

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 27 February 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 120 residents of South Australia praying that the House do all in its power to reduce home loan interest rates was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold. Petition received.

OTTOWAY FOUNDRY

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Ottoway Foundry (Electric Induction Melt Furnaces).

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

SOUTH AFRICAN TRADE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier investigate a contract just awarded by the Department of Lands for the supply of computing equipment to determine whether it breaches the Government's previously stated policy on purchase of goods from South African owned companies? I have been informed that the Government has awarded a contract worth about \$.1 million to a substantially owned South African company called Sigma Data for the supply of equipment to the Department of Lands. My information is that this was done even though there were competing tenders of about the same value submitted by firms which are South Australian based or other than South African in their shareholding. If this is true, this decision would appear to be in conflict with statements made by the Premier in this House on 30 October last year when he said he did not think that the Government should be purchasing from South Africa and that, in most instances, the Government could certainly identify the origin of goods it purchased.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of this contract, and I thank the Leader of the Opposition for drawing it to my attention. If the facts are as he states, it is in breach of Government policy and I will certainly investigate to see whether that is the case and whether there are any other circumstances about which we do not know.

MOTOR REGISTRATION FORMS

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport say what further research and development is taking place in the Motor Registration Division on the introduction of plain language and helpful redesign of motor vehicle registration forms? Professor R.D. Eagleson (Associate Professor of English in the University of Sydney) in his article in the *Current Affairs Bulletin* of January 1985, under the heading of 'Common sense of plain English', favourably refers to the new forms being produced by the Motor Registration Division of the Department of Transport. I have been informed that these forms not only translate previously hard to understand forms into plain English, but also provide for a saving in production costs.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. We would all agree that the forms with which we in the community have to deal ought to be in the plainest language. They should be kept simple so that simple folk like I can understand them. The fact that there has been favourable comment about the Motor Registration Division form changes would suggest that they have not sought my advice, because I think that every honourable member understands the tortuous language that I am likely to be involved in from time to time. Frankly, I am not sure what further studies the Motor Registration Division or the department is involved in, but I would be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member. I am certain that the very good work that has been commented on in a complimentary way is continuing.

PHILIPPINES TRADE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of State Development ask the Department of State Development to assess whether the new political situation in the Philippines will increase the potential for South Australian trade with that region? Over the past four years, South Australian exports to the Philippines have been worth just over \$46 million. However, there has been no regular pattern to this trade. It has fluctuated between \$8.7 million and \$13.8 million on an annual basis, which is probably a reflection of the economic decline of the Philippines over recent years.

Now that President Marcos has departed the scene, there may be the possibility of arresting the decline and, because of an expanding economy in this region, the authorities will have to purchase key items such as chemical products, petroleum products, iron and steel, automatic data processing equipment, telecommunications equipment, transport equipment and the like—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and certainly agricultural machinery and products. South Australia can supply all of these. Another reason why the Department of State Development should assess the new situation in the Philippines is the need, which has bipartisan recognition, to reverse the decline which has occurred recently in our exports of elaborately transformed manufactured products to the ASEAN countries. The Philippines would certainly appear to be one country where we should be able to expand our export penetration in this vital sector of the State's economic base.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly refer the question to the Department of State Development for its attention and discuss the matter with the Director later this afternoon when I meet with him. It is not within the practice of the Department of State Development to conduct what might be termed political assessments of possible investment or trade markets: that would be the responsibility in the first instance of the Federal Government, because it is clearly a foreign affairs matter, and in the second instance it would be for the Cabinet to discuss that situation. I acknowledge the point made by the honourable member that it would be likely that the economic decline in the Philippines since 1980, when the growth rate was markedly cut back, might have the capacity to be reversed and it might be possible that, with different management of the economy, growth can again be part of the Philippines situation.

I note that the honourable member referred to the transfer of enterprises from Australia to countries within the ASEAN market. I guess that an expression of concern in that regard would have to be carefully considered. While it is certainly

true that industrial parks enclaves have been established in the Philippines which are tariff and tax free and which, may I say, in a reprehensible way are free of any reasonable controls with respect to working conditions and industrial organisation, they having posed significant threats to many Australian industries, and we would want to be a bit careful, I would imagine, as to how we want to compete in future in that regard.

I believe (and I say this as an individual) that we would want to support a situation where there is fair competition between factories in different countries and oppose unfair competition. The prospect of increasing exports to the Philippines would certainly arise, but it would depend on the capacity of the Philippines economy to pay, and I am not certain of the debt burden that the Philippines is facing at present, although I know that that is a major problem facing many other countries in the developing world.

It is a matter that certainly would have to affect any desire to promptly increase trade. The Deputy Leader referred to agricultural machinery as being one area where we could see exports going to the Philippines. My guess is that there would have to be significant variation in the product range of machinery produced in South Australia at present, not only because dry-land farming—which is a major impact on agriculture in this State—is not significant in the Philippines but also because of geography—the contours of the Philippines are quite different in many ways and the land is used for terrace farming rather than open-space farming, which we are used to.

My guess is that there would not be quite the potential in the area of agricultural machinery, but certainly there could be potential with respect to chemicals and the like. There again, one would have to look at what has already happened in the Philippines. The green revolution started in the Philippines, where new strains of rice resulted from intensive chemical application to land areas, resulting in much higher yields. That is an area, I suggest, in which perhaps they are well and truly up with many other countries in the world.

I certainly take note of the question. I will refer it to the department, which will give me a report on what potential may exist. It could well be that the agent we have charged with the responsibility for looking at South-East Asian and East Asian markets, based in Hong Kong, could well look at that and provide further advice to the department and the Government. Clearly, it is the commitment of the department and myself, as Minister, and the Government that we pursue any reasonable trade opportunities that may exist.

HILTON BRIDGE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of progress on the redevelopment of Burbridge Road and the Hilton bridge? Is the redevelopment progressing smoothly or are there any unforeseen holdups? Is the project proceeding on schedule? Is it intended to allow a right-hand turn at Burbridge Road into South Road? Following the change of electoral boundaries, much of this road, which is one of the main arteries for workers to go to and from my electorate to the city, is now within my district, and I have received many questions concerning the progress of the development.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: To answer the last part of the question first, I cannot tell the honourable member whether or not it is proposed that a right-hand turn from Burbridge Road into South Road will be provided in the final design. However, I can obtain that information for him. I will be discussing a number of matters with the

Highways Department this afternoon and I will certainly take that up.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would assume coming into the city.

Mr Plunkett: Going out.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Going out of the city. That information will be made available to my colleague. The contract is on schedule. In fact, it is slightly in front, and I think that is to the credit of those involved—the workers—and the weather has something to do with it. I am not aware of any problems. We are within the tendered cost, which was \$9.8 million with a 10 per cent contingency allowance. There is no indication of problems that may affect that. This important facility for the honourable member's constituents and others in the western suburbs should be ready for use early in 1987. That was the original proposed completion date and there is no reason why that will not be met. Any further information I can obtain will be passed on to the honourable member.

STATE TAXATION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Can the Premier say whether a further increase in State taxation is an option that Cabinet will consider if the Prime Minister cuts promised Commonwealth funding to the States next financial year? The Premier differs from Mr Cain and Mr Wran in his attitude to the current Commonwealth review of its commitment on State funding for the next financial year. The Premier has been quoted in the *Melbourne Age* as saying that he sees it as no real threat, while the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales have both strongly attacked the Prime Minister for even suggesting that the Commonwealth's commitment will not be honoured.

However, the Premier's reluctance to challenge the Prime Minister in the same way as his colleagues from other States may be something he will regret if the States do not get their promised 2 per cent increases in real terms. This would cost South Australia at least \$24 million, and would come on top of a slowdown in some State revenues, most notably stamp duties from declining real estate activity, other receipts affected by an anticipated downturn in general economic activity, and royalty returns.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think the honourable member misunderstands my position on this matter. It is certainly true that I did not attack the Prime Minister in lurid terms and launch in the way that perhaps would warm her heart and make her feel better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Quite frankly, I do not believe that that is the way one can get things done. If the time comes and if in fact this is made as a serious suggestion—and that can be explored only at the Premiers Conference later this year—naturally my voice will be raised very loudly indeed against it. What I said was this: that the suggestion that the Commonwealth tax sharing agreement and the agreement made last year by the Premiers and the Commonwealth should be amended in order to solve budgetary problems that the Commonwealth may have is simply transferring the problem from one area of the public sector to another, and that is totally unacceptable. That stands to reason.

I also referred to the fact that it was not the Prime Minister who raised this matter but the shadow Treasurer, a Mr Carlton, perhaps known to members of the Opposition, but not very well known to anyone else (and, looking at some of his statements, one can understand why). In

fact, he was the person who, in December or November last year, said that he believed—and he was speaking on behalf of the Federal Opposition—that State grants should be cut in order to do something about the federal budget. He proposed that. I did not hear a single word of complaint, a single rebuke to this person from members opposite. He is in their Party; he is part of their team. He and the hapless John Howard were at that time campaigning in our State election, and not a word was said about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It has been proposed definitely and seriously by the Opposition shadow Treasurer. I can understand in part why Opposition members did not bother to respond—because he certainly is a shadowy figure whose views do not carry much weight. However, in responding to the suggestion of the range of options that the Commonwealth may have that were raised by the Prime Minister, I drew attention to the fact that this was something that had been raised by the Opposition, and I said it would be most unlikely for the Federal Government to accept that proposition.

If, at the time that we are looking at the Commonwealth-State financial agreements, these things are seriously considered, you can expect that they will be resisted very strongly indeed. I might add that we are already disadvantaged by the new formula for Commonwealth-State taxation. It is already going to cost us something, and we were very fortunate indeed that we were given special assistance as a result of the representations I made in order to ensure our position. That is where it stands, but I will end where I began by emphasising that it is not a case of the loudest and most strident voice getting the results in this area: it is how effective your representations are and whether they actually yield results. Our results are showing already over three years of relations with the Federal Government. I expect them to show over the next four years as well.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next question, I remind members that it is not an appropriate practice in this House for a member to ask a question and then greet the ministerial response with a constant stream of interjections.

HIGHWAY NUMBERING SYSTEM

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Transport advise what progress has been made by the Highways Department to introduce a route numbering system on roads in South Australia? In January, whilst in Western Australia, I noted that the Main Roads Department was introducing a new route numbering system throughout Western Australia. The metropolitan area, I understand, was the first to get the new signs, and it will be progressively introduced throughout the rural areas and tourist drives until the whole State is covered. The department's slogan will be, 'Driving by numbers', as drivers will be able to find their way around Western Australia, even if they are newly arrived from overseas or interstate. The signs were put up in four categories: the national green and gold to be used for national highways—that was declared by the Commonwealth Government to have interstate significance—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: It is not a doroxy dixer at all.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The cynicism of members opposite is incredible.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will confine himself to his question.

Mr HAMILTON: The Adelaide-Perth and Perth-Darwin links are rated national highways, whereas the Highway 1 route marker will be black on a white background to signify that it is a route with interstate significance but not a direct link between capital cities. The article from which I am quoting says:

By far the most numerous will be the State routes, inter-regional and urban—white numbers on a blue background indicating the Perth to Albany route and the Stirling Highway as good examples.

The article points out that this will be most popular with visitors, particularly the white and brown tourist drive signs. Finally, the article points out that this marking has been used extensively in the United States, European countries and Victoria with particular success. Given the Government's stated policy of trying to encourage more tourists, both intrastate and interstate to visit South Australia, I ask what progress has been made in this area?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question, I think.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes. This has not been a really good day for me, because I have to get another report for the honourable member. I do acknowledge the honourable member's continued interest in both tourism and road safety, and I think that both those aspects are involved in the question that he has asked. It seems such a sensible proposition that no doubt the department has done a lot of work on this in the past, and the fact that it has not already been introduced all over South Australia would suggest that there is a very good reason for that not happening. I will have to get a report for the honourable member. I will be happy to do that and provide him with the information as soon as I can.

GRAPE HARVESTERS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Agriculture urge the Minister of Transport to review the interpretation of regulations by which owners of grape harvesters must now register and pay stamp duty on such machines to allow them to move along the roads from one property to another? I hope that the Minister is aware that in previous years a permit could be obtained to move grape harvesters along roads for a weekly permit cost of about \$5. For an average harvesting period, this amounted to a total of \$40 a year.

Now, grape growers are faced with an initial stamp duty charge of as much as \$5 000 just to get their machines on the road, and registration is required at a further cost of more than \$100 for the six month period, depending on the type of harvester involved. This dramatic increase in cost to harvesters is then inflicted on grape growers and comes at a time when the industry is in dire straits. These increased costs will be reflected in the charges to grape growers with hourly harvesting prices rising, in some cases by up to 30 per cent.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. I will make it an even worse day for the Minister of Transport and ask him to prepare another report. I have been advised of this matter by the department, and it would be appropriate for me to discuss it with my colleague to see what we can come up with. I understand the reasons behind the question and why the honourable member's constituents have taken up the matter with him. I will get back to him as soon as I can after discussing the matter with the Minister of Transport.

CYSS PROGRAM

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of State Development say whether the State Government has made submissions to the Commonwealth Government for supplementary funding for Community Youth Support Scheme groups whose programs have been jeopardised by a change in funding arrangements? In November last year, CYSS groups in my area and in other parts of Adelaide were notified of changes in funding arrangements because of a new award for CYSS project officers. I am advised that these changes have caused a serious curtailment of CYSS programs. In fact, I am told that the Salisbury CYSS faces a shortfall of \$12 000 for its programs. This means that only 28 programs of the 40 programs previously available will be offered this year. I am told that hundreds of young unemployed people will therefore miss out on programs this year in Salisbury, and that similar program cuts are expected for the Paddocks CYSS.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government has expressed concern about this serious situation, because we acknowledge that CYSS groups have been very valuable in providing assistance to young people in areas by way of running programs and activities that have helped many young people to develop the skills that they may need both in the workplace and in the community generally. On 20 December last year I wrote, in two capacities, to the Hon. Ralph Willis (Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations): first, in my capacity as member for Ramsay and, secondly, in my capacity as a Minister of the South Australian Government. In that letter, I identified facts that have again been brought to the attention of the House by the member for Briggs. As local member, I refer to the concern about the Salisbury CYSS program.

