

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 17 November 1988

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):
South Australian Health Commission annual report, 1987-88.

QUESTIONS

RAH PARKING

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about Royal Adelaide Hospital car parking.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Most members in this Chamber would be aware of the ongoing saga of the shortage of car parking for nurses, patients and visitors at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Back on 5 July the Government tried to allay the growing concern about its inaction in providing adequate parking by announcing a two-stage \$14 million car parking scheme. The first stage, a 577-space car park, is to be built on land owned by the Adelaide City Council on premises bordered by Frome Street and Vaughan Place, while the second stage will involve the construction of a 728-space park in the northern precinct of the hospital's grounds.

Two gravely disappointing aspects of this announcement were the Government's apparent totally ignoring widespread support for a car park on the site of the existing South Australian Institute of Technology car park. It went instead for an off-site parking station, which will only put at risk, according to what I understand from hospital sources, the safety of nursing staff. At the same time the two-stage development will mean that, while work on the off-site car park is scheduled to start in 1989, work on the second, larger car park within the hospital grounds may not start until 1997. This means in short that not only will there still be a major shortage of parking in the hospital area but also that hospital staff will still face problems with safety in obtaining alternative parking for their vehicles.

I have recently received a letter from Sydney from a senior architect with a major car parking firm which now also appears to place a serious question mark over the Government's planned expenditure of \$14 million on the RAH car parks. This letter states that the interstate firm could construct a car park at a cost of \$7 000 to \$7 250 per space or, for a 1 305-space project planned by the Government, a maximum of \$9.5 million. To put it another way, that is 32 per cent less than the proposals announced by the Government last July. I am informed that even if the site for the car park was reasonably level it could even be practical to enter into a guaranteed maximum price for the project and to table all figures so that any savings could be credited to the hospital should the work cost less than the guaranteed maximum and on the agreed fixed fee.

The \$9.5 million figure, I am also informed, would include all professional fees—which would normally be expected to

add up to 8 per cent to a project's cost, and presumably the Government's plan—and would include all fire protection devices, computer controlled entry and exit points, lifts as necessary and toilet facilities at ground floor. The interstate proponents are prepared to provide funding for the project and, if necessary, manage the development on completion so that revenue generated from the scheme can be maximised for the hospital.

In view of the foregoing comments and the fact that there appears to be some doubt about the length of term of the lease from the City Council, my questions to the Minister are: does the \$14 million for the proposed two-stage RAH car park, announced by the Government in July, include fees, computer control, lifts and ground works? Who is to provide funds for the car park project? Would the \$14 million car park proposal be expected to be a guaranteed maximum or rise and fall contract? Does the \$14 million provide for piling of the structure? Does the project allow for a one-way traffic solution inside the car parks? Does the \$14 million project allow for internal spaces to be column free? What is the length of term of the lease? Who will be the owner of the building and the land at the finish? Finally, does the Government intend to negotiate for the purchase of the land so that the car park will forever be a part of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and so be available to the staff?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will have to refer those questions to my colleague the Minister of Health and I shall bring back a reply.

ASH WEDNESDAY 1983

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the Ash Wednesday 1983 bushfires.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Honourable members would know that I have made a number of statements and raised a number of questions about the progress of the consideration of and settlement of various claims arising from the February 1983 series of disastrous bushfires which swept through different parts of South Australia. The McLaren Vale fire has been the subject of the most attention, as that was the fire that the Supreme Court decided, in August 1985, was the responsibility of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Since then, of course, the question of liability has been resolved by the Supreme Court in respect of the Clare series of bushfires and also the South-East bushfires.

In respect of the McLaren Vale bushfires, liability was resolved in August 1985. Since then a number of claims have been settled, but I am advised that many claims remain unresolved, some of which involve very large sums of money—into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. A sense of frustration is being experienced by those claimants that they are unable to get a satisfactory resolution of these claims. Many people feel that they are still being squeezed by the Electricity Trust, and their impression is that this is being done on the basis that delay will make desperate victims settle for less than what they are entitled to.

I am told also that there is really no acknowledgment of the effective interest rate which those claimants have had to bear since August 1983 on the losses that they have suffered. The interest rate, which has fluctuated, is presently around 18 per cent or 19 per cent. As I say, there is a sense of frustration about the matter. Yesterday, I asked the Minister some questions in relation to the Ash Wednesday 1980 fires and the settlement package, details of which the Min-

ister announced earlier this week. By way of a supplementary question I asked whether, in the light of the three years delay in resolving the claims in the McLaren Vale fire, that would be regarded as undue delay, when taken in the context of the Minister's response that several months delay in settling the Stirling council question of liability and claims might prompt some intervention.

My concern is that, while the Government believes—as the Minister has expressed—that a matter of months would be an appropriate time frame within which to settle the Stirling claims, the Electricity Trust of South Australia, which is an instrumentality of the Government, has taken well over three years to settle some of the claims arising from Ash Wednesday 1983.

A great deal of hardship is being created by that. In the light of her responses yesterday, will the Minister investigate the current status of the Ash Wednesday 1983 bushfire claims with a view to informing the Council as to the number of claims that remain unsettled, and will she urge the Electricity Trust to adopt the same willingness to settle and to treat claimants reasonably, as the Government has indicated should be undertaken with respect to the victims of the Ash Wednesday 1980 fire at Stirling?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yesterday in response to the honourable member's questions I said that I hoped that claims for the 1980 Ash Wednesday bushfire victims could be dealt with in a matter of months. Certainly in the interests of the people involved it would be desirable for that to happen since those people have now been waiting for eight years. I also indicated that it would clearly depend on the resolution of some of the outstanding legal issues involved. In that context I discussed the possibility of alternative means for establishing quantum for claims and other issues which may be possible to set in train in order to hasten the process.

I also indicated in my reply that I was not able to comment on the situation as it relates to the 1983 bushfires and claims against the Electricity Trust of South Australia. I am still not in a position to make judgments about this since it is not a matter I have been dealing with directly or of which I have direct knowledge. I am certain that the Minister of Mines and Energy would share my view that, as far as possible, it is desirable for claims to be settled as quickly as possible for the victims of that bushfire also. If steps can be taken by the Minister in that respect, I am sure he will be willing to take them. I will certainly refer the honourable member's suggestions to my colleague and I am sure that if there is some action he can take, he will do so.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about the Adelaide Convention Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Adelaide Convention Centre was officially opened in June 1987. In publications and promotions of the Convention Centre, much was made of the fact that the building was multi-purpose. The ASER official brochure describes it as follows:

The innovative design of the building enables it to be flexible enough to be converted from a stadium capable of handling international tennis tournaments in front of 2 800 spectators to a banquet hall for 2 000.

At the launch last June the official program stated:

Besides conventions and banquets the main hall can be transformed into a sports stadium for events such as indoor tennis,

boxing and basketball and be utilised as a variety and live entertainment facility.

The Premier and the Minister reinforced that written message that the Convention Centre was designed for sporting events and live entertainment. The official brochure, which promoted the Adelaide Convention Centre, actually contained a sketch of a tennis match and spent some time discussing the attraction of the centre for both entertainment and sporting events. The Minister will recall that in the Appropriation Bill debate just a few days ago, I asked questions about sporting events at the Convention Centre.

Rather remarkably, she had very few details. Since that time, I have made some inquiries which reveal that the Convention Centre is suitable neither for competitive basketball nor for tennis matches. The design of the Convention Centre simply does not provide sufficient run-off on the sides for either basketball or tennis. In fact, there is only 18 inches from the side of the basketball court to the seats. As one basketball authority observed, 'It is just downright dangerous. A spectator or a player could be badly injured.' The same is true for tennis.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Don't take a front seat.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: You just do not sit in the front seats, and I think that the Minister would prefer to take a back seat on this subject, too. In other words, the centre is good only for exhibition matches, and who will pay good money to watch a game that is not fair dinkum and restricted by lack of space? From my inquiries, it appears that there was a lack of consultation in the design of the Convention Centre. How else could a mistake like this have been made? Although much was made of using the centre for sporting and entertainment events, it also appears that no provision was made for changerooms or shower facilities. Indeed, there was an exhibition match of basketball, where the players played very carefully and not in a full-blooded way, but they had to cross busy North Terrace after the match to shower at the Grosvenor Hotel—which is hardly what one would expect of a convention centre which is claimed to be of world standard.

My questions to the Minister are as follows: why did the promotion of and publicity before and after the opening of the Adelaide Convention Centre highlight the fact that the centre was suitable for tennis and basketball when the lack of run-off space has made competitive matches quite impossible? Why are there inadequate changerooms for entertainers and people involved in sporting competitions? How did this error in design occur and who was responsible for this design bungle at the Convention Centre?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This seems to be another example of those favourite three press releases that the honourable member carries around in his back pocket and refers to when he is approached by journalists and other people. As I recall it, it is not new at all. It is something that has been canvassed a number of times by people following various events that have occurred at the Convention Centre during the past 12 months or so.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! You have asked your question, Mr Davis.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member would be fully aware that, when he questioned me during the Committee stage of the Appropriation Bill, I indicated that, during the time that the Convention Centre has been operating (and we have had an opportunity to test it in the various modes possible), the various strengths and weaknesses of the design of the centre have been identified. There are some events and functions for which it is more suitable than others.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Based on the experience that has been gained from the various uses of the Convention Centre, the administrators of the centre are able to provide appropriate advice to people who make inquiries about using the centre, and they are quite open and frank about the possibilities, strengths and weaknesses.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: That is a misrepresented situation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order, Mr Davis! You have asked your question. I ask you to cease interjecting.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There are some organisers of sporting events who, therefore, go ahead, based on information that can be supplied to them, and hold their functions. There are others who subsequently choose not to hold their events there. As to the particular basketball demonstration match to which the honourable member referred, that was held at the Convention Centre and, as I understand it, the organisers of that event were advised of the arrangements concerning changerooms and other facilities which would be associated with it, and they were quite happy to proceed on that basis. It was never intended that this centre should be all things to all people.

The administrators of this multi-purpose centre have always acknowledged the fact that it will be more useful for some events than for others. In the case of the basketball match to which the honourable member refers, the game was adequately played. I am informed by the people who are associated with the basketball organisation that they felt that it was adequate for their purposes. They were prepared to go along with the arrangements concerning showers and changerooms and that is all that needs to be said about it. If they wish to come back again to play another match, I am sure that they will. However, if they felt that it was inadequate for their purposes, then they will not return, but other sporting events and functions of other kinds for which the centre is perfectly adequate will be conducted. People will make their judgments on that.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It's an absolute joke. It's a fiasco.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member will never acknowledge the success of the centre, because he does not approve of any one single—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Mr Davis!

