HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 October 1984

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

PETITION: COORONG BEACH

A petition signed by 1 381 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the entire Coorong beach remains open to vehicles and the public and that all tracks are maintained in good order was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: ANTI DISCRIMINATION BILL

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia praying that the House delete the words 'sexuality, marital status and pregnancy' from the Anti Discrimination Bill, 1984, and provide for the recognition of the primacy of marriage and parenthood was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: X RATED VIDEO TAPES

A petition signed by 17 residents of South Australia praying that the House ban X rated video films in South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 47, 146, 147, 150, and 151; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice and questions asked during Estimates Committee A be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

OFFSHORE SAND

In reply to **Mr MATHWIN** (29 August).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The use of satellite surveillance by the South Australia Centre for Remote Sensing to look for offshore sources of sand has been considered by the Department of Environment and Planning. However, the idea has been rejected because the image does not always provide a clear picture of the sea-bed due to interference from waves and water, and because the satellite cannot provide any indication of the depth of sand where the sea-bed does appear on the image. Techniques such as seismic survey, diving and coring, all of which are considered to be superior in effect to remote sensing, have been used by the Coast Protection Board to look for sand offshore. Whilst, regrettably, no suitable source has been found the search is continuing. The details of sand supply, processes, costs and options for Adelaide beaches are set out in the Adelaide Coast Protection Strategy Review. That review was only recently completed by the Coastal Management Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning and recently released.

STOCK GRAZING

In reply to **Mr ASHENDEN** (20 September).

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

1. The subject land is named the Anstey Hill Open Space Reserve and is under the control of the Minister for Environment and Planning. The land is under interim management by the Department of Environment and Planning and negotiations are currently in progress for its divestment to a permanent management authority.

2. Internal fencing was completed on 18 September 1984 to enable sheep to graze to reduce the fire hazard on peripheral areas of the land.

3. Sheep were placed on the northern peripheral area of the land on 9 October 1984. It is proposed that the sheep be shifted progressively to other peripheral areas to ensure efficient fuel reduction to reduce the fire hazard within the Reserve.

INTERIM DEATH CERTIFICATES

In reply to **Mr KLUNDER** (7 August).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: My colleague the Attorney-General has informed me that there is provision in the Births, Deaths and Marriages Act for the issue of an interim death certificate. The State Coroner does issue interim death certificates when the occasion requires. In cases where a particular death requires a post mortem, a final certificate cannot be issued until receipt and perusal by the State Coroner of the full post mortem report.

There are other cases where a final death certificate cannot be issued for some time: for example where the State Coroner may disagree with the cause of death provided by a post mortem report. In these situations the cause of death can only be determined by an inquest. Accordingly the final certificate as to cause of death cannot be given until the completion of that inquest.

Certain establishments will not accept the interim certificate. However, this is a matter that is out of the control of the State Coroner and the Government. Obviously, if a claim is made to an insurance company as a result of the death of a person, that insurance company will not pay out on the claim until it has received a final death certificate. Every effort is made by the State Coroner to issue death certificates as soon as possible.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

ROADS OPENING AND CLOSING

In reply to **Mr MEIER.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A tendency towards higher density living in the metropolitan area is generating a demand to have roads closed to achieve both an increase in residential land and to improve the amenity of the environment. In rural areas the environmental implications of road proposals in sensitive areas are taking on a greater significance than in the past. Tourism and recreational pressures will exacerbate this problem. In addition, the existence of specific rights over roads which are the subject of a closure is a constant problem to both the administrators of the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act and the purchasers of such land. Furthermore, the status of a road claimed to be public is frequently placed in doubt due to its method of creation, the subsequent actions of Local Government and the related Statutes.

There is also an increasing tendency for the public to mount legal challenge to road alteration proposals and this

creates an increased work load in administering the Act because of the need to satisfy specific and general inquiries concerning the proposals. Many inquiries relate to public access along closed roads. The requirement which exists in the Roads Act for the Surveyor-General to recommend to the Minister that road proposals be confirmed is far reaching in that among other issues he should take cognisance of the public interest and individual access rights. The planning implications regarding access to all land parcels affected by a closure often require considerable investigation and liaison with interested parties. In fact, the Surveyor-General provides the objectivity necessary to evaluate the relative impacts on the affected parties. It is this function as an arbiter in assessing community interests which shapes his recommendations to the Minister.

COMMONWEALTH FUNDING

In reply to **Mr GUNN.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Department of Environment and Planning has provided both financial and manpower assistance to the District Council of Hawker to enable a detailed conservation and development proposal to be prepared, and a funding application to be made to the Commonwealth Employment Programme. The Department supports and continues to be involved with the project in the hope that it will be successfully realised by the District Council of Hawker.

HISTORIC TOWNS SIGNPOSTING

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Following discussions between officers of the Department of Environment and Planning and the Department of Tourism, draft policy papers on the signposting of historic towns have been prepared by both departments. These papers are being consolidated and it is anticipated that the matter will be referred to the Highways Department in the near future.

COORONG NATIONAL PARK

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The construction of the new administrative and interpretation centre at Salt Creek in the Coorong National Park was undertaken at a cost of $150 000.

WINDY POINT LOOKOUT

In reply to **Mr BAKER.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A reply to the letter concerning the lower car park at Windy Point was sent on 18 June 1984. The reply indicated that repairs to the floodlights and the surface of the car park had taken place. Subject to the availability of funds, provision will be made in the Department of Environment and Planning's capital works programme for the next financial year for the expenditure of up to $50 000 for rehabilitation of the lower car park area, including resurfacing.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It has not been necessary for the Government to become involved in the preparation of either a development plan or supplementary development plan, under the provisions of section 41 (2) *(a)* (iii) of the Planning Act, for an area whose council has refused to prepare a plan when requested. It is confirmed that a council has a period of three months to decide whether to undertake preparation of a supplementary development plan at the request of the Minister. At present the Department of Environment and Planning is preparing:

(1) 10 supplementary development plans at the request of councils; and

(2) 10 supplementary development plans covering the areas of two or more councils; five of these plans relate to metropolitan Adelaide.

BOTANIC GARDENS

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There has been a decrease in vandalism in the past 12 months. Whilst vandalism continues to be of serious concern, the appointment of a part-time officer to patrol the gardens and increased police surveillance following liaison between police and Botanic Gardens staff has resulted in only minor acts of vandalism being committed.

REVEGETATION

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A national workshop on broadscale revegetation methods is currently being planned for March 1985. To date no papers have been prepared for the workshop.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The $2 500 voted in 1983-84 was for an administrative filing system which was deferred due to the forthcoming introduction of a centralised Government system. The $17 850 proposed for 1984-85 under the new 'programme' lines now includes replacement equipment for three support service divisions (Management and Administrative Services, Technical Services and Community Information Services). The items being replaced are drafting and photographic equipment and a text editor.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Two new environmental impact statements were called for during the period July 1983 to June 1984. In addition, the Commonwealth Government gave notice during this period of its intention to prepare an environmental impact statement for the Port Wakefield Proof Range Extension, and this work is now proceeding. Only one of the environmental impact statements called for during the period July 1984 has been assessed at this time. The time for assessing that statement (being the time between the receipt of the final EIS from the proponent and the completion of an assessment report on that EIS) was six weeks (32 working days).

NATIVE FAUNA

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Illegal taking and possession of native fauna can be separated into the following categories:

(1) Fauna taken as a result of illegal hunting for the purpose of eating and protected animals taken for meat. This category includes persons apprehended without hunting permits, and persons violating park regulations.

Persons prosecuted for these offences in the period July 1982 to September 1984—132.

(2) Protected animals taken or kept illegally by aviculturalists not necessarily for trade, but for household pets or in pursuit of a hobby.

Persons prosecuted for these offences in the period July 1982 to September 1984—20.

(3) The more serious category of taking native fauna relates to those who specifically take from the wild for the purpose of trade and profit.

Persons prosecuted for these offences in the period July 1982 to September 1984—22.

HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS ACT

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Under section 21 of the Historic Shipwrecks Act, 1981, the Minister may appoint a person to be an inspector for the purposes of the Act. However, the Act does not provide for the appointment of voluntary wardens. To date, 78 people have been appointed inspectors, 17 from the Department of Environment and Planning; 31 from the Department of Fisheries; and 30 from the Department of Marine and Harbors. They are all Government officers from these various departments. In addition, all police officers are automatically inspectors under the Historic Shipwrecks Act, 1981. These inspectors have the power to:

board a ship;
search a ship;
require a person to answer questions;
obtain a warrant to enter and search land;
arrest a person without a warrant if the inspector believes that the person has committed an offence against section 13 or the regulations;
arrest a person without a warrant if the proceedings against the person by summons would not be effective;
seize a ship or equipment if he believes it has been used in the commission of an offence against the Act, for a period of 60 days.

AUTHORITY BOARD AND COMMITTEE FEES

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The amount noted in 1983-84 for fees to be paid to members of authorities, boards and committees was $240 300. The actual expenditure was $229 777. The expenditure proposed for 1984-85 under the line 'Authorities, Boards and Committees fees' is $226 000. The variation between noted and actual expenditure in 1983-84 arose from temporary vacancies on some committees, while the reduction in the amount noted for 1984-85 is due to the transfer of the salary of the Secretary, Environmental Protection Council to the salaries and wages line under the new programme accounting arrangements.

CAPITAL WORKS PAYMENTS

In reply to **Mr BAKER.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The following payments were made by the Department of Environment and Planning on capital works during the month of June 1984:

Project	Paid to	$
Land Purchases:		
Dalhousie Station	Crown Solicitor	650 000
Bool Lagoon	Crown Solicitor (A/c McBeath/Schinkel)	34 000
Poocher Swamp	Crown Solicitor (A/c Staude)	50 000
Loch Luna	Lands Department	40 000
Finnis	Crown Solicitor (A/c Lewis)	29 608
Naracoorte Caves	Crown Solicitor	10 000
Purchase three tractors—NPWS	Peter Hood Holden	60 713
Wilpena—Chlorination Plant	Public Buildings Department	20 000
Katarapko Reserve Works	Public Buildings Department	24 000
Northern Region—four generators	Public Buildings Department	25 000
Morialta—Fourth Creek Gorge Development	Public Buildings Department	55 365
Mount Lofty Kiosk—design	Public Buildings Department	50 800
Moorook and Pandappa—surveys	Public Buildings Department	12 000
Danggali—water desalinator	Public Buildings Department	18 150
Balcanoona—Accommodation for Aboriginal trainees	Public Buildings Department	10 600
Salt Creek—Roadworks	District Council of Meningie	33 000
		1 123 236
Payments less than $10 000		286 080
Total Loan Payments June 1984		1 409 316

GOLDEN GROVE DEVELOPMENT

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows:

Re: Estimated total investment (in escalated value terms) in land, housing and associated facilities over the 15 year span of Golden Grove development.

	$
Land development and housing (based on 10 000 dwellings at an initial average of $70 000 for land and dwelling)	1 246 m
Educational and community facilities	80 m
Retail/industrial	38 m
	1 364 m

It should be noted that these figures are very broad estimates only. For example, it is not possible to determine money escalation factors, rate of take-up of residential, commercial and public land, etc. However, the Urban Land Trust considers that this estimate by Delfin (of total investment by Government, private enterprise and individuals over the approximate 15 year life span of the project) is a reasonable one to make at this early stage.

RABBIT CONTROL

In reply to **Mr GUNN.**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There are no plans to permit rabbit trappers into the Oraparinna section of the Flinders Ranges National Park for a limited period for the purpose of trapping rabbits. However, a contractor is at present undertaking a rabbit trapping programme on two out of three weekends. This exercise has been undertaken by the Department of Environment and Planning's National Parks and Wildlife Service to determine the effectiveness and value of such work. Unfortunately, the National Parks and

Wildlife Service experience is the same as that of other authorities, in that trapping or shooting simply sustains viable healthy rabbit populations by reducing competition by sheer numbers. It is therefore not as effective as a control or eradication technique. The South Australian Vertebrate Pest Control Authority and the National Parks and Wildlife Service have worked together consistently during the past six years period to develop effective control programmes.

The current programme of works to reduce rabbit numbers within the Flinders Ranges National Park commenced during 1978 comprising extensive survey works to determine population numbers, distribution and density. The European rabbit flea was introduced during this period by the South Australian Vertebrate Pest Control Authority. The following control forms have been undertaken:

(a) Remote areas—infestation areas are treated with 10/80 oat baits, followed by warren ripping and subsequent phostoxin gassing; 700 hectares have been treated in this manner during the past four years.

(b) Areas visited by public on an infrequent basis—warrens are treated with phostoxin and ripped follow up treatments are undertaken where the above treatment is repeated; 150 warren complexes have been treated in this manner during the past four years.

(c) In extremely high visitor use areas 10/80 poison and phostoxin gas are not used, and warren complexes are ripped as and when necessary; 100 warren complexes have been treated in this manner during the last four year period.

During the period 1980 to 1984, $9 700 has been spent specifically on plant equipment and chemicals for rabbit control work. Approximately 1 920 man days per year are allocated specifically for vermin control works within the Flinders Ranges National Park, totalling in excess of 8 000 man days over the aforementioned period. The situation is similar in the Gammon Ranges National Park. The sum of $4 000 has been spent on plant, equipment and chemicals over the past two years controlling rabbits on the northern boundaries of the Park.

The following funds have been allocated in the 1984-85 financial year for equipment and associated chemicals:

$1 500 for the Flinders Ranges National Park with associated 160 man days per month in control activities;

$1 000 for similar works within the Gammon Ranges National Park with associated 50 man days per month in control activities;

$20 000 for works within Katarapko Game Reserve where the National Parks and Wildlife Service's major rabbit infestation exists.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GRAND PRIX

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As members would be aware from press reports of the past few days, South Australia has now secured definite commitments concerning the staging of a Formula One Grand Prix race in Adelaide in October next year. While Adelaide had been placed on the calendar of Grand Prix events by FISA, the governing body of international racing, detailed organisational and financial arrangements had to be concluded with the Formula One Constructors Association.

There has never been any doubt that staging the race in Adelaide would bring considerable financial benefits to the State. However, the Government's aim was to limit its financial exposure as well as maximising its opportunities to participate in financial rewards of the race. The original contract we were offered by FOCA gave us access only to revenue from gate takings which we did not believe was sufficient to meet this aim. As a result of the negotiations in London last week with FOCA, South Australia will now share the revenue from sponsorship originating in Australia, including naming rights, merchandising, and concessions, as well as receiving gate takings. The value of this will, of course, depend on the extent to which the private sector participates in sponsoring the race. However, there is already considerable interest and we estimate that, as a result of the concessions we have negotiated, the Government should receive extra revenue of the order of $1 million.

The net cost to the State of staging the race, based on conservative estimates, will be between $1.5 and $2 million. Members will appreciate that the task of staging the race within 12 months is an enormous one. We are working closely with the Adelaide City Council and have held discussions with other local government bodies who will be affected. The complex nature of the race will mean that legislation will be needed to cover such aspects as temporary road closures and erection of signs, the suspension of speed limits on public roads for the duration of the race and the establishment of a corporate body to contract with private organisations on the administrative and financial arrangements. There will, of course, be some short term disruption within the city during the few days the race is held. However, in planning the course we have attempted to ensure that the area which will be immediately affected is limited.

South Australia has secured the Grand Prix against stiff competition from Victoria and Queensland. It is quite clear that the race will provide an enormous impetus for our tourist industry and also gain world wide exposure for our city and our State. It will generate income and create jobs as well as adding an event of world wide standing to the celebrations to mark our Jubilee year. In that context, I would like to place on record the Government's appreciation for the work done by the Jubilee 150 organisation over the past year in securing this event for Adelaide.

I appreciate that many honourable members will wish to ask detailed questions concerning the arrangements for the race, and indicate that the House will have ample opportunity to debate all aspects of the race when the legislation is brought in.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Financial Institutions Duty Act, 1983—Regulations—Exemptions.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Woodville—

I. Albert Park.
II. Aberfeldy Avenue, Woodville.
III. Rawley Terrace, Woodville.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—

I. Central Zone Abalone Fees.
II. Western Zone Abalone Fees.
III. Southern Zone Abalone Fees.
IV. Spencer Gulf Prawn Fees.

v. Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fees.
vi. Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fees.
vii. Size Limit on Tuna.
viii. Fish Processors Requirement for Tuna.
ix. Tuna Fishery Mangement.
x. Investigator Strait Experimental Prawn Fishery.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Medical Board of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. West Beach Trust—Report of the Auditor-General on, 1983-84.
ii. Corporation of Whyalla—By-law No. 24—Street Hawkers and Traders.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Electricity Trust of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Builders Licensing Board—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act, 1981—Regulations—Control of Alcohol.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. South-Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936—Regulations—
i. Illegal Machines.
ii. Ticket Sellers.

QUESTION TIME

GOLDEN GROVE INDENTURE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction explain why the board of the Housing Trust has issued a statement this afternoon which virtually dissociates the Trust from the Golden Grove indenture signed this morning by the Premier? The board of the Housing Trust has this afternoon issued a statement expressing concern about a number of elements of the joint venture agreement signed this morning by the Premier. The Trust has also asked Parliament and the public to investigate with special thoroughness the terms of the joint venture and, in the board's words, 'the process by which the Government was led to accept it.' This statement was issued less than three hours after the Premier signed this agreement, hailed as a unique marriage between the private sector and the Government.

As the initiator of obtaining private sector interest in the project two years ago, the former Liberal Government has continued to support the need for the Golden Grove development, despite the delays which have occurred over the past two years. However, the statement by the board of the Housing Trust is an unprecedented one for a statutory body to make in these circumstances. It is one which requires a full and immediate explanation from the responsible Minister, and I ask him to provide the House with those details.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question in this case should more properly have been directed to me because, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, I have this day, on behalf of the Cabinet, signed the indenture which finalises the agreement. The Housing Trust statement has been brought to my attention, as have the attitudes of the Housing Trust and the board been brought to Cabinet's attention constantly by my colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction in the course of the negotiations surrounding this indenture.

I might point out that the Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact of the previous Government's initiating private sector involvement in such a development, and that is true. In fact, the previous Government's proposal for this development effectively would have been to hand it over lock, stock and barrel to a private developer to do what that private developer wished with it. That does not happen to be the attitude my Government takes. We believe that the best and most productive way of handling a development of this size and nature is through a joint venture which preserves and protects the public interest, but also harnesses the skills and marketing abilities of the private sector, and that is the nature of the agreement that has been developed. My Government also has insisted, unlike the attitude taken by its predecessors, that the Housing Trust should have full participation in the development and that there should be a substantial Housing Trust presence in the Golden Grove development.

That is in accordance with policies of establishing a proper mix of housing (both public and private) in any such major development. That is something that the Trust would welcome. The Trust has, of course, expressed reservations about the price of such participation, but negotiations have occurred and arrangements made which I think have satisfied its objections in relation to that matter, despite the statement made today.

Incidentally, the other side of the coin to our predecessors' approach would be to have a fully public sector development of it, as the Land Commission previously would have been empowered to do. Honourable members would know that that was rendered totally impossible, even though the Land Commission did in fact assemble the parcel of land and had carriage of it under the previous Government. It was rendered impossible by the dismemberment of the Land Commission by the previous Government, by its reconstitution as the Urban Land Trust with extremely limited powers and, in fact, the explicit prohibition of its undertaking the sort of development that could have been handled by the public sector in the past. So, within those constraints and those areas of policy, the Government has had an extremely complicated job of negotiation.

In relation to the statement made by the Housing Trust, I welcome the aspect which says that the Parliament and public should investigate with special thoroughness the terms of the proposed joint venture and the processes by which the Government was led to accept it. That is precisely what will happen; it will happen through the vehicle of a Select Committee constituted by this House.

That Select Committee will examine in all details, and I hope with all vigour, the terms of the indenture that has been drawn. I believe that that process will provide answers to questions and make quite clear the true nature of the agreement that has been signed for mutual benefit, the protections that have been included in that agreement and the codicils to it. So the Trust's call for a close and thorough investigation is welcomed by the Government. Indeed, that will happen in the Select Committee, and later today my colleague will introduce the Bill to enable that to occur.

LEGAL AID

Ms LENEHAN: I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General in

another place. Will the Attorney-General make representations to the Federal Attorney-General requesting that the Federal Government reassess the criteria for eligibility to obtain legal aid? In recent weeks several constituents have approached me requesting that I support their application for legal aid which had either been refused because of ineligibility or had been suspended due to certain matters. It has come to my attention that recently some of my constituents actually pleaded guilty in the local court because they were not prepared to take on the responsibility of defending themselves at the local court level because they were ineligible for legal aid. These constituents are in my view very deserving people.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member is tending to overstep the mark.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will most certainly pass on the honourable member's comments to my colleague in another place. The provision of legal aid has been the subject of an inquiry at the Federal level at the instigation of the Federal Attorney-General. I understand that the level of service provided by the Legal Services Commission in this State is amongst the highest in Australia, but obviously there are still many more people who are of a deserving nature with respect to their rights to have legal representation before the courts but who do not fall within the limited criteria for receiving legal aid that have been established because of funding limitations. Obviously the Government is sympathetic towards that matter, and I will ask the Attorney-General to see what he can do.