Recently, I have been pleased to note the very strong public propositions that have been put by the honourable member in this regard supporting the need for supplementary funding to that group. *Inter alia* in my letter to the Federal Minister I made the point that the Salisbury CYSS program (and one can relate that to the CYSS program generally) had been a most valuable community support service meeting the needs of unemployed youth in that area. Further, I pointed out that that group needed to be able to continue its work without reductions in either staff hours or program offerings. It is clearly one of those two, as the member for Bragg pointed out, which is in the offing if no supplementary funding is forthcoming. My letter to the Federal Minister continued:

I therefore urge you most strongly to give favourable consideration to providing supplementary funding to CYSS programs so that the excellent work they do can be maintained.

That letter was sent just before Christmas, and only this week I instructed my office to follow it with another approach from me, this time as a member of the South Australian Cabinet, to ask yet again for this matter to be favourably considered by the Federal Government. The CYSS program was in some jeopardy under the former Fraser Government. In a sense, that action generated a lot of public analysis as to what CYSS actually did. The outcome of that analysis from the community point of view was that it does much good work.

Finally, the Fraser Government decided that it could not cut back the program, because it would not only be undermining valuable work but also bringing on its head significant community opposition. I am convinced that the Federal Government is aware of the value of the CYSS program. From its point of view, this is a budgetary matter. Nevertheless, it is not a valid area of budget constraint for the Federal Government to try to cut back on activities in this area. We will repeat our submissions to the Federal Gov-

ernment, and I will keep the House advised of the responses I receive.

O-BAHN

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister of Transport give bus commuters a guarantee that services will not be disrupted by union action directed at the introduction of the O-Bahn system? Last December, during a dispute over roster problems at the Elizabeth depot of the STA, the bus drivers union threatened further action when the O-Bahn comes into service in just over a week.

In the *Advertiser* of 17 December a senior STA officer who would not be named said that the Elizabeth dispute was just a taste of things to come, and he went on (and I quote his words):

The introduction of a new and different service like the north-east busway will definitely cause a strong union reaction.

I understand that the union is still threatening that, unless all its demands are met, it will disrupt the new commuter services to be introduced in line with the opening of the O-Bahn system on 9 March.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I see no reason why the O-Bahn services should not commence on 9 March, as intended. Certainly, there have been considerable negotiations with the union over the new rosters, as one would expect. Systems have been established to ensure that the various depots involved in the new rostering system have the opportunity to put requests to the STA to ensure that they have an input into how those rosters are finally determined, and that has taken place. Until yesterday there were still some matters to be determined.

At a meeting yesterday between the union, the STA and other officers, most of those requests were cleaned up in the sense that they were satisfactorily resolved. There are still one or two issues outstanding, but there are dispute procedures that can accommodate them prior to 9 March. The process is continuing as expected, and I see no reason why the services should not commence on 9 March. I do not think that any Minister is able to give a categorical undertaking that that will be so, because unions still have their roles to play but, as far as I am able, I give that assurance to the House.

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport request officers of the State Transport Authority to examine the rate of return of the small boom gate on O-Bahn buses? I have received correspondence from a constituent who advises me that she boarded one of the new O-Bahn buses in Para Hills with her two daughters. The 4½-year-old daughter went up the steps, followed by her 2½-year-old sister. The mother was dragging a pusher into the bus and was finding money for fares when the boom gate swung back (a lad must have just gone through) and hit one of her daughters on the back of the head, causing the child to lose her balance and fall down the steps of the bus. I regard that as a serious matter, and I would like it investigated and the rate of return of the boom gate reduced.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. As Minister of Transport I should say publicly that I regret the incident that the honourable member has related to the House, and I certainly hope that the young child did not suffer serious injury as a result of being hit by the boom gate. I understand that when the new buses were ordered the boom gate was an integral part of the chassis. These buses operate mainly in Europe, and the boom gates were not actually installed at the request of the STA, although they serve a very useful purpose.

When passengers are boarding a bus they pass through the boom gate, which is just past the driver's seat. People coming in show their pass or card, or they pay the fare, and move down the bus. The boom gate moves with them and closes behind them, then forms a barrier between the passengers and the bus operator. Convenience and safety provisions are involved in that. I happened to be on a bus this morning and walked through the boom gate and the rate of return—spring loaded, I suppose—was not very strong on the bus I was in. Nevertheless, the gate is at a height that would, if it were to spring back, certainly hit small children.

I will have the STA investigate this matter to see whether or not we can devise a system that ensures that young children—and I think frail elderly people, too—are not in any way placed at risk. If the gates present the danger that the honourable member has suggested exists through the example he has related to the House—and I have no reason to dispute that—I am certain that the STA will do all in its power to overcome that danger totally or to diminish it to an extent that would be acceptable.

ASH WEDNESDAY FIRES

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: By prior arrangement, I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy whether he or the Government can assist in speeding up the settlement of claims against ETSA for property damage caused generally during the 1983 Ash Wednesday fires and, in particular, damage caused to the McLaren Flat fire victims. I understand that ETSA installations are alleged to have caused several fires on that fateful day in February 1983 in the Clare region (in the Mid-North), in the South-East of the State, and south of Adelaide in the McLaren Flat, Kangarilla, Meadows, Hope Forest, Bull Creek and Ashbourne districts. The latter region is partly within the boundaries of the electorate of Alexandra and the new electorate of Heysen, and my colleague and I have received requests from constituents for assistance in having their claims settled.

After going to ETSA and the respective solicitors handling the cases on behalf of those constituents, we do not appear to be having much success. It is true, as has been reported, that in June 1985 a test case (as it is commonly described) was heard, in the company of some 78 other victims petitioned at the time, on behalf of the Dunn family of Ashbourne, and was proved in their favour. In that case, ETSA was ordered by the court to pay the applied damages, and a further ruling was given that interest on other claims delayed would be at a flat rate of 11 per cent. In the meantime, not one of those other victims has been paid.

I am not aware of precisely how many have been assessed, but I understand it is about six of the 78 in question. The member for Heysen and I believe that the Government should intervene on behalf of these constituents, and accordingly we seek the assistance and cooperation of the Minister and his colleagues. I might add that some of the cases are really quite devastating. I have correspondence to hand which demonstrates that bank loans and assistance from the Department of Agriculture for carry on purposes have now been exhausted and that the property in question (about which I briefly told the Minister prior to today's sitting) is at a stage where it will have to be sold and vacated by the family. I can cite other cases almost as devastating as this, and I indeed believe that a case involving damages caused by a fire in 1983 should have been finalised by now. Indeed, we are just at the very beginning, it would appear from the evidence at hand.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I suppose I could be excused if I noted at the beginning that, when the member for Alexandra pointed out that his question was raised by prior

arrangement, we did not get the usual chorus of 'dorothy dixer' from the other side. It shows something I have known for a long time: things are different when they are not the same, particularly in the House.

This matter is one that every member of the House would view seriously and with concern. Those people who suffered tragic losses from bushfires in the 1983 Ash Wednesday disaster should not, we would all agree, have their suffering added to by undue delay in the settling of claims for losses. That is not to say that it is easy to settle these matters quickly. I know that the honourable member has had some experience in matters relating to compensation.

Whilst the judgment can be made or an agreed settlement can be decided upon, the settling of the details can take time, and there is a kind of protection built into the system that consists of providing fairness to the recipient and not just the party involved in paying the losses concerned. I will take on notice the matter that the honourable member has raised with me. I was aware that a so-called test case, to which he referred, had been processed. I understood that settlement was under way—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Settlement was made in September last year.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: So still there have not been any other cases that have followed. That is the point that has been raised. I will take up the matter with ETSA to see what I can do to arrange for expedition of the matter. If I have any specific detail I will get that to the honourable member as soon as I can.

REAL ESTATE COURSE

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education indicate whether the criteria set down for student selection by TAFE colleges for real estate courses are satisfactory, and whether equality of opportunity is being provided? Several constituents have been unable to obtain acceptance locally or at any TAFE college to do this course. The main reason is their not being able to meet the guidelines for acceptance, as applicants must be employed or engaged in the industry. Two women have been to see me in recent times. One has spent the past two years full-time at Magill, studying to obtain her BA in business administration in order to pursue a career in real estate. She has not been accepted on application for the last three semesters.

The second woman, who has been employed in the industry for 11 years in a clerical position, sees the course as a natural progression for her career. The questions raised are as follows:

What percentage of women are accepted on application for TAFE real estate courses?

Has positive discrimination been considered to enable equality of opportunity for the course in question?

What percentage accepted complete the course, that is, the male:female pass rate?

Are all accepted applicants legitimately employed or engaged in the industry?

The last question relates to the accusation put to me that friends are assisting by saying that this is the case.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can give an answer to the honourable member's question, both the general question raised and in terms of the specific matters of concern as well. I can advise the House that students are selected for entry to courses in real estate in the Department of Technical and Further Education upon the following criteria: employment within the industry; strong employer support; and educational background. Of course, it is contingent upon the number of applications received *vis-a-vis* the number of places that are available. To that extent gender is not

a criterion for selection, with one exception. That exception answers the second part of the honourable member's question: that is, whether or not equality of opportunity is being provided, namely, the NOW course (New Opportunities for Women).

That course is offered only to women, so to that extent there is a clear gender restriction, although for general real estate courses there is not. I can say, as to the percentage of women accepted on application, that an analysis of places offered in 1985 at the Kensington Park College of TAFE—and I chose that as the main focus of attention because it is the principal college where it is offered; students doing courses in real estate, if doing it in the classroom mode, must finish it at Kensington Park—shows that in the part-time real estate courses 42 per cent of the students were women. In the full-time courses which were offered intensively during 1985, and for which the industry selects the students, some 30 per cent of those enrolled were women.

Again, I mention that the college at Kensington also conducts the NOW real estate program which has 20 female students. Of all of these different client groups doing the real estate course in different modes, it is estimated that an average of at least 50 per cent of all enrolments within that course are women.

Coming to the matter of success rates perhaps at the end of the course, which may be an indication of how students have done (and the honourable member asked for the pass rate), in the part-time course in 1985, 42 females and 46 males were enrolled and 33 females and 36 males passed, making a pass rate of 78 per cent for both male and female. The results of the NOW program are, clearly and understandably, not included in that figure.

Coming to the matters raised by the honourable member's constituents, the suggestion that there may be some unfair treatment with respect to the determination of whether or not somebody is employed in the industry, I can only say that that is a very difficult matter for the department to judge, because it asks for a detailed examination of the veracity of a statement made by candidates with regard to employment in the industry. However, the department requires a written and signed statement, and every attempt is made by the department to assess whether or not that statement reflects the correct situation, particularly where employers are offering the possibility of employment on completion of the salesperson's component of the course. So, it is an area where I agree there may be some difficulty, but I can give the assurance that the goodwill of the department and the endeavours of the officers of the department are there to make sure that the criterion is being adhered to in good faith.

The general level of applications for the real estate course is always far in excess of the number of places available, and that has been a matter of some concern, but it has been the clear policy of the Department of TAFE, supported by the Real Estate Institute as an association group rather than as individual real estate people, that it is not appropriate to design a course that meets the total demand for places. Rather, there must be some reflection of meeting the need within the economy for extra real estate qualified agents.

WORKERS FOR GAY COMMUNITY

Mr S.G. EVANS: Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education outline the details of the program for people to learn skills to work among gay people, as advertised in the *Advertiser* of Friday 21 February, working from a CITY office in Hindmarsh Square? The advertisement mentioned that people wishing to learn the skills to work amongst gay people were invited to attend a project called

'A Gay Games Party', and a contact was given to phone Sue at the Hindmarsh Square office of CITY (I think the telephone number was 217 0444).

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: I incorrectly wrote to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins), because I believed it was included in his portfolio, but it is the Hon. Lynn Arnold who has responsibility for this matter. In that letter I asked some specific questions. Would the Minister like to give a report about that advertisement? In particular, I think the House would like to know whether the advertisement was placed with the authority of senior officers, and what program is supposed to be taking place.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Some points concerning last Friday's advertisement in the *Advertiser* need to be clarified. First, there is no project as such. Secondly, before any project can take place it must be approved by senior officers of what is presently the Department of Labour but what, in the fullness of time, as administrative arrangements are being determined under the new Employment and Further Education Ministry, will come within the direct departmental area of employment.

If such a project were submitted, it would have to be approved at that level before it could exist under Government funding, but there is no project at this stage. Indeed, no project has been submitted to an officer for consideration. The advertisement in the newspaper was put in the wrong section. It had been intended to insert it as a free course for the unemployed, not to put it in the employment section which could indicate a project. It was designed, as is common practice for the CITY group, to assess needs in certain areas of the community and to determine whether anything needs to be examined there.

Regarding the area examined by that advertisement, this came out of a recognition by certain officers within CITY that certain young gay people have personal problems to the extent that they have difficulty relating to others, there being a reaction by others that makes it impossible for them to take part in counselling groups and workshop situations, where they might try to include their communication and organisational skills. So, it involved an attempt to determine whether or not the needs of that group could be addressed by a discussion group as proposed.

After all, it is only fair to recognise that, if a person has personality characteristics, it may preclude their participation in other groups that are available to the general population. That was the full intent of the advertisement. It was not intended to institute a project that would involve Government funding: it was merely an attempt to assess whether there was a need in this section of the community; that assessment would then be referred to senior officers to determine what should happen. As it has not reached that stage, that is purely academic. If it became a project application, it would be assessed with other applications and determined on the basis of whether a real need had to be met and whether there was justification for the funding of such a project. However, it is nowhere near that level of development.

