

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 15 November 1984

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: GILLES PLAINS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A petition signed by 296 residents of South Australia praying that the House provide realistic funding to the Gilles Plains Community College was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: OPEN SPEED LIMIT

Petitions signed by 406 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal to reduce the open speed limit from 110 km/h were presented by Messrs Lewis and Meier.

Petitions received.

PETITION: ANTI DISCRIMINATION BILL

A petition signed by 1 627 residents of South Australia praying that the House delete the words 'sexuality, marital status and pregnancy' from the Anti Discrimination Bill 1984 and provide for the recognition of the primacy of marriage and parenthood was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNSWORN STATEMENT

A petition signed by six residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of the unsworn statement was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: COORONG BEACH

A petition signed by 681 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the entire Coorong beach remain open to vehicles and the public and that all tracks are maintained in good order was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions as detailed in the schedule that I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

A.D. VICTORIA

In reply to **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (18 October).

The **Hon. R.K. ABBOTT**: The previous Government approved of an overall amount of \$2.75 million to acquire the dredge A.D. *Victoria* including an amount for essential repairs (\$0.4 million), spare parts (\$0.15 million) and modifications to the bucket band (\$0.7 million). A new dredge

could not be purchased for less than \$5 million. A mistake did occur when designing new buckets for the new bucket band in that clearances in the auxiliary ladder were overlooked, no doubt because the new buckets were not dimensionally larger than the original buckets. Necessary modifications were subsequently made with the work completed in two weeks and costs still well within the provisions for the work. Virtually no additional cost was involved because if the problem had been identified at the design stage those modifications would have been included in the design.

The final cost of work associated with the new bucket band will be below the estimate of \$0.7 million. The cost to date of all work, including purchase of spare parts is \$966 000 and final costs will be well within the approved amount of \$1.25 million. There has not been an overrun of costs and consequently no requirement to fund any of the work from funds provided for dredging projects. The project has had no effect on the employment prospects of the dredging employees.

COSTIGAN ROYAL COMMISSION

In reply to **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (23 October).

The **Hon. R.K. ABBOTT**: The particular transactions referred to in the Costigan Report were between members of the Ship Painters and Dockers Union, contractors and shipping agents. The Department of Marine and Harbors was not a party to any of these transactions. The report has been referred to the Crown Solicitor and the police for consideration as to whether any legal proceedings are justified.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A**ATTITUDE SURVEY ON LIBRARY USE**

In reply to the **Hon. B.C. EASTICK**.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: An officer will be appointed to implement and co-ordinate market research projects related to library usage. These projects will be developed in association with the Publicity and Promotions Officer and the Systems Officer. It is planned that this project will provide the State Library of South Australia with essential and previously unavailable data related to user statistics and public attitudes to existing and new library services.

The project activities involve the designing and implementation of market research programmes, particularly attitudinal surveys, designed to improve library services. Three main groups of people will be considered: non-users; existing users; and community leaders. As well as developing questionnaires to obtain new information, the officer will also analyse and evaluate statistical information from existing informational services. This will help establish behavioural patterns of users and could help facilitate long term planning for the library.

Non-users: This group represents a potential market which has not previously existed. The reasons for their non-usage of library facilities are expected to range from traditional perceptions of library services to dissatisfaction and rejection of library services. Issues of misconceptions and general misunderstanding about a library's role in the community will be examined.

Users: This group will be examined to establish their usage patterns, i.e. are they reference or lending services only—their level of awareness of other library services outside the ones they use, opinions related to staff and the service offered, how often do they use the services (i.e.

weekly, monthly, infrequently, etc.), what they would like to see to improve existing services, and attitudes to membership and fines, etc.

Community leaders: The survey will include community groups, e.g. social welfare organisations, educational institutions, Government departments, and recreational organisations, to establish ideas on areas which can be developed further or specialised services which could be established.

The project will be managed by the State Librarian and co-ordinated by the Publicity and Promotions Officer and Systems Officer in consultation with branch heads of the library.

TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY TRAINING COMMITTEE

In reply to Mr OSWALD.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The debt servicing cost is interest and sinking fund charges allocated in respect of capital account expenditure. The amount is advised by the Public Buildings Department at the end of each financial year for the forthcoming financial year. The costs are common to all departments.

2. A copy of the pamphlet 'The Tourism Information Service in Country Areas of South Australia' has already been provided to the honourable member.

3. The Tourism and Hospitality Industry Training Committee is comprised of representatives of industries with a clear involvement with tourism. Member organisations are:

Australian Hotels Association
Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees' Union of Australia
Australian Federation of Travel Agents (S.A. Chapter)
Licensed Clubs' Association of South Australia
South Australian Restaurants' Association
The Motor Inn and Motel Association of Australia (S.A. Branch)
Catering Institute of Australia
Department of Employment and Industrial Relations
S.A. Department of Technical and Further Education
S.A. Department of Labour
S.A. Department of Tourism

It would not be appropriate for the Chamber of Commerce to be represented on this industry committee. However, another committee, the Retail Industry Training Committee, does consist of organisations such as the Chamber of Commerce and it is of interest to note that discussions have recently been held between the two organisations concerning training in customer service and associated matters, with a view to assisting the Retail Industry Training Committee with the training facilities already established by the Tourism and Hospitality Industry Training Committee.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MYPOLONGA PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On Thursday 18 October in this House, the member for Mallee explicitly implied that officers of the Public Buildings Department had lied to me, as Minister of Public Works, in a report they prepared in relation to a series of alleged incidents at the Mypolonga Primary School. The member for Mallee, when introducing a letter from a constituent, said:

I want to warn the Minister, quite simply and forthrightly at the outset, before reading the letter, that he ought to go back to

his Department and tell them that he wants the truth, not the concoction they have ostensibly given him and from which he quoted at length in the Estimates Committee.

Later, the member for Mallee said:

It may just be possible to get statutory declarations which would lay the lie to what was reported to him.

All of this, of course, represents a very serious allegation. The member for Mallee was saying, in effect, that public servants had deliberately and knowingly misled a Minister by lying to him in a report intended for use in Parliamentary proceedings. I therefore initiated a detailed reinvestigation of the claims made about workers at the Mypolonga school project.

The Director-General of the Public Buildings Department has written in his report to me on this matter the following statement:

All officers, including myself, who were concerned in the preparation of the original report to you on the circumstances of the Mypolonga school project, categorically deny that an untrue report was forwarded, and would be prepared to make statutory declarations to that effect.

The Director-General further said he resented statements attacking his integrity being made in Parliament without any redress being available to him. I am satisfied that the report originally prepared for me in relation to the Mypolonga school was a complete and truthful one. I am also satisfied that a second investigation confirms this to be the case. On this basis, I call on the member for Mallee to retract his statements made in this House calling into question the honesty of employees of the Public Buildings Department.

QUESTION TIME

OPERATION NOAH

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Emergency Services ask the Police Commissioner to undertake an Operation Noah in South Australia to seek information from the public about drug trafficking? The Operation Noah phone-in yesterday organised by police in New South Wales and Victoria has been enormously successful. In New South Wales the police received more than 2 000 calls from the public in a 12 hour period, resulting so far in 20 arrests and 44 charges, with more expected today. Police in Victoria made 13 arrests and confiscated hundreds of Indian hemp plants. The operation has been described as the biggest crackdown on drug traffickers in Australia and has been endorsed by the Chairman of the National Crime Authority, Mr Justice Stewart.

It focuses on drug traffickers, distributors, growers and manufacturers. The success of the operation in New South Wales and Victoria must encourage South Australia to copy it because of the significant growth in drug trafficking in this State during the past two years. Last financial year, for example, 6 829 drug offences were recorded in South Australia, an increase of more than 38 per cent over the previous year, and the Minister has told the House (indeed, it was on 17 October) that 'the most serious and entrenched aspect of organised crime in South Australia is that associated with the growing, manufacture, importation and trafficking of illegal drugs.'

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am aware that the Leader of the Opposition asked his question of my Deputy, the Minister in charge of police, but the question he asked I think raises very much more broader issues because, on this whole question of anti-drug campaigns, we are talking not just about police action, the detection of offences and the conviction of criminals: we are also talking about a major programme of prevention and drug awareness in the community at all levels. That, of course, is one of the effects of the Operation Noah campaign. It is because of this inter-departmental aspect, if one looks at what role the Govern-

ment can play, that a number of discussions have taken place over the past few months on a major anti-drug campaign in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition's question gives the opportunity for me to say that fairly shortly we will be making some announcements about that campaign. Members may be aware that the Health Commission, in association with the Education Department, has already embarked on a drug awareness campaign in schools. That campaign will be developed and refined and a large amount of resources will be put into it. My colleague the Deputy Premier and I have had discussions about police initiatives and my Deputy has talked at some length with the Police Commissioner about a package of anti-drugs initiatives that can be taken in conjunction with this overall programme.

It has in fact been developed to quite a large extent, and although it is not ready to go into operation yet, the Commissioner says that this will be a major part of the strategic plan for 1985. A major component of that package will indeed be an Operation Noah type programme, where people telephone police with information on drug dealers and distribution networks. The establishment of such an operation and its comprehensive nature, which of course relates to its effectiveness, involves a major undertaking. There has to be training of police staff to accept and analyse the calls that come in as a result of the operation, computer and telephone facilities have to be established to assist in that reception, and analysis and various other back-up supports have to be provided.

That planning is already very well advanced. We have monitored closely the experience in other States. In fact, the Commissioner has already held briefing meetings with his commissioned officers following discussions that he has had with his Minister. Also, there is South Australian co-operation, in a limited way at this stage, with the Victorian Operation Noah. Obviously, part of the success of this operation in an individual State will depend on the degree to which it can lock into similar operations and exchange information with other States.

The Government fully supports and encourages not only police planning in this area and the initiatives that have been developed by the Commissioner and by the Police Force but also the whole range of anti-drug initiatives that are being undertaken. I foreshadow that in the not too distant future we will make a major announcement on the anti-drug campaign, embodying all those various elements. If we can gain the sort of co-operation and active support of the community that I think must follow this, we will be able to make extremely important inroads into this dreadful social and criminal problem that pervades Australia at the moment.

HOME PURCHASE ASSISTANCE

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction say what steps the Government has taken to ensure that effective home purchase assistance can continue to be provided to low income households in the face of rising real estate prices? Several of my constituents have already been helped to buy a first home with assistance provided through the State Government's Home Ownership Made Easier programme. However, it now appears that large rises in house prices are reducing the level of assistance available, and I believe that new levels of loan limits have been announced recently.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Government is well aware of the squeeze effect that rising house prices are having on first home buyers, particularly on low income households. The levels of assistance provided under HOME,

although adequate at the time of the introduction of the programme in November 1983, have diminished in real terms over the past 12 months. One of the strengths of this programme, however, is the inclusion by the Government of a regular review process to ensure that effective levels of assistance are maintained. Consequently, I announced earlier this month that the maximum loan available under the HOME programme would rise as at the fifth of this month from \$38 000 to \$42 000.

I also announced that the maximum allowable price for a house bought under the HOME programme would rise from \$55 000 to \$65 000. The new loan limit, together with the average grant of \$3 000 available under the Federal Government's first home owners scheme, will provide real assistance to those low income households having difficulties in trying to buy homes. The new purchase price limit is higher than the median house sales price of \$60 000 recorded in many metropolitan and country local government areas and thus maintains a good range of choice for HOME applicants. I might add that the HOME programme has been most successful, with almost 8 000 applications having been lodged since its inception.

ECONOMIC FORECASTS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier asked Treasury to revise its economic forecasts on which this year's State Budget is based, in view of the depressed level of consumer confidence shown in the retail sales figures released yesterday? While the Labor Party has been intent on talking up the economy for the purposes of the Federal election—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:—key indicators in South Australia continue to point to the fact that the recovery has peaked, and there are problems ahead for South Australia. The latest indicator is that of retail sales. The ABS figures released yesterday reveal that the value of retail sales in South Australia over the year to September declined by 3.9 per cent.

This compared with a national figure which showed a growth of 2.2 per cent. Victoria was the only other State to record a decline of .9 per cent. When total sales in the September quarter in 1984 are compared with the same period last year, South Australia recorded a drop in total retail sales of 1.1 per cent compared with an overall national growth of 5.6 per cent. South Australia was the only State to record a decline. These figures and our unemployment rate, which remains the highest in the mainland, raise serious questions about the Premier's claims as to the extent of economic recovery in South Australia under his regime.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Treasury obviously constantly revises and reviews its forecasts of economic activity in the light of prevailing indicators and performance. I do not think there is any cause for major concern about the level of retail sales. In fact, South Australia's share of the Australian retail sales value has been remarkably stable for the last four quarters. There has been very little change. We are talking about less than .0-something of a percentage. On the latest retail figures for September 1984 there was no major increase overall—there was a 2.3 per cent rise, which is about a 1 per cent lift in real terms. That is generally accepted as being not very good.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You've got the wrong page.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader should not be ridiculous. I am looking at retail sales figures for the change on the previous three months. I will say something about retail sales figures and put them into perspective.

First, the retail sales figures do not include expenditure on the purchase of houses, motor vehicles—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—on some white goods or on entertainment, recreation, holidays and travel. In all those areas South Australia's performance has been at a level above that of the rest of Australia. In fact, an analysis of the figures has suggested that consumer expenditure in South Australia has been directed to those areas rather than to the standard retail sales area. I know that that concept is a little difficult for members opposite to grasp, but in any household a particular amount of money is available to be spent. There is choice as to whether one spends that money and, if the commitment is being made in relation to things like housing, motor vehicles, whitegoods and so on, we will either be at the same level of those or be higher.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The evidence clearly is that, in terms of consumer preference, both nationally and more acutely in South Australia because our performance in those other areas is so strong, the amount of money that people are spending is being directed to those areas. Therefore, there is no cause for alarm at all about the level of retail sales. There is evidence that when an election is on there is a slowing down and, indeed, a stoppage in retail sales.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, there has been election speculation for some months. That suggests that we will not see any major recovery in retail sales.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If it is the Opposition's intention to say that South Australia is performing appallingly, and that the bottom is falling out of the economy, let it say that loudly and clearly and take the consequences on confidence. I am simply saying that, if one sets in context the expenditure of households in this State, one will find that consumer expenditure choice is being directed to items that are not considered in the retail sales index. It is an simple as that. It will be interesting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable members for Bragg and Alexandra are definitely out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that members wait and see what sort of figures are shown up over the next six months or so, as we believe that that consumption expenditure will begin to work through into the retail area. I put that on the record now. I may be wrong; the analysis of our economic advisers may be wrong. If it is, we will make that quite clear. However, one would expect there to be some stagnation of sales over the current two or three months since those figures were collected.

One also hopes that there will be a major upturn in December retail sales once the election is out of the way. In fact, retailers advise me that they have stocked and prepared on the basis that that will occur. We will see what the evidence is. However, I hope that my answer is not being interpreted in any way as attempting to put other than the factual situation.

Yes, South Australia's retail sales at the moment are not buoyant. There is no question of that. However, I repeat that our share of the Australian sales is very stable and that there is, therefore, no cause for concern about the overall level of consumption expenditure in this State. I invite members opposite to talk to the people I have mentioned—the home building, travel and tourist industries, motor vehicle dealers, and others—and they will see that the performance that is shown in the retail sales index, which excludes

those areas, is stronger than for the rest of Australia. There is a limited amount of money to be spent. That may well be the explanation, but let us wait for a few months. But, whatever we do, let us not attempt to talk the economy down.

TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General inform the House whether the Attorney-General's Department is prepared to amend the regulations in respect of the payment of traffic infringement fines? I have been informed by the Legal Services Commission that when a person receives a fine he or she is given 28 days in which to pay and after that the matter goes to court. When people are on unemployment benefits or similar payments, it is sometimes difficult for them to find \$60 or \$80 within 28 days. Some of my constituents have suggested to me that they be allowed to pay a portion of the fine and the remainder in instalments. There is no resistance to paying the fine, but the fact is that they cannot find the money within 28 days.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is an important one. It has two aspects to it: first, whether the current legislation ought to be amended to provide for fines to be levied according to an offender's means to pay, which I understand is the situation in some Scandinavian countries and other parts of the world; and, secondly, whether there ought to be a system of relief for persons who wish to pay their fines over a longer period as a result of necessitous circumstances. That is the case with respect to juvenile offenders where an alternative is provided; they can perform community work as a means of paying off their fine. However, I will most certainly refer the honourable member's concern to the Attorney-General for his consideration.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT LONG SERVICE LEAVE

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I ask the Minister of Education whether Treasury has asked the Education Department to refuse long service leave to teachers and, if so, why, and how many applications have been refused.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The situation with regard to long service leave is essentially no different this year from what it has been for the past three or four years, namely, that some applications for long service leave have been deferred or refused in the current financial year and at a later time will be taken up. The Budget this year provided for 130 000 days long service leave, which is a maintenance in terms of the numbers of days that applied in the previous financial year.

However, it now appears that that might not be able to meet all the long service leave requirements that normally could be expected to be met reasonably. That matter is being pursued both with the Treasurer and Treasury and I will formally advise the House of the outcome of this later. No teacher who has applied for a term of long service leave has had his or her application rejected.

