refer only to the motor car event taking place early in November in the eastern sector of the centre of Adelaide. If the Hon. Mr Dunn has some doubts, I would be happy to sit down and allow the Hon. Mr Griffin to explain it to him. The Hon. Mr Griffin can probably explain it far better than I can because that is his bag; that is what he lives for. If the honourable member does not like the words, that is fine, but he should not tell me that they will affect someone elsewhere.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am prepared to support the amendment from the House of Assembly. It is a very fine point to object to the words 'Australian Grand Prix' or 'Adelaide Grand Prix' considering that the overall intention of the legislation has been accepted, especially considering that the Government has accepted the Hon. Trevor Griffin's substantial amendments which protect the manufacturers who might have been caught. I am glad that the Hon. Trevor Griffin picked up that point. If those manufacturers have unwittingly made goods before 22 August, the Bill, if passed, will cover that. There is still flexibility in regard to the board as clause 4 (4) states:

> A consent under this section—
>
> *(a)* may be given with or without conditions (including conditions requiring payment to the board);

If we do not have any faith in the board, obviously the whole event will be very nerve-racking. The board is granted the substantial responsibility of running the Grand Prix and it is important that it has reasonable power to protect and control the goods that are marketed specifically for the event. It does not upset me to include those two extra phrases which the other House has seen fit to suggest.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I had not joined in the debate earlier and I do not intend to take up much time. I indicated the other night that I thought a reasonable compromise had been reached between the Hon. Mr Griffin and the Minister. It is a pity that the matter was not left in the Council but went to the other place and was messed up. I thought that everyone got a bit of a corner out of it. Certainly, South Australian manufacturers have been left aside and have not had a share in the whole event, because a number of interstate firms have been selected. I am disappointed that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has seen fit not to continue to hold the position, this Council, certainly to the point where the matter could have been discussed at a conference. That is quite normal. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan has seen fit to take a decision away from the initial decision of this Council and many small manufacturers in this State will not be happy with that.

The Hon. K.L. MILNE: I am concerned about two aspects. First, I would like to hear more debate on the question raised by the Hon. Mr Griffin. I would also like further information about the fact that licences are being refused to, I assume, reputable South Australian manufacturers.

Honourable members: Hear! Hear!

The Hon. K.L. MILNE: Well, I cannot believe it.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I will tell you why.

The Hon. K.L. MILNE: I would like to hear why. It will have to be a pretty good excuse. One of the great selling points of the Grand Prix has been that it will spread a maximum amount of business around this State. I realise that we are a nation and not just a State and that other people should have an opportunity to join in but, from what the Hon. Mr Griffin has said, it sounds to me as if, for some reason, the board has an unnecessarily monopolistic attitude. I want that matter cleared up before I make a decision about what I am going to do. I have a feeling that someone has been got at, and that an offer has been made by experts in the Packer organisation, so that much of the work that should have been shared has been cornered: it has turned out to be something of a monopoly. If some people are putting their foot down and preventing people from South Australia from joining in, I do not like it.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The point I am making is not a fine point—it is a very important point, that is, whether the names 'Australian Grand Prix' and 'Adelaide Grand Prix' should be proscribed and be subject to absolute control in the hands of the board. In relation to the event run at Victoria Park Racecourse, I agree. However, the difficulty is that although lots of South Australian small manufacturers, who are reputable, have been denied licences, the more important fact is whether the name 'Adelaide Grand Prix'—involving the name of the City of Adelaide for nearly 150

years, and 'Grand Prix', the name of a motor race—should be proscribed by this legislation.

That means that, in relation to the race, the board becomes the proprietor of that description. It has all the variations of Formula One and Formula One Grand Prix. I agree that the coexistence of Formula One and Formula One Grand Prix is special to this sort of motor car racing, but I cannot agree that the description 'Adelaide Grand Prix'—words in common usage—ought to be the subject of property rights in the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board.

Those words would not be able to be registered under the Trademarks Act; they could not be protected under the Trade Practices Act; they would not be subject to any successful passing off action and, even in relation to the Business Names Act, the Corporate Affairs Commission through the Crown Solicitor says, 'We think that the name, "The Adelaide Grand Prix Company", is undesirable.' It probably should never have been registered in the first place, but it has been registered as a business name by a private citizen. We have a Government instrumentality saying that it is not desirable for that to be now registered. I find it extraordinary that, whether for commercial or other use, those names in common usage ought to be proscribed. That is the basis on which I do not want to support this amendment.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I appreciate the point made by the Hon. Trevor Griffin. It is a difference of opinion that should not require extensive debate: it is merely a difference of opinion as to which set of words should be protected and which should not. That is a matter of opinion, basically. I do not mind these being protected; the Hon. Trevor Griffin does. That is all. We will leave the Hon. Mr Dunn to the Hon. Trevor Griffin.