NATIONAL PARKS

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning ensure that the Queensland privatisation practice of allowing developers to buy national parks for private profit-making development is not adopted in respect of South Australian national parks? A report in last Saturday's *Weekend Australian*, headed 'Joh basks in sale of island national parks', reveals that the Queensland Government

has sold Lindeman Island National Park to one of Sir Joh's closest associates, Sir Edward Lyons. The report states:

The island has unique areas botanically and in terms of bird life.

A warning has been issued by the Opposition Labor spokesman on national parks, as follows:

If we allow this to happen, it will be just the first instance of our national park areas being sold off to private enterprises. The prices you now must pay for these resorts are astronomical. It will mean the average person who wants to utilise these national park areas is no longer able to do so.

The newspaper also reports that the Queensland Government will consider allowing more—

Mr OSWALD: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I submit that this question is completely hypothetical. The honourable member is putting forward a hypothetical proposition that has no basis in anything that is happening in South Australia, and I ask that you rule the question out of order.

The SPEAKER: I rule the question in order. It is not totally in the hypothetical category, because it deals with the situation that has arisen, or is alleged to have arisen, in another State.

Ms GAYLER: The *Weekend Australian* also reports that the Queensland Government will consider allowing more developers to buy national parks on the basis that such offers are too good to refuse. In fact, the Queensland Minister for National Parks is quoted as saying:

Conservationists have to learn to be a little more broadminded.

The moves by conservatives to privatise national parks have reportedly outraged conservation groups. It has been suggested to me that the Australian Environment Council, comprising State and Federal Ministers, ought to consider this gross alienation of vital national parks at the next ministerial meeting. In view of the privatisation philosophy expounded by the Liberal Opposition in this State and nationally, it has been put to me that the public is entitled to know the law and policy applying to national parks in South Australia.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have long since ceased to be amazed at anything that might happen in Queensland, particularly in the environmental field. The honourable member has asked whether I am prepared to ensure that this matter is raised at a meeting of the Australian Environment Council or at the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers, which meetings will be held in South Australia at the same time this year. I shall be only too happy to do so. At a previous meeting of the Nature Conservation Ministers, the Queensland Minister, whether the present one or a former one, was boasting that about 2 per cent of Queensland was in national parks. I found that interesting, because that meeting was held in New Zealand where, I understand, 15 per cent of that relatively small country was in national park use. Further, more than 5 per cent of South Australia is in national parks.

The Hon. H. Allison: Does that include Aboriginal reserves?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That may have been the case when the honourable member was in Government, but I have been an assiduous dedicator of national parks over the past three years, and the statistics in the honourable member's mind are a little dated.

Members Interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The interjection concerning Ayers Rock was interesting, as it is a little symptomatic of the thinking of members opposite that they can equate, on the one hand, the return of land to traditional owners with, on the other hand, the freeholding of the national estate to private profitmakers. That is an interesting equation that they make in their own mind. In relation to South Australia,

the National Parks and Wildlife Act in its present form was introduced in this place by a gentleman for whom I have an immense regard. I refer to the present Chairman of the Environment Protection Council and the Minister of Environment and Conservation (as it then was), the Hon. Glen Broomhill.

He ensured in that Act that land could not be alienated from national parks use except by a motion carried by both Houses of Parliament. That has brought one or two minor problems: for example, if one wishes to realign the road along the boundary of a national park, one must get a motion through both Houses. However, on balance, that procedure is to be preferred to leaving the national estate (in the sense that I am using the term: these environmental assets of the people) open to predation by those whose enthusiasm for privatisation (and that is what this is) runs away with them.

An honourable member: Garbage.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member may say 'Garbage', but what is privatisation other than the return of public assets to private assets? That is precisely what it is, especially in the context in which the honourable member has put it and as it is in the article that I have before me. Someone is making a quid: it is a private business, and that is fair enough. That is our economy. Public asset is being converted to that use, a use that is entirely inappropriate. We are committed to the better tourist use of public assets, but we will not do that by alienating national parks.

COFFIN BAY WATER SCHEME

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister of Labour, through his resources or those of the Minister of Water Resources, investigate the conduct of the Coffin Bay water scheme project? In April 1985, a scheme to provide water to Coffin Bay was commenced under the CEP umbrella, the total cost being some \$1.9 million, to be spent over nine months. The scheme is meeting a long identified need and the locals are very grateful. However, I have been contacted by several people who worked on the project. They have expressed grave concerns about the way in which it was managed and the injuries which resulted. The following observations were made by these people:

1. The machinery was outdated and from all accounts taken out of salvage by the E&WS Department.

2. All the trucks were deficient in some regard—either their brakes did not work or the steering was slack. There was more than one occasion when the brakes failed or trucks overshot corners.

3. Most items of digging equipment required constant repair and did not conform to safety standards. For example, one of the trench digging machines had no guards, little suspension and inadequate cushioning.

4. Asbestos pipes were cut without the use of protective clothing and equipment, despite the warning on the pipes themselves.

5. Some of the unemployed people on the project were required to operate machines for which they had had no training other than limited on the job instruction. This was despite the fact that regulations require a certificate before the person can operate the machines.

6. I have been informed that currently five people have suffered disabling injuries and a number of others took leave during the project because of injury.

7. I understand that there is a ditch witch machine currently being used on the road construction which has no safety guards nor seat belts.

I would be pleased if the Minister would have the matter thoroughly investigated.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will certainly do that. My understanding is that the Coffin Bay water project was originally part of the CEP project which, along with the Porter Bay project, is part of the Labor Party's long-term plan to win Flinders. Some strange decisions were made. The picture painted by the member for Mitcham is quite alarming, and I will certainly have the Department of Labour look into those instances. The honourable member might like to give me a copy of his question so that we will not have to wait until tomorrow. I will have the matter investigated to ascertain the true picture.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In making this statement, I must apologise to the House that the normal courtesies will not be observed, as this statement was drafted during Question Time because the matter was brought to my attention only one minute before we came into this Chamber. However, I will read slowly.

My attention has been drawn to a statement issued this morning by the member for Coles in which she claims that the effect of an amendment carried by the Committee last evening was that so-called wine cooler bottles will no longer be subject to a 5c deposit. That is not so. The honourable member and I in the course of debate disagreed as to whether the Government's Bill provided for other than point of sale returns for these containers. I claimed that it did, but the honourable member was unconvinced.

Finally, from an abundance of caution, because I am a reasonable man and because it seemed useful to have a definition of this beverage in the legislation, I accepted the amendment. The present state of the Bill allows the Government, if the industry can come up with an acceptable system, to, by regulation, allow these containers to be returned through marine store dealers. I have discussed this with the industry today, but there is no resolution as yet. The 5c deposit remains untouched. It is true that clause 4 of the Bill allows the Government to prescribe a refund amount. The Government fully intends to do so.

I have taken advice on this matter. The amendment more clearly defines that wine coolers are subject to deposit. The honourable member is spreading confusion in the industry. Since I am not in the business of accusing members opposite of telling untruths or of being deliberately misleading, I can only say that the honourable member obviously misunderstood the effect of the amendment that she herself moved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Minister is quite correct in his concern at the wording of the statement that I released and also in his interpretation of the amendment. A typing error in the statement that removed the words 'Point of sale redemption on the 5c deposit' is responsible for the misunderstanding, and I can only say that, when

members return home after midnight and start early in the morning, such errors occur as occurred in this case. I regret any confusion that has occurred, and I refer all members and the industry to the *Hansard* proofs of the debate which support what the Minister has said and which quite clearly identify the problem that the amendment has remedied.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 February. Page 515.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the Bill, which principally clarifies definitions that have been causing contractual problems for the Grand Prix Board. The Opposition questions the setting up of some of these definitions, in particular the definition in relation to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix and the need to reclassify some of the definitions in terms of Grand Prix insignia and the official logo. We purely and simply question the need for these changes and how they relate to sponsorship deals that might be organised by the Grand Prix Board. Will the Minister clarify the position in relation to the announcement of sponsors and say what is happening in that regard?

The Opposition is concerned about the reporting of the Grand Prix Board to Parliament. We believe that the time frame of two months as originally set out in the legislation is adequate. Will the Premier say why there is to be an extension to six months? I understand that the collection of data after the staging of any event, such as the Grand Prix, would take a considerable time.

We support that, if it can be justified. Our concern is that we are now at the end of February, and the report of the Grand Prix Board which was supposed to have been produced before this Parliament on 30 December still has not been produced. We would like to question the Premier on that matter. Obviously, there are some difficulties in obtaining information within that two to three month period, and I understand that, but we would like this matter clarified in the general discussion on the clauses.

As I said earlier, we see this Bill principally as a Committee Bill, and we will ask pertinent questions at the appropriate stages. We support the concept of liquor licensing in the Bill because we believe that, for clarification, with a massive extravaganza such as the Grand Prix, all the relevant rules, regulations and specific provisions that may apply in other legislation should be brought together under the one measure. We support the Government in that regard.

One area in this legislation concerns the opening and closing of roads, in particular, Bartels Road. The Opposition is concerned that there is a need to more clearly define the opening and closing of that road so that the public knows who is responsible for compensation if any is due (and hopefully none is required)—whether it is the board, the Government or individuals, as the case may be. We support the general provision, as long as we can have further clarification on it.

I take the opportunity, on behalf of the Opposition, to congratulate the board on the excellent presentation of the Grand Prix in 1985. That has been said many times, but it is the first opportunity we have had to state it in Parliament. The Opposition would also like to congratulate the General

Manager of the board, Dr Hemmerling, and his assistant, Mr Barnard, on the excellent engineering management job they both carried out. We also congratulate the board on the two awards it received. First, it received an award for achieving the best organisation of a Formula One Grand Prix. Those of us who had the privilege of being in the Premier's suite on one day and, on the final day, of having the opportunity of being in the pits area would know the magnificent organisation that was controlled by the two people I have mentioned, together with the workers involved in running the Grand Prix. The other award was for the best television presentation, and the Opposition expresses its congratulations to all those involved.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I endorse the remarks of the member for Bragg. The Opposition is mindful that a venture as important as this in the motor sport calendar means much to this State and Australia as a nation. We are fortunate that South Australia has proven that it can manage to attract the top formula one drivers in the world and can compete with other well established European and North American cities in conducting the event.

Like the member for Bragg, I do not believe that any authority, or this statutory authority, should require six months to bring down its annual report. I believe that the annual report of the Grand Prix Board should have been presented to Parliament by now. Surely Dr Hemmerling and his staff are in a position to advise us of the financial outcome of the event. We have read much in the media indicating that there will be a deficit in line with budget—something like \$1.5 million to \$2 million. If that is so, I think it represents extremely good value, because the first event would have been very expensive. Some modifications will have to be made to the track, but bearing all that in mind, I believe it was a pretty good result. The Commonwealth Government was generous with its \$5 million grant, and I hope that the Premier can attract another \$5 million. If he cannot, we do not invite the Prime Minister: that will soon solve any problem in that regard.

It is a national event, and the Commonwealth Government should be prepared to make \$5 million available to South Australia again. The organisation of the Grand Prix was superb—there is no doubt about that. Anyone who for the first time was attending a Grand Prix would have been absolutely staggered by the efficiency with which the program was conducted. I was determined to take the opportunity of witnessing it, and I am pleased I did. I only hope that I can get the same seat I had last time, although I fear that more stands will be built and it will be difficult to reserve actual seats.

There were some criticisms of the Grand Prix, and one can only expect that on the first occasion. I understand that work has already commenced to redress those problems. It must have been disappointing for young people paying \$25 to get into the unreserved area to find that they had to stand more than three deep and saw very little. This was caused by the geography of the track and of the general admission areas.

I take this opportunity of asking the board to seriously consider the lavatory facilities at the Grand Prix. We have now had two, possibly three, major events in Adelaide involving Jubilee 150, and on every occasion the lavatory facilities have been totally inadequate. They have been so bad that women have had to take over the men's lavatories. This means that there is something wrong with the planning arrangements. It is difficult to forecast attendances, such as the New Year's Eve crowd at Victoria Park racecourse, but when it comes to the Grand Prix organisers should know with reasonable accuracy the expected attendance. I plead with them to ensure that the sanitary conditions surround-

ing the lavatories are upgraded. They must not be allowed to overflow as they did last time. I also think that these facilities will have to be doubled in certain areas.

The member for Bragg talked about the legislation encompassing the liquor licensing aspect of the Grand Prix. I doubt whether it is necessary to have alcohol at sporting events, but on this occasion I believe not one incident of misbehaviour occurred as a result of alcohol. I hope that that continues, because this is a top event and organisers cannot afford to have anything go wrong. The behaviour of the people attending the Grand Prix was exemplary in that respect.

Another problem I see with this year's Grand Prix is that the main race will occur on 26 October, the day when daylight saving is introduced. I hope that daylight saving this year will either start a week earlier or be postponed a week.

Mr Ferguson: A week earlier.

Mr BECKER: That would suit me: I reckon it should start at the beginning of October, on the Labor Day weekend—

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I know that there are problems on the West Coast, and I support a time zone change for that area. I hope that it will not coincide with the commencement of daylight saving, because we cannot afford to have any problems whatsoever, and we want to maintain our reputation. Certainly, I want to know exactly how many countries received live television coverage of the race—how many people saw the race—because that is part of the measuring stick from our point of view.

If we are to spend \$20 million and if we get 200 million or 300 million people around the world viewing the race, it represents good value. If we get an audience of 500 million, it is exceptional value and, if we get 700 million, as was claimed, it is a tremendous bonus, but I do not believe that those figures can stand up.