The applications that have been deferred or refused at this stage are shorter term applications—four weeks, six weeks, or the like. As I say, for each one of the past three or four years such applications have been refused. That is done partly to meet logistical requirements of the Department to cater for needs of filling those vacancies within the schools. One surely understands that there are needs within schools themselves.

The situation is that in the medium term all Governments, owing to the ageing profile of their employees, face the situation with which they have to come to terms in relation to long service leave, because more people are becoming eligible for long service leave. I have already discussed this matter with my colleagues and we are certainly looking at the ramifications in a budgetary sense, in the medium term and long term, as to what that means to Government financing, because clearly people will at some stage have to take their long service leave, and any increase in the rate of deferral of applications for long service leave just adds that on to a later time when at some stage it must be met. Indeed, in deferring the leave, it has to be met possibly at salary levels higher than those that are presently met.

I conclude on the point that the allocation in this Budget in real terms was maintained at 130 000 days. The policy being followed is the same as that which was followed in previous years. However, it is true that the rate of deferral or refusals at this stage is somewhat higher than it was last year. That matter is being pursued separately, as I have indicated, and I will advise the House formally when those discussions have been resolved.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL KESWICK TERMINAL

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport approach Australian National to ensure that a red telephone and/or a taxi telephone direct line be provided at the new Australian National terminal at Keswick for the convenience of passengers? I raise this matter because of the inconvenience suffered by interstate passengers who left Melbourne last night and who travelled to South Australia on buses on the night of 14 November. They arrived in Adelaide today at 5.30 a.m. However, there were no taxis, buses or telephones available, and on a talkback radio programme this morning the inconvenience that was caused to interstate visitors and indeed tourists was highlighted. I ask the Minister, therefore, whether he will ensure that these facilities are provided for the future use of passengers.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I will certainly take up that matter with Australian National for the member for Mawson. I have already discussed some of the problems at the Keswick terminal with Dr Williams, the General Manager of Australian National, and a number of matters are under consideration. The ramp to the Richmond Road end for connection with the STA Keswick station will be opened and available by January or February next year and feasibility studies are under way regarding allowing the STA red hens to traverse through the Australian National terminal.

A subway to connect to the STA State system is also being considered, as are a number of other matters. Australian National accepts that it is its responsibility to provide those facilities for interstate passengers, and I will be pleased to take up with Australian National the matter that the honourable member has raised.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT LONG SERVICE LEAVE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier indicate whether the Government's decision to refuse long service leave applications beyond a qualified period in the Education Department also applies to other departments and what assessment the Government has made of the long-term budgetary implications of the decision? The Opposition has received many complaints from teachers who have had applications for long service leave in 1985 refused. In the latest issue of the *Teachers Journal*, the President of the

Institute of Teachers, Mr Jackson, made the following statement about the situation:

The Department is currently sitting on a powder keg. Long service is now growing at a faster rate than the increases in funds for it. If the Government won't confront this issue, the pressure will escalate.

The Opposition understands that this policy of refusing long service leave applications is being applied in some other Government departments. The long-term budgetary implications of this policy are potentially serious, because while it may alleviate the financial situation this year it will only increase the liability on taxpayers in future years. This is typical of the decision making of this Government, putting off decisions today, which only stores up the problems for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member well knows that that is out of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: True, but it is a factual statement. In view of the serious implications of the decision for all taxpayers, I seek information from the Premier on the number of public servants who will be affected by it and estimates of the additional costs which future Governments will be forced to meet.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thought that this issue, particularly relating to teachers—but what was said about teachers could be extrapolated generally—was well covered a minute ago by my colleague the Minister of Education. This problem is nothing new and the extraordinary thing—I excuse the member for Light because he was not a member of the previous Government—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: You said that before.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is right, and I can say it again. Perhaps the honourable member is being asked to raise these questions because they would come oddly from those who were part of that Government. The fact is that under this Government, as I understand it, for the first time a systematic attempt is being made to analyse the nature and extent of the problem. That was not done under the previous Government. Also, under this Government, a policy of encouraging people to take their long service leave rather than store it up as some kind of retirement bonus has in fact been promoted and, again, I would suggest that the previous Government did very little in this direction. Rather than—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Questions are asked, and these pathetic interjections follow!

The SPEAKER: Order! It is difficult to hear the reply above the barrage of interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Alexandra to order after he has interjected on many occasions. I now warn him. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This problem of long service leave is one that is naturally going to exacerbate as the age profile of the public sector gets higher.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What assessment have you done on it?

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is no point in answering this question. I refer members to the answer given by my colleague, but I point out that we are looking at this matter. I also point out that long service leave, under all award provisions, is to be taken at the convenience of the employer, and that policy will continue, but that this Government's policy is to ensure that leave is taken as close as possible to when it becomes due because of the long-term financial problems that any other approach might cause. If members are serious in asking their questions and are not prepared to listen to the answers or allow the answers to be given in

any way which would aid their understanding, there is absolutely no point in their wasting my time here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are failing to observe their own Standing Orders. I can only ask that they do so in future. The honourable member for Unley.

FRANKLIN STREET BUS DEPOT

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Tourism contact the operator of the South Australian Bus Terminal in Franklin Street to see what provision is made for passengers arriving there at the weekends after 9.30 p.m. in order to provide security and comfort for intrastate and interstate passengers? Several constituents have contacted me about this matter (I personally have been required to pick up relatives from this terminal, and the issue was raised as well on a talkback programme this morning) because the terminal closes down some evenings at 9.30. This unfortunately leaves some passengers stranded without any facility to arrange transport and without any form of comfort. I note from comments on the radio this morning and from contact with constituents that in many cases it leaves passengers stranded.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I appreciate the honourable member's directing this question to me as Minister of Tourism, because there is a very serious tourism impact on the standing of South Australia within Australia if we do not provide for the needs and comforts of people who are visiting our State. Normally, I expect that this would be a question with which my colleague the Minister of Transport would deal, particularly in relation to commuter services within South Australia, and I will take the matter up with him.

I am aware, as are all members, I imagine, that the long haul road passenger services in South Australia (that is, the Mount Gambier to Adelaide and the West Coast to Port Lincoln to Adelaide via Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie) on weekends do arrive in the city at a time when the terminal is closed. Because of the length of those trips and in circumstances where there is a young family involved, the need to be able to provide adequately, particularly at the destination, for simple toilet stops, etc., is a serious matter.

I take the honourable member's point about security and the need for relatives and people who are waiting for passengers to be able to wait in comfort, out of the elements, rain, etc. I will take the matter up with my colleague the Minister of Transport so that we can make a joint submission to the proprietors of the bus depot in South Australia to see whether it is possible—and I cannot imagine that it would not be possible—to provide adequately for the needs of not only the commuters but more particularly, I expect, from the point of view of my portfolio responsibilities, those intrastate, interstate and international tourists who use our bus service.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND PRICES

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Premier explain the discrepancy of more than \$6 000 between his estimate and the Department of Environment and Planning's estimate of average land prices in the Tea Tree Gully area? In a statement in this House on 30 October, in response to the concerns of the Housing Trust Board about the Golden Grove indenture, the Premier said that the average price for a building

block in the Tea Tree Gully area in the September quarter was about \$31 000. He also repeated this estimate in various media interviews on that day.

However, the latest land monitoring report published by the Department of Environment and Planning puts the average price in the Tea Tree Gully area at \$24 699, that is, \$6 301 less than the Premier's estimate. It has been put to me that one possibility for this discrepancy is that the Premier was attempting to deliberately exaggerate the difference between the cost of Housing Trust blocks in the development and private allotments to be available for purchase, because of the criticism of the Golden Grove indenture by the Housing Trust Board.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: From the information that the honourable member has given, I am not sure whether he is comparing like with like or, indeed, the timing of those estimates, but I will refer the question to my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning for a detailed reply.

MEMBERS' PHONE CALLS

Mr HAMILTON: My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Will you take the necessary and appropriate action to ensure that the privacy of members' telephone conversations between each other and constituents is guaranteed? Since being elected to this Parliament in 1979, I have listened to members complain about crossed lines, overhearing personal conversations, and losing connections during conversations between constituents and business houses. In addition, members receive telephone calls which are of a confidential nature, sensitive, personal and, in some instances, of a libellous or defamatory nature.

But, most importantly, we cannot guarantee our constituents that their telephone conversations will remain confidential, all because of an outdated and obviously malfunctioning telephone system in need of replacement. Therefore, Sir, will you bring down a report to Parliament on what action will be taken, and when, to overcome the problems that I have outlined?

The SPEAKER: I am pleased to report that the Table Officers have in fact already taken action. I have been aware for a long time of the problems outlined by the honourable member, and they can be embarrassing. I think that all honourable members can probably remember at least one occasion on which a problem has occurred. Currently, the Table Officers are discussing the matter with officers of the Minister of Public Works, and most certainly I would hope to have an early report to bring down for the benefit of the whole House.

DEATH DUTIES

Mr INGERSON: Does the Premier support the reintroduction of death duties on a national basis? In a document being circulated by the Government referring to its so-called achievements during its first two years of office, the Premier has stated that the Government has no intention of reintroducing succession duties. However, he has also gone on to state:

Amendments to taxation of this kind will occur only in the context of fundamental taxation reform undertaken at a Federal level.

As that statement suggests that the Premier may be a supporter of death duties levied on a national basis, I ask him whether he will make a clear statement on his attitude.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have made a clear statement about my attitude. We have made it quite clear that there is no intention to reintroduce succession, death or estate

duties in this State. In the context of any national tax reform and national tax conferences that may be held, I guess that a number of options will be explored. However, certainly in the current context that is not one that I would favour.

DREDGING

Mr PETERSON: Can the Minister of Marine tell the House whether the Department of Marine and Harbors has reduced dredging operations from two shifts to one shift and what are the Department's plans for future dredging operations in South Australia? Many Department of Marine and Harbors employees in the deepening section have contacted me recently expressing concern about their future employment. I attended a meeting of the men, and subsequently met with the Minister of Marine and the Director of the Department to clarify this concern that the men have about their jobs. Since then I have been informed that the Department is considering moth-balling the dredging operations which will necessitate relocating about 50 men from the two dredging shifts within the Department. This will also lessen the amount of maintenance work for dockyard employees, who are also very concerned about their future employment. Will the Minister inform the House of the Government's policy on this matter?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Since 1945 the State's port system has been undergoing an upgrading process both to catch up following war time inactivity and to adjust to developing shipping technology, particularly in view of the increase in the size of ships and their specialisation. The deepening branch of the Department of Marine and Harbors has undertaken some major projects over the past 10 years. However, the need for capital deepening has now been reduced, because the main facilities are complete. Although there will be a need for dredging in future, the jobs in question are unlikely to be larger in the foreseeable future. The dredging programme has involved a two-shift operation, and by reducing it to a one-shift operation the remaining and future work could be arranged to carry on for longer periods.

The work force has objected to this and desires to continue with the two shift operation. However, the effect of that means that the work available runs out more quickly. The Department has quite a large civil works programme and jobs will be found elsewhere within the Department. The Department is currently negotiating with the grain industry for a deep draft grain terminal and with the gypsum consortium out of Thevenard. If all projects go ahead, it will provide work for the dredging crew for the next few years. The question is under consideration by the Government and, hopefully, continuity of work will be found.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr GUNN: Does the Premier support the opposition by small business in the rural community in South Australia to the introduction of a capital gains tax? If so, will he make his views clear to the Prime Minister?

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I will explain my question if the member for Mawson, who obviously supports it, will cease interjecting. The Prime Minister's policy speech yesterday has heightened speculation that a Federal Labor Government after the next election would impose a capital gains tax. While the Prime Minister has proposed a taxation summit in much the same way as the Premier promised a tax inquiry before the last South Australian election, most political commentators have concluded that Mr Hawke's summit is merely a prelude to

a capital gains tax and a device to put off giving a commitment before the election. There is widespread opposition to such a tax in South Australia, particularly amongst the small business and farming communities.

The Director of the South Australian Employers Federation, Mr Warren, has said that a capital gains tax could stifle investment by business and prevent companies from upgrading or replacing equipment, while the economist with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Mr Nettle, has said people are delaying investment decisions until they find out one way or the other what is going to happen, and he has called for commitments from the major Parties before the Federal election.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is no intention and support at the State level for the introduction of such an impost. If invited (as I imagine it will be), the South Australian Government will participate in any general tax conference or inquiry that the Federal Government may undertake. The matter will be addressed in that context.

OVERSEAS CURRENCY

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare inquire whether overseas aid organisations such as Austcare could find some way of making use of the loose change brought back to Australia by returning travellers? Exchange facilities normally are not readily available at airports and similar such locations for converting coins from one form of currency to another. Paper currency is readily convertible, but exchange bureaux are usually unwilling to accept smaller denomination coins, regardless of, or perhaps because of, the quantity involved. Even large denomination coins are usually unwelcome. Subsequently, it is not unusual for travellers returning to Australia to have with them a dollar or two in small change in the currency of each country they have visited. These coins are likely to just end up being tossed into the bottom of a desk drawer somewhere (although I have been told that a few coins might surreptitiously end up in slot machines or in financial transactions where the level of illumination is not very high).

More seriously, however, I recently became aware that Oxfam in the United Kingdom, with the assistance of English travel agencies, distribute pamphlets to prospective overseas travellers asking them to contribute that loose foreign change on their return. I understand that collection boxes can be provided at airports for this purpose. I would surmise that a similar scheme operating through Australian airports could provide additional \$1 000 per day for worthy causes such as famine relief in Ethiopia.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion in this regard. It is obviously a matter that would require discussion with the Commonwealth Government, which has responsibility for airports and their management. I will be most pleased to take it up with the responsible Federal Ministers and voluntary aid organisations. The suggestion is very worth while and, obviously, very relevant to current campaigns that are being conducted quite successfully in Australia to provide very much needed relief to persons suffering from starvation in countries such as Ethiopia.

ELECTRICITY TARIFF

Mr EVANS: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware of the concern of some local government bodies about the new electricity tariff rating on which they have been placed? Recently, I attended a Happy Valley council meeting, and it was brought to that council's notice that from now on it

would be placed on an 'S' tariff, in particular, for the new bore that it wishes to have equipped and for other facilities for which new meters will be installed. That 'S' tariff starts at 21 cents and gradually reduces with the amount of power used.

In the case of that sporting complex, it had reduced to approximately 18c based on the amount of water used. Previously, it was on a 'P' tariff which gave a nightly pumping rate of roughly 7c under the old rating, yet the new figures will take it nearer to 10c. The council is deeply concerned, because it will have to increase hire fees and rental charges for sporting and other community facilities if this 21c 'S' tariff is to apply gradually across the board. What information does the Minister have to hand? If he has none, can he supply it later?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member was kind enough to speak to me yesterday about this matter. At that time I had some initial information and I have since endeavoured to obtain some more. I have not had a great deal of success until now because there appears to be some confusion in the minds of the Happy Valley council and possibly also in relation to ETSA. The information that I have been able to obtain suggests that there has not been any change in the situation.

I am endeavouring to obtain more information, but as far as we have been able to ascertain from ETSA the council has five accounts, four of which are and have been on 'S', so there has not been any change. One is on 'P' tariff, which involves the optional night rate referred to by the honourable member and which makes pumping a much cheaper operation. So, there does not appear to have been any change. That is the best that I can put forward to the honourable member. We did try to contact his office this morning to see whether he could supply more details to narrow down the actual problem, but we were not able to do so. However, I give the honourable member an undertaking that we will continue to try to ascertain whether there is a genuine concern by the council or whether there is some confusion about the matter.

JUNIOR PRIMARY SCHOOL POLICY

Ms LENEHAN: I ask a question of the Minister of Education.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: It is not a Dorothy Dix question, as a matter of fact. Can the Minister explain to the House what educational benefits will be experienced by children entering school in 1985 and beyond as a result of the Minister's recent announcement that some children will have up to one year extra in the junior primary school? I raise this question because I have been asked by several constituents what benefits will result for their children by completing between seven and 10 terms in junior primary in contrast to the present situation where they have to complete between six and eight terms. Also, some confusion exists within the community about the implications of this educational innovation. Will the Minister explain what those implications are?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am very happy to take this opportunity to inform members of the House, who I hope will take the opportunity to inform their constituents who raise this matter with them. When I announced the policy yesterday at the Croydon Junior Primary School, parents of the school community were invited along to hear it. I was quite impressed by and interested in the amount of concern expressed by parents at that time and by the number of parents who came along asking questions about it. Clearly, there is much parental concern or interest in

what this policy means for education of their children. The suggestion by members opposite a few moments ago that this is a matter of non-interest does not reflect what parents in the community are saying.

The policy announcement goes back to the release of a policy development paper. Before the last election we committed ourselves to releasing policy development papers on particular areas of education, the first of which was released in this House and related to the early years of schooling. That put forward a number of issues or concerns about the junior primary period of schooling and how much time students spend in that. A number of proposals were made; they were floated out for community discussion. We received significant community response, and that was considered by the Department. The Department made recommendations to me; I took it to Cabinet; and Cabinet endorsed the proposals that I announced yesterday. They are that from 1986 there will be a change in the number of terms that children will spend in the junior primary years of schooling: that is reception through to year 2. Until now, depending on the age or birth date of the children concerned, children have spent between six and eight terms in the junior primary years of schooling.

