HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 31 October 1985

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VICTIMS OF CRIME) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: CRIME

A petition signed by 109 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to increase the penalties for crime, provide greater resources to the police, and reject the automatic release of prisoners was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answers to questions without notice, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

DRUG REHABILITATION UNIT

In reply to **Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (24 October).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: My colleague the Minister of Health has advised that prior to seeking Cabinet approval the Chairman and Acting Chief Executive Officer of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council (DASC) met with the Mayor, Town Clerk and the Town Planner of the District Council of Strathalbyn on 4 September to discuss the proposed use of the Croxton Park property. On 16 September 1985 the Chairman and Acting Chief Executive Officer attended a full council meeting at Strathalbyn and explained the proposed establishment of a therapeutic community in the Strathalbyn area. At both meetings with the Strathalbyn council, officers of DASC received a positive indication of support in principle to the proposed rehabilitation facility. On 23 September 1985 Cabinet approved the purchase of the property known as 'Croxton Park' at Ashbourne at the price of up to $205 000. Cabinet approval was given to proceed with the purchase prior to obtaining full planning consent for use. It was also indicated that, should consent not be forthcoming, the property would be resold. DASC's planning consultants have indicated that this process was the most appropriate course to follow.

On 7 October 1985 settlement occurred and the amount of $205 000 was paid for the purchase. DASC obtained two valuations on the property, one from R.J. Taylor and Associates Services Pty Ltd, Property Management and Valuation Consulting Services, for the amount of $210 000 and one from the Valuer-General for the amount of $195 000. The current status is that the property has now been transferred and purchased in the name of the South Australian Health Commission and DASC is currently preparing a submission in order that planning consent can be obtained. It is intended to establish a long-term drug-free residential rehabilitation program catering for clients and where appropriate their families.

Clients who elect to participate in this drug-free program and who have been assessed as suitable for the program will enter into a contractual agreement following satisfactory detoxification. In other words residents will have undergone a comprehensive appraisal, including physical, social and psychological assessments, will be free of drugs and committed to long-term change. They will also be required to have shown that they are responsible and responsive to the country environment. There will be strict rules and guidelines which clients must adhere to as part of their contractual obligations with the centre.

The Drug and Alcohol Services Council intends to maintain the property as a grazing property and to ensure that the current high standard of facilities is maintained. As previously indicated the Chairman and Acting Chief Executive Officer of DASC met with the Mayor, Town Clerk and the Town Planner of the District Council of Strathalbyn on 4 September to discuss the proposed use of the 'Croxton Park' property. On 16 September 1985 the Chairman and Acting Chief Executive Officer attended a full council meeting at Strathalbyn and explained the proposed establishment of a therapeutic community in the Strathalbyn area. At both meetings with the Strathalbyn council, officers of DASC received a positive indication of support in principle to the proposed rehabilitation facility.

In addition, letters were distributed to local residents through the Ashbourne Post Office, clearly explaining the DASC position and intentions. The Chairman and Acting Chief Executive Officer of DASC will also be attending a public meeting which has been called for 1 November at 8 p.m. at Ashbourne to explain the proposed use of the property and to allay the community's anxieties. The Strathalbyn council and its District Clerk are fully aware that DASC is required to make application for consent to use the property and that members of the community will be able to follow traditional processes in voicing their opinions once application for planning consent has been made.

COUNCIL RATES

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

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: My colleague the Minister of Local Government has advised the following in reply to the question asked by the member for Ascot Park concerning council rates. Recently some councils in NSW have exercised a discretion available to them under the NSW Local Government Act 1919 to introduce incentives for the early payment of rates in 1984. The Waverly council is one of these.

Generally, two types of schemes are used. In the first, the council provides a reward such as a holiday trip and the cost of which it underwrites through section 504 of the Local Government Act. This section allows councils to expend one per cent of rate revenue for purposes 'not authorised but not expressly prohibited' by the Act. In these cases the council presumably estimates that the advantages in terms of improved cash flow and lower administrative costs of following up outstanding rates offset the cost of the prize.

The second scheme in NSW involves the council entering into an arrangement with a second party, a bank, travel agency or a similar organisation whereby the second party underwrites the cost of the prize and in return gains publicity or similar benefit. In South Australia at present the Local Government Act does not envisage incentives of the first kind. There is no reason, however, why councils cannot enter into agreements with another party as in the second scheme, provided appropriate licences are obtained. At this

stage no requests for amendments to legislation have been made.

Nevertheless, the rating and financial provisions of the Local Government Act are currently being reviewed in the second stage of the Local Government Act revision. It is hoped that a Bill from the review will be presented to Parliament next year. The timing and payment of rates will certainly be covered in that review.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Long Service Leave (Building Industry Board)—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1985.

South Austalian Waste Management Commission—Report, 1984-85.

State Transport Authority—Report of the S.T.A. Pension Scheme and Superannuation Scheme, 1984-85.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOR VEHICLE SALES

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier make immediate representations to the Federal Treasurer about the impact of the Commonwealth's fringe benefits tax on motor vehicle sales in South Australia? I have had discussions this week with four of South Australia's major motor vehicle retailers. All are expressing serious concern about the impact on sales of the new tax on company cars. One has already had more than 100 orders cancelled or deferred while a number of major companies such as Hardys, Ad Steam and Elders IXL, for example, have also announced their intention to stop adding to their vehicle fleets.

As about 50 per cent of all new cars and station wagons retailed in South Australia are company owned, this tax has serious implications for South Australia. Whilst there is an impact already at the retail level, which accounts for about two-thirds of total employment in the automotive industry of some 140 000 people, the most significant effect at the manufacturing level is likely to be felt by GMH, Ford and Mitsubishi rather than the importers, and this also foreshadows serious problems for South Australia in particular.

A loss of some 40 000 motor vehicle sales will hurt employment in South Australia from a section of industry that has lost some 14 200 jobs over the past two years. The Vehicle Builders Union is already circulating a petition in South Australia calling on the Federal Government not to proceed with this tax. I ask the Premier whether he is now prepared to review his support for this tax and make strong representations to the Treasurer, Mr Keating, in view of the fact that the tax is already affecting sales in South Australia, and will in the short term start to hurt and affect jobs in this State.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition has a fairly short memory, because he will be aware that before the federal tax package was announced certain representations were made by me to the Federal Government. In fact, I wrote to the Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce (Senator Button) pointing out to him the problems that could arise in the motor vehicle industry and asking that they—

Mr Olsen: You still supported the tax.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can see it is not a short memory: it is just that the Leader of the Opposition keeps shouting through the answers and does not listen. That is probably why he missed the fact that I made these representations before it was imposed. Subsequently I have had discussions with the Federal Treasurer and with the Minister. We are doing an assessment of the impact on the industry. I might add that there is still some doubt about the actual impact that will take place. Indeed, as recently as yesterday I was talking with a representative of one of our manufacturers who said that they could not assess the situation and that, although they knew there had been an early reaction to it that seemed to result in the cancellation of forward orders, they thought that position might be restored.

It was further stated that some of our local manufacturers might in fact benefit as against imported vehicles, but it was still too early to say. As far as the State Government is concerned, we have a brief to protect our manufacturing industry in this State including our vital motor vehicle manufacturing industry. We will do so to the utmost of our power, but we will do it on a solid basis of fact and not simply by airy rhetoric, because that will not get us anywhere. We are working with the industry to ensure that the impact is properly judged and, as I said some time ago in my letter to Senator Button, there is no point in having a vehicle industry plan, which has been introduced by the Federal Government, which is proving successful, and which has provided benefits to the South Australian component of that important industry if the effect is destroyed by a tax regimen that results in dislocation of that industry, so our position has been made quite clear on this matter.

We must remember that we are talking against a background of record motor vehicle sales. There is an inevitable levelling off and, if this tax has the effect of driving the sales down further, that will be very damaging to this State's economy. The South Australian Government will continue to rigorously ensure that we work to protect that industry.

COMMUNITY HOUSING PROGRAM

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction explain the nature of the local government community housing program? Recently, under that program the Marion council was awarded a $15 000 grant to research housing needs of the aged and disabled in the local area. In my opinion, because of the large number of aged people in the council area, which takes in part of my electorate, this is a most appropriate grant. I ask the Minister to inform the House of the objectives of the program and how it came about.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Brighton for her question. I recognise, as I think the whole House recognises, her interest in this area of aged accommodation. I congratulate her on the excellent speech that she made last night in relation to the problem of housing the aged. It is true that the Marion council is one of several councils that is taking advantage of the local government community housing program.