Overall, we must do all we can to ensure that this event will maintain its rightful place in the formula one car racing calendar. We must do all we can from a bipartisan point of view to ensure the event's continued success.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development): I wish to speak briefly to the Bill and indicate my support for most of the propositions in it as, bearing in mind the excellent event conducted last year, I believe it will be an important machinery matter to enhance what will be a magnificent contribution to South Australia's life, I hope for many years to come. However, one provision in the Bill with which I cannot concur is that dealing with the removal of certain restrictions relating to the sale and consumption of liquor, and I intend to vote against that provision in Committee. However, I will support the Bill at the second reading and hope that the House will see fit to vote with me in Committee on that clause.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I thank members for their support of the Bill. As indicated in the second reading explanation, the four headings under which amendments are being made are self-explanatory. They are based on the experience of staging the first race. They seek to clarify or put beyond doubt legal rights that need to be protected, and I guess that following this year's Grand Prix we may also find other possible amendments to be made. We can only refine and develop the statutory backing to the event as we refine and develop the event itself. There is no question that Grand Prix No. 1 was enormously successful, and Grand Prix No. 2 will be even better. In order to make it better we need these amendments, which I commend to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Preliminary.'

Mr INGERSON: What is the purpose of striking out the definition of 'Australian Formula One Grand Prix'? It seems a strange decision.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That definition is being struck out of the Act in order to give the flexibility to designate official insignia and an official title from year to year based on the requirements of naming rights, sponsors or the race organisers themselves. The phrase 'Australian Formula One Grand Prix' will still be used and is still protected: I make that clear. Its protection comes not from its incorporation in the Act as a phrase but in the power of the board to so declare such a title. The copyright and other protections will continue to apply.

Mr INGERSON: On page 2 of the Bill are the new definitions of 'official grand prix insignia', 'an official symbol' and 'official title'. Will the Premier indicate whether (and how) those definitions relate to sponsorship?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Clearly, when sponsorship is being sought the first prize, as it were, is the naming rights sponsorship. Of course, negotiations are taking place on that matter. The House will remember that last year Mitsubishi Motors gained the naming rights sponsorship. It did so fairly late in the piece, but it is fair to say that it got good value indeed from that sponsorship, and the company would agree with that.

As to the sorts of arrangements under which naming rights sponsorship can be made, it is on a one year to one year basis, or on a one year with an option basis, or in a set contract over a series of years for particular prices. The negotiations on that have been very protracted and highly competitive. A decision will be officially announced as soon as possible. I say that bearing in mind that obviously a sponsor wants to obtain maximum mileage from that sponsorship, and the sooner the sponsor is identified with the event the better. Its significance in terms of the insignia and the name is simply that the board has the flexibility that it did not have under the previous legislation to use that name and to better protect it for prosecution of trade mark breaches, and so on.

Mr INGERSON: In paragraph (e), reference is made to 'or associated activities'. Is that deliberately broad? What is meant by it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is drawn broadly because, as members will recall, the Grand Prix and particularly the three days leading up to the race itself saw a number of events being staged on the circuit. While the circuit, in terms of the Act, could be closed and made available for that, the Act refers to a motor racing event, and it could be argued, although it was not, that the event is actually the race itself, on the race day. If the board wishes to conduct races of vintage cars or other formulae, or if other arrangements are made—one would hope that there can be considerable flexibility in this because clearly it adds to the excitement and the build-up to the main event itself, as was indicated—we believe it should be beyond doubt in the Act that, when we are talking about the Grand Prix, we are talking actually about a package of events that people pay to see, whether it be on Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Sunday, and not just talking about one race that takes place on one day. So, in essence, it is not seeking to extend powers beyond what were exercised last time and assumed to be part of the whole process. It is just putting it beyond any doubt in the Act itself.

Mr INGERSON: I have a supplementary question.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has already asked three questions.

Mr BECKER: Getting back to the beginning of section 3, where the Bill is to amend the Grand Prix insignia, is it the intention by putting the expressions there as listed in lines 21 to 26 to virtually seal up the use of any words or connotations of words that could in any way refer to Grand Prix, Adelaide Grand Prix or Australian Grand Prix? Is that what you are really trying to do, to tie up any use of it at all?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the intention is to tie up those expressions on an exclusive basis. By stipulating them under the definition in that way we have covered a series of expressions that have already been used. Therefore, if there was any belief that they were not protected, they could easily be seized on for commercial exploitation by somebody not connected with the event itself. They are familiar expressions, as you realise, and were used in the course of last year's event. This provides them with a protection, provided, as the Act says, that they are reasonably taken to refer to a motor racing event. I am further advised, incidentally, that the protection is only in relation to 'in the course of trade'; in other words, in headline parlance or discussion, nobody will have a writ slapped on them for using those words, even in promoting the event, in promotion which is ancillary to the official promotion of the board, but where people seek to exploit them commercially without the authorisation of the board we seek protection.

Mr BECKER: I suppose I am getting technical, but I think that we will find in the clothing area, and certainly leisure clothing—and there were some superb products manufactured during the Grand Prix by Australian manufacturers, and the standard and prices charged by one South Australian factory for its clothing was excellent, and there are also souvenirs—we will always get people looking for designs and using an expression of words that relates to the event. I am wondering whether the Premier could have gone a bit further in the drafting and added in line 25, 'where any other expression which can reasonably be taken to refer to a motor racing event,' instead of having to come back whenever anyone thinks up a new word or connotation of words. There is always the smart operator who thinks up something to exploit the event, so could it be tidied up a bit more by including those words? Is it worth further consideration?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are two problems with that, as I see it. First, using that broad brush phrase would create considerable uncertainty among traders and other people who wish to be associated in some way with the event but not necessarily marketing licensed products. Secondly, the all-embracing nature of the phrase is making it all the more difficult to provide the legal protection required. The level of disputes and the ambiguity of various expressions would mean that, rather than making the situation more favourable for the board, it would probably make it very much more difficult. The expressions that are there are the expressions that we want to protect, because they are the ones that are used. If some smart operator can find a way to work with different word formulae in a way that is consistent with the law, it is very difficult to prevent that happening. However, the board feels that, by protecting those expressions as they stand, there is sufficient sanction. We accept that it is inevitable that there are people who will latch on to the event and associate with it in some way without official licence or sanction. The object of the Act is not to exclude that in a way that would make it impossible to enforce, but to ensure that those people who are playing ball and get their products licensed are suitably protected, and the Act will do that for them.

Mr BECKER: Does the board envisage that the logo that has been used will be changed or will remain as it is, except with the year changed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The logo, which I think has been pretty well received, has now got fairly high visibility and will be retained. As with any of these things, the more it is used, the more it becomes associated with the event. Obviously, the date will be changed year by year, but there is no question that the logo was seen as extremely successful. In fact, it won an award as the best logo design of the year at the national awards for those things, and has had high overseas acceptance. It is very clever. It is properly protected under copyright, within the Act and in the schedule. If at some stage in the future it is thought desirable to change it in some way, in order to provide that full scale protection we would have to go through all this legal procedure again. So, for the moment, we will stick with the successful logo.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Functions and powers of board.'

Mr INGERSON: Since this is a consequential amendment, I can probably ask my supplementary question now. In explaining the associated activities, and I think it was reasonably clear as far as the Premier was concerned, do they apply exclusively to the event at Victoria Park? Can the expression 'in conjunction with a race' be interpreted as relating to associated activities in another place, in other words, at Morphettville or somewhere else? Does it mean only at Victoria Park?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have just taken some advice on that, as it is an interesting point. The situation appears to be that this applies to the declared area, because it is over that area that the board has direct jurisdiction. Therefore, it is events associated with and in and around the course. In relation to an event like, for instance, a trade show at the Wayville Showgrounds, or something like that, it would not be protected under this area, but because of its commercial association with the Grand Prix there will be other protection for those events. While anything taking place on or around the circuit in the declared area obviously has the direct jurisdiction of the board, if the board were supporting activities at Wayville Showgrounds, or wherever, there would have to be regard to the restrictions and by-laws that apply to those venues. I think that is the reasonable way to approach it.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Reports.'

Mr INGERSON: During my second reading speech, I made the comment of the statutory requirement that the first Grand Prix report be made by December 1985. Can the Premier say what has happened to that? Secondly, what is the reason for the extreme increase in the time required to report? I understand the variation in relation to the date and that two, three or four months would not matter, but why do we need six months, and when can we expect the first report?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The first report, in terms of an official report, is notional. As Minister, I have chosen to accept it on that basis because I do not think that anyone will take the point because, when the original legislation was before Parliament, we expected that the event would be held before November, whereas it was eventually held in that month. A report will be made. Indeed it is being prepared at present and it will contain all the information that one would expect it to. The technical requirements of the legislation have been observed in an interim report from the board.

The second point made by the honourable member has obviously more substance, because there has been a considerable extension in the time required for the board to report. The period of six months is based on our experience with the first event. The volume and difficulty of collation of all the information required was not appreciated when the original legislation was passed. Indeed, only in the light of

its experience with the first event has the board been able to assess how long it will take to compile a definitive report containing all the information required. The problem has been compounded because this is an international event, so the board must deal with people overseas in getting financial details and other information for the report, and this takes longer than if the event were a local one. We believe six months is a reasonable time. In practice it means that, for an event held towards the end of the year, the report will be made in the first quarter: it will certainly be made in the first half of next year, which will be well before the next event is staged provided, of course, that the date of the next event is fixed once and for all and not altered as it was last year.

Mr BECKER: When will the first report be tabled?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that it is in a fairly advanced stage of preparation. I do not think that I shall be able to table it before Parliament rises in this span of sitting, but I intend to table it when it becomes available, and if that is later this year, to make it public well before that so people can see it.

Mr BECKER: It is important that the report be published as soon as possible, because we do not know the position regarding advanced bookings. I should be cross if advance bookings were opened before we knew the exact situation in relation to the previous event. I assume that the board's report will be contained in the Auditor-General's Report. There may be an accounting weakness if it has taken so long to prepare the report referred to. After all, Government departments and statutory authorities close their books on 30 June and, after the Auditor-General has audited the accounts, he presents his report in late August or early September. Indeed, the Auditor-General's Report used to be tabled before the Royal Show adjournment, but recently it has been tabled on the first sitting day after the show. That gives Government departments such as the Education Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Housing and Construction Department, which are active and large departments, about two months to put the whole thing together, and one must remember that some of the operations of those departments are complex.

In this respect, has the Grand Prix Board been given sufficient administrative staff? Must payments be made by the board to people overseas? Surely, such payments would not take long to arrange. It is hard to see why six months is required for the presentation of the report. Advance bookings could have been opened in December and the money raised thereby invested on the short term money market so as to make a profit. The report could then state that such a profit had been made and it could offset any loss made on the event itself. If our major Government departments and statutory authorities, including the Electricity Trust and the State Bank, can have details of their business printed in the Auditor-General's Report only 2½ months after the end of the financial year, the Grand Prix Board must be put in that category. A period of two months might be too tight, but three months should be ample.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Although a period of 'within six months' is stipulated, in the ordinary course of events in future years the report will probably be presented well within that time. However, that time span is reasonable. It is unreasonable for the member for Hanson to suggest that the board, having gone through this exercise for the first time, with no established procedures or fixed methods on which to work, should not be given time to ensure that satisfactory procedures are in place and that it is getting the right information.

As the years go by, such procedures will be built into the administrative structure and the accounts will be compiled more quickly because there will be established procedures

and experience on which to work. However, this year the format and content of the report and accounts are a one-off affair and, therefore, more work is required than was first expected. Already, provisional bookings and expressions of interest have been received in respect of corporate platforms and sponsorship agreements. The work of compiling the accounts and assessing the financial position of the board after the first event is continuing, but the formal reporting by the board does not affect what is being done about future events. The legislation provides for a period of six months but, as the procedures are established, the period required will probably be shorter.

Mr BECKER: I will monitor that progress. Surely, board members have visited other places that have conducted this event, and they should have returned with copies of reports and financial statements from a whole range of organisations that have been associated with the promoting and conducting a Grand Prix event. I and many other people will use the first annual report, as well as subsequent reports, as a prospectus for future corporate support.

There is no doubt in my mind that the first report will need to be of high quality—a document that will have to compete with those of normal commercial undertakings. It should set out everything involved and be almost a prospectus. A good report which is presented well and which is distributed widely throughout the world, or certainly in countries where Grand Prix events are conducted, would foster corporate sponsorship and the number of corporate boxes. I think it is tremendous. I do not know whether bookings are open yet, but I believe that there will be more corporate boxes this year, and that is good.

While it was somewhat difficult to get the first Grand Prix off the ground, the second and third Grand Prix will no doubt be better than the first. The competition will be on to come up with something different, although just as attractive, apart from the main event. That is why the sooner the report is out the better. It can be distributed Australia wide and world wide, thus assisting the board. Therefore, I wonder whether there has been a delay because the board is conscious that this report must be well presented so that it can be used as a document that will help to sell the importance of this event.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I note the honourable member's remarks, but I repeat that the board's annual report is not the chief marketing and promotion vehicle or prospectus for the event. In witness of that, although this invaluable document has not yet been published, corporate platforms and boxes have been doubly subscribed for the coming event. There is no doubt that the development and marketing of the event is going ahead full steam. It does not depend on an annual report, although I agree with the honourable member that the report should be attractively produced and certainly available for wide distribution.

Mr INGERSON: Since there are only three or four sitting days until the end of this session, will the availability of the report be publicly announced during the next five months?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I have already indicated that. I will not sit on the report until Parliament meets again. As soon as it is received and it is appropriate to publish it, we will do so.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Board to have care, control, etc., of declared area for declared period for each year.'

Mr INGERSON: The Bill does not stipulate how the board will advise the public when the Grand Prix track will be opened or closed as a public road. Will that be done by regulation? If the rules and regulations under the Road Traffic Act are to be suspended, to protect the board and

the public there must be an announcement about specific opening and closing times?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It will be done by public notice, as was the case last year. We hope that we can refine that process in the light of last year's experience. The important aspect of this amendment is simply to make clear that the ordinary road rules will apply to the general public who use the road in the ordinary way, that is, in a way that is not connected with the Grand Prix event. An ordinary person driving on the Brabham Straight during the Grand Prix period would be required to observe the speed limit. There should be no misapprehension about that. This provision and that relating to section 25 aim to make that quite clear. The ordinary rules of the road apply when the roads are open during the declared period, and the board will indicate the opening times; they will be published.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Insertion of new Part IIIA.'