GOLDEN GROVE INDENTURE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Because the board of the South Australian Housing Trust is under Ministerial control, and in view of the serious nature of the statement released by the board this afternoon, will the Minister of Housing and Construction immediately instruct the board to make a full public statement setting out all the reasons for its concerns about the indenture?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

OSBORNE COAL COMBUSTION FACILITY

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with a progress report on the construction of the Electricity Trust of South Australia's coal combustion test facility at Osborne?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes. A couple of weeks ago I attended an ETSA function at which a presentation was given by a very able team of three people, headed by Dr Mario Bosio. During that presentation the position in respect of ETSA's coal combustion test facility was explained. The presentation itself related to the ongoing way in which ETSA continually examines the utilisation of the State's low grade coals. The construction work on the test facility has been completed and running-in trials are now taking place so that the facility can be in full operation before the end of this year.

The test facility itself will be one of the most modern and comprehensive in the world; certainly, it will be the most modern and comprehensive in the southern hemisphere. The difficulties that have been encountered by ETSA in the past, when it has been necessary to make combustion and other tests on sample amounts of the State's low grade coals, were in respect of both cost and time.

First, in respect of time, the number of facilities in the world are not always available when a series of tests and a test programme may be required by ETSA. Secondly, in relation to cost, it has involved the cost of transporting, in some cases, quite sizeable quantities of coal overseas to enable the tests to be done fully. Sometimes hundreds of tonnes have needed to be sent, and that in itself has meant considerable expense.

With respect to the type of testing that can be done on the present or new facility located at Osborne, I have seen a comparison table showing every other facility of any ability in the world. The score sheet comes out extremely in favour of this latest test facility. Also, I had the opportunity not so long ago to see the facility being constructed and installed, and it is quite clear that it is of very high quality. I understand that it can be controlled in a very extensive way and that there is also use of computerised continuous monitoring test facilities, providing figures that can be examined continuously.

I believe that the facility itself will also be increasingly used in the whole of South-East Asia because the range of coals that can be tested range from those which we have in South Australia (and which are described as lignites) right through to the bituminous range of coals. I expect that ETSA could build up a reputation for expertise and reliability of testing results which will result in the opportunity for it to obtain orders to carry out testing for countries within the sphere of influence surrounding Australia.

TAFE BUDGET

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because rising electricity bills are the major reason for cutbacks in technical and further education courses throughout South Australia, will the Minister of Education immediately review TAFE budget allocations? The Opposition has been supplied with information from a number of colleges which demonstrates the extent to which rising electricity charges are significantly reducing the proportion of budget allocations which TAFE colleges can spend on courses. For example, Marleston college faces an increase of 67 per cent in its power bill. At Tea Tree Gully the increase is 44.6 per cent and at Gilles Plains it is 38.5 per cent.

Last week, the Opposition revealed that a significant number of vital courses were being cut back and eliminated in TAFE colleges. This applies in particular to special education courses for intellectually and mentally disabled people and, in this respect, I have received a letter from a class at the Croydon college which makes the following points:

> The classes we have now have all been cut back by half an hour each and it means that the important things we learn like reading, writing, cookery and communication are all rushed. Because we are slower to do things we need longer time, not shorter. Some of us are in our last year at college and think it is not fair to have our last term shortened. These cuts will stop us doing the things we want to, like doing our shopping and banking; getting married; living in a flat or a house; travelling for holidays; and moving on to more independent places.

This is just one of many examples that the Opposition could give which call for an immediate review of present TAFE budget allocations.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First, I remind honourable members of my statement in this House last week about the State effort that has gone into TAFE funding under this Government *vis-a-vis* what happened under the former Government. Secondly, during the former Government's time in office electricity charges went up by 60 per cent. That also needed to be accommodated by TAFE budgets against a highlight of reduction in actual State support for the technical and further education sector.

It is true that increasing electricity charges have had a significant impact on technical and further education costs over recent years. It is also true that that cost has been exacerbated by the new facilities coming on line needing new kinds of energy consumption patterns. That is something that has had to be taken into account by the Department. Indeed, I can say that prior to the last election I identified this issue as one of some considerable significance and indicated that there should be further consideration of energy management issues in both principal departments in my portfolio area, namely, education and technical and further education. Indeed, I indicated that a study should be done of lighting control systems and, in the eventuality of my coming into the Ministry and of my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy coming into the Ministry, that issue was followed through as a Government-wide approach, because my colleague had also previously raised the issue as one of great significance.

The Minister of Mines and Energy has had in place a Government energy management scheme to examine ways in which energy costs can be reduced for all departments, and that scheme is resulting in reporting back to various Ministers, advising of the kinds of resource savings that can be made in each department. I am following that scheme very closely indeed.

The other point I want to make is with regard to the TAFE budgeting situation. It is certainly true that particular colleges at the moment are advising the Department of the impact in 1985 of their budget situation. The Department is consequentially advising me, and we are examining all the possible options available to us as to what should happen in each regard. Therefore, many of these issues are the result of further discussions and, as a result of those further discussions that have already taken place, I make the point that when we heard a rumour about a 50 per cent cut in adult literacy that cut, in the finality, did not eventuate at that one college level. In fact, the situation for 1985 at that college is about the same as it was for 1984 and, indeed, for adult literacy it is about the same globally as it was in 1984.

The other point I need to make is that I as Minister have given some undertakings with regard to the needs of special education in TAFE and in particular with regard to the needs of those who turn 20 and who in the past have no longer had Education Department services available to them. A number of commitments have been given there. We are still on schedule in providing extra support in that arena in the 1985 calendar year, because we believe that it is a very important arena. I want to make this point: it is an area that for too many years under too many Governments, of whatever persuasion they may have been, has been overlooked. I refer to the very special educational needs of those who turn 20 and who are no longer provided for in special schools particularly and who until now have been left out of the education system altogether. TAFE has in the years gone by attempted to meet some of those needs, and it is our belief that that should be the main focus of meeting those needs. However, as I said, the individual college budgets are still being discussed with the Department of Technical and Further Education.

The other point I want to make is that I as Minister am monitoring very closely what is happening in the whole access education arena and, as I indicated last week, I have asked the Council of TAFE (SACOTAFE) to provide me with a report on how we can ensure that stream 5 access programmes will be secure in the budgeting processes of the Department in the years ahead.

GRAND PRIX

Mr TRAINER: In the light of the Premier's report a few minutes ago relating to the Adelaide Grand Prix, can the Minister of Tourism inquire whether what are called bed and breakfast facilities could be encouraged and co-ordinated by the Department of Tourism to meet any short-fall in hotel accommodation in Adelaide that might eventuate during the Grand Prix? Estimates in regard to the number of hotel beds available and required suggest that additional short term requirements could eventuate during that week. However, it is possible that accommodation in private homes along the lines of the bed and breakfast facilities provided in England and Ireland might be one solution to these requirements.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I think it is an extremely pertinent one, as it is obvious that considerable strains will be placed upon our capacity in Adelaide to meet the full demand for bed accommodation during the Grand Prix. Having been successful in securing for South Australia the 1985 Grand Prix and the Grand Prix that follow from that, the Premier has achieved for Adelaide and South Australia prominence throughout the world which in the traditional way would have cost us millions of dollars to secure. Those of us who pay some attention to the tourist industry, and those members of Parliament who are aware of the interest shown throughout the world in Grand Prix, know already of the movement within that industry towards Adelaide in 1985 and the interest that is being shown in other parts of the world. Considerable strain will be placed upon our ability to provide the numbers of beds that will be required. Frankly, I think that is a pleasing situation in which to be, and it does not distress me in any way at all.

The honourable member's suggestion to provide the type of bed and breakfast accommodation that is popular in the United Kingdom and Ireland is obviously one that will be investigated. We have not had any need in South Australia to promote bed and breakfast facilities as a form of accommodation likely to attract people to the State, but I think during the weekend of the Grand Prix the situation will be different. I will take up the matter with the Tourist Development Board and in particular with the South Australian Tourism Industry Council to get their feedback on this very sensible suggestion because I believe it has merit and I certainly believe it will be one way for Adelaide and South Australia—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Will you check with the Australian Hotels Association, too?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, I will check with the AHA and I thank the honourable member for her suggestion. I will also check with all appropriate bodies. I am hopeful as a result of that that the honourable member's suggestion will become a reality.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: My question to the Premier follows on from his Ministerial statement. At the end of his statement the Premier said that members will be afforded the opportunity to ask questions about the details of the Grand Prix, but some details must be available to the Premier at the moment which I believe taxpayers of this State need to know. Will the Premier provide full details of the projections on which he has based the net estimated cost to the Government of staging the Grand Prix and, in particular, will he say what are the estimated number of spectators, what admission charge will be made, whether admission will also be charged for practice runs, and what is the proportion of sponsorship the Government will receive?

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What about the hot dog stand?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: With your leave, Sir, and the concurrence of the House, and without the asinine interjections of the Minister, I seek leave to explain briefly my question. The Premier has just said that his negotiations in London were over the sharing of sponsorship and gate takings for the race. He has also said that he sees $1.5 million to $2 million as the upper limit of the net cost to the Government of staging the Grand Prix each year. This estimate must be based on detailed projections of the number of people who will attend the race and of admission charges, as well as the sponsorship agreement.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can give some of those details, certainly in the broad sense. They certainly have been completed and in fact two separate market analyst companies have done some quite detailed work into possible receipts, levels of sponsorship moneys, admission charges, and so on. I might add, incidentally, that in some respects their assessments, which we had commissioned, seem to conform fairly closely to some that had been commissioned by FOCA from entirely separate sources, so the ball park figures are probably about the same. There is, though, considerable flexibility in the area of admission charges. I do not have precise figures before me, but provisional estimates were based on an attendance of around 20 000 paying customers with the possibility of sponsorship boxes that can add to that revenue. The suggested fee for the race on which it was based was, I think, $20 for paying customers, plus sponsorship box amounts.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Is that $20 per spectator?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. There are many variations on that, but there are three days of racing and, in answer to another aspect of the honourable member's question, yes, it would be anticipated that people would pay to attend practice sessions over the period of the race as well as on race day. In terms of marketing, the equivalent of a season ticket could be sold at discounts, and there are all sorts of variations on that. FOCA suggests that those rough figures completely underestimate the possible revenue that can be gained from ticket sales. This was one of the sources of argument we had because, in terms of their bargaining attitudes, they rejected the lower estimates we had of what could be gained from ticket sales and said that, as we get a much higher return from them, extra concessions and access to revenue we wanted were not reasonable.

The overall assessment is that probably we will be able to, first, accommodate more paying customers. The key to that has been our access to Victoria Park Racecourse, the stands there and the added area that that gives for the erection of temporary stands. There are other points on the route where temporary stands can be erected. The estimate of 20 000 could be greatly increased. There will be many non-paying spectators at the race over whom we will have no control. The projection of what we can earn from the admission tickets and sponsorship box sales to which we have total claims would be of the order of $2 million to $3 million—$2 million is probably a lower realistic estimated figure but, if FOCA's experience overseas is to be any judge, it may well be the higher figure. However, for the purposes of the initial assessment we are using the figure of $2 million.

In addition, there is an estimate of our 50 per cent share of Australian generated sponsorship, which is of the order of $750 000 to $1 million. That figure stands up well in terms of marketing advice received but, again, FOCA suggests it is an under-estimate. That figure includes 50 per cent access to naming rights—whoever is the naming rights sponsor of the race—and 50 per cent of any sponsorship generated within Australia, whether it be from an international or locally based company. It includes the sale of concessions—the proceeds from the sale of goods consumed or bought by those attending the series.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Nicky Lauda T-shirts.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, things of that nature—perhaps not Nicky Lauda T-shirts but Adelaide or Australian Grand Prix T-shirts—will be marketed on an international basis. By putting all these figures into the equation, the figure of $1 million becomes realistic. FOCA believes that, if not initially then over time, those figures can be increased.

The recurrent cost of staging the race is of the order of $4.5 million. In round figures $1 million of that relates to the establishing and dismantling of the course—an expensive operation and one which has to be done rapidly as it involves the moving of much equipment. That is one aspect of the cost. The rest comprises payment of expenses to FOCA for the cars and teams; to CAMS (the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport) for the services it would give in running the race; promotional budget; and one or two other aspects such as that.

So, one arrives at a total of $4.5 million. If one then deducts from that figure about $2 million for attendance and $1 million for sponsorship, one arrives then at the $1.5 million figure that I have used. I suggest that that is a realistic assessment of our maximum recurrent exposure in this area. However, one can see from the figures I have given that there is potential within both those areas to improve that and, to the extent that we improve that, our $1.5 million reduces. While I certainly believe that we should look at this matter conservatively and be fully aware of the financial exposure that will result, I believe that, all things going well, we can reduce that $1.5 million. One should bear in mind, of course, that that figure, in terms of governmental outlay or sponsors' outlay, must be set off against the overall revenue that is derived from the race and that, of course, includes things such as pay-roll tax, various stamp duties and franchise fees which come back to the Government. Rough estimates can be made of those, depending on various factors, but they could be quite significant: certainly, around the order of $500 000.

So, immediately one can see that there is a direct return in the sense of income generated to the Government. That ignores again the return to the State, which is probably a factor, in conservative terms, of about 1:6, again depending on what sort of estimate one makes. The figures for international and interstate tourists who will attend specifically for the race again have to be refined, but they certainly run into something like 10 000 persons, who will be here for two to three days, occupying hotel accommodation and spending accordingly. If one adds in those economic benefits, one can see that, in terms of jobs created, at the end of the day the Government's outlay is very small beer indeed.

HENLEY BEACH JETTY

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Marine say when work will be commenced on repairs and replacement to the Henley Beach jetty; when the work will be completed; and what is the estimated final cost of the work?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I will answer the last part of the honourable member's question first. The total cost of the project, which involves repairs to the Henley Beach jetty, is about $30 000. The work involves the replacement of four piles, six strengthening braces, some decking and repair work, and the replacement of some hand railing. The work commenced on 11 October, I think it was, and will take about six weeks. It is therefore anticipated that it will be completed by 22 or 23 November.

GOLDEN GROVE INDENTURE

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House why he did not honour his promise to liaise with the Tea Tree Gully council about the final indenture agreement concerning the Golden Grove development prior to that agreement being presented for Cabinet approval? I have been approached by a number of elected members of the Tea Tree Gully council who are both angry and dismayed that neither the Minister nor his officers discussed the final indenture agreement for the Golden Grove development prior to its consideration by Cabinet and its ratification and signing today.

The council was given absolute assurances that the indenture would be placed before council for its consideration prior to it going to Cabinet. This was to ensure that the council—a vital organisation in the planning of this development—would be able to offer any advice on its format. The indenture was provided to the Mayor of Tea Tree Gully only last night. This precluded any consideration of it, and elected members now fear that the final indenture will not be acceptable to council. Those elected members are angry that the agreement will be forced on council without the promised consultation. Council members are also concerned—

An honourable member: They don't want the development?

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member is ignorant. Of course they want the development; they just want to be involved in the discussions on it. Council members are also concerned at the long delay (two years) that has occurred in the preparation of the agreement, because in that time land values have sky-rocketed, financially prohibiting some suggested developments. Will the Minister advise the House why the promised consultation with the council did not take place?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: My advice is that consultations with the council occurred over a considerable period of time. Indeed, I appeared before the council quite some time ago in the very early stage of the development of the concept at which time I answered a good deal of questions in what was a very free and frank discussion. Since that time further discussion between Government representatives and council have taken place.

The honourable member also raised the whole question of the timing of this matter, and he talked about two years. I remind the honourable member and the House that two years ago there was not the statutory capacity for the concept that has emerged to be carried through. The only move available to the present Government when it came to office was to flog off the land to private developers, and away they would go. It was necessary for us to amend the Urban Land Trust Act by way of the Parliament to enable us to joint venture. The honourable member would well recall that debate and the fact that eventually it was possible to get that agreement. As I recall, the stance of the Liberal Party in this place was that the legislation should be confined purely to the Golden Grove venture and that it should not apply generally; in fact, a broader concept was arranged, although at this stage no other joint venture agreements have been entered into.

So, it was not possible for the Government to have a direct involvement in the venture two years ago because we were left with an Act that did not allow that to happen. If there are lingering concerns so far as the City of Tea Tree Gully is concerned, it has the proceedings of the Select Committee available to it. However, irrespective of its concerns, I would be very surprised and in some ways a little disappointed if the Tea Tree Gully council did not seek to give evidence to the Select Committee.

NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY SYMPOSIUM

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Transport obtain a report on the national Road Safety Symposium beginning in Canberra today, and will he have an evaluation made of any recommendations of that symposium? Also, I would like to know whether South Australia is represented at the symposium. With your leave and the concurrence of the House I desire to briefly explain the question.

Mr Lewis: Which one?

The SPEAKER: Order! The House, I think, and I have given leave. The honourable member for Price.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you very much, Sir, for your protection. In an article that appeared in the *News* on Friday night under the heading 'Tough gaol terms "may cut deaths" ', the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr Morris, was quoted as saying:

> A national Road Safety Symposium, starting in Canberra on Tuesday, should provide a clear direction in the debate surrounding drink driving and alcohol limits. The debate questions not only the alcohol limits but also whether or not random breath testing should be introduced at all. Since its introduction in Victoria and New South Wales, the number of road fatalities involving alcohol has dropped by 20 per cent. But in Western Australia, where random breath testing has not been introduced, the fatality figures are nevertheless encouraging.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Yes, I will obtain a report on the Road Safety Symposium that commences today in Canberra. I had an invitation to attend this symposium, and I indicated to the Federal Minister (Peter Morris) that I was keen to attend. However, because of our Parliamentary sittings, I was unable to do so.

We have departmental representatives at the symposium and we will certainly evaluate that report when it comes to hand and give every consideration to the recommendations that are made. I point out to the honourable member that I understand that the Select Committee in another place that is looking at the whole question of random breath testing in South Australia has visited both Victoria and New South Wales to evaluate the operation in those States and that its report is likely to be handed down perhaps prior to Christmas. I was very pleased to hear on the radio this morning a person indicating that the Bannon Government has an excellent record in the road safety area.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: They said it wasn't just words, but action.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: My colleague has reminded me that what they said was not just words, but action. We are doing everything in our power to reduce our road toll in this State. However, there is much more to be done and we will be looking at the recommendations of that symposium.

GOLDEN GROVE INDENTURE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Premier aware of suggestions made on a radio programme last night that the Golden Grove indenture does not protect the public interest? On the Trevor Ford programme on 5DN last night, Mr Ford raised certain questions. He commenced by saying:

> I believe the land will change hands, so to speak, for the sum of $3 million. That is the sum total of the actual out of pocket investment.

First, is it true that the developers stand to make at least $25 million from this development? Secondly, is it true that the developers do not have to pay for this land until it is sold, which can be any time between tomorrow morning and 1999? Thirdly, is it true also that the price that will be paid to the Urban Land Trust will be at the rate of $2 000 per building block, notwithstanding the fact that the actual developed market price is more likely to be of the order of

$50 000, granted that the Urban Land Trust will ultimately get $20 million out of the deal?

Fourthly, is it true that between now and 1999 the Government will need to buy back at least half the land for the purpose of building schools, Housing Trust accommodation, and so forth? Fifthly, is it true that the Government has agreed that such land shall be purchased at the prevailing market price, and, if that is so, does not that mean that the Government will be purchasing land for perhaps $50 000 per block, out of which the developer will deduct $2 000 to pay the Urban Land Trust on the original purchase?

Sixthly, is it true that the South Australian Government has agreed that there should be no price control in relation to the overall sale of this land at Golden Grove? Finally, is it true that the South Australian Government would dearly like to back out of this agreement but will not do so for fear of the political consequences?