The House would be well aware that this program was introduced as part of the new, and I would like to say historic, Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement that was negotiated last year between the Hawke and Bannon Governments. When dealing in those negotiations with the local government community housing program, this State insisted that a certain percentage of the money coming into the

States be allocated to research rather than bricks and mortar. The Marion council is a typical case of a council using part of the money for research, because it was our view that, where councils identified particular needs through research, then the private sector would put money in and therefore subsidise the tremendous amounts of money put in by this State Government.

We have recognised that there are many organisations within the community, in line with the local government community housing program, that will be motivated to provide accommodation for the aged, the infirm and for those certain sections that are otherwise missing out and would have to go to the private sector to obtain loans, or put their names down on the Housing Trust waiting list.

That is one of the highlights of this scheme. The program is in its second year. It has proved within this State, Victoria and New South Wales (all with Labor Governments, I might add) to be very successful. We have always maintained that the amount of money given to the States is insufficient. However, I have always accepted the Federal Government's argument that this was only the first year, and in the second year we will see whether the program is successful—at which time the amount allocated to the States will be reviewed.

The project which is being undertaken by the Marion council, and to which the honourable member refers, indicates that the program is very successful indeed. I think that, apart from the increased funding that we obtained from the Commonwealth Government as a result of the renegotiation of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, the local government community housing program is something that this Labor Government should be extremely proud of. I remind the House that we will not be resting on our laurels. Next year—in our second term of office—we will continue Labor's attack on poverty related housing needs. It is an attack that this caring Government will not stop. We will continue until we have solved the problem.

The Liberal Opposition continues to proclaim that an election is due, but we have yet to see its housing policy, apart from the glossy pamphlet in the *Sunday Mail*. I suggest that the Opposition should sit down this weekend and try to come up with a housing policy that it can put to the people of South Australia. However, knowing the Opposition as I do and given that it is completely bereft of ideas to help the needy, the aged and the infirm I doubt whether it will come up with anything.

STAMP DUTY

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: My question is to the Premier and is supplementary to that asked by the Leader of the Opposition. Has the Premier asked Treasury to assess the potential impact on stamp duty collections of the Commonwealth's new tax on company vehicles? Last financial year the State Government collected $23 million in stamp duty on the sale of new cars and station wagons. As half of all new vehicles sold are company owned, any significant downturn in sales caused by the new fringe benefit tax has important implications on State revenue collections.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is 'Yes'; the implications of the federal tax package are being studied in detail by Treasury to determine the impact on State finances.

AIR POLLUTION

Ms LENEHAN: Is the Deputy Premier aware of a statement by a spokesperson from the Friends of the Earth claiming that a 240 per cent increase in air pollution will result from the Grand Prix? The spokesperson claims that this information was obtained from minutes of the Clean Air Committee. Can the Minister say whether the minutes of the Clean Air Committee support this alarmist allegation?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I believe that over the years the Friends of the Earth has done very good work in publicising environmental problems and suggesting avenues of attack on those problems. Therefore, when representatives from Friends of the Earth make irresponsible statements and quote statistics out of context, that saddens me somewhat. I do not like to see people whom I would like to regard as allies being discredited in the eyes of the public as a result of irresponsible attitudes and statements. I guess that when we are looking at air pollution measurements and increases in air pollution measurements we must determine a benchmark for comparison. If, for example, the monitoring equipment is placed in the exhaust of a motor vehicle, it is not surprising that there will be a 1 000 per cent increase, or even higher. Of course, that does not really mean anything. I think a proper basis for comparison would be the percentage increase in emissions that is likely to occur in an area *vis-a-vis* what we normally experience in the central business district of Adelaide.

An attempt has been made to determine that matter. It is conservative in the sense that it probably overstates the case, because it assumes that the emissions will be 10 times those of an uncontrolled passenger car—uncontrolled in the sense that there is no control on the emissions from the vehicle. We regularly take data from the city, particularly in relation to the levels of carbon monoxide and the oxides of nitrogen. In this case we need to look at carbon monoxide, the oxides of nitrogen and the hydrocarbons. Work has been done to predict what the immediate effect would be, but more importantly, the increase over what we have come to expect in Hindley Street, King William Street, and all those areas where daily we are able to tolerate some level of emission from motor vehicles.

When we look at that background, we find that the probable increase on those levels is as follows: for carbon monoxide 3.8 per cent, for the oxides of nitrogen, about 7.1 per cent, and for the hydrocarbons, about 2.2 per cent. On the absolute figures for Victoria Park, the highest is for carbon monoxide, but we must remember, as any high school chemistry student could tell us, that carbon monoxide is dangerous only where it is in an environment where the natural oxidisation process to carbon dioxide cannot occur. That is why, from time to time, people are concerned where there are higher levels than we would expect in places like Hindley Street, which is a fairly confined environment.

However, at Victoria Park, which is an open environment with breezes sweeping across (one would hope that they might be gentle breezes on sunny days for the weekend), one would expect that the carbon monoxide would oxidise quite rapidly indeed. I make the plea that, when looking at statistics, people must look at them on a realistic basis. Taking account of all the predictions that we can make from the information that we have, there will be absolutely no deleterious effects on the environment of the city as a result of emissions from the Formula One motor vehicles.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy report to the House on the progress of the Roxby Downs project? According to the Premier's timetable, the joint venturers should have made a commitment to the project before now. In the paper entitled 'Employment aspects of the 1985-86 budget', presented to Parliament on 29 August, the Premier stated:

A formal commitment to the initial mining project by the joint venturers is likely in September 1985.

The Premier also presented a timetable in relation to production. He said that gold production would begin in mid-1987 and that copper and uranium production would start 12 months later—a pretty good mirage in the desert. Because the Premier's expectation has not been fulfilled, I ask the Minister whether he has had any recent discussions with the joint venturers and, if he has, whether he can tell the House if a commitment to the initial project is imminent.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I suspect that the Deputy Leader is trying to make some capital out of what might well be a simple typographical error, because, if we substitute 'December' for 'September', with everything else remaining as it is, it all falls into place. So, I think that is really all that the Deputy Leader's vast research activities have unearthed. The situation was that in an arrangement between the joint venturers, BP and Western Mining, there was a six month period after the feasibility economics, etc, had been accepted in which they were, in effect, able to consider their position.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It is in the indenture.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, it is referred to in the indenture as well. I am pleased to see that the Deputy Leader's memory functions accurately and fairly on occasions. That usually happens when it will present the honourable member in some creditable light. However, I suppose that that is not a particularly unique human trait, so I do not quarrel with him in that regard. I have been in Opposition, so I know that one can feel quite wistful and be happy to pick up what little crumbs one can. I am sorry that the honourable member will have another three years of that very shortly, but unfortunately that is the position he is in.

As far as I am aware, we are on time in regard to the other dates that were given. I was asked whether I could give any information. I remind the honourable member that there was a reference to the Public Works Standing Committee not so long ago in relation to the preparation that is necessary for some of the infrastructure that will be required at the site. The six months period to which I refer will be up by 6 December, and of course 7 December is quite an important date in history. On or before 6 December I look forward to hearing from the joint venturers that they are taking this further step and expanding even more the currently buoyant South Australian economy.

CHILD ENTERTAINERS

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Community Welfare investigate the conditions of engagement of children in the entertainment industry? I have been provided with a fairly large amount of information from Actors Equity indicating a considerable degree of exploitation, both potential and actual, of children in relation to hours worked and conditions of employment in the entertainment industry. I should say from the outset that children who actually perform roles are generally treated with some considerable care and have, on occasion, been provided with child-care facilities or a tutor. However, children who work as extras are not so well treated.

I am informed that a great deal of their day is spent waiting around, when on location often in harsh climatic conditions. It is rare for child-care facilities to be made available for child extras. I am told also that a 10-hour day is not uncommon for children in this industry. I have been provided with various examples, which indicate the hours spent not necessarily engaged in work but in their being required either to stand around or to wait for the relevant part of the film. On one day a 13 year-old child was engaged from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.—and again I hasten to stress that these children are not necessarily working during those hours—and there was one hour for lunch. Another 13-year-old worked from 6.30 p.m. to 1 a.m.; a three-year-old, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.; a 10-year-old, from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.; a 3-year-old from 9.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m.; and a 15-year-old from 6.30 p.m. to 1.30 a.m.

Although these examples refer to the feature film *Beattie Bow*, I am told that these examples of hours worked can occur in relation to any film produced in South Australia or on any television set. I am also told that another major problem relates to child-care facilities, as I said earlier. Children are often left at sets or on locations. Parents have found themselves in situations where they have decided to stay but there have been problems with the parents obtaining meals, particularly on locations: they have been told that they must pay for meals, even though they are there in the role of free child-care providers. On location meals are available only through the catering arrangements that are made by the producer.