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not going to warn you again, Mr Davis.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —element of the ASER development. He has knocked it from the very beginning and he continues to knock it. He has never acknowledged the success of the Adelaide Convention Centre, which made an operational profit in its first 12 months. It is the first purpose-built convention centre in Australia and, instead of congratulating the Government and those other people who were involved in bringing this initiative to fruition, we have received nothing but carping criticism about the Government, the State and every single initiative that is taken that might help to put South Australia on the international map. Many people in the tourism industry—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —in the convention business and various other sectors of the economy in this State would like Mr Davis to go away and play with his bow ties.

BANK TRANSACTION FEES

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism,

representing the Acting Minister of Consumer Affairs, a question about bank transaction fees.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On 1 December the Commonwealth Bank will begin to charge transaction fees on small accounts on a quarterly basis. Therefore, from 1 December, people who have an account which holds less than \$250 at any time during a month will be charged a fee of \$1.50 if a withdrawal is made during that month. The Commonwealth Bank's decision to impose charges of about \$18 a year on small depositors follows the lead set earlier this year by the ANZ and Westpac Banks. I understand that the Commonwealth Bank will exempt the accounts of pensioners who have their pensions directly deposited into their account, children under 18, and young people between 18 to 24 years who have a minimum monthly balance of \$100.

However, the people who will be hit by this new transaction fee are the low income earners, young families, and people who receive unemployment and sickness benefits—the very same people who at present are just surviving week to week and from pay packet to pay packet.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, not the left wing socialists. The transaction fees are being imposed at a time when major savings banks are pressing for the introduction of new annual fees for the credit cards Bankcard and Mastercard. I understand that consumer groups and groups such as the South Australian Council of Social Services are concerned that the Federal Government has not acted to stop banks imposing the transaction fees. There is also concern about what the State Government's response will be when Federal and State Ministers meet earlier next year in respect of this annual fee for credit cards. In fact, SACOSS has released a statement this week calling on the Commonwealth Bank to withdraw the latest imposition of charges on small depositors.

What is the Government's view of the imposition of transaction fees by banks on small account holders of \$250 or less? Has the State Government, under the auspices of the social justice unit, or, alternatively, the Department for Community Welfare or the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, assessed the impact of transaction fees and/or annual fees for credit card charges? Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs, like his counterpart in Victoria, oppose the claims by banks to impose annual fees for credit card charges when the Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers meet early next year?

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

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about legionnaire's disease and STA buses.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Yesterday, the Hon. Martin Cameron asked a question about legionnaire's disease, and today's *News* carries an article about the disease. The article states:

Health Commission authorities investigating the latest outbreak of legionnaire's disease in Adelaide are checking household water supplies and air-conditioning cooling towers in southern suburbs shopping centres.

The article further states:

Two people have been seriously ill in Flinders Medical Centre for more than a week with a rare strain of the often fatal dis-

ease... The Health Commission believes four others who have since recovered also contracted it. The three confirmed cases, two men and a woman all more than 50, came from the southern suburbs of Hove, Brighton and Christies Beach.

Reference is also made in the *News* to a new type of legionnaire's disease which has been identified.

A staff bulletin of 1 November 1988 from the State Transport Authority refers to bus evaporative cooler operations for this summer. The bulletin states:

Last summer bus coolers were operated on MAN SG280H buses, Mercedes-Benz and MAN SL200 buses, although those on the latter group did not prove to be completely reliable. This year, we intend to extend operation of coolers on the Volvo B58 buses and improve the reliability of those on the MAN SL200's.

The bulletin goes on to discuss *legionella* control:

Over 60 water samples from the buses were tested by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, last summer. None contained any *legionella pneumophila*, the bacteria responsible for *legionella* cutbreaks. One of the best ways of preventing any bacteria growth is to keep the systems clean and for some weeks now a team of maintenance staff have been working on our equipment to ensure that when the coolers go into service they will be as pure and fresh as possible.

Also, since last summer, we have sought further expert advice on purification of the water and this year we will be using a new anti-bacteria biocide called Myacide A.S. This material is quite safe for use in this way and is in fact used in lipstick and other cosmetics as a preservative. With these measures we are confident that we will have even greater success in the control of *legionella*.

The bulletin also refers to the operation of the coolers. It states:

On all MAN and Mercedes-Benz buses, the coolers will be available from 14 November 1988.

For the Volvo B58 buses, we are working ahead steadily converting the old unserviceable equipment to the more reliable trickle fed type, similar to those on the Mercedes-Benz buses. Based on available resources, it is anticipated that all rigid B58 buses and the front section of the articulated buses will have operating coolers by January 1989.

Further in the bulletin, in relation to refrigerative air-conditioning, it states:

The authority has undertaken to conduct trials with refrigerative air-conditioning to the front saloon area on two Volvo B58 buses and these buses should be in use by early December.

My questions to the Minister are, first, because of the report in the *News* about the outbreak of Legionnaire's Disease in the southern suburbs, are any of the buses referred to in the bulletin operating in the southern suburbs? Secondly, in the light of the disturbing report about outbreaks of this deadly disease, will the State Transport Authority reconsider the directives as set out in the staff bulletin?

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

WILPENA DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Is the Minister of Tourism aware that in the city last night a protest meeting was held aimed at halting developments in our national parks, and is she concerned that at that meeting a resolution was passed that essentially seeks to prevent the Wilpena Station development from proceeding?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes, I am aware that a meeting was held in Adelaide last night, which was designed to protest against development in South Australia's national parks, particularly the development in the Flinders Ranges. I imagine that the organisers of this public meeting, including Mr Stewart Cockburn, who has been very prominent in the media recently, would be very disappointed and embarrassed by that meeting because, as I understand from reports in the *Advertiser* this morning, the meeting was attended by only 170 people. I understand, too, that 170 people is only

about 10 people more than Mr Cockburn has been able to get to sign the various petitions that he has been circulating around South Australia. So, rather than this enormous groundswell that Mr Cockburn and other people have been suggesting exists in our community, I would say that the turn-out at this public meeting indicates that the level of opposition against the Flinders Ranges development is not as high as we would be led to believe.

It is interesting to note, too, that none other than the Opposition spokesperson on environmental issues, Jennifer Cashmore, was present at that meeting. I understand that she introduced herself to the meeting as the Opposition spokesperson on these issues and, when a series of resolutions was put to the meeting, Ms Cashmore was one of those who voted for a four-year moratorium on development in national parks.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's not true.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That is certainly the information that I have received.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I was told that it was true.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections shall cease.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: When matters like these are raised in this way—

The PRESIDENT: Order! When I call for interjections to cease, that includes the Hon. Mr Cameron.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Minister.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Ms President, I am told that the Hon. Ms Cashmore—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —was one of the people who voted for this motion and, if that is so, I must say—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On a point of order, Ms President, is there any requirement in Standing Orders for the Minister to tell the truth to the Chamber? In fact, Ms Cashmore did not vote for that particular resolution.

The PRESIDENT: You are just as able as I am to read the Standing Orders which govern the issue of what is and what is not permitted in questions.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am answering a question. What may or may not be contained in questions and answers is to be found in Standing Orders 109, 110 and 111. I suggest that you refer there.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: She doesn't have to tell the truth?

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that you refer to those Standing Orders and read for yourself what the Standing Orders are regarding questions—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On a point of order—

The PRESIDENT: —and I will not accept interjections from you, Mr Lucas, when I am speaking to you.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On a point of order, Ms President, will you accept that an allegation that a member of Parliament did something which that member indicates that she has not done is an injurious reflection under the Standing Orders and therefore ought to be ruled out of order?

The PRESIDENT: I have no knowledge whatsoever of any comment made by Ms Cashmore or by any other member of Parliament in this matter. It is not a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Ms President, as I indicated, I have been told that the Hon. Ms Cashmore sup-

ported a motion for a four-year moratorium, and, if that is so and she was acting as the Opposition spokesperson on this issue, I would suggest that she was also acting in contravention of her Leader's policy. The Leader of the Opposition indicated recently that the Opposition supports development in the Wilpena Pound National Park and he supports it if there are modifications to it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The shadow Minister for Environment and Planning, who claimed to be speaking for the Liberal Party, suggested that she opposed this development by supporting this resolution, and I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition would want to take some action against the shadow Minister if that is so, because she is in direct contravention of the statements that he has been making in this place. The Hon. Ms Cashmore, on numerous occasions in past weeks, has been making a number of statements about development in national parks and in various other places which are of enormous concern to many people in our community who have some interest in the development of the tourism industry in this State because, as everybody knows—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —tourism is Australia's fastest growing industry. We have had—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —a number of very important announcements recently which indicate that South Australia in future has a much better opportunity than previously to capitalise on this international growth in tourism to Australia. But, we must also have appropriate development in this State in those areas where people can capitalise on the natural attractions that this State has to offer. At the public meeting last evening, as I understand it, there were many people who—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There were many people who spent much time reminiscing about the golden days of the 1960s, when they were able to go to the Flinders Ranges with their back-packs and enjoy the natural environment. However, those people completely ignore the fact that we now live in the 1980s. There has been an enormous growth in visitation to places like the Flinders Ranges in the past 20 years, and the fact is that the damage that is being done by visitors to those parts of South Australia in the absence of suitable controls and appropriate accommodation and facilities to look after visitors is creating enormous problems for the management of those national parks and the natural environment that people want to visit.

I would have thought that members opposite, and particularly those people who have responsibility for commenting in these areas, would take a balanced view of these issues and a greater interest in the protection of the environment and that they would be promoting sensitive development in these areas in order to control the flow of people there and to preserve the natural environment that people come to South Australia to visit.

I believe that the Hon. Ms Cashmore should be condemned by her Leader for showing such an expression of support for such a moratorium in view of the stand that the Leader has taken on this issue and in guiding the Hon. Ms Cashmore on these issues because she is out of step with other members of her Party. Members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Members opposite are

very sensitive on this matter because they know that there are divisions in the Liberal Party on this issue. It is not clear where any one of these people stand on this particular issue.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I request the Minister to seat herself. I would remind members that Standing Orders provide that repeated interjections are out of order. I have permitted quite a number of interjections but, when the same interjection is repeated 25 times, I am sure that you would all be convinced that that is contrary to Standing Orders. I would ask for all interjections from both sides of the Council to cease.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: That includes you, Mr Dunn.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The point I was making is that it is not clear where members of the Liberal Party stand on these issues because they seem to be all over the place. The Hon. Mr Davis stands up in this place every day of the week and knocks developments of one kind or another and, on the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition says from time to time that he supports development, but usually with some sort of qualification or when it suits him and after he receives protests about the Liberal Party's position on some of these issues. It is about time that the Liberal Party and all its members got their act together on the question of development in this State. Otherwise, we will become a stagnant economy that people like the Hon. Mr Davis are constantly telling us we should be trying to avoid. The only way we can avoid it is to encourage appropriate growth in this State in order that we can provide jobs and, in the case of the areas of the State to which we can attract tourists, provide sensitive development which will enable us to create the facilities and protect the environment.

