HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 November 1988

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act Amendment,

National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act Amendment,

Telecommunications (Interception).

WASHPOOL LAGOON

A petition signed by 506 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to recognise the Washpool Lagoon at Sellicks Beach as a natural wetland and protect it from commercial development was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 53, 56, 75 to 77, 80, 81, 84, 95, 96, 102, 111, 116, 120 and 123; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

COMMUNITY WELFARE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles)** 8 September.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: DCW has not resisted the efforts by Mr and Mrs Buchecker to retain custody of their grandchildren. A unanimous decision of a case conference at which there were a wide range of professionals involved with the children, both from within and outside the department, decided that the children should not be sent to their grandparents until such time as they can build a relationship with them.

The Chief Executive Officer met with Mr and Mrs Buchecker on 29 September 1988 with Chris Conway, Manager Welfare Services, Noarlunga District Office. It was agreed that the children should see their grandparents that afternoon and the whole of the next day, and if that was satisfactory from the children's point of view they should leave on the Saturday to have a holiday with their grandparents. It was also agreed that if the children were happy with their grandparents and if a satisfactory report came from the New South Wales Department of Family and Community Services then the children could stay with their grandparents. The access in Adelaide was successful and the children returned to Wentworth with their grandparents.

An officer from the New South Wales Department of Family and Community Services has visited four times and reports that the placement is very positive. A written report will be forwarded to Adelaide shortly. The children are getting on well with their cousins and extended family. They will be in the wedding party of a cousin who is getting married in the near future. The children have enrolled at the local school and this has been successful to date. Danny has been booked in to see a psychologist at an early childhood centre at Mildura. New South Wales officers are concerned at the health of the Bucheckers, particularly for the long term, but everyone is hoping that the extended family will provide the necessary long term support. If the reports continue to be satisfactory, arrangements will be made to transfer guardianship of the children to the New South Wales Minister of Family and Community Services.

IMMIGRATION APPLICATIONS

In reply to **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** 4 October.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Persons seeking permanent residency status are the subject of certain checks and verifications to determine their suitability. In relation to these checks Federal immigration authorities do not seek information directly from the South Australian Police Department. It is understood information is sought by the Australian Federal Police or ASIO.

POLICE CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria)** 5 October.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government became aware in general terms of a number of investigations into allegations of police misconduct or corruption following the referral of those matters to the NCA by the Commissioner of Police. It is considered inappropriate to disclose the nature of the allegations as this may prejudice ongoing investigations.

In reply to **Hon. B.C EASTICK (Light)** 5 October.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: At the time the question was asked, South Australian Police had not interviewed Barry Malcolm Moyse since his conviction, although it was the intention of the South Australian Police to do so. Since that time Barry Moyse has been interviewed. However, it is not appropriate to disclose the outcome of the interview.

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

In reply to **Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles)** 1 November.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Inquiries were carried out by the Police Internal Investigation Branch into allegations of corruption against Barry Malcolm Moyse between October and December 1986. The matter was investigated, and Mr X, the complainant in the matter, elected to tell police that he had invented the story to impress fellow criminals.

Other persons apart from Moyse and Mr X were questioned. The National Crime Authority was made aware of the inquiry in May 1987 and was permitted access to the report. Parts of the report were used in evidence against Moyse in both the committal proceedings and the subsequent trial before the Supreme Court.

In reply to **Mr INGERSON (Bragg)** 1 November.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Police inquiries in relation to the Mr X transcripts are proceeding. The Government is not prepared to disclose the identity of individuals against whom allegations are made. The Commissioner of Police has advised that it would be unwise to forecast and make

public the timing and extent of inquiries, as such disclosure could seriously jeopardise the outcome of the investigations.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Remuneration Tribunal—Report Relating to Chief Executive Officers.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
The Treasury of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Eyre Peninsula Cultural Trust—Report, 1987-88.
South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
South Australian Planning Commission—Report, 1987-88.
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—Coorong Park Fees.

By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—
Riverland Development Council Inc.—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
Public Parks Act 1943—Disposal of Portion of a Reserve, Davies Road, Sandy Creek.
Building Act 1971—Regulations—Australian Standards.
Local Government Act 1934—Regulation—Dogs on Beaches Fee.
Corporation By-laws—
Noarlunga—By-law No. 11—Foreshore.
Port Lincoln—
By-law No. 2—Renumbering of Existing By-laws.
By-law No. 3—Fences, Hedges and Hoardings.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Supreme Court Act 1935—Supreme Court Rules—Documents, Injunctions and Costs.
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Regulations—Certificate Fee.
Trustee Act 1936—Regulation—State Government Insurance Commission.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1987-88.
South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority—Report, 1987-88.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Attorney-General has advised me that today he wrote to the Leader of the Opposition and provided the Leader with a copy of the full transcript of the Mr X-Wordley conversations. The Attorney-General and, indeed, the Government are not prepared to table the transcript in Parliament. To do so would trample upon the civil rights and liberties of innocent individuals named in the document, and would violate their privacy. In addition there are criminal proceedings pending in respect of at least one of the individuals named in the transcript. The name, address and occupation of that individual is the subject of a suppression order, and there is of course the issue of *sub judice*.

Moreover, there are matters relevant to enforcement of the law which militate against the public release of the transcripts. Whether or not the Opposition Leader chooses to table the transcript or otherwise publish it is a matter for the Leader to weigh up and determine. I point out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The honourable Deputy Premier has the floor.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I point out to the House that the document provided to the Leader has not been tampered with; its contents and quality are as provided to the Government. The Attorney-General has decided to make the transcript available to the Leader of the Opposition to put beyond all doubt that the Government has nothing to hide and is sheltering no person.

I also remind the House that the matters raised in the transcript have been and are the subject of inquiries by the police. The information has been made available to the National Crime Authority which, if it considered there to be any appropriate basis for investigation, would be able to carry out discreet and appropriate investigations without the abuse of civil rights and away from any atmosphere of public disclosure of ill-founded and irresponsible allegations.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I call the Leader of the Opposition.

An honourable member: Put up or shut up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I ask the Minister of Emergency Services: why is the South Australian Government refusing to give the Federal Parliamentary Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority access to the authority's report on allegations of corruption in South Australia? This all-Party committee has the responsibility for monitoring and reviewing the performance of the authority and has requested a copy of the report on South Australia in discharge of that responsibility. In a public statement, a member of the committee, Senator Robert Hill, has referred to the South Australian—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

Mr OLSEN: —Attorney-General's interpretation that the NCA, through its report on South Australia, has accused the South Australian police of a lack of resolve to investigate allegations of corruption. In addition, he said that that amounted to a serious allegation by the NCA against the State police, and that it was well within the province of the Federal parliamentary committee to consider whether such an allegation was well founded, but this could not be done without access to those parts of the report upon which it is based. However, we have been informed that the South Australian Government, through the Attorney-General, has refused to agree to the committee's having access to this material.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: For people to exercise responsibility, they must demonstrate to the public that they can exercise responsibility publicly. From time to time, Senator Hill has made a series of quite astonishing statements. He has been invited by the Commissioner to place specific matters before him and he has not been prepared to do so, or has not been in a position to do so. I know nothing of any suggestion from the Attorney-General that

the South Australian Government should exercise muscle to prevent access to any documents by members of that committee. I do not imagine that we are in a position to be able to do so. I rather imagine that it is a decision for the NCA itself. My advice to the Attorney-General would be that we should be guided by Justice Stewart and the NCA in this matter. If they believe that it is proper and they believe—

Mr Olsen: They are quite happy for the committee to—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am not prepared to accept anything from the Leader along those lines, after some of the things that we have heard in this place in the past fortnight or so. Our adviser in this particular matter is the NCA. We have given the NCA far less cause for concern in recent times than has Senator Hill as a member of the very parliamentary committee that is supposed to service the NCA. I will discuss the matter with the Attorney-General but I make absolutely clear that our concern is for the proper continuation of the investigations which our police and the NCA are carrying through. We will be guided by their advice as to which is the best way to go. I am also astounded that again today the Leader of the Opposition should seek to give credence to reports that continue to come from his Party that its members are not happy with the approach our Police Department is taking in these matters. I find that astonishing and I am sure that the Commissioner and his officers also find it astonishing.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mount Gambier to order.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Has the Premier received a report on allegations made last week by the Leader of the Opposition that certain unnamed police officers in South Australia were reluctant to come forward with information concerning corruption because of their concerns about rumours relating to the Attorney-General? The Leader of the Opposition made this claim during an interview on Channel 10 last Thursday night. It has been put to me that such a claim made without any substantiation could seriously undermine confidence in the administration of criminal justice in South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That assertion is most serious (and I thank the honourable member for his question). It is certainly consistent, though, with some of the quite disgraceful things that we have heard and seen over the past few days. In that same interview the Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Opposition was not involved in a rumour campaign against the Attorney-General. That is quite staggering when one realises that on that very morning (Thursday) journalists were being told by the Leader's office that the Attorney was the target of its campaign. They were told that a question about the Attorney's association would be placed on the Notice Paper 'next week'. Because of an administrative slip-up, it actually appeared last Thursday, but it was meant to appear this week.

Having tried unsuccessfully to smear the Attorney, the Leader suggested that police officers were unwilling to provide information on corruption. Normally, in view of those allegations, I would have called for a report. However, I have not needed to do that because statements were issued over the weekend by both the Police Commissioner and the Chairman of the National Crime Authority, Justice Stewart, which were openly published—and it is a good thing they were. In fact, the Police Commissioner said:

> I state that I am not aware of any such reluctance for anyone to come forward. I add that I am not aware of any evidence of wrongdoing which would cause me to notify the Minister of Emergency Services, or the Premier, concerning any member of Parliament in South Australia.

Justice Stewart, the Chairman of the National Crime Authority, was asked by the Channel 10 news service whether he had any problems liaising with the South Australian Attorney-General with regard to National Crime Authority activities in South Australia. His answer was as follows:

> The authority enjoys a good working relationship with the South Australian Government. The Minister, who has been a member of the inter-governmental committee since its establishment in 1984, has been very supportive of the work of the authority generally and in particular in relation to its investigations in South Australia.

Those are hardly comments which would throw doubt on the role played by the Attorney—the most senior Attorney-General in Australia with an international reputation in the area of crime prevention and victimology. Despite those statements, the innuendo and assertions are still on the record. There is still no apology or substantiation from the Leader of the Opposition, who is still running to the media.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am informed that on Friday it was extremely difficult to get any statement from the Leader of the Opposition. It was only towards the end of the day—perhaps in the hope that there could be no response—that members of the media were invited, one by one, to go into the office of the Leader of the Opposition and have an interview with him. They were not asked all together and they were not able to freely question him in that environment. One by one they were given an audience with the Leader, who told them what he wanted to tell them. I am not one to plagiarise, and certainly I would not want to plagiarise without attribution, but unfortunately I do not know the author's identity—but I will borrow from a publication which is doing the rounds at the moment. So, with apologies to the author, 'When the smear's on, Olsen's gone'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Does the Minister of Emergency Services have the information he promised to provide in answer to key questions on corruption that were asked during the past five weeks and, if so, will he now give that information to the House? If not, why not? Since I framed the questions, the Minister has today provided answers to three questions posed on 4 October, 5 October and 1 November. However, there are still no answers to the questions of 1 November, as to the promise that he would seek advice about whether he could provide further information relating to investigations of alleged police corruption that were initiated by the present Commissioner in 1983, and last Wednesday, when the Opposition sought details of the new term of reference being given to the NCA to investigate alleged corruption in South Australia and the Minister said that he would make available to the House all information 'which can properly be made available'.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland was out of order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: With the exception of the last question, I thought that all the others had been answered and conveyed back to the House in the normal way. I will ensure that that is the case but, in relation to the last matter, I point out that that has effectively been answered by way of a press release which I issued the following day and in which I made perfectly clear that the matter of the terms of reference was still being negotiated between the Attorney and the NCA.

I also pointed out in that press release that the Leader of the Opposition, in a statement he had made later that day, had grossly misrepresented my position, because he twisted (and I use that word advisedly, Sir) my offer to obtain the information for the House into a charge that I was not prepared to provide information. I recall that clearly in the statement that I issued at that time. I will have that matter put together by way of a question to the House; no doubt my staff are working on this matter right now. But I point out that publicly that question has effectively been answered.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Does the Minister of Emergency Services share the Leader of the Opposition's concern that the Attorney-General has named himself as the South Australian politician who has been targeted by the Opposition because of alleged 'associations with criminals'?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In short, the answer is 'No'. I believe that the Attorney has demonstrated courage in confronting the rumour and innuendo. It seems to me that the Opposition's association with such rumours is quite disgraceful. The *News* story of 3 November, the question on notice from the member for Murray-Mallee and the question asked in this place last Thursday by the member for Light clearly demonstrate the Opposition's involvement with the peddling of these rumours.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Albert Park and the Minister of Community Welfare to order. The Deputy Premier will momentarily resume his seat. The member for Murray-Mallee has a point or order.

Mr LEWIS: The Deputy Premier clearly imputes improper motives to me—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: —for placing that question on notice and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to direct him to withdraw. It is offensive to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier whether he would withdraw any imputation that was directly aimed at the honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am certainly prepared to do that but, on the other hand, I would have thought that the content of the question on notice stands for itself and I invite members and the general public to consider the content of that question on notice.

Mr Lewis: That's humbug!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Let me—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Let me proceed. When confronted to make public—

Mr Lewis: You're a slob.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I take exception to the interjection from the member for Murray-Mallee and I think it should be withdrawn as unparliamentary and quite unbecoming.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot entertain a point of order while I am receiving a point of order from the Deputy Premier. If the member for Eyre has a point of order, we can deal with that in due course. The member for Murray-Mallee has used words which were offensive to the Deputy Premier and, in the same spirit that he was offended and got a withdrawal, I ask him to withdraw those words.

Mr LEWIS: I had never realised that accuracy was offensive, but I withdraw.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I take further exception to that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In the spirit of maintaining some sort of harmony in the Parliament and having the Parliament earn the respect of the community, I ask the member for Murray-Mallee to unreservedly withdraw his remark in view of the fact that it has again been drawn to the Chair's attention.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Speaker, on a point of order I would ask—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not accept the point of order at this time.

Mr S.G. Evans: How do you rule for one and not the other?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not receive a point of order from the honourable member for Davenport because I have already asked the member for Eyre to hold back on his point of order while we deal with a matter that is already before the Chair. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: At your behest, Sir, and out of respect for the office you hold, I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: My point of order is that during the course of the answer by the Deputy Premier, members on the Government benches have made a series of quite offensive and provocative comments towards the member for Murray-Mallee which appear to have escaped your attention, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is in a tricky position here, because it is standard practice that we do not accept points of order made after the events that led to the particular points of order. However, that is partly counter-balanced by the fact that I declined to take the honourable member's point of order earlier. Nevertheless, I am still of the view that the actual moment when he took the point of order was still some time after the alleged offences and so I cannot uphold the point of order at this time. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: My point of order, Mr Speaker, is why did you rule that it was against Standing Orders for the member for Murray-Mallee to say that he thought it was quite proper to say something he believed was accurate? In the case of the Deputy Premier, he withdrew and then said that he thought it was an accurate interpretation of the question being on the Notice Paper. They were both using exactly the same circumstances.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The member for Murray-Mallee was asked—not directed, but asked—a second time to withdraw remarks because the Deputy Premier took a second point of order. As for the other content of the honourable member for Davenport's point of order, the Chair did not hear, and does not believe were uttered, the words which the honourable member for Davenport believes were uttered by the Deputy Premier. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Premier did not make an unqualified withdrawal of his remark. The Deputy Premier gave a heavily qualified withdrawal along the lines that he thinks the question speaks for itself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. What the Chair dealt with at the time of that particular point of order was not unparliamentary language as such, although it is possible that the words could have been

considered in that category. What we dealt with were words used by one member that were offensive to another member. The honourable member who was offended asked for them to be withdrawn, seemed at that time to be satisfied with the withdrawal, and took no further point of order. No other member can now raise a point of order on that particular matter on behalf of the honourable member.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is a certain matter which I think has to be placed in the public arena as a result of the unfortunate events of last week. One might have thought that the Opposition would want to have done with this whole matter after the Leader of the Opposition went to water on the challenge that was made by the Attorney-General. But not quite. He went to water publicly but he also wrote a letter to the Attorney-General and I think it is worthwhile quoting from that letter because, indeed Sir, it almost takes one's breath away in the circumstances to read these words. I quote it. This is what the Leader of the Opposition is saying to the Attorney-General:

> This is a highly undesirable state of affairs for the chief law officer of the State. It is important for the public, the Parliament, the police and indeed all sections of the community to have complete confidence in the integrity of the holder of this high office.
>
> Attorneys-General, by the nature of the position, receive regular briefings on the criminal situation in the State and, as in your case, represent their Governments on bodies such as the Intergovernmental Committee responsible for the National Crime Authority. This is a particular reason why no holder of this office can have any association with known or suspected criminal elements.

It seems to me that there are two possible interpretations of those two paragraphs. Either the Leader is saying in that letter to the Attorney-General that he should not have stood up last Thursday, despite all the rumours that were circulating and despite all that we knew about what Opposition members were saying to journalists and others, and said, 'It is I whom they are falsely accusing,' or else Opposition members are running a guilt by association campaign.

By that second criterion, not one Opposition member is fit to hold office because of their past association with one John West, and that is the plain fact of the matter. If people find that outrageous (and indeed I do), I merely say that that is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the criterion laid down in that letter. The Opposition is clearly unrepentant in this matter and is still persisting in advocating guilt by association. That view is not shared by the Government, by Mr Justice Stewart, or by the Commissioner of Police. I am far from satisfied that the Opposition has acted responsibly in this matter.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier say whether there is a written contract involving the Grand Prix Board, Channel 9 and FOCA which governs a live television coverage of the Grand Prix in South Australia; and, if so, will the Premier reveal what that contract stipulates about the number of Grand Prix admission tickets which must be sold before a live coverage can proceed, and will he give the latest information on how many tickets have been sold?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, I am not aware of the detailed contract between both bodies.

Mr Lewis: Surely there is one?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There would obviously be contractual arrangements between Channel 9 and FOCA in relation to television rights. I do not believe that any specific figures act as triggers. As in any event where obviously it is desirable to get as many people as possible to attend the event—because that is part of what is being televised—in terms of local TV coverage that decision would have to be made on the basis of agreement by all the parties that it would not jeopardise attendances. The contract is an international contract. As to the ticket sales figure at present, I understand that sales have certainly improved, but many people are hanging back at this stage. However, my figures are not up to date: they are over a week old. I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Mr RANN (Briggs): Has the Minister of Health received any representation recently from the Opposition spokesperson on health, Mr Martin Cameron, concerning the proposed changed roles for hospitals in Laura, Blyth and Tailem Bend? Last week the Opposition spokesperson on health was reported on Adelaide radio stations as saying he would be prepared to congratulate the Government if it changed its stance on the restructuring of the three country hospitals. In one interview he was reported as saying the Opposition's only concern in the debates was to help country people reach a satisfactory outcome. I understand a Liberal document entitled 'Key Result Areas' shows that this attitude of the Opposition spokesperson on health is entirely phoney.

The SPEAKER: The last remark is comment. The honourable Minister of Health.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: In the area concerning the changing role of country hospitals, the Opposition has tried to give the impression that it is interested only in the welfare of country people, that it has no ulterior motives and that, if the Government changed its mind, it would congratulate us.

Having heard that over the past few months from the Opposition, I was very shocked when a document came into my possession which stated quite clearly that there was another motive. The document to which I refer is a memorandum to the Leader of the Opposition from the shadow Minister of Health and the subject is 'Key Result Areas'—KRAs. Apparently, a number of these things are produced from time to time. Mr Cameron, of the Liberal Party, states in this document:

> We have developed community anger over the Government's handling of the closure of the three hospitals.

They are stating that they developed the anger. They are saying not that the anger was there or that they channelled it but that they developed it. This is manipulation of country people of the worst possible kind. They are attempting to instil fear into people in country areas by suggesting that lives could be lost because of these changes to the health services in those areas. That is what they developed. I am appalled that such an attitude—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Public Works to order; I call the member for Briggs to order; and I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: —would prevail in what we would have hoped was an Opposition that had some shred of responsibility. I have wondered why they behaved in this way. It is base political opportunism. The memo from Mr Cameron gets even more interesting. It states:

> We have sought to undermine the Premier's credibility by developing the invisible man tag for Mr Bannon (Heather Burnett's concept).

They are totally incapable of developing their own concept.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Now that Ms Burnett has left, we have seen a deterioration in the Opposition. The memo further states (and I know that you, Sir, will enjoy this) the following:

> We are attempting to promote a Liberal profile of unity, although I am deeply concerned about the actions of individuals such as Ren DeGaris, a member of the staff of the member for Victoria, actions which are doing much to undermine that perception.

I had the 'pleasure' of serving for about a decade in another place with Ren DeGaris. He manipulated very effectively the Liberal Party for that decade; he did so for a decade earlier; and I am delighted to see that Ren DeGaris is still manipulating you today.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister cannot refer to members opposite as 'you'. He must direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Yes: indeed. We all know Mr DeGaris. We listen to exactly the same phrases coming out of the mouth of the member for Victoria, I recognise them. I heard exactly the same phrases for 10 years. It is like a ghost from the past, still hovering around and manipulating.

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable Minister resume his seat for a moment. His current remarks are obviously very entertaining to members on both sides of the House, but I ask him to link them more closely to the representations of the shadow Minister of Health referred to in the question.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will leave the document there for the moment, but I may have necessity to quote from it later. It is perfectly clear that the campaign of manipulation by the Liberal Party has not worked. The boards of the three hospitals concerned are meeting and cooperating with the Government in the implementation of the Government's proposals, and that will enable us to bring better health services overall to those regions. Since becoming Minister of Health, I have been very pleased at the overwhelming response to this issue. People have said that the Government must hold its ground. The campaign is a manufactured campaign. The more responsible people in country areas appreciate that times change, that the role of health services changes and that they must change to meet current community needs. Members opposite know that and I am delighted that the community is seeing it so clearly.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Let us have no more about the outrage in country areas. Clearly, from the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition in the other place, it was a campaign developed by the Liberal Party.

GRAND PRIX

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Coles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The sustained applause on my right is out of order.

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): I ask the Premier: will the current Adelaide Grand Prix track conform with the new rules, designs and other standards established by FIA, the international body responsible for controlling Grand Prix racing and to which all Formula One promoters around the world must adhere and, if not, what changes are required to the track to bring it up to these standards, what is the estimated cost of these changes, how will they be funded and will they involve any further encroachment on the parklands?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Because a Bill is before the House, I cannot refer to the result of current negotiations for an extension of the Grand Prix contract. Reference has been made in another context to the very detailed requirements of FIA—to which we must conform—for the conduct of Formula One races. With respect to the technical requirements of our track, stands and so on, we have no problems. Indeed, our standards have set the pace internationally. I recall a comment by the FOCA organisers that we have put much greater pressure on all those overseas who stage races in terms of the quality and standards they provide, but we must keep ahead of the game. Yes, it does cost money—a considerable amount of money—but it will be raised in the normal way.

So far, the Grand Prix Board has not had to take advantage of direct grants from Government revenue, as was envisaged. So far it has been able to fund on an interest bearing loan basis, and that is a remarkable achivement. In relation to the length of the track itself, that depends on the number of teams that are admitted into the competition by FIA at any one time. At the moment, our track conforms. It is above the requisite length and it conforms to the number of teams required. If more teams are admitted to the Formula One competition, some extension of the track would have to be contemplated. That will be addressed when necessary and any plans will be laid out and made quite clear.

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore: Will there be encroachment on the parklands?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In response to the interjection, I point out that we are talking about the inner area of the Victoria Park racecourse. If any further extension is required, we would not seek to do it within the street part of the circuit, instead, we would extend in some way that part which lies within the Victoria Park Racecourse.