I am also told that in South Australia (and I have examined this) there is no specific legislation regulating the employment of children in the entertainment industry. There is some piecemeal legislation, such as the provisions under the Education Act, because all children between the age of six and 15 years are required compulsorily to attend school during prescribed hours. Of course, that does not apply to after-school hours, holidays or weekends.

Victoria has specific legislation, by way of contrast. The department in Victoria will not issue a permit for a child to be employed after 11 p.m. or before 6 a.m. and so production companies are required to obtain a permit. Questionable situations such as scripts involving children in scenes of violence, nudity and sexual intimacy (that is where children may be present for such scenes or involved on the periphery) must be submitted to the Department of Community Services for perusal.

Because no legislation currently regulates the type of work and the hours put in by children in the entertainment industry, particularly the film and television industry, for every parent whose child has worked with the industry and who is not happy with the hours there are four or five others who would wish for nothing more than for their child to become another Brooke Shields, and that is not an unnatural aspiration on the part of parents. In view of the information provided by Actors Equity, will the Minister ascertain whether any action is warranted?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and advise the House that I have also received similar representations from Actors Equity. I understand that the Minister of Labour has also looked at the matter. Both departments are investigating the matters that have been brought before them with a view to considering the necessity for legislation to rectify the injustices that do occur in this area. If the honourable member has any additional information, he could give it to me, as it concerns child care and other ancillary matters, and I will take those issues on board in considering the question.

PAYMENT OF BILLS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Premier advise why the Government continues to break the undertaking given by the Premier on 21 March, and again on 28 August, that all Government departments will pay their bills within 30 days as a means of assisting small businesses? The Premier gave the original undertaking on 21 March. The promise was that all Government departments would be asked to

pay their bills within 30 days in a move to boost cash flow to small businesses. On 28 August I raised in this Parliament my concern that the promise was being ignored by Government departments and I gave a specific example. In reply the Premier assured me that he would pursue the matter to ensure that his directive was carried out.

The small business of R. Draper & Co Pty Ltd sold 4 000 adhesive labels to the Education Department as a rush order with only five days to deliver them (order No. 25184 from the Education Department). Mr Draper sent invoice No. 2035 on 30 July to the Chief Accountant of the Education Department and has now sent three monthly statements for July, August and September (of course, another one is due today for October), but still there has been no payment. The account is now 90 days overdue. Mr Draper has been asked to send a copy of the original invoice to the Education Department. This small business operator pointed out to me that all his profit on this $220 sale has well and truly been lost in chasing payment.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At least with respect to this question the honourable member has been a little more forthcoming than he was on the question he asked on 28 August, when I specifically invited him to present me with the details of the case. He explained later that he felt it was inappropriate to do so, because the person concerned was not prepared to have it taken up in that way. I accepted that, but obviously there is nothing I can do about it in the absence of those details. Again, the honourable member stands up and asks, in a quite unwarranted aggressive manner, whether we will continue to break the undertaking. We are not breaking any undertaking at all. I have invited all members, where there are specific instances, to ensure that those issues are pursued. I suggest that the individual in question may have done better to place the matter more directly in my hands, or those of the Minister, for following in the first instance, rather than going laboriously through the honourable member.

Nonetheless, that is the way that has been chosen. Again, I assure the honourable member that on this occasion, having been given the details, I and my colleague will take it up. I am pleased to see the honourable member diversifying yet again, of course, in his pursuit of matters away from his heavy responsibility for transport issues in the new electorate of Davenport.

I realise that he is having to spend a little time and energy in these areas, because I note from a recent advertisement his announcement that he is establishing a transport task force for that electorate and that, as he is likely to be the future Minister of Transport, this means that these constituents will get a better deal than they got in the past. This underscores very heavily the point made by my colleagues and me that the Opposition transport policies at the moment in the hands of the member for Davenport are related very directly and specifically indeed to that electorate.

There is a lot of big dollar expenditure there. This advertisement that was drawn to my attention confirmed completely that what he is saying to the electorate is, 'I am going to be the Minister of Transport if the Government changes, and you will get some real action.' I suggest that he concentrate on his broader based portfolio and that, rather than take up the issue of slow payment of bills, he should tell some of his other colleagues from the north-eastern, northern, southern and western areas what he will do about transport there and not just in this confined area where he is supposed to be the man who will get action.

QUESTION ON NOTICE No. 122

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House why he has not apparently been able to get the information in order to answer my question on notice No. 122?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I would dearly like to answer question on notice No. 122, asked by the member for Henley Beach, concerning those people who are either totally or partly on the Leader of the Opposition's payroll. Certain people employed by the Leader are paid through the Department of Housing and Construction. However, we all know that five or six other people work in the Leader's office. I doubt very much whether they are working in that office at the moment; they are probably out there—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat.

Mr BAKER: I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask whether the Minister of Housing and Construction has suddenly become Deputy Premier. I am—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I call the Minister of Housing and Construction.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I doubt whether the five or six people in question who are employed in the Leader's office are there at the moment; they are probably out watching the very successful Grand Prix that this Government has sponsored for the benefit of the citizens of Adelaide. However, I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition early in August requesting the relevant information. It was a very courteous letter: I called him 'My dear Leader of the Opposition' and said that I had certain information as Minister of Housing and Construction about certain people working in his office. I then referred to others who were employed—mind you, if I employed them and they gave me the type of advice they are giving the Leader I would have sacked them long ago. Nevertheless, I asked him for the relevant information. However, the Leader has been so rude as to ignore my letter. Nevertheless, I will send him a telex this afternoon asking him to supply the required details. As soon as the Leader is decent enough to give me that information I will give an answer to the member for Henley Beach.

GRAND PRIX INSURANCE

Mr INGERSON: My question is to the Premier. Is the Government aware of the concern within the medical profession—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are not obeying the Standing Orders at all.

Mr INGERSON: —about the lack of insurance cover for specialists who have volunteered to provide their services at the Grand Prix and, if so, does it intend to take any action?

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: With the encouragement of the House I would like to explain. One of the vital safety procedures for the Grand Prix will be provided by teams of medical specialists who will be stationed at trackside. These teams must have the capacity to reach the scene of any incident within seconds and the nature of their work will expose them to significant risks in the unfortunate event of any serious crash.

I have been informed that the specialists who have volunteered to provide this service are concerned that they may not have insurance cover. One specialist, an anaesthetist, has already withdrawn his services, while others have so far been unable to obtain special insurance cover from the Grand Prix Board.

The SPEAKER: Just before calling the Minister, I will say one thing and that is that there are certain forms that are actually basic to the House and one is that permission

is sought, and therefore the intrusion of words like 'encouraging' or anything else will not be tolerated. I will overlook it in this instance, but from now on people will ask the normal permission of the Speaker and of the House.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As the Minister representing the Minister of Health I am not aware of the matters raised by the honourable member, but they are of such importance and urgency that I will have them referred immediately to the Minister of Health so that he can address them to ensure that the medical cover that those attending and participating in the Grand Prix are entitled to can be provided. I am concerned about the matters raised by the honourable member and I will have them looked at immediately.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Education advise what arrangements have been made, since the establishment of the Children's Services Office, for the provision of special services? In discussions that I have had with people associated with child-parent centres and the old Kindergarten Union kindergartens, they have expressed their concern about the availability of advice and assistance that they get from these people who provide these special services.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can certainly give the House some further advice on this matter. Upon coming to Government we were committed to doubling the size of the Special Services Office of what was then known as the Kindergarten Union and is now part of the Children's Services Office. I have to say that we have not yet actually doubled it, but we have certainly made significant strides in increasing the size of the special services facilities within the Children's Services Office.

As at November 1982, on the change of Government, there were 14 full-time equivalent staff employed in the special services within the then Kindergarten Union. As at October 1985 the figure, including vacancies that are funded but not filled and are awaiting the positions to be advertised, is 24.5, which is an increase of 10.5. It is of course acknowledged that that is still 3.5 short of the doubling that was promised, but I can assure members that we still have a commitment towards achieving that. Of course, it had to operate with some incredibly difficult financial conditions, not the least of which has been taking over fully the responsibility for the funding of preschool education in this State, which has meant an extra $3.7 million in a full financial year without any improvement in service delivery.

In the 1985-86 financial year, the four new positions which have been created and which are consequential upon the proclamation and establishment of the Children's Services Office are one position within the northern country region, one in the central-southern region and two in the southern country region. Those positions are a new position of special educator speech pathologist in central-south, a position of special educator in the northern country region, and positions of speech pathologist and special educator within the southern country region.

In total, that takes us to a situation where we have now either filled or have advertised positions to be filled (which means they are funded) as follows: a half-time community health nurse, seven speech pathologists, eight special educators, one speech pathologist cum special educator, four social workers, and four psychologists.