An honourable member: A supplementary question.

The PRESIDENT: A supplementary question can only be asked by the person who asked the original question. The Hon. Mr Elliott.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about the Wilpena development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: A topic of conversation by many people has been exactly who or what is this company, Ophix. Quite a few rumours have been flying around and I went checking to find out a little more about the company and its links. What I have been able to ascertain for certain is that it is a \$4 company listed in New South Wales. I have not been able to substantiate anything else at this stage. At this time, I simply ask the Minister whether she can give more background information on the Ophix company and its expertise in tourism developments? Further, can the Minister give an absolute guarantee that the initial contact between Ophix and the Government in regard to the Wilpena development was not initiated by either a member of the Government or an employee, rather than being initiated by Ophix?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I understand that the Ophix company does have experience in tourism development. It was responsible for a tourism development in the Mount Kosciuszko National Park.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Was it Ski Tube?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I cannot tell the honourable member; I do not know exactly what the development was. However, that is one of the developments with which Ophix has been associated, and I believe that there have been others. As to the initial contact that was made with Ophix, I will have to seek advice from my colleague the

Minister for Environment and Planning, who has the responsibility in the matter of the Wilpena proposal. The negotiations that have taken place during the past couple of years or so have been with officers of his department. So, I will seek a report on these matters and bring back a reply.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: By way of a supplementary question, can I take it that, although the Minister cannot remember, she is quite sure that the company is very experienced in tourism developments?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have been informed that this company has been involved in tourism developments in Australia, one of which was in the Mount Kosciusko National Park. As I indicated, I will seek further information about the extent of the company's experience in this area from my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, with whom the negotiations have been taking place, and I will bring back a reply.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I address my question to the Minister of Local Government. In the light of information which I have that the Minister's information upon which she based her earlier reply to a question asked by the Hon Ms Pickles in relation to Ms Cashmore at the meeting last night is wrong, what is the source of the Minister's information upon which she has based her reply?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have been informed by a person who attended the public meeting last evening.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Who?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The person who has informed me has wished to remain anonymous—and I do not intend to divulge that source.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about the Wilpena development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: My question relates to what took place here a few moments ago. I gather that a public meeting was held last night, with some 100 people participating in it. Allegations have been made that Ms Cashmore was there and voted in one way, while allegations have been made from the other side of the House that she did not vote the other way. Can the Minister ascertain whether the shadow Minister of Tourism voted or did not vote at the meeting, so that this side of the House, anyway, and possibly the people of South Australia know where the Liberal Party stands on development?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Short of putting the question to each and every member of the Liberal Party, I am not sure whether we will ever know what their position on tourism development is. They seem to have a different view on the matter every day of the week and a different view on every single development proposal that comes forward. I suggest that most of their views on each proposal have been negative, as far as I can tell, over the past few years. I must say that it is creating a most unsatisfactory climate in South Australia amongst various sections of the community, and most seriously amongst those people who have an interest in investing in South Australia and in the various tourism and other development proposals in this State.

It is very important for the key players in public life, particularly in the Parliament, to take a consistent approach to issues relating to development and building a prosperous future for our children. It is important that there be some sense of consensus on these matters wherever that is possible. One of the unsatisfactory features of political debate on development issues in this State over the past two years

has been that, by and large, whenever the Government has expressed some support or encouragement for a certain style of development, as a sort of knee-jerk reaction members of the Opposition have found some reason to oppose it, for some sort of political reason. This is really not helpful in facilitating a constructive discussion in this State on very important issues about development and development versus environment protection.

It is very important for the players in this debate to treat the issues seriously and to deal with the consequences of any potential development in a way that provides some certainty and assurance for potential investors and creates an environment in which people in our community, who have every right to be involved in the discussion process on these matters and every right to comment on them, can contribute to the debate in a reasonable way, in a climate which is not constantly charged with emotion and political point scoring and which, ultimately, will be in the best interests of the State.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: In view of the fact that a public meeting was held last night which, evidently, would have been convened by somebody, can the Minister approach the convener of the meeting and ascertain the way the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning voted on the resolution?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I believe the matter of how she voted should be put in order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will see whether it is possible to find out who the conveners of the meeting were and whether or not they have recorded who voted which way. I imagine that, in a public meeting of that kind, it would be difficult to record everyone's name when a vote is put. However, I will see whether it is possible to get that information and, if it is, I will bring back a reply.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Is the Minister of Tourism familiar with the content of the Department of Tourism's submission relating to the call for comments on the environmental impact statement for the Wilpena development which opposed the development in its current form and expressed grave concerns about many aspects of that development, and can the Minister say why she is not prepared to back up her department's submission on this matter?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I fully support Tourism South Australia's submission on this matter. Tourism South Australia does not oppose the development.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! Order! Order! If interjections can be repeated, I will repeat my calls for order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The submission by Tourism South Australia on the EIS process indicated support for the proposed development.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Unqualified support?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Let me finish, Di, for God's sake. Tourism South Australia's submission supported the proposed development in the Flinders Ranges. Tourism South Australia's proposal, in addition to expressing its general support for the development, also suggested that the golf course was probably not a component that ought to be included.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: So, it opposes it?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: No, it supports the development.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The submission indicated that the golf course is a dubious component of the development, but whether it should go ahead depends very much—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What do you think?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —on assessments that need to be made of the water supply issues. Such assessments of the water supply in the area are being undertaken as part of the environmental impact process. That is one issue upon which the submission by Tourism South Australia expressed some reservations. Some reservations have also been expressed about the projections for visitor numbers for the project as indicated in the submissions put forward by the proponents, but those reservations about visitor numbers have also been qualified to the extent of saying that whether or not they can be achieved depends very much on the marketing efforts of the people who will be operating the tourism development if it gets off the ground. They are the general issues upon which the Tourism South Australia officers have commented.

It is quite inaccurate to suggest that Tourism South Australia has not expressed broad support for the proposal because in fact it has. It is clearly stated in Tourism South Australia's submission that it does support it. In fact, it was as a result of a consultant's report commissioned by Tourism South Australia some four or five years ago that this proposal is now on the drawing board and being assessed. The consultant that was engaged by the organisation suggested that there should be a tourism development in about the area where Ophix is proposing to build its development. The original consultant's report, however, suggested that further feasibility work needed to be done over and above the work it had carried out because the concept upon which the consultants had been working would not be economically viable. It suggested that further work would need to be done on putting together a different mix of components so that the proposals could be made economically viable. That is the process that Ophix has been undertaking over the past two years and its concept is now being assessed and commented upon.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's message intimating that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendment.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendment.

As honourable members will recall, when we considered the Firearms Bill, the Hon. Ms Laidlaw and the Hon. Mr Gilfillan both had this amendment on file. The amendment itself related to subsequent amendments that were voted upon and disagreed to. In fact, even though the two Opposition parties came together to include this amendment in the Bill when it left this place, it was very much consequential on the remaining amendments being agreed to. They were not subsequently carried by this place and this amendment is therefore superfluous for the purposes of the legislation. For that reason we should not now insist upon its inclusion.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: The Democrats do not insist on the amendment. Although it may have had a connection

with amendments which did not prove successful, it was still useful, in an Act dealing with firearms, to have a definition of 'pistol' and/or 'handgun'. I do not see why the Government is being so pedantic about it. However, it is not worth taking issue with, so I will not insist.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As the Minister noted, the Liberal Party agreed to the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan. We will not be making an issue of it, essentially for the reason outlined by the Minister. I regret the decision not to pursue the amendments we had on file with regard to registration of which the reference to the definition of 'pistol' was a key component.

Motion carried.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's amendment:

Clause 6, page 2, lines 15 to 24—Leave out this clause and insert:

Substitution of s. 21

6. Section 21 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is substituted:

Entry of child's surname in register

21. (1) Subject to this section, the name to be entered in the register of births as the surname of a child is the surname of either of the parents, or a combined form of the surnames of both parents, of the child as nominated by the parents when furnishing the particulars required for registration of the birth.

(2) In default of nomination by the parents as referred to in subsection (1), the name to be entered in the register as the surname of the child is—

(a) the surname of the father of the child in the case of a child born in lawful marriage, or the surname of the mother in the case of a child born out of lawful marriage;

or

(b) such name as a local court of limited jurisdiction may, on application by a parent of the child, direct.

(3) An application for a direction of a court under subsection (2) must be made within 28 days after receipt by the Principal Registrar of the particulars required for registration of the birth.

(4) In determining an application for a direction under subsection (2), the welfare and interests of the child must be the paramount consideration of the court.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

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

This matter was raised in another place, and the Government agreed to this amendment. In respect of section 21 of the Act, the amending Bill passed by the Council provides for a court to determine the surname to be given to a child if there is a dispute between the parents or if the parents have failed to nominate a surname in the information given to the Principal Registrar for registration of the child's birth. The amendment proposed in the Bill returned from the House of Assembly maintains the right of parents, who are in dispute over the surname to be given to their child, to take the matter to a court for adjudication, and gives them 28 days from receipt of the registration particulars by the Principal Registrar to make such a move.

The Assembly's amendment further proposes that, if the parents do not take their dispute to court within the time given, or if they simply neglect to nominate a surname, which I understand is the problem in the majority of cases, then the Principal Registrar will be able to register the child's birth with the father's surname, if the child is born in lawful marriage, or the mother's surname if the child is born out of lawful marriage.

The Government believes that the Assembly's amendment gives the child's parents the rights that the Council's amendment did, but is more workable and convenient from the Principal Registrar's point of view where the absence of a nomination is simply the result of neglect. It will also minimise the effects of this new provision on the resources of the courts, which we agree are overtaxed.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: This is better than what was in the Bill when it left the Council and, for that reason, we do not raise any opposition to it. It was quite clear during the course of the Committee consideration of the Bill in this Chamber that the Attorney-General was caught somewhat unawares by the request to indicate what the Crown Solicitor's opinion was on this clause in the Bill because, quite clearly, the Crown Solicitor was of the view that it did not breach either State or Federal law. However, the Attorney-General added that it was not clear in consequence of a New South Wales tribunal decision.

This amendment proposed by the House of Assembly maintains what is, in effect, the *status quo*, but if anyone feels strongly about the surname, if there is no agreement between father and mother, then they can go to a local court within 28 days after receipt of the particulars required for registration of the birth. That minimises the prospect of litigation over a long time relating to the name of a child. In those circumstances, we will not raise any opposition to the proposal from the House of Assembly.