CHLOROFLUOROCARBONS

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Can the Minister of Environment and Planning provide the House with information on when Federal Senator Richardson will introduce legislation into the Commonwealth Parliament to control the use of ozone depleting substances, such as CFCs, and what is the State Government's policy on this issue of critical importance? It is a fact that most products, such as hairsprays, refrigerants and air-conditioners, are made and marketed in Australia nationally and not on an isolated State basis. Therefore, according to constituents with whom I have discussed this matter, this issue should be dealt with on a national basis.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is too late for the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to withdraw leave. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have described previously to the House that at the Conference of Australian Environment Ministers this year the States were lectured by Senator Richardson against the dangers of individual States running off on their own in all sorts of directions and doing their own thing.

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Let the member for Coles not lead herself up some sort of blind alley—she may well be going in that direction. We were given to understand that the Commonwealth would legislate before Christmas

and that a copy of the Bill would be sent to us, enabling us to judge whether complementary State legislation would be necessary and to ensure that, if such legislation was contemplated, it was complementary and not contrary to the spirit of the Commonwealth legislation. Yesterday it was revealed to me that a copy of the Commonwealth Bill arrived in my department very late last week. In the light of that, I prepared a press release which I will read to the House. My reason for doing so will be made clear before I sit down. The press release states:

The State Government will not be stood over by the Democrats. State Government's position on the banning of chlorofluorocarbons has always been quite clear. We agreed with the Commonwealth Government at this year's Conference of Australian Environment Ministers that we would not legislate in South Australia until the Commonwealth Government had drawn up its legislation. It would be a ridiculous situation to have every State running off in a different direction on this matter.

I received the draft Commonwealth legislation last week. We will now be able to start preparing complementary legislation. I understand that the Federal Environment Minister, Senator Richardson, plans to introduce the Commonwealth legislation before Christmas. The complementary South Australian legislation will be introduced in the first session of Parliament 1989.

What I find astounding is that in an article on CFCs on page 2 of the *Advertiser* not one reference is made to the fact that not only is the Commonwealth intending to legislate but the Bill has been prepared and is in the hands of the State Minister. All I wanted was for the *Advertiser* to give one line to my statement. I did not need more than that, as long as it was the right line. Perhaps then the member for Coles would not have been drawn into saying the sorts of things that she said. I am not sure whether the member for Coles is still the spokesperson for the Opposition on this matter, but let us at least give the *Advertiser* the benefit of the doubt. The member for Coles said:

When the Democrats introduced a similar Bill last year, the Liberals felt uniform national legislation would be better than a private member's Bill in a single State.

She went on to say:

But both the Federal and South Australian Governments have dragged the chain and been so slow on this critical measure that we intend to support Mr Elliott's Bill simply to indicate that we regard action now as essential.

I am sure that the honourable member would not have said that had she known that a Bill had been prepared and that Senator Richardson intended to not only introduce it before Christmas but get it through and have it proclaimed on 1 January. Here is the peril of from time to time ignoring all the information available to us. The legislation is at hand. We are now in a position where we can judge the sort of complementary legislation which we, as a State, should introduce and we are proceeding to do that.

5AA

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport concerned that the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal will not renew the licence of radio station 5AA? In May last year the tribunal renewed this licence for only two years instead of the customary three after expressing its concern about a number of aspects of the station's performance, including falling ratings and a poor financial performance.

Since this renewal, the station has lost a further $820 000, and its ratings, which were at 5.6 per cent in the May-June survey period of 1987, are currently at 4 per cent. There are unresolved issues in relation to a possible conflict of interest situation involving one member of the board of the station, Mr Harry Krantz.

In the *Sunday Mail* of 19 June this year, the Minister said he believed that, in the light of the station's continuing poor ratings, the tribunal would look at how 5AA operated and, to directly quote the Minister, 'that is, of course, of concern to me'.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has misquoted and taken the statement out of context in terms of the issue raised by that newspaper. The matter directly concerns the TAB board and, as the Opposition has constantly stated, it is a matter which is at arm's length from the Minister. If the Opposition now suggests that I should become engaged in the day-to-day running of 5AA, it has made a complete 180 degree turn in its views.

The tribunal will conduct its own deliberations and make its own assessments. Because the TAB owns 5AA, the 5AA board is accountable for its management and organisation to the TAB board. As Minister, I have a direct relationship with the TAB, so that is how I receive advice about the operations of 5AA. Obviously, the TAB board is concerned about the matter of ongoing management and it is addressing that issue.

The last survey indicated that the ratings of 5AA had increased and, if one looks at the service provided and relates that to the overall cost that the TAB would incur if that service was provided through a contract with another commercially licensed radio station, one can see that there are obvious, and significant, cost advantages for the TAB in its relationship with 5AA. It is also a significant service, because the service that would be provided through any commercial station would not come within a bull's roar, if I can use that expression, of what is now provided through 5AA. In undertaking any sort of analysis, one must therefore take into account those offsetting costs and benefits.

This issue is of great interest to the TAB board and management. It is obvious from the new composition of the 5AA board and the rearrangement of the station that it is directing its attention towards ensuring that that licence is renewed. I am sure that, given its commitment to the industry and to the radio station, all its efforts will be directed towards ensuring that that licence is renewed and that the South Australian public will continue to receive that service.

SOUTHERN SCIENCE PARK

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology indicate to the House the status of the new Southern Science Park in the Sturt Triangle, particularly in relation to whether any companies have confirmed their interest in establishing facilities there? I am aware that, in announcing plans for the Southern Science Park, both the Premier and the Minister indicated that there had been expressions of interest from private companies in establishing operations at the park. This park has already attracted strong interest in the region, especially among those who are awaiting announcements about potential occupants.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, the more so because of his persistence over a number of years in pursuing this matter of a Southern Science Park. He is to be congratulated for having raised this matter on a number of occasions, having talked to the Government about the feasibility of such a proposal and having insisted that that work be proceeded with. I can say that on the occasion of his first raising the matter, there were some doubters about such a proposal, admittedly even within the local community in the south,

but he has persisted with it and, indeed, has been joined in his support by written or verbal approaches from the members for Mawson, Bright, Hayward, Mitchell and Baudin. Now we see, as a result of the feasibility study that was carried out independently earlier in the year and commissioned by Technology Park Adelaide Corporation at the request of the Government, that here is a viable case for a science park in the south and, as is now known, that has been publicly announced. It is to be built in what has been known variously as the Sturt Triangle, Laffer's land, or whatever, adjacent to the Flinders University.

Just because it has been proposed to establish a science park, to denominate an area of land to be a science park, does not mean that that will necessarily be a success. However, I am now in a position to advise that the corporate interest to which I referred a few days ago in first announcing this project has been converted into further tangible expression; the Marion council last night accepted the lodgment of applications from two South Australian companies that are seeking not only to relocate their entire Adelaide activities to the Southern Science Park but indeed to have expanded operations there, in other words, extra employment opportunities and extra technology developments for South Australia.

Those companies are Hamilton Laboratories and Mineral Control Instrumentation. Hamilton's is a world leader in the design and development of sunscreen products and research into the effects of the sun on the skin. MCI is a manufacturer and developer of scientific instruments for the mining and mineral processing industries and is moving into research into photochemical smog and air pollution monitoring. If all the required procedures were completely successful, these two companies would bring to the science park about 75 workers who will be housed in stand-alone, purpose built facilities in the northern corner of the Sturt Triangle adjacent to Sturt Road. Clearly, that validates the entire concept. That proves that the feasibility study has correctly estimated that there is a role for the Southern Science Park and it certainly endorses the commitment of the member for Fisher in pushing for this development for a number of years. The Government is very excited that, alongside the internationally successful Technology Park Adelaide at the Levels, we will now have a science park in the southern suburbs.

RU RUA

Mr GUNN (Eyre): My question is directed to the Minister of Health. Is it a fact that very seriously intellectually impaired residents at Ru Rua nursing home voted in the recent Federal referendum? If so, how many voted and by what criteria are people in this position encouraged and assessed as being qualified to cast their own proper vote on such occasions?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I have no knowledge of that matter, but I will ask the Attorney-General, who is responsible for electoral matters, and bring back a report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PENALTIES FOR LAW BREAKERS

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): My question is to the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General in another place. Can the Minister advise the House whether there has been any reduction in penalties for law-breakers? This claim has been made in a recent Liberal Party election advertisement.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER : I can provide the House with some evidence which will refute those statements that were made in that advertisement, which I understand was circulated widely in the honourable member's electorate. It is important that the community know, with respect to the law, what the facts are and what the application of the law is in our community. There certainly has not been a reduction in penalties for law-breakers.

The Summary Offences Act (formerly the Police Offenders Act) increased the penalties for over 50 offences. As an example, the maximum penalty for assault police was increased from a $200 fine or 12 months imprisonment to a fine of $8 000 or five years imprisonment.

Under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act penalties were increased for producing or trading in pornographic material involving children. New offences in relation to dealing in drugs have been added to the statute book—persons convicted of drug dealing face fines of up to $250 000 and/or 25 years imprisonment, as well as confiscation of assets acquired with the profits of such drug dealing. Much tougher penalties for cause death by dangerous driving are in force. The maximum penalty of seven years gaol was increased to 10 years with a minimum five year licence suspension for a first offence. There is simply no evidence to support the claim that criminal courts are becoming more lenient in their approach. Indeed, data suggests that, for more serious crimes, time served in gaol is now longer than previously. For example:

(1) The average time served by a life sentenced prisoner since December 1983 is 13 years. Prior to December 1983, the average time was eight years, seven months.

(2) In recent months there have been three separate instances for the crime of armed robbery where sentences with non-parole periods of at least 20 years have been set.

Members would also be aware that the Attorney-General has a role in authorising appeals by the Crown against sentences which are considered to be manifestly inadequate or lenient. The Attorney-General has in fact authorised in excess of 100 such appeals. For example:

(1) With respect to armed robbery, the Attorney-General has authorised 13 appeals with 11 being successful and two pending.

(2) In a murder case the sentence was increased from 24 years to 36 years as a result of a Crown appeal.

In relation to armed robbery I would advise that the Crown in 1987 mounted a test case seeking an increase in the level of sentences for that crime (*The Queen v. Dube and Knowles* (1987)). In delivering judgment, the Full Court said that an increase in the level of sentences would occur because of amendments to section 302 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act (which oblige the judiciary to take into account the fact that a prisoner of good behaviour will automatically receive remissions of up to one-third of the non-parole period set by the court).

This has resulted in substantial increases in the level of penalties for the crime of armed robbery. In practice, this means that if it is desired that a prisoner should spend years in prison, a non-parole period of 30 years would be set. So, those examples clearly indicate the fallacious nature of the information being peddled in the community by the Liberal Party. Simply, the arguments addressed by Opposition members have no more substance than snowflakes falling on hot asphalt.

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Will the Premier say whether his former Executive Assistant, Mr Geoff Anderson, is now a permanent public servant and, if he is, will the Premier explain what role Mr Anderson is playing when he is present in the public and press galleries talking to media representatives, as he was last Thursday and as he has been today in the television gallery? Does the Premier agree that Mr Anderson is jeopardising the independence of the Public Service when, in discussions with media representatives in these circumstances, he makes statements that are often highly offensive to and defamatory of some members of this Parliament and other people involved in politics? Finally, will the Premier instruct Mr Anderson not to repeat this behaviour in future?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure what Mr Anderson has done to the member for Victoria, but I can confirm that Mr Anderson is the Director, within the Premier's Department, of the inter-government advisory service area dealing with inter-governmental relations. Mr Anderson is eminently well qualified and recognised in this field and I have no reason to doubt his professional capability in that job.

HOUSING FINANCE

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction assure the House that adequate funding will be provided to the State Bank to ensure that the waiting time for concessional loans does not lengthen unacceptably as a result of the Housing Trust's sale program? Further, will he review the sale process to ensure that sales to tenants proceed with the minimum of delay to the individual tenant? The Minister will be aware of the significant ongoing success of the sale to tenants scheme, but this success carries with it the risk that the additional demand for State Bank concessional loans will cause an unacceptable increase in the waiting time for such loans. Tenants in my electorate who have purchased their trust unit have reported significant delays in certain procedures, and they have suggested that steps need to be taken to ensure that internal trust procedures are made as efficient and expeditious as possible.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will certainly take it up with the South Australian Housing Trust and the State Bank so that they can speed up the process and ensure that financial arrangements are finalised as quickly as possible. I am pleased to see that the member for Elizabeth is reporting enthusiasm by trust tenants who wish to purchase their homes.

May I again tell the House the difference between our policy in encouraging trust tenants to buy their own homes and the Opposition's policy. Under our policy such tenants pay full market price for their property, whereas the Liberal Party, at both State and Federal level, is talking about massive discounts. I should have thought that even Liberal members would understand that difference. Anyway, I suppose that eventually it will get through and I look forward to seeing at the next election campaign how the Liberal Party dresses up its sales program and whether it can dupe South Australian Housing Trust tenants into swallowing the discount line. Tenants failed to accept that argument in 1985 and I am convinced that at the next election the result will be the same.

Regarding the concessional loan program, this Government is concerned that the waiting time is blowing out and that it is now between 15 and 17 months for those people seeking concessional loans. It is fair to say that the Home Ownership Made Easier scheme has been worthwhile up to the present. In the five years to the end of June 1988, the State Bank advanced 13 800 loans totalling $548 million by way of concessional housing and rental purchase loans. That is something of which we should all be proud. However, over the past year it has become apparent that the current concessional lending program does not adequately meet the needs of many potential home buyers. For instance, the maximum loan is $48 000, whereas the maximum house price is $72 000 and the median house price in Adelaide is at present $78 500.

So, we are currently conducting a review of alternative housing finance involving the HOME scheme and investigating a more cost-effective form of lending for low-middle income home purchasers in South Australia. That review should be completed late this financial year and I think that the resultant package will benefit low and middle income earners in this State.

ISLAND SEAWAY

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Why has the Minister of Transport not released the seaworthiness, safety, failed and inadequate equipment report on the *Island Seaway*? An investigation into the ship's shortcomings, post construction tank testing of models, etc., was commissioned earlier this year, with a promise of a report by the end of August, and that is more than two months ago. This action to professionally investigate the issue followed a series of incidents, service delays to Kangaroo Island, cancellation of the Port Lincoln link, frightening reports by a ship's engineer, embarassing public interviews with senior members of the ship's company, including Captain Skuse, and a threatened walk-off by the crew. In the meantime, a study of the ship's log, released by R.W. Miller & Co. on 12 October 1988, reveals some startling statistics. The period of the ship's performance study is for the first nine months of operation, that is from 12 November 1987 to 30 July 1988.

In summary, there were over 98 return trips between Port Adelaide and Kingscote and on 10 separate occasions the *Island Seaway* did not travel at all on the day scheduled. On 36 occasions the ship departed her port more than 30 minutes outside her scheduled timetable. On 87 occasions the ship arrived at her port of destination more than 30 minutes outside her scheduled timetable. Finally, the ship's log records reveal that on not one single trip covering the ship's first nine months in operation did she both depart and berth at times matching her advertised schedule. This record of gross irregularity in the *Seaway* service is directly costing every commercial and industrial supplier of goods and produce—and, indirectly, every resident of the island—money they can ill afford.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member did not point out that there may have been occasions when the vessel left and arrived early. He knows as well as I do, with the very nature of that type of ferry service, the expectation that it leaves and arrives strictly on time is not always fulfilled. I have stated in this House and publicly that the Government is not satisfied with the level of service being provided to Kangaroo Island by the *Island Seaway*, and it is for that reason that we have commissioned a very expen-

sive and much more detailed and complicated report than I thought likely when the first report was commissioned.

The work undertaken by the Marine Institute in the Netherlands has been completed, and the work undertaken by Lloyds of London has also been completed. Those reports are with Howard Smith. When everything is drawn together and I receive the report, I will take the matter to Cabinet for discussion. In due course, the honourable member and everyone else will know what action the Government will be required to take as a result of that report.

SELECT COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE

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

That the Hon. R.K. Abbott be given leave to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on Effectiveness and Efficiency of Operations of the South Australian Timber Corporation, if he thinks fit.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for all stages of the following Bills:
Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act Amendment,
Trustee Companies,
Law of Property Act Amendment,
Travel Agents Act Amendment,
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Act Amendment,
Mining Act Amendment,
Summary Offences Act Amendment (No. 2),
Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 3),
Building Act Amendment,
Racing Act Amendment (No. 2),
Local Public Abattoirs Act Repeal,
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND AGENCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It makes three amendments to the Powers of Attorney and Agency Act 1984. Section 6 (1) of the Act is recast to make its meaning clearer. The substance of the section is not changed.

Section 11 is amended to ensure that when an enduring power of attorney is revoked the remedies contained in section 11 (1) *(a)* and *(b)* of the Act are still available. The situation has arisen where a protection order has been made under the Mental Health Act and the Public Trustee has been appointed administrator, the protected person having executed an enduring power of attorney in favour of a third party. In some cases it may be necessary for the Public Trustee to revoke the power of attorney as a matter of urgency. The wording of section 11 (1) *(a)* and *(b)* does not make it clear whether in these circumstances the Public Trustee can apply to the Supreme Court for an order requiring the donee of the power to file in the Supreme Court records and accounts kept by the donee of dealings and transactions made pursuant to the power and for these to be audited.

It is arguable that a donor of an enduring power of attorney continues to be a donor after the power has been revoked but this opportunity is taken to make it clear that the remedies in section 11 (1) *(a)* and *(b)* can be sought even though the power has been revoked. The third amendment protects the interests of a beneficiary named in a protected person's will where a specific gift bequeathed or devised to the beneficiary is sold by the administrator. The new clause 11a allows the Supreme Court to make such order as it thinks just to ensure that no beneficiary gains disproportionate advantage, or suffers disproportionate disadvantage, of a kind not contemplated by the will, in consequence of the exercise of the donee's powers during the period of the legal inapacity of the donor or former donor. Section 118s of the Administration and Probate Act and section 16a of the Aged and Infirm Persons Property Act contain similar provisions.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes a minor change to section 6 of the principal Act to clarify the operation of that section. (The Act provides that the authority conferred by an enduring power of attorney may be either to act notwithstanding the donor's subsequent legal incapacity, or to act in the event of the donor's subsequent legal incapacity). The matter is further clarified by an associated amendment to the second schedule.

Clause 3 amends section 11 of the principal Act to ensure that the remedies contained in subsection (1) of that section are available even if the enduring power of attorney has been revoked or the period of legal capacity has come to an end.

Clause 4 inserts a new section 11a into the principal Act that confers jurisdiction on the Supreme Court to make orders in relation to a will where the share of a beneficiary under the will has been affected by the exercise of powers by the donee of an enduring power of attorney during a period of legal incapacity on the part of the testator. Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to the second schedule.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 1159.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): This is the fourth time in four years that Parliament has debated legislation relating to the Grand Prix. There were amending Bills in 1985 and 1986 which my Party supported, and there was the principal Act, introduced in 1984, which again my Party backed.

In this House on 15 November 1984, I began my contribution to the second reading debate of the principal Act by saying:

The Opposition supports the staging of this event in Adelaide. We accept that it can bring significant benefits to the city and to South Australia.

That remains our view. We continue to give the staging of the Grand Prix our full support, and we will do nothing to oppose the provisions of the Bill now before the House that

aim to ensure that Adelaide secures the race for the longer term.

An analysis of the Bill shows that only the last clause, clause 9, affects the future of the race itself. This removes the present December 1992 expiry date for the Act. While it can be argued, from the point of view of facilitating regular Parliamentary scrutiny, that the sunset clause should have been extended by, say, five years, rather than repealed, we will not move an amendment to achieve this. Our objective will be to ensure that the Premier is in a position to sign contracts for future races while international Grand Prix officials are in Adelaide this week, if that is his intention. At the same time, we will subject the remaining major clauses to close scrutiny.

There is much in the Premier's second reading explanation which was left unsaid, unexplained or unjustified. For example, the Premier did not explain to Parliament or to the public that passage of this Bill in its present form could, in effect, set up a South Australian equivalent of the Paul Dainty Corporation at taxpayers expense. Some of the provisions of this Bill go to the very heart of the question of what are and what are not legitimate activities of Government agencies. I will come back to this issue in debating some of the clauses.

First, however, I invite the House to consider some of the recent history of this Bill. It was first foreshadowed by the Premier on 10 August this year when he answered a question about Grand Prix finances, as follows:

> We cannot conclude negotiations because the Act covering the Grand Prix in Adelaide contains a sunset clause. In fact, it expires at the period at which the contract ends. So in order to achieve an extension of that contract, the Act will have to be brought before the Parliament again. I certainly give notice that I intend to do that at the appropriate time.

This statement indicates that the future of the race being staged in Adelaide depended only on an amendment to the sunset clause. As I have already said, the Liberal Party will certainly support this. This is an important point. For while my Party will support this amendment, we may not back others put forward by the Premier.

Let the Premier not use our questions or our possible opposition to these other matters to claim that we are jeopardising the future of the race. He has already said that this depends only on the removal of the sunset clause. However, I began to have my doubts about what the Premier is really up to when we heard statements from him while he was in London last month. In the *News* of 19 October he was reported to have said:

> For any amendment Bill to be rejected would be inconceivable.

In the same paper the following day there was a report of concerns held by the Premier about whether or not the Opposition and the Democrats would support the legislation to guarantee the future of the race. I suggested that the Premier was grandstanding if he was referring only to legislation to remove the sunset clause. I said he knew that that would receive the full support of the Liberal Party. At the same time, I said that my only concern about the Premier's comments was that there could be something in the legislation that the public did not know about. My concerns were well founded.

Before proceeding to detail them, I take up the Premier's statement in his second reading speech that Mr Bernie Ecclestone of FOCA, during their recent talks in London, confirmed FOCA's desire to continue staging the event in Adelaide, dependent upon the successful passing of necessary amendments to extend the period of operation of the Act. I take this to refer only to the sunset clause, that this is further confirmation that the only obstacle in the way of securing the race for Adelaide for the longer term is the need to extend the operation of this Act to cover the period of the contract now being negotiated.

Because of the matters to which I have already referred, I trust that the Premier will accept our attitude in good faith, that he will not go outside Parliament to claim that anyone who does not support all of this Bill is jeopardising the future of the race. On previous occasions, the Premier has deliberately confused and misrepresented legitimate questions about the Grand Prix as opposition to the event. Let him not do it on this occasion.

At issue in those clauses of the Bill which do not directly affect the future of the race are matters of fundamental principle glossed over in the Premier's second reading speech. In that speech, he said that the amendments in large part dealt with certain procedural matters which have arisen since the establishment of the Grand Prix Board: that is not exactly true. Certainly, some procedural matters are dealt with, but they do not relate directly to the original function of the board, which was to promote the Grand Prix. They go to much wider issues of new, much enlarged functions for the board in the future.

In scrutinising these new functions, I make clear that my Party does not reflect on the work of the board or its staff in the past. Indeed, I acknowledge that work and attest to it by reading into *Hansard* some of the awards received by the Grand Prix Office since 1985:

- The FOCA trophy for best organised event in 1985;
- The best international television coverage—1985, 1986 and 1987;
- The Confederation of Australian Sport Award for best organisation and presentation of a sporting event—1985 and 1986;
- The National Tourism Award for best in festivals and special events category—1986;
- The State Tourism Award for best festivals section—1986;
- The State Tourism Award to Executive Director Dr Mal Hemmerling—1986;
- The Advance Australia Award to Executive Director Dr Mal Hemmerling—1986 and 1987;
- Adelaide Art Directors Award for corporate identity;
- Regional Tourist Award to the Grand Prix Office for contribution to tourism in South Australia—1987;
- State Tourism Award for best special event, tourism marketing and the Harry Dowling Award for overall excellence—1987.

These are awards of which the Grand Prix Board and the Grand Prix Office rightly are very proud, and South Australians are also proud of their performance.