For some considerable time there has been concern by parents and teachers, particularly for those children spending only six terms in junior primary, that that has been insufficient to meet the educational needs of those children, given how much critical learning takes place in those early years of schooling. So, the view has been expressed that if that could be extended perhaps some of the remedial problems that are sometimes faced by some children later in schooling or later in life may well be overcome because the extra support will have been available. Consequently, it is now proposed that children will spend between seven and 10 terms, depending on their birth date, in the junior primary years of schooling.

That will give them the opportunity to pick up the extra support or reinforcement that they might need. To help schools adapt to this policy change, we have appointed two advisory teachers to commence at the start of 1985 to assist in curriculum development and in service work with teachers to assist the implementation of this policy, which in a formal sense will start from the beginning of 1986. However, I must say that a number of schools have already started to adapt to it and at this stage we are advised that about 40 per cent of schools in the system will be able to start in 1985.

The other point that needs to be mentioned is that, because of the longer period of time that some children will spend in junior primary schools, it will mean that at the peak there will be an extra 6 400 students in the system than otherwise would have been the case had the previous policy continued to apply. This does have a cost factor attached to it in terms of the number of teachers needed to meet the needs of those students. Indeed, the cost over the decade 1988 to 1998 will be of the order of \$5 million. However, we believe that, in terms of the research evidence of how much extra educational support this will mean to children, it will be an investment well worth making in human terms. The other point that we want to make is that it is clearly a policy that has grown out of concern within the education community, which has reacted very positively to this.

Some parents have wanted to ask questions such as, 'What about my child? Will I be given the opportunity to talk with the school about whether my child will continue to receive seven terms or 10 terms?' I have clearly given the undertaking that that will happen: parent opinion in this matter will be critical for the future of children. Some people say, 'This is fine for the junior primary years of schooling: it is fine for those early years.' I make the point

that it will be educationally beneficial for a child throughout his or her schooling and, indeed, one could suggest, throughout his or her life, because so many of the educational or learning problems that people face later could have been resolved had enough time been available in those first seven to 10 terms.

Members may ask one question: why was it previously six to eight terms—a difference of two terms between the maximum and the minimum—and now it is seven to 10 terms? A child whose birth date comes up to the second week of the third term and who is entering a reception class would spend the third term in a school plus all of next year and all the year after—that is seven terms. The teacher and the parents may feel that that still has not been quite enough: that is only one term extra than the six terms minimum that presently applies before the new policy begins. We are offering the opportunity for those parents and the teachers concerned to say, 'If you would like your child to stay on a full further three terms—a full further year—you are free to do that.'

It is not a compulsory thing: they can either make it seven terms or 10 terms, and that is quite a significant choice that has been given to parents and teachers in those circumstances. I was very impressed with the enthusiasm with which it was received yesterday, and I believe that this will really offer great educational opportunities to children in the years to come. It will really assist in trying to meet those particular remedial problems that all children have in one way or another in their early years of learning. I am certain that any member who has young children about to enter that arena will be as pleased as the Department is about how well this policy is developing.

VALUATION FEES

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask his colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate whether land valuers' fees for property valuations are fair and reasonable? About two years ago the Highways Department set out to acquire a property owned by Mr Thermos at Brompton and offered him about \$50 400 for the property. Mr Thermos was advised that he could approach a valuer and a solicitor to have an independent valuation made. He went to Gaetjens, and they valued the property at \$75 000 and charged him a valuation fee of \$250, which I understand was the basic fee at that time. Mr Thermos was not satisfied with that valuation because he thought his property was probably worth more than that. He went to Mr Christodoulou, who valued the property at \$95 000 and charged a fee of \$760. He then went to Maloney Field Service, which valued the property at \$83 000 and charged him \$918. This gentleman was most upset to think that he had received three different valuations and the valuation fees had varied from \$250 to \$918.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that this is a compulsory acquisition situation. As the honourable member has indicated, there are provisions within the legislation for independent valuations to be carried out at cost to the acquiring authority. The ultimate test, I suppose, of the value of the property in this situation is determined, if necessary, by the appropriate tribunal, under the land and valuation jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. That ultimate course of action is available to a person who is dissatisfied with the valuation he has received. However, I suppose it is always a matter of contention as to what a property is actually worth at any particular time.

Often the time of departure from a property compulsorily acquired is some considerable time after the service of the notice of compulsory acquisition at which the time the

valuation applied, and that often results in moneys being paid into court, that ultimate amount of money being far less than the current value of the property at the time of demolition or use for some other public purpose. It is not simply a matter of setting down formulae for valuations or the like: a normal valuation process must be undertaken, and the ultimate decision is taken by the tribunal. However, I will certainly refer the circumstances of this matter to the responsible Minister in another place to see whether some further light can be thrown on this situation.

PREMIER'S CIRCULAR No. 39

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether action has been taken by the Government to repeal the Premier's Department circular No. 39, or is the Government prepared to continue to ignore this direction? The City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976, was proclaimed in 1976. The primary function of the Act is to provide a flexible framework within which development proposals in the City of Adelaide may be examined. The Act established the City of Adelaide Planning Commission to which nominees of both Government and the City of Adelaide have been appointed. The Commission is empowered to consider and report on any matter relating to the planning and development of the city referred to it by the Minister or the council.

Whilst it is recognised that the Crown is exempt under the Act, this regulation means that Government departments and statutory authorities shall co-operate in all matters relating to development within the City of Adelaide, having particular regard to the following stipulations. All projects by Government departments and statutory authorities constituting development in terms of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act shall be in accordance with the principles of development control and regulations prepared under the Act.

In this regard, the Commission Secretary is available to assist departments and authorities as required, and it is requested that consultation should take place at the earliest possible time. Prior to final approval of the proposed project by Cabinet, the responsible Minister or the Board of the statutory authority, the proposal shall be referred to the City of Adelaide Planning Commission for comment in relation to the principles of development control and regulations.

Recently there have been significant examples of the way in which the Government has totally ignored the procedures set out in the circular. One example relates to the Institute of Technology building, on North Terrace (the old Brookman Building), which is a significant State heritage item and a fine example of period architecture. The Government has recently tacked a fire escape on to the outside of that building without any consideration being given to the Premier's Department circular No. 39 or bringing it before the City of Adelaide Planning Commission.

Another matter relates to the alterations being talked about by the Minister, the Minister of Transport and senior Government officers in relation to the Hackney transport depot, concerning which nothing has yet been put before the City of Adelaide Planning Commission. I ask whether the present Government is genuine about Premier's Department circular No. 39 or whether it intends to continue to ignore it.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The only derogation from the spirit of circular 39 on behalf of the Government, as narrowly defined as the Cabinet, was that which was secured through Parliament, namely, the legislation in relation to the ASER project which does modify the traditional City of Adelaide development control provisions, but that was—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I'm not talking about that.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I guessed the honourable member was not but I thought it was worth while putting on the record. For me to deny that the Government was in any way derogating from the spirit of circular 39 would be to ignore the fact that we did pass legislation through this House which modified the traditional City of Adelaide planning provisions in that respect.

Having cleared that out of the way, I can now go on and say that the Government is as enthusiastic about circular 39 as it has ever been. I applaud the honourable member's sentiments in relation to this matter. All I can say is that the honourable member was a little slow off the mark, because I concede that there have recently been several examples of instrumentalities which have proceeded without going through the machinery of circular 39. On every occasion that this has been brought to my attention I have made it clear that that procedure should be followed, and it will continue to be followed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Yesterday the member for Chaffey asked me a question about the Blanchetown bridge, and I have the following information for him. To allow for the normal small movements which occur in a bridge, expansion joints are provided in the deck, whilst still providing an acceptable riding surface. At Blanchetown, most of the movement of the bridge is taken at two expansion joints of the finger plate variety. These comprise a metal plate attached to each side of the joint, with protruding fingers which interlock with the fingers of a similar plate on the other side.

The finger plate joints of the Blanchetown bridge were inspected on 27 September 1984. This inspection revealed that the finger plates were not fully clamped to the bridge deck, resulting in some noise from the joint when a vehicle passed over it. Despite this fact, the joints are in good condition and the safety of road users and of the bridge was not affected. Adjustments have now been completed. The bridge is programmed for a comprehensive inspection in December 1984, using the Department's bridge inspection platform. This inspection is part of the Department's routine programme of bridge inspections, which are undertaken at regular intervals.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 4 December at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr OLSEN: I seek some information from the Leader of the Government in this House. I understand that the other House has been advised of the Parliamentary sittings for February/March, and I ask whether there is any reason why in this instance the Leader of the Government has not advised us of the intended sitting times for February/March next year.

The SPEAKER: Taking the spirit of the question, I will allow it if it can be dealt with quickly.

Mr Ferguson: If he speaks he closes the debate!

The SPEAKER: I should add, by the way, that having called the honourable Deputy Premier that means he closes the debate.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Thank you for your generous ruling, Mr Speaker. There is no reason why I have not informed the House: I think it is purely a matter of having been too busy, but I will convey the information to the Leader soon.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It is pretty important to inform the House, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Building Societies Act, 1975, came into operation on 17 April 1975, and there has been a number of amendments since that date, most being of a relatively minor nature. This Bill introduces several amendments which are intended to facilitate the needs of societies in a rapidly changing financial environment and which relate to the administration of the Act. The introduction of this Bill comes at a time when most other States in Australia are seeking to introduce or are working toward similar legislation that will provide a greater degree of freedom in asset management by societies and a greater ability to meet the financial needs of members. Such an expanded role as proposed in this Bill, whilst still preserving the predominant role of a building society, which is the provision of housing finance, will not in the Government's view affect the viability of building societies.

The reasons for this Bill are virtually self-explanatory—recent developments in the banking and finance sector, precipitated by the Campbell and Martin Committee reviews into the Australian financial system, necessitated urgent deregulatory measures for societies to maintain their competitive position in the market place. This Bill therefore seeks to free up a percentage of society funds equating to 6 per cent of assets for the purposes of capitalising corporate subsidiaries for the provision of a range of services, including unsecured lending. It also provides that societies may provide advisory and other services to members. The Bill also provides for the administration of the Act to vest in the Corporate Affairs Commission. Previously the Registrar of Building Societies held this statutory responsibility. The Bill also applies appropriate provisions from the Companies (South Australia) Code relating to inspection, a measure that has been adopted in other 'co-operative' legislation.

This Government is supportive of the important role conducted by the building society co-operative industry in its provision of housing finance and other financial services, and introduces this Bill, confident that the future develop-

ment of this industry will be greatly facilitated by this amending legislation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act which sets out the arrangement of the principal Act. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act by inserting a new definition (that of the Corporate Affairs Commission) and deleting the definition of Registrar. Clause 4 repeals sections 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the principal Act and replaces them with new sections 6, 7, 8, 9 and 9a which cover substantially the same subject matter. Those provisions of the principal Act that dealt with the appointment and the office of Registrar have been omitted in consequence of the transfer of the Registrar's functions under the principal Act to the Commission.

New section 6 provides that the Commission is responsible for the administration of the Act subject to Ministerial control. New section 7 provides that the Commission shall keep a register of societies and such other registers as it thinks fit. Any person may, on paying a fee, inspect a register kept by the Commission, or any document, or obtain certified copies or extracts of registers, documents or certificates. New section 8 provides for an annual report on the administration of the Act. New section 9 provides for the continuation of the Building Societies Advisory Committee—this section is the same as present section 90, and it is considered appropriate for the section to be moved into that Part of the Act that deals with administration. New section 9a provides that the provision of the Companies (South Australia) Code relating to inspection extend to societies as if they were corporations under the code. Modifications may be made as necessary or as prescribed.

Clause 5 adds new subsections (2), (3) and (4) to section 10 of the principal Act. New subsection (2) will allow societies to provide advisory and other services to members and to conduct business as an agent. A society may only operate under subsection (2) with the approval of the Commission. Subsection (3) will allow a society with the approval of the Minister to undertake an activity that is not specifically authorised by the Act but that is appropriate, in the Minister's opinion, to be carried on by a society. Subsection (4) requires the Minister to publish notice of an approval in the *Gazette*.

Clauses 6 to 24 amend the principal Act by replacing references to the Registrar with references to the Commission, and other consequential amendments of a minor nature. Clause 25 amends section 40 of the principal Act. The amendment provides for deregulatory measures of asset management by allowing a society to increase its holdings of shares in companies or bodies corporate, and by the making of loans (unsecured or secured) to such companies or bodies corporate to the extent of 6 per cent of the total of the paid up share capital of the society, the deposits held by the society and the outstanding moneys borrowed by the society. The Government considers that there is an urgent need for societies to meet the competitive thrusts of the changing financial environment and such measures are in general terms compatible with the spirit of the Campbell and Martin Reports.

Clauses 26 to 45 amend the principal Act by replacing references to the Registrar with references to the Commission, and other consequential amendments of a minor nature. Clause 46 repeals section 84 of the principal Act which dealt with inspection of documents held by the Registrar. The corresponding provision relating to inspection of documents held by the Commission has been placed in the earlier part of the Act dealing with administration. Clause 47 amends section 86 of the principal Act by replacing references to the Registrar with references to the Commission, and other consequential amendments of a minor nature. Clause 48 repeals section 86a and replaces it with new section 86a which is to the same effect but which refers to the Com-

mission rather than the Registrar. Clause 49 repeals section 88 of the principal Act which dealt with annual reports. A corresponding provision has been incorporated in the Part of the Act dealing with administration (clause 4). Clause 50 repeals section 90 of the principal Act which dealt with the advisory committee. A corresponding provision has been incorporated in the Part dealing with administration (clause 4).

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1906.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the staging of this event in Adelaide. We accept that it can bring significant benefits to the city and to South Australia. It is an appropriate Jubilee 150 event which is, of course, how the project was conceived. Indeed, my colleague the member for Torrens, as the former Minister of Transport, was involved in the initial discussions on the staging—that is, before the last State election—of the Formula One Grand Prix for Adelaide in 1986. The first one will now be held slightly earlier than that—in October 1985. This schedule will give the Board once it is appointed only about 10 months to do all that is necessary to stage the first race.

Given the scale of this event, that is an enormous task. The Opposition, therefore, understands the Government's desire to deal with this legislation expeditiously. We will accommodate the Government's desire to have this legislation through Parliament so that the Board can be established early in December. At the same time, we will exercise our right and fulfil our obligations to question the Government closely about some of the provisions of the Bill, because it does confer on the Board some very significant and wide powers. It will interfere with the rights of many people and with some businesses, and it will deny the public access to parklands and public roads from time to time and involve the use of taxpayers' funds.

I will deal with that last point first, because a significant omission from this Bill in the Premier's second reading explanation is any reference to the cost of the project to taxpayers. In an earlier statement to this House (I think on 30 October) the Premier said that the net cost to the State of staging the race would be between \$1.5 million and \$2 million. However, there was no elaboration in that statement of how that estimate had been arrived at, nor does this Bill inform the House any further. I understand that no contract is to be signed which stipulates the Government's commitments and returns in financial terms.

When calculating the net cost to the State this House does not know whether the Premier's estimate includes the police and other emergency services, which will have to be deployed during the event, the erection of grandstands and other spectator facilities, the preparation of the circuit and the erection of safety barriers. All those items are costly, and the public deserves to know more than it has been told so far about how those costs are to be met.

Another important omission from the Bill is any precise definition of the area to be declared for the purposes of staging the race. The legislation provides that this area can be fully cordoned off for a five-day period each year and that parts of the area may also be cordoned off at other times, even for a full year. As the declared area involves public roads, a considerable area of parklands, and is bordered by houses, offices and a major college, hotels, motels

and other private premises, much more elaboration of what will constitute the declared area also needs to be given by the Government whilst this Bill is before the Parliament.

The proposed route is bordered by premises, which I will indicate to the House, where activity is likely to be disrupted during the declared period. I refer to Prince Alfred College, the Old Coach and Flinders Lodge Motels, several rooms for doctors and other professional groups, the Country Women's Association, the Britannia Hotel, a private hospital, an advertising agency, the Local Government Association's headquarters, and the East End Market, to name but some.

Clause 23 of the Bill implies that business and financial interests might be adversely affected by the staging of this event yet there is to be no liability of the Board for it. On the face of it, this provision seems to be extremely unfair to the owners and occupiers of all those premises directly on the route. What happens to them in the event of an accident, for instance? If their properties are damaged by the staging of this event, the Board is to take no liability for compensation. What is to happen about access to their properties during the declared period, when the Board has total control?

As I understand it, at least three barriers have to be erected on each side of the track: a prefabricated concrete barrier one metre high, on top of which is erected a three-metre high chain wire debris fence. About three metres behind this will be the spectator fences, generally chain wire, about 1.5 metres high, and then a barrier on the outer extremities of the circuit area through which spectators have to pass to pay admission. It appears that the need for these barriers must restrict access to all areas along the route, possibly causing loss of business as well as significant personal inconvenience to many people. Yet, in the Bill as it is drafted at present, those affected are to have no opportunity for compensation.