Motion carried.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: This would be the appropriate clause on which to address some questions which remain unanswered following the Minister's reply last evening. During the course of the second reading debate, the Minister gave attendance figures for the 1988 Grand Prix but did not address the other part of my question which I then raised in respect of the actual capacity of the Grand Prix this year—in particular, the number of persons on each day who could have been accommodated. I wonder whether the Minister is able to give an indication as to the capacity of the Grand Prix for this year and compare that with its capacity last year, to give us some appreciation of the extent to which the attendances were below capacity for this Grand Prix.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The attendances varied by about 4 000: about 300 000 people attended in 1987 and about 304 000 attended in 1988. It is very difficult to provide a breakdown of those areas and what the capacity might be, because the general admission areas are rather difficult to judge.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I appreciate the difficulty in determining, for example, the general admission capacity. I suppose that, in some respects, that is almost limitless, but can the Minister provide some indication of the capacity in terms of available seating and relate that to the actual attendances this year and then indicate the capacity seating last year? If there is real difficulty in answering the question off the top of her head, I do not want to apply so much pressure that we delay the Committee stage indefinitely. Therefore, I would be happy to accept that information

within a few days. However, if the Minister does have an estimate now, that would be helpful.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: We do not have the exact figures with us today. This year's seating capacity was greater than during last year, because some new seating arrangements were undertaken for this year's event. I will obtain the appropriate figures and provide them to the honourable member.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister also referred to the three sets of surveys that were conducted during the course of the Grand Prix. I attended the event and at the gate I was asked whether I was from interstate. When I said 'No', they said, 'We are looking to survey people from interstate.' That may be the way in which the survey was structured, but was it only a survey of interstate visitors to the Grand Prix and, if it was, can the Minister provide some appreciation of why there appeared not to be a survey of South Australians who attended the Grand Prix?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will have to seek further information about that survey. I suspect that, if the questioning to which the honourable member was subjected was framed in that way, then possibly they had people there who dealt with each separate component of the survey. Some people might have looked for Adelaide residents, while others looked for people from interstate; they might have collected that information separately. If that is so, it seems to be a rather peculiar way of conducting a survey. However, rather than speculating on it, I will seek a report on the nature of that survey and I will supply the information.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I appreciate that the Minister has offered to pursue that further and to supply an answer later, but will the results of the survey be made available publicly? If so, will the questions which were asked also be made available?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I believe it is intended that the results of the survey will be made available. Of course, a report of that kind would also include a copy of the questionnaire.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I hope that I will be put on the mailing list. In the initial part of her response yesterday, the Minister stated:

In answer to the question raised yesterday concerning the term—that is, the term for which Adelaide is likely to hold the Grand Prix—

it has been correctly reported that Adelaide is now in a position to continue to host this premium event until the year 2000.

Has that period been negotiated? If so, is the Minister able to indicate what qualifications might be placed upon Adelaide's continuing to host the Grand Prix for that period of time?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The period has been negotiated and our capacity to keep the Grand Prix is subject to our complying with the international rules and requirements that are applied in all cases around the world where Formula One Grand Prix races are conducted. From time to time such rules and requirements change, but they relate to such issues as levels of safety, facilities for teams and drivers, provision of marshalls and standards in that area, communications, videos at various parts of the course and other issues. Those things may change from time to time as technology and circumstances change, but it is largely based on those sorts of issues.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Does the answer given by the Minister indicate that the only remaining requirement before execution of the appropriate documents to effect that intention is the passing of this Bill? If not, can the Minister

indicate when the documentation is likely to be completed and executed?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Obviously, the passage of this Bill is essential to enable the contract to be agreed upon. However, some details of the contract are yet to be concluded. Some of those issues may be resolved following a meeting of promoters of Formula One races to be held in Paris in December and after receipt of advice that must be received concerning the role of the FIA in future years. Some of those issues will affect the terms of the agreement and will probably be concluded at that time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That would then suggest that, at the earliest, the agreement could be signed after that meeting, before the end of this year, but possibly in the early part of next year.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That is correct. We hope that the agreement can be concluded before the end of this year but, if not, it would be very early next year.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Can the Minister indicate what issues currently remain unresolved in respect of that meeting of promoters? I take it that, given that it is a meeting of all promoters, it is not just a difficulty with South Australia or Australia but that there are other promoters around the world who have some concerns.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The meeting in Paris at the end of the year will discuss a number of issues, one of which will be the rules that will apply for the 1989 race. As the honourable member may have read in the press, from next year the rules will require that normally aspirated cars be used. That is a new requirement, and the Grand Prix Board is, to some extent, simply using an abundance of caution before finalising the contract. It is ensuring that it is fully aware of the requirement that will be placed upon South Australia for 1989, following these changes, before we sign on the dotted line. The board is ensuring that it is satisfied with the terms of the contract once it is fully apprised of the requirements to be placed on us in 1989.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In those circumstances, is it anticipated that there will be a requirement for additional capital expenditure or any additional recurrent expenditure directly related to that decision to require only normally aspirated vehicles? If there is a need for additional capital expenditure, and if there is likely to be a requirement for additional recurrent expenditure, can the Minister give some indication of what those figures might be, at least in the first year?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is very difficult to estimate at this stage. It is not known whether there will be a need for any additional capital expenditure. However, I understand that, if there was such a need it would be something less than \$10 million. It could be somewhere between \$1 million and \$10 million. I do not know why we are using that particular figure because, at this point, we have no idea whether there will be any additional requirements. We do know that if there were additional requirements they would not be significant.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I assume from that answer that that would apply also in the area of recurrent expenditure?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I understand that there would be no requirement at all for further recurrent expenditure.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In her reply, the Minister said:

It is not yet known with any degree of certainty whether it will be necessary to extend the Grand Prix track.

I interjected:

Will there be a decision next year, or some time soon?

The Minister replied:

It could be next year, but we will not know for some time. In the event that an extension is required, the appropriate bodies will be consulted and every effort will be made to minimise the effect as much as possible.

The Minister then indicated that it was not intended to add any additional public roads to the circuit and that, if any extension was likely to occur, it would be into the Victoria Park Racecourse. Presumably that decision, or the necessity, would not be made or known until after the negotiations in Paris in December. Is the Minister therefore able to indicate what sort of bodies are encompassed by the reference to the 'appropriate bodies' being consulted if, in fact, an extension was necessary?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It may be that the meeting in December will clarify some of the issues that may impact on decisions relating to the parklands, but it may also depend on the number of entries in next year's race. As I understand it, people have until March of next year to enter next year's competition. This means that we may not know the implications of any impact in this area until March next year. Should a further move into the parklands area be necessary, then the organisations that would be consulted would include the South Australian Jockey Club, the Adelaide City Council and various environmental groups that have an interest and a concern in the development and use of the parklands. One other organisation that would be consulted is the Archery Society, because it has indicated an interest in using the area for next year's Masters Games. Clearly, that society would have an interest in any developments in that respect.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I wish to pursue the question of the extension of the track, and the existing facility for pits and ground crews. Am I right in assuming that there is no further room for expansion of those facilities as they now exist in pit straight?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Ms Chair, the situation as far as the pits are concerned, is complicated by the question of the number of entries that might be received for next year's race. As far as the physical limitations of the area are concerned, it is affected by the safety regulations for the pit exit. It would not be possible to extend the pits northwards for safety reasons because of the exit requirements.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Is that in the area closest to Wakefield Street?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes. The distance to which the pits could be extended in a southerly direction would depend on the requirements, that is, how many additional cars, etc., would need to be accommodated in that area. If it were a minimal requirement, the capacity to extend the pits area would depend on what design modifications could be made to the construction.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: What do you mean by a minimal number?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Maybe one or two additional cars, then it may be possible to modify the design to the extent that the change would be able to be accommodated. If it went beyond that, then it would be difficult to extend the pit area in the existing area of land.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I should declare my interests in that I am an ageing petrol head along with the Hon. Rob Lucas who also has a keen interest in Grand Prix racing. One aspect of Grand Prix Formula One motor racing over the years has been the constant changing of the rules. For instance, we are seeing that turbo charged engines are being phased out for next year and only normally aspirated cars will be allowed in the Formula One competition in 1989. Given that there have been changes in the numbers allowed in Formula One in past years, was there any flexibility built

into the original design of the track when the first Grand Prix was planned in Adelaide in 1985? From what the Minister has indicated, it seems that any more than one or two additional entries could mean a change in the track. Perhaps the Minister could respond to the question: did the original plan provide for some flexibility in the size of the pit stop requirements?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Ms Chair, flexibility was built into the original design for the pit buildings and it was not until last year that in the eyes of the local organisers of the Grand Prix we reached capacity. This year we accommodated two new teams in that facility which was really stretching the limits of the building, but to put the reply simply, there certainly was flexibility in the original construction and for the first two races there was excess capacity.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Ms Chair, in my second reading speech I raised the question of a television interview that I saw with Mr Bernie Ecclestone in relation to this question of the extension of the track and my understanding of what Mr Ecclestone said was that a system of prequalifying would be introduced next year. He did not say definitely but he anticipated a number of extra teams being attracted to Grand Prix competition. This prequalifying system would take place during the lead-up to the Sunday event and this also occurs in Grand Prix overseas. The system is that, say, 30 cars would participate on a time basis and during prequalifying they would be balloted out in accordance with their performances over the days.

My understanding is that currently we have a situation in Adelaide where one or two of the cars were balloted out or were excluded from the actual event on the Sunday as a result of the prequalifying trials. They did not perform quickly enough or well enough during the three day warm-up and therefore were not on the starting grid on the Sunday. I am not sure what the numbers were; 24, 25 or 26 cars started and, in the context of the interview with Mr Ecclestone, I gained the impression that he did not believe there would be any need for an extension of the track and that, for a range of reasons, including safety reasons in relation to the number of cars on the track at any one time, there would be any need for the extension of the track within the Victoria Park racecourse.