The establishment of the board in 1984 recognised the fact that this event could not have been secured and staged in Adelaide without a total community effort coordinated by the Government. The event requires the closure of public parklands and public roads, and the overriding of a number of Acts of Parliament. It depends on other public support through agencies such as the police. The special nature of the event and its impact on wide sections of the community give continuing justification for a Government role in its staging. However, where my Party begins to part with the Government is in some of the much wider powers proposed for the board which do not relate directly to the staging of this one event.

The principal Act passed in 1984 required the board to undertake on behalf of the State the promotion of a Grand Prix once a year. However, under this Bill, the board will be given the power to negotiate and enter into agreements for holding motor racing events in Adelaide. With little explanation from the Premier, it is now proposed that the

board take on a much wider role relating to motor racing; it will promote not only the Grand Prix.

The Bill extends the definition of 'promote' to include 'organise' and 'conduct', thus giving the board power to organise and conduct an unspecified range of motor racing events in Adelaide, and also to negotiate and enter into agreements for those events. What is meant by this? Is it that Adelaide will seek to stage other major motor racing events which will require Government support? If so, let the Premier say so, so that Parliament may have a better idea of why some of these wider powers are being sought.

With an adequate explanation, there may well be good reason why this particular extension of the board's powers should be supported. However, my Party has much deeper concern in relation to the new powers, because the board will have to provide advisory, consultative and managerial services to promoters or other persons associated with the conduct of sporting, entertainment or other special events or projects.

Read in conjunction with the further provision that the board can undertake such other functions as the Minister (in this instance, the Premier) may approve from time to time, these amendments amount to a far-reaching extension of the board's powers, again without any adequate explanation by the Premier in his second reading speech. If the Premier wanted to placate any concerns about the introduction of this Bill, his second reading speech might well have explained all those points to members of Parliament so that we could be in a position to judge on merit the Bill and its clauses relating to the extension of power. The second reading speech was silent on many of these matters.

My fundamental concern is that, with the guarantee of the taxpayer, the board is to take a wider entrepreneurial role. This will mean that yet another South Australian statutory body will act in direct competition with the private sector. The area of organising, promoting and conducting major sporting and entertainment events is competitive and often high risk. It is not a role that a Government body should have.

The Bob Lotts and Paul Daintys of this world have not been given $6 million of taxpayers' money to stake their claim in the commercial world, as has the Grand Prix Board. To set it on its way, the board received a $1 million State Government Jubilee grant and a $5 million Commonwealth grant. It continues to have access to loans at Government concessional rates—another advantage over private sector competitors. While the board has made losses on the first three races, it has improved its financial position. At the same time, its administration and debt servicing costs have increased significantly.

Salaries cost $880 000 in 1987, compared with $383 000 in 1985 when the board's work was at its most onerous with the challenge of staging the first event. General administrative costs were $433 000 in 1987, compared with $263 000 in 1985, while debt servicing costs amount to $460 000—well over double what they were in 1985. Obviously, in seeking to do more, the board will have to spend even more; and it will enter fields in which there is already strong and healthy competition in the private sector.

The board has already acquired major interests in two South Australian based companies, but there has been no explanation from the Premier. These moves, into Goodsports Pty Ltd and Arena Promotional Facilities, have resulted in the board making a direct investment of $100 000 and taking out loans of $213 000. Ultimately, if these investments do not pay off, the taxpayer is liable. The taxpayer therefore deserves much more explanation and justification than the Premier has so far provided of why he wants the board to take on a wide entrepreneurial role.

On the face of it, I see no reason for allocating and exposing taxpayers' money for this purpose. Current developments in Western Australia require all State Governments to reassess their commercial activities. In its own way, over the past six years, this Government has extended the reach of the public sector into many areas of private sector activity such as the timber industry, real estate, insurance and financial services.

Where the private sector already is providing services and there is healthy competition to ensure that consumers have choice at prices set by an efficient and informed market, there is no need for Government involvement. The Grand Prix Board was established to promote one event—a very special event requiring significant Government involvement because of its nature. I have no dispute with that.

However, I cannot accept, in the absence of any justification from the Premier, that South Australian taxpayers should be underwriting a sporting promoter and a concert promoter to compete with private enterpreneurs in these areas who are willing to risk their own capital to serve the public. Under this Bill, the board could undertake these activities anywhere in the world, and my concerns about this matter are increased when the proposed new procedures of the board are considered.

Clause 4 of the Bill could result in some members of the board, who do not agree with or approve of board policy, being frozen out of board discussions and decisions. For example, if the city council opposed a particular proposal by the board because it could adversely affect the city or ratepayers, a meeting could be held without involving the Lord Mayor or the City Engineer, who are both members of the board, and the decision of that meeting taken in their absence would be entirely legal and enforceable. This clause suggests a mode of operation in which impromptu meetings are held at the drop of a hat and *ad hoc* decisions are made without full board approval.

Again, the Premier has given no real explanation of the need for these new procedures. The lack of justification from the Premier is also concerning in view of what I suspect will be requirements faced by the board to inject even more capital into the Grand Prix itself, let alone the other extended activities proposed. The Premier only hinted at this in his second reading speech when he said:

> If Adelaide is to secure this premium event on a long-term basis, we must accept and agree to meet the ever changing international criteria which apply to all Formula One world championship promoters in 16 countries around the world. The FIA, as the international body responsible for controlling the sport, considers this area of paramount concern. To this end, it has issued a complete manual of new rules, design and other standards to which all Formula One promoters around the world must adhere.

What precisely does this mean? Again, the Premier's second reading explanation is silent. I suspect it means that, to secure the event for the long-term future, further injections of capital will be required to upgrade the track and associated facilities. If this is the case, what are the implications for taxpayers and for further encroachment onto the parklands? These and other issues will be questioned by the Opposition in the Committee stage.

There is no doubt that the Grand Prix has majority public support, but this fact will not deflect the Opposition from raising the very legitimate questions which arise from the introduction of this Bill—questions begged by the lack of supporting explanation provided by the Premier during his second reading speech. This Bill does very much more than the Premier has admitted. I hope its introduction in Grand Prix week is not an attempt by the Premier to use the public

popularity of this event to pressure Parliament to give the legislation—or any legislation—less scrutiny than it deserves when it comes before Parliament.

As I have said, the Opposition will give complete support to the repeal of the sunset clause. I emphasise that this, according to both the Premier and FOCA, is the only obstacle standing in the way of securing the race in the long term, but the other issues I have raised demand answers from the Premier. In the absence of satisfactory explanations, the Opposition will not resile from its duty to ensure that this Bill does not lead to the expenditure of more taxpayers' money than necessary and does not expose efficient private sector entrepreneurs to unfair Government competition.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I want to underline what the Leader has just said about the Opposition's support—and my own support in particular—for the Grand Prix as we have come to know it. It is something of which this State can be justifiably proud. Notwithstanding that fact, it is necessary for the Premier to understand that we will not accept—nor would any thinking South Australian—that it is in any way legitimate for the Government to give the Grand Prix Board *carte blanche* to go into business in any enterprise or activity that it wished in opposition to existing entrepreneurial interests in this State and, more particularly, in what is and always has been a very high risk area. Whether or not the members for Fisher and Bright have any respect for you, Mr Acting Speaker, by turning their backs, it is not appropriate for the Premier to imagine—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): The member for Murray-Mallee will resume his seat. The member for Bright has a point of order.

Mr ROBERTSON: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I point out to the House and to the honourable member opposite that I was not turning my back to the Premier or anybody else.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr ROBERTSON: It is a point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is no point of order.

Mr ROBERTSON: It is a point of order in the sense that—if you want it spelled out for you—I am asking the member to withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Acting Speaker, I apologise to the member for Bright. I meant to name the member for Briggs in conjunction with the member for Fisher. Notwithstanding their rudeness to you—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Murray-Mallee had been addressing his remarks to the Bill before the Chair, no point of order would have been taken, and I ask him to do so now.

Mr LEWIS: I am not sure what you were telling me, Sir, as I could not hear, but I will get on with my remarks relevant to this Bill. The Premier's proposal to amend the Grand Prix legislation is quite acceptable to the Opposition except for the provision that he wishes to quietly slip in, in an unassuming way, to enable the Grand Prix Board to use taxpayers' money as the base capital and go into other risk ventures outside the Formula One Grand Prix week activities.

The Premier should have told all members of Caucus—if he has not done so already—that that was the intention of this simple amendment. I think only one clause in the Bill addresses that aspect, and it provides that the Grand Prix Board can go into these enormously risky ventures into which other entrepreneurs can go if they wish. I do not think that it is appropriate for the Grand Prix Board—which is a Government-backed body; it is not even a quango—to get involved in such high risk ventures. Nor do I think it appropriate for the board to compete with private enterprise on that basis. The Premier should have been honest about that, especially in his second reading speech—but he was not.

We in the Opposition, understanding the undesirability of that one aspect of this legislation, have now drawn it to the attention of the House and indicated to the Government that we support every other part of the Bill—as we have supported all previous measures in relation to the Grand Prix that have been brought into this House—except that one. We will not let the Premier get away with it. The Government needs to be better informed of what the legislation contains.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I am talking about other members—they need to be better informed by the Premier. I cannot imagine for a moment that members opposite would want to support a provision in law which enables a Government instrumentality, such as the Grand Prix Board, to go into business in any venture it chooses without further reference to this House. Yet, as we can see from reading the measure, that is exactly what the amendment does. It enables the board, without further reference to this House, to go into any of those very dangerous and highly risky entrepreneurial activities that it may choose from time to time, and they can be quite outside Grand Prix week and quite detached from anything to do with Formula One motor car racing.

I do not know how many members opposite were aware of that fact, but from the looks of astonishment on their faces I believe they were not aware. Now that they are aware they may choose to require the Premier to be a little more frank with them on such matters in future, and they should understand why the Opposition has intimated that it will attempt to sensibly and sensitively deal with that aspect of the legislation and ensure that it is set up appropriately and properly as a separate part of the legislation in the statute book.

Whether it is done here or in another place does not really matter, but we must remove those provisions from the Bill. We must ensure that, if the Government ever gets involved in these kinds of risk venture, at least the Parliament will know about it. Accordingly, the Government would be required to introduce separate legislation for each such venture in which it wished to become involved.

Philosophically, we do not believe that money, which is taken out of the purses of taxpayers who are trying to run households, should be put at risk in that kind of venture. It is not appropriate, and a public service is not being rendered by such a venture. Indeed, there is very good reason for the Opposition's view that Governments should never become involved with that kind of venture. Such a venture would compete with other private sector corporations which can and will take up entrepreneurial opportunities with or without Government assistance. More importantly, the private sector pays taxes, but the Government cannot tax itself. If the opportunity for the private sector to become involved in these ventures is removed in favour of a Government instrumentality, then not only is the opportunity for investment by private risk takers removed but also the amount of revenue which the Government can collect in the form of taxes is reduced.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Exactly. Those other businesses which are still left in the private sector will have to carry the additional

tax burden and finance all Government services because, although the Government venture might pay indirect taxation on goods or services, it would not have to pay any direct tax. I hope that all members understand the seriousness of the situation. I do not know whether or not the Premier realises that this clause makes it possible for the Grand Prix Board to go into any business venture which is totally unconnected to the Formula One Grand Prix week. It can do that without any further consultation with Parliament. Let us ensure that that situation does not occur and that anything the Government does is, in the first instance, accounted for in this Parliament and that the Government remains accountable to Parliament. It is bad policy and bad law to allow Government agencies to have this *carte blanche* power to decide how to invest, to put at risk and perhaps to squander taxpayers' money.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I enjoy the Grand Prix, which I think is a tremendously well organised event. It has certainly brought national and international acclaim to this State. Further, it has boosted the tourist industry, but we will never be able to quantify that benefit. I believe it is very difficult to quantify the spin-off effects on the economy of this State. From time to time it is stated that the Grand Prix runs at a loss and I would be very interested at some stage to hear how the Premier quantifies this loss. How does one determine the flow of cash through the State when it is related to the number of people who stay in hotels? They may travel here by car or by bus, but they then spend money in shops and in businesses. How do we determine the number of people who go to the pictures while they are here and how much money they spend?

There is no doubt that the Grand Prix has put Adelaide on the map. The Grand Prix officials do an extraordinarily good job and their expertise increases year by year. However, the provision relating to the Grand Prix Board's being allowed to move out of its accepted role of organising the Grand Prix into other ventures does concern me. As the Premier said, the expertise now associated with the event is an invaluable asset for the State. My difficulty with the Bill is as to how we utilise that asset as such. Obviously, the board has an enormous amount of knowledge available to it, so should we confine it to organising the Grand Prix, or should we allow it to go outside that area and offer services in an advisory capacity? Further, do we allow it to acquire shares and to set up companies? It is the last matter with which I have some difficulty. I have been informed by a colleague (and perhaps the Premier could confirm this) that the Grand Prix Board already operates companies which are involved in grandstand manufacturing and clothing manufacturing.

I freely admit that the Grand Prix Board is competent and has the expertise to run the Grand Prix, but I fail to understand the philosophical reasons for the board's moving into private enterprise. Plenty of clothing companies are battling to maintain turnovers and plenty of engineering firms are perfectly capable of diversifying and moving into the grandstand manufacturing area. I fail to understand why the Grand Prix Board, through the Government, is now moving into the private sector.

This provision reflects a much wider debate. Over the past three or four years, the Government has increasingly become involved in the private sector through the medium of Government instrumentalities. We have seen the movement of the State Bank into the private sector; and we have seen the Government use Beneficial Finance Corporation and its associated companies to become involved in the private sector. It has become involved in the sale of products, merchandise and services which have normally been the prerogative of the private sector. We have seen the Government use Myles Pearce and the Executor Trustee and Agency Company to become involved in and run in competition with the private sector. We have seen the State Superannuation Fund and many more Government instrumentalities competing directly with the private sector. And now we see the Grand Prix Board moving out to become involved in the private sector. I suppose, if one was a democratic socialist, this would sound like good, heady stuff but I, as a recognised conservative, one who believes in private enterprise above all else, find this most offensive.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The member for Fisher, who we all know is a committed democratic socialist, is very happy to see the Government go off through the medium of Beneficial Finance Corporation. The honourable member probably does not know what I am talking about. If he had read the newspaper, he would have seen that Beneficial Finance Corporation, the State Bank, Myles Pearce, and the Executor Trustee and Agency Company were moving out their tentacles to become involved in the private sector. He would also know that the Grand Prix Board is being orchestrated to move out and become involved in the private sector. I know that the honourable member opposite does not believe this because he is a socialist, but I happen to believe that the Government of this State has no right to move out and compete with the private sector.

The Grand Prix Board has expertise available to it and its officers are well paid to run the Grand Prix. I have no argument with that. They do it well, and they have brought credit to this State. But they have absolutely no right to become involved in and compete with the private sector as another instrumentality of Government.

I also take this opportunity to put on record the case of those thousands of Adelaidians whose lives are disrupted by the Grand Prix (they do it freely and they put up with it) and who are then denied the right to watch it on television. I know that the reason for the delay of the announcement on the television coverage is to try to generate more ticket sales, but members must freely admit that there are thousands of Adelaidians around this city whose lives are disrupted, who would perhaps never go to the Grand Prix but who, I believe, should be entitled to know that they can at least watch the event on television if they choose. The rest of the world will view this spectacle on television. Those thousands of Adelaidians who put up with this disruption for two or three weeks should at least know that they will be able to watch the Grand Prix on television. On behalf of those people, I ask the Premier to ensure that the telecast for the local residents goes ahead.

With the exception of the provision on the extension of the activities of the Grand Prix Board into the private sector, I support the Bill. I have very carefully put on record my objection as to the way in which the Government is using the Grand Prix Board as an extension of its other moves out into the private sector. The Government has used SAFA, the State Bank, Myles Pearce, the Executor Trustee and Agency Company and the like. Notwithstanding my philosophical difference of opinion with members opposite, I support the rest of the Bill.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I am more than happy to support the Bill and I do so with a great deal of enthusiasm. The board, which was established under the principal Act, has received from speakers both on this occasion and on previous occasions when the Act has been amended nothing but acclamation and support. The activities of the members

of that board in the way they have staged the Grand Prix, managed the Grand Prix, and organised the finances of the Grand Prix Board have received nothing but support. The expressions of confidence in the activities of the members of the board are obviously well founded; there is no doubt about that at all. I might say that the activities of the board have been in response to a large range of suggestions, amendments and, indeed, pressure from a variety of people.

The seating arrangements in various places around the Grand Prix track have been improved as a direct consequence of comments made to members of the board by the public who, after the first Grand Prix, felt that the rake of the seats, particularly in Rundle Road, was not as high as it could have been and that consequently their enjoyment of the Grand Prix was impeded. The board responded to those comments which were forthcoming as a result of community consultation after the Grand Prix and improved the quality and the rake of the seats. Indeed, it has provided a range of other facilities around the course and in the centre of the track. For the board to be able to do this, particularly in respect of seating, it has had to have absolute control over the provision of seating—to be able to use it, and to have access to it over the month or so leading up to the Grand Prix, during the four days of the Grand Prix, and in the days after the Grand Prix when the seating is dismantled.

In order to do this, the board became involved with a company through which that control over seating could be effected. It had control of design; it was able to amend it in response to advice received from the consulting engineers; and it was able to make changes in response to suggestions made by the public. But that action also enabled it, with that extra resource, to bring finances into the operations of the Grand Prix as a consequence of its being able to lease those seats not just in South Australia but indeed in many other places around Australia. I understand that negotiations have been going on so that those facilities, that capital resource which the Grand Prix Board now has at its disposal through a holding company, can be leased overseas, to other Grand Prix organisers as well. Those seats have been designed so that they are the optimum.

I believe that the operations of the board in its being responsive to the demands made and ensuring the best utilisation of the financial and physical resources at its disposal should be supported. I found rather odd the comments made by some members in this debate criticising the way in which the board is managing the financial and physical resources at its disposal. The Leader of the Opposition had obviously read the annual report, because from the report he cited the numerous awards that have been won by the Grand Prix Board and the Grand Prix administrators for their conduct of the three previous Grand Prix. Indeed, he endorsed the concept. But he seemed to question whether or not the board was going beyond power and whether the power that he suggested would be given to it in this case would lead it beyond what was appropriate.

The objectives of the Grand Prix Board were also set out in the annual report, which listed all the awards that the organisation and its individual executives have received. The objectives are the enhancement of employment opportunities for the residents of the State and other Australians; the stimulation of the local economy through the provision of new opportunities; and the promotion of Adelaide, South Australia and Australia on an international level to encourage increased and tangible foreign interests in local industry development. So, the board as it has operated over the past three years had the responsibility of ensuring that South Australia and Adelaide were being promoted and that Adelaide business opportunities were being created. I believe that the approach taken by the board has led to extensive and widespread community support not only for the event but for the operations of the board itself.

Even though the Leader, the member for Murray-Mallee and the member for Morphett raised the philosophical question of whether in fact the Government should be involved in any commercial operation, no proposals were put to the House by way of amendment that would limit the operations of the board in the way they thought appropriate. In terms of whether or not the Government should engage in commercial operations, which was the point taken by the member for Murray-Mallee, there is a whole range of activities in which the State would be the poorer if the Government were not involved.

Presumably, the member for Murray-Mallee would argue that there should be no Government involvement in an entertainment centre and that, if private industry cannot be involved in getting a satisfactory proposal up for an entertainment centre, it is not the Government's responsibility to be involved in that sort of activity or in the establishment of such things as Technology Park and similar commercial and quasi-commercial operations that are part and parcel of modern government. In fact, taking this argument to its logical conclusion, I suspect that the member for Murray-Mallee would argue that, because the Grand Prix was a commercial event, the Government should not be involved in any way in its organisation.

Of course, I know that the honourable member does not mean that because, at the beginning of his remarks, he said that he did not support such a proposition. Indeed, he supports the Grand Prix, as do all Opposition members, and that is an excellent approach. However, at the same time, the member for Murray-Mallee suggested that the Bill should be amended, although he did not say what those amendments should be. He merely said that he would oppose various clauses of the Bill. He opposed philosophically the general idea of the Government's commercial involvement in any operation and would therefore vote against any amendments in the Bill designed to allow the board to operate sensibly and efficiently using the resources that the Government has already given it. Nevertheless, he foreshadowed no amendment and suggested no proposals for amendment or change: he simply expressed opposition to those sections of the Bill that dealt with what he believed was an unnecessary excursion into commercial areas of operation.

In conclusion, I simply come back to where I began. The board itself has been charged in the principal Act with the responsibility of running the Grand Prix and it must do that with the best use of the financial resources that it has been able to get as a consequence of the initial grants made to it by the State and Federal Governments. It has been able to discharge this responsibility in two successive years without further injection of major Government funds. As a consequence of the way in which the board itself and through its holding companies has managed the original funds and conducted the operations associated with the Grand Prix, the board has not had to make any claims on the public purse.

In fact, the 1987 annual report of the Grand Prix Board indicates a positive cash flow in the board's operations of about $1 million, substantial improvements to the circuit, substantial increases in attendance, and an increased return to the board in the areas of grandstand and general admission ticket sales, corporate hospitality packages and sponsorship. So, the Grand Prix Board is acting responsibly. The amendments in this Bill will give it the capacity to continue

to do so and will ensure that the Grand Prix remains the premier event not only in South Australia but on the national scene as well. I support the Bill.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the Bill and wish to put some points of view as a local member whose constituents are affected most of all by the disruption caused by the Grand Prix. I believe that the South Australian public has a right to ask certain questions, through this Parliament, about any aspect of development of a statutory authority. Since the first Grand Prix, the Grand Prix Board has attempted, successfully, to minimise the disruption to the eastern suburbs. There is no question about the board's desire to improve its communication with the people most seriously affected, namely, those occupying properties along Dequetteville Terrace and in the Rose Park area generally.

In this regard, I congratulate the Grand Prix Board on having done that but, having said that, I point out that there is still massive disruption to constituents in the eastern suburbs and a seeming lack of desire by the Grand Prix Board to explain simply to residents of the eastern suburbs how the limitations to road movement, especially by bus, will occur. The timetables and advertisements published by the State Transport Authority last weekend would require a computer or a computer mind to enable the reader to understand what was occurring, and one would need to be a mathematical genius to understand some of the maps produced and the so-called simple explanations of road closures. Indeed, it behoves the Grand Prix Board to do this sort of thing properly in the interests of those people whose movements are so seriously disrupted by this event.

I am also concerned about communication with the public. Many South Australians cannot afford to attend the Grand Prix and this Parliament, on behalf of all South Australian taxpayers, should guarantee that every member of the South Australian public has a chance to see the Grand Prix on television. It is easy for the Government or for the promoter to say that we must wait until the last minute before deciding whether the Grand Prix can be televised for the benefit of the South Australian public, but we must remember that many South Australians just cannot attend the event and they, as taxpayers, should not be denied the chance to see it. Those people include the young and old in hospital, those who are disadvantaged, and many other people living in the suburbs.

Year after year the same concern is expressed and we are told right at the last minute, 'The Grand Prix will be televised for the South Australian public.' However, that is not good enough. It should be part of the promotional package to ensure that every South Australian can see the event on television. In this regard, I ask the Premier to do what he is so good at doing: announce the good news to South Australia. He should come out early this week and announce that the Grand Prix will be televised for all South Australians. He should not wait until Friday: he should do it now. He should take the opportunity today to let members of the South Australian public know that they will be able to see the Grand Prix on television.

We all know that for many reasons, whether it be Expo, competing events in other States, or economic conditions in our State, considerably fewer tickets have been sold this year, and the chance of our reaching the budgeted figure is highly improbable. We ought to accept that and go out and market the event and get as many people along to it as we can, but give those who cannot go the opportunity to see it on television, without waiting for some grandstanding later in the week.