Essentially, I believe that this is a Committee Bill because this Parliament and the public deserve a great deal of information about an event which, in one way or another, is likely to affect a large number (in many respects, one could almost say every member) in the community. So that the Premier can be ready for some of the questions we intend to raise in Committee, let me foreshadow our other major areas of keenest interest.

I said at the outset that the Opposition supports the staging of this event and we recognise it as an important element of the Jubilee programme. The former Government, when establishing the Jubilee Board, ensured that the then Opposition was represented on that Board and, in keeping with that bipartisan spirit in which we are approaching this event, I believe it would be appropriate for the Premier to invite the Opposition to provide one of the six members of the Board to be nominated by the Minister: it may well be in his own interests to do that. It may also be appropriate for the SAJC to be represented on the Board, as a significant area of the Victoria Park racecourse and most of its facilities, including the grandstands, are to be used for the event.

The Board is given a range of powers, some of which it could exercise in competition with the private sector. I refer, for example, to advertising and promotion, to the sale of food and drink and items directly associated with the race, including books and programmes, and the construction of the circuit. The Opposition seeks assurances from the Government that these activities will be given to the private sector to undertake. Clause 16 establishes a trust fund and all income earned through commercial operations of the Board are to be paid into this fund. The moneys are to be held upon trust for the State and 'such other persons as may be appointed by the Minister'. Parliament needs to be informed about the people likely to be appointed by the Minister to share the moneys in the trust fund. What are

the terms and conditions of any proposed declaration of trust and why should the Minister have the ultimate right to determine the destination of those moneys?

Clause 20 gives the Minister power to make a declaration that an area is to be a 'declared area' for a year specified in the notice and for the Minister to declare a period to be a 'declared period' for a year. The Premier needs to explain why this should be the Minister and not done by regulation. The area to be declared could vary from year to year and the public, especially those directly affected by such a declaration, can have their interests prejudiced at just the stroke of the Minister's pen.

Clause 21 (2) provides that any public road within the declared area ceases to be a public road for the declared period. This raises questions about liability for accidents involving motor vehicles on that road when it is not being used for the Grand Prix. I have seen some reports which suggest that, during the declared period, public roads in the area may be open from time to time when practice and racing are not being held.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, and I would hate to think about the prospect of some young people getting on that circuit and being exempt from all applicable legislation during non-racing periods. Such a possibility raises questions about clause 25 which provides that certain laws, including the Road Traffic and Motor Vehicle Acts will not apply. Will this allow private motor vehicles to travel at unlimited speeds through the declared area when, during the declared period, public roads are open?

Clause 25 (2) suspends the operation of the Planning Act within the declared area for the year. This will mean that there will be no controls placed on the Government in relation to the removal of trees and interference with other environmental aspects of the proposed circuit and no planning approval will be needed to erect any particular structures, whether permanent or temporary. Before Parliament approves the suspension of the Planning Act in what is a most attractive and important part of our city, the Premier needs to explain why this is necessary and what particular objects, especially trees and gardens in the parklands, will need to be removed to make way for the circuit.

I might just point out that we obtained assurances and undertakings when the ASER Bill was before Parliament, and in good faith we did not impede the progress of the Bill as it related to the ASER project for the same reasons as I have outlined in relation to this legislation. However, it disappoints me particularly that the undertakings given by the Premier to this House relating to the ASER Bill have simply not been fulfilled, and that has been clearly established on the public record by a variety of groups which have clearly identified that the Premier has not lived up to the undertakings given to this Parliament in relation to that Bill.

I trust that the Premier will recognise that the Opposition wants to assist in this matter and to facilitate the passage of the Bill before the House; however, we will seek specific answers and assurances in relation to certain matters. Should the Premier not be prepared to provide reasonable answers and assurances in relation to matters that will be raised, I indicate that the Opposition will seek to amend the Bill in another place. One of the fundamental obligations of an Opposition in any Parliament is to ensure that the rights of all citizens are protected. I hope that it will not be necessary to amend the Bill in the other place: the ball is squarely in the Premier's court.

Clause 25 (3) is very wide, ensuring that no citizen can take any civil action for nuisance arising out of any activity carried on, by or with the permission of the Board within the declared area. Residents living close to the circuit will

need assurances that activities during the declared period are kept to a minimum outside the hours of practice and racing. I said at the outset that I understand the haste with which this Bill has had to be introduced. However, in many respects, the Bill overrides private rights and therefore commands the closest scrutiny by this House. Some of my colleagues have other concerns which they will express during the second reading and Committee stages. We will do so not to hinder in any way the desire of the Government to stage an event which obviously has wide community support. Rather, our efforts will be directed towards ensuring that this legislation is fair and workable and does not lead to subsequent problems in the organisation and staging of this event as a result of imperfect scrutiny of the Bill while it is before the Parliament.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): It is a pleasure for anyone associated with the tourism industry to be able to support a project which I believe will have powerful, far reaching and beneficial effects on the tourism industry in South Australia. It is with pleasure that I support the Bill. My Leader's speech has dealt with the specifics of the Bill, and very properly with matters which arise out of it directly relating to the legislation. I want to canvass a somewhat wider perspective, in the latitude that is allowed in a second reading speech, in looking at the framework, if you like, in which this Bill will be set in terms of the Government's and the community's wider responsibilities which extend beyond those given to the Board to be appointed by the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act.

I would like to begin by paying a tribute to the original Steering Committee, which was responsible for getting the idea off the ground in the first place. The Chairman of the original Steering Committee was Mr Bill O'Gorman, and the members were Mr Kym Bonython, the Chairman of the Jubilee 150 Board; Mr John Mitchell, a staff member of the Board; the present Lord Mayor, Mrs Wendy Chapman, who at the commencement of the planning was an alderman of the Adelaide City Council; and Mr John Haddaway, the Traffic Manager of the Adelaide City Council, who, I understand, has made an enormous contribution to the planning for this event.

As honourable members will probably know, Australia was on the short list for the World Formula One Championship in the early 1980s. No doubt, New South Wales and Victoria assumed, as is so often the case, that the battle to achieve the Grand Prix would be staged between those two States. I think that the point should be made that, because of the initiative and determination of the people I have just mentioned, South Australia outbid the Eastern States in bids for the event, and as a result we have the Bill before us today.

The success in gaining the event for South Australia places a very heavy onus on the Government, and on industry across the whole spectrum in South Australia, as well as on the community, in responding to what is probably one of the most significant opportunities ever presented to a State in Australia to put itself on the world tourism map and on the world car racing map. Certainly, the event can only be compared in its significance to the America's Cup. As the Premier said in his second reading explanation, a television viewing audience of about 250 million people in 80 countries will be focusing on Adelaide when the race is held in 1985. There are only two sports spectacles in the world which outclass this event in terms of television coverage, namely, the Olympic Games, which are held only once every four years, and World Cup Soccer, which is held annually.

So, the opportunity to put Australia on the world map is without parallel. One of the great pluses which no doubt gained Adelaide its final selection is the fact that we can

provide a road circuit rather than a closed circuit race. As the Leader said in his speech, it so happens that the road circuit chosen encompasses some of the prettiest parts of the eastern side of Adelaide. It happens to be a route with which I am familiar as it is the route, by and large (except for the racecourse section), that I commonly take from my home to Parliament House.

Another significant motor racing event is to be held in Australia in the week preceding the Australia Formula One Grand Prix, namely, the Hardie Ferodo race at Bathurst that will take place on the weekend of 6 October. For the first year ever the Bathurst race will be run under group A regulations and therefore there will be more than usual European and North American media interest in it. I understand that literally hundreds of journalists will come to Australia to cover both events. Already the event has received significant coverage in the world motor sports press. The weekly magazine *Auto Sport*, which has a multi-million circulation, in its October issue ran a headline that must send something of a thrill up the spine of those involved in the organisation. The headline stated, 'Monaco out, Adelaide in'. Again the onus of knowing that the world's eyes are upon Adelaide should require us all to give of our best for this event.

My concerns, as well as my enthusiasm, for this event are geared to the capacity of not only the Board to be established by this legislation but also of the related Government departments to fully exploit the marketing and investment potential of this event. From a tourism viewpoint we must ensure that South Australia is identified as the Grand Prix State and that the benefits of the television exposure in Europe, South-East Asia and North America flow through on a long-term basis to South Australia in tourism terms.

I am advised that the Chief Executive of Page and Moy, one of the biggest United Kingdom and European tour operators, is arriving in Adelaide next week. We have to ensure that the chief executives of the big travel operators who will be coming to examine the lie of the land here in the next few months receive every possible assistance from both the Government and the tourism industry. There will be visits from chief executives associated with both the car and tourism industries and an enormous amount of effort must be put into ensuring that these people are properly provided with information, hospitality and anything that they need by way of assistance to ensure that their part in the event can bring profit to South Australia.

As far as the Department of State Development is concerned, there is a heavy onus on that Department to ensure that the investment potential in relation to the motor industry is fully realised. South Australian based companies such as General Motors, Mitsubishi, Bridgestone, Monroe-Wylie and all small component manufacturers cannot be allowed to miss out on any single investment opportunity that might accrue as a result of the presence in Adelaide of large numbers of important executives from motor companies all over the world. In the Committee stage I will certainly be asking the Premier what action has been taken and what is planned to ensure that the Government and the State get full advantage from the event.

I have discussed with the State Manager of Qantas the likely prospects for international visitation to Adelaide. He has placed what he describes as industry estimates based on previous events against a realistic assessment of the numbers that might come. It might be interesting for the House to have such information. The number of journalists estimated to come is in the region of 800, but the expectation of Qantas is that it is more likely to be 400. The number of sponsors' representatives could be as high as 1 200, but is more likely conservatively to be 500.

There will be approximately 25 teams involved in the race, each with approximately 20 members, so another 500 people from overseas, along with two or three dozen top corporate executives, will be involved. That adds up to probably 1 400 extremely influential people in world terms who will be part of the 50 000 visitors and spectators that we can expect at this event. I cannot stress too much the importance of providing those 1 400 people with every facility that they might need to ensure that nothing but the best publicity results for South Australia as a result of their presence here.

There are likely to be possibly 200 tourists from the United Kingdom who respond to package deals designed for British sports fans. There could be up to 400 motor racing fans from Europe. The number who might come from Japan is unknown at this stage, but because the Honda racing engine launched at the end of the European season this year will be featured in the race, it is likely that there will be strong Japanese interest.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It is turbo-charged.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Is that a fact? From New Zealand there could be anything from 700 to 1 000 patrons. The enormity of the challenge before us is extremely important. Whilst the Government ultimately and inevitably will have to shoulder the lion's share of the responsibility, efforts must be made to ensure that the whole South Australian community, in typical South Australian style, responds to the challenge and that we have an enormous voluntary input which characterises our State and gives it a special characteristic and flavour so much appreciated by visitors.

As this is a Committee Bill, the real meat of the debate will take place in the Committee stages. I simply express firm support for the concept, with the warning that the taxpayers' liability must be foremost in our minds in debating this legislation and the capacity of the Government to arrange proper co-ordination and liaison with every section of the South Australian community must be assured if the event is to be the success that we all want it to be.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I do not wish to add to the remarks of my colleagues, the Leader and the member for Coles and I support entirely what they have had to say. When I was conducting preliminary negotiations on a Formula One Grand Prix for South Australia as Minister of Transport in the Tonkin Government, initial discussions took place with the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport and through an intermediary, Mr Eccleston. We were informed at that stage that certainly the Formula One Manufacturers Association would retain all the television rights.

We were also informed that the State Government or the authority running the Formula One Grand Prix would retain all the sponsorship rights. I would like the Premier, when replying in this debate, to confirm whether or not that is the case.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): First, I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill, its readiness to debate it and to ensure its passage through the House. It is obvious that we are working to a very tight time table and, as with the arrangements for the race itself, the handling of the legislation has to be done with dispatch. However, I certainly accept that that should not mean that aspects of the Bill should not be subjected to examination and questioning. In response to remarks made opposite, I certainly say that I will attempt to give all reasonable assurances and information.

Of course, I point to the fact that there are still some matters of detail that have not been concluded, including the actual contract itself. In tracing the course of negotiations

there, I state that the Formula One Constructors Association supplied the Government with a contract which left us—and this in part response to the question by the member for Torrens at the end of his contribution—with the entrance fees for the races as virtually the only source of income that would have been available to us.

Clearly, while one could anticipate reasonable revenue from that source, that was totally inadequate. There have been a lot of changes both in standard contracts and in arrangements between FISA and FOCA and the various venues for Formula One Grand Prix over the past four or five years. The dispute over the Monaco Grand Prix is I think an example of the way in which that has come to a head in recent years. Sometimes the disputes have been between the venue and those presenting the race and on other occasions they have been between FOCA (representing drivers and their teams) and the International Automobile Federation itself.

Fortunately, I think the disagreements as between FISA and FOCA have been pretty well resolved over the past couple of years, but such is the size both in terms of finance and organisation of Grand Prix racing that there are inevitably tensions and problems. So, it is a very complex operation, and obviously there are matters which we are not able to anticipate at this time but I hope that as they arise we will be able to sort them out.

Prior to our final negotiations with FOCA, there have been quite extensive discussions by our team on an earlier visit to Europe and North America with promoters and operators of venues. So, we had access to information and experience which gave us considerable pointers in terms of what Adelaide might expect. However, again I stress that each venue is different and the demands of each venue vary. Therefore, it is difficult to get precision in some areas.

We certainly want, as the Opposition has said, fair and workable legislation but legislation which provides a framework for the race to be promoted and conducted and at the same time providing for the liability of the State in terms of such taxpayer contribution as may be necessary (because the State Government is the key operator in terms of the racing circuit itself) to be kept to an absolute minimum.

I believe that we do have the basis of such an agreement. However, again—and I think the contribution of the member for Coles highlighted that—we are working in a field of unknowns to a certain extent. We, as a Government, commissioned two marketing firms separately and individually—both of them firms with very great experience in this area—to assess the possible costs and possible revenue return that we could obtain. However, as this type of Formula One Grand Prix has not been held in Australia before, there are still a number of imponderables.

So, any financial estimates must have effectively an upper and lower limit, just as many estimates by Qantas or whatever of numbers (whether it be journalists, international or interstate visitors) have upper and lower levels. At all times we have attempted to be conservative in those estimates—to look at the lower figure as the one that we might anticipate in order to try to assess a total exposure. Of course that means that if things turn out as well as certainly the current enthusiasm for the event suggests, we could do much better than that. I certainly thank the Opposition for its support and undertake to try to answer, to the best of my ability on the information we have at present, the questions that members opposite wish to ask concerning the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr OLSEN: When does the Government intend that this Act should be proclaimed, and is it the Government's inten-

tion to sign a contract with FISA before the Bill is proclaimed? The Premier has indicated that he and the Government have thus far worked on a verbal agreement or some heads of agreement and that the contract itself has not yet been signed. The Opposition seeks some financial background in relation to the contract being entered into. First, when is it the Government's intention to proclaim the legislation? Will it be proclaimed after the contract has been signed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The negotiations on the final form of the contract are almost complete. It is anticipated that that will be ready for signature within the next two weeks. This measure will not be through Parliament prior to the signing of a contract. That will mean that when the matter is before another place we will have some more precise details on the actual nature of the contract. As to the proclamation, we will wait until the appropriate time, which I envisage would be once we have identified the Board and are in a position to move to appointments. No particular time has been put on that, but I hope that it will be quite soon.

Mr OLSEN: I seek a commitment from the Premier that when the contract is signed a copy of it will be made available to the Opposition. One would assume that it would therefore be before the passage of the measure in the other place.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure whether all provisions of the contract relating to some commercial matters can be made a matter of publication, but I would undertake if there are any matters of such sensitivity to ensure that the Opposition is aware of its terms, provided that confidentiality is observed.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr OLSEN: There is no definition in the Bill of the declared area envisaged for the race. Can the Premier give the Committee an outline of the area and say whether it is to include property bordering the route such as private houses, business premises and the like?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Negotiations on the precise route and its definition are still proceeding, although they have almost reached a stage of finalisation. In fact, just this afternoon a further meeting is being held. The object is not to affect private property or private rights in relation to declared areas, but the proviso is that the Board must have rights to things such as space for signage. That does not mean commandeering a privately owned structure, but it could mean either negotiating with the owners of the structure to place signs or sponsorship material on them or, alternatively, if that is either not possible or denied, to erect such signs in front of these properties. However, that matter will be subject to negotiation, of course. Therefore, that declared area, which will be published and made quite clear, will be so declared in order to keep at an absolute minimum the interference with the enjoyment of users or owners of such property.

Mr OLSEN: Another matter that I would like clarified is, for example, how much of the parklands will be included in the declared area. The Premier has indicated that those negotiations are still continuing, and he expects them to be finalised shortly. In line with the commitment given in relation to the contract, I ask that in relation to the declared area also that that be made available to the Opposition prior to the passage of the Bill so that we know exactly what we are talking about in terms of a declared area.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I will undertake to do that.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Opposition does not regard the Premier as being Superman and would be quite happy for the Premier to consult with his advisers.