There has been further speculation in media circles today about the detail of this indenture. In view of the statement by the Housing Trust board, it has been suggested that those questions asked late last night reflect the attitude of the Housing Trust board. As the questions have been raised publicly by the media, it is essential that they be answered as a matter of urgency, rather than waiting for the Select Committee to report.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Premier, I would like to make a statement. First, there is obviously a fine line between explanations and questions, as became apparent in the case of the honourable member for Murray. That does not concern me personally, but there are two risks in that, it seems to me: first, that the explanation would slide right over the edge so that the honourable member loses his rights; secondly, although the honourable member expressed concern that this was an urgent matter, the question in the end, together with the explanation, became so long and so complex that there was a distinct danger that the person of whom the questions were asked might ask that they be put on notice. That is up to the honourable member, but I would like to make those comments.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As the honourable member well knows, this question raises very complex matters which cannot be readily dealt with. Certainly, I was not able to note all those questions. I am able, though, to respond to some of the points made. I did not hear the questions that were posed on the radio station to which the honourable member refers. I must say that I will be very interested to see what the honourable member's attitude is to this indenture when it goes before the Select Committee. It is all very well for members of the Opposition, as no doubt they will be doing over the next couple of weeks, to gather in any objection or protest and to recycle it through this House. However, I think that it would be very important to know their attitude to this matter. I fear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I point out again that this whole transaction—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would say that during the course of the Select Committee proceedings, as I have already stated today, that is the procedure in which all these matters can be properly canvassed. Opposition members will, of course, be on that Select Committee. However, the questions are based on a total misunderstanding and misconception of the indenture that has been provided, and I would imagine that the honourable member has some inkling that that is so. In fact, the financial arrangements are not as simple as has been expressed. There is certainly an estimated profit margin. First, I would point to the fact that that profit is shared between the Government, through the Urban Land Trust, and the private developer on a 50 per cent basis as joint venture partners.

Secondly, I point out that the developer's profit is subject to Commonwealth taxation, and that the Government's component (that of the Urban Land Trust) is not. So, in fact airily used figures such as $25 million, and so on, ignore the general level of return. If all goes according to projections, the net return after tax by the developers will be of the order of 15 per cent to 17 per cent. That is not an unreasonable amount for the risk that is involved, and honourable members should be aware that a considerable risk is involved.

If those calculations are out by less than 10 per cent in terms of the cost of developing, the whole profit factor is wiped out. Therefore, as members who I thought understood the private enterprise system but who demonstrate a very major lack of understanding will recognise, there is risk involved for that possible profit; so, that is the first point. That profit is not unreal and, if we go back 10 years and think of a project like this being commenced in 1974 on a 15 year basis, we would see—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Like Monarto.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Exactly—like Monarto. Based on predictions of population increase, as Monarto was, expenditures set in place with the sort of return that Monarto envisaged and within five years all those predictions being turned around, one can see the very great risks involved in such a long term venture. Secondly, the developers do not own the land at any time: it is bought progressively. Surely, that is an appropriate arrangement and way of doing it, and that is the answer to one of the questions posed.

Thirdly, in relation to the block prices, the average block price in that area in the September quarter figures was about $31 000. In relation to the Housing Trust component of this development, blocks will be provided—and we have a letter of undertaking on that—in the initial release at a price of between $19 000 and $21 000 and to first home buyers at a price of between $20 000 and $22 000. They will be blocks of a comparative nature and, indeed, in this new integrated development they will probably be of much greater value over time. That is some $10 000 less than what one might call a market price in this area. That results in a significant saving to first home buyers and lack of exposure to the Housing Trust.

Secondly, one must set that against the cost of developing these blocks. Based on an initial price cost of $2 000 there are some who are opposing this (and no doubt this will be retailed for their own purpose by the Opposition) and who say, 'How is it that they can get land for $2 000 and then sell it back at $20 000?' The fact is that, in the course of preparing the land for such sale at $20 000, about $16 000 has to be spent, and that figure can vary; that is where the risk is involved. We are talking about overall development costs which must be added to that price. It can be seen again in that context that that is a reasonable rate of return that is not unreasonably exposing those areas.

Finally, let me talk about the question of control. This is a joint venture, and it is a very sharp contrast to the Opposition's proposal, which was that the land be sent off in large parcels at the cheapest rate possible to a developer to do what he liked with. That is what members opposite would have done: every one of those blocks would have been going at $30 000 plus if they could have got away with it, and there would have been no public housing component whatsoever, or protection of the public interest in that way. That is the alternative that the previous Government legislatively made a fact of life.

We were able, with great difficulty, to secure an amendment to the Urban Land Trust Act. The matter went to a conference between the Houses, and it was the best deal we could get, but at least it opened up a crack which allowed the Urban Land Trust to be involved in a joint venture so that we could retain some control. That control under this joint venture is being handled by a development body which will comprise equal representation from Government and the developers, with an independent Chairman. There will be three representatives from the private side and three from our side. It will be their responsibility to protect the Government and community interests, and they will have the means to do so throughout the course of this development. That is an essential and important element which, again, critics forget.

I would suggest that instead of retailing the doubts and questions of others, instead of trying to fuel public controversy for the sake of it, the Opposition should look closely at the terms and conditions and, most importantly, tell us where it stands. Does it want the Golden Grove development to go ahead or not? If this indenture does not go through, if we are not able to secure this agreement with its elements of public interest involved, we will not be getting the blocks on the market in the middle of 1985; if we are lucky, there will be something done in 1987 or thereafter. That is what we are facing at the moment. Talking of delays—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. I readily concede that if the Opposition had had its way blocks would have been on the market earlier—there is no doubt about that—but they would have been on the market at rip-off prices with no reflection of the public interest; that is the difference. We have taken the responsibility of, first, getting the Act amended to allow the joint development to take place and, secondly, we will go to the market.

MICHAEL HUGHES AND ASSOCIATES

Mr HAMILTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Will the Minister seek, through the Federal Minister, guidelines from the National Companies and Securities Commission to overcome dubious transactions and schemes such as those I described in this House on Thursday 18 October? Members will recall that I raised an issue in relation to an advertisement pertaining to X-Lotto. Since that time I have received from Western Australia—the Consumer Affairs people—information that indicates that they had investigated Michael Hughes and Associates at the address given in the advertisement. I understand from information supplied to me that Consumer Affairs met a Mr Joseph Campbell, who informed them that he was the proprietor of Michael Hughes and Associates.

Mr Campbell said that he had been trading as Michael Hughes and Associates since March 1983 and had registered the business name. Mr Campbell was informed that information had been sought from the Eastern States about the investigation of claims made in his advertisement. Mr Campbell was asked whether he had a computer, where it was located and whether it was on the premises. He said that the computer was not on the premises and he was not prepared to tell Consumer Affairs where it was. He was again asked whether there was a computer, and he said, 'Yes, there is, and I will not produce it unless I am ordered to do so by the court.' At this stage, the information supplied to me indicated that Mr Campbell appeared to be very defensive and not willing to answer questions.

Further, Mr Campbell was asked whether he could produce copies of the testimonials published in his advertisements. He said that he could, but when asked to do so he supplied copies of literature which did not give the names of those people contained within the testimonials. I ask that the Minister seek this information from his Federal colleague, because a copy of this typed advertisement and the multi-successful numerical solution has been supplied to me, and I want to quote one paragraph about this X-Lotto system and demonstrate how good this solution is. It states:

> The solution is very easy to understand once you have given it a little thought and read these pages very carefully. The solution works quite well, but I must emphasise at this stage that you still need a little luck in picking your choice of numbers.

I find it incredible that these people can advertise in such a way, and I ask the Minister to investigate my request.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his follow-up question on this matter that he raised recently. I will certainly ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place to consider the suggestion made today. However, I think that the matter of the availability of information to be transferred from one Consumer Affairs office to another throughout Australia is one of the most efficient ways of tackling this matter so that consumers in each State, under the privilege that is afforded to Commissioners of Consumer Affairs and indeed Ministers, may be warned of the dangers of dealing with particular trading companies.

Last weekend the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs made a public announcement about a company that was advertising from the United States offering, in a bold advertisement, the payment of $US750 for the work involved in addressing 1 000 envelopes. The advertisement gave no address in Australia but an address in California. The Commissioner's concern was that consumers in South Australia and, indeed, Australia would not only pay that sum (which I think he said would probably be the last they would see of it) but would also give information relating to their credit facilities, whether it involved Bankcard, American Express or some other form of payment.

He is most concerned that that information is being sought by these companies, because extensive lists of names, addresses and credit card numbers are obviously very valuable property, particularly when they contain the names of what I would suggest are the more gullible consumers in the community. That is a very real concern, and it is a warning that should be heeded by the community at large. This is a very valuable service that the Commissioner and the Ministry of Consumer Affairs can provide to the citizens of this State.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

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

That, pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972, members of this House appointed to the Public Accounts Committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House this week.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Act, 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its purposes are threefold. First, the Bill empowers the Metropolitan Fire Service to attend at and act in relation to emergencies generally and, in particular, in relation to the discharge of hazardous chemicals and dangerous substances. Secondly, the Bill establishes a disciplinary code and procedure for dealing with breaches of the code which will be applicable to all members of the Metropolitan Fire Service. Thirdly, the Bill provides for an appeal system with respect to decisions arising from disciplinary matters and appointments to positions within the Service.

When the Act was first considered, there was little perceived threat from the uncontrolled or accidental release into the environment of hazardous chemicals or dangerous substances. However, in recent years this threat has become all too real, and the emergency services have moved to meet this threat. Both the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service have accepted the primary responsibility within their respective areas of operation for combating this type of emergency. The fire services have obtained the necessary expertise, equipment and scientific information which is required to deal with the problem of hazardous chemicals.

The Bill seeks to give statutory recognition to this emerging role of the Metropolitan Fire Service. The Service is empowered to take control of emergency situations which involve the escape of a dangerous substance or a situation which involves imminent danger of such an escape. The Metropolitan Fire Service will be able to use the full range of emergency powers in relation to the escape of a dangerous substance as would be available to it in the event of a fire.

Such powers as the right to enter buildings, disconnect the supply of electricity, gas or water and the right to close roads are all examples of the powers which the Metropolitan Fire Service would need to be able to exercise in the event of an emergency situation.

However, I would like to make clear that the definition of an emergency situation in this context is strictly limited by the Bill to emergencies arising from a fire or the escape of a dangerous substance. There is no intention on the part of the Government or the Metropolitan Fire Service to use Fire Service personnel in other emergencies such as civil disturbances, which are the traditional role of the Police Force. I now turn to the provisions of the Bill which relate to the disciplinary code.

In any emergency service it is essential that the chief officer be able to maintain high standards of conduct and discipline among the members of the service. The Metropolitan Fire Service is no exception. The Bill establishes a clear and effective mechanism for the maintenance of discipline within the Service. The Bill constitutes a disciplinary committee which will consist of the chief officer or the deputy chief officer, an officer of the service, and an officer or a firefighter according to the rank of the person appearing before the committee.

While the chief officer will have the power to reprimand an officer or firefighter whom he considers is guilty of misconduct, more serious matters will be deal with by the disciplinary committee which will have the power to dismiss a member of the Service whom it finds guilty of the most serious offence against the good order and discipline of the Service. Naturally, less serious offences attract less severe penalties. The Bill also establishes the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Appeals Tribunal. The functions of the Tribunal are to hear appeals from officers and firefighters who are aggrieved by a decision of the chief officer or the disciplinary committee in relation to matters of discipline and to hear appeals against nominations by the corporation to positions within the Service.

The Tribunal is constituted by a district court judge nominated by the senior judge and three members appointed by the Governor, one of whom shall be appointed on the nomination of the chief officer, one on the nomination of the Fire Brigade Officers Association and the third on the nomination of the Firefighters Association. For the purposes of hearings, the Tribunal is made up of the chairman, who is to be the district court judge, the nominee of the chief officer and the third member is selected according to rank of the person who is appealing to the Tribunal.

The Tribunal is given wide powers to determine the facts of the matter before it. The Tribunal may require the production of any relevant books or papers, the appearance of any person who could give relevant testimony and require any person to answer any question put to him on oath even though the answer may tend to incriminate him. However, where this power is used, any answer to a question given under protest may not be used in any criminal proceedings except proceedings for perjury. These powers are limited to the matters then before the Tribunal. The production of documents and the power to demand the answers to questions must relate to the matter before the Tribunal.

These powers will not be available with respect to industrial matters except in so far as a matter before the Tribunal has industrial connotations and then only to the extent necessary to bring relevant information before the Tribunal. The powers of the Tribunal are intended to be used in matters of day to day discipline within the service and in relation to appointments to positions by the corporation. The Bill represents a much needed upgrading of the management and powers of the Metropolitan Fire Service.

The legislative endorsement of the use of the expertise of the service to combat the emerging threat from dangerous substances is essential if the Metropolitan Fire Service is to play an effective role in this area. The enactment of modern principles of discipline and promotion appeals mechanism is an important step forward for the service as a whole and should serve the interests of the community, the officers and the firefighters alike. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 replaces the long title to the principal Act with a title that contemplates attendance by the fire service at emergencies other than fire. Clause 4 makes consequential amendments to section 4 of the principal Act. Clause 5 adds definitions to section 5 which are required by subsequent amendments contained in the Bill. Clause 6 makes a consequential change to the heading to Part II of the principal Act.

Clause 7 enlarges the functions of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service by including the function of dealing with emergencies in addition to fire in fire districts. The fire service will not, of course, be equipped to deal with every kind of emergency. It is proposed that the Service will deal with the escape of dangerous substances in addition to emergencies caused by fire. The Service will, however, be empowered by this amendment to attend at other kinds of emergency. Clause 8 inserts into the principal Act a new Division which establishes the Appeals Tribunal. New section 14 sets out the membership of the Tribunal. Section 15 deals with matters relating to membership including removal from office and vacation of office. Section 16 provides for the constitution of the Tribunal on an appeal. Sections 17 and 18 are procedural and section 19 provides the powers of the Tribunal. Section 20 makes provisions as to notice

and representation on hearing appeals. Sections 21 to 25 are standard provisions.

Clause 9 makes a consequential amendment to section 38 of the principal Act. Clause 10 inserts a new heading to Part V of the principal Act. Clause 11 inserts a new section 40a into the principal Act. This section establishes a system of nomination of appointment to the Fire Service and provides for notice of nomination to be given to those eligible to be appointed to the position in question. Subsection (3) enables such a person to appeal to the Tribunal against the proposed appointment of the nominee. Subsection (6) provides the criteria on which the Tribunal must determine the question of who should be appointed.

Clause 12 replaces sections 45 and 46 of the principal Act. The new provision caters for the attendance by fire brigades at emergencies other than fires and provides that all persons, including other authorities, such as the police and the CFS will be under the control of the commanding officer at a fire or an emergency consisting of, or arising from, the escape of a dangerous substance in a fire district. The powers of the commanding officer set out in subsection (3) are basically the same as those in the principal Act at the moment. New subsection (4) retains the substance of old section 45 (VIII). Clause 13 makes consequential amendments to section 48. The effect of new subsection (2) is to limit the right of the chief officer to enter and inspect premises in relation to those emergencies (other than fire) for which the Fire Service is specially equipped, namely, the escape of dangerous substances.

Clause 14 repeals section 50 of the principal Act. The substance of this section is included in new sections 45 and 51a. Clause 15 replaces subsection (1) of section 51 of the principal Act. Clause 16 replaces the substance of section 50 (2). This provision should logically follow section 51 rather than preceding it. Clause 17 makes consequential changes to section 52 of the principal Act.

Clause 18 inserts new Part VA in the principal Act. New section 52a establishes the disciplinary committee. Subsection (3) ensures that one member of the committee will be an officer or firefighter appointed by the industrial association of the person whose conduct is in question. Subsections (6) and (7) provide for representation before the committee, and subsection (7) provides for the payment of witness fees. Section 52b empowers the chief officer to reprimand an officer or firefighter. Section 52c (2) sets out the penalties that can be imposed by the disciplinary committee. Section 52d provides for suspension of an officer or firefighter who is the subject of a complaint to the disciplinary committee. Section 52e provides for appeals to the tribunal against decisions of the committee or the chief officer on disciplinary matters.

Clause 19 replaces section 63 of the principal Act with a provision that reflects the current practice of the police in attending at emergencies at which the Fire Service is present. Clauses 20 and 21 make consequential changes. Clause 22 replaces section 71 of the principal Act. The new provision is designed to extend to all emergencies (including fire) at which the Fire Service attends. Clause 23 makes a consequential change to section 72 of the principal Act.

Clause 24 replaces section 73 of the principal Act. Clause 25 makes certain consequential amendments to section 77 of the principal Act. Clause 26 inserts new section 79 in the principal Act. This section spells out the immunity that members of the Fire Service, other persons having certain duties under the Act and volunteers are entitled to enjoy. Clause 27 sets out in the form of a schedule a code of conduct to be observed by officers and firefighters.

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

GOLDEN GROVE (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve a certain indenture between the State of South Australia, Delfin Property Group Limited and the South Australian Urban Land Trust; to repeal the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, 1978; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to ratify the indenture setting out the arrangements for the Golden Grove joint venture development. The Golden Grove project constitutes a major urban development initiative in this State. In the 15 years or so of anticipated development activity, some 25 000 to 30 000 people occupying 8 000 to 10 000 dwellings will be attracted to the area. The scale of projected investment in land development, housing, retail, industrial, commercial and public facilities and services will be of the order of $1.36 billion.

Market conditions require that the project should commence as soon as possible and, to this end, the Government has undertaken exhaustive negotiations with a major private developer—the Delfin Property Group—to ensure the continuing supply of developed land under terms which protect the community interest. Our objective is to have developed allotments available for sale by November next year, and to ensure a continuing supply thereafter. This Government is indebted to former Governments in providing for the genesis of this project. A major joint venture development agreement is achievable now because of the foresight and commitment of the Dunstan Government in the early 1970s, to procure and assemble a large broadacre land parcel in a location suited to a comprehensive development. That foresight has ensured that the Golden Grove area will be free of many of the pitfalls which often beset fragmented development in new urban areas.

In securing this project, a prime motive of this Government has been the belief that South Australia's future prosperity depends on a creative and energetic partnership between public and private enterprise. The Golden Grove project, as we have negotiated it, is a good example of how private sector expertise, experience and investment can be harnessed positively with public objectives, resources and capital. Delfin Property Group Ltd, which has been selected as the Urban Land Trust's partner in the Golden Grove project, has accumulated considerable experience in working with Governments, principally through its involvement in the West Lakes project. Members will be aware of Delfin's achievements at West Lakes and of that project's reputation as an outstanding example of urban development.

Obviously, the Golden Grove development will have a major impact on our local economy, both in terms of direct and spin-off employment. Apart from our economic and housing objectives, the Government is concerned to ensure this most attractive part of the north-east region is developed according to the best planning principles, and in an environmentally sensitive way. Furthermore, the Government must ensure that the development of new urban areas like Golden Grove must be matched by effective community development—in terms of health, welfare, education and other people oriented services.

The area is ideally suited to urban development. It is a high priority growth area in terms of the Government's metropolitan staging strategy, which aims at achieving an efficient and economic extension of public utilities and services. It is a most attractive area physically, with an interesting landform, excellent views and natural vegetation. In addition, the area has close functional links with the

available facilities and services in the adjoining north-eastern suburbs, including the Tea Tree Plaza regional centre, Modbury Hospital complex and the industrial areas of Salisbury. Existing transport, utilities and human services can all be readily extended into the area.

The Government's objectives for the development have been incorporated in the indenture to act as the paramount focus for the joint venture's activities, and to ensure adequate protection of the public interest. These objectives are contained in the third schedule to the indenture. In essence, the objectives provide for:

(a) the orderly planning of development and its integration with broader regional planning requirements;

(b) a wide range of land and housing opportunities, including a public housing involvement of 25 to 30 per cent of total dwellings;

(c) systematic release of developed land, according to an economic staging programme for public works;

(d) an adequate land supply at fair and reasonable prices;

(e) a cost-conscious approach to development;

(f) creation of a safe, pleasant and convenient urban environment containing adequate community facilities and services;

(g) an environmentally sensitive development approach, coupled with an effective system of planning administration; and

(h) scope for a comprehensive range of builders to be involved in the project.

The indenture also contains a 'State preference' provision, which promotes the use of South Australian based skills, labour, materials and businesses in the development of Golden Grove. Local employment should benefit significantly from this measure. Of course, in seeking to achieve these objectives, the joint venture will need to conduct its operations according to sound commercial principles and this is recognised in the indenture. The Government is conscious that the physical development of new urban areas needs to be matched with delivery of human services and a community development programme which assists new residents. The indenture provides for appropriate planning and consultation processes, plus the basic land resources to allow this to occur. It also creates a 'communities fund', which derives its funds from joint venture contributions and matching council grants. The fund will assist in the provision of community facilities and services. This measure, when coupled with the open space requirements in the indenture, is a significant innovation in terms of promoting effective community development.

Members will be aware that the previous Government called for registration from private developers to ascertain their interest in the project. Following review of future options for development, this Government decided to place the project in a firm position to proceed, by taking certain positive actions, including:

(a) amending the powers of the Urban Land Trust to allow it to enter into joint venture developments with private enterprise;

(b) selecting Delfin Property Group Limited as a joint venture partner, because of its financial, management, planning development and marketing capabilities and its proven track record with a major development project of this type;

(c) conducting detailed negotiations culminating in a proposed indenture and joint venture agreement;

(d) giving a commitment to meeting the necessary infrastructure associated with the project; and now,

(e) introducing the Golden Grove (Indenture Ratification) Bil into Parliament.