The other thing that has happened under this Government is the provision of those services in regional areas. Previously, the overwhelming majority of services was provided within the central support section of the Kindergarten Union. The present distribution between the areas is as follows: five in central-south, four in central-east, four in central-west, 5.5 in central-north, three in northern country, and three in southern country.

That clearly indicates that we still need improvement in the northern and southern country areas. They will be priority areas for any further growth in the special services staffing of the Children's Services Office. We recognise that, in terms of picking up early learning needs and in picking up special disabilities suffered by many children, the earlier they are addressed the better. The special services section of the Children's Services Office helps us to do that. It has been a priority of this Government to increase that section, and, as I have said, it has been increased from 14 to 24.5 funded positions. That is really just the start of further improvements so that we can offer further support and development in the special services section in order to meet the needs of preschool children in South Australia in the years ahead.

O-BAHN

Mr ASHENDEN: When will the Minister of Transport take long overdue action to protect the living environment of residents in close proximity to the work being undertaken on the O-Bahn track between Darley Road and Grand Junction Road? On 10 October I wrote to the Minister of Transport and raised three serious problems that have been put to me by constituents. The first problem relates to dust caused by the work; in fact, this matter was canvassed in this place just last week. My letter to the Minister states:

> My constituents have approached persons working in the area to ask that watering-down be undertaken, but those requests have been (I have been advised) met with very rude rejection.

The second point in my letter to the Minister related to drainage. One area in Holden Hill adjacent to the works is low lying and suffers drainage problems, and on that point my letter states:

> Secondly, the area adjacent to Chrysler Drive is very low lying and recently the Tea Tree Gully council built new drainage to take away the water which used to lie in this area after rain. My constituents have informed me that workmen along the O-Bahn track recently utilised graders to completely fill in and destroy the drainage works that were only recently undertaken by the council.

The third matter that I raised related to danger. Again, I quote from my letter:

> The third matter which has been brought to my attention is also extremely serious. Trucks and other heavy vehicles were originally entering the O-Bahn section at a point virtually on the corner of Lyons Road and Chrysler Drive. This created an extremely dangerous situation to passing traffic and, in fact, police called at the site and instructed that vehicles entering and leaving the O-Bahn area were to do so at a point 100 metres east of the junction of Lyons Road and Chrysler Drive. For a short while this instruction was obeyed, but the vehicles are now again entering and leaving the site at the very dangerous junction referred to. I have been advised that when my constituents have approached the drivers, reminding them of the police instruction, they have been met with extremely rude responses and the junction has continued to be used for entry and exit.

As I have said, I raised those matters with the Minister in a letter dated 10 October.

This week I have been contacted by a number of constituents—including some who provided me with the original information in my letter—who have advised me that absolutely nothing has been done. One constituent in particular was absolutely beside herself with anger when she telephoned me, because she has been forwarded a copy of my letter to the Minister, as have other constituents who have contacted me with this problem. They are aware that the Minister was notified of the problems three weeks ago. Anger is being directed at the Government as a result of the total lack of response that my representations have received.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I do not think it is valid for the honourable member to say that there has been a total lack of response to the representations that he has made. The fact that he has not received a letter does not mean that no action has been taken. The honourable member mentioned that his letter was forwarded three weeks ago. The matter concerning the dust has already been reported to the House, and action will be taken on that.

I point out that I do feel concerned for residents whose living environments are affected by major Government construction works: as I have lived through similar situations myself, people affected have my sympathy, and I will do what I can to see that their inconvenience is reduced as much as possible. But it is not possible to reduce it completely. I think we would all understand that there are times when a minimum of inconvenience must be suffered—with 'suffered' being the operative word. Although it is impossible to do away with it altogether, the degree of inconvenience caused by these major construction works can be minimised.

I am still waiting for the engineering solutions to the drainage problems. All these things seem fairly easy to a complainant and sometimes to a member of Parliament who brings them to the Government's attention. However, they are not always so simple to solve from an engineering point of view.

On the matter of danger, I am concerned that further complaints are being made and that the policing action has not had a consistent and permanent impact on people who are using the entries and exits to the two major O-Bahn stations at OG Road and Darley Road. I will take up these matters and ensure that the honourable member gets an early response to his question. Three weeks, I might say, is not an inordinate length of time to wait for a response to matters that need technical and engineering resolution. I will ensure that the honourable member gets a very early response to these matters.

DISABLED PERSONS PARKING

Mrs APPLEBY: I direct my question to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government in another place. Is the Minister able to report on proposed action to be taken following a request for changes to be made to the Private Parking Act 1965 to alleviate the problems faced by the disabled parking in private parking spaces provided at shopping centres, for example? I first raised this matter in the House in May 1984. That was followed by an initiative of the previous Minister of Local Government in setting up a working party to look into the problems involved, and recommendations were made in a report to the Minister in September. As I understand that the Minister of Local Government has done some work on this matter, I seek an update on the present situation.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I shall be delighted to take up this matter with my colleague the Minister of Local Government and bring down a report for the member for Brighton, particularly as I was the Minister who was involved in the initial work which followed the honourable member's very sensible request to the Government. So, I am as anxious as she is to ascertain just exactly what the position is in relation to providing facilities which are so urgently needed by that group of people for whom the member for Brighton has consistently shown a great deal of care and sympathy.

SAFETY BARRIERS

Mr S.G. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport take immediate action to negotiate with the Highways Department and the Grand Prix management to have the concrete safety barriers from the Grand Prix track installed as safety barriers in the centre of that part of the South-Eastern Freeway between the Toll Gate and Eagle on the Hill when the Grand Prix is over?

Several constituents have spoken to me pointing out that most of the barriers must be stored somewhere—they cannot be left at the track. They will be lying idle until next year's Grand Prix. The Minister knows about the dangers on that part of the South-Eastern Freeway because these people have written to him. These barriers will be used during the Grand Prix to protect people from such dangers. My constituents point out that with two flows of traffic going in opposite directions about one metre apart and with cars travelling at 80 km/h, any accident that occurs is head on, and quite serious, and could result in people being killed or crippled for life.

My constituents are concerned. They know that the barriers that will be used for the Grand Prix are not of the type used on the subway on Gilbert Road at Lonsdale, but they are not dissimilar to those used in the centre of roads in other parts of the world. They point out that, if these barriers are used in that regard until they are required for the next Grand Prix, it will provide a test of how successful they are and what the Government must do for long-term safety on that section of the road, or perhaps upgrading might be required. Will the Minister consider this as a matter of urgency before the barriers are stored away in a useless corner to no-one's benefit until the next Grand Prix?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I think, in a sense, it is a good try, because in my view the honourable member is trying to highlight the danger that he sees on that stretch of road. I am not too sure of the engineering possibilities, but I suspect that the barriers that will be used for the Grand Prix track would not be suitable for the use suggested by the honourable member.

Mr S.G. Evans: At least part of them would be.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I believe that the barriers for the Grand Prix track are a package—they fit together and fit the delineation of that road circuit. They are not likely to be suitable for use on the road, as the honourable member proposed. It is important to understand that the Highways Department is considering a number of options to make that stretch of road safer, because it has a record of accidents that requires attention. That study is continuing at present.

I am not too sure what the final Highways Department recommendations to me will be, but I can assure the honourable member that we are aware of the problems on that stretch of road from Eagle on the Hill to the Toll Gate. Not only has that road a history of accidents and delays but also it is a busy part of the Adelaide road system, being Highway 1, the major road servicing the transport and carriage of goods between Adelaide and the Eastern States. Therefore, the Highways Department has two projects in mind. First, there is a short-term project to try to determine the safest way of ensuring that traffic can traverse that section safely and, secondly, there is a long-term study on the most appropriate treatment of the road between Eagle on the Hill and the plains.

I might say that this is something about which the member for Davenport might be concerned because, if the study suggests that the alignment will change, it might go through the District of Davenport, and the honourable member might want to build a nice big freeway there—something that he is anxious to suggest for the western suburbs. The fact of life is that that is one of the possibilities for the long-term treatment of Highway 1, with federal finance.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I understand the honourable member's question and I will take up the matter. However, I do not think that anyone really expects that a solution to the dangers that the honourable member perceives would be to move the Grand Prix barriers from the circuit to Highway 1 as a trial, as the honourable member suggested. Personally, I do not think it is feasible but, because the honourable member has raised the matter with me, I will ask the Highways Department. I will not negotiate with the department, as the honourable member suggested—if need be, I will instruct. The Monday evening television that the honourable member obviously watches does not apply to me.