A couple of areas of the Bill concern me. I was on the original committee that considered this legislation when the two Houses were locked together and we were deciding on 'Grand Prix', 'Formula One', 'Formula 1', and 'Adelaide Alive'. Why do we have to go through this process again? Why do we need to have these words released again when these words were discussed and discarded when this legislation was introduced four years ago? It seems to me that those simple English words should not be locked into legislation but that we should allow people in the community to use them, even though they may be associated with a motor racing event.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I can see that the Premier is laughing. All I seek is an explanation. What are the Premier's problems? Are there commercial opportunities on which the board is missing out? All of those reasons should be in the second reading explanation instead of our having to ask these obvious questions now. In his second reading explanation, the Premier mentions letters of intent, new rules, designs and standards set by FIA. They are really just passing references thrown into the explanation without any reason given. Again, the treatment of this Parliament seems to be 'We'll tell them what they have to know, and then run it out to the public of South Australia by way of a news release.' Parliament does not receive a proper explanation. I ask the Premier to lay such criticisms to rest and clearly explain this matter.

Like the member for Morphett and the Leader of the Opposition, I am concerned about the expansion of the role of statutory authorities into the private sector. Already we have the expansion by the Grand Prix Board into a clothing company, Goodsports Pty Ltd, and the expansion of the Grand Prix Board into Arena Promotions, which is involved directly with the seating aspect. It concerns me that we have another statutory authority getting involved in an area which I believe the private sector could adequately handle. I hope that the Premier will explain why we need the type of expansion provided under this clause in the Bill. I note in the original Act that the Grand Prix Board can in fact go into this area now, so I wonder why we need this further expansion. It is a little like the STA Act before the House recently, where the STA already had the authority to do certain things. As the Grand Prix Board already seems to have the appropriate authority, it seems strange that it is necessary to expand it further. I ask the Premier to explain the matters about which I have expressed concern.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am one who has not been to a Grand Prix.

Mr Tyler: Shame!

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member can say 'shame'. I have nothing against motor racing. I have raced on the track whereas the member for Fisher most probably never has. I raced in smaller class cars and was involved in the operation. On principle I would not attend the Grand Prix because, even though I believe it provides a benefit and is a credit to the State (and many people enjoy it), we were stopped from conducting our operation because it involved Crown land and the people who drew up the lease argued that one person could not lease Crown land. It was an incorporated body, and that involved one person.

When the challenge was raised at the time about the South Australian Jockey Club having the lease of Victoria Park, it was stipulated that the South Australian Jockey Club would have the lease, with the clause contained therein that one other person be involved. When the Grand Prix was placed in the parklands, I decided, after our volunteers had

lost our particular case, that it would be unprincipled for me to attend that event, even though I watch it on television (if I am near one) or my family go and enjoy it. What disappoints me is the haste with which we put legislation through. This may be an important issue that needs to go through quickly; we could at least have the Bill on file, since it was introduced last Wednesday, but we do not, and I find that quite amazing.

Mr Tyler: Copies were circulated.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am aware of that but, if members do not happen to be in the House at the time it is circulated, it may not end up in their possession. The practice is that we do have copies on file. I am not saying that I did not see it: all I am saying is that there is a principle involved with the way the place operates and the speed with which we push through legislation. We put more workload on those who work in the place and we try to speed up the process. There has to be some consideration for those involved in running the place. Usually we have plenty of time to prepare legislation brought before the House. In this case the Premier tells us that he went overseas and somebody whispered in his ear that the Bill restricts them a bit and, 'As we're signing a longer agreement with you, we want you to speed up the passage of an amendment through the House and get it on its way.' So be it. Part of the management of the House should fall within the Deputy Premier's province, so that any action that may help members a little will be taken and so that normal circumstances prevail.

My main concern is that the Grand Prix Board seeks through this Bill, with the Government's support, to move into other ventures. The ALP's attitude of being involved in all sorts of business ventures is quite obvious: it tried in the mid-1970s to move into the hotel business. It virtually succeeded, with the AHA's support, until the little wanderer from the Hills decided to write to all the hotels and let them know what the AHA was doing with them. That Bill was defeated. That was a deliberate move by the ALP to get into the hotel industry. It repeated it recently in a subtle sort of way with a so-called training college. When the drinking age is increased, as Parliament will prescribe at some time in the future (perhaps when I am not here), that venture will not be so successful because they rely on the young ones buying booze to make it successful.

I object to the provision allowing the Grand Prix Board to move into other areas. I believe it is against all the principles enunciated in connection with the Grand Prix. It was not the intention to move into areas in competition with private enterprise and then expect private enterprise to pay high prices for seats in corporate boxes. I know that they do that willingly, but there has to be a cut-off point. If in the future a Labor or Liberal Government wants to get a new venture off the ground under the conduct of a board comprising some of the same personnel as on the Grand Prix Board, so be it.

That is a decision for Parliament. If we vote for this as it is, we will not have much say. We can squeal and yell, but the Government will do what it wants to do, especially if it is early in the parliamentary term. It will be a *fait accompli*. Any competition will be destroyed by the next election so that no-one will be around to complain.

The member for Adelaide suggested that no-one has foreshadowed any amendments. Given my philosophy on this, if I were to move an amendment, the Premier, as is his wont, would say that I oppose the Bill in total. That is the sort of practice that is conducted here. A member can no longer oppose part of a Bill because he or she disagrees with it strongly although that member agrees with the rest of the Bill. The immediate attack is that, if one opposes one part, the whole lot will be thrown out. I am not prepared to do that in a place in which I do not have the numbers. The media are often happy to promote that point of view and not, as is suggested through editorials, that individuals should express their point of view. Immediately that happens, the media says that there is a split or a disagreement. It suits them both ways to give it a bit of a write-up. I oppose quite strongly that aspect of the Bill. If it gets through both Houses of Parliament as is, I hope that there will be a change of Government—and I am sure there will be—before anything else is implemented and the Government of the day will fix it for the future.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I take umbrage at the timing of this legislation. In my opinion it is very poor timing to bring the Bill before Parliament in what is called Grand Prix week, because many aspects of the legislation need thorough investigation. The time has come when the role of the Grand Prix Board and the proposals contained in the legislation should be reviewed. The impression is that the first three Grand Prix were extremely successful. The event is proving to be valuable for tourist development in South Australia and we are led to believe that it has made Adelaide an international destination. I am not sure how many cities take a direct telecast of the Grand Prix, but I know that some European countries take a delayed telecast, so I question whether we get the exposure that we are led to believe.

I am concerned at two aspects of the legislation. We have not been told how much is paid for the royalty in relation to putting on this 'circus', which is what it really is. I am patron of the Auto Cycle Union of South Australia, which is the controlling body of motorcycle sport in this State. I am also a very keen supporter of Formula One and other forms of motor car racing, and have been since a teenager. I was delighted to have the opportunity of attending the first two Grand Prix, watching the races from the Hairpin Stand. However, there comes a time when an assessment must be made of the financial arrangements of this organisation.

With respect to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board, page 248 of the Auditor-General's Report states that, in 1986, the contracts were worth $5 044 million and, in 1987, they were worth $5.518 million. I am led to believe that, to put on the circus, the main contract of the Formula One organisation costs somewhere between $4.5 million and $5 million. It is not cheap entertainment. That is a lot of money to have to lay out or guarantee before the event becomes profitable, and consideration must also be given to the other events that make up Grand Prix week.

I understand the organisational problems. The first event was easy, the second was not too bad, the third proved a challenge and was an exciting Grand Prix, but the fourth event is proving to be difficult. The world drivers championship has been decided, as has the manufacturers championship. The McLaren team has won and won hands down. The Japanese Grand Prix of two weeks ago defeated the opportunity of the Adelaide race deciding the world drivers championship. There is no doubt that the Japanese still have a nasty taste in their mouth about the first Grand Prix. Mitsubishi was enticed to become the sponsor of the first Grand Prix and I thought it did it well, but it has never forgiven us. It was great to see that car manufacturer in South Australia involved in the event, but I know that the company felt let down and did not get value for money from its sponsorship. So, it was an ironic twist of fate that the world championship was decided in Japan this year. The prize-winning engine is a Honda, so no doubt the

manufacturer of Honda engines in Tokyo is absolutely delighted with the result.

The Grand Prix Board must whip up enthusiasm and encourage Australians and followers of the Grand Prix racing circuit around the world to come to Adelaide for this event. That has been part of the difficulty, so it is necessary to put on other events that will attract people, and I am sorry to have to say that we are starting to see the same old, tired events. I know Mal Hemmerling very well and have a lot of respect for him, but he must lift his game if he wants to ensure that people come to Adelaide to watch the Grand Prix and the other events associated with the race. Celebrity races and the like do not attract the majority of people to the event. Something else is needed.

The Government should be mindful that two events have reflected on this year's Grand Prix. The first is World Expo which was held in Brisbane, Queensland, over the past six months. It has taken a tremendous amount of the internal tourist dollar. It was highly successful and has been hailed by citizens throughout this country. What Queensland did with World Expo was outstanding, but it has affected sales for the Adelaide Grand Prix. Secondly, the most important event to hit the motor racing calendar will be the first round next year of the world motorcycle championship at Philip Island. There is no doubt that the opening of ticket sales and arrangements for accommodation to this event in Victoria have hurt the Grand Prix. The person responsible for organising and engineering that event is Bob Barnard. Barnard and Hemmerling were responsible in the main for the engineering, promotion and ideas behind the first two successful Formula One Grand Prix in Adelaide.

The loss of Barnard is being felt in South Australia. It is a tragedy that the Grand Prix Board allowed that partnership to split—and it will have an impact, there is no doubt about that. The world motorcycle championship, to be held on Phillip Island, will exceed all expectations. Tens of thousands of people, if not up to 120 000, will attend that event. In Europe, up to 300 000 people watch Grand Prix motorcycle racing—far greater numbers than watch Formula One. Two years ago, in excess of 500 000 people watched the motorcycle Grand Prix in Amsterdam, Holland. This sport is exciting and popular.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Mount Gambier said, the event was also staged in Nurburgring in West Germany and Ostereichring in Austria, but I did not have the opportunity to see them. It is the most fantastic spectacle that you could wish for. So, we have competition but, let us face it, there are problems. I do not agree that the Grand Prix Board should become involved in entrepreneurial events outside the Grand Prix.

I go back to my earlier statement about the partnership of Barnard and Hemmerling in establishing and engineering the promotion of the Grand Prix. The best entertainment centre concept ever presented to this State was the Barnard proposition at Hindmarsh. If the Premier is listening and is interested in getting an entertainment centre off the ground in this State, I suggest that he takes the matter out of the hands of the Grand Prix Board because whilst it is there that conflict between Hemmerling and Barnard will act to the detriment of the State. If SA FM, Bob Lott and many other entrepreneurs want an entertainment centre for South Australia, let them, in conjunction with the Barnard corporation, come up with a proposition independent of the Government.

To allow the Grand Prix Board to get involved, I believe is wrong. I would go to the Basketball Association of South Australia, which is keen to develop a new headquarters in the new centre, in conjunction with SA FM, the Barnard corporation and any other entrepreneur, and say, 'Let's put a syndicate together and float a public company. Let's ask the public of South Australia to contribute to a new company to build an entertainment centre'. We should not do it through the vehicle of the Grand Prix Board because I do not believe that the expertise and the engineering and promotional ability is there without Bob Barnard. You can call me biased or whatever you like, but I honestly believe that this legislation will not resolve the situation as far as an entertainment centre for South Australia is concerned. All the Government has to do is make the land available, provide a remission on land tax and payroll tax and a few other incentives—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: You do not have to, but I suggest you should. We would then have an entertainment centre that we can be proud of. Let us go back to some of the other entrepreneurial events that the Grand Prix Board has put its finger on. Nobody has mentioned—and they never will—the entrepreneurial event at the Wayville Showgrounds for the first Grand Prix. An oustandingly successful motorcycle event was held at that venue, but there was also an Expo which was an absolute financial disaster. There have been efforts by the Grand Prix Board to control events which ultimately were unsuccessful leading up to and surrounding Grand Prix week. So, I suggest that the Grand Prix Board should keep right out of it.

There was an opportunity to promote speedway. The speedway organisation in South Australia wanted to develop speedway on the Friday and Saturday nights, but it bumped into the Grand Prix Board. The board is stepping into areas in which I honestly believe it has no right to be involved. We should still support the right of private enterprise to get behind and support this Grand Prix, but at the same time the challenge lies with the Grand Prix Board to rejuvenate that organisation without encroaching on areas that are normally left to private enterprise. That is why I am critical of the Government's involvement in the Grand Prix.

I said from day one that I support the Grand Prix. I point out that Bonython and Bill O'Gorman were the brains behind it, but they were never given the credit that they deserved. They would have put together a private enterprise package to run this Grand Prix Board and it would not have cost the taxpayers a penny with respect to initial capital or anything else. It really gets up my nose when I have to work hard and I see my wife and her girlfriends work hard to raise a few hundred dollars so that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital can buy urgently needed medical equipment, and this is going on all the time around the city. However, we can provide millions of dollars out of State Treasury to promote functions which could be run by private enterprise. That is what I find very hard to accept.

The other plea I make to the Premier is that, for goodness sake, he should dispel any problems this afternoon and put the pressure on the Grand Prix Board. We should be saying to the Grand Prix organisation, 'If you want to use our city roads to put on a car race, it is on the condition of a live telecast for the citizens of South Australia.' There are 150 000 people living in poverty in South Australia along with the aged, infirm and disabled, who will be unable to go along to witness this event. Give them the opportunity to see it through the medium of television. It must be a condition of the organisation conducting the Grand Prix in South Australia that the event is telecast live to the people of South Australia. It will not make any difference. The football league found out that it does not make much difference. The basketball association has never had any problems

filling its stadium. In fact, you cannot get a ticket into the Apollo Stadium to see the 36ers; you have to be a season ticket holder. So, this problem with a live telecast is a lot of nonsense. I would like to know how much Channel 9 pays for the rights to telecast the Grand Prix. I do not think it is all that much when one considers the cost of putting on the event. For goodness sake, give the people of South Australia a fair go!

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I will take one minute on this subject. For a person who has smelt the gasoline and drunk in the atmosphere of the Grand Prix, I can say that it is a memorable experience. I am sure that everybody here who has paid for a ticket to, and attended, the Grand Prix feels exactly the same way—it is an experience not to be missed. Having said that, there are two comments I wish to make: first, I think it is very smelly politics of the Premier to announce in London that there is some doubt about the Opposition supporting the event, given its unequivocal support of this project over a period. If ever there was a bipartisan topic of this Parliament it was certainly the Grand Prix. I do not think that the statement did credit to the Premier or the person who put together that press release.

The second point—and it is probably more important with respect to the long-term future of the Grand Prix in South Australia—relates to profit. I do not believe that South Australia can afford to run this event at a loss. It should never run at a loss. If it had been run in America, it would have made a profit in the first year and would have made larger profits thereafter.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will not delay the House, as I promised to speak for only one minute. Whilst there is some justification in providing capital investment in the first year, because it is necessary to put in the infrastructure, the fact remains that we have a very high profile and saleable asset: which should be exploited to the extent that this State should not suffer a loss because somebody cannot administer it properly. My comments reflect on the fact that I do not believe it is appropriate for members of the Grand Prix Board to extend their tentacles further. They should look at their performance and say, 'Have we done this State justice? Now that we have such a good event why are we not making a profit out of it?' We cannot afford to keep taking from the taxpayers' pocket.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): If the Premier speaks he closes the debate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This debate has not been a terribly pleasant one and the Leader of the Opposition certainly set the tone when he said that the Opposition supported the Bill but in the most limited way possible, and with all sorts of qualifications. The start was good. In fact, my notes say, 'Thank Opposition for support.' Then, as the Leader of the Opposition developed his remarks and, because of all the qualifications, that comment in my notes became totally inappropriate. He praised the board, which incidentally is something that other members of his Party have not been prepared to do. On the contrary, there is a severe lack of confidence in the board on the part of a number of his colleagues, including the member for Mitcham, the member for Hanson and the Opposition spokesman on recreation and sport, so the Leader of the Opposition's confidence in or praise of the board was not shared by other members of his Party.

Having praised the board, the Leader of the Opposition went on to complain about administration costs and he drew attention to how they have risen—the usual snide relationship of two things in order to make sure that the overall impression is of something wrong or that something suspicious is going on. He made this matter seem quite complicated when in fact it is quite simple. He suggested some sinister purpose in the amendments when there is none whatsoever. They are based on the experience of—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order. His speech was listened to in silence and I ask that the same courtesy be extended to the Premier. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I feel obliged to defend the Grand Prix Board, its efficiency and its effectiveness. Further, I feel obliged to defend proposals which will increase and enhance that effectiveness in operation. There is nothing sinister about this and there is no intention to compete with private enterprise or in other ways to undermine activity in this State—on the contrary. The Leader of the Opposition complained of a lack of explanation or justification, but he then went on to imply that, whatever I say, it will not be satisfactory. We know that. I could supply as much information as possible and make the most lengthy explanation, but I could guarantee the House that, at the end of this debate, we would still be told that the Government has not been open, frank or honest and that it has not presented the information.

We get these complaints all the time and we are getting used to them, but nonetheless it has been set up in order to have that situation. The same situation will apply in the Legislative Council, where it will be pushed to a vote and we will probably be placed in some similar crisis to that which occurred in 1984. The groundwork has been laid and that is why I speak in this vein. I understand what the Opposition is doing. It is not just damn with faint praise—assent with a leer; it goes much further than that. It juxtaposes this concept of some kind of secret agenda or some kind of mysterious thing that will be wreaked upon the people of South Australia.

Most of the comments made ignored the high cost of the event. We all accept that it is a very expensive business to set down a street circuit every year. It is an ongoing cost and we cannot avoid it, but we can try to reduce it by efficiencies and technological improvements, and by having some control over the equipment and facilities which we provide. In relation to the point made about the private sector being competitive, if the private sector was totally competitive in all these areas in an event of this scale, there would be no problem, but it is a fact that, at Grand Prix time, on a number of occasions a supplier—the only source of supply—has been in a monopolistic situation and has been able to dictate the price that the Grand Prix Board will pay. It is probably very sensible for the Grand Prix Board to have some of its in-house capacity in order to ensure that it has some sort of bargaining position in the market place.

Secondly, if it has that capacity, why should it sit idly in store for the rest of the year? What is wrong with trying to get better value for the taxpayers of this State and defraying the costs of the event by making that equipment work for us, as was the case in the 1988 bicentennial celebrations at the Sydney Opera House? Let us ensure that we get maximum value. If we are to get maximum value from equipment and materials, why can we not get maximum value from expertise also? In other words, a sinister plot is not involved but, rather, it is a question of making the most of a marvellous resource. I know that the Opposition does not have any confidence in that resource and that it believes that that resource should be constrained to the most narrow

of parameters, but I believe that the board has a proven record which is an asset to this State and we ought to use it as an asset where it is appropriate. To deny the board the right to do so simply adds to the cost overheads of staging the event. If we are to have this event long term, we have to find ways of defraying those overheads.

It is interesting also to note the conflict over the value of the event. The shadow Minister (the member for Bragg) really remains to be convinced that we are getting value for money. The member for Mitcham goes even further; at every single opportunity he claims that the event makes a loss. Actually, the financial performance of the event is very good indeed. However, I concede that the member for Morphett hit the nail right on the head when he mentioned that it was difficult to compute the value of having the State's hotel rooms, restaurants, services and facilities fully utilised. The so-called clawback effect to Government of this event outweighs the direct cost of staging it. Studies have been done to demonstrate that fact. Although those studies do not convince some members of the Opposition, fortunately they convince others. We are in no doubt as to the economic and financial value of this event.

I have not dealt with the promotional and other aspects of this event that all have values, but surely we come back to the core point: if we are to stage this event in the current manner, we have to ensure that it is staged as cost effectively as possible. If we are to have an organisation with this skill and expertise, then we want to obtain maximum use of it. It is a sound business principle and I am amazed that the Opposition does not endorse it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr OLSEN: I refer to the letters of intent which were exchanged between the Premier and Mr Ecclestone in the Premier's recent overseas trip. When must this legislation be proclaimed to allow those letters of intent to have effect?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Quite clearly, any contract which is signed cannot have effect until the legislation is proclaimed, because any contract that is worth writing will extend beyond the period of the Act. The Bill was introduced last Wednesday and we anticipate that it will pass this House today, or that is the way in which the week's program has been constructed. It has taken a little longer so far and one hopes that it will pass in this place and it can then go before the other place this evening and be placed on its Notice Paper. I hope that the other place will be able to deal with it if not this week then during next week so that, by the end of next week, the Act will be in position. The proclamation depends upon the Governor in Executive Council so, once the Act is in position, the contracts can be arranged. I hope that we can deal with this Bill with some despatch so that we know where we stand.

Mr OLSEN: There is no problem in dealing with it with some despatch. Does it have to be completed by Thursday in terms of any contractual commitments that might or might not be entered into by the Premier and FOCA this weekend? I take it from the Premier's remarks that, if it is completed by Thursday week, that will not interfere with the arrangements that are in hand for contractual commitments. Do the letters of intent form any part of the contract, or is there a contract still to be signed with Mr Ecclestone in relation to the extension?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is a contract still to be signed and it is still under negotiation.

Mr OLSEN: Do the contract and the letters of intent extend the period of the contract for five or ten years, or is there no specified date?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is still under negotiation at the moment. The extent of the commitment that Mr Ecclestone was prepared to give to me in London was a three-year extension. We are naturally seeking a longer one than that.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier release the letters of intent?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I released them in London two weeks ago.

Mr INGERSON: Supplementary to that, are those letters of intent available to the Parliament?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They are available to the public, the media, and certainly to members of Parliament.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier confirm that the only clause affecting the future of the race is the last one relating to the sunset provision?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I will not confirm that, because I believe that, looking into the future, the board has to have some flexibility in terms of its operations. If we are not able initially to secure a contract of some 10 years or so, we would like to see it on a rolling basis. Circumstances can change; we need to have the confidence to write. It is not just a simple fact of the Act's expiring. I believe that a number of these provisions, some of which relate to when reports and finances are made available and so on, are certainly necessary in case the date changes in some fundamental way. In terms of powers of the board it may be that ancillary or other events become part of its charter over time. If we have to come back and amend the Act every time this happens, our flexibility, the opportunity if you like, becomes very limited. I would think that any Government in office in future needs to have that flexibility or that opportunity.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr INGERSON: Under the interpretation provision the current Grand Prix insignia effectively under copyright are the Adelaide Formula One Grand Prix, Adelaide Grand Prix, Adelaide Alive, Adelaide Formula One, Fair Dinkum Formula One, and Formula One Grand Prix, and under this clause Grand Prix, Formula One, Formula 1, and Adelaide Alive are included alone or in combination with other words. Why is it necessary to broaden this area of effective copyright, given the rights it would deny other people to use these words without payment to the board?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These changes, in large part, are brought about by the greater tightening of FIA in relation to protecting Formula One insignia and the various expressions that go with Formula One Grand Prix. As was discussed in 1984, it is not our intention to unreasonably restrict people from using these terms and I think the practice has worked out quite well, but we are required to have a tight lead of sanction if some problem arises, and we certainly are required to satisfy FIA in this respect. The existing Act does not satisfy FIA.

Mr INGERSON: How much did the board earn last year and in 1986 from the use of the Grand Prix insignia?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I might have to take that question on notice. Some of these matters would be covered in the Grand Prix annual report, which I presume the honourable member has consulted. The 1987 report has been tabled, of course.

Mr INGERSON: I point out (and I have made this comment once previously in the House) that the detail in the Grand Prix Board report does not set out specifically

where the income comes from in this area. I understand that there are certainly royalties that the board wishes to protect, but I do not believe this information is there, and that is the reason for my question. Did the board reject any proposals last year for the use of Grand Prix insignia and, if so, can the Premier give details? Has the board launched any prosecution for unauthorised use of its insignia?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No prosecutions have been necessary, but certainly many letters of warning have been required. Sometimes they are mild and sometimes they have to be, effectively, legal warnings of impending prosecution. So, at this stage, thankfully, people are cooperating, but there is no question that they have to be told. Referring to the previous question, I am told that we do have to protect some of the arrangements in this area, but it involves about $500 000.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Procedures of Board.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6—Leave out 'a number of members not less than that required for a quorum of the Board' and insert 'all members of the Board.'