We are prepared to wait while he gets information for the House. I am very glad to see the advisers in the box, but on this question it is very important that we know how far outside the bounds of the City of Adelaide the declared area is to be, because it has very serious ramifications later in the Bill which I will raise at the appropriate time. For instance, if the declared area is to extend over Dequetteville Terrace into the city of Kensington and Norwood (I think that that is the adjacent council area), it is very important that we know now, because it will certainly influence the questioning later.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The only reason that the declared area would intrude into, say, the Kensington and Norwood area would simply be for the purpose of the barrier fences along Dequetteville Terrace. However, one will notice in later clauses that there is provision for the declared area to be gazetted and published. Clause 20 of the Bill provides that notice will be given and it will be made quite clear where that area is. It should also be recalled that any closure of the declared area, of course, operates only for that period of five days as allowed. Certainly, what is intended there is not only the safeguarding of the track but also the ability to ensure that unauthorised persons do not go into areas that could have access to the track. In other words, it has to be a control of that sort of access.

Most importantly, too, there are sections into which entrance can only be secured by way of an entrance fee; in other words, an important part of the revenue that we seek to derive in order to defray the costs will depend on preventing access to certain areas where the race can be viewed so that access can be controlled and charged for those who wish to come and watch it.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I appreciate the Premier's answer, and that was one of the reasons why I asked the question. However, the second reason was that it is important—and, like most members of this House would know, I ought to know this—because, from memory, Dequetteville Terrace is under the care and control of the Commissioner of Highways. If that is the case, I think that there are ramifications. It may well be that the Government may need to amend the Bill, but we will come to that later. I would like an answer to the question: if Dequetteville Terrace is to be in the declared area (and obviously it has to be), is it under the care and control of the Commissioner of Highways?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In relation to the declared area and acknowledging that there is no schedule to the Bill at this stage identifying the precise declared area, at least most of us know that it will encompass East Terrace, Rundle Street, and Dequetteville Terrace, and that it will close off Bartels Road between East Terrace and Dequetteville Terrace. That, effectively, completely isolates Rymill Park for the five days, and I would like to know if any period is involved prior to or following that. That time of the year—mid October—is a time of the year when Rymill Park is very heavily used: it is used for fund raising fetes and charity fetes. Every Saturday, except in the depths of winter and even sometimes including the depths of winter, there are invariably several weddings there.

If one drives along Bartels Road between 4 o'clock and 5 o'clock one might see half a dozen couples being married in Rymill Park. I think that it is tremendously important that those who might in their plans or dreams be anticipating using Rymill Park right now should be made aware immediately and as forcefully as is necessary to spread the message around that Rymill Park will not be available for any functions, play, recreation, weddings or fetes. They should be told when it will be strictly off limits, because a lot of people planning events of that nature—either weddings or

fetes—would have at least a year's lead time for their plans, and that leaves us one month behind already. I ask the Premier, if plans are not already in hand, whether he will undertake to ensure that ample public notice is given to people who might be planning to use Rymill Park in October next year for any event.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In all published plans (and that includes the original plan and the alternative plan, which takes in part of the Victoria Park racecourse) one can see that that park land is effectively encircled by the route, and those plans have been widely publicised. There have been television cameras tracking down the Lord Mayor, others and me, and drivers have tested it over the past 12 months or so. Also, it has been published in the newspapers on a number of occasions. It would obviously be the desire to ensure that the closure of any section of the park lands be kept to an absolute minimum, and it may be that even during the five days prescribed by the Act some form of access could be allowed. I am not sure whether that will be possible: it depends on a number of practical considerations.

Certainly both with the parklands such as Rymill Park and some of the feeder roads into the city the object would be to ensure that they are kept as open and as accessible as possible during that period, but the bottom line is that if we are to have a street circuit then sections will be closed and some people will be disappointed. I guess that is true in any event, for instance, when the Royal Show is on quite large tracks of the parklands are opened up for the parking of vehicles—perhaps not as salubrious an area as Rymill Park, but still nonetheless areas enjoyed by golfers and people like that who obviously are denied access for that period of time.

It will certainly be widely publicised and once the route is published and the race is being promoted I guess everyone will have that emblazoned on their mind and certainly people who are planning events about that time of the year will obviously have to try and make alternative arrangements in one of the other parklands that are available.

As to disturbance to residents and others, the Board will have the very important task of ensuring that they are not just informing people but they will where possible be providing assistance for alternatives. That, working in conjunction with the Adelaide City Council, I think is something that really will not cause major problems to anyone.

Mr OLSEN: 'Public road' is defined as being any road, street or thoroughfare (including any carriageway, footpath, dividing strip and traffic island) commonly used by the public or to which the public are permitted access. That suggests that car parks attached, for example, to hotels and motels and footpaths are included in the definition of public road. Can the Premier confirm whether that is the case because that has an implication for the SAJC?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A car park would not be included in the definition unless it is an area included in the road, street or thoroughfare.

Mr INGERSON: As has been pointed out in most of the diagrams, the only part of the racecourse that is run by the SAJC that will be directly affected is a couple of crossovers of the racetrack. Some concern has been expressed about the fact that the declared period is one year, and that the declared area could include the SAJC facilities as well. I think they would like some clarification if that has not already been done.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These questions are being discussed with the SAJC. Quite clearly there is no intention to use or alienate SAJC facilities during the ordinary racing calendar. Its lease will be untouched and the only time in which it will be involved is during the construction of the circuit and the actual conduct of the race itself. All these questions I think are being dealt with to the satisfaction of

the SAJC. I say 'think' only because I am aware that discussions are taking place this very day.

Mr BAKER: Can the Premier state whether the declared area will be the area of total control or will it be an area limited to the control of spectators and the track itself? I am unsure of the principle behind the declared area as there are wide ramifications on how people will get through other controls outside the racetrack and the barriers themselves.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It includes any land which comes within the area that is gazetted, the purpose of which is to control and regulate access to the actual track and its surrounds. Where an area is not required for that purpose, access will continue to be permitted. As I said in response to an earlier question, the idea will be to ensure maximum access to as much as possible of the circuit area is maintained throughout to avoid dislocation. I think with the planning of the route and its location we have achieved a good mix of both a city circuit (which is the prime attraction for the race being held in Adelaide) and a minimum dislocation to business, residents and through traffic.

Mr BAKER: Have discussions taken place about the development in the south-east corner of the circuit as it comes out of the Victoria Park racecourse, because it has been suggested to me that the declared area will have to encompass living units and hospital accommodation because of the width of the road?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No hospitals are directly involved and the only area of residential occupation in the revised route which is effectively surrounded by the track is a small block on the corner of Hutt Street and Bartels Road which includes the LGA building on the corner and Dimora, which is the old house which has a number of other residences connected to it. In terms of residential disturbance, places not just directly on the route to it can be affected by noise and dislocation of other sorts.

Mr Russell Arland has been commissioned over the past few months to make contact with a series of groups and residents and under the old route he was talking to churches and hospitals as well (although they are not affected any more which is one of the beauties of the revised route) to acquaint them with what is intended and to discuss the logistics involved in getting around any problems they might have over that period. I think he will calm or quell doubts that this even will put places out of action. It is intended that either Mr Arland or someone like him will continue that work but on a more intensive basis over the next few months once the area is declared so that residents and people involved in business around the track are fully acquainted with what is going to happen, time scales, the nature of the closures and so on.

I believe by that process they will also be able to see what sorts of options they have in terms of any nuisance they perceive arising out of it. With co-operation and adequate communication I do not think there will be any major problems with residents.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Membership of the Board.'

Mr OLSEN: During my second reading speech I indicated to the Premier that in view of the fact that the composition of the Board was nine persons, three of whom would be selected from specific areas of interest with the Minister of the day having the right to appoint six, and in view of the fact that when the Jubilee 150 Board was established the then Government offered to the Opposition a position on that Board, I believe that, to continue the bipartisan approach on this matter, it would be appropriate to respond in kind as to the offer that was made to the then Opposition by the then Government which is that the Opposition ought to be

invited to be one of the nominees of the Minister when he selects the Board of nine members.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have noted the request of the Leader of the Opposition. I would have to give some consideration to it. There is no clear precedent for such a nomination. The Board we are to appoint will be comprised of professional and expert people in various aspects of what is needed for the race. It is not quite the same analogy as the Jubilee 150 Board, where I think it is quite appropriate. I will give some consideration to that but, at this stage, we have not gone through any specific categories of persons who should be on the Board and there have been a number of suggestions made to us. The only two to have rights, as it were, that were specifically safeguarded are the City Council and CAMS, but I am not prepared to go any further at this stage.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have two questions for the Minister—one a question and one a request. As the Premier is handling the Bill, I assume that he will be the Minister who administers the Act, but I would like clarification of that, an undertaking that it will be either himself or the nomination of the Minister who will be administering the Act. Secondly, in terms of the composition of the Board, it is quite clear that, apart from the nominees identified, the other individuals will be chosen for their personal competence and skills they have to bring to this Board.

Nevertheless, it is quite clearly essential that the tourism industry should be represented in one way or another and that its representative person or persons, as I would hope it would be, will have some kind of formal link with the South Australian Tourism Industry Council. In that way, the information which must necessarily be disseminated to the industry could be most effectively and quickly communicated through the medium of the tourism industry council, which is the umbrella organisation embracing some 18 or so representative bodies in South Australia. I ask the Premier if he can, without indicating any of the individuals he may already have in mind, give an undertaking that he will ensure that the South Australian Tourism Industry Council is at least consulted prior to any appointments being made.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly agree and in fact have already indicated that the tourist industry must be represented on the Board. Their particular skills and participation are vital to the success of this operation, particularly in terms of the ongoing benefits. The Department of Tourism is going to be and has been to date very closely and fully involved in ensuring we get maximum benefit. As to whether the person or persons who have tourist experience should be drawn from a particular council or body, I have not decided, but I will certainly consult widely in selecting the members of the Board. In view of the time involved, I do not think that formal consultation is appropriate, but we will definitely ensure that tourism is represented.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would hope that Mrs Chapman will be nominated by the City of Adelaide and if that does not occur obviously that would be one hat that she could wear. In any case, there will be consultation to make sure we have a representative Board that can properly feed into the industries that are so important.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: What about implementation? Will it be you or some other Minister?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, at this stage it will be me.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I want to indicate my total support for the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to having a member of the Opposition represented on that Board. The Premier has stated that the Board needs to be made up of people with specific interests

in the event. Well, no one could have a greater interest in that event than the people of South Australia, which the Government and the Opposition jointly represent 100 per cent. The special provision, and rightly so, is made for the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and also the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport, but I have anticipated that a step further. That is fine, but certainly the people of South Australia need to be represented in total and the only way that can be done is the same as on the Jubilee 150 Board, and that is by a representative of the Government and a representative of the Opposition being part and parcel of that Board.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Term and conditions of office.'

Mr OLSEN: Most Boards that are established by Statute require appointments for specific terms, that is, a fixed term appointment. Yet, in this measure, it leaves it to the Government's discretion. Can the Premier indicate what the Government's discretion is likely to be, that is, what term of appointment has the Government in mind for Board members?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That has been deliberately left open because of the nature of the operation. We have a year-to-year proposition, although initially we are looking at a series of three races. It may be that persons involved in the initial planning stage, once the first race has been successfully accomplished, may either wish to be or it would not be appropriate for them to carry on once we have an ongoing operation set up. So, some flexibility has been introduced into this area.

In the case of nominees by the City of Adelaide and CAMS, the Government must be prepared to be quite flexible; a person so nominated should be subject to some sort of term that can be agreed between us so that we ensure that at all times they are properly representative of the bodies that have nominated them. In the case of other members, I hope that we would see members prepared to serve for a period of two or three years. This will be subject to individual negotiation with each person approached and a suitable term nominated. It is wise to keep it flexible because of the nature of the transaction, the fact that it is a Bill with sunset provisions in it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Functions and powers of Board.'

Mr OLSEN: Clause 10 (2) (d) gives the Board power to collect fees for admission. What decisions have been made about entrance fees? Will a fee be charged for entrance to every part of the circuit, including standing areas and park lands, and will it also include practice as well as the race itself?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This will have to be considered by the Board. There are numerous variations of both levels of admission charges, places of admission and periods of admission. Practice overseas varies quite considerably but it has been urged on us by those with experience in promotion, such as FOCA and the marketing people that the Government commissioned earlier this year, that we should retain some considerable flexibility. What and how we can control admission will depend on the final decisions about the circuit. One of the advantages of the Victoria Park access is that it does provide an established grandstand, the ability to put sponsor boxes and things like that into it, and possibly some further temporary stands. Where it is possible to do so, temporary stands will be erected and seats to them will be sold. There will be standing room as well, probably to a limited extent, bearing in mind the safety fences and the distance away that standing spectators would be, and the obscurity of their view around the circuit. All these things will have to be worked into the design.

It is anticipated that there will be a series of admission charges depending on the part of the race to be viewed by the spectators. Perhaps the quality of the seating to be provided and the nature of the people purchasing tickets will have to be taken into consideration; that is, there could be family tickets and there could be special arrangements made for sponsors in terms of viewing boxes to be provided to them and so on. It is envisaged that a ticket could be available that will embrace the practice sessions as well. For instance (and I gather that this is the practice overseas) one could buy a three-day ticket which would involve the two practice days and the race day itself, or variations or combinations of that.

Obviously, the premium tickets will be for the race. There will be discounts and other provisions for series tickets and for persons just simply seeking to gain access to practice sessions there would be a lower price. It is a complex commercial exercise that needs to be undertaken. That is why our estimates of admission fees are not precise, because it really does depend on, first, what the market will bear, and, secondly, what is fair and reasonable. We will certainly be aiming to ensure that persons can gain admission for the sort of prices one would expect to pay at other sporting events such as grand final football and other major sporting events of that kind—the sort of admission price paid for general entertainment by people who might not have a great deal of means. Whether it will be possible to introduce some form of concession for pensioners or whatever is another question that the Board will have to consider.

We will be relying on local marketing information, on overseas experience and on the definition of just what viewing areas will be available, and in what way. So, I cannot be more precise than that, other than to say that it is certainly a very important power that the Board has. It has to be considered very carefully, and, once the course design has been completed to the extent that we are quite certain of where and how effective the various viewing areas are, it will be one of the Board's first tasks.

Mr OLSEN: I appreciate the Premier's comments and his inability to be precise in relation to the cost of tickets, but in coming to an estimate of the bottom line or net cost to the Government of this project of \$1.5 million or \$2 million for each year that the race is run, some consideration must have been given to the approximate or average cost of ticket sales for the event. I am not asking the Premier for the precise or final cost of tickets in relation to this project. However, can he give us details of the estimates upon which he has based the calculation that the net cost will be \$1.5 million or \$2 million for each year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is a variation of figures used. For corporate boxes and that kind of admission one could envisage \$200 to \$300 or more; for certain categories of seating one could envisage a cost of more than \$50; and for other areas prices of, say, \$20 or \$25 may apply. It is how those are combined and what numbers are ascribed to them that an estimate can be made.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That has not been determined, and cannot be determined until we know what sort of income we can secure from it. We are balancing two things: anticipated demand and anticipated revenue from the race. That is a judgment that any sports promoter has to make at the time it is known what one is actually promoting and what the demand for it is. So, it is not possible to be precise on that matter, and that is a bit unfortunate. If one refers to figures now, in a sense, due to the publicity that ensues, one is then locked into those figures. If one says '\$25' then there will be a subsequent headline stating, 'Grand Prix tickets will cost \$25'. If that amount proves to be not enough or too little or if there are only 1 000 tickets available rather

than 10 000, one is immediately in a bind. The admission charges will aim to that balance in order to maximise the revenue that we can get by the variety and nature of the tickets, but it will also be necessary to provide some reasonably priced tickets which will allow access to as many people as possible.

Mr INGERSON: I accepted the earlier assurance given by the Premier in relation to the SAJC. Obviously in regard to its involvement the SAJC has a lot of concerns. There is one matter in particular in relation to the removing and rerolling of the Victoria Park Racecourse track: to a depth of about 30 inches or whatever works out to be practical. There are matters concerning compensation to be paid if the turf does not stick or involving perhaps accidents to horses in the long term, although I know that those sorts of comments are a bit theoretical. Reference is made in the clause insurance policies will be taken out. Will those policies be taken out for the declared period of a year and consequently cover any accidents that might occur in those two specific areas referred to?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The policies would aim at full and comprehensive coverage in whatever reasonable terms there are. In relation to the question of the race track, bearing in mind the techniques that will be used, it is most unlikely that there will be any problem. Also, of course, the part of the track involved is not used to a great extent for horse racing—it is used very rarely indeed, because it is after the finish post and before the normal starting area. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any problems will occur. Certainly, insurance coverage of the event will be important. It will be a costly item, and the Board will have to negotiate carefully to ensure that all contingencies are covered.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Clause 10, which is really the key clause of the Bill, confers very wide powers on the Board. There are 18 specific powers, and one all-embracing power near the end of the clause are conferred. Considering the enormous financial power which the Board will be able to exercise in the selection of firms to carry out the work, and the advertising and to grant various licences, publish various books, programmes or brochures, will the Premier give an assurance (which it would hardly seem necessary to seek were it not for the question asked during Question Time yesterday about the selection by the Government of Melbourne based consultants for the selection of a new Under Treasurer for South Australia) that the Board will be advised that the Government as a matter of policy requires preference to be given to South Australian companies to ensure that the financial benefits of this event flow directly to South Australia and that they are not dissipated or siphoned off to other States?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is certainly a prime object of the exercise. As much as possible the expenditure, production, and so on, will be sourced in South Australia. That will not be possible in all cases. I guess that we cannot claim that that must be the case, because we will be asking for the co-operation of sponsorships, financial contributions, and so on, of a number of Australian organisations and firms. It should be remembered that, although the Grand Prix is to be held in Adelaide, great benefits will flow to Australia generally. The whole intention and the Government's involvement are aimed at securing maximum South Australian component in every aspect. That was one of the matters that was under discussion and negotiation with FOCA, because we felt that it was important to emphasise with FOCA that in the course of their activities of sponsorship and promotion they were directing themselves to South Australia's needs rather than looking more widely afield.