TAXI SERVICE

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House whether the multiple hiring of taxis will continue for other major events such as the Adelaide Festival of Arts? I understand that the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board will be urging passengers to share cabs during the Grand Prix carnival. This will reduce the taxicab fare by 25 per cent. The direction has been made to try to overcome what might be a shortage of cabs during this time, when more than 6 000 potential passengers will arrive at the Adelaide Airport. Information supplied to me suggests that customers booking taxicabs by telephone will be encouraged to share a cab with other people.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Taxi Cab Board, with the agreement of the taxi industry, was conducting a trial of multiple hiring during the Grand Prix period, when it was anticipated that taxis would be under great stress. That has not, incidentally, occurred, but it is a strange phenomonon that we are experiencing. Peak demands are very short but very intense. Over the weekend we will have significant demands for taxis at our airport. I understand that certainly on Sunday morning and Sunday evening, as with Saturday, we will see extreme activity at the airport. I will take up the matter with the Taxi Cab Board so that it can discuss with the industry whether a need exists to involve taxis in multiple hiring.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They have been multiple hiring for three years.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, but as the member for Torrens would understand, it depends on whether the owner or driver of the taxi requests multiple hiring or whether the customer requests multiple hiring. The multiple hiring system we have introduced is not at the request of the driver but will be under the control the Taxi Cab Board. People at the airport will be almost packing customers into a taxi to ensure that available taxis are able to cater for the demand. We will talk to the industry and, if appropriate, we will ask it to try it again during the fesitval and other peak demand periods in 1986 and beyond.

LINCOLN COVE DEVELOPMENT

Mr BLACKER: Is the Premier able to give any construction dates and details on the marina project signed last week? As the Premier would well know, the project has been long in coming—some three to four years. At last the indenture agreements have been signed, and we are now looking to the time when physical construction will commence on the site.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member was present at the ceremony at which the agreement for the start of the project and the letting of the contract was signed a week or so ago. It was said at that stage that it was hoped we would see site activity within three or four weeks. I am not sure what that will comprise—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am referring to the Lincoln Cove project. I made the assumption that all honourable members would know the project in which the member for Flinders was interested.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, as my Deputy says, there are so many projects that I must clarify it. 'Porter Bay' was the original title given to the project. It is now called Lincoln Cove—a more glamorous and precise term as it focuses on Port Lincoln, the base of the marina project. It is an exciting project and combines elements of utility, in the sense that it will provide a safe harbour for the fishing fleet and the economic benefits that flow from that; it has elements of housing and accommodation, as well as elements of recreation and tourism, all of which Port Lincoln is admirably situated to serve well. Residents of that city are eagerly looking forward to seeing the start of work. I have been told by the contractors that they will be there very shortly. As we understand that there are no hitches in that, planning is well advanced and physical work should begin.

USED CAR WARRANTY

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister for Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, advise when the new regulations will come into effect to alter the $499 used car price below which no warranty is provided? I will explain my question, although I cannot promise to do so briefly. However, I point out to members opposite that I have deliberately placed myself at the bottom of the question list so as to not inconvenience members opposite.

This matter has come to my attention through two separate incidents. The first was when I traded in my 1969 Datsun 1600 on a replacement vehicle. I was rather attached to it, but after 16 years of service it was getting rather long in the tooth.

The trade-in price for the vehicle was only $400 and I understand that that was on the basis that the dealer would dispose of it through the trade as a $499 vehicle without warranty. It is probable that this Datsun 1600, to which I had a strong attachment after so many years of loyal service, could have been sold by me privately for $600 or $700. However, I chose not to follow that course of action, as there was a possibility that the purchaser could end up being one of my constituents and it would not be advantageous to me if something went wrong with my dear old Datsun shortly afterwards.

On a more serious note, the second incident relating to the $499 price barrier relates to the experience of the handicapped son of a constituent. An invalid pensioner, to whom I will refer by his first name of Paul, suffered brain damage due to an oxygen shortage at birth and is easily taken advantage of in commercial transactions. On Tuesday 7 October, he went to a used car firm and was attracted by an HQ Holden panel van, RZZ-203, carrying a $2 995 price tag on the pink notice on the windscreen, but reduced to $2 295 as 'today's special'. Paul had another Holden HQ (SGH-141) which he had purchased only a few weeks before from another car firm for $2 400, although the actual price, bearing in mind the interest Paul had to pay, was closer to $4 000.

The second firm (Future Wheels of Edwardstown) offered a swap—Paul's Holden for their $2 295 Holden, subject to the condition of his trade-in. Fortunately for Paul the deal fell through the next day because the car the first firm had sold Paul was faulty and had been so when he purchased it

from that firm. I say 'fortunately' because it seems that the Future Wheels vehicle would not have had a warranty despite its price tag of over $2 000.

I have with me a carbon copy of the Retail Buyers Vehicle Order and Agreement. It indicates that HQ panel van, registration number RZZ-203 had on it a trade-in allowance of $499, equity in trade-in $499, and a total payment of $499. It is amazing how a sale for over $2 000 can become a $499 sale. It is certainly a coincidence, particularly since the *Advertiser* of 10 October—a couple of days after the cancellation of the deal—carried the following advertisement:

Holden HQ panel van. Now only $2 490 and a bargain. Ducoed white, good int. trim and features a powerful V8 5 litre motor, mechanically very good, drives excellently, mag wheels, &c. At only $2 490 less trade-in. RZZ-203. LMVD No. 2007. Future Wheels—

and it gives the address. It appears possible that manipulation of prices may be occurring because of the fact that the $499 limit, set I think in about 1971, is probably many years out of date.

I understand that draft regulations may have been prepared in recent months incorporating a sliding scale for warranties on used vehicles. I understand that a possibility is that no warranty will be provided below $1 000 as distinct from the current outdated figure of $499; that there will be a warranty of 1500 kilometres or one month for cars sold between $1 000 and $1 999; 3000 kilometres or two months for cars sold for $2 000 to $2 999; and, 5000 kilometres or three months for used vehicles for over $3 000. It would appear that these regulations may be long overdue.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. If he would like to give me the contract and the other information that he read to the House, I will have the Department of Consumer Affairs check the adding up to which he referred. Also, I will obtain information from the Attorney-General on when the regulations will be brought down and laid on the table.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Payment to producers for market milk in South Australia is regionally based, with each scheme providing equitable sharing to all producers within the scheme. The major region is the central region which supplies metropolitan Adelaide. These farmers receive payment for 40 per cent of their milk at market milk prices (currently 32.32c per litre). In contrast, the South-East milk producers receive payment for only 5 per cent of their production at market milk prices and the reminder at manufacture prices (approximately 15c per litre).

A Government established review in 1977 recommended that the South-East milk producers have their incomes augmented by funds from a market milk levy pool paid for by the metropolitan milk producers. The industry subsequenty negotiated its own augmentation aqreement which currently transfers 7 per cent of market milk returns ($983 000 in 1984-85) from metropolitn milk producers to South-East producers.

The current augmentation transfer is fixed at 7 per cent and has not progressed to the agreed 10 per cent because of a milk production and sales qualifying clause in the agreement. This aspect of the augmentation agreement has frustrated South-East producers. With current over supplied and depressed world markets for manufactured dairy products, the difference in financial returns to the South-East producers compared to the metropolitan milk producers has been exaggerated.

The South-East industry and the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association have been unable to reach agreement in respect of a more equitable transfer of money from metropolitan milk producers to South-East producers. The proposals to incorporate the augmentation principles into legislation has been extensively discussed by industry and previous Governments, but legislation has not eventuated. This amendment is designed to ensure South-East producers receive a more equitable share in the returns from Metropolitan area market milk sales.

The amendments to the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act will enable an equalisation scheme to be declared and fees collected from holders of milk treatment licences to be paid for the benefit of specified producers licensed under the Dairy Industry Act (that is South-East producers).

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 provides for the insertion into the principal Act of several new sections.

New section 30aa provides that the holder of a milk treatment licence (licensee) shall pay to the board a licence fee in respect of each calendar month.

The fee will be $2 or a fee calculated under the regulations by reference to the quantity of milk treated by the licensee during the relevant antecedent period, whichever is greater. The licensee must, within 14 days of the end of a calendar month, lodge with the board a return specifying the quantity of milk treated by him in pursuance of the licence during the relevant antecedent period, and containing the prescribed information and pay to the board the licence fee in respect of the calendar month last preceding lodgment of the return. The penalty for failing to do so is a fine of $10 000. The expression 'relevant antecedent period' in relation to a calendar month means the last calendar month but one before the commencement of that calendar month.

New section 30ab provides that where a licensee fails to pay a fee, any amount unpaid may be recovered as a debt due to the board, and the board may suspend the licence until the fee is paid.

While the licence is suspended the licensee is deemed to be unlicensed. Where a licence has been suspended for 3 months or more, the Minister may cancel the licence. New section 30ac provides that all licence fees are to be paid in to a fund to be applied, after deduction of administrative costs, for the purposes of an equalisation scheme under the section.