Members will be familiar with this clause; a similar clause has appeared in previous Bills in relation to boards of this kind and the one which comes readily to mind is the Government Financing Authority legislation. But the provision basically is one which enables urgent matters to be decided, in effect, by telephone, by personal meeting or indeed by mail, I suppose. A quorum of the members of the board can in effect be the board for the purposes of making that kind of decision. This, of course, is something which can be very useful for a board like the Grand Prix Board when it is required to make urgent and expedient decisions. Unfortunately, it can also have a number of drawbacks. Obviously, if the secretary or chairman of the board consulted only with a minority of board members, board members who were not consulted, who had a special interest in the matter, might well have been able to sway their colleagues in a particular decision, and that of course might have changed the result. While I am not suggesting that any chairman or secretary of the board would not act properly in this respect, one has to be careful with these kinds of provisions, because they allow extraordinary departure from the normal course of decision-making which a board like this would adopt.

I have particular concern also with this clause, because it enables a quorum of the board to make these decisions. If the board has its complement of nine members envisaged in the principal Act, the quorum as determined by the Act is made up of four members. It is not an absolute majority, as has been suggested in relation to this Bill, but rather it is made up of four members, as I interpret the clause; the principal Act requires that we disregard any fraction after dividing the number of members by two and, if the board had nine members, that would lead to a four member group making fundamental decisions. If my understanding of this provision is correct, that could leave five members of the board perhaps opposed to the decision. Decisions could be made without reference to those members. I am not suggesting that that will occur, but it is possible. That aspect is undesirable and requires further attention.

My provision to insert 'all members' will certainly create difficulties for a board such as the Grand Prix Board, but deputies are available and the board itself regulates the calling of meetings, so a valid meeting could be called within hours if required and, if the absent members and their deputies could not attend, a valid meeting could be held, and I should be much more satisfied with it. I move my amendment not only because I believe it is necessary given the nature of this, but also to draw attention to the provision so that the Government may consider it further, if necessary.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I take the honourable member's point, which is reasonable. We must have care in how the clauses are drawn. It is intended to facilitate not only decisions on major matters but also the making of quick decisions by a board whose members may be travelling or be resident in another State. For instance, the CAMS representative resides in Perth and it is not always easy for him to jump on a plane quickly to attend a meeting here. As the honourable member has pointed out, there is the power to appoint deputies in certain circumstances.

We will consider the honourable member's comments about the way in which this formulation would operate. Although at this stage I oppose the amendment, I assure the honourable member that the matter will be considered and a possible formula, whether that proposed by the honourable member or a similar one, will be moved in the Legislative Council.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I accept the Premier's assurance.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 5—'Functions and powers of Board.'

Mr OLSEN: Has any member of the Grand Prix Board resigned recently?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Mr Bill O'Gorman.

Mr OLSEN: Why has he resigned?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Basically, he now resides in Sydney and has other business interests. Although he has resigned from the board, he will still have a relationship with the Grand Prix as a special adviser or consultant to the board.

Mr OLSEN: The principal Act provides that the main function of the board is to undertake on behalf of the State the promotion of Australian Formula One Grand Prix. Under this amendment, the board would be required, in addition to that function, to negotiate and enter into agreements not only in relation to the Grand Prix but also in relation to other motor events. In relation to the Grand Prix, why is the board now to be empowered to negotiate and enter into other agreements as well as to promote the event?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Purely because the board has developed specific expertise, which means that it is an extremely useful resource. There may be matters that are ancillary but at some remove in which the board could be productively involved on behalf of the State or by which it could enhance its core function of running the Grand Prix. Therefore, we believe that it should have that power, although the extent to which it will exercise that power we do not know at this stage. However, if it has that power, it will have the flexibility to respond to opportunities that may arise.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to the board's power to secure and promote other motor racing events, are any other such events contemplated that would entail the board or the administration expanding its range of activities? If so, what are they?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, there are not specifically at present, although there has been talk of a power boat event, which has received some publicity. Promoters or those wishing to stage such events may seek out the Grand Prix Board. That has been our experience (interstate, interestingly enough) and in such situations those promoters may invite the board to be a partner or join in the staging or some other aspect of an event. This power would enable it to do that or put beyond doubt the ability to do it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Premier was asked today about the possible need to extend the Grand Prix track. Has he further information on that matter? He said that this matter would be discussed under the Bill. What extensions of the track will be needed and what is the anticipated cost of such extensions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot add to that at this stage, because those matters are all part of discussions and negotiations concerning future events. I simply stated that, depending on the number of teams involved and the requirements of the promoters, more space might be required. If it is, the track would have to be extended, negotiations conducted sensitively, and the extension properly planned so as not to impede the existing uses of the Victoria Park course. As I said previously, the area of flexibility is in the paddock of the course. The existing track has not proved intrusive or a problem, so I do not expect there to be any problem in accommodating the event if that should prove necessary. However, it is too early to indicate what is proposed, the designs, and what dislocation might take place.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Bearing in mind the new rules and the possible need to extend the pit area, can the Premier release a copy of the new rules that have been agreed by the FIA?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The FIA publishes a manual of requirements for Grand Prix operators, but it is not my document to release. Indeed, I do not know that it is in the public domain. It has been formulated by the FIA as part of its requirements. It is a technical document that must be complied with by the Grand Prix Board and it is not our property to publish.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I did not know whether it was a public document that could be made available, and that aspect should be clarified. The board can negotiate and enter into agreements on behalf of the State in relation to the Grand Prix. In relation to the current contract being negotiated to secure the race in the longer term, what fee is payable to FOCA and will that fee escalate in future? If it will, on what basis has the escalation been agreed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The fee is at the core of the contractual arrangement with FOCA. As I said in reply to a question on notice on this matter, the amounts paid to FOCA in accordance with the contract cannot be released prospectively. Obviously, it has a figure and so have we, and that is a matter of detail and very complex negotiation because it is affected by exchange rate fluctuations, what aspect of the event is covered under escalation clauses, and so on. It is, as I say, part of the commercial core of the negotiation going on. I am not directly involved in that and, at such stage as some sort of agreement or parameters of agreement are reached, it will be as the responsible Minister referred to me. Essentially, it is a commercial transaction.

Mr S.J. Baker: How do we know whether we've got a good deal?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The only way you could tell whether you got a good deal is, first, by knowing the details of every other FOCA contract around the world, and obviously that is not possible. Secondly, you look at the accounts and results of the Grand Prix Board over the years. So far I think the deal has been very acceptable. There is no way that Parliament and the public can judge whether we have a good deal in the sense that the member is talking about.

Mr INGERSON: The Premier has virtually given us a scenario which suggests that we may have to extend the track, and obviously, if that is necessary, Pit Straight and other areas will probably also need to be extended. There must be some sort of estimate of cost for that sort of extension and, surely, that would be part of this new contractual arrangement. Can the Premier give us any idea of the estimated cost that the Grand Prix Board will face with this future development?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Anything from about $1 million to $10 million could be involved in capital improvements and so on. Some of those improvements may be necessary, anyway, whether or not there is an extension of the track. We must accept that there will always be capital requirements. Each year sometimes minor and—for this year's event—major capital expenditure is needed to improve the facilities and the track itself. That will certainly continue. As the promoters of the event and the owners of the track, we have to bear those costs, and so far we have managed to do that. We received initial support from the Federal Government. If any major expenditure is contemplated in the future, I would hope that we could get further support from it, because of the international significance of the event.

Mr INGERSON: New subsection (1) *(d)* gives the board power 'to provide advisory, consultative or managerial services to promoters or other persons associated with the conduct of sporting, entertainment or other special events or projects, whether within or outside the State'. Precisely why are these powers necessary?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, to make clear that the board is able to provide that sort of assistance. Secondly, there is a clear opportunity for the board to provide those sorts of services. Thirdly, if they are provided, they can be provided for a fee, thus earning the board money which can in turn defray the costs of the event. There have been some examples. Members may recall that, when the Three Day Event was running into trouble, the Grand Prix Board was called in to assist with a number of aspects of that event. By so doing, it ensured that the event was staged extremely successfully. It was not able to prevent the financial losses but, with its technical and other support, it was able to assist the operation of the event.

I have already mentioned the advice given and the supply of facilities to organisers of the Australia Day celebrations on 26 January in Sydney. It is a big feather in our cap. It was rather good to be in Sydney and to say to people in front of the Opera House, 'This event is truly national because some of the equipment used comes from South Australia,' the expertise that South Australia developed in the outdoor stand area through our Grand Prix Board being taken advantage of.

I referred the question of the entertainment centre to the board for an assessment, and it came up with a report. A number of inquiries of that kind come in, not just from Adelaide or South Australia but from other States and overseas. We ought to be in a position to take advantage of that and make some money out of it. I am not suggesting, nor is it the intention of the board, that we set up a marketing arm and travel the world touting for business but, because of the high profile and clear expertise that we have in Adelaide, people are seeking us out.

Do we say to them, 'Sorry, we're not quite sure that that's within our power'? They say, 'We will pay you,' and we say, 'We don't really want your money'. On the contrary, it is a feather in our cap if we can sell that expertise interstate and overseas. By doing that, we can also sell the services of our local contractors, engineers and others. In other words, there is a real private sector spin-off from this because we can introduce those clients who want advice from the Grand Prix Board to operators in South Australia to undertake commercial contracts for them. I think the

private sector here would see this as a very useful power as far as the board is concerned.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to the Grand Prix Board's possible current involvement in the negotiations to build an entertainment centre. Which site is contemplated, and will a private developer be involved? When does the Premier expect an agreement to be finalised and what will be the board's outgoing involvement in such a centre?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The board completed its report some time ago and provided a range of advice on a number of sites and possibilities to the Government. It has no direct involvement at this stage. Whether it will have a future involvement, I cannot say. The whole question is still being assessed. I hope it will come to a resolution soon. I refer the honourable member to a number of statements I have made on this issue almost daily.

Mr OSWALD: In relation to the functions and powers of the board, subsection (2) new paragraph *(m)* gives the board the power to 'enter into any partnership or joint venture arrangement, appoint any agent, or enter into any other contract or arrangement with another person, whether within or outside the State'. Is the board currently negotiating with any such partnerships or involved in any joint venture arrangements and, if so, what does this relate to and who are the parties?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The board currently has shares in two companies, both of which have been very valuable to the event and to the successful operation of the Grand Prix Board. One is a company involved in the supply and building of stands, and I have already mentioned how that has meant we have had a capacity to provide those for other events, in other words, to get some return so we do not have a moribund asset. It also has the advantage not only of the board's experimenting and looking at stands on an in-house basis but of having, if you like, a window on the industry in terms of assessing propositions made to it by the private sector for the hire and supply of stands, without which we would have been in a quite difficult situation.

The second company, the Goodsports company, has been a very good investment as well, because it has aided some return to the board. In fact, its turnover has increased five times. One of its prime contracts this year was to the Expo organisation in Brisbane—a contract worth $3 million. That would not have been possible for that small company without the participation of the Grand Prix Board. It is a mutual arrangement which has proved very productive as a joint venture. I cannot really say how many more of those opportunities there will be. The important thing is that, where they arise, it is in the interests of the State and of the private enterprise company that seeks that association to join with it.

I was concerned about the honourable member's comments on the State Bank, which operates under a commercial charter. It is certainly Government owned and, as shareholders, South Australian taxpayers are pleased to receive the revenue of a successful operation. An organisation such as Myles Pearce is involved with the State Bank as part of the State Bank group on a commercial basis to improve the effectiveness of that group's operations. Whether one is a democratic socialist or the most advanced of free market capitalists, I do not see how one could criticise that unless one believes that we should sell the State Bank, and I do not think—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member does not know that. Beneficial Finance, if not the best, is certainly one of the best performing finance companies in Australia at the moment with a big spread of investments returning real benefits to this State. If that is the honourable member's implication, it is a pity that he does not recognise the real commercial aspects of that operation. Similarly on a much smaller scale, in very different circumstances, is the Grand Prix Board.

Mr OSWALD: In relation to the two companies to which the Premier referred, will he detail the total of capital and loans involved in each company and the projected returns on that capital?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In the case of the clothing company, the investment was $100 000 and, in the case of the company building stands, there was no direct financial investment. An arrangement was entered into with the Grand Prix Board under which no financial equity was required from the board. A sum of $213 000 in loans was put out to these companies. Those moneys have all since been repaid, so the position of the companies is a pretty healthy one. Obviously, if they are to expand or get other opportunities, they may need further equity injection but they are certainly delivering the goods as far as the Grand Prix is concerned.

Mr OSWALD: With respect to the Premier's comments on the State Bank and Beneficial Finance and the other methods by which the Government is taking control of commerce in this State at a very rapid rate, I will probably have to agree to disagree with him. As long as we both stand in this place, we will have a different philosophical outlook on Government involvement in the private sector. New section 10 (1) *(e)* worries me because it gives the Grand Prix Board the capacity to have almost unlimited access and powers to follow the track of Beneficial Finance and other organisations. The provision gives the board *carte blanche* to use its funds in direct competition with the private sector. The Committee has heard about the massive growth in sales of one of the board's companies and I submit that it cuts across the path of private enterprise. What additional activities does the Premier contemplate for the board, given this provision?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That subsection must be read in conjunction with the other functions outlined. The honourable member is unnecessarily concerned because the increase in turnover and the contract I mentioned were won commercially. There was no hidden subsidy or hidden deal. It was in a competitive environment, and that is the only way that these companies can survive. As to what other ventures the Grand Prix Board can get involved in, there is nothing specific in contemplation at this stage. As I said, it is a question of, where an opportunity arises which fits in with the board's core function and helps defray the costs of staging the event, that opportunity should be grasped. One must have confidence in the personnel on the board that they will make commercial decisions and, if they do not, the Minister has the power to intervene.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In the discussions that the Premier has had with Mr Ecclestone or others, did he at any stage discuss the possibility of the Grand Prix being held at a different time in South Australia, bearing in mind that last year was and this year is something of an anti-climax as a spectacle of driver against driver? The world drivers championship has already been decided and it has been suggested, as the Premier would be aware, that the lack of final competition in the result is a deterrent to the Grand Prix as a spectacle compared to its earlier events in South Australia.

It does not matter whether it is motor bikes, motor cars or horses; if a series of events results in a final winner and

the decision is taken before the final event, that event is not the drawcard it would otherwise be. South Australia has been placed in that position on more than one occasion, lacking the drawing power of competition that it would have if the event were held earlier in the season. I suggest that a position more favourable to the one in which we find ourselves at present should be considered.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We would not want the event earlier in the year: the March/April period clashes with the Festival. In any case, that probably would not suit the nature of the circuit so we are really talking about the end of the season. While it is true that the final race of the series may not always be a decider, sometimes it is and, when it is, it is certainly bigger than anything else in the event. The chances are that, on occasions, it will be the decider and that will be a major plus. The other thing about having the last race in the series is that it is very often the race in which the teams prepare or look to the following year in terms of experiments with other vehicles, other drivers, different driving techniques and things of that kind.

As a wrap up to the season, it creates an enormous amount of interest worldwide. It is the occasion on which all the media followers and others take stock of the year's Formula One racing, and the wind-up interviews and all those other things are done. So, there are considerable advantages which militate against the disadvantage that sometimes the series would have been decided. But you cannot always pick that—we could have the second or third to last race and still find that the event had been decided. So, overall, this is a good time.

One other point worth making is that, in terms of getting more people here for longer, being the last event in the season helps greatly. For instance, the teams have taken to increasingly using South Australia as a place to have a holiday. Some will have a holiday in South Australia while others will go to other parts of Australia. By contrast, as soon as the Tokyo race is over the teams come to Adelaide. Each year they are coming here earlier and staying longer—so that is another advantage. We get a better return in a touristic sense by having the last event. Having said that, the matter is not really under our control. Even the way the circuit is organised, it suits them to have Adelaide following Tokyo at the end. As long as that is the case, we do not control the timing and we must accept the date offered.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I did not note that the Premier indicated that he had made any specific representations on behalf of South Australia in any of the negotiations. He might like to touch on that matter when he answers my next question, which is interrelated in part. This year the Auditor-General indicated an expectation that by 1990 the Grand Prix might be making a profit or might have written off the deficit that has accrued thus far.

Ticket sales for this Grand Prix are not as good as they might be—and I give as my authority recent statements by Mike Drewer when interviewed by various radio commentators. He said that there are problems and that we may not see the event televised in South Australia because insufficient people are passing through the gate, etc. I can accept the commercial sensibility of that situation but, because the returns for 1988 may be down on expectation, is the Premier able to indicate whether the Auditor-General's prediction is in any way likely to blow out further than the 1990 date? Now that there is an admission that further capital will be required to make adjustments to the circuit for the extension and the new aspects of the activity, will the Premier reveal what considerations might have been given to a revised date, deficit or break-even point?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The event will always depend on sales—customers through the door as well as sponsorships and other areas of revenue-raising, including commercial activities of the Grand Prix Board. The situation with this year's event in terms of sponsorship and going on in to the future is very healthy indeed in terms of boxes, corporate response and gold and silver passes. The slowness in demand is in the general admission area. Over the past few years we have noticed that people are buying general admission tickets later and later. But, we need them through the gate. There is no question that, if South Australians stop supporting the event, the cost of staging it will go up quite considerably—that is, the direct profit and loss statement—and, in turn, most South Australians will bear the burden.

Because of the nature of the event, it is a little hard to predict where we will be in 1991. All I can say is that to date the Grand Prix has out-performed all expectations. Members should remember that we proceeded on the assumption that over the period of its operation we would probably need the support of a direct general revenue allocation of anything up to $2.5 million. That is the estimated figure that we looked at and, having done our calculations on the event, we are still way ahead with respect to that type of direct support. In fact, we have not had to provide that direct support from year one when there was a Jubilee 150 program grant of $1 million and capital assistance from the Federal Government. The board has not had to call on the Government for a budgetary allocation, and that is a remarkable achievement. So, we are way ahead in many respects.

As I said earlier, the question of profit in these proceedings is nebulous. Sure, we can look at the direct cost of staging the event and the income that is derived and out of that assemble a profit and loss statement, but also we must look at the effect on Government revenue of the $40 million-plus with respect to the surrounding economic activity generated by the event. When we look at that, we are way ahead. I am very confident of the long-term outcome. If you want any evidence of that, look at the commitment by CUB. Ahead of this legislative change and of the Government securing an FIA contract, it has taken a five-year sponsorship deal, one of the biggest of its kind in Australia. So, there is a lot of confidence in the future of the event and hence its financial viability, but we still have to get people through the gate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In the Premier's discussions with the powers that be did he indicate that the sponsorship permitted by tobacco companies would be permitted to continue for the duration of the extended period of time? I ask that question given the tobacco sponsorship exemption for the Grand Prix until 1990. Is the extended period of time the result of the Premier's guarantee to people overseas or the sponsors that the sponsorship may continue for a greater period than 1990?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is quite clear that, if we are to stage the event while international advertising in tobacco products is permitted, it will be permitted in South Australia. The legislation governing that in South Australia was drawn up with that in mind. So, the short answer is 'Yes', however, there is such an understanding and a guarantee.

Mr BECKER: Supplementary to the question posed by the member for Light, I understand that, under the tobacco sponsorship legislation, whilst the Grand Prix is mentioned in that legislation, any South Australian person who enters a motor vehicle in any supporting event is barred from wearing or having painted on his vehicle a sign in relation to tobacco sponsorship. In other words, if I or any other

South Australian entered one of the supporting events in a car with the word 'Rothmans' written all over it, we would be banned, but someone from interstate or an international person with a similar car would not be banned. Can the Premier give an unequivocal assurance that that is not the case and that tobacco sponsorship will continue for any event associated with the Grand Prix?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am told that there is no time period in the tobacco legislation. I think one member mentioned that it expired on a particular date.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I am advised that the exemption continues as long as the board runs the Grand Prix. Members will recall that at the time the legislation went through the House—and I am referring to legislation which is not before us and, without having it before me, I can only put to the Committee my understanding of it—it was not contemplated that that Act would in any way impede the operation of the Formula One Grand Prix Board in its staging of events.

Obviously, it is open to any promoter or sponsor to seek replacement sponsorship or whatever avenues are open to them under the other provisions in the Act, but it was made quite clear in the Act and in the debate surrounding it that, because of the national and international nature of the event, we were not really in a position to make laws surrounding it. That has always been understood. There was criticism that in some ways this was discriminatory. It is hard to establish how it could be discriminatory against particular bodies or groups because, as members are aware, where any organisation is in receipt of tobacco sponsorship and by reason of the Act is precluded from continuing it, that will be replaced through Foundation South Australia, as it is now called.

In relation to discriminatory treatment, it was always made quite clear that that legislation could only apply to things over which we have control, and international and national series events are things over which we do not have control and nor do we seek to control them. Obviously, if a national code were introduced, we would seek to ensure that it did not catch up the Formula One Grand Prix event while international agreements remain in place.

Mr BECKER: Under this clause I believe that the board can enter into all sorts of agreements, partnerships and contracts, so it is important to establish that the board will not be inhibited when negotiating contracts with FOCA or any other organisations involved with the Grand Prix circus, as it is known in motor circles.

In his second reading explanation the Premier said that this clause amended a list of powers of the board to make it clear that the board had a number of powers. Paragraph *(b)* provides:

> *(l)* form, or acquire, hold, deal with and dispose of shares or other interests in, or securities issued by, bodies corporate, whether within or outside the State;

Does that mean that the board can enter into an agreement with the unions in relation to the employment of persons involved with the staging of the Grand Prix? I understand that, over the four days of the event, about 5 000 people will be employed. Those people who check the tickets for seating allocations will receive a net $277 for those four days, out of which tax is deducted. Further—and they have no choice in this—a union fee of $5 will be deducted.

I understand also that any labourer or person who is employed on construction relating to the event is compelled to be a member of the appropriate union. Irrespective of their age, any juvenile who sells icecreams, drinks or whatever is also required to pay a small fee to the appropriate union. Does this clause ratify a situation where the board can enter into an agreement (and has it entered into an agreement) with the respective unions that the event will involve a totally closed shop situation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It does not ratify or affect that position; the position is unchanged. The board already has power to enter into industrial agreements for the proper conduct of the event, and it has done so very successfully over the years. This is a very difficult area, but industrial relations are very good. I congratulate the board on the way in which it and the trade unions, their representatives and employees, have been able to negotiate the agreements.

Mr BECKER: I think it is a disgrace! We are providing temporary employment for some people who could well need this extra income. They might be young teenagers who work to earn some pocket-money, or they might be students who will use this extra money to assist them with their tertiary education. They have no choice—they have to become a member of a union for those four days. If the employee is an adult, it will cost $5 for four days and, over a period of a year, that would amount to about $400 in union fees. That would be the highest union fee structure in Australia. I totally oppose the Grand Prix Board being involved in this type of tactic. The building unions would blackmail anybody. They know they can stand over anyone who wants anything built or erected, but the Government and the Grand Prix Board do not have the courage to stand up to the building unions and say, 'This is not on.'

The Hon. H. Allison: Union fees of $325 a year.

Mr BECKER: As the member for Mount Gambier said, on the basis of $1.25 a day, that would amount to $325 per annum for union fees. That is absolutely outrageous! The Grand Prix Board has proved itself to be incompetent by giving in to that sort of deal. I do not think that this arrangement was mentioned in the agreement which was exchanged with Mr Ecclestone or that FOCA has any idea about the industrial relations aspect. I doubt whether many countries in which the Grand Prix is held, including Japan, parts of Europe and America, would insist on a totally closed shop agreement.