The proposed formal arrangements between the Government, Urban Land Trust, Delfin Property Group Limited (and its subsidiaries, Delfin Management Services Pty Limited and Delfin Realty Pty Limited) are contained in three interrelated documents, namely:

(a) A joint venture agreement between the Trust and Delfin Property Group Limited which provides for the Urban Land Trust to make its land available (in stages) to the joint venture and for the Urban Land Trust and Delfin to contribute to the costs of development in equal proportions. Over the life of the development programme, the Trust receives a payment for its land, plus one-half of the project profits.

The Joint Venture Committee directing the joint venture will consist of three representatives appointed by the Government and three representatives appointed by Delfin, with an appropriately qualified and independent Chairman mutually agreed by the parties. The Chairman will have a casting but not a deliberative vote. The paramount focus of the committee's decision-making will be the Government's paramount objectives set out in the indenture.

(b) A Management Agreement between the Urban Land Trust and Delfin Property Group Limited, on the one hand, and Delfin Management Services Ptyy Limited on the other, whereby Delfin Management manages the project on behalf of the joint venture partners under the direction of the Joint Venture Committee.

(c) An indenture to be ratified by a special Act of Parliament, between the Premier (for and on behalf of the State), the Urban Land Trust and Delfin Property Group. The terms of the indenture require the Premier to introduce into Parliament legislation providing for ratification of the indenture and authorising the State and any Minister to act as necessary to give effect to the indenture.

Although the indenture defines in detail the cost-sharing, administrative and other arrangements, it is useful to highlight several key elements.

(a) Public works: The cost-sharing arrangements for sewer, water, electricity, roads and other services have been based on the normal charging policies administered by the various authorities. The basic works programme has been negotiated with authorities to ensure economies of scale and cost-effective programming.

(b) Housing: The Government's objective is to ensure housing opportunities are provided for a broad spectrum of the housing market, particularly first home buyers. The joint venture will have the flexibility to involve a range of housing suppliers in the construction of alternative types of housing, from detached dwellings to medium density and other forms of accommodation (including rental accommodation).

The indenture provides for the Housing Trust to achieve an involvement of between 25 per cent to 30 per cent of the total housing programme at Golden Grove. This is one of the most significant and innovative components of the project—a process aimed at fully integrating a large proportion of public housing into one of Australia's largest planned community developments. Indeed, the Government believes this arrangement to be a break-through in urban planning whereby integration of public and private housing on a scale never before attempted in Australia can be

achieved through a positive relationship between the Housing Trust and the joint venturers. Participation of a wide range of local builders will be an important element in the success of this approach as will be the Housing Trust's leading role in setting pace-setting standards for public housing.

The indenture requires full consultation at the planning stage between the joint venture and the Housing Trust on all matters of planning, development and pricing related to the Trust's requirements. The indenture provides that the joint venture should perform in making appropriate serviced land available to the Trust. The Housing Trust will be able to utilise a variety of development methods (e.g., purchase of completed allotments, design/construct, purchase from builders, medium density housing) to secure its housing programme.

(c) Planning: The planning system is in the main to be based on the normal requirements of the Planning Act, 1982. However, given that the Government objectives are the paramount focus of the project; given that the Government through the Urban Land Trust has a direct role in the management of the project; and given the unique planning opportunities provided by a comprehensive development project of this nature, it is appropriate that certain variations apply. These are as follows:

(i) supplementary development plans are to be prepared in full consultation with council and with a Golden Grove Advisory Committee. This committee is a unique arrangement, providing a vehicle for Government, council and other views to be considered in the planning process. As Minister, I will be the approving authority for all plans.

(ii) an arbitration process is to operate in lieu of the Planning Appeal Tribunal system which normally applies in relation to land division decisions.

(d) Role of the local government authority: As demonstrated in the indenture, the City of Tea Tree Gully (being the relevant local government authority for the area) is to have a major role in the provision of certain works, in providing planning input, in the administration of development control and in ensuring that an effective community facilities programme is achieved. The Government shares the council's aim of ensuring Golden Grove develops as an integrated part of the existing Tea Tree Gully area, in addition to being an innovative and attractive place in which residents will be proud to live.

The indenture contains other provisions of an administrative nature to ensure the efficient implementation of this major project.

I commend the Bill to the House as a ratification of a worthwhile partnership between the Government and private enterprise, directed at the achievement of an important set of community objectives for planned urban expansion in the north-eastern sector of Adelaide.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 defines the expression 'the indenture' as meaning the Golden Grove indenture (including the schedules of the indenture), a copy of which is set out in the schedule to the Bill. The expression is to include the indenture as varied, amended or replaced from time to time. Clause 4 provides that the ratifying Act and the indenture bind the Crown. Clause 5 provides that the indenture is ratified and approved. It requires the Crown, public authorities and local government authorities to do all things necessary or expedient to give full effect to the indenture and provides against actions that may frustrate the implementation of the indenture. Clause 6 provides for the repeal of the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, 1978. Clause 7 provides for the modification of the law of the State to the extent necessary to give full effect to the indenture.

The remainder of the second reading speech sets out the terms of the Golden Grove indenture as set out in the schedule to the Act. I seek leave to have the balance of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The schedule to the measure sets out the terms of the Golden Grove indenture. The provisions of the indenture are as follows: clause 1 provides definitions of expressions used in the indenture. Clause 2 requires the Government of the State to endeavour to secure the passage of the Bill and to have it come into operation prior to 31 December 1984. Under the clause, the indenture is to lapse unless the Bill is passed and brought into operation as an Act before that date or such later date as the parties may agree in writing. Clause 3 requires Delfin Property Group Limited (Delfin) and the South Australian Urban Land Trust (SAULT) to progressively develop the land owned by SAULT in the development area (which is depicted in the first schedule to the indenture) in accordance with the joint venture agreement. This is to be done in an ethical and commercial manner that is consistent with the paramount objectives set forth in the third schedule to the indenture. The clause also sets out the general obligation of the State to do all things to facilitate the purposes of the indenture.

Clause 4 deals with planning, the division of land and environmental impact statements. The fourth schedule to the indenture contains a supplementary development plan which under clause 4A1 is to operate under Part IV of the Planning Act to amend the development plan as it applies to the City of Tea Tree Gully. The clause then provides that section 41 of the Planning Act shall apply in relation to the development area in a modified manner, that is, so that the joint venturers (Delfin and SAULT) are put on the same footing under the section as a council. This means that either the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully or the joint venturers would be able to prepare another supplementary development plan to further amend the development plan in relation to the development area as depicted in the first schedule to the indenture. Where a supplementary development plan is received by the Minister from the joint venturers, the Minister must either:

(a) approve the plan;

(b) amend the plan (after consultation with the joint venturers and any council affected) having regard to any submissions of the Golden Grove Advisory Committee constituted under Division 5 of the indenture, and approve it as amended; or

(c) reject the plan.

This procedure is to replace the procedure for public submissions and public hearing set out in section 41 (5) to (11). Upon approval by the Minister, the plan may be referred to the Governor and declared by the Governor to be an authorised supplementary development plan. It will not be subject to scrutiny and disallowance by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation as would normally be the case under section 41 (13), (14) and (15). No supplementary development plan affecting the development area is by virtue of clause 4A4 to be submitted to the Minister without the prior written consent of the joint venturers.

Clause 4B deals with the division of land within the development area. The joint venturers are required:

(a) to consult with public authorities nominated by the Minister as to their land purchasing requirements;

(b) to supply a copy of each approved plan of land division to the Minister indicating the allotments sold or to be sold to public authorities;

(c) to supply on a quarterly basis reports detailing negotiations and transactions with public authorities;

(d) to show in each plan of land division the areas to be set aside for reserve for local community purposes as provided for under Division 9.

Clause 4B2 prevents the Tea Tree Gully council from consenting to a development under section 47 of the Planning Act without the prior written concurrence of the joint venturers. Clause 4B3 fixes a time limit of 60 days within which the council or the Planning Commission must issue any statement of requirements under Part XIXAB of the Real Property Act in relation to any plan of land division submitted by the joint venturers. If such a statement is not issued within that period, the plan is to be deemed to be approved. Disagreements between the joint venturers and the council or the commission as to the division of land are to be referred to arbitration under the arbitration provisions of the indenture.

Under clause 4C, the joint venturers are not to be required to prepare a draft environmental impact statement in relation to any development but, instead, any such statement is to be prepared by the Minister under section 49 (1) *(a)* of the Planning Act. A draft impact statement relating to a development proposed by the joint venturers is not to be subject to public advertisement and public submissions under section 49 (2) to (4). Any technical correction of an officially recognised impact statement is only to be made after 28 days notice to the joint venturers. Clause 4D provides that the State is to endeavour to ensure that no declaration is made under section 50 of the Planning Act that relates to the development area unless the joint venturers have first been consulted and afforded a reasonable opportunity to make representations.

Clause 5 provides for the establishment by the State of a Golden Grove Advisory Committee. The committee is to have five members, one being nominated by the Tea Tree Gully council and another (who is to be Chairman) being the Chairman of the Joint Venture Committee established pursuant to the joint venture agreement. The clause provides for a two year term of office and for the committee to be provided with staff by the Minister. The joint venturers are to consult with the committee during preparation of any supplementary development plan and to refer any such plan to the committee for comment not less than two months (or such lesser period as may be approved by the committee) before submission to the Minister. The committee or any of its members may report to the Minister upon a supplementary development plan prepared by the joint venturers.

Clause 6 deals with public housing and requires the joint venturers:

(a) to confer with the Housing Trust on planning, development and pricing of developed land;

(b) prior to submitting any plan of land division, to ascertain any requirements of the Housing Trust;

(c) to offer to the Housing Trust at fair market value sufficient land to enable it to provide 25 per cent to 30 per cent of the total dwelling units in the development area.

The State and the Housing Trust are required under the clause to take up that proportion of the land and to develop it for public housing in accordance with standard development requirements imposed by the joint venturers on a uniform basis and so that (in accordance with clause 3 of the paramount objectives set out in the third schedule of the indenture) the public housing is integrated with the private housing and is not provided in separate identifiable public housing estates.

Clause 7 deals with the public works to be carried out in the development area. The public works to be constructed by the joint venturers (including all public streets and ancillary services) are to be maintained by the venturers for not less than six months after completion. The venturers are to remedy any latent defects in such works appearing within 12 months after completion of the works. Arterial roads as set out in the fifth schedule are to be designed, constructed and maintained by the State in accordance with a programme to be prepared by the Commissioner of Highways. The Tea Tree Gully council is to design and construct collector roads (and related screening reserves and fencing) as set out in the fifth schedule.

The joint venturers are to design and construct all other collector roads (and related screening reserves and fencing) according to a schedule agreed with the council (or failing agreement—as fixed by the Commissioner of Highways), with the council contributing 40 per cent of the cost of the first 13 kilometres of such roads. Contracts for the collector roads the responsibility of the joint venturers are to be given to the council or its nominee if the council or such nominee makes competitive tenders. SAULT is required by the clause to transfer at no cost to the Commissioner of Highways or the council the land required for road purposes. The roads (other than arterial and collector roads) to be constructed by the joint venturers need not exceed 7.4 metres in width and need to be paved only to the ordinary standards appropriate for the type of traffic to be carried. Clause 7B deals with sewerage and water supply. Under the clause, the State is required to design, construct and install specified major or large scale sewerage and water works involved in the development according to a programme prepared by the joint venturers and a nominee of the Minister of Water Resources.

The joint venturers are required to construct and install other sewerage and water works under the supervision of the Minister of Water Resources or his nominees and to pay all normal fees and charges in connection therewith. Clause 7B5 provides that the Minister of Water Resources may request the joint venturers to contribute to any excess over the normal costs involved in providing electric power connections to any pumping station.

Clause 7C deals with the supply of electricity. Under the clause the council is to cause the development area to be designated an underground mains area in relation to mains of 11KV or less, but with lines to supply substations being overhead. The State is required by the clause to cause all improvements within the development area to be supplied with an appropriate supply of electricity, while the joint venturers are required to provide the Electricity Trust with appropriate land for the purpose. This work is to be done in accordance with a programme prepared by the joint venturers and the Electricity Trust.

Clause 7D deals with stormwater drainage and creek diversion. Under the clause, the drainage for the area is to be reviewed by a consulting engineer at the cost of the joint venturers and a strategy for drainage in the area is to be prepared as part of the review. Stormwater drainage works within the 40 hectares of uppermost elevation of all catchment areas and subdivisional stormwater drainage works are to be at the cost of the joint venturers while other stormwater drainage works and flood control structures are to be paid for by the council and the State in accordance with the requirements of the stormwater drainage subsidy scheme.

All drainage works are to be constructed by the joint venturers (unless otherwise agreed with the relevant drainage authority) in accordance with a programme prepared by the drainage authority and the joint venturers. The council, the drainage authority or its nominee is, if its tenders are competitive, to be given the contracts for the construction of those drainage works to be constructed by the joint venturers at the cost of others. The joint venturers are empowered by the clause to divert or vary watercourses in the development area. The State is required by clause 7E1 to assist the joint venturers in obtaining telecommunications and other services not within the ambit of the State Government's functions. The clause provides that the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927, shall not apply to or in relation to works carried out under clause 7.

Clause 8 deals with the provision of reserves. Under the clause, SAULT shall provide 240 hectares as reserve or similar open space to the State or the council. Not less than 25 per cent of the land is to be provided for active recreation or community purposes. The land provided for community purposes (other than for sports grounds) is to be prepared and landscaped by the joint venturers. The council is to assume responsibility for the maintenance of the reserves 12 months after completion. Under the clause, section 223li of the Real Property Act (developers to vest portion of land in council for open space) is not to apply in relation to the division of land owned by SAULT within the development area.

Clause 9 provides for the establishment by the council of a controlling body to manage a 'Golden Grove Community Fund' and reserve lands that the council places under its management. The controlling body is to consist of three persons (or such other number as the council and the Minister may agree) appointed by the council, one being nominated by the joint venturers and one by the Minister. The Chairman is to be a member of the council. The fund and the lands under the control of the controlling body are to be managed, applied and used for the purpose of benefiting communities within the development area. The joint venturers must, under the clause, pay into the fund 00.45 dollars per centum of the selling price of each residential allotment created by subdivision within the development area. The council may with the agreement of the Minister vary the powers of the controlling body or abolish the body.

Clause 10 provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, vary the boundaries of the development area so as to increase the area. The joint venturers may, under the clause, recommend that land held by the Crown, or owned by or under the control of the council, or owned by Delfin, be included within the area. Land included within the area is to be available for purchase by SAULT. Land held by the Crown adjacent to the area is not to be developed for residential purposes without SAULT having an opportunity to acquire it for the purposes of the joint venture agreement.

Clause 11 requires the joint venturers to ensure that proper steps are taken to ensure that the heritage items (the buildings known as Surrey Farm, Ladywood Farm and Petworth Farm) are maintained and reserved for ultimate community use. Clause 12 provides for road closures by the Commissioner for Highways at the written request of the joint venturers. Any road so closed is to vest in SAULT for an estate in fee simple. These provisions are to operate to the exclusion of the provisions of the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act.

Clause 13 protects works carried out in pursuance of the joint venture from an action in nuisance. The joint venturers must nevertheless take reasonable action to prevent any nuisance. Under the clause, the joint venturers may mine or quarry for sand, gravel, clay or rock. The Mining Act is not to operate in relation to any such mining or quarrying. Land within the development area is to be exempt from other mining operations notwithstanding the provisions of the Mining Act. Clause 14 provides for cancellation or variation of the indenture by agreement of the parties. Any such cancellation or variation is to be subject to disallowance by resolution of either House of Parliament.

Clause 15 provides for State preference. Under the clause, the joint venturers are required as far as reasonably and commercially practicable to use the services of South Australian professionals and South Australian labour; to give South Australian suppliers, manufacturers and contractors an opportunity to tender or quote; and to give, where possible, preference to South Australians when letting contracts or placing orders where price, quality and other factors and commercial considerations are equal to or better than those obtainable elsewhere.

Clause 16 provides for arbitration of any question, difference or dispute arising in relation to the indenture. The provisions of the Arbitration Act (other than section 24a (1) of that Act) are to apply in relation to any such arbitration. Section 24a (1) renders void any provision of an agreement requiring arbitration as a condition precedent to any right of action. Clause 17 makes it clear that there is not any relationship of partnership between the State and joint venturers. Clause 18 requires the joint venturers to consult with the State and to keep the State informed on a confidential basis of action taken under the indenture that might significantly affect the overall interest of the State under the indenture.

Clause 19 provides that only the State, the Minister and the joint venturers are to have any right to enforce compliance with any provision of the indenture. Clause 20 provides a right for either of the joint venturers to terminate the indenture and obtain compensation if legislation of any kind comes into operation that materially modifies the rights or liabilities of the joint venturers. Clause 21 provides for termination of the indenture upon termination or expiration of the joint venture agreement or by 90 days notice by the State upon material default by the joint venturers.

Clause 22 provides for the service of notices. Clause 23 provides that the law of South Australia is to govern the indenture. The first schedule to the indentures contains a plan of the development area. The second schedule more particularly describes the land delineated in the first schedule. The third schedule sets out the paramount objectives of the indenture. The fourth schedule sets out the City of Tea Tree Gully—Golden Grove Supplementary Development Plan which under clause 4A is to operate as an amendment to the Development Plan under the Planning Act.

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

TOBACCO SALES TO CHILDREN (PROHIBITION) BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As honourable members will be aware, this Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council by the Hon. K.L. Milne. There are two purposes behind it. The first is to place greater emphasis on the question of selling tobacco products to children under 16 years of age by taking the subject out of the Community Welfare Act (section 83) and assigning it to a special Act. The second is to increase the penalty for selling tobacco to minors from $50 to $500. I seek leave to

have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The Bill will provide a similar offence to the existing legislation, but in addition provides:

(a) a wider definition of tobacco product to include any manufactured product intended for smoking of which tobacco is a constituent part;

(b) a prohibition against the sale, etc., of a tobacco product to a person where the vendor knows, or has reasonable cause to believe, that the product is for the use of a person under the age of 16 years;

(c) a defence for a defendant to prove that he had reasonable cause to believe that the person to whom he sold or supplied the tobacco product was of or over the age of 16 years; and

(d) a requirement that vendors must display warnings as to the effect of this Act.

It is hoped that the increased penalty will be a more effective deterrent than the present penalty. It is expected that health surveyors can periodically check compliance with the requirement to display the notices.

It appears that the number of outlets that sell cigarettes to children are very much in the minority. It is hoped that this Bill will stop most of those sales (that are already illegal). The House may be interested to know that recommendation No. 49 of the Senate Standing Committee on 'Drug Problems in Australia—An Intoxicated Society?' stated:

That laws which make the sale of tobacco products to minors illegal be strictly enforced and that the penalties prescribed be increased.

The Government considers that this Bill is a worthwhile measure and accordingly is worthy of support.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 defines 'supply' and 'tobacco product'. Clause 3 makes it an offence for a person to supply, offer to supply or sell a tobacco product to a person under the age of 16 years, or to a person where the vendor knows, or has reasonable cause to believe that the tobacco product is for the use of a person under that age. The penalty will be $500. It will be a defence to prove that the defendant believed, on reasonable grounds, that the person to whom the product was sold was of or above the age of 16 years. Clause 4 will require the occupier of premises at which tobacco products are sold to display a notice relating to the general effect of section 3 of the proposed Act. Clause 5 provides that offences against this Act shall be disposed of summarily. Clause 6 provides for the repeal of section 83 (1) of the Community Welfare Act, 1972.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In introducing this Bill to amend the Prisons Act, the Government is again showing its commitment to bringing the operation of the correctional services system in South Australia into line with standards already established in other Australian States and overseas. The legislative programme of the Government, involving these amendments to the Prisons Act and amendments to the Correctional Services Act, will complement the major capital works programme already begun by this Government. This programme will allow South Australia to introduce programmes into our institutions which have been available interstate and overseas for a number of years. Members will be aware that the Correctional Services Act was assented to on 29 April 1982. That Act ultimately will replace the Prisons Act. However, until the regulations pursuant to the Correctional Services Act are drafted, we will continue to work with the Prisons Act, and it is therefore necessary in the first instance to amend the Prisons Act.

This Bill provides for amendment of those sections of the Prisons Act dealing with parole. The amendments proposed by the Government will allow the parole system to operate more efficiently and effectively for all concerned. These amendments are the result of 12 months of working with the legislation passed by the Parliament last December. Following the passage of the Prisons Act Amendment Act, 1983, in December 1983, the Government was able to introduce significant changes to South Australia's parole system. These changes placed the responsibility on the courts to determine what proportion of a person's sentence was spent in gaol, and what proportion was spent in the community under supervision. In addition, the 1983 amendments gave those sentenced to a term of imprisonment some guidance in determining what proportion of the sentence would be spent in an institution. Managers of institutions also received assistance in managing, by being able to award a limited amount of remission of a sentence to a person who behaved well while in the institution.