If Mr Ecclestone has been saying those sorts of things publicly, my question to the Minister is: has Mr Ecclestone indicated those things to Grand Prix Board officials here? Given the concept of prequalifying, as I have just outlined it and also in my second reading speech, there would not be a need for the extension of the track. When the Minister came back she said 'that is still up in the air'. My understanding of the interview was that Mr Ecclestone did not believe that would be necessary because of prequalifying for a range of reasons, one of which was safety. Obviously, 40 cars cannot run around the track safely at any one time during a race, and he indicated that publicly. I am asking whether Mr Ecclestone has indicated that in his discussions with the Grand Prix Board and, if not, whether the staff of the Grand Prix Board saw that television interview and agree with my understanding of what Mr Ecclestone said.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The comments that were made by Mr Ecclestone in his interview are based on his view of the matter—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: But he is the boss.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: His view on this issue is not necessarily what will occur, ultimately, because it is the FIA, and not Mr Ecclestone, which will determine ultimately how many entries there will be for next year's race. So, it is not possible for Mr Ecclestone to predict accurately

at this stage what the requirements for the 1989 race will be. Although Mr Ecclestone might speculate at this stage that there will not be any additional requirements for the pit area, because he does not believe there will be additional teams, a different circumstance might eventuate. In fact, for the most recent race it was not until October that our local people could be certain of the number of teams that would come to South Australia. Sometimes the teams do not make a final decision on the matter until close to race time.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: But we have a maximum.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes, we have a maximum that we can accommodate.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: As to the potential extension of the pit facilities, if the FIA—which, I take from the Minister's answer, is the ultimate authority in determining the number of cars that should be catered for—decided that an increase should occur, and if the current area used for the pit facilities, as well as the area into the parklands, could not accommodate the increase, the Government would be put in a bind, in that really the Government would be dictated to in the matter of having to use more area of parklands. My understanding is that how much pit area is to be provided is really a determination to be made by the FIA, over which the Government has no say. Is that correct or not?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Our contract with FOCA requires us to abide by FIA rules. The rules would require us to provide accommodation for 'X' number of teams for each race.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You mean pit facilities?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes, I mean pit facilities for the number of teams participating in a race. Whilst certain standards have to be complied with, there is some flexibility for us to determine what is the best way of providing the facilities. However, there are limits to the flexibility that exists because of the physical requirements of each team to enable them to perform equally and appropriately.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I understand what the Minister is saying, but I do not feel that that addresses the issue that I am raising, which relates to the fact that extension into the parklands is really in the hands of a totally alien body, which can determine—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Well, alien to the parklands, I can tell members that! We are not all sort of intoxicated with sniffing petrol out of cans. There are limits, and there should be quite clearly defined limits as to how much parkland can be taken over on an original cut, or a creep program, which could very easily evolve if this pressure is allowed to be catered for, at the determination of FOCA abiding by FIA rules—as I understand it, from the Minister's answer. It seems to me that the Government could be confronted with the dilemma of being put under irresistible pressure to extend further into the parklands. Does the Minister agree that the situation I have outlined is accurate, and does the Government have in mind a certain distance in relation to extending into the parklands that it is prepared to grant, beyond which further extension will not go?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member is really raising a philosophical question. He is asking me to comment on a proposition which the South Australian community needs to determine. He is asking me whether a minor extension of the Grand Prix track is worth it in terms of the benefits that might come to the State from hosting the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. My own view would be that if a need exists for a minor extension of the

track in the area of the pits, it is worthwhile because we are not talking about the construction of permanent buildings but rather a minor extension of an asphalt surface to accommodate the track and pit facility buildings that would accompany an increase in the number of teams.

In my view and assessment the sacrifice to be made is one worth making when compared with the economic advantages that can flow to the State from hosting the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. We as a State have the right to say that we are not prepared to entertain any further extension. That will be fine as far as the international organisers are concerned because many countries are lining up to host a Formula One Grand Prix race. They will be able to find another country tomorrow, if we want them to, to take over our race. That would be a disaster for South Australia, and for Australia. It is not the sort of thing that I would want to entertain.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I was not asking for an apology for the Grand Prix or a speech in favour of its being held in South Australia. However, it is significant that, if I understand the Minister and if she is speaking for the Government, the Government will put forward no objection to any requirement for an extension of the Grand Prix facilities into the parklands on the basis that there would be a risk that Adelaide would lose the continued capacity to host the Grand Prix. There must be several other circuits in the world bound by immovable objects such as buildings or fixtures which, in the event of a desire to have extra pit facilities, could not be moved.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: They will lose the Grand Prix then.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: On the argument of the Hon. Barbara Wiese, they would. I do not accept that—it is a nonsense. The Government should make plain—and I urge it to do so—that enough of our parklands are currently alienated for the Grand Prix and we will not extend any further.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have been trying to ascertain whether or not the international organisation has some sort of notional view of what the limit might be to staging a Formula One Grand Prix race. The information is not available to me so I cannot pursue that line. Certainly, as far as the Government is concerned, we would hope that we have already come close to what might be considered the optimum size for a Formula One race because we do not wish to have a range of issues emerging that will create division within the South Australian community as to the desirability of the race continuing here in Adelaide. Obviously, we would like to maintain majority support in the community for the race because the advantages to be gained for the State in many ways are enormous. We certainly would not want to see the race grow to such an extent that the pressures on the tolerance of the community were stretched. However, it is not possible at this stage to say what the limits might be for the Government or the South Australian community.

Neither is it possible to predict what the demands might be that will be placed upon us. I suppose that is the nature of these things and many others in the life of a community, and it is the nature of the decisions that Governments or Parliaments must take from time to time. We will all monitor the progress of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix and the demands that it places upon us as a community and make judgments as the years progress. At the moment we are in a position to secure a contract which will take us up to the year 2000 and, along the way, I guess people will make assessments as to whether or not they continue to believe that the race is an advantage to us in the lead time

to the period during which we might have the chance to extend the contract.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Trying to be helpful about this matter of a possible extension, I take it that when we talk about an extension to the hairpin bend at the most southern point of the course, we are talking about a fairly simple extension, namely, perhaps straightening out the entrance to the straight, coming in from Wakefield Street and creating a hairpin bend farther to the south of the existing course. One would presume, for example, that if the scenario painted by the Hon. Robert Lucas was true, and let us say another two or three teams entered the race, that would involve an extension of maybe 50 or 60 metres. Surely the Adelaide Grand Prix Board has looked at the logistics of a possible extension, given that there has been talk about an increase in the teams. It is something its members would not have ignored. Some game plan options must have been canvassed in this matter.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, a couple of options could be pursued for the extension of the track. They would both be very simple extensions. It is not possible at this time to indicate how many metres might be required but in this discussion we are speculating about something which may not even be required at all. We must view this discussion in that context. We may not have to do anything at all next year or beyond but, should such an extension be required, then it would be a simple operation and it would not be an extension that would encroach very much at all.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Pursuant to section 20 of the principal Act, the Governor can make a declaration of a period of up to five days in any year, during which period the race or associated events will be held. That means that any public land or roads may be in effect appropriated for the purpose of the Grand Prix. Can the Minister indicate whether there is any present intention to extend the period beyond the four days to take up the additional day permitted by the Act, and whether that is likely to be one of the consequences of the extension of the agreement?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is not envisaged at this stage that any extension would be required.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I now address the question of the definition of Grand Prix insignia. I raised some questions about this during the second reading debate, and the Minister gave some information last night in her reply. My concern was the effective appropriation of the description 'Grand Prix' which, in my view, never would be the subject of any approved trademark under Federal legislation, and certainly would not be copyright in itself under the Federal Copyright Act, so that, effectively, the State gains a proprietary interest in the words 'Grand Prix'.

We have argued about this on previous occasions when amending Bills were before us. In her amending Bill last night, as I interpreted it, the Minister said that the broadening of the definition of Grand Prix insignia was necessary as a result of the new rules issued by the FIA. Is the Minister able to indicate specifically the rule which requires that extension?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The extension to cover the words 'Grand Prix' has not been brought about because of any change in rules imposed upon us but is part of the effort being made to exert greater control over the unauthorised use of names associated with the Formula One Grand Prix in Adelaide. As to the question of the use of those names as a trademark, we have already registered the words 'Grand Prix' as a trademark in Australia in certain classes. I am not able to list the classes at this time, but

those words are already registered as a trademark associated with the FIA Australian Formula One Grand Prix.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: The words standing alone—'Grand Prix'?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Rather than putting the Minister on the spot now, after the debate has been concluded she might be able to give me the detail of the classifications in respect of which the trademark has actually been granted. I presume it has been granted and is not an application which is pending.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The trademark has been granted and I should be happy to provide the information about the classifications.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In that context, that is the protection that the Government or the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board really requires. Is it necessary to proceed with it in the context of this Bill and the overall conduct of the Grand Prix? What of a hotel such as Lennies Tavern at Glenelg which might choose to hold a Grand Prix disco or Grand Prix ball on the Grand Prix weekend? If this measure is passed, the event could reasonably be taken to refer to a disco at Lennies associated with the motor racing event, the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. Is it reasonable to prevent from using the term entrepreneurs who do not necessarily make any money out of using the words 'Grand Prix' but who hold events that focus on that event?

I do not think that I am extending the interpretation of it too far. What is the Minister's view as to the extent to which this will affect hotel proprietors, senior citizens clubs and local primary schools which choose to hold Grand Prix bingo, Grand Prix discos or Grand Prix fetes? It is important to define the extent to which the Government proposes to take this.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The objective that the Grand Prix Board is trying to achieve is the protection of the rights of those sponsors and licensees who make a financial contribution to use the goodwill of the event; that is, they pay money to use the name and to be associated with the event, and their rights in that respect must be protected.

It is not reasonable that organisations which are not associated in such a way should be able to gain commercially by suggesting that they are associated with the event. That is what the amendments seek to do. That is not to say that some community organisation that wanted to establish a Grand Prix disco or something of that kind would be prevented from doing so. In assessing applications that have come before it thus far, the Grand Prix Board has always taken a very fair and flexible approach. It has granted a whole range of applications of the kind that I have just mentioned, and will continue to do so.

During the time that this legislation has been in place, there has not been a single prosecution in this area, and that indicates the flexibility and the approach that has been adopted in the implementation of these provisions. Prior to drawing up these ideas, the board received legal advice to the effect that, in addition to the trademark protection, these other provisions should also be implemented so as to ensure the protection required for commercial purposes of the various names associated with the Formula One Grand Prix.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: This new definition really imports into the ordinary affairs of people who know about the Grand Prix but who may never attend it, or who may never be doing anything more than recognising that there is a Grand Prix weekend, a level of bureaucracy which, I

suggest, would be extraordinary. I think that there is a dilemma, because every South Australian knows that there is a Grand Prix weekend. Some country people will not be able to get to the Grand Prix and some city people will not be able to afford to attend it. They may organise events called 'Grand Prix bingo', 'The Grand Prix Ball', or some other activity expressly associated with the Grand Prix.

Under this Act they will be required to obtain consent from the Grand Prix Board to use that title, because it will be an official Grand Prix insignia. If they do not get consent, under section 28a (3) they may well be guilty of the tort of conversion and guilty of an offence for which the maximum penalty is \$15 000. The Act provides:

A person who, without the consent of the board, assumes a name or description that consists of or includes official Grand Prix insignia commits the tort of conversion and is guilty of an offence.