I protest very strongly about this arrangement. I am a great supporter of the event but, when I think that young teenagers in particular are forced to pay a compulsory union levy, my blood boils. Before they are entitled to vote, they have to pay union fees. No-one will ever justify to me the fact that a union has the right to compel any organisation to enter into this agreement. It is about time that somebody showed a little courage and that all these interstate and overseas visitors were made aware of the situation. Do the amendments in this clause mean that the board anticipates that it will significantly expand its staff in order to undertake these new functions and, if so, how many additional employees does it anticipate that it will engage? What will be the cost in salaries and general administration expenses?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is no intention to increase the staff. In the time that the board has operated, the staff has increased from 8 to 12. Those staff work extraordinarily long hours and are involved in weekend and overtime work. It is an extraordinarily compact and extremely efficient group. If expanded functions require people being employed, whether temporarily or permanently, that would take place, but one of the purposes is to ensure that the skills and the expertise of the board's staff can be used during the year in between events. As the operation of the event becomes more organised (and each year one learns and improves procedures and thus creates efficiencies), those skills can be utilised at other times of the year. That is the idea. Contrary to the remarks just made, and implied previously by the Leader of the Opposition, the administrative expenses of

the Grand Prix and the way in which the staff work have been remarkably efficient.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the position in relation to ticket sales and arrangements which would lead to the event being televised?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that that issue broadly is whether it will be telecast live because, presumably, the event will be relayed somewhere. I dealt with this question earlier in response to a follow-up question from an honourable member. I think I said effectively that I cannot add to what I said to the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TRUSTEE COMPANIES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 1165.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Before I actually address the contents of the Bill, I should put on record again my disenchantment with the way this House is being treated by the Attorney-General. We received in this House on Wednesday last three Bills which are to be debated today. We are still circulating those Bills for comment; at least two of them are complex Bills (although not long) in terms of the ramifications. We believe that we deserve far better consideration than has been shown. Six Bills have come from the other place which have been fully debated there; we have all the background information we need on those Bills from the Attorney-General and as a result of questions asked by my colleague the Hon. Trevor Griffin. But not in this case. We have six Bills pending that could have been dealt with this week; instead, someone in his wisdom decided that we will deal with these Bills today. I believe that this is a total misuse of this Parliament. We deserve far better consideration from the Government than we are getting at the moment.

Mrs Appleby: Can't you cope with the workload?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Whip asks, 'Can't you cope with the workload?' In response to that inane interjection, the fact remains that we are required to seek the advice of people out there in the wider world who have to deal with these laws. Unlike the people here who have to consider them, they actually have to live with them and we should be given the opportunity to obtain comment. The Leader of this House should understand that it is simply not good enough to have Bills delivered on Wednesday that have to be debated on the following Tuesday. It is total incompetence.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The member for Hayward and the member for Mitcham must not debate with each other. Would the member for Mitcham debate the issue before us, and direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have mentioned this matter previously and I have put myself out on a number of occasions to facilitate legal legislation, as members on the other side would appreciate. When we have been in a tight situation I have bent over backwards to assist the processing of legislation through this House on a number of occasions. But I just believe that if we are to facilitate things, there should be a *quid pro quo*. We should be given appropriate time. For example, I know that my colleague in another place would not even dream of debating these Bills on a Tuesday after they have been introduced on the previous Wednesday. He would require at least a week's notice so that he could canvass the various professions that need to be canvassed in these circumstances.

This Bill deals with trustee companies. It is an extremely serious and sensitive matter, and for that reason it is important not only to canvass the views of the legal profession and the trustee companies but also to somehow ascertain what the client group out there feels about the service that is being delivered and indeed whether the laws that are being enacted are appropriate.

The Hon. H. Allison: It is a matter of life and death.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My colleague the member for Mount Gambier says that it is a matter of life and death. For many people in this situation who have to rely on trustee companies, it is an after death situation. For many it involves having trust in a body corporate to look after the affairs of a person who is mentally incompetent to look after their own affairs. So, for the relatives involved, on the death of a loved one or for the relatives of a person who is mentally incompetent, it is vitally important that they have confidence in the people who are looking after their affairs. There are a number of ways in which these affairs can be looked after, such as by a member of the family, a lawyer or indeed a trustee company. I do not know what the figures are, but I presume that the trustee companies would enjoy a very large share of estate work in South Australia.

The important point I wish to make is that I cannot give due justice to this Bill and there may well be a number of matters which cannot be adequately dealt with because I simply do not have the information. I have admitted to this Parliament previously that I do not have the legal background to cope with the technicalities, but having seen the responses from the other side on a number of occasions I feel that my legal knowledge must indeed be adequate in terms of what I am facing from the other side of the House. Importantly, this Bill promulgates a set of rules that will govern the conduct of trustee companies and it is important that this set of rules is concise, indeed unequivocal or straightforward in their demands of trustee companies in relation to their responsibilities to the people of South Australia.

Interestingly enough, under the way we used to operate previously, trustee companies could come into being only by an Act of Parliament especially promulgated for each individual company. On the statute book at present there is the ANZ Executors and Trustees Company (South Australia) Ltd legislation. That company was especially formed in 1985, taking as its base a company some 70 years old. There is the Bagot's Executor and Trustee Company, which was formed in 1910: the Elders Trustee and Executor Company, also formed in 1910; the Executor Trustee and Agency Company, formed in 1885, and the Farmers' Cooperative Executors and Trustees Limited, formed in 1919. Members would appreciate, just by looking at those dates, that on average these companies are 70 to 75 years old. So they are tried and true in the marketplace.

This legislation takes away the principles with which we have previously dealt and grants trustee companies status by regulation. That is a very significant move, and the Attorney-General suggests that we should head in that direction because the financial market has been deregulated and therefore many finance organisations wish to provide a range of services to their public, one of which should be a trustee company. One problem is that no guidelines are laid down in this legislation as to the minimum requirements that will have to be fulfilled in relation to a trustee company.

The Attorney-General said in the second reading explanation that there will be a stringent review of all applications.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr S.J. BAKER: Immediately before the adjournment, I said that under the previous arrangements a separate Act had to be passed before a trustee company could commence operations in South Australia. This requirement represented a strong check and balance in the system, because the new company had to enjoy the confidence of the Parliament and of the Government of the day. I referred earlier to the companies that had passed this test, most of them having passed it before the 1920s. Indeed, none have done so since. The changing economic climate and the deregulation of the financial market have prompted the Government to say that we need to be more flexible in our trustee arrangements, but we must be just as careful as before in setting up trustee companies, and I will address certain of those matters in Committee.

A question mark that I have about the Bill relates to the fact that it contains no standard. Indeed, there are no requirements to be met by an individual, a financier or a company that is set up for these purposes as to what should be complied with in terms of the demand to perform in the marketplace the function of providing trustee services. However, we are here dealing with a sensitive area where people must have trust in the trustee company and I suspect that, if we went back to 1885, we would find that trustee companies were then set up so that they would enjoy, and have enough checks and balances to enjoy, the confidence of their potential client group, which comprised those people making wills, requiring deceased estates to be administered, or wishing to have the affairs of the mentally or physically incompetent administered.

So, it is vitally important in this sensitive area that the rules that we set down are so tight that the people using the services of these companies are confident that their estates will be dealt with professionally and in their best interests. However, this Bill contains no such guidelines, and that is my first disappointment with the Bill.

I have reservations, too, about the regulation process. It opens the way for the Government to make decisions that were previously made by Parliament with the distinct risk that a particular Government of the day might act in a certain way in exchange for money. There might be compelling reasons why certain people in the marketplace would persuade the Government of the day to allow them to perform trustee services. In this regard the stakes could be significant, so we are not dealing with small sums. When one considers the assets in this State in real and liquid forms, one sees that even a small proportion of those assets in the hands of trustee companies can provide a strong financial base that could be used, abused or manipulated if we are not careful.

An interesting thing about trustee companies is that they are somewhat shaded in mystery. Members opposite might have dealt with such companies as a result of the death of a relative, and they would then know that it is like a maze trying to understand some aspects of the operations of those companies. Having recently had such an experience, I was at a loss on a number of occasions to understand some of the fees that were charged and why it took so long for moneys to be paid over once the estate had been established and should have been settled. On the other hand, for many people trustee companies provide an element of security when they are faced by worry and concern in dealing with estates.

Some people are of an age that makes them incompetent to deal with an estate, so for such people trustee companies provide a sound basis for managing estates and hence are popular in South Australia. We should like to know a little more about trustee companies than we know today, as the only thing in the legislation that we know about trustee companies is the maximum amount that can be taken out by way of a charge against an estate, against a capital asset, or against income earned from moneys invested. Obviously, the divorcing of the client in this situation from the intricacies of estates makes it doubly important that the rules provided by this Parliament work and that they be as simple as possible for all those dealing with them.

After all, if one buys a motor car, one knows what one is getting and, if there is a manufacturing fault, one has the warranty whereby that fault is corrected. However, if serious faults occur in the trustee company's system, hardly anyone would be the wiser because people do not know the intricacies of the system with which they are dealing. The operations of such companies are shrouded in mystery and people are often deliberately kept in the dark about those operations. In the case of the settlement of an estate, a friend of mine had to deal with six people, all of whom had to read the documents each time. So those documents were handed on to the next person. A charge was made for the time taken.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Was there a will?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes. My friends did not believe that they were getting good service from the trustee company. Sometimes people approach a trustee company heaving a sigh of relief because they do not know what must be done to settle an estate. Another area that is perplexing and sometimes concerning is that often relatives of the deceased are not aware of the full value of the assets of the estate and the valuation is left in the hands of a trustee company. Such assets may comprise real property where the value is indeterminate, even though everyone may make a guesstimate at the time of death. This also applies in the case of shares and other forms of property.

It is also difficult and often impossible when someone brings in a box of papers and says to an officer of the trustee company, 'This is what mother had. Can you sort it out?' In such cases, much trust is placed in the trustee company. I have never heard anyone say that a trustee company had undervalued assets or anything like that, but many clients have not known what assets were being dealt with by the trustee company.

Probably the area concerning which I have heard most comment is the length of time taken by the trustee company to settle an estate. Many people have told me that, long after their parent has died the listings have been made and the releases have been signed, a year or two had elapsed before the final settlement of the estate.

In that time, the trustee company has had the use of those assets and has made charges against them. It may well be that it is acting as quickly as possible but often clients are not informed as to the reasons for the delay. That has been the major reason of contention. Trustee companies are a very valuable device in the marketplace. They take away a lot of concern felt by people and will be with us for a long time to come.

I do have some concerns about the mechanisms here, because no strict guidelines are laid down in the legislation. Whilst there will be a mechanism for setting up these bodies, I am not convinced that that will be sufficient if we are going to deregulate in the same way that the financial system is being deregulated. Many people know the costs borne because of financial deregulation in Australia. If we treat

trustee deregulation in the same way as we treat financial deregulation, a lot of little people will be hurt in the process. Although the Opposition is totally unhappy about the way in which this Bill was presented to the Parliament on Wednesday and expected to be debated today, we support the measure.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure and for its cooperation in dealing with it in the first instance. I point out to members that it is with the cooperation of the Opposition that we are able to maintain our legislative program in this way, particularly when there is an inordinate number of measures emanating from another place. Whilst I know that that places the honourable member under some pressure in order to prepare for this legislation and consult with those that the Opposition feels it should, it does in fact allow even longer for the shadow spokesperson in another place to scrutinise the measure and, if it is thereby amended, it will come back to this Chamber for further consideration. I appreciate the concerns of the honourable member, but I think in the long run there will be sufficient opportunity for the Opposition to deal with the matter responsibly. There will also be the facilitating of measures in this House so that we do not find people waiting around at the end of the session without due cause.

The honourable member has raised a number of concerns of a general nature, some of which deal with estates not only relating to trustee companies but also involving solicitors and even private executors who do not expeditiously deal with these matters. Whether or not there is a particular problem with trustee companies, I do not know. That probably is not the case, but what we do know is that private Acts of this Parliament that provide for the establishment and activities of the existing five executor companies are really quite outdated, and it is appropriate that they be amended and updated to be part of an encompassing piece of legislation rather than maintaining the private Acts.

As was explained in the second reading explanation, that was the alternative facing the Government when Perpetual Trustees Australia Limited and National Mutual Trustees Limited applied to be authorised to act as corporate trustees and executors in South Australia. Rather than enacting special Acts to provide for those two financial institutions to carry out these associated activities, along with the five existing companies (Executor Trustee and Agency Company of South Australia Limited, Elders Trustee and Executor Company Limited, Farmers' Co-operative Executors and Trustees Limited, Bagot's Executor and Trustee Company Limited and ANZ Executors & Trustee Company (South Australia) Limited), it has been decided—and I believe rightly so—that it should now be encompassed in the legislation we have before us in the form of a Trustee Companies Bill. That, of necessity, provides for the general application and authorisation of the activities of trustee companies.

Many of the general concerns expressed by the honourable member I believe can be dealt with by way of regulation provided for in the Bill before us. Of course, those regulations do come before this Parliament, receive the scrutiny of members and can be dealt with at that time. By suggesting that we may embrace within the main piece of legislation a code of conduct or establish some statement of ethics in this area, the honourable member would be encompassing something which would be very difficult to achieve and also would be setting this group within the marketplace apart from other groups that provide similar services. Also, I think it would lead to the criticism of over-regulation in this area.

Certainly there is a need to ensure that the community is provided for, that there are certain safeguards there and that there are established practices in the community interest. I believe that can be attended to by way of regulation and also by application of the general law in this area which is, of course, very well established. I commend the Bill to members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: The obvious question is: when is it intended that this Act be proclaimed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: It really is dependent upon the regulations being drawn. We assume it will be early 1989.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: For the definition of 'trustee company', it states, '*see schedule 1*'. Can the Minister indicate, when there is a change to the listing of trustee companies by regulation, what information will be provided to this Parliament? I treat this matter very seriously because, previously, when the matter came before Parliament, Parliament had to be sure that such companies had the capacity to perform. It was subject to debate. That is not the case with regulations. In this instance, unless members have details of the companies that will be listed, Parliament cannot determine whether they are fit and proper to carry out the duties of trustee companies. Can the Minister indicate how we are to facilitate the understanding of Parliament as to the capacity of such companies?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The two companies that have applied are Perpetual Trustees (Australia) Limited and National Mutual Trustees. I am not sure whether the honourable member has any doubts about their capacity to perform this function. Of necessity, a report will be prepared for the Subordinate Legislation Committee concerning approval for these companies to operate in this State. That committee has powers to call for witnesses and additional information to make an informed decision about these matters.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Commission chargeable by trustee company.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause sets ceilings on the amounts that can be charged. Members will note that, under subclause (1) *(a)*, the maximum that can be charged against an estate is 7.5 per cent of the income received by the company on account of the estate and, in subclause (1) *(b)*, 6 per cent of the capital value of the estate. Both amounts can be charged. Unless companies advertise their charges, how will clients know what benefits accrue or what can be taken out of the estate should they place their wills with those trustee companies? People should know such things before they take on a trustee company.

For very small estates, such as those of people who live in rental houses and have very little in the way of assets, 7.5 per cent would be grossly inadequate to cover the cost of administering that estate, as would the 6 per cent charge. Those people may be forced into a public trustee company because no other company would want to accept them on those terms. The Minister would appreciate that it would cost more to administer a small estate than would be gained from the maximum terms shown in the Bill. How does the Minister envisage that people will know what trustee com-

panies charge? Will these limits preclude people with small estates from going through this process?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: It is my experience that people are very conscious of the rates that are charged to administer estates and, when they have their wills prepared, that is one of the very first things that is asked. Choices are available in the marketplace, whether it is an hourly rate as charged by most legal practitioners or a commission/percentage basis as is the practice of trustee companies. If people are not aware of those charges, when having their wills prepared they should ask what is the going rate for the administration of an estate and how it is charged. They can make a decision as to whether they want to vest this responsibility in a company of this type or seek assistance elsewhere. The rates set out in the Bill are those that currently apply to trustee companies, and this measure simply puts it into legislation. I understand that the trustee companies are quite happy with this provision and they can refer it to their clients as the provision in the law, it being the basis on which they operate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will these ceilings limit the access of trustee companies by people with very small estates?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: That is a matter between the company and the client. This clause sets out the maximum charges, but companies could charge less. However, they cannot charge more and it is up to such companies whether they value such a client and whether they wish to encourage that sort of clientele. They might advise that the client contact a legal practitioner who may charge less than a trustee company to administer the estate. Those practices are already well established and companies have their own policies in dealing with very small estates.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister explain why subclauses (1) and (2) deal with capital value as at the date of distribution by the company but subclause (3) *(a)* deals with the valuation at the time the asset came under the auspices of the trustee company? This raises some interesting questions about anomalies that could arise in such situations.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: That simply translates into the statute the current practice that is applied within trustee companies.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—'Fee for administering perpetual trust.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister explain the provision contained in subclause (3)? I would think that the vast majority concerned deceased estates, so can the Minister explain this perplexing terminology?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In some situations estates establish a perpetual trust for the group of beneficiaries, and the management and administration of that trust is vested in the trustee company, which is obliged to continue on, the estate having been wound up, but this is the residual responsibility vested in the trustee company.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Court may review company's charges.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Clause 12 provides that, if people are dissatisfied with the charges made against the estate, there is a right of appeal to the Supreme Court, which may review the charges incurred. If a company has declared its fees in the original circumstances, but further down the track they are revealed as excessive because the estate has accumulated a great deal of wealth over a period, would the court determine that the fees were excessive because the legal requirements have been satisfied but the moral requirements might not have been?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I think the honourable member will find that at this stage of our consumer laws there is a common thread about harsh and unconscionable practices. In the consumer credit legislation, in particular, there is established practice dealing with interest rates, but generally throughout the legislation there is the right for judicial review of these practices in the marketplace that are regarded, in some way or another, as excessive and contrary to the public interest. It would be an invidious situation if there was not some right of judicial review. Obviously, one does not take that in a frivolous way—costs and reputations of companies, and so on, are associated with it—but there should be that right vested in laws of this nature for clients of these people operating in the marketplace to take that course of action. There is settled law about the meaning of excessive charges—what is harsh and unconscionable in these situations. It may well be that the courts take a moral stand on these issues but, although moral in its nature, it would be based upon precedent and established principles at law in order to determine whether charges are excessive in that set of circumstances.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I must say that the Minister has more faith in the Supreme Court than I in these circumstances. We have given power to a number of tribunals to look at the question of what is fair and equitable. When it comes to the Supreme Court I find that a body that may not be able to exercise that power to the same degree and may be more convinced by the legal argument that the legal processes have been duly constituted than about the fairness of the fees. As I understand, the Supreme Court reviews legal fees but there are no set charges. In this case there is a distinct difference between the way that the Supreme Court can cost out legal fees and the way in which it will deal with this piece of legislation. It may work very well, but from a layman's point of view it does not seem to be appropriate that the Supreme Court should be the body to review it. I would imagine that a commercial tribunal may be better versed in carrying out some of these duties. I do not believe that the Supreme Court's time should be tied up with these actions, given the circumstances involved.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I want to clarify a point made by the honourable member. The Supreme Court does review lawyers' and solicitors' charges, and where they are excessive it exercises its jurisdiction. Fees are established in the Supreme Court and other jurisdictions and are the basis upon which bills of costs are taxed. So, this is an established practice of the Supreme Court—the Masters in particular. I suggest that there are established practices which can bring relief in these situations and, as I said, I believe they should be available to the clients of these companies in these circumstances.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—'Returns to be made by trustee company.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Clause 17 relates to the duties and liabilities of trustee companies. I make the observation that a number of areas are not canvassed in these duties and liabilities where heavy penalites obtain for improper practices. I note that the only two reasonably heavy fines in this Bill are in clause 20, which limits the trustee's ability to accept certain moneys, and clause 26 which deals with the making of false documents or statements. I cannot find in this legislation any statements about fraud or misuse of clients' money. Can the Minister point to any section which would cover those items?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: They are already included in the general law and it is believed that there is adequate provision to deal with each of those circumstances as they arise.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If one invested large amounts of the investor's funds outside the parameters set down by the trustee company, by this Act or the regulations under this Act, and which could be seen to be speculative investments and not to the benefit of the people involved, I see no reference in this Bill which covers that contingency. Such a trustee company would be involved in those sorts of investment for its own benefit—to cream off the top or gain extra benefit in the marketplace—but I cannot find anything that precludes that sort of activity.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: If there was a breach of the type referred to by the honourable member, clearly it would lie against the trustee company in terms of its fiduciary relationship to its client as a trustee and that would give rise to an action to remedy that situation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: This matter may be pursued in another place, but on my short search of the legislation I could not find any provision of proper safeguards. A number of nebulous areas are covered in the legislation. Clause 17 provides that a trustee company must lodge documents, and if it fails to do so a division 8 fine obtains. In the Hodby situation, the failure to lodge documents was to cover up an enormous fraud, but that is not the principle we are talking about here. Most of the items under this legislation are of a very minor reporting nature. I think there should be some strong provisions in this Act which clearly indicate that companies cannot become involved in speculative ventures at the expense of trustees because those speculative ventures would only be to the benefit of the directors of the trustee company and not of the estates concerned.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I note those observations. The Commissioner for Corporate Affairs acts in a supervisory role in this area. The Attorney can also cause an investigation to be conducted into the affairs of these companies and the ultimate sanction is their losing the right to continue to operate.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I suppose that could be levelled at anybody in the marketplace, such as a bank, landbroker or any other body which takes moneys from its clients and invests them in certain ways. The law provides for such situations, and it depends on the ability of the agency vested with that supervisory role as to what can be rescued in order to protect their clients, or whether those practices can be eliminated from the activities of the company one way or the other.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 30 passed.

Clause 31—'Regulations.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I take this last opportunity to express my concern (and it may well satisfy my colleague in another place) that in this Bill standards are not laid down about the conduct of trustee companies. That will be covered by regulations. This legislation does not provide proper sanctions against certain actions by directors of trustee companies and we will leave the designation of trustee companies to regulatory processes. I think that, in such an important area, each of those items should have been subjected to the scrutiny of Parliament. As this clause allows for regulations, I use it to make my simple protest.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I note the honourable member's concerns, which he is entitled to express in this place. However, as I have explained, I believe that the honourable member's concerns are misplaced and that his fears will be addressed by mechanisms which exist not only in this legislation but also in the law generally.

Clause passed.

Schedules and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): When I expressed my unhappiness about the regulatory processes that will follow the passage of this legislation, I omitted to point out that in the schedule two companies have been included about which this Parliament has received no particular information. Whilst they have not gone through the full flush of legislation, as did the previous trustee companies, they have suddenly appeared on the schedule as being fit and proper bodies. The Minister might say that they are well recognised bodies, and we would all agree with that, but I believe that it is a gross breach of faith to include them in the schedule in this way.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 1165.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): This is fairly complex legislation and I do not pretend to understand more than one-tenth of it. It is probably useful to note that the Bill does two things. First, it alters the power with respect to a person contracting in two or more separate capacities. For example, a person may be a trustee and also a beneficiary. There has been some doubt about the capacity to contract one with the other. This Bill provides that that is permissible but only where there are at least two persons who are parties to the contract or conveyance, one of whom is the person contracting in two capacities. During the Committee stage I will ask some questions about that *vis-a-vis* the old provisions.

A second area covered by the Bill relates to the execution and attestation of deeds. There has been doubt about the way in which deeds may be executed. A deed is usually signed, sealed and delivered and is distinguished from a mere contract. The Bill provides that a deed no longer needs to be sealed and delivered by a party to it. This area could cause some concern, in that people may take the easy way out and not bother to register their deeds.

In conjunction with this latter amendment, the Bill also provides for conditional execution of an instrument. Previously, there was doubt as to whether a document could be executed and held in escrow until it is needed. For example, where shares as transferred to a purchaser but the whole purchase price is not paid, and is to be paid over a period of time, it was not uncommon for an executed share transfer from the purchaser back to the vendor to be held by the vendor to be acted upon in the event of default and a need to recover the shares. That can be done, but the Law of Property Act formalises that sort of situation and provides an improved procedure to enable it to be done.