The courts are now able to clearly sentence a person to a fixed period of imprisonment in an institution, and a fixed period in the community under the supervision of a parole officer, knowing the maximum amount of remission a person is able to earn for good behaviour. Those time periods set by the court to be spent in an institution, and outside but under supervision, reflect the particular circumstances of the trial judgment. The person sentenced now knows from the day of sentencing how much time will be spent in an institution if they are of good behaviour, how much time will be spent in an institution if they are not of good behaviour, and how much remaining time will be spent back in the community under supervision. Following 12 months of working with these amendments the Government is satisfied that the new parole system is a significant improvement on the old parole system, and is firmly of the view that the courts are the most appropriate place for determining the length of time a person should spend in gaol.

The amendments in this Bill to those sections of the Prisons Act dealing with parole will clarify a number of aspects in relation to the operation of the parole system. In particular, the few remaining prisoners who had applied to the old Parole Board for parole release before the 1983 amending Act, will now clearly know that they are required to return to the appropriate sentencing court to have a non-parole period fixed before they can be released from an institution. An area which has caused some confusion since the proclamation of the Prisons Act Amendment Act, 1983, is the requirement that a court shall fix a non-parole period for all sentences of more than 12 months, except in excep-

tional circumstances. It is evident that the requirement should more appropriately be that a non-parole period should be fixed by the court on sentences of 12 months or more.

In working with the new parole system, the Parole Board found that the requirement to release a person on the day calculated as their release day has caused some concern. In particular, when a person has returned to court to have a non-parole period fixed, in some cases the release date has been set as the day on which the judgment was given. Given the procedures involved in setting parole conditions, the Parole Board has found it difficult to work with directions from the court that a person be released on the day the order is made. The amendment will allow the court to give the Parole Board 30 days from the day on which the court makes an order, to have the conditions of release prepared, and the person ready for release.

The Government and the Parole Board are also of the view that the Parole Board should have the discretion to vary or revoke the parole conditions of a parolee with a determinate sentence; that the Parole Board of its own volition should be able to recommend to the Governor a variation in parole conditions for a person given a life sentence; and that short prison sentences for failure to pay a fine should not invoke the cancellation of a parolee's parole release. Amendments are included to cover these situations. The Government is also of the view that the power of the permanent head to delegate certain powers to other officers should only be done with the approval of the Minister. An amendment to provide the permanent head with such a power of delegation has been included in the Bill.

A change to the administration of the remission system has also been incorporated in the Bill. At present institutions are required to calculate a prisoner's remission at the end of each month each prisoner serves. This means the institutions are constantly required to calculate remissions as a month served comes up for each prisoner. The amendment will allow institutions to calculate everyone's remission at the end of each calendar month, and to award part remission for part months served. The most significant amendment to the Prisons Act put forward by the Government in this Bill is the incorporation of those sections of the as yet unproclaimed Correctional Services Act which allows 'day leave' from an institution to occur. Provision was made in the Bill introduced by members opposite in 1982, for the introduction of a system of unescorted day leave.

However, due to the unavoidable delay in drafting regulations, pursuant to the Correctional Services Act, 1982, the current day leave programme operated by the Department of Correctional Services is inadequate. The incorporation of the appropriate sections in the Prisons Act will avoid further delay in introducing a much needed system of unescorted day leave into our institutions. Such leave will allow people soon to be released, to reorient themselves to the wider community, in a more planned and caring way, by using temporary leave to find employment, to re-establish ties with families, to undertake work release and to study.

This Bill has two main objectives in mind. First, it aims to improve the operation of the new parole system, following 12 months experience with the legislation. Secondly, it aims to make day leave available to current prisoners, rather than waiting for the proclamation of the Correctional Services Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides that all applications for release on parole that were before the old Parole Board prior to the 1983 amending Act, and that still have not been disposed of, shall be deemed to have been withdrawn. A prisoner affected by this provision will thus have no alternative but to go back to the appropriate sentencing court and apply to have a non-parole period fixed. The amendments to subsection (4) will enable the current Parole Board to deal with such matters as the cancellation of warrants for arrest that were issued at the direction of the old Board. Clause 4 is consequential upon the next clause.

Clause 5 gives the Director the power to delegate, subject to the approval of the Minister. Clause 6 empowers the Director to grant what is commonly known as 'day leave'. This power is given to the Director under the as yet unproclaimed Correctional Services Act, and should be available to him now. Clause 7 provides that non-parole periods must be fixed by the courts for all sentences of one year or more. The Act as it now stands only makes such provision where the sentence exceeds one year. The power of a prisoner to apply for a non-parole period to be fixed is now extended to all prisoners serving sentences of one year or more who do not have a non-parole period. Thus, prisoners serving a year's sentence may go back to the sentencing court, as may any prisoner who was sentenced before December 1983, and any prisoner in relation to whom a court at any time exercises its discretion not to fix a non-parole period.

Clause 8 provides that a prisoner must be released on parole on a day no later than 30 days after the day calculated as his release day. As the Act now stands, he must be released on that release day, which gives the Parole Board very little leeway in carrying out its task of fixing parole conditions. Clause 9 does not effect a substantive change, but simply makes it clear that life prisoners released on parole prior to the commencement of the Prisons Act Amendment Act, 1981, remain on parole for the remainder of their sentence (the 1981 Act provided for the fixing of a fixed period of parole for life prisoners released on parole after that Act came into force).

Clause 10 provides the Parole Board with the power to vary or revoke, of its own motion, parole conditions (or recommend to the Governor such variation or revocation) in respect of any parolee. As the Act now stands, the Board may only act on its own motion in relation to a parolee released from a sentence of life imprisonment. Clause 11 makes clear that a sentence of imprisonment in default of paying a fine or other sum does not operate to cause cancellation of parole. Clause 12 amends the section dealing with remission, so that the granting of remission is done at the end of each calendar month, not at the end of each prisoner's month of imprisonment.

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

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 1049.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill, although it has some reservations about certain aspects of it and some questions it would like answered in the public interest prior to the passage of the Bill through this House. As indicated in the second reading explanation, the Bill establishes the power of the Commission to conduct sports lotteries. It will also allow any unclaimed prize money to be retained by the Commission and offered as prizes in subsequent lotteries. It gives the Commission authority to make certain rules governing the conduct of lotteries, giving it more autonomy as a statutory body.

The Bill also empowers the Treasurer to regulate the total value of prizes which may be offered in any given financial year to the sports lotteries, which is due to the Government's desire to control funds from lottery proceeds to the Recre-

ation and Sport Fund and the Hospitals Fund, something not clearly defined at present or in existing legislation.

The existence of the Recreation and Sport Fund is due to the foresight, one initiative amongst many, of my colleague and former Minister in the former Government, the member for Torrens. That fund was originally established under the soccer football pools legislation of 1981 and collected moneys for building programmes and major development projects which had some connection to recreation and sport. Indeed, the Sports Institute owes to the member for Torrens (as Minister of Recreation and Sport in the former Administration) its promotion, its establishment and its contribution to the very significant achievements of our athletes overseas. I am sure that the current Minister recognises the involvement of the former Minister in that regard.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I do.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed. I am pleased that the Minister does acknowledge the role of the member for Torrens in the establishment of that Sports Institute. I would be pleased if he would say it on the 5DN sports programme occasionally and give some credit to the former Minister for its establishment. However, it must be seen (and I am sure the Minister agrees) that it was a very sucessful move and one which has been greatly supported by the sporting community in this State. By the time of the last election, the fund had raised well over $1.5 million, and helped to pay for the Administrator salary subsidy scheme and towards other major sporting development programmes. The advent of sports lotteries will, I trust, help to increase the amount of money paid into the Recreation and Sport Fund and in turn increase the capacity of Government to direct funds where they are needed most, to ensure the pursuit of excellence in sporting achievements.

The Bill allows for money that has been unclaimed for more than six months to be paid as prize money for subsequent lotteries. At present, technically there is no cut off point for unclaimed prize money: a person who discovers that some prize money is due to them from a lottery conducted some time ago can still claim that money. A concern of the Opposition with the running of the sports lottery by the Government is that there could well be detrimental effects on other sports lotteries, raffles, and so on, run by clubs.

As the Minister would well know, many sporting clubs rely heavily on their own lotteries to sustain them and to provide enough revenue for their existence. Those sporting lotteries individually conducted by the various clubs have ensured their continued existence. The Government's deciding to enter the field of sports lotteries does not necessarily mean that the amount of money that people are prepared to spend on lotteries will increase. It is reasonable to expect that people spend a certain amount of money each year on lotteries of all kinds and allocate this expenditure as they see fit. The effect that this will have on the lotteries take has not been clearly spelt out by the Government, and I would like the Minister to address that question.

I give notice to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who at the moment is standing in for the Treasurer, that the Opposition has some questions about this Bill that it would like answered. I trust that the Treasurer, who is absent I think at a press conference, will return to the House before the Bill goes through the Committee stage. If the Minister of Recreation and Sport is unable to answer the questions at this stage, at least he could take the questions on notice and provide us with the details if the Treasurer has not returned. We want to know whether the Government has undertaken any market research or study to determine the effect of this new type of Government run lottery, and what effect it will have on existing lotteries run by various sporting organisations throughout South Australia.

It is important for us to understand the implications of this legislation for the various sporting clubs throughout South Australia, because many individual sporting clubs throughout this State have many imposts placed on them by way of operating costs and, like the rest of the community, they are not immune to such things as electricity tariff increases. In fact, many sections of the community, including the sporting clubs, are feeling the pinch of increased imposts such as that. We need to consider seriously the matter of whether the fund raising capacity of the clubs will be put in jeopardy.

Whilst the Opposition supports the Bill before the House we have genuine and sincere fears about the effect that a sports lottery will have on individual organisations throughout South Australia. In his response I would like the Minister to provide us with information about whether market research has been undertaken to establish the effect of the proposed lottery so that the Opposition has that information available to it while the Bill is awaiting passage through the other place before finally passing through Parliament.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: We are also concerned of course that the money going into the Recreation and Sport Fund remains in that fund and that it is not purloined off to general revenue, as has happened in the past couple of years.

Mr OLSEN: I hope that any honourable Government would not siphon off funds for a particular purpose, and indeed, as the member for Torrens has rightly pointed out, the lottery funds are designated for a specific purpose. It is one thing to leave the money in the fund and then reduce the departmental budget so that the Department must rely on the fund to prop up its existing sports programmes, having had its Budget allocation actually reduced in the meantime; that would be what one could call sleight of hand, that is, to allow the department to keep the money, although reducing money allocated to other departmental programmes, thereby relieving the Government of its funding obligations.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It is almost like a Treasury suggestion.

Mr OLSEN: I would not think that it is a Treasury suggestion. I am sure that it would be a suggestion that the Government and Ministers of the Government would agree to, because in the final analysis all Treasury documentation must have Ministerial agreement. As we all well know, the buck stops with the Minister of the day. We have seen what happened with the Highways Fund over the past 12 months, and we would not want the same thing to occur in relation to the siphoning of funds from a lottery intended to meet a very real need which exists in the community and which the Liberal Party in Opposition supports.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the Leader in his remarks and congratulate the Government on introducing a further measure to enable sport to benefit. Previous Governments of both persuasions have not recognised the need to put money into the recreation and sport area, and it is very important that we support the Government in this action. As the Leader has stated, it is to be hoped that the Government will not allocate less money to the Department of Recreation and Sport due to there being another means of finance available through the sports lottery. As we all know in this place, there is a need to continue to make money available for elite athletes. There is no question that the Sports Institute is doing an excellent job in this area.

It is also true that more money needs to be put into the area of elite sport, and this is a means by which the Department can provide more money. We know that there is a need to recognise the development of young people in sport and more money is needed for the development of youth

in sport by way of clubs, the associations and the education system. Additional money is required for facilities. During the Estimates Committee proceedings the Minister provided details about a few projects for next year and further into the future that are being considered, and it is for those sorts of projects that we need extra money. Obviously, a sports lottery of the type proposed will enable more money to be placed into the Recreation and Sport Fund that hopefully can be used for the development of major facilities.

There is no question that more money must be made available for administration grants. It is all very well for a Government to make money available at a low level and to encourage associations to have administrators, but we all know that the cost of obtaining the services of a good administrator is not cheap. If one makes available a small sum of money in the administration area often one gets only what one pays for. Extra money for this purpose must be made available.

I take this opportunity to refer to the matter of sponsorship and to a couple of decisions that have been made federally in the past two weeks or so. I refer first to the decision in relation to the controlling of cigarette advertising, and secondly to the potential controlling of alcoholic beverage advertising, which will have a very dramatic effect on the running of sports organisations and associations. I would like to know what is the Government's attitude towards sponsorship, because there is no question that if, on the one hand, Governments take money for the use and sale of products like cigarettes and alcohol and put it into taxation, but on the other hand they do not seemingly do anything to enable these companies to freely advertise their products, it seems a very one-sided argument to that question.

Of course, only one group misses out—the sporting associations—because without sponsorship from major sponsors (in this case two very significant sponsors of sport in South Australia—the cigarette and alcohol beverage industries) somewhere, somehow, someone will have to get money to put into those associations. So, this is important in the context of this Bill, where money will be made available to the sporting industries through the sports lottery. Also involved is the question of the sponsorship, which should be answered by the Minister. I ask the Minister how he sees this Government supporting or not supporting the sponsorship of products, because the whole thing flows through into the funding of sports associations.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I want to make clear to members opposite that I am not in charge of the Bill. The Lotteries Commission is under the administration of the Treasurer, but I want to speak very briefly to the matters contained in the Bill, specifically in relation to the introduction of a sports lottery. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said that the proposal for a sports lottery was part of Labor Party policy prior to the last election. Of course, the purpose of sports lotteries is to provide additional funds for sporting development in this State. Although the Government, through the Department of Recreation and Sport, has undertaken a number of developments and initiated a number of programmes, we certainly desire to further implement other initiatives. Indeed, the member for Bragg remarked on the subsidies scheme for administration salaries, which has been under review for the past three or four months and on which I have had a report. From time to time we need to upgrade and assess the value for money that we get for those programmes: the salary subsidies scheme is one of those.

Although we have initiated a number of programmes, there is certainly some way to go. State funds are provided by Treasury, but we are looking for assistance in relation to international standard facilities programmed from the Commonwealth Government. Over the past 2½ years the Recreation and Sport Fund, from soccer pools, has provided quite a substantial amount. The member for Torrens, who is nodding his head in agreement, should cast his mind back to the debate that occurred on that occasion, because I was one of the very few supporters in Opposition of the establishment of soccer pools. Of course, we have now established a Recreation and Sport Fund following the passage of that legislation.

It has not proven to be an outstanding success, as we might have anticipated, but nevertheless it has contributed something like $3 million over that period, which has been utilised for recreation and sport development. The fund has been used for various purposes over that time, but all of it has been for recreation and sport. It is true that, whatever funds one may have available for recreation and sport, requests always exceed that amount. Of course, expansion takes place and developments occur which need to be fulfilled from time to time.

I do not think that any Government or Minister who has been involved in recreation and sport will say that funding, whether it be from one Government or another, has been sufficient to enable all requests made by various sporting and recreational groups within the community to be acceded to. It is not possible for us to predict what amounts of money may be forthcoming. I find it impossible to do that in relation to the sports lottery because it will be somewhat of an experiment. However, dicussions have taken place between Treasury officers, officers of my Department and of the Lotteries Commission in regard to what might be considered as the format for the lottery. Whatever amount is generated will be additional to those that are already available for development and promotion of sport and recreation in this State.

The Leader of the Opposition asked what effect a sports lottery might have on social and sporting clubs that have already raised substantial moneys from small lotteries, bingo, and so on. I anticipate that there will be no substantial effect on moneys raised by such sporting clubs.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: People will have to actually patronise the sports lottery—

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, the lotteries are open to the public generally, as is every other lottery in South Australia. We are seeking to encourage sporting organisations and sporting people in the community who may not even be associated directly with a sport. One of the Australian ethics is that we regard ourselves as sporting people. Some of us even sit up until 11.30 p.m. to watch the Australia versus Ireland football.

An honourable member: It was later than that.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That may be so, but the Australian ethic is that we are supporters of sport, although we may not be directly involved. So, we are looking to the sporting public to assist in regard to the sports lotteries. As I say, discussions have occurred between officers of my Department, the Lotteries Commission and me regarding the form of lottery to be devised.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Did you have discussions with Treasury officers?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I understand that Treasury officers were involved in discussions. However, the Premier is in charge of this legislation and is the Minister responsible for the Lotteries Commission. I support the introduction of sports lotteries, because they will add to funds that are already available for the development of recreation and sport in this State. Already, a number of initiatives have been undertaken in the past two years in regard to recreation and sport, some of which are of fairly great significance. I

do not want to delay the course of the legislation, but I thought that it was appropriate to mention those matters.

I accede to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the Sports Institute which was started by the previous Government. Again, I was a supporter of that initiative. Of course, over that period there has been increased funding, as the member for Torrens would realise, and the Sports Institute has proved a great success. However, we do not deal only with athletes in South Australia: we have to deal with the community at large. One must pay as much attention to the sporting fraternity at large, not just to elite athletes, of whom there are very few. Of course, the other matter is the aquatic centre. I know that there have been some negative comments from the other side. The member for Bragg can smile. I would have thought that members opposite would be the last ones to criticise—

I would have thought that members opposite would be the last ones to criticise—

Mr Ingerson: How much is it going to cost this week?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That is the question that the honourable member has been raising, not I. As far as I am concerned, we are on target. Members opposite have been critical of the building of the aquatic centre. If the members for Hanson, Torrens and Bragg cast their minds back a couple of years when the previous Government had a project on the site of the South Australian Brewing Company, they would realise that $1.3 million was spent on consultancy and feasibility studies and we finished up with absolutely nothing. Indeed, they purchased the land the day before the 1982 election. They ought to be the last ones to criticise what the present Government has done in regard to the aquatic centre, because we are building an aquatic centre that will be up and running early next year and, once and for all, we will be able to provide to the swimming fraternity of South Australia and the public generally an all year round facility that will be there for a long time.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: How much will it cost?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It will cost $7.2 million. I want to mention also some of the other things that have been undertaken in the past couple of years. Indeed, as I said, we need more money to go on further. For instance, the other initiatives have included the relocation of the Department of Recreation and Sport administration centre on the corner of Sturt Street and King William Street; the outdoor international roller skating venue at the Parks Community Centre; the international softball diamond at West Beach; and the feasibility study which we are conducting at present and which I know the member for Hanson supports (I do not know about other members opposite) into Adelaide's hosting the Commonwealth Games in either 1994 or 1998.

In addition to those projects, we are also considering, and indeed have implemented, a number of programmes and initiatives that have been beneficial to recreation and sport in this State, not to mention the resurgence of the racing industry in South Australia in the past two years. So, we need to develop further recreation and sport in South Australia. I am pleased that members opposite have given their support with some reservations and questions—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: No reservations; you have our support.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Leader of the Opposition said that he had some reservations and that indeed he would ask questions of the Premier when the opportunity arose.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Yes.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I thought that that might have been interpreted as his having some reservations: perhaps I have misunderstood. A sports lottery will provide an additional opportunity to proceed even further and, for the information of members of the House, I state that in a few days I will be announcing South Australia's submission to the Federal Government in regard to the national facilities programme for the next three years. As I say, we want to obtain further development of sport in South Australia and, indeed, for large facilities we need the assistance of Commonwealth funds.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: We want our fair share.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We want more than our fair share; we need our fair share. I recall perhaps a member opposite or my mentioning during the Estimates Committee that in the past South Australia had not had its fair share of Commonwealth funds. I believe that the small States on a population basis are tremendously disadvantaged in regard to funds supplied on a 50-50 basis from the Commonwealth. The Eastern States have a population advantage and indeed much higher budgets. They are in a better position to match the Commonwealth funds than is South Australia, and that has been, and still is, a disadvantage not only to us in this State but also perhaps to the other small States.

Therefore, I would suggest that if the Opposition believes that it should support our representations to the Commonwealth Government I will, as I said, be making an announcement in the next couple of days in relation to the specific programme. The sum of $27 million is available to develop international standard sporting facilities under that programme, so we want to proceed with what I call a concerted building programme to cover as much as possible those sports that do not at present have a home of their own. I am not suggesting that a sports lottery will provide sufficient funds to do that, but it will assist. As I said, I would not like to make any prediction in regard to what amounts will be raised by a sports lottery.

I point out that the format of the lottery has not yet been determined. Indeed, the Lotteries Commission, in which I have confidence, has gained sufficient expertise and experience in the past 20 odd years to conduct successfully a sports lottery without impinging on either its own forms of lotteries or indeed small sporting clubs in general. I would expect that it will be a formal type of lottery; and, although it has not been finally decided, probably a $4 lottery would be the most appropriate for a sports lottery.