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I indicated previously that I will vote against this clause. I canvassed the arguments last year when this matter was raised under the auspices of the Liquor Licensing Act, but the significant difference now is not only that this provision will be applied to this year's Grand Prix but also that it will become a permanent feature of Grand Prix, for as long as they exist. I do not believe that that would be in the best interests of South Australia. In indicating my position, I hope that other members will oppose this clause. However, if mine is the only voice calling against the clause, I will not call for a division.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: While I understand the Minister's conscientious objection to an extension of licensing hours and liquor laws, I might have had a great deal more sympathy for that proposition last time (although I did not support it then) than now because in any of these areas of change one looks at the experience of that change to see whether or not it was detrimental. In fact, last year, as the Minister points out, this provision was inserted on a one-off basis to see how it would work. The overwhelming evidence is that it worked very well indeed and did not result in outrageous behaviour or major deterioration of morals in the State—or whatever other objection or concern the Minister has.

In the light of that experience, because it worked well and there were appropriate safeguards on noise, public drunkenness, and so on, and because of the general belief that this provision really enhanced the attraction and excitement connected with the event, I am surprised that the Minister persists with his objection—but of course he is entitled to do that. I simply say that, now that we have seen how the provision operates, it ought to be inserted into the Act permanently.

Mr INGERSON: I understand that in discussion of this matter in another place it was recommended that an examination or a report of the situation resulting from this provision should be put before Parliament. Has that been followed through?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware that any specific report has been formulated, but certainly in considering the extension regard has been had to police experience during the last event, complaints from the public, and so on. Those matters have been taken into account on a general basis, and I suppose that, if there is no specific report, it is really because there is little to report in terms of incidents or problems that should result in a change of the arrangements.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**TECHNOLOGY PARK ADELAIDE ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 February, Page 516.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I would like to make a few general comments on this Bill and put the Opposition's position in relation to the distribution of money from the TAB. I was concerned to hear that a Bill as important as this was not circulated to the three racing codes. I understand that during the past week the Minister has put to the three codes the possible distribution method and has advised them that that method has not been discussed by Cabinet. After sending out Bills to the three codes, I received a couple of letters that thanked me for doing so, because they thought that they would have been sent by the Minister as a courtesy. When one had a very significant change—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: —in distribution, as will be forced by this Bill, it would have been commonsense and courtesy to inform the codes. I also believe that cross code betting has not been discussed with two of the three codes. The problem therefore is not purely and simply the instance of the distribution, as other matters are also involved, and that should be clearly spelt out.

In relation to fixing percentages, obviously the Minister would have had to decide the best way to do it. However, it is of concern to the three codes that the new method will be introduced immediately and that previous budgeting for the year will be automatically changed with the introduction of this system. Fixed percentages have been set at 73.5 per cent for the galloping code, 17.5 per cent for harness racing and 9 per cent for the greyhound code. Those figures are almost identical to the current experience—a distribution that was applicable as at 5 February this year. The Minister's suggestion that the minor codes could be helped is difficult to comprehend, because the distribution is a reflection of what the market is presently exhibiting.

On 5 February this year the distribution was 73.34 per cent to the galloping code, 17.82 per cent to the trotting code and 8.84 per cent to the greyhound code, which almost lines up exactly with the distribution in this Bill. Compared to the position at 30 June last year, there has been a significant drop in percentage for the galloping code from 74.22 per cent to the existing 73.34 per cent but an increase for the trotting or harness racing code from 16.89 per cent to the existing 17.82 per cent. The greyhound code is almost identical, with 8.89 per cent at 30 June and 8.84 per cent today. The only shift has been in relation to the trotting code.

My understanding is that this shift has been due not necessarily to any great marketing expertise of those involved in the harness racing code but because nine extra race meetings were held at Globe Derby Park on Mondays. That increase in percentage, although it is difficult to say, may be due entirely to that. It is also interesting to note that the greyhound code has had 11 extra dog meetings on Monday nights at Angle Park and has maintained its share of the turnover. That tends to suggest that the only way that the two minor codes have maintained a consistent share compared to that of the previous 12 months has been to dra-

matically increase the number of meetings that they have held.

Obviously, another area that has had a significant effect has been the introduction of broadcasting by 5AA in some of the trotting events. I understand that broadcasting in relation to the greyhounds has not been as widespread, so it is less likely that there will be such an effect. It is important at this stage that we recognise that the two minor codes—harness racing and greyhounds—have been putting before the Government for some six or seven years the problems of the TAB's distribution methods. The principal reason for introducing TAB was to make more what was deemed to be illegal or off-course money available to the racing codes and allowing money to be distributed to the three racing codes in a fair and reasonable way. At that time it was decided to use market forces. It is interesting to note that the TAB was set up not purely and simply to be a benefactor to any one of the codes but so that moneys could be distributed in a fair and reasonable way.

This Government has chosen to use a fixed percentage system. The Opposition would have chosen to do it in a different way, and I will talk about that in a few minutes time. There are some disadvantages for the night codes in relation to the TAB. These disadvantages—and I agree with them all—have been set out in the Minister's second reading explanation. It is important to discuss them again—in particular, the number and category of meetings.

The fact that the two minor codes have had to increase their meetings purely and simply to hold their percentage supports that statement. The racing or galloping code has the total breadth of time that the TAB is open compared to the time that is normally spent by people who bet on trotting or greyhounds. Being night codes, the majority of people bet in a more confined time frame than those who bet on the galloping codes.

The other three areas are less important, although it is important to note, in relation to the galloping code, the significant amount of interstate betting that it picks up. It has been argued by many people whether or not that percentage is earned by the galloping code. The reality is that people wish to bet on the galloping code, and that has always been recognised as being the position. It is important to record the significant change in distribution that has occurred in dollar terms between 1982-83 and 1985-86.

In 1982-83 there was a maximum payout to the codes of \$4.31 million, comprising \$2.98 million to the galloping code, \$831 000 to harness racing and \$500 000 in round figures to the greyhound code. The estimated payout in 1985-86 to the galloping code is \$8.28 million, \$1.972 million to harness racing and \$1.01 million to the greyhound code. I have listed those figures to show the House the increase over four years in the amount paid out to the galloping code. It is \$5.3 million, just over double the amount the code received in 1982-83. Also, \$1.14 million extra has been paid to harness racing and just over \$500 000 has been paid to greyhounds.

There has been a significant increase in payout to the galloping code, and to a lesser extent to both harness racing and greyhounds. Without doubt, there is a case for making more money available to the two minor codes. Prior to the recent election, we put forward a case suggesting that the only fair way to recognise the plight of the minor codes was to continue with payout of moneys from the TAB on market share and to clearly recognise that subsidies should be paid to either or both of the minor codes, if it could be justified.

We said that, on the advice of the two codes, we would make available extra money from the Government's share of unclaimed dividends and fractions. It has been suggested that that would be impossible—indeed, illegal, but that is nonsense. The money from unclaimed dividends and frac-

tions goes into general revenue, and that money, or any portion of it, can be paid out, if that is the Government's decision.

We believe it is better to recognise a subsidy if it is needed and pay it to the industry, but we believe the need should be demonstrated and that this method of fixing a percentage, whilst it does help the minor codes in a small way (because it redistributes back to them some of the extra money earned by the galloping code), does not recognise the existence of real problems in the industry or the need for an increase in subsidy. We believe the method we put forward is significantly better.

The other problem involved in fixing percentages is that one cannot necessarily guarantee an increase in the volume of TAB turnover. One thing that is uncertain in the long term—over, say, two years—is that there is no guarantee that the projected 10 per cent increase in budget figures of the TAB will occur. There are several reasons for that, the principal reason involving the casino's operations, and another is the possible introduction of other gambling devices.

While some of us may see the introduction of poker machines occurring in the short term or the long term, the reality is that they will come in and have a significant effect on the existing entertainment dollar. At this stage I would like to put down some concerns and make corrections that need to be made involving the three codes. There is no doubt that the South Australian Jockey Club, the principal organisation in this area, is concerned about the money which it has earned through TAB turnover and which is now being redistributed to the minor codes. It believes strongly that there is a case for the minor codes to be subsidised and, if that is justified, for extra funds to be paid out. Certainly, it does not believe that it should be the guinea pig in the exercise and that, if the Government thinks there is a need to subsidise, it ought to do something out of its own budget.

I refer to an *Advertiser* report on 26 February containing two incorrect statements, which I now take the opportunity to correct. The first concerns the trotting people, who in their submission asked for significantly more than 17.5 per cent. That code has been a major force in seeking fixed percentages, and there is no doubt that it is happy, or as happy as it can be, with the setting of the 17.5 per cent. The same situation applies to greyhound racing. That code could be nothing other than ecstatic, because its percentage was determined at 9 per cent, and it has not been that high for some time.

To the committee of three people appointed to review the situation in three years, the only thing I can offer is good luck. This argument in the racing industry has been going on for almost as long as I can remember. I have been involved as a punter and owner for a long period. Whoever the three people appointed by the Minister are, I hope they have significant qualifications and are able every now and then to walk on water, because this decision will come back to a ministerial decision irrespective of how many committees the Minister sets up. No committee or group—whether it represents the three codes or whether they are independent—will come up with a decision that the Minister or the three codes will necessarily accept. I understand that the provision regarding charity race meetings is purely and simply to make legal what is going on already in the community, and we support that.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): In 1966 the TAB was established on the basis and understanding that its profits would be distributed according to the turnover and performance of each code. There were no objections in 1972 when the greyhound code came into existence and partici-

pated in the distribution on a code by code equity basis. That equity was seen to be preserved, and so there was then no objection to distribution based on performance.

I believe there is a strong moral and historical argument against fixed percentages of TAB profits. Since the introduction of TAB this has been the method of distribution, and it is true that percentages in the future will fluctuate on the basis of factors prevailing at different times. I point out that in 1982, when the previous Bannon Government came to office and when I was appointed Minister, the racing industry, particularly the galloping code, was in fairly bad shape.

Three years ago—and the member for Bragg confirmed this when he mentioned the extensive growth in TAB profits—the share for the galloping code was something like 67 per cent. Things were in pretty bad shape for a number of reasons, and there was considerable capital outlay. Since then, that code has improved its performance considerably to the stage where currently it enjoys viability. It made a profit last year and was still able to pay off its debt on the Morphettville grandstand and also make provision for further capital works required.

We all remember the argument about the Cheltenham racecourse three or four years ago when according to some it was going to be sold, but other factors prevailed at the time. Indeed, capital works are still being extended to retain three racecourses in South Australia—Cheltenham, Morphettville and Victoria Park—and certainly the galloping code—the South Australian Jockey Club—is committed to providing facilities for the racegoers of this State. Over the past three years we have seen an unprecedented rise in the profit of TAB which, apart from percentage factors, in actual monetary terms (as already quoted by the member for Bragg) has provided a significant increase to the three codes. If we are trying to predict that the present situation, based on the calculation of turnover for the past three months, will remain the same, it will not, simply because of different factors prevailing.

We have been told for the past 10 years that the night codes are disadvantaged, but moreso since the introduction of certain amendments to the Racing Act by the Minister at the time (Michael Wilson), most of which amendments at the time I agreed with. One amendment provided for after-race payouts, which it is believed has made a significant change to the distribution of TAB profits. That is only an estimation, and we have had varying reports in the industry. We have had the Hancock report which gave rise to the introduction by the then Minister (Tom Casey) of the Bill that is now the Racing Act. Then we had an inquiry into racing by the next Government, when Michael Wilson was the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and that led to certain amendments to the Act which I believe were beneficial for the short and long term viability of the three codes, as has been demonstrated.

In addition, as Minister at the time I introduced a formula for the distribution of Racecourse Development Board funds which boosted by 50 per cent moneys going to the codes for the development of racecourse facilities. I think last year that amounted to something over \$2 million, so these funds have also been beneficial in providing moneys for the racing industry. Not only are TAB profits important to the racing industry, but there are other factors—revenue factors, on-course tote, bookmakers turnover tax, private sponsorship, and various other minor revenue-raising sources. Therefore, all the codes have done fairly well in the past three years as a result of those revenue factors. I believe that, because of the sheer volume of turnover, there is clear evidence that effectively the galloping code is already subsidising the night codes. TAB would not exist if it had to rely only on night code turnover.

Mr S. G. Evans: None of them would exist if they didn't have gambling.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: True; that is the nature of the industry.

Mr S.G. Evans: So gambling is the industry; I thought it was horses and dogs.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Gambling is the industry, and that is no great revelation to anybody in this House or the community generally, because no-one goes to the races (or only a very few) just because they might be interested in looking at the horses. The industry certainly survives on the gambling aspect. That is what it is all about—it is a gambling avenue. The casino would not exist if it were not for gambling. People do not walk in there just to look at the decor: they go there for a purpose, just as people go to the races. Some people agree that the Jockey Club benefits greatly because people bet on Sydney or Melbourne races and, as a consequence, there is some kind of unearned income. We have to agree that there is some reciprocal arrangement between the States regarding interstate betting. The Victorian TAB bets on South Australia, as does New South Wales. Taking New South Wales as an example: the original proposal involving fixed percentages (introduced in an attempt to prop up the night codes in that State) was subsequently deemed inequitable and was varied in 1984 to redress what was believed to be an imbalance.