Clause 4 makes consequential amendments to section 31 of the principal Act.

Clause 5 repeals section 37 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section under which a licence, unless sooner cancelled or suspended, remains in force until the thirtieth day of June next following issue of the licence except in the case of milk treatment licences, which subject to cancellation or suspension, remain in force until surrender. Provision is made for the issue of a temporary licence.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY SURGEONS BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the registration of veterinary surgeons; to regulate the practice of veterinary surgery for the purpose of maintaining high standards of competence and conduct by veterinary surgeons in South Australia and to repeal the Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935.

In 1981, the Veterinary Surgeons Board completed a detailed study of proposals to amend the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1935. This study indicated that the required amendments were so extensive that they could most effectively be implemented by the drafting of a new Bill.

The amendments included in the Bill have been discussed over the past four years with the Australian Veterinary Association (AVA) South Australian Division, the Minister of Health, the United Farmers and Stockowners and the South-Eastern Dairymen's Association.

The Bill provides for the membership of the Veterinary Surgeons Board to be increased from five to six members appointed by the Governor. Five of the members are to be nominated by the Minister of Agriculture and one, who shall be a veterinary surgeon, is to be nominated by the Australian Veterinary Association, South Australian Division.

Of the members appointed on the nomination of the Minister one, who is to be the presiding officer of the board, will be a special magistrate or legal practitioner of not less than 10 years standing, three shall be veterinary surgeons and one shall be a person who is neither a veterinary surgeon nor a legal practitioner. Members are to be appointed for terms not exceeding three years upon such conditions as the Governor determines and on the expiration of a term of office will be eligible for reappointment.

The provisions of the Bill make it illegal for persons to make a living from veterinary science if they are not qualified to do so and empowers the Veterinary Surgeons Board to conduct hearings and impose penalties in relation to the practice of veterinary surgery.

In the past, the Veterinary Surgeons Board has from time to time received complaints relating to persons who have no veterinary qualifications who, for renumeration, treat and surgically operate on animals. Instances of highly incompetent treatment have been reported, but the board has been powerless to act in such cases if the person concerned has not claimed that he or she is a qualified veterinary surgeon. A qualified person under the provisions of this Bill will be a veterinary surgeon, a veterinary practitioner or a permit holder.

It is recognised, however, that there are many procedures within the definition of veterinary science which need not, or should not be the exclusive preserve of the veterinary surgeon. Accordingly, the Bill is framed in a way that does not restrict the owner of an animal, or an employee of the owner from treating the animal. It also includes provisions through regulation, for other exclusions, such as the rendering of emergency first aid.

The Bill provides for the registration of veterinary surgeons in South Australia to be brought into line with other States and in accordance with Commonwealth policy. It gives effect to the recommendations of the Council on Overseas Professional Qualifications (COPQ) to establish within Australia a uniform standard of qualification and uniform procedures for the registration of persons with overseas veterinary qualifications.

The Veterinary profession considers it desirable to provide for the registration of veterinary specialists and accordingly provisions have been made for veterinary surgeons or veterinary practitioners who have prescribed qualifications and experience and who fulfil all other requirements to be registered on the registrar of specialists. The Governor may, on the recommendation of the Board, prescribe the branches of veterinary surgery in relation to which a person may be registered on the register of specialists. Additional new provisions provide for the practise of veterinary surgery by companies. A company may be registered on the register of veterinary surgeons if it satisfies the requirements prescribed in the Bill.

In summary, the Bill recognizes the need to maintain a high standard of competence and conduct in order to preserve the integrity of the veterinary profession in South Australia. It also recognizes the importance of making registration procedures in this State consistent with those in other States and in accordance with Commonwealth policy.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 repeals the Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935.

Clause 4 provides definitions of terms used in the Bill. Subclause (2) provides that the Act will apply to unprofessional conduct committed before its enactment. This is in the nature of a transitional provision. A veterinary surgeon or veterinary practitioner who is guilty of such conduct cannot be penalised under the old Act after it has been repealed. This provision will ensure that he can be disciplined under the new Act. Paragraph (b) of the subclause ensures that he can be disciplined for unprofessional conduct committed outside South Australia.

Clause 5 establishes the Veterinary Surgeons Board.

Clause 6 provides for the membership of the board and related matters.

Clause 7 provides for procedures at meetings of the board.

Clause 8 ensures the validity of acts of the board in certain circumstances and gives members immunity from liability in the exercise of their powers and functions under the Act.

Clause 9 disqualifies a member who has a personal or pecuniary interest in a matter under consideration by the board from participating in the board's decisions on that matter.

Clause 10 provides for remuneration and other payments to members of the board.

Clause 11 sets out the functions and powers of the board.

Clause 12 will enable the board to establish committees.

Clause 13 provides for delegation by the board of its functions and powers.

Clause 14 sets out powers of the board when conducting hearings under Part IV or considering an application for registration of reinstatement of registration.

Clause 15 frees the board from the strictures of the rules of evidence and gives it power to decide its own procedure

Clause 16 provides for representation of parties at hearings before the board.

Clause 17 provides for costs in proceedings before the board.

Clause 18 provides for the appointment of the Registrar and employees of the board.

Clause 19 requires the board to keep proper accounts and provides for the auditing of those accounts.

Clause 20 requires the board to make an annual report on the administration of the Act. The Minister must cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

Clauses 21, 22 and 23 make it illegal for an unqualified person to hold himself out, or to be held out by another, as a veterinary surgeon, veterinary practitioner or a specialist.

Clause 24 makes it an offence for any person other than a veterinary surgeon, veterinary practitioner or permit holder to provide treatment to an animal for fee or reward.

Clauses 25, 26 and 27 provide for the registration of persons under the Act. The qualifications, experience and other requirements for registration will be prescribed by regulations.

Clause 28 provides for reinstatement of persons on the register.

Clause 29 provides for limited registration. Registration under this clause may be made subject to conditions specified in subclause (3). Subclause (1) will allow graduates, persons seeking reinstatement, other persons requiring experience for full registration and persons wishing to teach or carry out research or study in South Australia to be registered so that they may acquire that experience or undertake those other activities. Subclause (2) gives the board the option of registering a person who is not fit and proper for full registration. He may be registered subject to conditions that cater for the deficiency.

Clause 30 provides for provisional registration.

Clause 31 provides for registration of companies and provides detailed requirements as to the memorandum and articles of such a company.

Clause 32 provides for annual returns by registered companies and the provision of details relating to directors and members of the company.

Clause 33 prohibits registered companies from practising in partnership.

Clause 34 restricts the number of registered persons who can be employed by a registered company.

Clause 35 makes directors of a registered company criminally liable for offences committed by the company.

Clause 36 makes the directors of a registered company liable for the civil liability of the company.

Clause 37 requires that any alterations in the memorandum or articles of a registered company must be approved by the board.

Clause 38 provides for the issue of permits to provide veterinary treatment in areas not properly served by veterinary surgeons or veterinary practitioners.

Clause 39 provides for the keeping and the publication of the registers and other related matters.

Clause 40 provides for the payment of fees by registered persons.

Clauses 41 to 43 make provisions relating to the register that are self-explanatory.

Clause 44 is a provision which will allow the board to consider whether a practitioner who is the subject of a complaint under the clause has the necessary knowledge, experience and skill to practise in the branch of veterinary surgery that he has chosen. This important provision will help to ensure that registered persons keep up to date with latest developments in their practice of veterinary surgery. If the matters alleged in the complaint are established the board will be able to impose conditions on the person's registration.

Clause 45 is designed to protect the public where a practitioner is suffering a mental or physical incapacity but refuses to abandon or curtail his practice. In such circumstances the board may suspend his registration or impose conditions on it.

Clause 46 empowers the board to require a registered person whose mental or physical capacity is in doubt to submit to an examination by a medical practitioner appointed by the board.

Clause 47 gives the board the power to inquire into allegations of unprofessional conduct.

Clause 48 gives the board power to vary or revoke a condition it has imposed on registration or that is imposed by the transitional provisions set out in the schedule.

Clause 49 makes machinery provisions as to the conduct of inquiries.

Clause 50 provides for a problem that can occur where a practitioner who is registered here and interstate and has been struck off in the other State continues to practise here during the hearing of proceedings to have him removed from the South Australian register. Experience has shown that these proceedings can be protracted. This provision will enable the board to suspend him during this process.

Clause 51 provides for appeals to the Supreme Court from decisions of the board.

Clause 52 allows orders of the board to be suspended pending an appeal to the Supreme Court.

Clause 53 empowers the Supreme Court to vary or revoke a condition that it has imposed on appeal.

Clause 54 requires registered persons to be properly indemnified against negligence claims before practising.