Therefore, we are looking for public support and for the sporting public of South Australia to assist in the conduct of the lottery. Certainly, any gambling innovation or activity has an effect. We will have one which this House supported some 18 months ago, namely, the casino. I am not sure that it will have an impact; I merely use this as an example. In regard to Lotteries Commission, TAB and small lotteries activities, it is more likely to be the casino than a small sports lottery (involving probably five or six sports lotteries per year) that will have an impact.

Mr Lewis: Then you agree with me?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am saying that the introduction of any form of gambling needs to be assessed carefully so that it does not impinge on what I believe are the established forms of gambling in a State. Indeed, as I say, the Lotteries Commission, which has been what I call a success story, has the expertise and knowledge to ensure as much as possible that the sports lottery will not impinge on the operation of small sporting clubs in regard to their small lotteries, and so on. Therefore, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. Indeed, the Premier will address some of the questions that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bragg.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to raise one or two points. First, I support the concept of a sports lottery. I do not think that it will provide massive funds to sports in general. Governments will be able to make the decisions in the main that will have an effect on where the money is spent, and in some cases it will be done for political benefit, regardless

of who is in government. No doubt, those sort of things will occur. However, I have one or two queries and one or two general comments to make.

I wish to emphasise one point that my Leader raised. Can the Premier give the House a guarantee that market research will be done on the likely effect of a sports lottery on the lotteries of small clubs or associations and their fundraising capabilities? I think it is fair to say that, if we do not get a reasonable answer to that question, it is only proper that a request be made to those with whom the Premier may have close contact in another place to move some form of amendment if possible and, if there is enough support, to make sure that the Government will guarantee that.

I know that some local councils are charging clubs up to $1 100 a year for each team for the use of fields in the summer months. That is a substantial amount of money, and they charge as much as $450 or $500 a year for junior teams to use ovals. It is very difficult for small clubs and associations to raise that sort of money. I am associated with a club which annually puts out 15 teams, four senior and 11 junior, and we are fortunate that we do not have a high rental to pay, although we do have to pay our own water rates. The Premier needs to be conscious of the fact that the introduction of a sports lottery should not mean that a sporting organisation is told by Government departments, such as the Department of Recreation and Sport, that it has to sell a certain number of raffle ticket books before it is able to obtain a Government grant to be used by the club perhaps for new headquarters, additions to its building or for coaching programmes.

I am giving this warning now so that in future, regardless of what the present Minister and the Premier might say, those sorts of guarantees are laid down and so that any future Minister knows exactly what this Parliament meant when it passed this legislation. Quite definitely, I am looking for the Premier to guarantee that market research will be done into the effects of the new sports lottery on the viability of small sporting clubs and associations.

I believe that names and addresses of buyers of sports lottery tickets must be recorded. I am very concerned about the type of raffle or lottery being conducted by the Lotteries Commission in which the name and address of the person who purchases the ticket are not recorded. I am totally opposed to this shonky method being used in the sale of $1, $2 and $4 lotteries. I am not worried about the instant rub-off tickets: I am talking about the people who walk into the lotteries headquarters or an agency and buy a ticket. The name of the person who bought the ticket is not recorded anywhere. If private enterprise tried to do that, regulations would be brought before the Parliament within six months to outlaw the scheme because it was said to be shonky.

Some people who buy these tickets with the intention of checking the results when they are published may lose the ticket, go on holidays or perhaps into hospital and are therefore unable to see the results. There is no record in the Lotteries Commission to show that they bought the ticket, and if they do not claim the prize, it is added to the pool of unclaimed prizes. I believe that that person should be entitled to the prize money. I believe that we as a Parliament should be ashamed to think that we allow the Lotteries Commission to run this sort of lottery, because I believe that it is unfair and unprincipled. I am saying definitely that if private enterprise was running such a lottery it would be stopped immediately by Government regulation.

I believe many thousands of dollars has been denied individuals who have legitimately bought a ticket. I know that one of the conditions of buying the ticket is that the purchaser has to find out the result of that lottery draw, but there are unfortunate circumstances in which people are not able to see the results for various reasons or they lose the ticket and do not have a record of its number. I hope that the butts of tickets sold in the sports lottery will contain the name and address of the purchaser so that there is a cross check and the winners can be identified. I think the Minister has misled Parliament, or perhaps he should have used the English language more carefully when he talked about what happens in the West End. The Minister said that $1.3 million has been spent on consultancy fees and market research. That is untrue.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It was not spent?

Mr EVANS: I am saying that $1.3 million was spent on acquiring land which included some land for the busway, architects' fees for initial concept design and consultancy fees and market research. To say that the total was spent on consultants' fees and market research was false, and the Minister should know better than to say that. It is all very well to play politics but we should talk facts. The land was a valuable part of that overall concept and the Minister knows that. If the Minister says that I am not right, let him deny it. He is not right and he has misled Parliament.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You misled the public.

Mr EVANS: I did not mislead the public at any time. The Minister also said that the casino would have some effect upon TAB—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr EVANS: I think the Minister said that he expected the casino to have an effect upon all lotteries conducted, TAB, and so on, because it is another form of gambling and every new form of gambling introduced is likely to have an effect on existing forms of gambling. I do not disagree, and that is one of the reasons why I opposed the concept of a casino in this State. I believed it would be putting money into the hands of just a few people when other forms of gambling were available to the general community. I do not disagree with the Minister on that and that is why I believe we need some market research into the likely effects sports lotteries will have on lotteries conducted by clubs and associations.

I am particularly concerned about the effect on the lotteries run by charitable organisations. As the Minister has said, the sports lottery is likely to have some effect on the fundraising abilities of those organisations. I am sure all members receive, as I do, requests from charitable organisations for us to buy a $20 or a $30 lottery ticket. Many people are now switching themselves off from this sort of fund raising. I would like a guarantee from the Minister that no pressure will be put on organisations to sell tickets and that they will be only encouraged to buy tickets. I hope that is understood.

The other point I wish to raise is that when we established the Lotteries Commission it was stated that the excess money would go to hospitals. I draw a comparison in this case between the lotteries and the new sports lotteries. We need to be strong in our commitment that the money given from general revenue to sporting organisations is not decreased because money will be available from the sports lotteries, and that the money from the sports lotteries will be a little icing on the cake. There has been a tendency by some Governments, since the Lotteries Commission took over the role of trying to raise money for hospitals, to say that they have put X dollars into the Hospitals Fund when in fact they should not be claiming that at all because it was not a Government action: as a result of action taking place in the community through the Lotteries Commission, that money would go to hospitals. It is not a donation from the Government at all: it is a contribution from the community through the Lotteries Commission for that purpose.

We want to make sure that the present and future Governments do not say that they have put X dollars towards sporting activities when in actual fact the contribution was a voluntary one made through the lottery system by the

community. I support the proposition, but I would like some guarantee from the Premier that market research will be undertaken into the effect of the lotteries on other bodies and associations, particularly charitable organisations, because we need to be convinced that we will not be seriously affecting their capacity to raise money.

Bill read a second time

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Sports lotteries.'

Mr EVANS: I was disappointed that the Premier did not respond to the second reading. I understand that he was called away on urgent business while the Leader was speaking (likewise, the Leader was called away for similar reasons at the closing of the debate). However, I believe that it would have been a courtesy to be told, because some questions were asked. I take the opportunity of asking whether the Premier would give a guarantee that market research would be done on the likely effect of sports lotteries on existing clubs and on sporting and charitable organisation lotteries. There is no benefit in Parliament agreeing to something if it will seriously or adversely affect others or if we as a Parliament have not been informed of the likely effects. It is no good departmental advisers, the Premier or the Minister saying that they do not think there will be much effect. We have the opportunity nowadays, through consultants, to obtain market research, and it would not be an expensive exercise. We need that sort of detail from the Premier.

Likewise, the moneys coming from this area will be distributed as fairly as they can be to meet the needs of sport within the State. As far as the Premier can give a commitment, will the Government continue to recognise the need for more money to come from general revenue, as the inflationary trend continues, to support sporting organisations?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Three questions were asked, and I did not reply earlier because I thought the questions would be asked again in Committee. I am happy to respond to the honourable member. In relation to the first question on impact, the selling of sports lottery tickets will be marketed, promoted and sold through the Lotteries Commission agencies with, one would hope, the active co-operation and support of sporting organisations, but will not conflict with fund-raising activities that individual clubs conduct at the moment. The distinction will be clearly seen. There will always be an incentive for a club to have its own fund-raising, because it knows that the money raised will directly return to the club. In the case of the sports lottery, the money goes to sport, but sport in general. The distribution is not in the control of a particular club or organisation.

So, the marketing strategy will be aimed at attracting organisations and individuals interested in sport generally to support the fund and enable some of the projects outlined by my colleague to go ahead. Market research is being carried out. A project is being worked on currently to establish a statistical base on all forms of gambling and the relationship between them in which the Department of Recreation and Sport is involved.

My colleague tells me that it will be looked at on an Australia wide basis so that data will be exchanged between the various States and we will get a good picture of that impact. I assure the honourable member that we will have that statistical base on which to monitor the situation over time. As to whether the money will be distributed fairly, the procedures under which it will be distributed are those already established with some success as a result of the passing of the soccer pools legislation.

As to the final question in relation to the Government's commitment to sport, we have demonstrated during our period in office a strong commitment to support sporting organisations and their role in society. That will certainly continue, and my Government would certainly intend to maintain that commitment. As the honourable member said, we will see this fund, as with the soccer pool fund, as a way in which special projects and extra facilities that could not normally be secured out of general revenue can be achieved for a range of sporting organisations.

Mr EVANS: In regard to football or soccer grand finals, could a daily agency be established for tickets to be sold, or will it be conducted strictly through the normal lottery agencies we now have? I visualise a need to promote the sale of such tickets at major sporting functions, even races. It would not be impossible for a temporary or daily agency to operate under that system. Secondly, will the tickets be of a type so that, when people purchase a ticket, their name and address will be recorded on the butt to enable a follow-up and to avoid the doubtful operation of a ticket being sold with no name recorded at the Lotteries Commission, as currently occurs with tickets to the value of $2 or $4?

Thirdly, the Premier says that some market research is taking place now on an Australia wide basis in relation to a sports lottery. When is it likely that some detail of that report will be made available to Parliament? We are being asked to buy a pig in a poke by not having a copy of the report. As a Parliament we have no idea of the likely effect on other sporting clubs conducting raffles and lotteries, and this vital information is needed before the legislation passes both Houses of Parliament. Has the Government any detail to this point on the likely effect that the sports lottery will have on other lotteries presently operating with clubs, sporting and charitable organisations within the State?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member has changed his question. He asked whether we would do some research and monitor the situation and I said that we were going to do so and that a study is being compiled currently on a similar statistical base.

Mr Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This report will not be available for a number of months. In fact, obviously we will not be able to judge the real impact until such time as the lottery is up and running. I assure the honourable member that research will be carried out.

Mr EVANS: What is the position in relation to names appearing on tickets? Will the ticket butts carry the person's name? It is important that we be given such information.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot answer that question. The lottery will be marketed and promoted through the Lotteries Commission and would, I imagine, conform with current practice. My colleague points out that section 18 deals with various conditions that can be laid down, including the appointment of agencies, and so on. I do not know whether names will be recorded on the ticket butts. If that is not the current practice it will probably not be done in future. That causes no problem, unless one wants them for record purposes.

That causes no problem, unless one wants them for record purposes.

Mr Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think there is much evidence of that occurring.

Mr Evans: There is.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That would alter the general practice of the Lotteries Commission and I do not think it intends to alter that. The honourable member should bring it up in another context. If he would like to write to me about that, I will obtain something from the Lotteries Commission on it. In relation to temporary agencies, again, it will be up to the Lotteries Commission, but clearly that is one way in which this could be marketed. Obviously, a

study has to be done into the effectiveness of that approach and, equally, it would have to get permission from the appropriate authorities to do such selling.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I wish to ask a question about the Recreation and Sport Fund. In preface, I say to the Premier that we are not concerned so much about members of sporting clubs selling lottery tickets or tickets in this lottery, but likely clients of a sports lottery will be sporting people, and they are connected with sporting clubs. Therefore, if they are spending money on a sports lottery, there could be less money available to support their own club functions. I was told when I was Minister and looking at this matter that this is a likely result. The Premier has said that he will do some work on it; we accept that, and we will be interested to see the results. That is the problem, not sporting people selling tickets for the lottery. Sporting people will be the natural patrons of a sports lottery.

I now wish to raise a question about moneys to be paid into the Recreation and Sport Fund. There is a tendency for Treasurers to look eagerly at these dedicated funds and to use them as a method of bolstering general revenue. We need cite three examples in this State: the Highways Fund, the Hospitals Fund and now the Recreation and Sport Fund. The Recreation and Sport Fund is at the personal disposal of the Minister (although I do not mean disposal for his own personal gain). However, the tendency is for Treasurers to say, 'Look, we have X hundred thousand dollars in the Recreation and Sport Fund. Shouldn't we then reduce, say, the capital works budget in the Department of Recreation and Sport, not necessarily by an equivalent amount but by, say, 10 or 15 per cent,' and allow the particular Minister to use his Recreation and Sport Fund to make up the difference.

I do not think I am being unrealistic in saying that that tendency is there. However, it would be a great pity if, having introduced a sports lottery, where the funds would benefit the future development of sport in this State (and I would hope that junior sport would be the big priority), Treasurers reduced the Department's budget (probably the capital budget) by a like amount or by any amount because of the existence of the fund. Has the Premier any ideas on that, and would he be prepared to give a guarantee that he would not want to do that?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already answered that question in response to the member for Fisher, and I cannot add to that answer. My Government has a commitment to recreation and sport. We have increased quite substantially our appropriation from general revenue to it and we will maintain our commitment to it. There is no way in which any Treasurer or Government can guarantee particular allocations year by year—that is subject to the budgetary process.

However, I would see this fund as supplementing the Government's general revenue appropriation in specific ways and, while it is true that it is under the control of the Minister, the Minister of course takes advice in the disbursement of those funds on a range of projects. He has committees, and he eventually brings to Cabinet the sorts of allocations that he has in mind. That process will follow, but we certainly will maintain our commitment to sport.

Mr INGERSON: When are the lotteries likely to commence (it is mentioned that there will be a series of them) and how many are there likely to be in a year? It is also mentioned that there is a range of prizes that the Premier or Treasurer can vary. What is the sort of range of prizes talked about, and what is the value of the ticket? The Minister of Recreation and Sport mentioned a value of perhaps $4. The Lotteries Commission Report states the $4 lottery was the most difficult one to sell and and to complete. If this is to be of benefit to sport, perhaps the $4 ticket may be a bit high. I only throw that in as a general comment, having seen that remark made in the Lotteries Commission Report.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This will be handled by the Lotteries Commission, which is the Government's agent and expert in this area. I understand that the Commission is developing its marketing strategy on it. Perhaps four to six lotteries a year would be the number. Certainly, in terms of the ordinary Lotteries Commission programme, the $4 ticket has not been as successful as it was hoped. However, I make the point that the sports lottery is directed to a targeted market and for a specific purpose. All the evidence suggests that, if the marketing is handled properly one is tapping into a new or expanded clientele for the particular lottery. However, we will take advice from the Lotteries Commission on what it wants to do in that area and whether it be $4, $2, or whatever. The key is going to be how well it is promoted and marketed among people who are interested in sport.

It is one thing to talk about persons who are members of clubs, but in a sense they represent only a proportion of what we might call the sporting public or people interested in sport: not every person involved or interested in sport joins a club specifically, and we hope that the net can be spread very widely. That will be the Lotteries Commission's task.

Mr INGERSON: I thank the Premier and ask that when the study is done that comment about the $4 lottery is taken into consideration. Previously, I mentioned the problem facing sport in relation to sponsorship, particularly cigarette and alcohol beverage company sponsorship, which is likely to have a very significant effect on the amount of money that is available in the sporting arena. What is the Government's attitude on that matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is not really relevant to this Bill. We have indicated our attitude in the past to that matter. As I understand it, the question mark raised in this area is the result of the Broadcasting Tribunal's interpretation of the rule which is being handled at the Federal level. Obviously, we are subject to Federal legislation in this area. I do not think we have reached a stage where there has been any specific threat or notified withdrawal of such sponsorship.

Mr INGERSON: Sponsorship is an important factor and, since money from the lotteries is likely to go into helping sport generally, I think that the two are related. Is the Premier or the Government likely to make any submission to any tribunal on behalf of sport in this State, because it does have a very dramatic effect on the sponsorship and survival of sport in this State?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, there is no such intention. It is covered by Federal legislation. I imagine that my colleague will discuss the matter at meetings of Ministers of Recreation and Sport that occur periodically. That has occurred in the past. The Government actively encourages groups to find sponsorships, and this relates not only to sports groups but also to those involved with arts and so on.

The only question mark in the sponsorship area is over tobacco companies and, subsequently under this Broadcasting Tribunal ruling, the possibility in relation to the type of promotion that a tobacco company or a wine, beer or spirit company sponsor can provide, particularly in terms of signage at sporting grounds. That is really a Federal matter that will be determined then.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTION OF SENATORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 23 October. Page 1399.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this legislation, although we do not believe that it is necessary. Technically, under section 9 of the Constitution Act the States have the right to make laws to set the time and place of election of State Senators, and there is also provision, under section 12 of the Constitution Act, for Governors to issue writs. In any case, the Governor has traditionally issued writs with advice from the Federal Government and the Governor-General, and there has never been any problem in the past in setting the time and place for an election. The present power of the Governor to issue writs has no time constraint and, even though constraints are contained in the provisions of the Bill before the House, there is still some flexibility left for the Governor in the manner of and the time for writs to be issued.

The Bill seeks to do seven different things. First, it provides that seven days after the date of the issue of writs the electoral rolls are to close. Secondly, it provides that nominations are to close with the Australian Electoral Office for South Australia not fewer than 11 days nor more than 28 days after the issue of the writs. Thirdly, polling is to be not fewer than 22 days nor more than 30 days after the close of nominations. Fourthly, polling is to be on a Saturday. Fifthly, writs are to be returned not more than 90 days after their issue. The Bill also makes other specific provisions, such as that polls are to open at 8 a.m. and, for the first time, are to close at 6 p.m. for a Federal election. Finally, where a candidate dies before the time of nomination, the nomination time is to be extended for one day.

The Bill appears to be consistent with the Commonwealth Electoral Act. It does not remove the powers of the Governor of South Australia. It does not amend the Senate terms of office. It still means that senators elected at the 1984 elections will not be empowered to sit until July 1985. They will still hold office for a period of three years. All in all, although we support the passage of the legislation, because of the Government's intention that the State laws should line up with Federal legislation, at the same time the Opposition points out that the excuse that the Federal Government has given that it is necessary is simply a spurious one. We feel that it is an excuse for the Federal Government to hold an early election for the House of Representatives simultaneously with the Senate. Technically, although we believe that that is not necessary, the Opposition supports the legislation at the second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of this important measure.

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

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 October. Page 1520.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Opposition supports this legislation. As the Government would be aware, this was an initiative of the previous Liberal Government. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient time for this legislation to pass through this House prior to the last State election. However, during the preparation of this legislation I was concerned that the only avenue of appeal, if an approach to the Valuer General was unsuccessful, was a direct appeal to the Land and Valuation Division of the Supreme Court.

The reality of life is that the vast majority of people, particularly average home owners, are not prepared to go to the expense of, nor put themselves through, the uncertainties and unknowns involved with appealing or taking up the matter with the Supreme Court. While many legal authorities were of the view that this was not the case, if we look at the matter very closely and consider it carefully we will appreciate that most people are not prepared to go to that extent and would therefore accept by default the valuation determined by the Valuer General because of their not being prepared to incur the expense of going through the procedures involved with a Supreme Court appeal.

The Bill contains two additional matters to those presented to the House last year. First, it provides that the Minister can set the fee for valuations rather than its being determined by regulation. The Minister claims that there is a need to have flexibility, because at the moment the fee is determined on an *ad valorem* basis. In other words, it is determined by and added to the value of the cost involved; the valuation fee is directly related to the actual valuation that has been determined and not to the work and effort that have necessarily gone into that valuation.

Obviously, in many instances, the situation can arise where a comparatively low valued property may require a great deal of work and effort on the part of the valuer to determine the valuation. I have no real problem with that addition. However, I am still somewhat concerned about the amendment which will provide that legal counsel can be present at the tribunal hearings. The whole object of this legislation was to reduce to an absolute minimum the cost to the person concerned.