That does not mean, of course, that where something can be done more effectively within the right sort of cost frame

by somebody outside the State that it should not be so done. After all, the object is to ensure maximum return to the State as well as a top class international Grand Prix. If we do not produce that and if, for instance, we said that we knew that a certain group within South Australia could just do the job but that it could be done far better by somebody else, and something went wrong, we would lose the race. We must draw on the best resources available. I am confident that most of them will be found in South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Given that assurance, I seek a further assurance from the Premier that the contracts will be let to private companies in this State and that the Government intends that the various functions identified in the second reading speech, namely, the erection of temporary structures such as fencing, guard rails, stands and, to a lesser extent, advertising hoardings, will be undertaken by private firms and that it will not be using the Public Buildings Department or the Highways Department for this construction work. There will obviously be enormously valuable contracts let for what one would describe as the major works, namely, roadworks. The Committee is entitled to know whether it is the Government's intention that Government departments will in any way be involved in this or whether contracts will be let to the private sector.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Government departments in South Australia also employ South Australians. I do not understand why the honourable member would want to discriminate against them.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is right. The taxpayer pays for the infrastructure of these bodies and, if the taxpayer could get benefit from using them that would be appropriate. In other words, the answer is that the job will be done in the most efficient cost effective manner. That may be in some aspects through public sector activity and in other aspects through private sector activity. It depends on the nature of the operations.

Mr INGERSON: Paragraph (p) refers to the establishment of subcommittees. I had intended earlier to raise the suggestion that perhaps the racing club ought to be involved on the Board. It is probably more appropriate that it be involved in the racetrack subcommittee if there is to be such a thing. Will the Premier take on board that suggestion?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sure the SAJC will be happy to co-operate, be involved in and give expertise on any aspect deemed appropriate. That will certainly be kept in mind.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I mentioned in my second reading speech, the number of journalists visiting Adelaide for this event could run into hundreds—possibly as many as 800—but, if one is looking at a conservative estimate, it will be 400. The Board, presumably, will have the responsibility for making the necessary arrangements for journalists, many of whom will be of international stature and therefore extremely influential in terms of what they write. As we all know, the press like anyone else likes to be well accommodated, and it is absolutely essential that the arrangements made for all media, local, interstate and international, be of the highest standard.

As very many of these functions could embrace the arrangements being made for the media, and as arrangements should be in the planning stages already, will the Premier say what the Government has in mind and what arrangements are being planned to ensure that at least a significant proportion of those journalists remain in South Australia after the event to be feted, duchessed and swanned in any way we can so that we can ensure that the last ounce of good publicity comes out of this event.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We certainly will take the chance to do all we can to promote and display the advantages of this State, not just Adelaide but also surrounding districts. If we can get them to Port Lincoln, the South East, the Riverland, the Iron Triangle or elsewhere, we will do so. An operation will be mounted to that effect. The Tourism Department is already looking at that aspect and I will be discussing with the industry ways and means of doing it. Such will be the pressure of accommodation, particularly in the first year, that people may well have to be accommodated in places farther afield than the immediate City of Adelaide.

There has been an identification of all available high quality accommodation. The Board will have a responsibility to ensure that adequate accommodation is provided for the media teams. They will pay for it, of course, and we will ensure that telex, telephone and other facilities are available for them. That will be part of the brief. If those needs are not met satisfactorily it will be to the detriment of the race. However, the media will be expected to pay their expenses.

As to what other promotional type events can be organised, I imagine quite a bit will be done. The expenses of that will be looked at by the Tourism Department and others who wish to use this captive audience to try to promote other features of South Australia.

Mr BAKER: Will the Premier say whether all the roads that make up the route will have to be resurfaced, median strips lifted, some traffic lines removed and lights resited. My first question relates to road surfaces. I have been informed by a person who is well acquainted with Grand Prix that none of the roads, although they are smooth and good roads, will conform to the standards required for Grand Prix cars, which I understand do not have suspension and are susceptible to any small ripple in the road. All roads will have to be resurfaced, according to my scribe. The second point relates to the difficulty that will be faced with the lifting of median strips, traffic islands and traffic lights.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Considerable work will certainly have to be done on the roads, but not to the extent of total reconstruction of the roads involved. Some sections are of a quality that they could be raced on. Wakefield Road is currently on the city council's roadworks programme and will be surfaced in accordance with the standards necessary under that programme. There are some areas, for instance, around the East Parklands, where the road has certain cambers and where flattening may have to be carried out. Some problems exist around the East End market in terms of median strips and the route which will have to be attended to. Certainly, before and after each event there will have to be some taking up of median strips and replacing them. That is bound up in the cost estimate of around \$1 million every year in terms of assembling and dismantling the track. Some will involve work on the roads themselves, but the basic surfacing work is either well achievable within existing capital works programmes or, in the case of the area going into Victoria Park, once it is laid down year by year it will be available for the event.

Mr BAKER: I thank the Premier for his answer. I now refer to the provision of concrete barricades and crash barriers. Over what proportion of the length of the route will these concrete barriers be required? Where will sand traps be located and what type of block will be used as a barrier? What facilities will be specifically made at intersections that will have to be closed off temporarily during practice times?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All of the circuit will have to have protective barriers. It may not be concrete. It is usually a series of a concrete barrier, debris fence and different types of barriers such as tyres and, in some cases, Armco

light metal barriers. It will depend on the particular part of the course involved.

In most of those cases the concrete blocks, for instance, are reusable and in fact will be an asset that can be used for other events (not necessarily street racing circuits) for which they could be hired or lent out. However, it will certainly require a major construction job to ensure that the whole circuit is properly safeguarded by a mixture of materials which will conform to standards which FISA itself lays down internationally and which have, in fact, proved their effectiveness over the years. Obviously, safeguarding of the track is one of the crucial considerations, particularly on a city circuit.

Mr BAKER: The Premier mentioned Armco is the viable alternatives for crash barriers. I have been informed that Armco has been rejected by FISA as a material which is suitable for crash barriers. That was one of the reasons I asked what percentage of the track would be covered by concrete barricades. I understand that about 90 per cent of the route could require concrete barricades. As the Premier is well aware, they are a very expensive item which hopefully can be manufactured in South Australia, as I would expect. I would like the Premier to respond, because I understand that Armco has been rejected as a material to be used for barricades.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that is correct. However, obviously concrete will form the bulk of the barriers. I do not know whether it is 90 per cent or not; it will depend on the track designers and the safety inspectors' requirements. Certainly, it will require a great deal of expenditure and I hope that it will be sourced here in South Australia. I do not see why it cannot be.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Following the questions asked by my colleagues about the work done by public utilities, I suppose as a prediction one could say that the Highways Department would certainly carry out a good deal of the road resurfacing. I take it, from the Premier's remarks, that that is an option, anyway. Without the exact figures we cannot really identify it, but if that is the case the job could be very expensive. Is the Premier prepared to give an assurance that the Highways Department works programme will not be called on to pay for the surfacing of the roadway for the Grand Prix if, in fact, it is used?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to any works that one would expect to be carried out in the normal course of events, I think it is quite appropriate to either bring them forward or rearrange them in order to do this work. I have already mentioned that the City Council has done that in the case of some sections of the area. Its capital works programme allowed it to plan into this year's budget some of the roadworks necessary. The same situation would apply to the Highways Department. For instance, if there is a newly made road or median strip which has to be surfaced or pulled up, clearly that is over and above what a normal programme would envisage and therefore it would have to be paid for out of the allocation to the Grand Prix itself. That has been anticipated in the capital costs of establishing the circuit.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Does the Premier envisage that the work could be carried out better within the time frame, which I understand is extremely short, by private contract, rather than using Government utilities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I said to the member for Coles, it will be done in the most efficient and cost effective way in the time allowed. If that means private contract rather than using some of the public sector resources, that will be done. However, I cannot say what the mix will be or just how that will be developed, because planning has not fully commenced at this stage. Certainly, decisions will not be made until the Board is established.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: What is to happen to the activities of the East End Market during that declared period?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Will the East End Market be there at this time next year? I suppose that history suggests that it possibly will, although, as honourable members are aware, there are plans to relocate and redevelop it. Access to the market would only be closed on that one side. Admittedly, that side is used at the moment as part of the ordinary market access, but there are two ways in which this could be tackled. There are certainly alternative ways in which vehicles and traders can get to the market using back and side ways.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We might have to make special arrangements to permit parking in areas where at the moment it is not permitted. I envisage also, bearing in mind that the market is operated in the early morning, that some sort of temporary access could be provided if market days coincide with the track being closed.

Mr INGERSON: Subclause (2) (b) is an exceptionally broad statement, and there is some concern about the ability of the Board to be able to carry out construction, alteration or removal of other buildings and structures. What does the Premier think that means? It is an exceptionally broad statement, although I realise that there have to be those sorts of broad function.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is deliberately broad to ensure that any sort of work that proves to be necessary in construction of a track can be carried out. There is no bar to anything being done except that it must be done in connection with the race and the race track. In other words, this is not an enabling power that will allow the Board to go off somewhere else and start erecting grandstands and interfering with structures. It has to be related specifically to the race track. However, in that connection it has the ability to do whatever is necessary.

Clause passed.

Clause 11—'Board may control and charge fee for filming, etc., from outside circuit.'

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the race itself be televised within Adelaide and the surrounding area?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Live?

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes. Obviously, with the cost of tickets many people in the community who are interested in the race will not be able to afford the entry fee. Additionally, many persons are physically incapable of attending the Grand Prix. Also, it would not surprise me if the numbers attending are such that it will be necessary for restrictions to be placed on the number of tickets to be sold. I have been advised that a live telecast is provided to citizens of Detroit as well as to the rest of the United States and the world of the Detroit Grand Prix. Is the Premier aware of the arrangements that have been made for televising this event as far as the residents of South Australia, particularly Adelaide and the near area, are concerned?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that the same general procedure is intended as, say, with a football grand final: provided that all the requisite admissions are sold, there is a possibility of its being broadcast live. In other words, if the demand exceeds the number of spectators who can get there, live television will ensue. One can understand, of course, that if it were to be televised a lot of people who might pay admission would not bother to go, and it is vital for its viability that we get as many as possible to the track plus, of course, the excitement of the event and the need for big crowds.

It is practice, of course, for these races to be packaged in a video replay form that would go to air, anyway, so people who are prevented from going on the day personally will

certainly be able to view the race on the normal commercial network on its rebroadcast.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

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

Motion carried.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).

Mr ASHENDEN: I would like to take up two points that the Premier made. First, I take up the point that he made last. He said that the Grand Prix obviously will be recorded on video film and it would then be available for replay, but I am sure that the Premier would acknowledge that watching something after the event when the result is known is nowhere near as attractive, of course, as being able to watch the event live.

I would also like clarification of an answer that the Premier gave. I was pleased to hear that consideration will be given that, provided a certain number of tickets are sold, it is likely that a live telecast would be provided. Is the Premier there referring to tickets for those sitting in the stands or is he talking of a total number of tickets including what would obviously be standing space in the areas around the parklands? Normally when one talks about the preselling of tickets before a live telecast that refers only to seated areas rather than the entire general area.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is something that would have to be determined, but obviously we want to maximise attendance, whether it be sitting or standing, not just for financial reasons but also in order to stimulate and develop interest in the event as a spectacle. That has been, of course, another of the selling points of Adelaide. Our record of spectator participation, whether in street pageants or admission fee sporting events, is very good on a per capita basis. I think that the promoters and broadcasters of the race would be keen to see that kind of attendance and not empty seats or empty spaces. So, clearly the object will be to maximise attendance and I would doubt that any decision on the live telecast would be made until very late in the proceedings, based on what tickets were sold in all sectors, including standing room.

Mr INGERSON: In the second reading explanation there is specific mention that persons who record the event for their own private use will not be charged a fee. Can the Premier say how this could possibly be monitored?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Under the Broadcasting and Television Act any licensed commercial television station can be prevented from televising or recording an event where an admission fee is made if the images of the event emanate from the use of equipment outside the place. Anyone who seeks to record the race by whatever means with a view to profit can be prosecuted. However, what we are saying is that if a person is there and wants to record the sound of the engines or do some private filming they can do so. As to how one polices that, I guess that any person detected selling videos, charging admission for public showing, or whatever, will obviously be prosecuted and subject to pretty heavy fines. That is the way that it is regulated overseas. I do not think that there will be major problems in South Australia.

Clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13—'Officers and employees.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would like to ask a question of the Premier in two parts in relation to clause 13, which provides for the staffing of the Board. I appreciate that the Premier has not been able to be specific about costs and budgets in relation to other matters that cannot be determined, but clearly the Government must have some notion of what kind of staffing is expected and consequently what the cost will be. In my judgment the staffing of the Board will also be very much dependent on the complementary staff support that can be provided by other departments. I would say that two of the key departments in this area would be the Department of Tourism and the Department of State Development.

In the Estimates Committee debate on the tourism budget there were quite precise calculations as to the break-up of staff time in the Department of Tourism for the various programmes that will operate in the current year, and no doubt in the year to come. It seemed to me that at least the senior officers of that Department were fully stretched, if not over stretched, and, of course, no provision at that stage was made in the budget for any staff time to be devoted to this project, which will be extremely demanding on staff time both in the Department of Tourism and the Department of State Development. Therefore, can the Premier advise the Committee of the structure and numbers of staffing for the Board that the Government envisages, the cost involved in that staffing, the staffing implications for key support departments, such as the Department of Tourism and the Department of State Development, and does he envisage that any additional support will be given to these departments for what will clearly be an additional work load?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Based on overseas experience (and these are only rough estimates at this stage) we will need about \$300 000 per annum to staff the office and administration of the Board. That would include around 10 to 12 full time or permanent staff through the year. The numbers obviously would increase in the lead-up to the race and there would be scope for part time employment and supplementary employment as the time for the event approaches. As to support within departments, I guess that that is certainly a consideration, although I think that it is accepted that on projects like this (and that is why we have Departments of State Development, Tourism, and so on) we have officers with skills who are indeed stretched. They all work very hard indeed, and in this instance the Director of the Cabinet Office does not have written in his job description being *de facto* Project Manager of the Grand Prix.

That, in fact, has been occupying a large proportion of his time over the past few months particularly. Obviously the establishment of the Board and the appointment of permanent staff will relieve that pressure, but still people in the various departments will be called on. I would envisage, however, that they will be able to meet those demands within their ordinary allocations. This is, after all, a great opportunity and a matter of high priority and I suspect that there will be no problem about getting a major commitment from senior officers in those departments.

If the resources of those departments are stretched because of their particular demands made by the Grand Prix, it may well be possible to cross charge for any extra resources that are necessary, but that has not yet been determined. We will see how that works out.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Premier identified the annual cost as being about \$300 000. It is already apparent that not all of that sum will be a net cost to the Government because of the transfer of the Executive Director of the Board from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (and I would assume that that position in the

Department of the Premier and Cabinet is not to be filled in the interim and that someone will act in the capacity of the officer who normally fulfils that role). Although the \$300 000 is the global budget for the staffing of the Board, how much of that sum will be an additional net cost to the Government; how many officers does the Premier expect will be transferred from other departments to work for the Board and how many will be recruited over and above the number of existing staff?

As a further comment to that question, I wish that I shared the Premier's confidence in relation to the staff in the Department of Tourism. At least I cannot speak for the Department of State Development because I do not know the work load in that Department. I would be quite anxious, and I believe that the industry is anxious, that the work load in the marketing division of the Department of Tourism would become almost overwhelming if the responsibility for the marketing arrangements, both in the short term and the long term, associated with the Grand Prix have to be borne by the existing staff in that Department. I have contacted several areas of the tourism industry and whilst they have great confidence in the marketing division of the Department, they have expressed grave doubts that the Department has the capacity to cope with this on top of all the other projects which are already set in train and which have been announced by the Government for the current financial year. We need to know the net cost of additional staffing and the arrangements that can be made to transfer, supplement or assist staff in supporting departments.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly would not like to be held to that figure. The honourable member asked for some kind of indication and I plucked that figure not quite from the air but it is an indicator figure, no more no less. It is also an actual figure. When I mentioned 10 or 12 staff I meant new, additional staff. If in fact it was the unhappy fate of the Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to become the Executive Officer of this body, his position would be filled. Equally, if someone from the Department of Tourism was seconded, that person would have to be replaced within the Department of Tourism. We would not expect them to try and cover for a vacant position. I imagine that the Board as it develops will probably be a mix of seconded personnel, and personnel recruited directly from outside, depending on their skills and availability.