Clause 55 makes it an offence to contravene or fail to comply with a condition imposed by or under the Act.

Clause 56 requires a practitioner to inform the board of claims for professional negligence made against him.

Clause 57 provides for the service of notices on registered persons.

Clause 58 provides a penalty for the procurement of registration by fraud.

Clause 59 provides that where a practitioner is guilty of unprofessional conduct by reason of the commission of an offence he may be punished for the offence as well as being disciplined under Part IV.

Clause 60 provides for the summary disposal of offences under the Bill.

Clause 61 provides for the making of regulations.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PEST PLANTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1543.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): In the remarks that I was making when I sought leave to continue on 24 October (last Thursday) I had delineated most of the reasons for my intention to move amendments to this measure, and had expressed my support for it in so far as it goes in its present form. Members will be aware that the measure solves a problem which arose when the Local Court ruled that pest plants boards did not have the power with which to do weed control work—weeds being now defined as pest plants.

I ran through the history of the reasons why pest plants boards had become necessary and cited my belief that it was now the dawning of a new era where we could expect most weed problems to be addressed promptly and effectively by the board structure which extends almost right across the State. Some councils in my district have always done an outstanding job under the terms of the old Weeds Act. That has never been denied by any Minister of the Crown or any person interested in control of pest plants. The two district councils of Lameroo and Pinnaroo have been an example to every other district council area in the

diligence that they have shown over the years by insisting upon appropriate control measures being taken by private landholders and the control measures that they themselves have adopted on public lands within their area of responsibility.

I acknowledge the outstanding work that has been done by a number of people during the last couple of years prior to this measure's arrival here in the House. I did not mention the names of any of those people during the course of my remarks last Thursday, but it would be remiss of me if I did not mention at least one of them, namely, the Secretary of the Robe/Beachport Pest Plants Control Board in the South-East—Mr Gary Young. Had it not been for him, this Bill would not have been prepared so quickly, and the need for it would not have been so well understood. The Minister would not have been able to bring it in as simply and as quickly as he has.

Mr Young has always been alert to the need for pest plants boards to be able to do the kind of work that is necessary to control weeds, especially from where he sits as Secretary to that pest plants board. Mr Young did that homework in his own time and at no expense whatever to the public purse in any sense, and he is to be commended for it. In due course, Mr Young's belief that the Act was deficient was vindicated by the court decision, and we now have the measure before us.

Before I sit down, I remind the House of how important I believe it is for the amendments that I have proposed to be included in the legislation. I cannot stress strongly enough the necessity to protect the public interest—short and long term—by the inclusion of these proposals as provisions in the Act. I have explained them to be, as indeed they are, very simple additional measures which will ensure that the board—regardless of where it is located—is efficient and is seen to be efficient by the public.

Before any board can undertake the necessary work to control the weeds itself, using its own manpower, plant, equipment and materials, it must first publish in a local newspaper that the work needs to be done. Having published that information in the local newspaper, any member of the general public who has the equipment and inclination to do the work can state, in the terms referred to in the advertisement, their price, either in cost per unit area, cost per hour, on a cost-plus basis, or on whatever other terms are necessary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unfortunately, the honourable member cannot go on; his time has expired.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. I will not talk to my colleague's amendments because, of course, he has not moved them. However, I agree with his arguments, which he may use later when moving the amendments. I have a concern in relation to pest plants, and I will take this opportunity to raise it. I refer to the hills face zone. It is easy for us to pass laws which place an obligation upon landowners—whether private or public.

Last night I was invited to look at a six hectare property in the hills face zone, the owner of which has been told to clear it for fire protection. A similar situation would apply if the Pest Plants Board inspected the property: it would say that it was full of pest plants. In present circumstances, it is almost humanly impossible to clear all the land, as requested, for bushfire protection.

It would be almost as impossible to remove pest plants economically. The owner to whom I have referred has been told that he could face a maximum fine of $5 000 if he fails to provide bushfire protection. The letter that he received from the council stated that, on advice from the Magistrates Court, it was obliged to set a minimum fine of $1 200 plus costs. I have had as much experience as anyone else in this place in rugged country, working with machines or by manual labour. If the man had to clear this six hectares for bushfire purposes, I would say it would cost him in the vicinity of $8 000 or $9 000. If he had to do it for pest plant purposes, he would still possibly be looking at $5 000 or $6 000. We are in a bind.

In the early 1970s, when I said in this House that the day would come when we would talk about subdividing some of the hills face zone and building on it, people said, 'Don't say that. You will get into trouble. The mob outside will take to you.' When I walk down the corridors now some of those same people are saying to me, 'We think you are right; the day will be reached when it is a problem to us.' The day has arrived when, right through the hills face zone, there are pest plants in the type of country that is very difficult to clear by hand: it is impossible by machine and very difficult by hand. If we spray it, we kill all the natives; people do not want the natives killed, so we cannot spray it. If we try to rotary slash it we take a lot of the natives with it in places where we can get to it, but in most places we cannot even get to it.

One of my colleagues suggested that you could fence it and place some sheep on it. Most of the sheep would struggle over it, but even sheep would have difficulty getting over it. In other parts of the world in that sort of country they have built homes, eliminating the fire risk by planting the right type of trees that are not flammable. So I say that in the hills face zone we have a major problem relating to noxious weeds that carry with them the capacity to be fuel for fire. I am not blaming just this present Government, because it has been allowed to develop through successive Governments. We have said, 'It is the hills face zone so you must not touch it. Everything looks green and it is nice to look at.'

We are now suddenly saying that some of it is green and some of it has a purple haze, so we are waiting for the legal release of the leaf eating moth, with complementary legislation being passed in the States and the Commonwealth. The rest of it is noxious weeds or pest plants. There is really no simple answer to it.

The eradication of pest plants in that sort of country is very difficult. If we rated the owners fairly, we would rate their land as having virtually no value at all because, if it is to be maintained according to the laws as they are now written, the land is virtually valueless. The amount of money that it costs per year to clean it up would make the land virtually of no value at all to the owners. The argument may be that if we enforce the law the value of the land will drop to a point where it is virtually valueless, so only the people who buy it now will get the use of it because they have to abide by the law and clear the land. That is the sort of argument used at times by the Hon. Mr Hudson—I am not saying that he was wrong—but I disagree with it.

I remind the House that there is a problem with pest plants. We can create all the pest plant boards that we like with all the pest plant inspectors, but there are problems when it comes to shifting pest plants from that sort of country where the hills slope is greater than 45 degrees and the rocky outcrops and structure of the soil are such that it is virtually impossible for man to walk over. One can crawl over it, or a mountain climber may get over it. But amongst it all is a mass of olive trees and pest plants.

The olive tree is one of the worst types of exotic plant that we have introduced, because it transmits fire from ground to tree top. The cursed things have low branches that are at ground level and are very flammable. The fire starts at ground level and, because the trees are about seven to eight metres high, they transmit the fire very quickly from a ground fire that may be able in certain areas to be controlled, to the tree tops, so then we have a floor as well

as a tree top fire to contend with. The tree top fire usually travels a few hundred metres in front of the floor fire.

I think we all know the problems, but we need to be cautious as to how we legislate, especially when we start issuing notices under the relevant legislation. These notices were issued three or four weeks before the beginning of the fire ban season. It is humanly impossible for those landowners to clear that land. I draw attention to the ease with which we can pass laws, but the difficulty some people find in trying to abide by them in this sort of country.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank members for their participation in this debate and I also thank the shadow Minister for his indication of support for the legislation that is presently before the House. I note that the member for Mallee has indicated his intention to move amendments and at this stage I do not propose to canvass the issues raised by him, but will do so in Committee if the appropriate circumstances arise.

I may say that I personally have found the debate quite interesting and have been informed of some matters that were not previously known to me. It has been an edifying debate. I indicate that the Minister of Agriculture in another place will be examining the comments made and, where appropriate, will make responses for the benefit of members at some later time. I thank members for their support.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 1, line 14—After 'This Act' insert '(except for section 2a which shall come into operation on assent)'.

In general terms I have explained this amendment in my second reading speech. Explicitly the provisions are these;

A control board shall not carry out or contract to carry out any work for the destruction or control of pest plants unless—

(a) the Commission has, by notice published in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the control area in which the work is to be carried out, called for tenders for the work (the tender period being the period of 7 days from the day on which the notice is published):

and that is intended to be a local newspaper—

(b) the control board was only the tenderer, or was the tenderer offering the lowest price for the carrying out of the work;

and

(c) the Commission has, in a newspaper referred to in paragraph *(a)*, published notice of—

(i) the fact that the control board was the successful tenderer;

(ii) the ground on which the control board was so successful;

and

(iii) the price offered by the control board in its tender.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in relation to the destruction or control of pest plants by a control board where the control board is of the opinion that the pest plants concerned ought, because of the potential threat to primary industry, to be destroyed or controlled as matter of urgency.