It does not matter whether or not they will make a profit from it; the fact is that, if they merely use it, they are guilty of an offence.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Even if you have a Grand Prix ball?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: If you have a Grand Prix ball under the principal Act as proposed to be amended by this Bill, you commit an offence. It seems to me that that is particularly heavy-handed. The Supreme Court can grant an injunction to restrain that use. It seems to me that that really is grossly heavy-handed and I put it to the Minister that I think it is unreasonable. It puts ordinary citizens of South Australia, who are caught up in the atmosphere of the Grand Prix but cannot get to it or want to be associated with the Grand Prix weekend, in an invidious position where they may want to have a Grand Prix fete at the Glenelg Primary School or the Pooraka High School or some other event which picks up the atmosphere of the event.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: A Democrats fundraiser.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Sure—the 'Democrats Grand Prix Fundraiser'. The point I make is that I do not think anyone would see that as being reasonable. It may be that the board would not want to take civil action, but that would not stop other people initiating proceedings. In those circumstances, whilst it would be unpopular publicly and politically, certain people are still at risk by using the name 'Grand Prix' in association with any other name on, say, Grand Prix weekend when clearly it is associated with the motor racing event because everybody is caught up in that atmosphere.

I will not move an amendment. I have put my view on the record—and I thought we had argued this out on a previous occasion—that I think it is unreasonable and I am very concerned about it.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I understand the points made by the honourable member, but it is my view that in practice his fears that will not be realised. As I have indicated, the practice of the board so far has been to show great flexibility in its use of the provisions that currently exist in the legislation and it would be the intention of the board to continue this practice in this area with respect to the use of the words 'Grand Prix'.

To give an indication of the way in which these provisions are policed, there have been a number of instances where organisations have used words which are protected to describe particular events or other commercial operations, and which have been identified by officers working for the Grand Prix Board. In those cases, where the use of the words has not contravened the objectives of the legislation, it has been the practice of the board to simply write to those people unsolicited and advise them that they have been granted an exemption even though they have not

applied for it. I think that gives an indication of the flexibility with which these provisions are being applied and I do not believe that the fears the honourable member has expressed will be realised.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do not like to see us making laws which are so wide as to catch people acting in a quite reasonable way. I have quite clearly put my position on the record. We will watch carefully the way that it is administered. I now turn to the definition of 'promote'. In respect of an event or activity under the Bill, it includes 'organise or conduct'. Can the Minister take further the reply which she gave last night in relation to the questions I raised about entrepreneurial activity of the board by indicating whether it is intended that this definition will be used to organise or conduct events outside the Grand Prix long weekend?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This amendment has been included to clarify the existing activity that is undertaken. At one stage in international motor racing agreements there was a distinction between the roles of the promoters of motor racing events and the organisers of motor racing events. In order to clarify the position here, it was deemed desirable to include this amendment.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I refer to clause 3 (c), which deals with the definition of a motor racing event. At present a motor racing event is defined as follows:

- a motor car race—
 (a) that takes place in Australia;
 and
 (b) that—
 (i) is approved by the Federation Internationale de l'Automobile, as a race that counts for the Federation Internationale;
 (ii) is entered in the International Calendar of the Federation Internationale de l'Automobile's;
 and
 (iii) counts for the Federation Internationale de l'Automobile Formula One World Championship and includes any other motor race, or practice held in conjunction or connection with the race.

The emphasis of that latter part is associated activities 'in conjunction or connection with the race'. This amendment seeks to change that to:

... any event or activity promoted—

which, by virtue of the definition, means those organised or conducted by the board—
 in association with the race.

That conjures up a connotation that there may be an event earlier in the year which might be, in a sense, associated with the promotion of the event ('promotion' being used in its ordinary context). Is it intended that there should be other events or activities associated with the race organised away from the present four-day period of the Grand Prix? If so, what are those events likely to be?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This definition is also one for clarification. It is not intended that the activities would extend beyond those that are currently engaged in by the Grand Prix organisation. It would deal with promotions outside the four-day event itself that would relate to such things as the media launch, the marketing campaign, shopping centre promotions, the production of videos and other things—the sort of activities which are currently engaged in and will be continued in the future but which require clarification in the definition following some query that was raised about that matter.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In the Minister's response to the second reading debate she referred to three surveys that were conducted during the recent four day carnival. The first was conducted amongst people who were not attending the event to try to ascertain why, and to gain whatever information may be useful for future marketing endeavours. A second survey was conducted of corporate facility holders

and a third survey was of those attending the event in categories of whether they were people coming from Adelaide, country areas, overseas, or interstate. The Minister then gave some information about the information that was sought. Who conducted each of the surveys referred to? Were they conducted by the one market research company?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The first two surveys to which I referred in my second reading reply are surveys being sponsored by the Grand Prix Board. In the case of the survey of corporate facility holders, officers employed by the Grand Prix Board will conduct the survey. In the case of the survey of those people who did not attend the event, I understand that an outside group has been commissioned to do it but I do not have that information and I will have to provide it later. The third survey is being commissioned by Tourism South Australia with the assistance of the Department of State Development, and in that case I believe that we have commissioned an outside group of people to conduct the interviews but the name escapes me and I will have to provide that information later as well.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thought the Minister said that the first two surveys had been commissioned by the Grand Prix Board, then the Minister said that the survey of corporate facilities was being conducted by officers of the board. Is that right?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The survey of corporate facility holders is being undertaken by the staff of the Grand Prix office. The survey will take the form of a letter to corporate facility holders seeking information from them, so it is a written exercise. As I indicated, the other survey being called for by the Grand Prix Board has been contracted out to an agent. That is the information that I will have to provide later.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I understand from an earlier question that the Minister has indicated that the results of each of the surveys will be made available publicly. Is that correct?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have already indicated that the result of the third survey, which relates to information concerning people from Adelaide, country areas, overseas and interstate, will be made public, including a copy of the questionnaire etc.

In relation to the first two surveys a decision has not yet been made whether that information should be made public. It is being undertaken as an exercise to assist the board in planning for future Grand Prix. I am not aware at this stage whether any information that might be contained in those surveys could have some commercial confidentiality problems or something of that kind, and that is something that the board will make a decision about once the information is gathered.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: When the Minister provides the names of the consultancies conducting the surveys for the Grand Prix Board and for Tourism South Australia, will she provide information about the cost of the consultancies in each case and the tendering process that was undertaken by Tourism South Australia and the Grand Prix Board in relation to the commissioning of both consultancies? Finally, whilst I accepting that the Grand Prix Board will decide whether the results, questionnaire and methodology of the first two surveys will be released, is the Minister prepared to indicate to the Committee that at some stage she will provide to honourable members an answer from the Grand Prix Board whether or not it is prepared to release details of the questionnaire, methodology and finding—that is, 'Yes, we are prepared to do it at such-and-such a time' or

'No, it is commercially confidential' or whatever the reason is? Is the Minister prepared to give that commitment?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will subsequently provide whatever information I am able to on the issues that the honourable member has raised.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I refer now to another matter which I raised during the second reading debate but which was not addressed by the Minister in her reply, that is, the televising of the Grand Prix on the Sunday. I think the Minister and her adviser would be aware of the comments that I made in my second reading speech, namely, that I thought it unseemly that, as with the South Australian National Football League grand final, we should have to go through the last week leading up to the event not knowing whether it would be televised or not. I pointed out that an indication had been given to me that there was an agreement or an understanding, or whatever, with Channel 9 that the Grand Prix would be televised on the Sunday, contrary to the public statements that were being made. What is the nature of the agreement with Channel 9 in relation to televising the Grand Prix? Is there a contractual arrangement with Channel 9 televising the Grand Prix?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There is no agreement between the Grand Prix Board and the Nine network about whether or not the event will be televised. I understand that there is an agreement between FOCA and the Nine network on the question of television coverage. We do not know the nature of the agreement, but prior to each race the Grand Prix Board makes representations to those organisations about the matter of televising of the race, and the board believes that it has some influence on the decision that is taken. However, the Nine network is not in any way obligated to take the advice of the Grand Prix Board on this matter.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Minister says that the Grand Prix Board has no power in relation to the televising of the Grand Prix on the Sunday and that it makes representations to both FOCA and the Channel 9 network. Is it the case that Dr Hemmerling and others are not aware of the nature of the agreement between FOCA and the Channel 9 network concerning televising the Grand Prix throughout the world?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, the board does not know the details of the agreement between FOCA and the Nine network on this matter. It has information about the nature of the agreement but not about the detail of the agreement.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: When the Minister says that the Grand Prix Board does not know the details but knows the general outline of the agreement, what she is saying to the Committee is that in relation to the televising of the Grand Prix last Sunday the Channel 9 network could have made a decision to go ahead, contrary to the wishes and representations of the Grand Prix Board.

So, if the Grand Prix Board made representations to FOCA and Channel 9 and said that it did not believe that sufficient ticket sales had been made, Channel 9 would have the power under the agreement to go ahead and televise live to Adelaide?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In this case, as in most areas of this kind, one has to draw a distinction between the strict legal agreements that might exist and the way things happen in practice. Whilst the formal contract concerning the televising of the race is between FOCA and the Nine network, the Grand Prix Board has considerable influence in the matter in that it is able to make representations both to the Nine network and to FOCA on the question of whether or not the event is televised.

The Grand Prix Board also has considerable power over the Nine network in that the board provides the facilities that the Nine network uses to televise the race. Obviously, whilst there might not be legal power in the arrangement, a certain amount of persuasion can be exerted. In reality all of the organisations involved in the matter have a keen interest in cooperating with each other, because they are all about promoting the motor racing event and maximising coverage and commercial gain from it.

The legal arrangements do not necessarily reflect the situation that applies when the negotiations on whether or not a race will be televised are taking place. It is important for the Grand Prix Board to be able to mount a persuasive and reasoned case when making its representations to the two organisations that have formed an agreement.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Is it correct that the Channel 9 network makes payment to FOCA for the rights to televise and that no moneys go to the Grand Prix Board? If moneys go to FOCA from the Channel 9 network, does FOCA pass on to the Grand Prix Board any of the moneys it receives from the Channel 9 network for the televising of the Grand Prix in Adelaide?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Grand Prix Board does not receive any money through television rights.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It all goes to FOCA?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I cannot provide that information. That is a matter, as I understand it, between FOCA and the Nine network.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If the agreement is between the Channel 9 network and FOCA and no money categorically goes to the Grand Prix Board from television rights, it is fair to assume that FOCA is receiving money from the Channel 9 network. If FOCA and Channel 9 decide, by whatever means, not to televise the Grand Prix live in Adelaide, I take it from what the Grand Prix Board has stated that FOCA would have to reimburse the Channel 9 network some part of the annual payments for the television rights?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I cannot answer that question. As I indicated earlier, the Grand Prix Board does not know the terms of the agreement between the two organisations. Presumably, that is a commercial arrangement entered into by the two organisations.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am mindful of the time but I want to place on the record my dissatisfaction with the replies in relation to the direct televising of the Grand Prix in Adelaide. I am not being critical of the Minister personally. Every year we have this debate and this charade. I accept it is difficult for this Minister, who is not handling this matter on a day-to-day basis, but I raised these questions during the second reading debate so that officers of the Grand Prix Board could seek information as to the arrangements whereby Channel 9 would have televised the Grand Prix live, irrespective of the statements made by various spokespersons for the board in the week leading up to the event on the Sunday. I put it just in those terms. If there was a response from the Grand Prix Board that that was not the case or that there was some doubt about it, I would be happy to accept that.