If the Valuer-General is to be represented by legal counsel at the tribunal hearings, quite obviously the person appearing before that tribunal will be virtually forced into the position, once again, of having to employ legal counsel. If this does occur, the matter should be further considered by Parliament. I am prepared to let it go at this stage to see how the matter works out in practice. However, certainly the original intention of the Bill I prepared was that there would be no legal counsel representing the Valuer-General, or the person appealing against the valuation which had been determined, purely for the purpose of trying to keep the cost to an absolute minimum. This provision has been changed by the present Government, and I trust that it has not been done purely to appease the legal profession. If it has, then certainly the person out in the street whom we are trying to protect will once again be the one who suffers.

The Opposition supports the Bill, but we will watch with keen interest to see the effect of the additional provisions that the Government has included in this legislation as compared with the initial drafting. If what I have suggested does come to pass, I believe that further amendments will have to be introduced to delete the provision whereby legal counsel can be engaged, because it leaves the person appealing with no alternative but to engage counsel if the Valuer-General is to be represented by counsel.

This will have the undesirable effect of significantly increasing the cost—exactly the opposite result to what we are trying to achieve in this legislation. I am prepared to see how this legislation works, but if it turns out the way I fear it may we would certainly be looking to introduce amendments to correct that.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Lands): I thank the honourable member for those comments. I apologise for the fact that the expedition with which we moved through

the Notice Paper this afternoon means that I missed the first few moments of his speech. However, as I understand it, the honourable member was giving general support to the Bill but questioning just whether the amendment to the original draft for which he was responsible does allow legal counsel to be present and will introduce complications and additional costs.

I have some sympathy for that, but I would hope that the verbiage which has finally found its way into the Bill will resolve the problem that we all fear, and that was the reason for the verbiage being as it was when he was Minister. Of course, I refer here to subclause (6) at page 3 of the Bill, which provides:

> The matters to be considered upon a review under this section shall be confined to questions of fact and shall not involve questions of law.

We have endeavoured in that drafting to have the best of both worlds: on the one hand, we accepted the argument that there was a degree of inequity in precluding one profession from such a review, namely, the legal profession. On the other hand, we also accepted that, if complicated questions of law were to be raised at that point, individuals would see some advantage in having legal counsel there, and costs would proportionately rise. So, what the Parliament is being asked to do is write into the legislation that the review to which this legislation addresses itself shall not include points of law. In those circumstances, ideally one might well wonder why anybody would want to be represented by legal counsel.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Regarding legal counsel, obviously the appellant has no alternative.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Again, I simply make the point that that is, of course, an administrative question for Government, and Government fully accepts that at this point in the process everything should be done to make it as simple and straightforward as possible and to ensure that only matters of fact are considered. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Valuation for departments etc.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Can the Minister indicate what the prescribed fee is likely to be? Is it likely to be, say, $10, $100 or $500? I appreciate the fact that the appellant will get back the prescribed fee if the review brings down a finding which has a variation of greater than 10 per cent one way or the other from that of the Valuer-General.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am afraid that I do not have that information for the Committee. The honourable member is correct in his identification of the process which would apply. However, I will certainly undertake to get that information.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I simply make the point that, with this legislation, that is an extremely important matter for the average householder. If people are appealing against their valuation because of the effect it will have on their council rates, water rates, and so forth: if at the moment there is no charge for appealing back to the Valuer-General; if people are now to be confronted with a fee for lodging an appeal to the tribunal; and, if it is to be $100, they will think very seriously about whether or not they can afford to appeal once again.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can certainly give a commitment to the honourable member that it will be nowhere near that level and that the Government would obviously be concerned to keep such fees to a minimum.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Insertion of new Divisions II, III and IV.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I come back to the matter of representation by legal counsel. Subclause (6) provides:

> The matters to be considered upon a review under this section shall be confined to questions of fact and shall not involve questions of law.

However, once again we have the situation where this process will be open not only to individuals, such as small home owners but also to companies, and it will mean that in many instances companies certainly will employ legal counsel. As a result of that, one will have the Valuer-General doing likewise, and there can be a carry-over of that principle, once it is established, in the Valuer-General's office. It could reach the stage where, just as a matter of course, the Valuer-General's office will engage counsel for virtually every hearing, and I believe that this will be to the great disadvantage of the small home owner for whom we are endeavouring to reduce costs.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If the matter proceeded in the way the honourable member represents, certainly it would be most unfortunate. I can see no reason why as a matter of course the Valuer-General should be represented by counsel in these proceedings. The Government's whole thrust is to ensure that the matter does not get bogged down in legal argument, and obviously where an individual or a company sought to bring legal counsel with them for whatever reason it may well be that the Government would want to be represented similarly.

However, I also make the point that we are here inviting Parliament to proscribe any opportunity for facts or matters of law to be raised at this point, and in those circumstances I would have thought that being represented by the honourable member, any of his colleagues on that side of the House or members on this side of the House might be no disability *viz a viz* representation by legal counsel.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Can the Minister indicate whether, in the event of the appellant (and I am still referring to the average householder) indicating to the Valuer-General that, having lodged his appeal, he intends to appear and not to engage his legal counsel, that would be a pretty fair indication to the Valuer-General that he should do likewise?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, I give that assurance.

Clause passed.

Clause 8, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 1521.)

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I support the general intent of this Bill. I suppose one could say that it has four specific purposes, all of which deal with trying to tidy up the administration of blood alcohol tests, or breath tests, for people who appear to have a positive alcohol reading whilst driving. I think that all of us would agree that a campaign was established by the previous Government under the random breath testing legislation to reduce the amount of driving under the influence in our community. That campaign has been at least partially successful, and all of us would support the principles of that campaign in what it has been said to achieve, effecting such a reduction.

In the operation of that campaign a number of problems have arisen. First, a person who subjects himself to or is asked to undertake an alcotest and who is found to have a negative test can still actually ask for a blood sample to be taken, and the police must comply. One might ask why a person, having received a negative alcotest, would deliberately want to ask for a blood sample to be taken. I understand

that people do that simply to cause nuisance to the police and to disrupt perhaps further random breath testing by the police at that particular location. So, the first proposed amendment would remove the right of a person who, having subjected himself to an alcotest, is found to have a negative reading then to ask to have a blood alcohol test taken.

In fact, it was a drafting anomaly when the legislation was first prepared, and it is a reasonable one to be changed now. The second amendment deals with the allocation by the court of costs involved in the transportation of people who, having refused to undergo a breath analysis test, are breaking the law. The court cannot allocate costs in terms of the transportation of that person in association with that test or the test that the person should have undertaken, and I believe that it is reasonable that the court be given that power to allocate such costs.

The third amendment in this Bill deals with the appearance of Crown witnesses who would have to testify whether or not the person in fact had a positive blood alcohol level. At present, those Crown witnesses mainly from the Department of Chemistry would be required to appear because at present no notice needs to be given that they would be required at the hearing. Under the proposed amendment, two days notice would be required. I believe that that is a reasonable provision, and certainly the Liberal Party would support it. The fourth amendment deals with the right of a person who has a positive alcotest reading and who is then subjected to breath analysis to insist, if the test is positive, that he have a blood alcohol test or sample taken for testing purposes by a particular medical practitioner.

It could well be that the alleged offence and both the alcotesting and the breath analysis testing had occurred, say, at Noarlunga and the person might say, 'Yes, I wish to have a blood alcohol test or a blood sample taken; my favourite doctor happens to be at Jamestown and I am afraid that the police will have to drive me to Jamestown for that blood sample to be taken.' That might sound ridiculous, but I understand that in practice that is occurring. Section 47f of the present Act requires the police in fact to facilitate in every way possible the taking of that blood sample. In other words, it would require police officers to drive the motorist with the alleged positive blood alcohol level to Jamestown to see the nominated doctor to have that blood sample taken.

That has two adverse affects. First, it takes the police who are doing the random breath tests away from the basic task for which they are primarily there for an extended period in the case of Jamestown as it would take some time to get to Jamestown or even to the other side of Adelaide if, say, the nominated doctor was at Elizabeth. Secondly, by the time one took the motorist with the alleged positive blood alcohol level to Jamestown—which might take four or five hours—there is no doubt that his blood alcohol level would have dropped, and the reading would not then apply.

The amendment will give the police the right, when a blood sample has to be taken, to take that person to the nearest appropriate hospital or medical practitioner for the taking of that blood sample. I believe that fundamental rights are involved and a person who has nominated that he wishes to have his blood sample taken has done so because he wishes to preserve his rights. I believe he has the right to have the medical practitioner or hospital of his choice, if that is within a reasonable time and distance. This proposal by the Minister would abolish that right completely.

I intend to move an amendment which will reinstate that right but at the same time make sure in preserving that right that the person is not destroying the effects of the Act and imposing a distance and a time which would make the taking of such a blood sample impractical and useless because the alcohol reading then taken would bear little resemblance to what it was at the time of the alleged offence. This Bill was not introduced until last Thursday afternoon and it is somewhat unusual to be debating legislation the next sitting day after it was introduced, but I do not mind that. However, my proposed amendment has not been prepared and I have asked that the Committee stage of the Bill be deferred until after that amendment has been drafted.

In preparing such an amendment we would want to make sure that it is workable and therefore it is important that the Parliamentary Counsel have an opportunity to check the drafting of the proposed amendment with the police who operate the random breath tests to make sure that the procedure written into the legislation matches the procedure adopted. As I understand it, the procedure is that a motorist is stopped at a random breath testing station or is picked up after an alleged offence. An alco-test reading would be taken immediately and, if it was positive, the person would be asked to submit to a breath analysis test. The breath analysis unit might be at that location, a nearby police station, or it might have to be summoned to the spot to enable that breath test to be carried out.

My proposal is that a maximum distance of perhaps 10 km would be a reasonable distance within which the doctor or hospital of choice would be situated. It could well be that the doctor might be outside that 10 km radius, in which case there would be nothing stopping the doctor driving to that point within 10 km of where the breath analysis was carried out, so that the blood sample could be taken. I originally suggested that the time limit of half an hour would be appropriate but in my discussions with the Minister he indicated that one hour might be a more reasonable time. In reaching a satisfactory compromise, I would be only too happy to make sure that such a time limit was set, provided that that does not interfere with the workings of the police. Again, that needs to be checked.

I am proposing that a motorist who has a positive alcotest reading and who has a positive breath analysis test does still have the right to choose his doctor or hospital for the taking of a blood sample but that the doctor or hospital must be within a radius of 10 km at the time of taking the blood sample so that police officers are not tied up for an extended period. I also propose that the blood sample must be taken within a reasonable period and I suggested 30 minutes as being reasonable. However, the Minister suggests that it should be 60 minutes and I am happy to accept that. I have issued instructions for amendments to be drawn up to that effect and I look forward to the support of all honourable members.

A Select Committee of the other place is sitting at the moment looking into the whole area of random breath testing. I am satisfied that the matters before us in no way cut across the proceedings of that Select Committee which is looking at the effectiveness of random breath tests and how their effectiveness and efficiency can be increased. No doubt matters before this House have been canvassed by that Select Committee but I think it is important, especially as the Select Committee is still sitting and is likely to sit for some time before it reports to the Upper House, that the legislation be amended as quickly as possible, especially as the Christmas 'silly' season, with its Christmas parties, is rapidly approaching. The last thing we want is a breakdown of the whole random breath testing and analysis system just before Christmas because of technical deficiencies in the legislation. I therefore support the Bill and urge the House to support my proposed amendment

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I thank the Opposition for its support of these amendments. I think we have made quite clear during the three years that random breath tests have been conducted that the Police Department

has encountered problems in its administration. These are minor amendments without affecting the major principles of the random breath test legislation in an endeavour to try to overcome some of those problems that have been encountered. I agree with most of the comments made by the member for Davenport. I think everyone will agree that, where the law is being flouted by those who are caught under this system, it is just a waste of time and taxpayers' money, and I am sure the services of our Police Force can be utilised in more essential areas than that.

The member for Davenport has indicated that he intends to move an amendment, and I am happy to give it consideration. We have discussed it, and I do not see any real problem with it. However, as the amendment has not been drafted yet I am agreeable to leaving further discussion until tomorrow or until we can talk further on it. That will give me the opportunity to make certain, with the Police Department, that it is workable. I believe the member for Davenport wishes to do that also. I have had my amendment circulated and I think it has the support of the Opposition.

In view of the delay with the Upper House Select Committee on the whole question of random breath testing, the fact that its report will not be handed down for another three or four weeks, and that that will not give us any time to have the necessary legislation drafted and put through its various stages before the House adjourns at the end of this year, my amendment seeks to extend existing legislation so that Parliamentary Counsel, as well as the Government and the Opposition, have the opportunity to give fullest consideration to whatever amendments are necessary. I do not think I need comment further. I thank the Opposition again for its support.

Bill read a second time.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to random breath tests.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CANNED FRUITS MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It has been drawn to my attention that the Hon. Lance Milne in another place has been making statements and assertions that are completely incorrect; in fact, they indicate total confusion in the Milne mind. As I was personally involved in those allegations, I take this opportunity of putting the record straight. On one occasion in this House I had to describe Mr Milne's approach as being similar to that of a jelly fish—not knowing which way to wobble. Unfortunately, that statement rather cut Mr Milne whom, at the personal level, I quite like. However, when it comes to this forum and members of Parliament say things which obviously indicate such total confusion of the mind, and when one's reputation is personally involved, one has no recourse but to put the record straight. Honourable members opposite may agree with the Hon. Mr Milne when he states:

The colossal price increases in natural gas which were agreed by the Tonkin Government and which are reflected in electricity tariffs are rapidly causing economic stagnation in South Australia. In fact, that has been obvious for some time. In 1983, the gas price was fixed at $1.01 per gigajoule, which is the basic unit for expressing energy value. It was further agreed by the Tonkin Government that the price in 1984 would be $1.33 per gigajoule and, for 1985, $1.62 per gigajoule . . .

It was then reported that Mr Milne went on to say:

In other words, the situation was bad enough at the time, but has changed drastically since the liquids pipeline was put through to Port Bonython with the enormous volume of oil . . . That is why I refer to the natural gas now as a by-product, which it is.

He went on to say:

These extreme prices and price changes were not accepted by the Australian Gas Light Company in New South Wales for their natural gas from the Cooper Basin, supplied from the same source.

He further stated that New South Wales pays less for its gas, and he talked about a three times yearly review of gas prices in New South Wales. That demonstrates the total confusion and complete inaccuracy of information fed to Mr Milne. He is a very pleasant man, indeed, but when it comes to making up his mind on questions of fact and the stance he should take in the Parliament, he tends to rely on information fed to him.

In this case I understand that the information came from Mr Ruler, of the Consumers Association. I do not know whether Mr Ruler is still with that Association, but he has made some statements, indicating the same degree of confusion that Mr Milne exhibits, in the *Teachers Journal.* Those statements were refuted by me. Subsequently, for political motives, the then controllers of the *Teachers Journal* re-ran this confused inaccuracy and Sir Norman Young, the Chairman of PASA (the Authority charged with negotiating gas prices), saw fit to refute in no uncertain terms what Mr Ruler was saying. Anyone who knows Sir Norman Young and his cutting wit and ability would understand that the reply was most scathing.

Mr Milne has been fed this load of garbage again and has regurgitated it, unfortunately without checking the facts. The gas price was not set at $1.01 and it was not the decision of the Tonkin Government. The price was $1.10. This large increase came about because the terms of the disastrous contracts, as I have described and will continue to describe them, were negotiated by the former Dunstan Government. The Tonkin Government could do nothing about those contracts except try to renegotiate them. We set about starting to do that, but the contracts dictated that there would be an annual arbitration—a stupid provision in anyone's language. Far be it from New South Wales having that arbitration three times a year, as Mr Milne suggests: they have an arbitration every three years. Perhaps that is what he was trying to say. They were smart enough to have this haggle about gas prices every three years.

What is more, the New South Wales Australian Gas Light Company was far smarter than were the original negotiators, in that any arbitration would not lead to retrospectivity. In other words, under the Dunstan contracts, if the arbitration took a year, the gas price would be made retrospective back

to the beginning of the previous year in which it fell due. In New South Wales they were far smarter—there was no retrospectivity.

For the Hon. Mr Milne to suggest that the Tonkin Government agreed to a price of $1.10 is plainly quite nonsensical: the contracts dictated that. However, the Tonkin Government and I, as Minister, were charged with trying to do something about it. We were faced with an enormous increase in price as a result of this stupid agreement, this stupid contract, and what could we do to ameliorate the effect of the $1.10 figure? It was an enormous increase, about an 80 cent increase from memory—it may have been even more—from the 60 cents odd to $1.10 (not the $1.01 which was the New South Wales price), another confusion in Mr Milne's mind. What could we do about it? We set about ameliorating this by negotiating with the producers, who legally had this price granted, to cut it back with the concurrence of all major users. I understand that Mr Milne on the second day burst forth suggesting that I, as Minister, had been taken to the cleaners. In fact, all the major consumers (the Electricity Trust, the Gas Company and Adelaide Brighton Cement) were involved and kept informed while I, on behalf of the Government, sought to negotiate some amelioration of this legally binding price which was granted by an arbitrator, and we were successful.

We had the retrospectivity removed, very largely, so that half the increase would apply. We negotiated that there would be no further increase in the subsequent year. Mr Milne has his dates confused, too. However, the award was made at the end of 1982. They reached agreement that they would not apply for an increase in 1983. So, the price was held steady. They agreed that they would spend at least $50 million on exploration solely for gas—an obligation that they had never had to fulfil in the past under Dunstan. We spent a lot of Government money and taxpayers' money in trying to find gas to satisfy the New South Wales contracts—a further absurd provision. The offsetting factor was that two price rises would be agreed in subsequent years (in the third and fourth years). I defy anyone (and if one asks anyone who was party to those negotiations one would realise this) to strike a better deal. They were absolutely adamant that they would not move any further than that, and the only weapon we had was a court challenge, which I had been told would fail. Of course, I did not tell them that at the time.

For the Hon. Mr Milne to make statements elsewhere, as reported to me, indicates the total confusion in his mind or at least a naive acceptance of material that is trotted out to him by people who are of doubtful repute and who have been taken to the cleaners by no less a person than Sir Norman Young for regurgitating *ad nauseaum* this material; this indicates to me a degree of childishness, naivety, and political naivety.

An honourable member: Political opportunism.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know about opportunism—I like Mr Milne personally. However, he is really out of his depth when he launches into these areas and particularly when he takes for his adviser someone as disreputable as Mr Ruler, whom I understand in his last effort attacked not only me and the Tonkin Government but also Santos, which I understand had sacked him some years previously and for which he had a degree of hatred. Santos, on legal advice, believed it had a case for taking Mr Ruler to court but it could not be bothered; it held him in such little esteem. I told Mr Milne that I would be rude to him in this grievance debate. We are on terms of friendship still, I believe: he was rude to me, and I put the record straight.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I wish to raise a matter which has been touched on several times in recent days and which concerns funding for TAFE colleges. The Minister has several times in this House mentioned the previous Government's performance in this area. I would like to state to him and to the House that right at this moment the students in the literacy classes and I do not care about what has happened previously—we are worried about here and now and we want the best for disadvantaged students right now.

I wish to touch on the subject of adult literacy, because it should be a specifically funded area and not one to be manipulated up and down in Budgets: it is a right of people and not a ball to be played up and down in Budgets. It is not a new matter. In the *News* of 29 March, the Minister is reported as saying that there is a new programme for teaching adult readers. He said:

> Although they know they can read, many still feel locked out of normal educational institutions.

That is very true. It is a discrimination to leave these people out of these courses. A further article in the *News* of 6 August states:

> . . . an estimated 50 000 South Australian adults are unable to read or write.

It goes on to talk about the closing of classes at the Elizabeth College. It is not the Elizabeth College that I am worried about, although it is obviously part of the same area of which I am speaking. The students at the Port Adelaide College have written to me, so I will use their college as an example. As I am on the college council and as it is in my electorate, since the expansion of the boundaries, I believe it is my duty to raise this matter. Not only students from Port Adelaide area attend this college: I have letters from people residing in Glenelg North, West Lakes Shore, Kidman Park, Rosewater, Largs Bay, Seaton, and Ethelton. These letters prove that the benefits that are available are appreciated and utilised by a very widely distributed cross-section of the people of South Australia, and the western region in particular.

I would like to quote from these letters, and I hope that *Hansard* will take these letters afterwards and put them into the record as they are written because it shows the difficulty that has been met by these people. The first letter states:

> I'm wondering if you could please consider the feeling towards the students, for I am one myself and I found it quite an achievement to be better educated and to be accepted in the community—

they are key words—

> and I think that's why I think they should continue, especially at Port Adelaide Community College.

This next letter is from a student at Glenelg North, who says that some students find it difficult to go into town. A further letter states:

> As I left school when I was 14 years old, my education was not completed and I always felt if the chance ever arose I would return to school.