As regards the very fair question asked by the Hon. Mr Milne as to the method of marketing the Grand Prix, basically there are two methods of marketing anything. What one can do is what a whole range of manufacturers or people who have things to market do: they give exclusive rights to certain individuals or stores. I imagine that Pierre Cardin would sell his merchandise exclusively through certain stores rather than put it in the local supermarket. That is a decision by the person who wants to market a product. In the case of the Grand Prix, the Grand Prix Board has decided that certain outlets will have exclusive rights to market certain promotional material (and I will list a few in a moment) rather than allowing just anybody to do it. That is a perfectly normal, everyday occurrence in commerce.

The Hon. K.L. Milne interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will give the honourable member some of what is in South Australia in a moment, but basically it is a commercial decision. Do we want the maximum amount of promotion or whatever? That is why we have a board: to make those decisions. I am sure that the board would be only too happy to talk to the Hon. Mr Milne and justify the decision that it has taken. It has not taken the decision in order to in any way denigrate South Australia or the Grand Prix: quite the reverse! It wants to maximise the benefits to South Australia and maximise the publicity and promotion of the Grand Prix: that goes without saying. That is its role: it would not do anything contrary to that.

The Hon. Peter Dunn interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr Dunn interjects and says that it is a strange way of doing it. The Hon. Mr Dunn may disagree: all I am saying is that the decision has been taken by the people who own the event. The Hon. Mr Dunn has some arrangements in wheat marketing—and I do not want to go into it—in which we do not have a free market. The people who own the product decide to market it in a certain way, and I agree with them completely. I use that only as an illustration: there are many ways to market things. The people who own the product market it to their best possible advantage. The fact that the Hon. Mr Dunn does not understand it does not—

The Hon. Peter Dunn interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: They do own the—

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Not the Australian Grand Prix or the Adelaide Grand Prix.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We can argue about the words, but I merely outline to the Hon. Mr Milne that it is not strange or unique; it is very common to market things in this manner. Certainly, the people who own the product have taken that decision in the best interests of maximising the benefits to the State.

I give a very brief list of some of the South Australian firms and products that have been granted licences: a firm in Mile End to produce hats and caps; a firm in Stepney to produce jackets, knit shirts, track pants and rugby tops; an Adelaide firm to produce ties and scarves bearing the logo; a Stirling firm—the Hon. Mr Milne may know it—to produce sweat shirts and T-shirts; a St Agnes firm, T-shirts bearing the insignia and logo; a South Australian firm to sell beer in bottles bearing the logo; another firm to sell souvenir envelopes; a Wayville firm to sell flags and bunting; a North Adelaide firm, cigarette lighters and show bags; a Glen Osmond firm, posters; a Mile End South firm, stickers and labels; a Para Hills West firm, wall plaques; an Adelaide liquor firm, Grand Prix port; another Adelaide firm, pewter tankards; an Adelaide firm, copper wall plaques; a Glynde firm, souvenirs including teaspoons, lapel pins, rulers, coasters, stubbie holders, beer steins, postcards, erasers, litter bags and wallets; a Reynella firm, wines and champagne; an Adelaide firm, jewellery and medallions.

One would think that after that list there is very little else that anyone else would want to manufacture. All that I am saying is that overwhelmingly the work that has been generated by the Adelaide Grand Prix has been generated here in South Australia—by a huge margin. The benefits to this State are enormous. I would not like to quantify the percentage of the benefits that accrue directly to the State and those that go interstate, but it would be in the order of 90 to 10, or something like that. I am pleased that the Hon. Mr Milne stated that we live in Australia: we are expecting many thousands, if not tens of thousands—I am not sure—of overseas and interstate visitors to the State. It seems that if we have 90 per cent of the business that arises from the Grand Prix, really we have done very well indeed. The employment that has been generated in this State is enormous.

I hope that I have been able to give the Committee sufficient information as to why it ought to support these two names being added to the list of those that are already there. We have already taken a decision as regards other amendments to the Bill, which makes some of the questions that have been asked rather superfluous. The question is: do we agree with these two sets of words being added to the list, or do we not?

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (7)—The Hons. Frank Blevins (teller), G.L. Bruce, B.A. Chatterton, M.S. Feleppa, I. Gilfillan, Anne Levy, and Barbara Wiese.

Noes (8)—The Hons J.C. Burdett, M.B. Cameron, Peter Dunn, K.T. Griffin (teller), C.M. Hill, R.I. Lucas, K.L. Milne, and R.J. Ritson.

Pairs—Ayes—The Hons. J.R. Cornwall, C.W. Creedon, and C.J. Sumner. Noes—The Hons. L.H. Davis, R.C. DeGaris, and Diana Laidlaw.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment is not appropriate.

NATIVE VEGETATION MANAGEMENT BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 29 August at 2.15 p.m.