I do not think we can make a fair comparison with Victoria, because it was only last year that that State went over to a system of fixed percentages. I do not believe that we can make a comparison and say the other States have gone over to this system. It is a matter of trial and error: they are not sure, and there is no absolute solution in the matter. I ought to know, because I struggled with it for three years. When we established the racing and gaming section of the Department of Recreation and Sport, my first request to the manager of that section was to come up with a report. He provided a good report in relation to what could be done about the fixed percentages of TAB distribution. That report was referred to me in about May 1985, and even though as I say it was a good report I believed I could not accept the recommendation. That recommendation was for a 75 per cent share to the racing code, the balance to be divided between the other two codes.

However, the share was 75 per cent to racing. I established a working party comprising representatives of the three codes and the Totalizator Agency Board. That group, after holding several meetings, could not come to a conclusion, although it made the recommendation referred to by the member for Bragg concerning a further share of unclaimed dividends and fractions to the various codes. The State election took place late last year, so I did not have time to rethink the matter of a further share of the fractions and dividends, especially for the night codes. However, I believe that that would have been a better solution than a fixed percentage.

Mr S.G. Evans: This will give us trouble in the future.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: This problem has given us trouble in the past and there will always be a contention, whether real or imagined, that one or the other of the codes is being disadvantaged. It is a real can of worms, and I pity the new Minister.

Mr S.G. Evans: He'll go to the dogs!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I hope that he does, because it is good entertainment. I hope that he attends as often as possible. I believe that this measure will not solve the problems, real or imagined, that all the codes, especially the night codes, believe exist, and I have always been consistent in that view. As Minister, I tried as hard as I could to find a solution. I see that the member for Bragg is smiling. He is now the *de facto* shadow Minister, and I congratulate him

on his official status in his Party. The honourable member knows damn well that his Party had no policy on fixed percentages, because Liberal members knew that there was no easy solution to this problem. Be that as it may, I support the Bill, which is a Government measure, but I do so with some reluctance because of my knowledge and experience as Minister for three years and as shadow Minister before that. Unlike the member for Bragg, I have not been an owner: I have been a punter, as was my father for many years before me.

Ms Lenehan: A successful one, I hope?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That is hard to say, because a punter tells everyone about his successful days but does not talk about his losing ones. The punter has his ups and downs, the same as in politics and perhaps in life. This Bill will have consequences on the industry.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The member for Gilles is on his feet and I ask that members show him the respect that has been shown to other speakers.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: In Wednesday's press there appeared a headline stating 'TAB profit fixing upsets industry'. It has certainly upset the Chairman of the South Australian Jockey Club (Mr David Coles) and, according to the article although denied by the member for Bragg, this distribution is not fully acceptable to the trotting code. Indeed, the President of the South Australian Trotting Club (Mr Milton Bowman) said on radio last Saturday afternoon that his code was already getting 17.8 per cent but that now the figure would be 17.5 per cent. Whatever the Government does, this is a difficult problem, and I believe that probably in less than two years all the codes will come back to the Government and say that they are unhappy with fixed percentages, because there is a ceiling. Each code will see that it is contributing to one or more of the other codes.

As a moderate gambler, I bet that the codes will come back to the Government soon and that some, if not all, sections of the industry which regard themselves as disadvantaged will call for a further review well before the expiration of the period of three years that is referred to in the Bill. I suggest that eventually Parliament will have to review the situation again, as has happened in other States that have introduced a fixed percentage formula. The important lesson to be learned from other States is that, when funds are diverted from galloping, the harness racing and dog racing industries have not been able to increase their viability. Other factors are at work and, ever since TAB was introduced, the distribution has been based on performance, which I believe is a fair and equitable system.

Be that as it may, it appears that we are to have fixed percentages. I understand from his remarks that the member for Bragg supports the Bill. I seem to be alone in my stand today as a former Minister of Recreation and Sport who feels proud of his record in relation to the racing industry. I feel obliged to express a point of view that I believe is correct. Only time will prove whether or not it is correct. I do not want to be able to say, 'I told you so' but, nevertheless, from my knowledge and experience of the racing industry, I believe that this could well happen.

The racing industry is important to this State in terms of capital investment, employment, and social enjoyment. Therefore, any decision on the subject dealt with by the Bill must be taken carefully. It appears that the Bill will pass, but it cannot be considered to be a cure-all for the present situation. I should not like to see the racing codes, especially the gallopers, in the same position as they were in the early 1980s. Indeed, none of us would, because this is an important industry for the economy of the State.

I now wish to refer to cross code betting, an issue that has been with us for a while. By means of reciprocal arrangements, some codes have cross code betting: the trotting industry, greyhound racing and, to a limited extent, the gallopers. It has always been the basis of an agreed and reciprocal arrangement. This Bill somewhat alters that situation. Cross code betting is also tied to racing dates, which are submitted by the respective codes prior to the beginning of the racing financial year and must be approved by the Minister. Therefore, cross code betting is tied up with racing dates. As I said, there was always an agreed and reciprocal arrangement. There will be an opportunity for further disagreement and confrontation in relation to racing dates under this measure. At present there are too many racing dates—or certainly we have reached saturation point. They were extended somewhat last year, particularly in the trotting and greyhound codes in an effort to boost the turnover.

The only group that will be affected immediately by this legislation, based on the racing dates for 1985-86, will be people involved in the Kulpara dog racing meetings, where a straight track is used. They have been operating for 18 months to two years and I believe that they will have 13 meetings this season. I anticipate that next year and in future years cross code betting under this legislation will add a complication to the already complicated racing date situation. Those dates must be approved by the Minister. It is my considered opinion that saturation point has already been reached. There was a difference of opinion between two codes last year in relation to country meetings and dates, and I believe that this situation will be exacerbated because of the opportunity for cross code betting.

I point out that this measure relates to bookmakers and the on-course totalisator, perhaps through a mistake under previous legislation, will apply. I had intended to point out the other dates that have been agreed in this financial year. In actual fact, the current proposal, using 1985-86 racing dates, is only an extension of those clubs as listed. A few dates in this financial year have now passed. This measure affects the Kulpara dog racing meetings. A premises bookmaker from Port Pirie is also affected. A big crowd of 300 to 400 usually attends those meetings.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There are one or two bookmakers, depending on the meeting. It is a different type of dog meeting in that they use a straight track. I am obliged to support the Bill, but I am disappointed that it has been introduced today. I must support it as a Government measure but I do so with very grave reservations. I want to make that point clear. I believe that this is not the answer to the problem: on the other side of the coin, I believe that it will create more problems. From my knowledge and experience of the industry, I believe that it will not resolve the problems of the night code but will encourage confrontation rather than consultation between the Government and the codes. Worse still, it will encourage confrontation instead of consultation between the three codes themselves. That is sad, because they are all in the same business and, indeed, if they were to cooperate we could come to a solution of this problem in a much more amiable way. I support the Bill, but I make the point again that I do so with grave reluctance. I believe that in two or three years, or less, we will again be debating this same issue.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the Bill, but for reasons different from those of the member for Gilles, although I hold his views as to the likely effect of the proposal. I give the honourable member credit for his courage in saying what he said. There will be greater troubles down the track, and that is why I support the Bill. I think that we are just still fiddling around with the law, and the best way to let the new Minister learn is to support something that will give him a headache later on. Therefore, I am quite happy to support the Bill, because it will not do any harm to my way of life or to that of my constituents. It will not vary the situation in the industry: there will still be problems.

The industry to which I refer is the gambling industry, not the dog industry or the horse industry. When I was shadow Minister and the member for Gilles was the Minister we were opposites in the way of representations but not always philosophy, in particular when it came to this subject. The industry did not like it on one occasion when some of them met with me: they told me that theirs was one of the biggest industries in the State, that is, the horse racing industry, but I said, 'Horse racing is not an industry—gambling is. If you take away gambling, not so much money will be involved.' They got a bit excited. I did not say that in a nasty way, but I was trying to be factual. Then I was told that racing was a sport—the king of sports or the sport of kings. I am not sure which term they used: perhaps they used both. They were looking for some help in terms of sporting recognition through Government departments.

I suggested that they should make up their mind whether theirs was an industry or a sport, and then I was told that it was a sporting industry—so that covered both aspects. I had never had a lot of interest in this field of gambling because I played regular team sport, but my family had some interest a long way back in the 1930s, although they got out of it because they thought it was a racket. The Bill refers to betting being run in conjunction with races in other States and overseas. What a wonderful thing it is that we can tie up our TAB to Hong Kong racing and the problems there! With that comes the thought that wherever there is a gambling industry there are men and women who will exploit it, and there is no doubt that that happens at times even in our own country. Most of the time I suppose they are never found out.

I do not say that in disrespect to most of the people in the gambling industry, as most of those who breed animals for competition and to encourage the industry are honest business people who are using the opportunity that Parliament has given them to make money from thoroughbreds, whether dogs or horses. However, no other business interest in Australia has as much free publicity as does the gambling industry. Free publicity in the print media, on radio and television would run into tens of millions of dollars a year. Sometimes a substantial part of the daily press is taken up with free publicity for the industry. If any other industry in Australia received that sort of free publicity—millions of dollars worth—they would be riding on the pig's back.

Mr Gregory interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am talking about other industries; they would be making a lot of money and would not have to worry about spending it on advertising their products. The gambling industry should remember that Parliament gives them a privilege and allows betting at the racecourse and dog track, the casino or wherever. Parliament regulates that some of the money that changes hands in exercising that privilege comes back to the State. It is not a lot in terms of the total turnover, but it is of some benefit to the State—and that is for part of the privilege.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It is 17 per cent.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, it is 17 per cent, but it is not something about which one should complain. If we were to give this privilege to football, cricket, pigeon racing, bike racing or other areas that we now consider sport, those groups could say that they own their own industry. Once one allows gambling on a scale that is allowed with dogs and horses, one can expand the gambling industry substantially. I do not say that one would expand the turnover, because I am doubtful whether there is much more money in the community to turn over in gambling. However, one would then spread the gambling.

I hope that, when the people in the horse and dog industry (as they call it) come to parliamentarians—whether Opposition or Government members—and want more money to be spread amongst their field, they accept it not as a criticism of them but a statement of fact: that Parliament has given them a privilege to have gambling so that they can get high prices for the products they breed. At the same time, we recognise that by that method many more people are employed. If we gave that facility to other forms of competition or put poker machines into clubs, more people would be employed, and the spread of the gambling money would be greater. Therefore, the price obtained for a thoroughbred or the admission fee to join a club might vary considerably in order to try to keep the club alive.

One should keep in mind that half the States of America totally prohibit gambling. Therefore, it is not an essential part of life. Anyone in the gambling industry who says that it is essential is not stating a fact. In parts of the world gambling is prohibited, and in other parts of the world gambling is not allowed to be advertised. In the United Kingdom, if one wants to gamble, one goes and finds it—whether it is a casino or whatever. That is not a bad philosophy, either.

I support the Bill because some of the industry wants changes. However, the Bill does not cheer me up, and I do not think that we will gain anything by it. It will not satisfy the codes; they will be back, as the member for Gilles said, in a very short period of time. I support the Bill rather cynically, and I laugh to myself when thinking that, whoever has to administer it (and unfortunately it is the Minister, the member for Unley) will only get more problems. I suppose that when one is on the Opposition benches it is not a bad philosophy sometimes to vote for a Bill, because it will not harm a lot of the ordinary people. It will make a few people stand up in the gambling industry and make another assessment, and the Minister will learn a couple of lessons from it.

The gambling industry receives millions of dollars a year in subsidy from the news media and general advertising overseas. I hope it realises that, and does not think that what I have said was meant in a damaging way, because it is straight talking. Over the years Parliament has given them a great privilege that other industries would have liked. Gambling, not the sale of horses or dogs, is a back-up to making money. I support the Bill for the reasons I have stated.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I have listened with interest to the Opposition's position, and I am not really sure what it is. I am not sure that the member for Gilles correctly exhibited their position in relation to the Bill. Various members have said that this Bill will not be the panacea or answer to the racing, harness or greyhound codes. We know that certain problems in all the codes have to be addressed. As has been highlighted by previous speakers, there have been numerous queries, both internal and external, involving the industry, and they could not agree on a proposal that was acceptable to all of them.

One thing that came through in the discussions was that there was a disadvantage to the night codes as a consequence of a number of industry structures, not the least being the hours of operation of the TAB and the services that it provides. I think that that was agreed, from information with which I have been supplied, and discussions that I have had with the industry. All the codes agreed to some disadvantage. Also they needed more certainty in their budgeting. Having been involved for many years in budgeting, I think it is only fair and reasonable that they have an opportunity to plan, as best as possible, their budgets for the coming year.

We are not taking out all the variable factors. One major factor is the amount of activity. It has been argued in the press that this will generate complacency in the codes. I do not believe that, because they still get a return on any increase in stake money that is generated. Also people go through the gates to the various meets, and off course, too, is important. There is a general growth, and we know that there has been a rapid growth in TAB turnover in recent years, and it has shown itself, in an absolute form, in the money that has come back to the codes.

A number of points have been made by honourable members, and I will refer to the former Minister's comments about the role of the South Australian Government. It is generally acknowledged in all the codes that the Bannon Government has done a lot over the past three years to develop and encourage them. There is no question about that. It has certainly been beneficial for racing. Also acknowledged is the role of the former Minister of Education and Deputy Premier (Hon. Hugh Hudson) who played a major role in the SAJC. His guidance in assisting the SAJC helped in its recovery. It was in a pretty poor state five or six years ago. It is to its credit that all the codes have managed to survive those tough times and that they are now in a reasonable state.

Certainly, we have a couple of minor problems that we need to sort out. They will be addressed, and I intend to do that as soon as possible. This issue has come to a head, and I disagree with the former Minister about that: the matter must be resolved. It is one of the continuing sores that will continue to bounce around in the industry and cause frustration, irritation and poor decision making, because the codes have the other variable factor, namely, the percentage of their earnings coming back to them. This change will assist them in their budgetary program.