In regard to those two aspects—first, the fact that if anyone is seconded, say, from the Department of Tourism that position in the Department will be filled and, secondly, that the Board is charged under its functions and powers with a whole range of things including marketing and development, publications, promotional material and so on—we are not anticipating that as the Board gets under way and recruits staff there will be greater pressures or demands on the Department of Tourism. If there are pressures and demands through a general upturn in tourist activity, obviously they will have to be met from within the Department's resources, but where that upturn in activity has been generated in and around the Grand Prix, that will be met by the Grand Prix Board and its staff.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There is one other body outside government that I have not yet contacted about this matter and that is the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau. That Bureau is extraordinarily generous in the time, expertise and skills that it offers to government in support of any event that brings people to Adelaide. I do know, without having to ask, that the Bureau is over-stretched and that it has devoted an enormous amount of staff time without charge upon the Government even though it does receive a grant from the Government to assist with the ASER project.

I could easily envisage that the Bureau will be called upon to give advice and support to the Board in relation to the Grand Prix and I simply make the point without asking a question, that the Government cannot expect outside bodies that rely on membership funding and a small and static State grant to continue to provide skills and resources to the Government without getting some kind of staffing relief, even if it is the secondment or transfer for a period of some kind of administrative or office assistance that might not currently be required in a Government department. I earnestly put that plea because I believe that the Bureau is stretched out flat and would be severely hampered in its regular work if the valuable assistance it could give to this Board was to be given without any kind of monetary value placed upon it.

Clause passed.

Clause 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Dealings with moneys of the Board.'

Mr BAKER: Will the Premier outline what moneys will go into the bank account from the Treasury books; and how much will be kept within the Treasury lines as a credit against the account in the forthcoming financial year and in the following financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No provision has been made in this year's Budget for the Grand Prix, because when the Budget was formed we were not sure that expenditure would be necessary. Such expenditure as is necessary will have to be obtained by reallocation, by supplementary estimate or (and the Board will have this power) by authorised borrowings of the Board which in turn will be repaid from the income generated by the Board.

I anticipate that certainly in the initial stages moneys, in a sense, would be on loan to the Board and we would expect repayment. If there is a short-fall or deficit it will have to be dealt with in the context of next year's Budget.

Clause passed.

Clause 16—'Trust Fund.'

Mr OLSEN: I seek information in relation to the trust fund. Will the Premier say who are the persons likely to be appointed to share in the moneys from the trust fund and what will be the terms and conditions of any proposed declaration of trust?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure that I understand the honourable member's question. The Board itself will comprise the trustees and therefore it will administer the trust fund under clause 16. The moneys will be paid in as the clause states. Effectively, this provides for all the moneys that are generated around the Grand Prix to be separately identified and accounted for, but obviously there will be aspects of joint operations with FOCA and so on that will need such identification. Essentially, the Board will comprise the trust: it will be one of the adult functions of the Board itself.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier's response did not clarify the matter. Clause 16 (2) (a) provides that the funds shall be paid into the trust fund and paragraph (b) provides:

shall be moneys held by the Board upon trust for the State and such other persons as may be appointed by the Minister in accordance . . .

Is the Premier saying that the term 'and such other persons' means persons comprising the Board?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This clause has been inserted for technical reasons to maintain effective control over the moneys that are paid in to ensure that, because of our relationship with FOCA, we have some way of identifying Federal Government tax liability and any of the other implications of the Board's commercial type operations, but I will see whether I can get some advice.

The phrase 'and such other persons' confused me, because I understood the reference to 'persons' to be a reference to

FOCA—in fact, it is, but FOCA (the Formula One Constructors Association), I have been advised, comprises 13 separate members from the teams (the McLaren team, the Brabham team, and so on). It is those persons who are envisaged as being the other persons who would be involved in the trust. We must bear in mind that FOCA, of course, has its own access to sponsorship rights, promotions, and so on, and we have a contract with them. So, the 'other persons' are FOCA through its 13 constituent members.

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier advise the Committee what are the terms and conditions of the proposed declaration of the trust?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They have not been formulated as yet.

Mr Olsen: But you will provide them?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They will be provided.

Clause passed.

Clause 17—'Power to borrow.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: This clause allows the Board to borrow moneys not necessarily from the Treasurer alone but I assume also from the South Australian Government Financing Corporation. I imagine this is where the moneys will come from. Is the Premier intending to charge the .5 per cent impost for the Government guarantee, bearing in mind, of course, that any profits or moneys that the Board may retain will eventually return to Treasury in any case?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The general principle of public accounting, one to which the previous Government subscribed and one to which we also subscribe, is to try to identify the actual cost of borrowings or whatever to the greatest extent possible. The fact that it is circulatory, in other words, that such charges simply reduce on one side of the ledger and increase on the other, is less important than the fact that it is an identified cost. I imagine the terms of the borrowing of the Board will be on the standard terms offered to any statutory authority with no particular or special concessions unless there are good reasons for it. The accountability will be judged accordingly.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I take it that the Premier means 'Yes, the .5 per cent surcharge will be applied.' The Premier and certainly his advisers must have some idea of the initial amount of money they would wish to borrow before proceeding with construction. I realise that moneys will flow back to the trust fund, but obviously it is necessary for a reasonably large amount of money, I would suggest, to be borrowed initially so that the Board can get on with its job of construction.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At one stage there was an annual limit on borrowings by statutory authorities—that was removed at the Loan Council recently. It will depend on the expenditure and cash flow that is necessary for the Board. Most of the expenditure has to be incurred before there is actually any income.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That's what I just said.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is right. So, therefore, progressively the overall amount that is required will have to be outlaid, and we are talking about \$4 million to \$4.5 million—in fact, \$4 million to \$5 million might be a general figure to talk about. Then, of course, any income that is applied to that, whether by sponsorship moneys, grants or whatever, will go into the fund to defray those costs and reduce the loan at the earliest opportunity.

Mr BAKER: That was the answer I was seeking to an earlier question. Because a lot of the money borrowed will be through a transfer of a line rather than any money or cheques changing hands, I seek an assurance from the Premier that the costs incurred by Government departments or authorities will in fact be debited against this account in total so that no department or authority will be disadvan-

taged. I am sure that the Premier is well aware that police penalty rates, fire services, dedicated burn units, the Electricity Trust, and almost all of the services we have in Adelaide today will be involved in some form. What I seek is an assurance that the full cost will be totally debited against the appropriate line and that no department or authority will be disadvantaged in any way.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Where it is appropriate to do that it will be done. However, as the honourable member would know, there are events and occasions on which the provision of those services is not costed against any particular operation. We would want to get a picture of the total cost, income and expenditure, and that does include the extent to which Government facilities and services over and above what one would normally expect are being applied. So, that sort of accounting will be made where it is possible and appropriate.

Mr BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered giving a grant to the authority? My criticism has always been that when we establish these organisations we never provide them with sufficient working capital. Would it not be better to give a grant of \$5 million, and to say to the authority, 'This is your initial grant, live with that money and make it a paying proposition; this is the Government's commitment'? If, in exceptional circumstances, something went wrong and the authority had to come back to the Government for further funds, it would have to really justify the necessity for further funding and be subject to strict supervision and scrutiny by Parliament. However, most of our authorities are undercapitalised and are struggling to pay their debt commitments, and in a strict accounting sense most of them are insolvent. Let us get this authority started on a proper basis from the beginning by providing it with a grant as its working capital, and I am suggesting an amount of, say, \$5 million.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am conscious, as I think we all should be, of the question of priorities here. There has been some criticism of the Grand Prix on the basis that, while the demands for Government services in certain areas are not being met, at the same time the Government is prepared to outlay money on the Grand Prix. The Government is prepared to do that, in other words, to outlay money on what is essentially a commercial, promotional type of operation, because we believe that that outlay will in turn generate income. It is not the straight provision of a service. I believe that if the Government provided a grant to the authority, however desirable that might be in terms of its own accounting and capital capacity, it could be rightly argued that there were other equally worthy causes that needed grant money of that kind.

If we are going to sustain the argument—a correct argument—that what we are talking about is essentially a commercially based operation, I think that a loan is quite appropriate. When considering the limited scope of the event, I do not think the problems that the honourable member described will occur. Obviously, the experience of the race will vary year by year, but once the revenue from the first race has come in the demands on the authority for further borrowings ought to be reduced quite substantially. I do not think that having loan moneys will pose any problems at all. As Treasurer, I would say that we must ensure that the authority has sufficient money to carry out its operations, and that will be provided. It is far better to provide funds on a loan basis so that the commercial impetus of the operation is kept to the fore at all times.

Mr BECKER: Yes and no. If they make a profit we could tax them later. That should be the basis of the operation of our statutory authorities, anyway. But I still think that in principle it is wrong for an organisation to start off with a loan. No business gets off the ground in that way. The

authority should be given an initial capital grant—even if it is \$100 000, although I think that that figure is too low. There should be some ratio between a grant to establish the authority and a loan to provide the other money. In that way we could keep the authority reasonably viable, and then if at some time in the future it starts returning substantial profits—as I think it must do, due to its marketing concessions—there would be nothing wrong with the Government's wanting to tax it at 5 per cent on turnover or at a commercial income tax rate. It would make a worthwhile contribution to Treasury.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 and 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Minister may declare area and period for races.'

Mr OLSEN: This clause gives the Minister power to make a declaration in regard to areas to be 'declared areas' for a year specified in the notice, and for the Minister to declare a period to be a 'declared period' for a year. Did the Government consider making this power exercisable by regulation rather than at the stroke of the Minister's pen? I refer to this matter in my second reading speech and so I will not elaborate further on this matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is not determined at the stroke of the Minister's pen without due regard having been given to it. Details must be published in the *Gazette*: notice must be given, and that means that it is publicly declared. We need the flexibility of that procedure, as opposed to the regulation making power. In the case of the ASER project already one can see the problems that regulation making powers in certain areas can cause. In that case it could well impede the development of the project. I hope that that matter will be resolved. But in this case, we are talking about something that is clearly stated and sustainable. I do not think that the honourable member should be concerned about it.

Mr OLSEN: Under the provisions of the Bill the area to be declared can vary from year to year. Different areas can be stipulated as 'declared areas'. Can the Minister say that once the circuit is established for the first race that will remain the circuit for subsequent races? In subsequent years the circuit can be extended in any direction or in multiple directions which will alter the course of the circuit as stipulated at the moment.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the circuit is changed, that information will have to be gazetted and approved. That is provided. I do not think there can be major changes just simply by declaring new areas. Again, practical considerations are involved. The area is declared for 12 months, and if, at the end of that period, modifications are required or deemed to be appropriate before the next race is held, it is very likely that they would be minor modifications and the appropriate notice of such notices would be given. If an entirely new track is developed, again, that process would have to be gone through. The changes would have to be identified and notice would have to be given, and all the other provisions as required by the Act would have to be observed.

In practical terms, it is most unlikely that any changes other than minor modifications to the track might occur. I can think of one: the honourable member referred to the section of the route on the corner of Hutt Street and Bartels Road—it may be that a modification could be made to take that section of the track through the parklands rather than down Hutt Street, although I understand that at the moment that is not possible due to various engineering and design reasons. Perhaps that matter could be looked at again in the light of the experience of the race. That is the kind of modification that might be made, but modifications would

not be major. Certainly, looking at the matter realistically, once we have established the track it will remain in operation.

Clause passed.

Clause 21—'Board to have care, control, etc., of declared area for declared period for each year.'

Mr OLSEN: This clause vests the care, control, management and use of lands in the declared area for the declared period. Upon this vesting, the rights or interests of any other person in or in relation to the land shall be suspended for the declared period. This means that in the case of the Jockey Club it will lose control over facilities in Victoria Park. Will the Premier explain what discussions have taken place? I take on board that the Premier said discussions were continuing today. Is the club satisfied with the provisions of the Bill?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Discussions have been proceeding and the Jockey Club has been very supportive of the proposition. I was talking to the Chairman and Secretary this morning on another matter, and they referred to the discussions that are going on about the Grand Prix route. There were one or two matters on which they wanted clarification, and they notified the negotiators in writing of those points. Further discussions have been held. There is still a bit of fine tuning, but in principle the Jockey Club is perfectly satisfied with the arrangements that have been made and we anticipate no problem.

Mr OLSEN: Subclause (2) provides that any public road within the declared area ceases to be a public road for the declared period. Presumably, it becomes private property in that respect. However, I have seen reports that at certain times during the declared period, when there is no practice or racing, the declared area may be reopened to the public. That raises questions about liability for accidents involving citizens' motor vehicles on the roads when those roads are not being used for the Grand Prix. Will the Premier indicate the situation as to liability in those circumstances, recognising that the provisions of current legislation are suspended for the declared period. What is the position with motor vehicles using those roads when they are open?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Control of the use of that road for the declared period will vest in the Board. We will use the regulatory powers of the Board to reinstate the various Road Traffic Act and other provisions for the period that the Board declares they shall apply. So, effectively, they will apply for that period. It is going around in a circle, but for five days the public road will be under the control of the Board but the Board can, by its regulations, deem that on occasions when it so declares the Road Traffic Act and other provisions will not apply to that section.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I wish to take up a matter concerning my new electorate of Adelaide. I was approached by the President of the Lutheran Church of Australia, Dr Grope, over the past few weeks expressing concern about the effect that the declared area, and the restrictions in access to such declared area, will have on the Sunday services of the two Lutheran churches in the vicinity.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am simply looking after my new constituents. The matter is quite serious, despite the levity of some members in the House. In fact, the two churches were in the original declared areas but are now just outside it because of the new design of the track through Victoria Park racecourse. However, there is a restriction on access for parking. I understand that the Lutheran Church has been in touch with the Deputy Premier (the present member for the area) to see whether the Government, in conjunction with the City Council, will make some provision available so that the 500 to 600 people who attend worship on the Sunday concerned can be accommodated.

Will the Premier see that the matter is treated seriously and that provision will be made. One proposal was that both Lutheran Churches would conduct worship on that day at the Adelaide Town Hall, which is a considerable distance away from the declared area. There would also be more access to parking. The problem is that the Lutheran Church should not have to be responsible for the hiring of the Town Hall on that day.

I know that my colleague from Goyder is interested in the matter. The church is willing to co-operate in this matter, but it obviously needs attention. I ask for an assurance from the Premier that he will give the matter serious consideration or at least refer it to the Board for serious attention so that co-ordination and co-operation can be brought about.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think there will be any problem having the matter looked at by the Board. It will probably be the most appropriate body to do so when it is established. I guess that some do not like races being run on a Sunday, anyway, because of Sunday observance and so on, but, in terms of interference with people who wish to worship and attend church services, obviously there has to be access and sensitivity in the matter. The new course, fortunately, means that no church is directly affected in the way in which it would have been under the old situation.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: During discussion on clause 3, on declared areas, the member for Torrens raised the question of the East End Market and the disruption that could occur on market day preceding the race. I suggest that over five days at least two market days will be affected because of the race. I use that road when travelling between Parliament House and home and to depart from Parliament House at any hour between 1 a.m. to 5 a.m. I can vouch for the fact that the entire stretch of East Terrace from North Terrace down to the junction of East Terrace with Bartels Road, together with the east end of Grenfell Street, is fully occupied by trucks. In fact it is more than occupied—one might almost say it is occupied to the point of chaos.

If there are to be boundary fences I would think that the access of market gardeners to the road would be very much inhibited and that, even if the road were open, there would be severe disruption. In addition, I would think that the Formula One Constructors Association, if the road were left open for the convenience of the East End market gardeners, would be positively alarmed at the prospect of using the road following its other use, because invariably, later in the day, there are still cabbage leaves in the area, no matter how carefully it has been swept—there are still these small surface hazards that do not matter to ordinary traffic but certainly matter very much to Formula One racing cars.

I think that we need an assurance from the Premier, in view of plans to relocate the East End Market, and acknowledging the difficulty of doing so by October 1985 (although I suggest the possibility exists), that very early warning will be given to those who use the East End Market about the prospects for October and that an absolute undertaking will be given to have the market removed in time for the 1986 race. I, for one, hope that the facade will be retained and the area used creatively for tourism related purposes. The new occupier of the premises will have restricted access, but perhaps the inconvenience that will flow from that will not be as great as it will be to the present occupiers, because it will flow through to virtually all the retailers of green-groceries in Adelaide as a result of the disruption on the market day preceding the race.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already dealt with most of the aspects of the question that the honourable member has raised. I guess that all I can say is that we know there will be some disruption, but it will be kept to a minimum. The Board will have to be flexible in looking at alternatives

and will get assistance from civic and other authorities in so doing. I do not see any major problem in doing that. Most importantly, the route, times of closure, and so on, will be published widely and well in advance. Also, there will be officers assigned to the specific task of contacting each and every group or business that will be affected in some way by the race to ensure that they know what is involved. We must not over-emphasise the problems; there will be many people out there who will be quite happy to do that, either because of general opposition to the race, or because they feel personally affected. We should emphasise that we are only talking about five days in the year, and limited parts of those days. I hope that the Board will be flexible in its response, the publication of alternative routes and its advice to people.

Clause passed.