I understand that the changes contained in this Bill reflect the recommendations of the Seventy-Seventh Report of the South Australian Law Reform Committee, which dealt with law of property. From a lay person's point of view and, after a very brief reading of the Bill and looking at some of the old provisions, I do have some concerns. Many people come to me in order to have powers of attorney executed. Having got their MP to sign it with a JP present, having complied with all the other requirements, and then having lodged it with the Lands Titles Office, they feel

confident that they have a security which can be referred to at any time and which can stand up in a court of law.

As I understand the provisions in this Bill, there is now no need to follow that process and that power of attorney will survive on its own merits, irrespective of whether or not the document has been registered. Many people use this process as a means of securing their future and feel confident in doing that. There is some suggestion that we do not need to go through all those processes and that the mere signing and witnessing of the document is quite sufficient. I suggest that, if this is the first step towards deleting the sealing procedures, it could well detract from the security that people feel with the current process.

I think that every member would appreciate that more people are coming through the door asking for the powers of attorney procedure to be made out to relatives. Principally, they are concerned that if they should lose their mental facilities they will finish up on the wrong side of the Guardianship Board, which has a quite horrific reputation in this area. In fact, I have received a number of complaints about the way that the Guardianship Board operates from people who want to be able to put their affairs in the hands of someone in whom they feel confident. They do not want it left to the Guardianship Board to determine their future.

Parliament has received a number of examples where the Guardianship Board has made some fairly astounding decisions. In fact, there have been two in my area where the Guardianship Board determined that a husband had to divide his pension and put half in trust for his wife. The board did not care that the husband still had to meet car bills, phone bills, water bills and everything associated with living, and that is not the first time that this sort of decision has been made. That is why I believe that the process that operated previously has been utilised more than was the case in the past.

I may well have misconceived the intent of this legislation and what the amendments actually do, but I believe the security blanket is necessary and that we should encourage people to take up this facility and not discourage them by saying, 'Look, it is going to be all right and whatever document you sign will be a legal document'. So, with those few words—and I will be asking questions in Committee—I indicate that the Opposition supports the proposition.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support of this measure. In substance, the Bill provides for two amendments to the Law of Property Act and these matters arise, as the honourable said, out of the work of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia. The Bill provides for a situation where a trustee company is appointed the trustee of a deceased person's estate and one of the beneficiaries is also a co-trustee in that the beneficiary will be able to contract with himself and the trustee company in granting an indemnity. A further provision is that such a contract or conveyance is enforceable as if different persons had entered into it in those separate capacities. So that covers that type of situation and clarifies the law in that area.

Proposed new section 40 (1) implements a further recommendation of the Law Reform Committee by abolishing that delivery in its present form and replacing it with a statutory code to clarify the method whereby the execution of deeds could be suspended pending the fulfilment of a condition. Proposed new section 40 (1) is a statutory code which sets out the procedure of execution of deeds in these circumstances.

I point out to the honourable member that, with respect to his comments about the Guardianship Board (which I understand is currently under review), it is important before drawing negative conclusions about its work to have all the facts relevant to a matter before the board. The work of the board is very difficult indeed and, whilst it may appear to individual people and those who advocate on their behalf that the decisions taken are harsh or unfair in some respect, the Guardianship Board in its operations and the evidence it has before it is often placed in a situation where it must bring down decisions which do appear on the surface to be harsh. However, as I said, I think the law in that area is currently under review.

With respect to the registration of powers of attorney, to which the honourable member referred, there is not the necessity at law to have those documents stamped but, if they are to be used as the basis for, say, the transfer of property, obviously they do have to be stamped as such before they can be used in the circumstances provided for within the document itself.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Power to contract, etc., in separate capacities.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Section 40 (3) of the Law of Property Act 1936 provides:

> A person may convey land or any other property to himself, or to himself and others.

Proposed new section 40 (1) provides:

> A person may be a party to a contract or conveyance in two or more separate capacities (but a contract cannot be validly made unless at least two persons are parties to it).

In the circumstances outlined in the second reading speech and as the clause reads there is a separation of two parties. So. if the person is a co-director or director of a trustee company and is also a beneficiary, they are seen as two separate entities. Does the amendment cut out the provision in section 40 (3) of the Law of Property Act whereby a person can convey land or property to himself?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I believe that the honourable member's logic is correct. Section 40 is to be replaced by a new section 40 which contains the provision to which the honourable member has referred.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister explain the ramifications of deleting section 40 (3)? The Attorney-General talked only about facilitating a wider interpretation, which was a conflict between a person who was a beneficiary as well as a director of a trustee. However, in changing that, he has deleted this section. Will the Minister explain the full ramifications of that action?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I shall have to take the honourable member's question on notice, because I think that there is an explanation for it contained in the way in which the new section is drafted. In redrafting the old section 40, the wording of new section 40 in fact covers the concern expressed by the honourable member, because subsection (2) qualifies subsection (1) and provides for the set of circumstances about which the honourable member is concerned and which were previously provided in the old section 40 (3).

Mr S.J. BAKER: I suggest that the Minister take advice on that matter and have it checked out during the passage of the Bill between this Chamber and the other place.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Substitution of ss. 41 and 41aa.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: What is meant by 'indenture of deed' under new section 41 (5)?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Rather than try to give an approximation of the legal definition of 'indenture of deed'

and its consequences for this legislation, I will obtain for the honourable member the definition appropriate to this Bill. It is important that a precise definition be given to the honourable member in due course.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TRAVEL AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 1166.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill, which merely tidies the sections of the Act that Parliament passed in 1986 and amended earlier this year relating to compliance with the trust deed. As the Attorney-General explained in another place, when the original legislation was passed we were in advance of our legislative requirements under the national guidelines concerning the trust deed. Therefore, the major amendments in the Bill enact new sections 20 to 24 to comply with the uniform requirements. I have a question on clause 3 to ask in Committee but, subject to any further advice that the Opposition may receive in the interim, members on this side are relaxed about the passage of this Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure. Once again, the Government is acting expeditiously to provide the security that can be provided by way of a compensation fund to protect the clients of travel companies. Previously, Parliament saw it desirable to embrace to the extent possible some degree of national cooperation in this area, so the Government brought down legislation before the settlement of the trust deed. That has now been finally settled. That trust deed applies to the participating States of New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia.

The trust deed having now been settled, as a consequence of some alterations made to the first draft on which our original legislation was based, it is necessary to incorporate these minor amendments. We are pleased to bring them before the House to be dealt with expeditiously in order to protect South Australian consumers and indeed to improve the standing of the tourism industry in South Australia and in other States so as to give the degree of service that the overwhelming majority of highly reputable operators wish to give the community.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Substitution of ss. 20 to 24.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note from the original legislation that the Commercial Tribunal has the right to deny or grant licences, yet the Bill contains a cancelling mechanism which, under new section 20, effectively gives the power to the trustees to determine whether or not a licence shall be granted. Are we not creating a new form of conflict? Principally we have created the right of the tribunal to be judge and jury in relation to travel agents. Now the Minister has stated that the trustees can be judge or jury but we will allow the right of appeal to the tribunal. We seem to be getting ourselves into a bit of a pickle and that could cause some conflicts in the system. Why is it not the tribunal acting on the recommendation of the trustee that makes the decision, as should be the case?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Under the trust deed, and in cooperation with the other participating States, an agreement has been reached with regard to South Australia that there will be a right of appeal vested in an appropriate tribunal. In this State, it is the Commercial Tribunal in which that right of appeal is vested against the decision of the trustees. They have agreed to accept the findings of that appropriate jurisdiction in these circumstances.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I do not wish to labour the point. It appears to be inconsistent. The proper formality would seem to be that the trustee shall report to the tribunal which has the power of life and death. It is the body which issues the licence. That should be the proper reporting process. I wonder whether this creates another anomaly. Having made the point, I will leave it at that.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am not quite sure of the point the honourable member is making. In terms of the practical administration, it is important that the trustees under the trust deed have the ability to act very quickly and, if there are allegations which in their belief lead to a suspicion that immediate action should be taken to secure the assets that have been placed in the trust of a travel agent, the trustees obviously need to act very quickly and expeditiously to provide for that protection. If there is in the mind of that travel agent some doubt about the action that has been taken in these circumstances, there is a right of appeal vested in that jurisdiction in this State, and they can act upon it in due course. There is a practical mechanism that needs to apply so that proper protection can be provided for those clients.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Commencement of prosecutions.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am fascinated! In clause 5 we are deleting the words 'cause a member of the Police Force to', but in this clause, which amends section 37, we are inserting the provision that the commencement of proceedings may be made by the Commissioner of Police or a member of the Police Force acting in an official capacity. In one case it is deemed that we do not need the extra words but in this case we have added extra words. I would assume that the Commissioner of Police or his delegate could bring a complaint or proceedings if the 'Commissioner of Police' was referred to in the new subsection. Why do we need the extra words?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: There is a logical explanation and it deals with the administration of this procedure in whom the administration is vested and who can lay complaints. The wording is a result of discussions between the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and the Commissioner of Police, and this is the agreed position for the proper administration of investigations and prosecution of offences under the Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER: With all due respect to the Minister, he has not really explained why these superfluous words are included. I know it is only a small point, but he has gone to great effort in clause 5 to delete the words 'cause a member of the Police Force to' because they are seen as superfluous. Why is not the 'Commissioner of Police' an embracing term for him and his officers? I cannot understand why in one case we delete words and in the next clause they are included. I note that the Commissioner of Police did not previously have a right of intercession.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: With respect to clause 5, the amendment now allows for the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs as well as the Commissioner of Police to carry out the investigation and cause that investigation to

proceed. So, in fact it broadens the ability to investigate these matters.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Recently I spoke about the magnificent and practical innovative concept of Meals on Wheels. Because I did not have enough time to finish my remarks at that stage, I have decided to continue them tonight. Again, I wish to pay tribute to Miss Doris Taylor, MBE, the founder of this concept of Meals on Wheels. As I said, Miss Taylor was born in 1909. In 1954 she established the Meals on Wheels concept in Port Adelaide, which is in my electorate. On 9 August 1954, Doris Taylor commenced the service under very primitive conditions with 11 helpers at Port Adelaide and 11 recipients of meals.

Today, the operation is massive with nearly 9 000 volunteers serving thousands of recipients. This large army of volunteers come from all walks of life and are all unpaid. The volunteers are involved in all facets of the service such as planning, buying, preparation, cooking, packing, washing up, cleaning and delivering. Included in the delivery service is the serving of meals and driving. I am pleased to say that the member for Semaphore is actively involved in driving and I commend him for his involvement.

The most important aspect of Meals on Wheels is that it is not a charity. All recipients are required to pay for their meals. Last year 929 599 meals were delivered to recipients throughout South Australia at a cost of over $2 million. It is interesting to note that, in our bicentennial year, the 17 millionth meal was delivered from the Unley kitchen. It consisted of tomato soup, turkey, pork, beans, roast potatoes, peas and gravy with a sweet of blueberry pie and cream. This was by no means a special meal, despite its significance, but represented fairly usual fare for such meals. They are always of a very good standard.

Doris Taylor gave assistance to the setting up of Meals on Wheels in all other States of Australia but, unlike the other States, in South Australia the service is fully coordinated. Elsewhere the service is largely fragmented. Some branches are run almost entirely by local government and others on an *ad hoc* basis. No doubt they do a very good job in the other States but they are not as organised as South Australia. In South Australia the Meals on Wheels concept and service works in very well with the Home and Community Care program.

Meals on Wheels Incorporated sees itself as accountable in three areas, with three directions for the faithful and economic usage of all moneys received. It is accountable, first, to those who use its services: for the availability of its services, with eligibility determined by age or the medical needs of the individual rather than preferential treatment on account of race, colour, creed or social status; for the quality of its services and its recognition of the individuality of each person; and for its concern that each person should be supported where necessary and rehabilitated where possible.

Secondly, it is accountable to the general community: for the quality of its services; for the positive and appropriate usage of donations and bequests made, fundraising efforts supported and voluntary service given. Thirdly, it is responsible to the various levels of Government: for the faithful and economic usage of money received as subsidies; for the quality of its services; for its adherence to agreements reached in application of funds received and services provided in accordance with policy statements issued; and for its efforts to supplement Government support with voluntary assistance wherever possible. These directions, policies, values and the constitution were set up by Doris Taylor in 1954 and remain virtually unchanged.

I turn now to a statement contained in an old document, as follows:

> She who is on duty for the day will prepare a dinner and carry it to the sick. On arrival, she will greet them cheerfully, place the tray upon a table, set a cloth on it together with a glass, a spoon and some bread. She will put the soup in a bowl and the meat on a plate, arranging it all on the tray. She will endeavour to cheer the sick person if he is unhappy. Sometimes she will cut up his meat and pour out his drink. Then she will go off to find another whom she will treat in the same fashion.

One could be forgiven for thinking that the above quotation came from a modern day Meals on Wheels training manual but the words are those of Vincent de Paul to his volunteers in 1646. I also pay tribute to Derek Noble, AM, the State President of Meals on Wheels and former Mayor of Glenelg. He was involved with Doris Taylor in the concept of Meals on Wheels at the time of the establishment of the service and he worked with Doris before she passed on. Derek was with Doris Taylor shortly before she died and her last words to him were, 'Carry on the good work.'

Recently a Japanese delegation was sent to Adelaide to study the Meals on Wheels concept and to investigate how it was set up and how it operates in this State. I have always been something of a student of Japanese culture and have admired them for the way in which their community looks after their own, especially their aged people. Obviously, westernisation is overtaking the Japanese as with a lot of other countries and younger people are starting to opt out of their responsibility in this regard. There is an increasing need in Japan for a service such as Meals on Wheels, and the Japanese who studied the excellently run and organised concept in South Australia have taken the idea back to Japan.

In this the bicentennial year, the Federal Government has set up a Bicentennial Heritage 200 Project, which is a list of 200 great Australians. Approximately 2 000 people have been nominated, of whom 200 will be honoured later this year. I feel sure in my own heart that Doris Taylor will be one of those names. I will now read an extract from a paper written by Doris Taylor in January 1954. Under the heading 'A new approach to the problem of the aged', the extract reads:

> Because of the rapidly ageing population in all English speaking countries it is necessary to find new methods of caring for the aged. Old methods are useless because:
>
> *(a)* The number of young people in relation to the aged would make it physically impossible for permanent help to be provided in every house where old and infirm persons live.
>
> *(b)* Homes and institutions grow steadily more costly to build and maintain. Psychologically they are bad.
>
> *(c)* Staffing of homes for the aged will become almost impossible as the competition for workers grows keener with the ever-decreasing percentage of people of working age.
>
> *(d)* The community generally and the old people particularly benefit from the aged remaining in their natural environment. Any social pattern becomes unbalanced by the segregation or dislocation of any of its member groups.

Those comments are just as relevant today. Miss Taylor, MBE, worked under the handicap of being physically disabled and confined to a wheelchair all of her life. This grand lady died on 23 May 1968 at the age of 59, and she was indeed a legend in her own lifetime.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My first point concerns the ongoing case of Mr Reg McColl who has been infected with the chlorinated hydrocarbon Aldrin. This is the third occasion on which I have raised this matter and it is about time that the Government started to take note. I will remind members of the position. The use of chlorinated hydrocarbons has been banned for agricultural purposes in this State.

It has also been banned because of the impact it was having on the export of beef and because in the United States it is considered a dangerous substance and there is evidence in that country to indicate that it could be carcinogenic. However, the chlorinated hydrocarbons are still used by pest control companies in Adelaide and it is in relation to that matter that Mr McColl ran into trouble. Members may recall from my earlier speeches on this subject that Mr McColl had his home sprayed with a mixture of Aldrin and other substances. As a result, he became ill and had a blood test taken which was found to be positive with Aldrin. He complained to the Health Commission, which investigated the matter and said that there was nothing really wrong with him and that there were only minor traces around the house. They chose to ignore the blood levels, saying they were irrelevant, and virtually dismissed the matter with a report.

I asked the Minister to review that report, which he subsequently did. Once again, the Health Commission stuck to its original recommendations and did nothing about it. In the meantime, Mr McColl, his fiancee and Dr Seow continued to complain of feeling ill. It was only recently that he rang me and said that he still felt ill as a result of the blood levels that he had. He went to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in November this year and had another blood test. I have before me the two blood tests: one by the Department of Chemistry dated 5 March 1987 in which the blood level is 0.004 mg/L. On 2 November a document from the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science records the blood level as 6.8 ng/ml which, I am advised, can be interpreted as a 50 per cent increase of Aldrin in the blood level.

I do not think that any Government or health commission can continue to ignore Mr McColl and Dr Seow. If the blood level from the residual air levels from this chemical has resulted in the blood and fat tissue level of his system rising by as much as that, they can no longer turn a blind eye to the protests that this couple have been making. I intend to see the Minister at the earliest opportunity and ask the Health Commission to reopen the investigation into this case. I believe that if the blood levels continue to rise—as predicted by an American doctor who was out here recently and who reminded Australians of this problem of residual air levels—the Health Commission can no longer turn a blind eye to it.

We have tried to emphasise in this House the concern of the public that there is an unknown factor in relation to the use of chlorinated hydrocarbons. We want the experts to agree. I do not know the answers—I am only a lay person when it comes down to these matters. The Health Commission says it is safe, yet the Department of Agriculture says it is dangerous. Where do we stand in between? If the blood levels of this gentleman are going up at the rate they are because of the residual air levels in his home, I say to the Government: for goodness sake, reinvestigate this matter as a matter of urgency.

The second matter I want to raise is on behalf of another constituent, Mr R.M. Cutler, who lives at Glenelg North. He wrote to me about two subjects: first, objecting to the Government's proposal for the State to take over the Repatriation General Hospital. I think all members would have received correspondence on this matter. I want to put on record that the Liberal Party when in Government will not support any takeover of the Repatriation General Hospital in South Australia unless and until it is done on a timetable which has been set down very clearly in consultation with the RSL. When that timetable is set down it will happen, but not until such time as there is a general agreement with the RSL. The letter went on:

> In addition to that request, there is a further matter in regard to war veterans that I consider is deserving of some urgent consideration. I am suggesting that veterans should receive some consideration towards placing them in a more favoured position amongst other types of pensioners. Surely there is a case that those veterans who are only in receipt of a limited war service retirement pension because of superannuation, etc., should receive the concessions available to all pensioners on a full pension.
>
> From 1945 and the proliferation of nuclear bombs and weapons there is a realisation that the circumstances in relation to servicemen would be different in the event of war; there would be no-one left to receive or donate largesse to non-existent individuals. As a consequence the sacrifices made by personnel in the Second World War, Korean and Vietnam wars have become academic and are no longer of great significance in these days of economic struggle.
>
> I feel people who served in the armed forces during war and missed on higher civilian salaries and wages during those years should receive some consideration now we are older and becoming fewer every year.

That last paragraph sums up what Mr Cutler was trying to say. I would be surprised if any member in this Chamber did not agree with the sentiments expressed in that letter. I ask the Premier, in his position as Federal President of the Labor Party, to take Mr Cutler's appeal to Canberra and see that something is done about it.

Like many war service pensioners, Mr Cutler deserves the best in benefits from this country. They defended the country and they deserve everything they get, and it is a pretty poor show when, at this stage of life, when benefits are being handed out right, left and centre to recipients across this nation, this gentleman finds that there are recipients of pensions who are better off than a man who has served his country overseas.

In the last two minutes that I have available I wish to refer to a request from a constituent, Mrs Hopkins of Albert Street, Glenelg East. Once again, I ask the Premier to take this matter up with the Federal Treasurer. The letter which is addressed to the Prime Minister, and a copy of which was sent to me, states:

> I, Mary Hopkins, being a concerned citizen am outraged at the Federal Government's policy towards recipients of the pension. The changes announced in the Budget and May Economic Statement to the Social Security Income Test profoundly alter the basic right of all individuals to be treated fairly and equitably.
>
> It is unthinkable that pensioners should be considered second-class citizens. Many have worked all their lives and saved for their retirement. They should not be prevented from investing as they see fit and receiving fair and even treatment in return.
>
> For the Government to persist in classing capital growth as income is punitive and reprehensible. To ignore indexation for inflation and not allow the offsetting of capital gains with losses is also blatantly unfair. It is also very confusing as to why investors in managed funds should be singled out.
>
> Please withdraw this policy now so that equity can be returned to the system.

The letter is signed A.M. Hopkins and it is dated. Time has run out on me—I would have liked to raise some other issues—but I am sure that the sentiments expressed by Mrs Hopkins and Mr Cutler are shared by many of the aged in this community who are asking nothing more from this Labor Government than a fair go.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): At the risk of doing a good topic to death, I want to return to the greenhouse effect and examine the role of the world's rainforests in offering a buffer and cushion against the greenhouse effect and, to

some extent, turning around the effects of what has become known as the greenhouse effect. We know that 2½ times 10^{12}—2½ trillion tonnes—of carbon dioxide float around in the atmosphere above our heads. We also know that, although that only represents about .04 per cent of the atmosphere, it represents a doubling since 1750 and the advent of the industrial revolution. We know also that the biosphere naturally absorbs carbon dioxide, but most of us know that it only absorbs carbon dioxide at the rate of about one millionth of the rate that we are putting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. In other words, of each tonne we put in each year only one gram is reabsorbed into the biosphere.

We know that 80 per cent of the source of, if you like, human carbon dioxide comes from non-renewable fuels, such as coal and petroleum, and that the remaining 20 per cent comes from a mixture of the burning of methane and natural fuels and, more particularly, the burning of wood. Of that 20 per cent, half comes from the forest fires that have raged for the past half decade in the Amazon Basin.

President Reagan's Global 2000 Report indicates that 56 million hectares of forests were being cleared every year and that half of the 10 million animal and plant species on the planet live in the rainforests. It also states that about 20 species a day become extinct, largely through the clearance of the world's rainforests. I want to look very briefly at the state of play of tropical rainforests on the various continents. In India the World Bank is financing a series of dam building projects known collectively as the Namada River scheme, which consists of the construction of 30 dams and 3 000 irrigation schemes. That scheme in itself will result in the displacement of 1 million native people from the regions immediately south of the Himalayas.

In Indonesia the World Bank has invested $1 billion into transmigration schemes, with the result that 200 000 people a year leave the more populated islands of Bali, Java and Lombok. Those migrants are resettled on Kalimantan and Irian Jaya. In Brazil the World Bank again has promised $500 million to resettle the Amazon Basin where much of the clearance is going on. The British multinational, Unilever, has licences to clear 75 000 hectares of rainforests in the New Georgia group of the Solomon Islands. That will be carried out on the island of New Georgia, which is the third island in the New Georgia group to be virtually razed to sea level by that process of deforestation of rainforests.

In the Philippines, of the 30 million hectares of original forest, only 1 million remain and in Malaysia rainforest clearance also proceeds. The Atang Bari Dam project in Sarawak has displaced 3 000 people. That project involves the clearance of forests to build roads and to build the catchment area of the dam and, if the Pelagus and Bakun dams go ahead, another 17 000 native people will be displaced. It is also interesting to note that a fair proportion of the power generated by those projects will be purchased by Reynolds, the American aluminium company, for smelters on the south-western shores of Sarawak. The remainder of that will be piped across in underground cable to West Malaysia for distribution to the more urbanised areas there.

In Sarawak, along with the dam building, a rather extensive program of rainforest logging is carried out. Logs from Sarawak go to Japan, South Korea and Taiwan. That has had a substantial effect on the traditional hunting grounds of a whole collection of native tribes, including the Penan, the Kelabit, the Kayon, the Marut and the Iban. That logging process has also threatened the habitats of a number of endangered species, including the two-horned rhinoceros, the proboscis monkey, the silvered langur and the banded langur. I will not elaborate on the number of vulnerable animals which are threatened or are classified by the IUCN as simply being rare.