This is important because it shows the age span of these people. The letter continues:

> This opportunity came early this year when I, at 43 years of age, began an evening class, learning English with the Adult Literacy Centre. If the classes are cut, some of us are going to be very disappointed. The point is why should some students, after having made a start to improve their learning to read and write, which are basic skills, be denied this right.

A further letter states:

> I am making progress and notice that's very helpful for me. Specially importent is our teacher. Since I did visit this class, my English is getting better and better.

It is the spelling that shows that these people are learning. The letter continues:

> Last year I went to Adjucation School in Curry Street, there where I started. But that was only the beginning and now I have

to improved my English. I do believe and don't be wrong, to stay in a different country, so to have command of this language. But how can I learn if the school will closing. I really do need my English lesson.

Another correspondent states:

It has helped me a lot to learn reading and spelling as I was a slow learner and had very little education, and not just for myself but for others in the same position as myself.

Another letter states:

I do attend two classes at the college, and that is the adult literacy and the numeracy on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and these classes are so important to me and many others with the same problem. As you can see why I do this course is because I didn't do well at primary and high school so I left when I was 16, so coming to these classes has enabled me to be more confident in myself and finding a job. I am 20 years old and I have been unemployed for 3½ years.

That is because of being unable to read and write. A further letter states:

I have been coming to the Port Adelaide college for 12 months trying to learn wright and understanding the meaning when I am reading. Maynly as I go to fill in forms. It is very inparassin to ask the people in the offices to fill in the forms and also to tell me what it means. I would like to keep learning as much as I can and understand my kids better than I do now.

Another correspondent states, in part:

It has helped me better in my career by being able to read and spell a bit better.

Another letter states:

I am 39 years old and it has taken me all this time to make the move to come back to class and learn all that I missed in primary school. Having parents who were uneducated and unable to help me made my schooling years a nightmare. I worked in a factory until I married and have never been confident mixing with people who could speak 'properly'. It is also very difficult when I can't help my daughter who is in grade 3 with her homework. You might not understand what hope this class is giving me as a person to be able to speak properly and to feel good on the inside.

That letter was from a 39 year old, another one who had to learn to read and write. I refer to another letter: it is printed and shows the difficulties that people have. I will not read it out. A 17 year old lad printed this letter in which the spelling is very inaccurate, although he is learning because he is going to the school. The last two letters that I have are the most important ones. One is from a gentleman who is about 40 years of age and who provides an outline of his life. He states:

I started so that I can improve myself in writing and spelling so that I can ... the classes that I had started in all arc welding. A week or two later I heard at the school that Port Adelaide is to be closed which has all the facilities it needs for these classes.

The other letter I have is from that man's wife in which she outlines the difficulties that her husband has had in his life, such as trying to speak to his children and to teach them properly as well as trying to get on with his job. In her letter his wife states:

During the past months, my husband's confidence has increased, and he has taken pride in his achievements. However, he still has a long way to go before he will have corrected the many spelling and grammatical errors he has been making for all of his life.

Those letters illustrate the type of people who are going to the courses. There are many people who are new to Australia and who are trying to learn English. There are people who have left school early in their life and who had no-one to help them when they were at school and consequently do not now have an adequate education. These are unrepresented people—people with no voice in the community. There are 50 000 of them across the South Australian community. They are not likely to march on Parliament House or picket like the demonstrators have done at Olympic Dam. They do not have the basic skills to communicate, and are being denied the right (and I stress the word 'right') to obtain these skills.

We talk, hear and read all the time (because it is our luck to have the skills to enable us to do so) about technology and the need to meet the challenges that are presented by change, but people without literacy skills are condemned to an existence limited by their ability to interpret the written word and to express themselves. Now we have the disappointing situation of people being denied more and more the ability to learn literacy skills to enable them to have the opportunity to do things in everyday life that we take for granted, such as reading and writing, so that they can understand what a ticket says, for example, or read a book.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): Like the previous speaker, I also want to address myself to the problems being experienced by many people in the community due to the Government's heartless reduction of funding for TAFE colleges. As members here would know, I have already raised this matter in relation to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE College on a number of occasions, in both questions to the Minister and debates. I am receiving much correspondence and many telephone calls from my constituents protesting at the Government's actions in reducing the staff and funding of TAFE colleges, in particular the Tea Tree Gully TAFE College. Amongst that correspondence I received what I would regard as the most poignant letter that I have ever had since becoming a member of Parliament. I want to read that letter into the record (using the spelling that the writer of the letter has used). Obviously I will not divulge the name of this constituent, who writes:

I was quiet surprised to read in the *Leader* Mesanger on October 17. and confirm by my teacher that the Adult Literacy programme will no longer ran at Tea Tree Gully College, next year.

There he is referring to an article published in the *North-East Leader* which was based on a copy of *Hansard* speeches that I had made in the House. The letter continues:

I am 18 and unemployed and find it hard to get a job. I have trouble filling out Apication forms properly, and end up missing out on the job because of bad writting. I feel that if I continue with Adult literacys classes, I would get a job or maybe even go on to futher education. I hope that you can do something about the situation because there is certenly a lot of Adultes that need it.

I think that that letter sums up in a nutshell what the Government has done to so many people. The member for Henley Beach finds this amusing. I shall point out to the honourable member once again what the Government has done to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE College. It has completely removed all Matriculation classes from the Tea Tree Gully TAFE College. There are no Matriculation classes available at the college. Also, there are none available at the Gilles Plains college. That makes a mockery of what the Minister of Education said to me during the Budget Estimate Committee proceedings, namely, that it did not matter that these programmes were not available at Tea Tree Gully because some students find it an advantage to travel to other colleges.

In the north-eastern suburbs we have two colleges—Tea Tree Gully and Gilles Plains—neither of which offers Matriculation courses. Any student who wishes to undertake Matriculation in the City of Tea Tree Gully, once he or she has left school, has to travel to either Elizabeth or Kilkenny. What do honourable members consider my constituents think of that! Tea Tree Gully college no longer has any business studies, and there has been a reduction of 25 per cent in the number of business study courses at the Gilles Plains college. What do the people in my area do who want to go on and improve themselves so that they can work better in their employment and also, of course, undertake their own businesses, and so on?

There are no women's studies any more at the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. This is a Government that says it believes in helping the disadvantaged, in ensuring equal opportunities and helping women. What do we have at Tea Tree Gully, the biggest and fastest growing area in the metropolitan area? We find that we have no women's studies, either, and we find that the Government is reducing the funding that enables the handicapped to undertake programmes at TAFE.

Again, the member for Henley Beach found this amusing. When I got this letter from my constituent I just sat there and looked at it: it hit me really hard. Here is an 18-year-old kid who is trying to improve himself and who has been attending adult literacy programmes, yet there is no adult literacy programme available to him any more at the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. What does this kid do? That is a question he has asked me. I ask the Minister: what does he do? He is frustrated; he is trying to improve himself; and he has obviously led a life where he has been nowhere near as fortunate as most of us in this place today.

He probably left school early for a reason I do not know as yet. Whatever the reason, this kid is trying to improve himself. He has obviously been refused employment. When one has hundreds of applications coming into a company, and if one had received a letter like this when one was working for a company—and for a time I was in a position to employ people in a company—the first thing one would do is look at the application. Those applications that have spelling mistakes, and in which people cannot express themselves, would obviously not be considered for any position that requires writing or record keeping. Those people would be the first to receive a letter back saying, 'Unfortunately, your application has been unsuccessful.' This kid has obviously had that happen to him.

One cannot blame an employer—and I am not being critical of this boy in any way, shape or form—when he gets a letter like this when hundreds of applicants are seeking jobs, if the employer writes back and says, 'In this instance, your application has been unsuccessful.' This boy has obviously tried to get a job. He has had letters come back saying, 'You have missed out.' He has taken the trouble to ring up to find out why he has missed out and has been told that his application was not up to standard. So, what does he do? Does he sit back, go on the dole and do nothing? No, he goes to Tea Tree Gully TAFE and enrols to undertake an adult literacy programme to improve his literacy skills so that he can fill in application forms, spell and write properly.

What is he now told—that the Government is going to reduce staffing and funding to the Tea Tree Gully college—'We are terribly sorry, but we can no longer provide you with the course you were previously undertaking.' This is but one letter. The previous speaker read out a number of letters. I would be staggered if members opposite had not received as many letters as my office has received about what is going on in the TAFE colleges at the moment. It goes on and on, letter after letter, phone call after phone call, not from politically motivated students but from students who want to undertake courses.

At Tea Tree Gully TAFE no longer can students undertake Matriculation, business studies or women's studies. Another constituent rang me to tell me that he was undertaking a course at another college (Regency Park) which was conducting the only course of its kind in South Australia. It was a course that his employer required him to undertake. However, he has been given a letter stating that that course will no longer be continued—the only programme of its kind in South Australia! What does that person do—write to another State to get a correspondence programme he could undertake? It is just not good enough. The present members of the Government raised all sorts of red herrings concerning the previous Government's alleged cuts in education funding. It did nothing compared to what this Government is doing in the TAFE area.

The previous Government's record is one which, if we had not had such misleading attacks put out by the then Opposition, would have been seen for what it was worth. Unfortunately, Government members do not believe in the truth. Now they have come to power they are doing far worse in the reduction of funding and staffing in the TAFE area. It is something for which this Government stands condemned, not only in the eyes of the Opposition but the community in general.

Motion carried.

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 31 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 October 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ENERGY GENERATION

47. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: When will a decision be made on energy generation options for South Australia, taking into account the recommendations of the Stewart Committee?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Advisory Committee on Future Electricity Generation Options recommended a strategy for meeting South Australia's needs to the year 1996. The strategy is designed to deal with a broad range of possible circumstances. Uncertainties, particularly in respect of changes to the rate of growth in demand for electricity and the likelihood of achieving a satisfactory supply and price for gas, as well as the high cost of making premature capital commitments, require that flexibility be maintained. The strategy involves progressing the major options to the point where their implementation can be rapidly effected at the time they are needed. This process has been managed to create the competitive situation between options which is necessary to ensure the State obtains the most economic energy supplies. Decisions, depending on the final combination of options chosen, will be made at the appropriate time to fit into the then existing demand and supply scenario.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

146. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: What has been the cost of workers compensation in the Public Buildings Department for each of the past four years?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The information is as follows:

1980-81—$1 034 899
1981-82—$1 069 401
1982-83—$1 308 097
1983-84—$1 384 900

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

147. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What has been the cost of workers compensation in the State Transport Authority for each of the past four years?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The reply is as follows:

Direct Employees

1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
$0.62 million	$0.87 million	$1.25 million	$1.1 million

Australian National employees seconded to the State Transport Authority

1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
$0.61 million	$0.74 million	$0.83 million	$0.81 million

ROAD PENALTIES

150. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many road fatalities were there in South Australia in 1982 and 1983, respectively?

2. How many injuries resulting in permanent incapacity occurred from road accidents in 1982 and 1983, respectively, and how many of these victims are still requiring hospitalisation?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. 1982—270; 1983—265.

2. No such data is available.

SPEED LIMIT

151. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the estimated cost of changing all 110 km/h signs to 100 km/h?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Approximately 1 000 signs on roads for which the Highways Department is responsible would have to be changed or replaced, this depending on the condition of individual signs. The estimated cost of this is from $35 000 to $65 000, depending on whether alteration or replacement is required. I cannot say what the cost would be with respect to such signs on council roads.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

JOB CREATION SCHEMES

In reply to **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: A total of 4 030 persons were employed in South Australia in the Wage Pause Programme and the Community Employment Programme job creation schemes in 1983-84. To the end of September 1984, 5 173 persons were involved in job creation schemes in South Australia. The number of these persons who have found full time work since their participation in the schemes has not been determined. However, the job creation units own internal evaluation and the evaluation of the Bureau of Labour Market Research will provide indicators as to the proportion of job creation scheme participants who do subsequently obtain full time employment.

EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

In reply to the **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Approximately 28 011 persons in South Australia ceased receiving unemployment benefits and returned to work in 1983-84. An approximate figure only can be provided as Department of Social Security collects its data in four week cycles which do not exactly coincide with the commencement and completion of the financial year.

COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

In reply to **Mr ASHENDEN.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: An officer from the Department of Labour has discussed the participation of the Tea Tree Gully council with a senior officer of the council. Those discussions and a subsequent letter of confirmation from the council indicate that all of the council's problems with the scheme have been of a minor administrative nature and have been satisfactorily resolved in consultation with officers of the Community Employment Programme Secretariat.

WOMEN'S TASK FORCE ON EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr ASHENDEN.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No written submissions were received by the Women's Task Force on Employment and Unemployment. Accordingly, the expenditure which would be necessary to collate and release the statistical data cannot be justified.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT

In reply to **Mr PLUNKETT.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Shearers Accommodation Act was assented to in 1975, and since that time there have been 75 complaints and 2 prosecutions. On investigation of the complaints it has been found that 54 could be substantitated as being justified and 21 could not be substantiated. A breakdown of the statistics is set out in the following table:

Year	Total	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated
1975	14	9	5
1976	7	4	3
1977	9	9	0
1978	11	5	6
1979	12	8	4
1980	4	4	0
1981	6	6	0
1982	5	4	1
1983	5	3	2
1984	2	2	0
	75	54	21

The two prosecutions took place in September 1977 and August 1978. There have been other instances where it appeared that prosecutions would have to be necessary but these have been avoided by the property owners either complying with requirements on notices or alternatively employing locals who travel out from their own homes each day.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE SECURITY

In reply to **Hon. PETER DUNCAN.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: A record of incidents requiring police attention in the vicinity of Government House is not maintained, and I am therefore unable to give precise figures. It is true, however, that such incidents are rare and those that have occurred in the last 12 months have been without any particular significance. The current police establishment at Government House is six constables. Five members are necessary to maintain a 24 hour police presence at the Government House Guard Room. Their primary function is to provide general security of Government House grounds and policing of persons entering and leaving via the main entrance gate. They also provide a telephone service to Government House outside normal office hours. The sixth member works a permanent day shift providing a week day service to the Government House staff involving office and despatch duties. A review of this latter posting was made last year when it was decided that the matter would be further assessed when the present incumbent retires from the Force in about 18 months time.

CRIME STATISTICS

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: As indicated by the Commissioner, Mr Hunt, in his immediate personal response to the question asked by the honourable member, it is generally inadvisable to attempt comparison of increases in levels of crime in the various State jurisdictions for a variety of reasons. These include such factors as the lack of uniformity in counting procedures and the incompatibility of classification of offences within the various jurisdictions. In order to provide a meaningful response to the question raised, however, a detailed study has been made of five selected offences reported in those States where comparable statistics are available for the ten year period 1974-1983. The selected offences are homicide, serious assault, robbery, break and enter and larceny. These offence categories are representative of violent and property crime. The offence of rape has been excluded from the study because of the significant variation between States in the definition of rape and in counting procedures. For similar reasons, other offences categories have been excluded for the purposes of this study.

In essence, the picture which emerges from a study undertaken is that the level of reported crime in each of the five selected offence categories has risen during the ten years 1974-83 in all States included in this analysis. The Commissioner has stressed that it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusion from comparative studies of this kind.

REIMBURSEMENT OF LEGAL COSTS

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Although some time ago the frequency of private prosecutions instituted against police officers did become a matter for concern, the current situation is that this type of action is rare. The question of the adequacy of the costs reimbursed by the Government has arisen when the Crown Solicitor has had occasion to refuse to certify all costs incurred as 'reasonable'. Obviously, there must be some mechanism to ensure that exhorbitant legal fees are not incurred and this form of control is provided in policy guidelines approved by Cabinet. These guidelines relate to all Government employees. The guidelines provide that, in the event of dispute as to the reasonableness of the costs claimed, the legal practitioner's costs and expenses shall be taxed, pursuant to the Legal Practitioners Act, 1981. The amount so taxed shall be binding on the Government and the legal practitioner. It would seem that adequate procedures are now in force to safeguard the interests of the individual on the one hand and the Government on the other.

POLICE INJURIES

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is pointed out that 79 per cent of the active strength of the Force are considered as 'operational'. That is to say, the number of personnel who have frequent contact with the public approximates 2 660, which includes uniform patrols, inquiry units, detectives, traffic police and a number of smaller specialist units. Statistical records maintained by the Department show the number of assaults on police members during the past four financial years to be as follows:

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
No. of assaults	696	711	731	894

Note: These statistics are offence-based, not victim-based. Consequently, an individual member may suffer multiple assaults in the one incident but in the counting procedures each assault is counted as a separate case.

It can be seen from the 1983-84 figures quoted that an approximate assault rate is one in three operational police but, having regard to the counting procedures mentioned in the explanatory note, this does not mean that one in every three operational police were actually assaulted. The injury rate for assaulted members during the last four financial years is shown in the following table:

	FINANCIAL YEAR			
	80/81	81/82	82/83	83/84
% of assaults resulting in injury to an officer	53%	49%	56%	46%
% of assaults resulting in injury to an officer, but no medical treatment required	40%	37%	46%	34%
% of assaults resulting in officer requiring medical treatment	11%	11%	8%	11%
% of assaults resulting in officer being hospitalised	1.5%	0.6%	1.5%	0.6%

These statistics show that approximately half the members who were assaulted were injured in some way and that just under one quarter of those injured required medical treatment, that is, about 10 per cent of assaults on police resulted in treatment being required.

The Department has been monitoring the situation for several years and action has been taken, principally through the recruit training programme, to instil amongst members a great awareness of the dangerous situations which can face them in active police work and thus bring about preventative measures on the part of the individual.

ARSON

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Officers from the Fire Prevention Division of the Metropolitan Fire Service are rostered to carry out fire cause investigations at incidents of significance, which require more detailed examination documentation than is possible for operational officers. During 1983-84, 147 investigations of this nature were conducted, 97 of which were determined as malicious ignition. The fire cause investigation sub-programme of fire prevention is estimated to cost $66 000 for wages and allied costs in 1984-85, with an additional $13 000 being required to purchase a vehicle equipped for these investigations. Some four years ago, the Police Department conducted an in-depth study of its capacity to deal with an apparent rising incidence of arson. As a consequence, action was taken to up-grade the formal training in arson investigation of detectives likely to be called upon to investigate this type of crime.

A comprehensive 'Arson Investigator's Course' has been developed and since its inception some 120 detectives have been trained in the specialist skills required to carry out arson investigations effectively. In addition, members of the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service, as well as interestate police forces, have been participants in the course. This type of training is now an on-going part of the Department's in-house training programme.

In addition to these training initiatives action has been taken to establish close liaison between the parties involved including the insurance industry. This has culminated in the creation of the South Australian Liaison Group which represents the various interested disciplines. The group meets regularly in Adelaide. At the present time, the liaison group is negotiating to conduct a major training exercise in arson investigation.

STATE DISASTER EXERCISE

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The recent State Disaster Exercise, code named 'Exercise Shake Up II', was an unqualified success. From the point of the State Emergency Operations Centre, a notable feature of the exercise was the spirit of liaison and co-operation between the various emergency service groups taking part in the operation. One of the purposes of an exercise of this kind is to test the effectiveness of contingency plans. In this regard the operation was successful and a number of minor procedural matters identified in debriefing sessions will receive attention before the next such exercise. A factor which needs to be addressed is the location of the communications centre. The communications area within the Emergency Operations Centre does become congested and the noise levels are distracting. Some concern has been expressed about the centre itself in terms of its ability to withstand earthquakes.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAINING

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The proposed 1984-85 costs for training within the Metropolitan Fire Service are $360 000. This figure is based on—

	$
Wages and Allied Costs	286 000
Division and General Overhead Operating Expenditure	74 000
	360 000

This training includes recruit courses, breathing apparatus training, two day in-service courses, first-aid certificate training and promotional and induction courses.

FIRE PREVENTION

In reply to **Mr BECKER.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service is not the 'authority' responsible for deciding the standard of fire safety to be employed in restaurants, nightclubs or places of public entertainment. This power is vested with the Inspector of Licensed Premises under the Licensing Act, 1967-1974, and Chief Inspector under the Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913-1955. The Fire Prevention Division of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service has files on 321 of these premises in which recommendations on various aspects of fire safety have been forwarded to the owner/occupier and/or the inspector. These recommendations are not mandatory unless acted upon by the appropriate inspector referred to above. Since July 1983, 22 premises in these categories have received recommendations from the Fire Prevention Division.

MOTOR REGISTRATION RECORDS

In reply to **Mr BECKER.**

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Registrar of Motor Vehicles advises that the Motor Registration Division records can

only be as accurate as the information which is supplied to them by vehicle owners and driver licence holders. If the ownership of a vehicle changes and the Registrar is notified then the change is recorded normally within seven days of its receipt. The Police Department has a microfiche record of the master file records and they receive daily amendments to this file. When the Motor Registration Division installs the new on-line computer system, which is currently being developed, its records will instantly be updated as soon as the information is keyed into the system. It is planned that the Police Department will have access to the system.