Clause 22 passed.

Clause 23—'Board to consult and take into account representations of persons affected by operations.'

Mr OLSEN: This clause excludes the Board from any liability for its actions; it contemplates the possibility of business and financial interests of people being affected; it provides no compensation for such an eventuality, nor is there to be any compensation for any damage to premises bordering the circuit as a result of the race. Will the Premier say why any liability on the part of the Board has been specifically excluded and what rights people will have whose property is damaged during this event or whose business is in some way affected?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The area of compensation has caused a lot of head scratching and great difficulty in trying to balance the need to have a mechanism whereby proper compensation can be provided; on the other hand, there needs to be protection against spurious or frivolous claims. This has been based on overseas experience where the circuits have been developed. The intention is certainly not to prevent people from having a cause of action. There is specific provision in relation to occupation of land. There are certain things that the Board must comply with and obviously, if it does not comply with it, it puts itself in breach. So, in that lies a cause of action for people. Of course, there are general principles of administrative law which impose some general obligation on the Board. The idea is to ensure that each claim that is made or may be made arising under this clause can be looked at on its merits. Therefore, detailed provisions have not been inserted in the Bill.

It is too difficult to identify heads of damage that would need to be included. It is much more complex than the normal compensation provisions. So, there has to be a flexible assessment of loss and a flexible and efficient means of dealing with it. We believe that this procedure provides that balance of protection which is necessary in what is essentially a fairly unusual undertaking in which there are no established guidelines, either in practice or at law. I place on record the assurance that in the interests of this race being conducted properly and in the interests of it continuing, the Board will obviously have to respond to legitimate claims.

Mr OLSEN: This clause concerns me. With all the good will in the world we are usurping the rights of individual citizens and the people of this State with the insertion of this clause. That worries me. I take in good faith the Premier's comment that later due consideration will be given to this area. However, far too often in the system—and the Premier would know the system as well as I do—small people and individuals, whether they be property owners or small business men, quite often cannot afford to seek redress or compensation or the cost of seeking that compensation, and in that regard the clause and the Premier's response give me some concern.

Because of the commitment that I gave that we would complete the passage of this Bill and since the Government is to introduce two other Bills prior to 6 p.m., I indicate that we will closely examine this clause before it is debated in another place. I think the matter should be looked at further, despite its difficulties. I think a provision should be inserted to protect the rights of individuals who may become caught up in the system.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that is a reasonable way to approach the matter. It can be considered in another place and, if members there come up with another formula or a variation, the Government will consider that. Again, in practical terms, I think clause 22 clearly provides the ability for compensation or reimbursement on a fair and reasonable basis. That can be tested. I suppose that is modified by clause 23. I do not think it truncates the rights of citizens in any drastic way, but it certainly affects them. The mere closure of roads and the closing off of areas of parklands in the declared area will affect rights. We accept that, but it is the price we pay to stage the race. I do not think there is any alarming distortion of civil rights involved in this. If there is a formula which can maintain the balance I am talking about and which will not make the Board unreasonably vulnerable, naturally we will look at it.

Clause passed.

Clause 24—'Certain land deemed to be lawfully occupied by Board.'

Mr OLSEN: What arrangements have been made within the declared area for the declared period for people to have access to their premises?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Board will be under an obligation to provide that. Obviously persons living in an area that falls totally within the cordon must have access and special rights of access. That is understood and it will be provided. There will be consultation with all residents so affected to ensure that proper arrangements are made.

Mr OLSEN: In an effort to meet the time constraint I will ask several questions and ask the Premier to provide a written response. What alternative arrangements will be made for traffic flow between the city and the eastern suburbs, especially for emergency services such as the MFS? Subclause (2) provides for the fencing or cordoning off of a part of the declared area outside the declared period. That is a wide power. Why is it necessary and what areas are contemplated to be reserved for longer than the declared period?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will undertake to provide a written response.

Clause passed.

Clause 25—'Certain Acts and laws not to apply to declared area.'

Mr OLSEN: Likewise with this clause, I place on notice several questions for the Premier to give answers in writing. Subclause (1) provides that certain Acts or laws are not to apply to declared areas for the declared period. Again, this raises the difficulty: if access is given to the declared area to private citizens during the declared period, what happens to the speed of vehicles in any accidents that may occur during that interim?

Subclause (2) suspends the operations of the Planning Act within the declared area for any year. Obviously, this means that no controls will be placed on the Government in relation to the removal of trees and other environmental aspects on the proposed circuit. It would also mean that no planning approval will be required for any structures, whether permanent or temporary. Will the Premier respond to that? Also, how many trees are likely to be cut down to facilitate the construction of the circuit? In addition, can the Premier say whether any permanent structures will be built? For example, will the pit area be permanent or temporary?

Clause 25 (3) is very wide and ensures that no citizen can take any civil action for nuisance arising out of any activity carried on, by or with the permission of the Board within the declared area. Can the Premier say whether it is contemplated that entertainment will be provided in the declared area? For example, will there be any concerts or the type of event where other provisions of legislation of the State will not apply that will be to the detriment of those who live in or close to the circuit?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will undertake to provide that information.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The suspension of the Noise Control Act is clearly necessary, but at the same time there is the possibility of noise that bears no relationship to the actual race: possible riotous behaviour in the early hours of the morning of spectators who have stayed. The residents should have some protection from noise which is not associated with the race but which may well be associated with the presence of a large number of people lingering in the area after the race. Has the Government given any consideration to the rights of the residents living in the area between the hours of, say, 11 p.m. and 7 a.m., such noise being not consequential directly on the race?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Some regulations can be made. Conditions can be made for access under another clause. People comporting themselves in a riotous manner or hanging around the place can probably be dealt with under that. I move:

Page 10, line 23—After 'any', insert 'regulations or'.

This is simply a technical amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (26 to 29) and title passed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WHEAT MARKETING BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this short Bill is to make a minor amendment to the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1955, consequential upon the Wheat Marketing Bill, 1984, that has recently been introduced. The Wheat Marketing Bill, 1984, allows direct grower-to-end-user sales of domestic stockfeed wheat via a permit system administered by the Australian Wheat Board. Wheat sold directly from grower to end user may bypass the storage facilities operated by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited.

However, section 12 (1) of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1955, grants Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited the sole right of receiving, storing and handling bulk wheat in South Australia. This section is inconsistent with the stockfeed permit system under the Wheat Marketing Bill, 1984. This amendment is intended to rectify that inconsistency. This Bill has the support of the industry, in particular Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited.

The permit scheme for stockfeed wheat sales is a very important innovation in domestic wheat marketing, and I commend this Bill to the House. The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 12 of the principal Act by providing that that section is subject to the Wheat Marketing Act, 1984.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): By arrangement with the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture in another place, the Opposition has undertaken to proceed with the passage of this Bill through all of its stages. The Opposition supports the measure, which is contingent upon the Wheat Marketing Bill which passed through all stages of this House this week. We recognise the need for consistency in certain clauses associated with both Bills, so there will be no further speakers from the Opposition or any further questions from this side of the House. We wish the Bill a speedy passage through the Chamber.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): The Government appreciates the Opposition's support in this matter and its concurrence in its speedy passage. This enables the 3 December deadline to be met, as I am sure those in the industry will appreciate.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING ACT (REPEAL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 14 November. Page 1908.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This Bill has the support of the Opposition. The Government's involvement in artificial breeding in South Australia is no longer required. Primary industry, in particular the dairy industry, has now the opportunity of being serviced by an organisation which has demonstrated its capacity to provide semen and administer same artificially within the rural sector, and Government involvement is superfluous. The Act is obsolete and its repeal is supported.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I wish to put on record that the Government thanks the Opposition for its support of this matter and its desire to assist in getting this matter through speedily.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

Mr TRAINER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Explanation of Bill

In introducing this Bill to amend the Correctional Services Act, I wish to remind members of the Government's commitment to bringing South Australia's correctional services system into the 1980s. Once the Correctional Services Act has been amended the Government will complete the drafting of regulations pursuant to it, and so have it proclaimed. Some of the amendments to be moved by the Government in this Bill have resulted from the two year process of drafting the regulations. A major portion of the amendments, however, will simply bring the Correctional Services Act into line with the Prisons Act, particularly in relation to parole. These sections will be discussed in detail in the clause by clause reading. The most significant new aspect of the amendments proposed in this Bill relates to the running of the institutions and the management and control of prisoners.

The Bill contains provisions for the confinement of prisoners apart from other prisoners for up to 30 days in various sections of institutions, for a written statement containing the particulars of the orders of the sentencing court or a warrant of commitment to be presented when a person is admitted to an institution, for the proper control of visitors to institutions, for procedures to be followed in assessing prisoners for placement in an institution, for the person in charge of an institution to be more correctly described as a 'manager' rather than a 'superintendent', and for the rules of an institution to be made available to a prisoner in the most appropriate language. The Bill includes the current provisions in the Prisons Act in relation to the release of prisoners before their due release day when it is known that it will fall on a public holiday. The amendment will provide the permanent head with the discretion to authorise the release of a prisoner on any day up to 30 days preceding the due release day.

It is also intended to bring the timing for the presentation of annual reports into line. Under the amendment proposed, the Department of Correctional Services, the Correctional Services Advisory Council and the Parole Board will all be required to report by 31 October each year. The Government proposes that justices of the peace be appointed to inspect prisons and hear complaints from prisoners, and that these justices of the peace should be different from those who hear complaints against prisoners. The Government wishes the current system of hearing complaints against prisoners through justices of the peace to continue. Given resource constraints it is not possible at this time to have magistrates appointed especially to hear complaints against prisoners for breach of the regulations. Appropriate amendments will be moved by the Government to accommodate the continuation of the current system of hearing complaints in terms of the penalties to be imposed by a justice of the peace, and the procedure to be followed if a charge is not found to be proven.

Provision is also made in the Bill for the proper disposal of a prisoner's property, particularly property remaining unclaimed a reasonable time after release. The amendments follow a study by the Department of Correctional Services of the current system, and the recommendation from that

study that legislative backing was necessary for the introduction of a more considered approach to the issue of the disposal of a prisoner's property. In examining the unproclaimed Act it was also found necessary to include provision for dealing with a breach of day leave conditions, as no such provision has previously been made. The provisions relating to the assessment of prisoners are proposed to be amended to place the responsibility for assessment on the permanent head of the Department of Correctional Services. The permanent head will be assisted by a committee established by the Minister, and on request a prisoner will be granted an interview with the committee. In conclusion, I would say that this Bill has been introduced for three main reasons: first, to overcome the difficulties experienced in drafting regulations to the Bill in its original form; secondly, to bring it into line with amendments previously made to the Prisons Act in relation to parole; and thirdly, to allow the current system of hearing complaints against prisoners to continue once this Act is proclaimed.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the arrangement section. Clause 4 makes consequential amendments to various definitions and replaces a definition of 'superintendent' with a definition of 'manager', the new title for the officer in charge of a correctional institution. Clause 5 provides that the permanent head may only delegate his powers with the approval of the Minister. The permanent head is given power to delegate to the manager of a police prison. Clause 6 brings this section into line with the Prisons Act. Clause 7 provides that a visiting tribunal may be constituted of a magistrate, two justices of the peace or a single justice of the peace.

Clause 8 empowers the Minister to designate certain areas of a correctional institution to be for the detention of prisoners of a specified class. Clause 9 provides that all correctional institutions are to be inspected regularly at the direction of the Minister, who may appoint justices of the peace for the purpose. A justice of the peace who is a visiting tribunal or a member of such a tribunal for a particular correctional institution cannot inspect the institution. The purpose of such inspections is to oversee the treatment of prisoners. Clause 10 deletes a provision which is incorporated in the next clause. Clause 11 provides that a prisoner cannot be admitted to a correctional institution except upon presentation of the relevant court order or warrant of commitment. Clause 12 provides that the permanent head may not only assign a prisoner to a particular correctional institution, but also to a particular part of an institution.

Clause 13 substitutes Division III dealing with the assessment of prisoners. The permanent head is given the responsibility of assessing certain prisoners after their initial admission and thereafter at regular intervals, for the purpose of determining the appropriate prison or part of prison for a prisoner. The Minister is given the power to set up a committee to assist the permanent head in this task. A prisoner who requests a personal interview for an assessment must be granted his request. Clauses 14 to 17 (inclusive) effect consequential amendments. Clause 18 provides that a manager of a correctional institution cannot cause a letter to be actually perused except with the approval of the Minister. Letters to and from an inspector of a correctional institution are to be exempt from censorship. Clause 19 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 20 provides that the permanent head may cause a prisoner to be segregated from other prisoners for up to 30 days pending investigation of an allegation that the prisoner has committed an offence. Segregation for other reasons remains at no more than seven days in the first instance. The expression 'segregation' is used in preference to 'separate confinement'. Clause 21 provides that a prisoner may be searched not only upon entering a correctional

institution but upon moving from one part of the institution (e.g. workshop) to another.

Clause 22 brings this section into line with the Prisons Act by empowering the permanent head to grant up to one month's early release. It is further provided that a prisoner whose fine is paid after 5 p.m. on a particular day need not be discharged until the next day. Clause 23 inserts three new provisions dealing with prisoners' property. All property (including money) must be handed to a prisoner upon his discharge. If property is left behind, the prisoner must be notified. If he fails to collect the property within three months, the manager may dispose of the property as he thinks fit if it consists of items that he believes are of no monetary or sentimental value. In any other case, the manager must cause the property to be delivered to the prisoner if his whereabouts is known, except where it is not practicable to do so. Any item which the prisoner is not permitted by law to possess is not to be delivered or handed back to him.

Clause 24 is a consequential amendment. Clause 25 repeals the section that provides for the hearing of not guilty pleas by visiting tribunals constituted by a magistrate, and for the right of a prisoner to elect to have a magistrate or justices of the peace determine penalty for a breach of the regulations. The situation now will be that a visiting tribunal, however constituted, may deal with all cases of breaches of the regulations. Clause 26 strikes out the provision that requires the Crown to assume liability for the acts or omissions of members of visiting tribunals—this is not appropriate for a judicial body that deals with offences.

Clause 27 effects consequential amendments and makes it clear that a manager who hears proceedings against a prisoner has power to acquit him of the charge. Clause 28 makes similar provision in relation to a visiting tribunal. The power of a visiting tribunal to impose a further sentence of imprisonment up to ninety days is deleted, partly because for the time being tribunals will be constituted of justices of the peace and partly because the power of justices of the peace to impose up to seven days further imprisonment is anomalous in view of the fact that they have the power to cancel up to thirty days of remission.

Clauses 29 and 30 are consequential amendments. Clause 31 repeals a provision that purported to make it clear that where a prisoner is charged with any offence other than a breach of the regulations, he will be dealt with in the 'normal' way, i.e. in the appropriate court. This section is not strictly necessary and is seen perhaps to be ambiguous and so is struck out. Clause 32 makes it clear that where a prisoner is sentenced to a further term of imprisonment for escape, that further sentence is cumulative upon his existing sentence.

Clause 33 provides a new offence where a prisoner who is granted leave of absence fails to comply with a condition of his leave. A sentence of imprisonment imposed for such an offence is cumulative upon the existing sentence. Clauses 34, 35 and 36 bring the provisions of the Act that relate to the composition and procedures of the Parole Board into line with the Prisons Act. Clause 37 provides that the annual report of the Parole Board must be furnished by the same date as that of the advisory council and the permanent head, and also brings the section into line with the Prisons Act.

Clause 38 brings the provision that deals with the fixing of non-parole periods by courts into line with the Prisons Act. Clauses 39 to 48 (inclusive) similarly bring the provisions of the Act that deal with the release of prisoners on parole and the cancellation of parole into line with the Prisons Act. Clause 49 repeals the Part that provided for conditional release, and substitutes provisions for remission that are identical to those in the Prisons Act.

Clause 50 requires the Minister to cause prison rules to be published for the benefit of prisoners, and to take rea-

sonable steps to make them known to prisoners who are illiterate or whose principal language is not English. Clause 51 is a consequential amendment. Clause 52 repeals the section that provided for a statement of a prisoner's 'rights, duties and liabilities' to be handed to him on his initial admission to a correctional institution. Clause 53 inserts two new sections. One provides for the confidentiality of departmental files kept on prisoners, parolees and probationers. The other provides for the removal or barring from a correctional institution of any volunteer or visitor whom the manager reasonably believes is likely to interfere with the good order or security of the institution.

Clause 54 amends the regulation-making power. The regulations may provide for the hours of admission of prisoners to correctional institutions. The holding or investing of prisoners' moneys or personal property may be prohibited or regulated, as may the entering into of contracts between prisoners.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PARLIAMENTARY PROGRAMME

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Premier has asked me to put before the House the proposed Parliamentary sitting dates for next year. It is intended that the House will resume on 12 February and will sit for the three weeks beginning 12 February, 19 February and 26 February. It would then adjourn and sit again in the weeks beginning 12 March, 19 March and 26 March; in other words, for three weeks consecutively. Optional dates have been reserved for three further weeks and they are the 2 and 3 April (that being Easter week) and the weeks beginning 7 May and 14 May, just before the May school holidays.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Clerk to deliver messages to the Legislative Council when this House is not sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 4 December at 2 p.m.