I am not being personally critical of this Minister. It is highly unsatisfactory that this Committee and the Parliament cannot be provided with information during the second reading debate or the Committee stage as to the direct telecast of the Grand Prix. Each year Mr Drewer, Dr Hemmerling or others make statements about the possibility that it will not be telecast live. We then have members of the Opposition Parties and even Government backbenchers calling on the Premier and the Grand Prix Board to do

something about the telecast. Then, on the Friday or the Saturday someone makes a decision.

From what the Minister is saying, it is clearly not the Grand Prix Board, so we ought to know whether there is an agreement as per my information that it will be televised in any event, irrespective of the public posturing or statements made by spokespersons for the Grand Prix Board, politicians—be they Labor or Liberal—or whoever. I will not pursue that matter any further at this stage. I respect the fact that the Minister in this Chamber cannot provide the responses. However, I place on the record my dissatisfaction that we are not able to get that information. It is a matter that the Parliament ought to pursue at another time.

The last area that I want to pursue under this heading involves a matter I raised during the second reading debate. Public statements have already been made, and the Minister confirmed them, as to the attendance figures for each of the four days of the Grand Prix. During the week leading up to the Sunday Grand Prix, statements were made by officers and staff of the Grand Prix Board and the Premier about the extent of the dollar value of ticket sales. A figure of \$9 million was used by a number of people as the objective of the Grand Prix Board, and at varying stages through that week statements were made by the Premier and Grand Prix Board officers and staff as to having \$6 million, \$6.5 million, and up to \$7 million in ticket sales. We then heard statements that there was a rush in the last few days and that we might therefore be able to have a direct telecast of the Grand Prix. I am sure that a figure would have been provided to the Grand Prix Board as to the total in dollars of ticket sales at the end of the day for each of those seven days leading up to the Sunday Grand Prix, and I am seeking an undertaking from the Minister to provide that information.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not have that information, but I believe that I will be able to provide it later. Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Procedures of Board.'

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: My amendment is aimed at making more reasonable the rather extraordinary new section 8 (2a) under which a meeting or so-called gathering of the board will have these rather extraordinary powers to make decisions which will be valid, and replace that with an amendment which seems to us to be a more circumspect and cautious alternative for meetings of the board. The Minister has what appear to be two drafts of an amendment, and I assume that the correct one is that which reads:

(b) a number of members not less than that required for a quorum of the board have signified their concurrence in the decision by letter, telegram, telex, facsimile transmission or other method of written communication.

Is that correct?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Then I would prefer to hear argument from the Minister on her amendment before indicating which of the varieties of amendment the Democrats eventually will support. I will not formally move my amendment at this stage.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Government has considered the point of view put by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan about decisions being made outside of board meetings by the board, and considered the amendment that he placed on file. It is the view of the Government that the suggested amendment would not be practical because there are occasions on which members of the board are not available for consultation because they are interstate or overseas during the course of the year.

Therefore, the suggestion put forward by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan could not be met. However, the Government understands the point that was made by the honourable member and by the Hon. Mr Griffin on the same topic, namely, that there is a need for some accountability when decisions are made outside of board meetings.

I placed on file an amendment which I hoped would satisfy the concern of both members but, following further discussions yesterday with the Hon. Mr Griffin, I have placed another amendment on file, the one to which the Hon. Mr Gilfillan just referred, which I believe is the most satisfactory amendment to meet the concern expressed by all parties on this matter. It allows for decisions to be taken outside of board meetings, which is one of the requirements of the board, so that it can function appropriately. It also takes care of concerns that were expressed about accountability and about decisions being recorded if they are made in that way. I understand that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, having heard my explanation, will not proceed with his amendment, so I formally move:

Page 2, lines 4 to 6—Leave out subclause (2a) and insert:

(2a) A decision concurred in by members otherwise than at a meeting of the board is a valid decision of the board if—

(a) each member has had not less than 24 hours notice of the decision proposed to be made;

and

(b) a number of members not less than that required for a quorum of the board have signified their concurrence in the decision by letter, telegram, telex, facsimile transmission or other method of written communication.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I support the Minister's amendment. It overcomes all the problems to which I referred in my second reading speech and it also meets the concerns that were expressed by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan. It provides for 24 hours notice to all members of the board, and it allows a method of communication of concurrence and, if there is dissent, that will be recorded in the same way in writing so that there can be no dispute about whether a particular decision has been made. It safeguards the concerns that a number of people have expressed about the way in which it would otherwise have operated in the rather bald form presently in the Bill.

The Hon. Mr Gilfillan's proposed amendment picks up the usual formula in the corporate sector but, in the context of the Bill, the Minister's amendment safeguards all the operations of the board and the interests of the various members. Of course, the number which must concur is a quorum and under the Act, with nine members, that quorum is five so that is a majority of the board anyway. I am happy to support the amendment.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I indicate support for the amendment moved by the Government.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—'Functions and powers of Board.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: This clause seeks to amend the functions of the board and subsequently to allow the formation of joint ventures and appointments of agents. Will the Minister confirm what I think she said in her reply last night, namely, that, beyond the sorts of consultative arrangements that have existed, say, in respect of, I think it was, the possible establishment of a Grand Prix in Singapore and one or two other places, it is not expected that the board will be aggressively entrepreneurial in its activities in other parts of the world? Does it have any other proposals in contemplation for consultancies, joint ventures, and so on?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The object of this change is to clarify the desire of the Government that the Grand Prix Board should be in a position to act quickly in order

to attract particular events to Adelaide, or to be involved in activities which may bring revenue to the State by way of consultancies, as is the case with Singapore, where the Grand Prix Board has provided advice and assistance to the Singaporean authorities for establishing their own Grand Prix event. It is difficult to be specific about what opportunities may arise, but we want the board to have the capacity to avail itself of suitable opportunities as and when they arise.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: By providing that, amongst its powers, the board will have the power to enter into any partnership or joint venture arrangement, or appoint any agent, is it contemplated that there will be any joint ventures or that any agent is likely to be appointed by the board?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There are no current proposals for any joint venture schemes.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The other power sought to be given to the board is to hold or deal with and dispose of shares or other interests in, or securities issued by, bodies corporate. The power to hold shares and deal with them is already in the Act. Does the inclusion of the reference to other interests and securities have in mind immediately any particular set of circumstances or is it there to deal with circumstances such as interests in trusts and debentures which might be issued by some other body corporate at some time in the future?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There is nothing planned at this time. The provision has been incorporated in case an opportunity should arise.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I move:

Page 2, lines 11 and 12—Leave out paragraph (a) and insert:
(a) to negotiate on behalf of the State agreements for the conduct of motor racing events in Adelaide;

During the second reading debate I argued about the deep concerns of the Democrats for this wide-ranging power, especially as later in the Bill there is the scope for delegation to virtually one member of the board to exercise this power. We believe that is excessive and unnecessary and that the amendment would remove that scope for one member of the board to virtually single-handedly enter into agreements on behalf of the State.

In moving this amendment I point out that the questions asked by the Hon. Trevor Griffin were, and still are, of concern, but they are not of paramount importance. They reflect an interesting trend, the focus of which has been sharpened somewhat by articles in the *Advertiser* dealing with South Australia Inc. and the scope of how far quasi-government entities can go in a wide range of activities. We are concerned about the unidentified extent to which these amendments will expand the range of options, functions and activities of the board. However, that is only in passing and perhaps partially explains one of the reasons why we feel strongly that the power to enter into agreements on behalf of the State should be removed from the Bill.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Government opposes this amendment because this part of the Bill simply reinforces what is already happening. This clause makes it clear that the board is empowered to negotiate and enter into agreements on motor racing events as they are defined in the Act. Motor racing events as defined in the Act are those which take place during the course of the four day Australian Formula One Grand Prix. These agreements are being negotiated and entered into by the board at the moment, and there seems to be no good reason why that should be changed or not formally recognised in the Bill.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have already indicated my concern about the extent to which any State instrumentality

gets into the entrepreneurial range of activities. I have expressed concern about the extent to which the board, if not in practice but certainly legally, is able to get involved in activities which generally speaking are better left to the private sector. As I indicated in my second reading contribution, whilst that concern is on the record I do not intend to remove from the operation of the Act the present powers of the board, nor do I intend to oppose the substance of the Government's Bill. It will have to wear the consequences of being involved in entrepreneurial activity if, in fact, it is a failure. I am not suggesting that the expertise in the board will result in failure, but the difficulty with any statutory authority is that in a sense it tends not to be competitive and does not operate in a truly private enterprise context.

With respect to the Australian Democrats' amendment, I cannot see the reason for removing the words 'and enter into agreements' because, as the Minister says, this can extend to not only the principal agreement with FOCA but also other agreements, and there will be thousands of those for catering. Even a contract of service with all the employees would not be able to be entered into, as I would see it, if the reference to entering into agreements was removed. The board, because it is subject to the general control and direction of the Minister, ought to have the power to enter into agreements. Effectively, it undertakes the negotiations now, and it ought to be accountable to Parliament through the Minister.

I must say that previously we have experienced difficulty in obtaining much information from the Minister responsible. However, I am not saying that in respect of the Minister handling this Bill, because she has been able to give us a lot of helpful information in answer to our questions. It is for that reason that the Opposition is not prepared to support the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: It is interesting that both the Minister and the Hon. Mr Griffin have indicated that the board has been doing virtually what they are prepared to accept is necessary with an Act which did not specifically give the board this power. I am certainly not persuaded that any substantial argument has come forward that this wording is essential; in fact, I do not believe that it is even necessary. Negotiations can go on and I imagine that there would be a wide range of matters that could be finalised and deals clinched with the board where it has its own area of authority.