It must add a level of certainty to their budgetary work over the coming years. As to the issue of distribution, if we look at what this State provides to the gambling codes and the industry as a whole, we see that without doubt this is the most generous Government in Australia in regard to what is given to racing. There is no question about that. The former Minister would acknowledge that as well. So, what is the position when we have people like the SAJC complaining about their percentage of the money? I agree with the member for Davenport that it is a privilege to gamble. He is right about what happens in America, where in many States gambling is totally prohibited. This is done by statutory provision.

The codes have legal status through this Parliament to collect money from punters and to distribute and receive funds directly from the TAB. The codes have that privilege. Again, I refer to what this State provides, because it is most generous, not just in terms of the overall distribution to the codes but also in regard to fractions and unclaimed dividends. South Australia is the most generous of the Australian States. Treasury has taken the position, which I support, that we have gone far enough in that area. This year the racing code will receive between \$8.2 million and \$8.3 million which it can use to develop that industry.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: True, the Government has received \$11 million but, as I say, interstate Governments take much more. South Australia has already provided a better return to the racing, harness and dog codes than has been provided by any other State Government. That position should be put on the record. Clearly, we are providing them with a good financial base from which they can build up their respective industries. We are talking about millions of dollars.

In regard to fractions, it should be remembered that on-course fractions are kept by the codes and that they get half the off-course fractions. Again, that is the most generous provision of any State. I am angry at the reaction of the Chairman of the trotting code in relation to his comments on the 17.5 per cent figure. I know that the member for Bragg appreciates this: if we look at the seasonal factor, there is no question that their return will be below 17.5 per cent at the end of the year. If one looks at last year's figures, one sees that they dropped dramatically from this quarter to the end of the year. In fact, the code will be better off, and I say to it that I am angry and annoyed at the way in which it has reacted to this proposal, particularly giving countenance to the way that I briefed those involved. Also, the Premier offered his services prior to the matter even coming before Caucus.

So, as to the complaints about being briefed, I point out that those organisations have been treated with great privilege and honour—more than most members of the community and even Caucus members. We bent over backwards to offer that facility. Indeed, I remember in my former employment during the period of the Tonkin Government having Bills dropped on me without having been given any notice by that Government about those changes. It did not even tell me that a change was coming up. I would find out that there was a major change in employment—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, we have done better than that. We briefed the codes before the matter even went before Caucus. The codes have no grounds whatsoever for complaint. The fact is that the principle contained in the Bill is so simple that a six year old child could understand what is contained in it. It is important to note that we have done our best to brief the codes and, given that the Bill in its final form was put before Caucus on Tuesday and that it has been distributed to the industry today so that they understand—

Mr Ingerson: I have done it for you.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member did not distribute it to some of them, because I know that copies of the Bill were handed over this morning. In essence, we have been more than fair in our briefing. We advised the SAJC last week, and we also advised the harness and dog codes about the principle that the Bill contained. It was a significant factor for them to know. It was an excellent courtesy, but it did not involve just me: the Premier also was involved in the briefing.

The percentages warrant consideration in this Bill, because they represent the crux of the issue. The galloping code will receive 73.5 per cent. It is reasonable to accept that we are being more generous than any other State Government in Australia. I refer to comparisons of the percentages provided interstate. In Victoria the galloping code receives 73.25 per cent and in Western Australia it is a 60:40 division, 40 per cent going to the harness code and 60 per cent to the racing code.

In New South Wales a lower percentage is provided. I think it is 70 per cent, and that, too, indicates that we are being absolutely generous to the codes. As to the turnover factor, in New South Wales the turnover that the code earns

is about 80 per cent, so there is a loss of about 10 per cent on what it legitimately might argue it generates. However, New South Wales and Victoria have a far stronger argument about getting a distribution based on what they earn.

The argument put up by the racing code is that it should get what it earns but, in fact, about 40 per cent of what goes through the TAB goes on interstate races. What happens interstate is how they run their racing, and I refer to the benefits that come back through the TAB. It is the TAB which provides the service and which generates those funds. The harness and dog codes claim that that code does not generate it. In effect, it is generated by the interstate meetings. That is true. I have several friends who are interested in racing and who for a number of reasons punt heavily on racing markets in New South Wales and Victoria. I would not encourage them to do that, but that is how they decide to operate. That money is generated by races interstate. True, it contains a few weaknesses and flaws. That is one of the factors that must be taken into account in looking at the distribution.

As to the matters that were raised by the shadow Minister, I do not accept the arguments that have been raised about endangering the racing codes. I refer to the growth in the TAB, because we hope that it will continue to grow in that manner. In money terms we are talking about its potential on 1984-85 figures: the figure is 74.22 per cent of turnover. Really the per cent represents \$110 000, so we are talking about .72 per cent. We are looking at about \$70 000 or \$80 000, which is not actually being taken away from the galloping code, but which it could potentially earn, or not earn, as a consequence of the fixed distribution.

In essence we expect that the money turnover in the TAB will outstrip that significantly. I cannot accept the argument regarding reducing the potential of the industry to develop its capital facilities. I heard on the radio, and it was put to me by a couple of journalists, that the SAJC is saying that the decision has destroyed its idea of going to Cheltenham to build a \$3 million, \$5 million or \$8 million stand. If it is relying on that factor to pay for that stand, we will have seriously to consider their accounting management.

I do not think they seriously believe that that argument will hold water or be used in any way against the fixed percentage distribution. It really is a fairly frivolous and pointless argument to pursue, but I must publicly answer it. We are talking here about \$60 000 or \$70 000, which really is an insignificant figure in terms of the overall picture, involving between \$8.2 million and \$8.3 million, and possibly more on this year's turnover. I really discount that argument quite heavily.

If we look at what has been happening—and the member for Bragg has commented on the number of meetings being held by the night codes—one of the problems is that they are endeavouring to generate additional income by holding more meetings. The former Minister would acknowledge receiving applications for additional meetings, and I am in the same situation, having been in the job for only two months. What that does is stretch the gambling dollar and put more of the marginal race meets under additional pressure. In fact, I suppose it leads to the capital funds available being stretched beyond their limits and the stakemoneys, and so on, being stretched also. So, we do not look at the situation as being viable, and the industry ends up in bigger trouble than in fact it would have been had it decided not to take that decision.

In essence, it really does not answer the problems and, as the Minister responsible, I will have to address myself to that matter. We just cannot encourage these ongoing meetings, which in effect lower the overall quality of the meet. We have to encourage the highest possible standard in the industry, and I acknowledge that the codes have been

trying to do that. I acknowledge the work of people such as Harry Krantz and the Hon. Des Corcoran in helping to establish the codes. I really think that this measure will provide some stability. I disagree with the former Minister: I think it is a variable factor which has existed and which needs to be singled out. The other variable factor is the overall turnover, and that is still there. That offers an incentive for the clubs in the codes to generate additional funds.

I really think that I have addressed the main points raised by both speakers on my side of the House and by Opposition speakers, as well as the comments that I have had from members of the industry, some of whom are restricted in what they can say publicly. Those deeply involved in the racing industry in particular see this as inevitable. I have had it put to me by some fairly senior people in the racing industry that in fact it is a reasonably generous provision to the racing code. I am aware that in the trotting and dog-racing codes, as the member for Bragg indicated, there are people who are delighted about it and I think that some of them are quite embarrassed about some of the comments by certain spokespersons in the *Advertiser*. I know there has been some discussion among them about the way in which that appeared, because I am told that the one negative item was picked out from a series of positive items raised by the trotting and dog-racing people.

In general, I think that this proposal is seen as being inevitable, one which should have perhaps been implemented years ago and which the industry will accept. I believe that the respective codes will get on with improving their stake money and facilities for the public, so that patrons may enjoy what I regard as not only an industry and a sport but also a recreation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Program for conduct of on-course totalisator betting.'

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister say why the legislation is retrospective and not intended to come into force on a certain date or when proclaimed?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Basically we looked at this issue of giving stability within the industry and felt that the argument would just linger on for another 12 months. In fact, various members predicted that the matter would be bouncing around on my desk and that we would probably see it continuing to be debated within the racing community. We felt that the best thing to do was to introduce a structure providing for a review of the percentages in three years.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Cross code betting.'

Mr INGERSON: It has been suggested that a 100 kilometre rule is to be introduced. Will the Minister comment on that and explain what sort of conditions he may be considering?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In fact, I have issued a press release, which I can provide to the honourable member if he wishes. It was designed basically on the structure of the Act, that the Minister would make the decision. Fundamentally, it is to provide us with some sensitivity in respect of events such as regional country meets where we perhaps would not want to upset the TAB turnover. So, we are looking at the 100 kilometre radius. It is a very arbitrary thing. We looked at Victor Harbor and a couple of other areas just to maintain our TAB turnover and not upset that arrangement.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Application of amount deducted under s. 68.'

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: What is the monetary effect on the galloping code and the other codes based on the turnover figures for the period 1 July to the present time? What, if anything, is the difference between the 73.5 per cent and what has been achieved from 1 July 1985 to the present time, and what monetary effect has it on the various codes? If the Minister does not have the answer, perhaps he could supply me with the details later.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: On the current turnover, the figure would be \$30 000 or slightly more.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Therefore, the galloping code will be that much worse off, and retrospectivity could further disadvantage it. Will the Minister please produce the figures for which I have asked?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not have the exact figures with me, but I can get them for the honourable member. Roughly speaking, however, the figure, based on the half year, would be between \$15 000 and \$18 000.

Mr PETERSON: In view of the concern and doubts expressed by the galloping code about the long-term future of the Cheltenham racecourse, which was referred to recently in a study produced by the Department of Environment and Planning, can the Minister say whether this change in funding will affect the future of that famous and well established racecourse?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I appreciate the honourable member's concern about the Cheltenham racecourse. With the developments taking place at Victoria Park, Cheltenham will be essential to the racing industry. Only three days after being sworn in, I met with the Executive Officer and the Secretary of the South Australian Jockey Club to discuss the issues that they were facing, including the issues concerning the Cheltenham and Victoria Park racecourses. As I said in my second reading reply, those officials consider that they must now scratch plans for a new stand at Cheltenham, but I believe that that is only a knee-jerk reaction to fixed percentage distributions.

Based on the growth of TAB profits from 1984 to 1985, the increase in the return to the racing codes is dramatic. Not only is the return growing: it will continue to grow. At present, the relevant figure is almost \$8.3 million. After discussing with Mr Coles and Mr Paramour the future of the Cheltenham racecourse, I do not believe that this proposal will affect the future development of that racecourse.

Mr PETERSON: If the future of the Cheltenham racecourse was to be in doubt, would the Government help keep it open?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The whole thrust of this legislation is to allow the racing codes to enjoy a degree of certainty.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I was not referring to him: I was referring to the member for Mitcham. The return to racing in 1984 was \$8.173 million and for 1985 it will be \$9.352 million. That highlights the financial growth of the racing code, and it would provide certainty in planning for the future of Cheltenham racecourse. Other factors come into that decision. The honourable member has referred to the proposals of the Deputy Premier's department and local government involvement. My comments are public knowledge, and from the comments of the Chairman of the SAJC I believe that they are considering Cheltenham. I believe that they will continue to do that.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, the Government has not said that. It has said that it would consider it if they found themselves in a situation of assisting in some way or other. That is what the Premier said. I am confident, given this break-up, that they can manage quite well with continued

growth in TAB figures to consider capital planning and upgrading and look at Cheltenham.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It would be up to the Premier to make that sort of commitment.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The upgrading of Cheltenham racecourse is part of the SAJC corporate plan. I believe that there is a proposed capital investment to 1988-89 of about \$5.7 million. It is claimed, of course, that if there is not a continuation of funds, the redevelopment of Cheltenham racecourse could be in some jeopardy—and I am putting the SAJC point of view, not mine. I am not able to give a commitment as to whether or not that is true.

However, it is important that we retain three racecourses, as Victoria Park has been out of action for some time because of the Grand Prix. The SAJC cooperated with the Government in regard to the use of Victoria Park racecourse (and I give it credit for that) which the club holds under lease from the Adelaide City Council. Consequently, there must be upgrading of Victoria Park because it does not provide for distances of 1 350 metres or 1 400 metres.

Members will recall that there was a big kerfuffle three or four years ago and I am sure that the member for Price and the member for Semaphore will certainly be interested in the retention of Cheltenham not only from a racecourse point of view but as a very important element of the racing industry, that is, as a training track. Anything that jeopardises the Cheltenham racecourse must be carefully considered. I am advised that Cheltenham racecourse must be redeveloped because it is not up to health requirements. The SAJC has undertaken a capital commitment to do that work, and I certainly hope that it is not jeopardised in any way by any legislation that we might pass.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am not sure whether that was a policy speech or a statement. Regarding the turnover rate, basically the position is that at present the return to the racing code stands at 73.34 per cent. That highlights the point I am trying to make—the uncertainty in the industry. There is no guarantee that the return will rise above 73.5 per cent, given the distribution under the current system of 'Get what you earn'. In essence, we are providing another level of certainty in the budgeting structure. I have said it once and I say it again—we are talking about an opportunity cost of about \$70 000 at the most. There was an increase from \$8.1 million to \$9.3 million in distribution from 1984 to 1985. That is a growth of more than \$1 million, and we are talking about an opportunity cost of about \$70 000.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is an opportunity cost. There was natural growth, and it will continue to grow, based on TAB experience. That is the situation; basically, we are taking out one of the variables and the other variable is the overall turnover.

Mr PETERSON: The Minister has covered the situation very well in terms of dollars and cents, and I accept that as far as it goes, but he has not answered the question relating to Cheltenham racecourse. That racecourse is a very important part of the north-west area, providing a training facility for many trainers as well as employment. As the former Minister said, this State needs three racecourses. Morphettville—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It has been upgraded and is as good as new.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, it is great. There was an unfortunate fire at Morphettville racecourse, which is now set up very well. Victoria Park is out for much of the year: the Grand Prix will be held for the next four years, cutting into the time available for racing. Time and again Cheltenham has been put forward as a racecourse at risk. It has been said that it might go. The Minister himself has said that,

and that has been said in several recent reports. It is still possible that that area will be used for housing or taken over for some other use.