The response of native people to the clearance of rainforests in various parts of the world has been interesting. In India, the Chipko movement, which in one dialect or another refers to the hugging of trees, has been established. It simply involves village people going out to trees which are to be felled by loggers and forming a human chain around them. There is a similar group, known as the Green Belt movement, in Kenya. The response in Indonesia has been rather more violent and I suspect that much of the problem that the Indonesians have had with the OPM and Jacob Prei has resulted from the fact that the clearance of traditional hunting grounds has continued and that people who have basically lived as hunters and gatherers have been displaced. As a result, they are very angry. In many cases, they have taken refuge in Papua New Guinea and have mounted attacks on Indonesian troops across the border.

In the Solomons, the reaction to the Unilever logging project was that 200 people rampaged through the logging camp and did about $1 million damage. In the Philippines, particularly on Mindanao, and near the town Zamboanga del Sur, people lay in front of bulldozers, much as the member for Coles has promised to do. In Malaysia, 6 800 tribal people signed a petition in North Sarawak asking for the creation of a communal forest reserve.

The response of Governments in those countries has been fairly predictable: they have put people in gaol and charged them with obstructing lawful entry and that sort of thing. The solution of the logging companies has been a little more creative. The companies behind the Sarawak logging projects, namely the Wong Tung Kuang company, the Samling company, and the Limbang Trading Company, have gone to the villages and tried to buy off the tribal chiefs. They have promised to pay 75 per cent of the royalties to the tribal chiefs and to distribute only 25 per cent to the tribes.

I asked myself whether those people who are having their traditional hunting and gathering territories destroyed should be left to deal with the matter themselves or whether something more could be done. I have come to the conclusion that something can be done. Indeed, Governments in some Third World countries now realise that their rainforests represent a buffer against the greenhouse effect and that they represent a vast catalogue and library of genetic information with respect to the animals and plants that they contain. Brazil has had the courage to declare a moratorium on the logging of rainforests and I hope that Malaysia, the Philippines and other Governments follow suit.

The plight of rainforests can be brought to the attention of consumers in the developed world in rather more creative ways. In the United Kingdom the Friends of the Earth distributed a bumper sticker with the words 'A monkey lost his nuts for this product.' People place those stickers on such things as tropical fruit bowls and the like. At a more serious level, the United Nations Convention on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) has established the International Tropical Timber Organisation which met for the first time in March last year in Yokohama, and that organisation established the International Tropical Timber Agreement, which at this time has 41 signatories. Those nations agreed to abide by the notions of sustainable utilisation, conservation of genetic resources and the maintenance of ecological balance, amongst other things.

A series of actions can be played by developed countries through the multilateral development banks which bankroll many of these clearance projects. Between them (the World Bank, the Inter American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the African Development Bank)

they lend $25 billion a year to less developed countries. Australia has a 2.5 per cent vote on the World Bank and I believe that we could use that vote to change the policies of the development banks so that we could control in some way the development of those logging projects.

I believe that we can go a little further than that. We might also move in the United Nations for a convention to underwrite the survival of existing rainforests in Third World countries and to subsidise the replanting of those forests, partly to give ourselves breathing space in the face of the greenhouse effect and partly to preserve the human cultures and those native animals and plants that are threatened by forest clearance.

Motion carried.

At 9.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 November 1988

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

COOPER BASIN REGIONAL RESERVE

53. **The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What action has been taken to develop a Conservation Management Program for the Coongie Lakes area of the Cooper Basin Regional Reserve and when will the management plan be available for public discussion?

2. In the meantime, what steps are being taken to control litter and vandalism in the reserve?

3. Are any checks kept on the volume of rubbish and, in particular, the volume of beverage containers found in the reserve?

4. What are the staffing arrangements at the reserve and what staffing arrangements are planned for the next 12 and 24 months?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The draft plan of management for the proposed Innamincka Regional Reserve, which includes a conservation management program for the Coongie Lakes area, will be available for public comment following proclamation of the reserve.

2. As the reserve is not yet proclaimed there is no existing management framework to control litter and vandalism.

3. No.

4. In the absence of a proclaimed reserve there are no current staffing arrangements beyond the existing field staff of the Far North District of the National Parks and Wildlife Service based at Leigh Creek. Following reserve proclamation staff will be based in the area on a seasonal basis using facilities purchased at Tirawarra mining camp.

REMOTE SENSING UNIT

56. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Which Government departments and agencies contributed $460 915 to the Remote Sensing Unit in the past financial year, how much in each case and for what reason?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

Government agency contribution to SACRS financial performance of $460 915.

Cash balance brought forward 1986-87 expended	$150 000
Non-cash depreciation expenditure	$136 000
Project sales of image analysis work for Government agencies:	
Department of Agriculture	$13 000
Lands Department	$9 000
ETSA	$7 000
	$315 000

The remaining $146 000 was made up as sales to non-State Government customers.

NORTHFIELD ACCOMMODATION

75. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: How many cottages for the accommodation of minimum security women at Northfield are to be built, where will they be built and at what capital cost?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Two, four bedroom cottages are to be constructed at the Northfield Prison Complex for low security female prisoners. Included in each cottage will be a facility for nursing mother prisoners. The cottages will be built to the north of the existing women's section utilising the present rear fence as the southern boundary of the cottages zone. The estimated capital cost for these cottages and associated fencing, siteworks, recreation area and connection to services is $310 000.

PRISONERS' MEDICATION

76. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. How many prisoners at each prison required medication on a regular basis each day and for what reasons?

2. What additional training are staff given to handle prisoners with various disabilities and complaints including epilepsy, asthma, diabetes, heart, cancer, intellectual disability, alcoholism and drug addiction?

3. What progress has the prison drug unit achieved in the past financial year and how many incidents of drugs detection have occurred in each prison or institution in that period?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of prisoners on courses of medications on 7 October 1988 was determined to be the following:

Institution	No. of Prisoners on Medication
Adelaide Remand Centre	34
Yatala Labour Prison	41
Northfield Prison Complex	16
Mobilong Prison	22
Cadell Training Centre	31
Port Augusta Prison	17
Port Lincoln Prison	11
Mount Gambier Gaol	10
Total	182

The figures approximate the daily average for the institutions concerned and represent inmates prescribed medications more often than just a one-off dose, and approximately 50 per cent of these would be prisoners who are on 'long term' medications. These 182 prisoners are receiving medications for a wide variety of medical conditions including diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, drug addiction, psychiatric illness, muscle skeletal complaints, hayfever, infections, skin conditions, heart diseases and high blood pressure among others.

2. All Correctional Officers undertake a Senior First-Aid Certificate course or St John Ambulance Association course. These courses enable them to give emergency treatment for any life threatening situation and to recognise such potential life threats as epilepsy, asthma, diabetes, heart conditions and substance abuse. Correctional Officers also receive training in handling persons who are psychologically disturbed. This training is generally given by a medical practitioner or psychologist from James Nash House, Hillcrest Hospital.

3. The Prison Drug Unit, which commenced operation on 2 March 1987, has an alcohol/drug program which incorporates the following elements:

Assessment—Prisoners referred to the unit are assessed regarding their drug or alcohol intake.

Counselling—At present, the program is limited to one-to-one counselling with group work and education programs in the planning stages.

Pre-release—Prior to release, the unit re-establishes contact with the prisoner and a report is prepared concerning the client's drug using behaviour.

Post release—Attempts are made to maintain contact with prisoners after release and individual hand over of the referrals to other clinics or agencies.

The following statistics give a breakdown of referrals to the unit and the number of counselling/assessments which occurred for the last financial year, 1987-88:

281 individuals presented to the unit;

they accounted for 1 433 attendances/occasions of service; and

of these individuals, 216 were new clients to the Prison Drug Unit.

There has been a high incidence of direct case work over the past financial year. As demonstrated by the statistics it can be seen that the Prison Drug Unit has been able to provide a service to a large number of prisoners with drug/alcohol problems in 1987-88.

The number of incidents of discovery of marijuana, hashish oil, heroin, cocaine, rohypnol, amphetamines and hallucinates during the 1987-88 financial year were:

Yatala Labour Prison	40
Adelaide Gaol	7
Northfield Prison Complex	19
Cadell Training Centre	18
Port Augusta Gaol	15
Port Lincoln Prison	5
Mount Gambier Gaol	10
Adelaide Remand Centre	12
Mobilong Prison	8

Other discoveries have been made during the financial year of alcohol and illicit brews, syringes and bong pipes. In addition, there are many instances where the Dog Squad has indicated the presence of drugs but have not located any. The information for each institution in relation to these categories is:

	Alcohol and Illicit Brews	Syringes	Bong Pipes	Drug Indications	Total
Yatala Labour Prison		20	77	69	166
Adelaide Gaol	1	1	6	13	21
Northfield Prison Complex		12	7	13	32
Cadell Training Centre	8	7	32	16	63
Port Augusta Gaol	7		19	9	35
Port Lincoln Prison	3		22	15	40
Mount Gambier Gaol	3	1	5	2	11
Adelaide Remand Centre		4		73	77
Mobilong Prison		4	10	13	27

MEDICAL ASSESSMENT OF REMANDEES

77. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. What medical assessment is undertaken of all remandees and offenders upon their admittance to Department of Correctional Services institutions?

2. What neurological or other specialist examinations and assessments of offenders are undertaken?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The vast majority of new prison admissions are in metropolitan Adelaide or Port Augusta. In these prisons, prisoners are seen by a nurse within hours of arrival and most are also seen by a medical officer within 24 hours. In other areas, doctors visit the prisons on a regular weekly basis. Should the nurse consider that an earlier medical consultation is warranted, arrangements are made for this to occur. New prisoners with expected stays of more than seven days have their blood tested for HIV infection compulsorily and, at the same time, may also volunteer to be tested for Hepatitis B.

2. Specialist consultations are undertaken from time to time, including neurological examinations, upon the medical judgment of prison doctors. the indications for such specialist referrals are the same as those for people with similar problems in the community.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES STAFF

80. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: How many female staff are employed by the Department of Correctional Services in each prison and in what capacities, and how do these statistics compare with those of 30 June 1987?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The number of female staff employed by the Department of Correctional Services, in each institution, is indicated below by classification. This information is provided for the years ended 30.6.87 and 30.6.88.

FEMALE STAFF BY INSTITUTION AS AT 30.6.87 AND 30.6.88

TITLE	CLASSIFICATION	ARC		CTC		MOBILONG		MT GAMB		NPC		PORT AUG		PORT LINC		YLP		ADEL GAOL		TOTALS	
		86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88	86-87	87-88
Clerical Officer	CO-1	4	3	4	4	n/a	3	1	1	1	3	2	1	2	2	3	4	6	n/a	23	21
	CO-2	2	2				3					1	1		1	1	1			4	8
	CO-3									1						1	1			2	1
	CO-4									1		1								2	
Correctional Industry Officer	PI-1									1										1	
	PI-3			1	1					1	1									2	2
Correctional Officer	PO-1	14	14		4		12	1	1	16	18		2			8	19	11		50	70
	PO-2						1											1		1	1
	PO-3									1	1									1	1
Social Worker	SWO-1			1	1		1			1	1					1	2	3		6	5
Totals		20	19	6	10	n/a	20	2	2	23	24	4	4	2	3	14	27	21	n/a	92	109

81. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: How many staff are located at the Department of Correctional Services head office and in what capacities and classifications, and how do these statistics compare with those of 30 June 1987?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The following table indicates the number of staff located at the Department of Correctional Services Head Office as at 30 June 1987 and 30 June 1988, and the classifications of these positions.

HEAD OFFICE STAFF—30 JUNE 1987 AND 1988

Classification	30.6.87	30.6.88
AO-1	8	7
AO-2	1	—
AO-3	8	8
AO-4	2	3
CO-1	33	34
CO-2	7	10
CO-3	7	7
CO-4	6	6
CO-5	11	12
EO-1	4	4
EO-3	1	1
EO-5	1	1
LIB-3	—	1
PO-1	1	—
PP-3	1	1
SO-2	1	1
SHR-5	—	1
SR-5	1	—
SWO-1	1	1
SWO-2	1	—
SWO-3	2	2
SWO-6	1	1
TOTAL	98	101

The capacity in which these officers are employed is dependent on the division in which they are located. The duties performed are relevant to the operations and objectives of those divisions—operations, community corrections, prison industries, programs, support services and research and planning.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

84. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: How many Department of Correctional Services staff were absent on workers compensation in the past financial year, for what reasons and for how long?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: There were 250 claims for workers compensation reported during the past financial year. The reasons for the claims vary, but the major causes were:

Sprains and strains	113
Contusions and crushings	53
Stress/anxiety disorder	20
Fractures	15
Lacerations, etc.	13
Miscellaneous	36
	250

The total number of weeks lost was 488.40.

GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

95. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What causes 'lumpiness' in the flow of Government contracts and what action will be taken to avoid 'lumpiness' in future (Program Estimates and Information, page 320)?

2. Which Government buildings will be refurbished in 1988-89?

3. What benefits and achievements have been obtained from liaising with construction industry representatives in the private and public sectors, particularly in relation to the area of training and apprentices?

4. Were any overseas joint ventures identified involving private and public sector construction industry bodies and, if so, what benefits were or will be achieved?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Lumpiness in the flow of Government contracts arranged through Sacon can be caused by a number of different factors. For example, education works usually need to be finalised to coincide with the commencement of the school year. In the case of projects for the Children's Services Office there is a requirement to spend Commonwealth funding by the end of October. In addition to normal planning procedures, three specific initiatives are in operation in an effort to avoid lumpiness, viz.:

(a) Sacon project allocation meetings are held monthly, to address forward planning of contracts and departmental works allocation.

(b) Sacon contracts consultative committee meetings are held bi-monthly, to address union aspects of work allocation.

(c) Construction Industry Advisory Council meetings are held monthly to advise the Minister on a wide range of matters. Membership comprises representatives from Government departments, private industry and associations.

2. No major refurbishment of Government owned buildings has been included on the 1988-89 capital works program. However, the partial refurbishment of the South Australian Travel Centre was completed this month at an estimated cost of $475 000.

3. The Construction Industry Advisory Council provides a useful forum for discussion and information sharing between the private and public sectors. One of the most recent initiatives to arise from these discussions concerns the establishment of a full-time 'off-the-job' training centre at Sacon's Netley complex. The centre, which is Commonwealth approved, will be eligible for craft subsidies. The centre will facilitate training to enhance existing skills of tradespersons together with providing the opportunity to develop new skills. It will cater for most building trades from all sections of industry, both government and private, and will also include pre-vocational students from schools.

4. Negotiations are continuing to develop overseas joint ventures.

POLICY ADVICE TO THE MINISTER

96. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How are the expenditure of $1 397 000 and employment of 11 staff made up under the allocation for Policy Advice to the Minister, (Program Estimate and Information, page 305) and why was $15 555 000 allocated in the 1987-88 budget, but only $664 000 spent?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The staff of 11 represent the staff of the Office of Housing and the proposed 1988-89 expenditure of $1 397 000 is made up as follows:

	$
Salaries wages and related payments	434 000
Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries	154 000
International Year of Shelter for the Homeless	102 000
State Bank—HOME Administration Fee	707 000
	$1 397 000

For 1987-88, the actual expenditure of $664 000 did not include the payment to the State Bank—HOME administration fee of $668 000 as it was shown under a different subprogram (Debt Servicing). In 1988-89 it is shown under the subprogram 'Policy advice to the Minister' as indicated above.

The 1987-88 proposed expenditure of $15 555 000 provided for an amount of $14 900 000 in Commonwealth funds for housing offset by an equal amount under Recurrent Receipts. Changes to the Public Finance and Audit Act, which came into effect from July 1987, require that money received by the Treasurer from the Commonwealth Government be credited to and distributed from the Consolidated Account. This change is reflected by the reduction in actual expenditure and receipts for 1987-88.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

102. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What action will be taken this year to assist the Aboriginal community in its housing needs (Program Estimates and Information, page 312)?

2. What is the waiting time for Aborigines seeking rental accommodation in the metropolitan area and country regions and how many families are on the waiting lists?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. South Australia received a CSHA grant of $6 391 000 earmarked for Aboriginal Housing for 1988-89.

2. The waiting time for Aboriginal funded rental accommodation ranges from three years in the Elizabeth/Salisbury and Noarlunga areas to four years in the inner metropolitan area. In country areas it varies from town to town, as shown below:

Ceduna	1½ years
Port Augusta	1½ years
Port Lincoln	1 year
Murray Bridge	2½ years
Riverland	1 year

At 30 June 1988 there were 1 197 applications on file for rental housing with the Aboriginal Funded Unit. It is not known how many Aborigines have applied for rental housing with the general trust or how many Aboriginal tenants are housed by the trust. Unless an Aboriginal person applies for Aboriginal housing no record of Aboriginality is taken.

WEST TERRACE CEMETERY

111. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What is the cost of the national environment consultancy which has been contracted to prepare a management and conservation plan for the West Terrace Cemetery (Program Estimates and Information, page 314)?

2. How much grave restoration was carried out in the year ended 30 June 1988 and how much will be undertaken this year?

3. How many leases were issued and renewed in the past year, how many leases have now been issued and what is the capacity of the cemetery?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The total cost to prepare the management and conservation plan for the West Terrace Cemetery by the national environmental consultancy is $29 500.

2. In the year ended 30 June 1988, $24 048 was spent on grave restoration. The allocation for the 1988-89 financial year is $48 000.

3. In the year ended 30 June 1988 there were 27 new leases issued, four leases transferred and one lease renewed. In total, 28 640 leases have been issued. However, it should be noted that this does not mean there are 28 640 individual leases issued at present. Since leases were first issued in 1839, each transfer and renewal results in another lease being used. In the past, leases were transferred through the family for generations. A number of those leases issued prior to 1888 have expired and, under the current burial criteria, only a very small percentage would carry burial rights. Currently it is estimated that there are 3 500 sites in the general section which are vacant or where leases have expired. There are approximately 1 500 sites in an area which was used for 'common' or unleased burials and around 5 000 sites in the Catholic section.

ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE

116. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Why has the Government not advised the public of a serious incident at the Adelaide Remand Centre on Sunday, 31 July 1988 when six staff were assaulted, one seriously, when a remandee acted irrationally?

2. What happened to the offender?

3. What medical assistance was available?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The incident involving a remandee and staff at the Adelaide Remand Centre on 31 July 1988 was reported to head office, Department of Correctional Services on the departmental incident reporting system as per normal practice for this type of incident. Before providing the Minister with the full details of this type of incident it is common practice for the Executive Director to await the result of the offender's court appearance. In this instance, the remandee is due to appear in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 4 November 1988, and a full report on this incident would be provided once the action taken against the remandee is known.

2. The offender has been charged with four counts of assault, and is due to appear at the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 4 November 1988. The offender was also charged with various offences under the Correctional Services Act. He appeared before the Visiting Justice Tribunal, was found guilty, and the Visiting Justice ordered "loss of seven days contact visits; loss of seven days telephone calls (except legal); a fine of $60 to be paid at $4 per week".

3. Staff, and the offender, were seen, and appropriately treated by medical staff. As a precautionary measure, three officers attended the Royal Adelaide Hospital for X-rays.

BAROSSA GOURMET WEEKEND

120. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: How many motor vehicle accidents were reported in the Barossa Valley for the weekend 20-21 August 1988 and how do the statistics compare with the Barossa Gourmet Weekend of the previous year?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In 1988 there were three motor vehicle accidents, and three also in 1987.

PRISON EQUIPMENT

123. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. What equipment and recreation facilities are made available to offenders in recreation rooms at Yatala and Mobilong Prisons and the Adelaide Remand Centre?

2. What equipment is available in the exercise yards of each division at Yatala, what is the condition of the equip-

ment and is it protected from rain in winter and, if not, what action is taken to prevent equipment rusting?

3. Are there toilet facilities in the exercise yards of each division at Yatala and, if not, why not?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Yatala Labour Prison

(a) 'B' Division: The assembly hall has a variety of weight training equipment, table tennis tables and a boxing ring. The outdoor recreation area has a tennis court, a basketball court, a cricket pitch, football field and a running track. Equipment is provided so that these facilities can be utilised. Prisoners may engage in leather work in their cells and equipment is made available for this purpose. In each unit of 'B' Division there is a small library.

(b) 'S & D' Division: Prisoners have access to two small exercise yards in which tennis balls and soccer balls are provided. Board games are also provided for prisoners in these areas. For those prisoners who must be exercised individually, a small yard is provided to the west of the Officers Station. This area does not have any recreation facilities. There is a small library in 'S & D' Division.

(c) 'E' Division: The prisoners in units 2 and 3 in 'E' Division have access to an indoor weight training facility in the central court of 'E' Division. They also have access to two tennis courts/basketball courts and are given appropriate equipment with which to engage in activities in these areas. The prisoners in unit 1 in 'E' Division who require protection, also have access to the tennis courts for approximately one hour each day. They have a small yard in which the old weight lifting equipment from 4 Yard in Adelaide Gaol has been installed. This equipment is placed under a shelter which was originally designed only to provide shade for prisoners recreating in this area. There is a library in 'E' Division.

(d) Infirmary: There is a small recreation yard attached to the infirmary in which prisoners may engage in light activity. There is a library in the infirmary and televisions are available as well as jig saw puzzles and board games.

Mobilong Prison

Units: Each unit is provided with two televisions, one table tennis table and equipment, one pool table, two dart boards and darts, playing cards and board games. Videos, selected by the inmates, are shown on Wednesday evenings, Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. There is a fenced off grass exercise area at the rear of each unit which is used for volleyball, football, soccer and general exercise.

Recreation Hall: Each prisoner is entitled to four half days a week to enrol in a recreational program. Programs which are provided are running, weight lifting, circuit training, tennis, badminton, squash, music practice, and seasonal sports such as football, soccer, baseball, and cricket. Equipment for these sports is provided by the department but, if prisoners wish to purchase their own, they may do so through the institutional canteen.

The recreational hall comprises the following facilities:

(a) Two squash courts;
(b) Multi-purpose weight lifting section;
(c) Standard gymnasium with stage, dart boards, boxing equipment, trampoline, and safety harness;
(d) Change rooms and shower areas for both prisoners and visiting sporting teams.

External recreational area includes:

(a) Two tennis courts;
(b) Swimming pool;
(c) Grassed oval which is used for seasonal games, for example, football, soccer, baseball and cricket.

Education: The educational block is used as a recreational facility from 1730 hours to 2200 hours; Monday to Friday. The following is available in this area:

(a) Ceramics;
(b) Leatherwork;
(c) Computers;
(d) Comprehensive library and reading room;
(e) Bible study session every Friday evening.

Adelaide Remand Centre

The equipment and recreational facilities which are made available to offenders in recreation rooms/units at the Adelaide Remand Centre are:

Television set (two videos are shown daily);
Pool table and accessories;
Table tennis table and accessories;
A variety of library books and magazines;
An assortment of games.

In addition, the recreation complex, comprising of a gymnasium, weights room and swimming pool, are available to offenders daily.

2. The condition of the equipment in 'B' Division is excellent. The condition of the equipment in 'E' Division is excellent, except for the old weight training equipment which was transferred from 4 Yard at Adelaide Gaol. The Activities Officer in 'E' Division maintains this equipment in reasonable condition given that the installation of the equipment was an *ad hoc* measure to provide extra recreational facilities for protectees and was able to be facilitated upon the closure of Adelaide Gaol. The area in which this equipment is installed is not purpose designed and, in fact, was constructed to provide shelter from the elements for those people recreating in this small yard adjacent to the protectees accommodation area.

3. There are toilet facilities in the 'B' Division recreation area, adjacent to the 'S&D' Division exercise yards, but there are no toilet facilities on the tennis courts in 'E' Division or in the protectees yard in 'E' Division. There is a toilet which could be used by prisoners exercising on the 'E' Division tennis courts, which is on the northern side of 'E' Division. The small yard which is used for protectees currently does not have a toilet. However, Stage 2 of the post commissioning in 'E' Division has funds allocated for the installation of a toilet in this area.