The Bill specifically provides 'on behalf of the State' and it is a wide interpretation. It seems to me to be quite unnecessary. There has been no plea that the board is not able to work, that it is restricted or curtailed in its range of activities, or deficient in fulfilling its obligations and requirements because it does not have this power. The arguments against the amendment are pretty feeble, to put it mildly. I still say that the argument behind the amendment stands. I find it unacceptable—and I do not intend to pick it up—that the Opposition is only remaining passive in its pursuit of its criticism of the board's wide range of powers and activities because the Government will build for itself some form of ogre which can be used to attack the Government in an election campaign. I feel that that is a demeaning argument to defeat my amendment. As I gather from the two principal speakers I have heard, I am unlikely to win on the voices. If I lose on the voices, I will not call for a division.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I want to clarify one point as a result of the honourable member's recent contribution. The board has been negotiating and entering into agreements on behalf of the State with respect to the formula

one racing event under the powers of the Act by way of delegation from the Minister. It is not, as I think the Hon. Mr Gilfillan was implying, something it has been doing unauthorised; it has been authorised to enter into these agreements in the past. We are now seeking to make it perfectly clear in the Act, and not just by way of administrative direction, that the board has the power to so negotiate and enter into agreements.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It seems to me that this paragraph is confined to the negotiation and entering into agreements on behalf of the State under which motor racing events are held in Adelaide. They are strictly defined in the principal Act and I do not see that there is any harm in giving the board this power. If the Minister decides to restrict it, then he or she has the power to do that under the general power of direction conferred in the Act. I take exception to what the Hon. Mr Gilfillan said about my so-called weak attitude in relation to this particular amendment. I made the Opposition's position clear. We support the Grand Prix.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Do you support the entrepreneurial activities of the board?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: We don't. We said that we are concerned about the board becoming too entrepreneurial. I have asked the Minister a whole range of questions and the answers indicate that there are no proposals to go beyond what the board is presently doing; and I accept that. If the Minister is misleading the Committee she will be called to account later. She has given me the answers and I accept them. I have made our view clear in relation to statutory bodies getting out into the private sector and carrying on a whole range of activities that are inappropriate to Government.

While this board has the opportunity to do that, it does not appear that there is any present intention to do it and, if it does, it and the Government of the day will be judged on what it does. It is as simple as that. With respect to this amendment, it is to negotiate and enter into agreements—and that is what we are dealing with—on behalf of the State under which motor racing events are held in Adelaide. It has nothing to do with the promotion aspect. It is a technical aspect of whether this board enters into agreements or whether someone else does.

It seems to me that if a statutory body has the power to negotiate and to organise this particular event, it ought also to have the power which, the Minister has indicated it is already exercising, to enter into agreements which result from that negotiation and if there is a foolish or unwise agreement then ultimately that will come out. But as a practical matter, it seems to me to be quite reasonable that any statutory body which has the power to negotiate should also be able to enter into agreements. For that reason, on a purely practical basis, I support the Government and oppose the amendment of the Hon. Mr Gilfillan. I make clear that this particular amendment has nothing to do with questions of promotion.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I move:

Page 2, after line 38—Insert paragraph as follows:

- (d) by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:
 (3a) The board may not delegate its functions or powers under subsection (1) (a) or subsection (2) (l) or (m) except with the prior approval of the Minister.

This amendment continues on the line of concern the Democrats have for the power of the board. It is related more directly to delegation as spelt out in the final paragraph of clause 5 about the delegation of any of its functions or powers to the Chairman or any other member of the board,

to a committee established by the board or the Chairman or to the Executive Director of the board or to any other person or body. That is a very wide and loose power of delegation and, as our amendment has proved not to be successful, it virtually means that the power to enter into an agreement on behalf of the State can be delegated to any other person. We are not content with that. That sort of delegation ought to be subject to the prior approval of the Minister, and that is the purpose of the amendment.

The Hon. Trevor Griffin seemed to take my remarks out of the context in which they were levelled as far as criticising his stand, and I am assuming his stand represents that of the Liberal Party. I was not referring to his opposition to my amendment in that context, but in his speech he had talked about the concern for the wider entrepreneurial role that is available to the board. He seems to have been placated by the fact that the Minister (who is being briefed on the run) has said that there is nothing on the drawing board. That has allayed all his fears of the expansion of entrepreneurial activities. That shows a naivety that the Hon. Trevor Griffin does not normally show. The capacity for the board to do its very worst as far as the fears of both the Hon. Trevor Griffin and myself are concerned is still in the Bill. In fact, the amendment that I am currently moving will not substantially affect that if the Government of the day supports this entrepreneurial role for the board.

However, the amendment specifically is for control of the delegation so that the board cannot, on its own whim, decide that some other person (that is the most extreme form it can take, but this legislation allows for that) can enter into an agreement on behalf of the State. So I move the amendment and indicate in general terms the concern of the Democrats for what appears to us to be a quite unnecessary expansion of the capacity for the board to enter into an enormously wide range of activities. The character of the board as being facilitating an executive unit to run the Grand Prix will fade into insignificance if it moves out and uses the full range of functions available to it through the Bill.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Government opposes this amendment. There is already power in the existing legislation for the board to delegate powers to the Chairman, to subcommittees or to the Executive Director of the board. This provision seeks to allow for the delegation of functions or powers to those people and for committees to be established to work on particular matters or to form task forces and so on to deal with particular questions in which the board has an interest.

There is always the protection in the legislation that enables the Minister to give direction, and should the Minister identify areas which are not appropriate for delegation, such directions can be given to the board. The intention of this provision is to facilitate the administration of the work of the Grand Prix Board, and there is nothing sinister in it. It is not likely that powers which, rightly, ought to be exercised by the entire board would be delegated to an inappropriate officer or committee, but from time to time there will be functions and powers which should be delegated to committees or to an individual in order that the work of the Grand Prix Board can continue satisfactorily. I cannot see any reason at all for the power to be restricted in the way that has been suggested by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: If guidelines for delegation have already been established by the board, can the Minister make a copy of those available in due course? If there are no guidelines for delegation, how does the board presently deal with delegations? Is it done on an *ad hoc* basis, looking at each case on its merits?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not aware of any guidelines that the board works by in the delegation of powers currently, but I am advised that decisions about delegations are made by the board. This relates to financial delegations, the establishment of committees, the delegation to certain individuals to execute contracts, etc., which are all determined at board level.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: And recorded?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: And recorded in the minutes, yes.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: From time to time I do have misgivings about delegations—mostly where discretions are involved. I recently raised a matter in this regard concerning the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. In this instance, because of the nature of the activity of the board, I do not have any difficulty with this and, in the light of the indication given that delegations are all authorised by the board and recorded by it, I am reasonably comfortable with the present situation. I indicate that I will not support the Hon. Mr Gilfillan's amendment.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am disappointed to hear the indication from the Government and the Opposition that they do not intend to support the amendment. If I lose on the voices, I will not call for a division.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6—'Committees.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I raised concerns about the chairman having the power to appoint a committee independently of the board. It is not clear whether a committee established by the chairman will be accountable only to the chairman, whether it is proposed that the establishment of any committee by the chairman will generally be approved by the full board or whether the chairman will have the opportunity to go his or her own way. Will the Minister indicate what sort of committees it is proposed the chairman, as opposed to the board, should establish? I am not worried about the board establishing committees, as it is an accepted thing.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The usual situation would be that committees would be established by the board, but there have been occasions from time to time between board meetings when there has been a need to react quickly to a situation, for example, to work on a tender, to prepare a submission for some reason or to seek rapid advice about a certain matter. In those circumstances it is deemed desirable for the chairman to have the power to establish a committee in order to ensure that such action can take place when it is required. Normally it would be the intention for such matters to be raised with the board and for the board to undertake those decisions.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Repeal of s. 29.'

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I apologise to the Chamber for not having had this amendment on file. It was partly due to the difficulty in making a decision. I move:

Page 3—Leave out the clause and insert in lieu thereof the following new clause—

9. Section 29 of the principal Act is amended by leaving out from subsection (1) 'thirty-first day of December 1992' and inserting 'thirty-first day of December 2000'.

Members can see quite simply the purpose of the amendment. The original wording in the Bill is obviously to delete any indication of a sunset clause, and I made some critical comments (which I will not repeat) about that in my second reading contribution. I urge support for my amendment on the grounds that the Government is already committed to an extension to the year 2000. That takes us on another 12 years. If (and I will not say 'heaven forbid', but there may

be very good reason to do so) there is an intention to carry on beyond the year 2000, the legislative process is readily available to amend this legislation further before the year 2000. It is a necessary amendment to give some assurance to the people of South Australia that they are not sentenced to an indefinite term of the Grand Prix.

It is not an amendment which criticises because, if that were the case, the original section would not have been included in the original Act. I regard it as a useful and responsible amendment which shows that Parliament will have to consider again in debate—which is only proper—if there is to be a further extension of the Grand Prix in Adelaide beyond the year 2000. I urge the Committee to support this amendment.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I oppose the amendment. First, it is most irregular that an amendment should be circulated at such a late time, and I was not aware that it was to be moved. I certainly have not had an opportunity to speak with the responsible Minister about it, but I am certain that he would oppose it. Such an amendment potentially jeopardises some of the purpose for this Bill. Contained in this Bill is the potential for the Grand Prix Board to become involved in a range of activities for which it might be undesirable for there to be some sort of sunset provision, because it may very well interfere with the activity that the board might engage in at some future time. For that reason and a number of others I oppose this amendment on behalf of the Government.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Ordinarily one has a sunset clause covering three to five years in advance because one is not sure that there is any good sense in continuing a particular legislative requirement. I can think of the Associations Incorporation Act which had, from memory, a four year sunset clause on the requirement to lodge triennial returns. Another piece of legislation was the Pricing Act, in which was provided a year-by-year extension in front of the Prices Act.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Random breath testing.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: And random breath testing—a whole range of legislation, where the sunset clause usually only relates to a period of two, three or four years in advance. If the sunset clause is to be until the year 2000, that is so far into the future that it is not a proper use of a sunset clause. It can be argued as to what is the proper basis for a sunset clause, but that is 12 years into the future. I do not think that it serves any useful purpose to have that sort of sunset clause. If there is to be a sunset clause it ought to be for five or six years, but the Minister says that the Government's negotiations are to take the Grand Prix up to the year 2000. In those circumstances, I do not think that a sunset clause ending on 31 December 2000 is an appropriate use of a sunset clause or serves any useful purpose.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: If I moved an amendment whereby the sunset clause applied five or six years ahead, perhaps the Hon. Mr Griffin would support it. If the justification for opposing the date of a sunset clause is that it is too far away, that seems a very wobbly argument.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (2)—The Hons M.J. Elliott and I. Gilfillan (teller).

Noes (16)—The Hons G.L. Bruce, J.C. Burdett, T. Crothers, L.H. Davis, Peter Dunn, M.S. Feleppa, K.T. Griffin, J.C. Irwin, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, Carolyn Pickles, R.J. Ritson, T.G. Roberts, J.F. Stefani, G. Weatherill, and Barbara Wiese (teller).

Majority of 14 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

**POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND AGENCY ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Bill read a third time and passed.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

COOPERATIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

ADJOURNMENT

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

At 6.13 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 29 November at 2.15 p.m.