There is another element of the argument: the racing code itself is saying publicly that Cheltenham could be at risk. If it is at risk, we need something to tell our constituents and the racing fraternity in this State. They must know where they can go for help. Will assistance be available? Cheltenham must be retained. It is a great facility, patronised by many people—and by many local people. The member for Price would know that that racecourse is very highly regarded and provides entertainment besides providing facilities for training horses. Many horses are stabled there. We need some guarantee that, if Cheltenham is at risk, there will be some assistance. Can the Minister give some indication along those lines?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member must understand that the SAJC is its own governing body; it makes the decisions about what it will do, and it could decide to close down Cheltenham tomorrow.

Mr Peterson: What if it was at risk?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not at risk. The point I make to the honourable member is that, if this Bill puts it at risk, there is something wrong with the financial management, quite frankly. I have just said that the current turnover is below 73.5 per cent, and more will be earned under this proposal than would otherwise have been earned at the end of the year. This Bill is providing a great certainty.

The SAJC has said that the capital works are at risk. I think, and commentators and people in the racing industry who have spoken to me say, that this is a knee-jerk reaction and, quite frankly, it is based on lost opportunity of income. They are saying that they will be \$70 000 worse off than they would have been had they earned more than 73.5 per cent, if they had received 74.22 per cent, which they received in the distribution of June 1985.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, and the TAB turnover is increasing dramatically.

Mr Peterson: It is at risk?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Given my information and the uses to which Victoria Park has been put, the SAJC needs Cheltenham, but what happens there is the decision of the SAJC. We will support them in their endeavour to develop whatever capital works programs they are involved in, and they are talking about a new grandstand, and so on. As far as I can gather, other authorities will have to say what they can do. I hope that has assured the honourable member of my position.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I want to pick up the point made by the Minister that the SAJC is a boss unto itself about what tracks it maintains. We know that it is a boss unto itself to a point. It is dependent on Parliament and the Government to get the benefits it gets through the gambling industry. Parliament and the Government have the opportunity to say that there are some obligations it has to meet to cater for the needs of the community, if it is given the privilege to be in full control of the galloping game within the State—which is what it is—added to the privilege of gambling. I for one do not accept that we can automatically say that it is a boss unto itself in relation to which track it closes or keeps open.

It must have substantial discussions with the Government and the Opposition before it sets about closing this track, if it wants to retain the benefits that Parliament gives it. Regardless of what the Minister may have said about the Government helping with backup, capital works, and so on, the principal point is that the code is not a boss unto itself to the nth degree if it wants to retain the privilege of having the sole right to gambling for galloping horses in this State,

and not allow quarter horses the privilege of participating in that gambling industry.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Perhaps the member for Davenport has taken it one step further. Certainly, under the Racing Act there would be power for me to choke the SAJC, with Parliament's support and approval—that is the only way. It is pretty draconian to find oneself—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is an interesting point. In essence there is a final control, but the governing body is the SAJC. It controls the races and has control over the whole operation of that situation, as the honourable member would appreciate. It is only in the final situation—and it would have to be a pretty desperate situation—where the Government could intervene. The honourable member is right in that sense. The Minister and the Parliament, as a consequence, have some control. For example, I suppose that one could bring in a Bill that stopped funds going to the club, but heaven forbid that that situation would occur. I would not like to be in a situation where, as Minister, I would have to do something like that.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I cannot hear the honourable member. I will not answer the interjection unless he pursues it.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Committee to make recommendation as to TAB deductions.'

Mr INGERSON: What guidelines will the Minister use in choosing these three people who comprise the committee? Are they likely to have racing backgrounds or will they be independent people plucked out of the air as people representative of the industry?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In fact, it is a fairly sensible measure to provide in a period of three years for a review of the percentage distribution, and advising the Minister—and hopefully I will be that Minister—of the distribution. I have looked basically at people who are prominent in the community: someone with a knowledge of the industry; and someone with an accounting or legal background who could ensure that the hearings and the collection of evidence are done with fair play and natural justice in mind. Basically, that would be the structure of the committee.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 13 February. Page 168.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): On 13 February, before I sought leave to continue my remarks, I mentioned that I had concerns about the West Lakes waterway. While I was in Western Australia recently I took the opportunity to speak to some people about the environmental protection agency in that State and how it operates, and at the same time I mentioned some of the difficulties I perceived with the waterway in my electorate. This came about because of my long-standing concern about the influx of fresh stormwater into the West Lakes waterway, and I discussed this with a number of my colleagues. At a meeting in August or September last year with the Minister of Marine and with representatives of the Woodville council and Delfin Management Services, I pointed out my concern.

Previously I caused an article to appear in the local *Messenger Press* seeking the provision of signs in and around the waterway indicating that inlets from drains could be

injurious to public health after a heavy influx of fresh stormwater. At that meeting with the Minister of Marine, if my recollection is correct, the General Manager of Delfin Management Services indicated that, if the Government and the local council authority erected these signs, it would strongly consider taking legal action. That alarmed me and, as a consequence, I continued to pursue this matter with the Minister of Marine and the Deputy Premier. Correspondence from the Deputy Premier, dated 17 February and received in my office on 18 February, in part, states:

It is considered that the recommendation by the Woodville council to place signs in appropriate areas to discourage swimming for three days after rain is a responsible suggestion and is a simple low cost and practical solution to minimise risk to public health.

I totally and completely agree with that statement. However, I was appalled, to say the least, by what I perceived to be the attitude of the local council authority. I know that my colleague the member for Price shares my view on the erection of signs in and around this area where the drains enter the waterway. This request has been refused. The first draft report of the Woodville council fell off the back of the proverbial truck and landed on my desk on 6 August 1985. Following a number of conclusions and recommendations, under the heading 'Method of advertising to the public in terms of the problems near those drains' the report states:

The simplest method of advising the public that the lake water may be unsuitable for swimming and diving is by the erection of permanent signs in the affected areas. Council's solicitors accept this fact but have indicated that signs are not a particularly effective method of discharging council's duty of care and has recommended, in addition to the erection of signs, that council advertise the information at least twice yearly in the local paper, and possibly the State-wide press.

I emphasise that. The report continues:

The solicitors have suggested that a satisfactory notice for display around the lake is 'Warning, these waters unsuitable for swimming, diving and the taking of shell fish for three days after rain due to the entry of stormwater, Secretary, Local Board of Health.'

My concern, which has been expressed over some years, is now starting to sink into the minds of some people. As I said, I was somewhat surprised when, just prior to Christmas last year (during the election campaign) I noted that *Delfin's Lakeside Magazine* No. 19, Christmas 1985 edition, found its way into many letterboxes in West Lakes, West Lakes Shore and Semaphore Park homes. Among other things, on the front page is reference to 'Lake responsibility, management and regulations'. In the last three paragraphs, headed 'Water quality', it states:

The Department of Marine and Harbours is responsible for water quality through a special West Lakes Water Quality Control Committee, which includes members from the E&WS Department, the South Australian Health Commission and the Corporation of the City of Woodville. No other lake or metropolitan beach areas are monitored and checked as thoroughly as West Lakes is. Water testing carried out on behalf of this committee by the E&WS Department has indicated the excellent quality of the West Lakes waterway with the proviso, however, that swimming should be avoided within the general vicinity of storm water outlets for up to three days following heavy rain. Any inquiries should be directed to the Engineering Department of the Woodville council, Tel. No. 45 7855.

For all the time that I have been concerned about this issue, I have been emphasising that this information should be imparted to the electorate. Indeed, in accordance with the recommendations of the Woodville council's solicitors, the recommendation was to be published in the local press and throughout the State-wide press at least twice a year. I was amazed when I picked up this magazine, not because it had given information to people in part of my electorate but because, to the best of my knowledge, the signs had not yet been erected in and around the affected areas of the West Lakes waterway. Why not? If it is good enough for my

constituents to be informed, surely it is good enough to tell other people—adults, juniors and children who can read or whose parents can tell them—that at certain times of the year it may be injurious to their health to swim in those areas.

But no, the council will not, I understand, take the advice given by its own solicitors, as contained in the first draft report. Why not? Is it because, as has been put to me (I will certainly not point the finger at anyone), that vested interests are involved? I have yet to determine what those vested interests are. I am worried because, if it is good enough for my constituents, it is good enough for other people, be they from interstate, elsewhere in South Australia or overseas, when they visit this area.

All people should be advised that there could be a problem after a heavy influx of storm water. I have made my position quite clear ever since I have raised this matter, and I have no fixation about it. There is a problem, and I want the matter resolved not just to the satisfaction of my constituents but also to my own satisfaction.

Having spoken to the Deputy Premier today, I am pleased that I will have the opportunity to have further discussions with his department's officers, and for that opportunity I am most grateful. This issue has caused me much heartburn and has made me ask myself whether I was correct initially in pursuing this matter. I am more than satisfied that the track down which I have travelled is the correct one. I hope that in the very near future this matter will be resolved to the satisfaction of everyone concerned and that the appropriate signs are erected.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I rise to take part in this Address in Reply debate in the first session of the seventh Parliament in which I have had the pleasure to serve. First, I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on being elected to the highest office that the House of Assembly can bestow on one of its members. I hope that you have an enjoyable and a fruitful time in the Chair. I hope, too, that you are in a position to assist all members in the difficult tasks that lie ahead of them. Also, I congratulate all the new members who have been elected to the Chamber, even though some of them are only temporary members who, unfortunately, will feel the chilly winds of the ballot box in the future.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The member for Victoria is not in any danger whatever. This Parliament and the people of South Australia have been denied the abilities and great qualities of Dean Brown through an unfortunate set of circumstances. I sincerely hope that in the future Dean Brown is again elected to this Parliament. In the time that I have been here he was one of the most capable and prominent members in this place. He made a considerable contribution to the welfare of the people of this State in his time as a Minister, a shadow Minister and backbencher. Parliament can ill-afford to lose people with such qualities.

To those members who retired at the last election I offer my best wishes. I refer to my old friend, the member for Victoria (Allan Rodda), who came from Eyre Peninsula in the early days. I hope that he has a happy and fruitful retirement. As to members of the other side of the House, I sincerely hope that George Whitten has a happy and fruitful retirement also.

I was sorry to see Scott Ashenden lose his seat. However, we all know the sort of campaign that was waged against some members—nothing was held back. In many cases the truth was a minor consideration but, as time goes on, we will highlight those matters. As the chickens come home to roost with this Government, it will be called to account. Also, in regard to the campaign launched against Dean Brown, some of the activities should be put under the

microscope and examined because some of the actions taken were not appropriate or necessary. Also, some of the things that were said and written in the papers in the area of Scott Ashenden were quite untrue.

The next matter with which I want to deal involves the scurrilous and untruthful campaign launched by the Public Service Association and one or two others. Indeed, I had a slight taste of it in my district.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is all right for the poison pen who was in the Premier's office. It is all right for him to smile. The chickens will come home to roost. We all know the sort of tricks that he got up to when in the days of the Tonkin Government he deliberately leaked to the press a report on uranium but pulled off the back page of that so-called confidential report. We know what credibility he has. He will be made to account for it. He is a sharp one on the other side. There are a few people who have been around this place for a while, and we will not forget some of those things.

I had a bit of it in my electorate. I had Mr Lesses who sits on the Electricity Trust board. After what he did there, in my opinion he is not a fit person to sit on that board, because he made statements purporting to come from the Trades and Labor Council at Leigh Creek. But, when I checked them out, I found that no such request had been made. If they want to get up to those sorts of tricks, they will have to take what comes to them.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am just putting the record straight. I have been in this place long enough to know that, if people want to throw mud at me, it is all right, but they will get it right back. I have never been frightened to stand up and be counted on issues, and I do not intend to change. I was elected to this Parliament to represent the people in the electorate of Eyre, over 80 per cent of the State. I accept that challenge and I am very grateful for the confidence that they have placed in me over the last 16 years. At every election I have increased my majority, and I look forward to the future with confidence. I am not concerned about the Labor Party—it even attempted to beat me by running two candidates.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am quite confident about the future, and I am confident that the Liberal Party has a good future, because it is in the interests of this Parliament, this State and this nation that the Liberal Party is strong and effective. Governments operate effectively and efficiently only if they have a strong and effective Opposition. I am delighted to have been given the opportunity to be a part of the Opposition shadow Cabinet, because I look forward to the challenges, particularly in the area of agriculture, which is so important to the economy of this State and this nation. Sadly, it has been neglected; it has been confused, and decisions are being made in Canberra and, to a lesser extent, in this State by people who do not really understand what they are about.

We have seen a deliberate campaign of action being taken against primary industry, led by that foolish fellow from Western Australia, Senator Walsh, who has a complete dislike for the farming community. The sort of action that the Government has taken to penalise and victimise the rural industry is not only short-sighted but also contrary to the best interests of the nation as a whole. What is urgently required in this country—

Mr Gregory interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I take those insults as compliments, coming as they do from the honourable member, because he knows nothing about the agricultural industry. He has belonged to

organisations that have attempted to penalise the industry and make life difficult for those on the land.

Mr Gregory interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes. People like you, your union mates and the honourable member for Peake have certainly exploited the nation and held it to ransom. They have held up the wharves and in Sydney cost our wheatgrowers millions of dollars because they stopped the export of wheat. What about the Mudginberri dispute? When members of the rural industry, those moderate and conservative persons who want to improve the welfare of this nation, were pushed to breaking point, and they set out to take some action to resolve their difficulties, we had the sorts of attacks like that which the honourable member has just made. The National Farmers Federation and the farming community

are fortunate at present to be led by such a capable person as Mr Ian McLachlan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Gregory interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I told you the other day: you are really a little boy and, when you grow up and want to enter into something, you may know something about it if you go out and have a look. If you really went out with a mob of men, they would rub your type in the dirt before breakfast. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 4 March at 2 p.m.