(3) Where a control board destroys or controls any pest plants as a matter of urgency as contemplated by subsection (2), the control board shall, in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the control area in which the work is carried out, publish notice of the work [that was] carried out.

That is simple and straightforward enough. It is a mechanism by which the public can be reassured that no board has an undue monopoly or is taking a higher price for the work done than is justified. It ensures that people who are interested in becoming contractors (or who are already in the business of contracting) have the opportunity of tendering for that work. It also ensures that the interests of the public are thereby are protected in every sense. I repeat: the aspects of public interest are not only the charges levied on private landholders for the work that the board may undertake compulsorily on their land in the event that they failed to do it before the notice requiring them to do that work has expired but also for work that is done on public land at public expense. Within five to 10 years it will relieve boards, in my judgment, of the onerous management burden of employing staff, buying and maintaining equipment and ensuring that a sufficient range of weedicides is on hand to do the work as it arises.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am allowing the honourable member to pursue his argument, but he is not speaking to the first amendment. The second amendment is consequential on the first being carried. I am prepared to allow the honourable member to go only so far in canvassing the second amendment. I assure him that, if the first amendment is defeated, the second will also be lost. I hope the honourable member does not go too far in explaining his second amendment.

Mr LEWIS: I understand that, Mr Chairman. However, I want the Committee to understand why it is necessary to pass the first amendment. To speak to the first amendment in isolation would waste the Committee's time. Mr Chairman, I accept your generosity in allowing me to proceed in this fashion. In conclusion, I stress that there will be no risk—nor will there be seen to be any risk—to the public interest in any sense whatsoever if this amendment is carried.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (11)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, Ashenden, Becker, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis (teller), Olsen, and Wilson.

Noes (31)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold (teller), P.B. Arnold, Baker, Bannon, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Ingerson, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Meier, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wotton, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Oswald. No—Mr McRae.

Majority of 20 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 and 4) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 October. Page 1484.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I indicate to the House that we support the passage of this Bill without amendment. It involves compensation distribution within the pig industry and, in particular, compensation paid to owners of diseased pigs is drawn from a fund levied on producers of stock at the time of sale.

Under the principles of the Act, the funds are invested in the care and control of the Minister of Agriculture. The Bill enables compensation maximums to be increased in line with market values and provides in future for adjustments to be made by regulation.

The second change proposed is to enable payment to the funds of money arising from the sale of properties originally purchased by the fund. The third change in the Bill proposed is to increase from $25 000 to $50 000 the annual allocation for pig industry related research. This annual allocation has not been altered since 1974. Again, future adjustments to the annual research allocation are to be prescribed by regulation.

The final change proposed in the Bill is to give formal recognition to the pig industry committee advising the Min-

ister in relation to the management of the fund and other associated purposes. The committee has been functioning unofficially since 1974. The funds referred to in the several areas that I have mentioned are sourced totally from industry. The legislation simply authorises a caretaker, that is, the Minister, to receive, distribute and administer the fund in consultation with the secretary of the industry advisory committee, and this is to become formalised under this Bill. I record the Opposition's full support for this Bill without amendment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I fully appreciate the full and comprehensive support given to this matter by the Opposition. The matter deserves such support. As a local member of Parliament with some constituents in my electorate in the industry, I can say that this is a matter that they will watch with interest. I am sure that they support the stand taken by Parliament on this matter. I thank honourable members for their support, and hope that the Bill is given a speedy passage through Parliament.

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

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 August. Page 735.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I indicate the Opposition's support for this Bill also. The Bill provides that section 8 will be amended by substituting for the words 'artificial insemination of any' the words 'breeding, by artificial means, of'. The Bill provides for a very simple but effective amendment. The Stock Diseases Act currently allows for regulating the practice of artificial insemination of livestock.

Advances in technology now allow artificial breeding of stock by means other than insemination; for example, using embryo transplantation, known in veterinary and rural industry circles as ET. The amendment provides for this technology to be embraced in the Act.

I might say in conclusion that I am grateful to D.F. and K.L. Cornell of Echunga for their activities in this field. The technical advances made under what is called the Agtech organisation, of which they are the proprietors, and their extensive investment and continuing research in these matters is creditable not only to that family but indeed to the industry generally. I commend the Cornells for their efforts in this direction so far, and I wish them very well in the future in pursuing the new ET program. I have pleasure in again indicating to the House that the Opposition supports the Bill with no amendment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the shadow Minister of Agriculture for his and the Opposition's support of the Bill. The Bill is worthy of passage. It recognises the massive changes that have taken place in biotechnology. Perhaps legislation in the past has not reacted quickly enough to those massive changes in biotechnological research. South Australia is showing itself to be in the lead of the nation with respect to biotechnology. For example, we receive the lion's share of research grants in this field, way out of proportion compared to our population as a ratio of Australia's total population. I hope that we will be able to keep that lead in the years ahead.

Legislative measures such as this are an indication that the Legislature is prepared to react and make the appropriate amendments where necessary. I must say that I had not quite considered the abbreviation that could have been applied to embryo transplantation. Had that been the case and had I talked about that at home, I am sure that my elder daughter would have been much more interested in this matter than hitherto was the case: she is 6½ years old and has a great interest in ET but not particularly in embryo transplantation. I also concur in the remarks made by the member for Alexandra in relation to people in South Australia who are undertaking pioneering work in this area. This links with the comments that I made previously about biotechnology. I thank honourable members for their support and, as I indicated in relation to the previous Bill before the House, I hope that this legislation can be dealt with speedily by the House.

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

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 September. Page 1068.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Opposition proposes to support this Bill. I shall spend a short time addressing a couple of observations that the Opposition has made on this subject. Representatives of the fruit and vegetable industry and officers of the Department of Agriculture have for some months been preparing a schedule of improvements to the Fruit and Plant Protection Act, in order to reflect today's commercial trading and transporting practices applicable to fruit and plants.

The Bill provides for increased penalties to act as greater deterrents to any person contemplating introducing plants or soil which might carry disease and/or pests which might place the State's plant industries at risk. The Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1968 provides for the prohibition by the Governor of the introduction of certain fruit and plants into South Australia. Clause 3 of the Bill gives this responsibility to the Minister. Clause 4 specifically identifies those places through which host fruits and plants might be introduced into South Australia, enabling a closer monitoring of that activity: again, that clause transfers to the Minister the power previously held by the Governor.

I want the Minister here, acting for the Minister of Agriculture in another place, to note one or two of these points, as questions might be asked during the Committee stage about these matters. Clause 8 requires orchardists to take precautionary measures not previously included in the principal Act. Can the Minister identify the additional precautionary measures which are to be undertaken but which are not currently being undertaken by orchardists? Clauses 10 and 13 make consequential amendments, about which the Opposition has no argument. Clause 14 repeals section 19 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section 19, giving the Minister powers to revoke a notice given by him under the principal Act.

Clause 16 amends section 20 of the principal Act, giving a new power to make regulations requiring certificate of identification of fruit, plants, soil or vehicles, and it also increases the penalty applicable to that. I have been in touch with a number of people from the industry on this subject, and those sources indicate that revision of the principal Act has been sought and that the action that has been taken is generally supported by the industry.

I propose, during the passage of this Bill, to make one or two points known. They relate to an activity that is allegedly occurring in the Riverland regarding the movement of fruit or fruit residue from one State to another, surrounding which activity much care does not appear to have been

taken. On 2 September 1985 I put out a press release on this subject in which there was some keen interest by the Riverland press, understandably, as well as by the metropolitan press. There was little response, if any, that I recall by the Government to the concerns that I raised at the time.

I said on that date that I wished the Government to undertake as a matter of urgency a thorough investigation into the importing of citrus peel from interstate. We were advised that several hundred tonnes of orange and lemon peel was imported from the Mildura region into Loxton in the weeks leading up to that date without sterilisation or fruit fly free certification. The department was warned of the possible import practice as far back as April of this year. Several loads were brought to South Australia in late June, early July and in August; and approximately a further 15 loads of about 15 tonnes each were transported by semi-trailer and delivered to Loxton for by-product manufacturing. At the Yamba border checkpoint, the inspectors were told by the department only to lift the covers and view the top of the loads in order to check the peel for fruit flesh content.

Accordingly, only a token scanning was undertaken by the inspectors in the transit of that material. Concern had been expressed at the time, and indeed I expect that it will continue to be expressed if that sort of practice is to be repeated. I point out, in fairness to the parties involved, that that concern will continue to be expressed if the practice is repeated as alleged and drawn to our attention, albeit subsequent to very wide inquiry. Concern had been expressed in the Riverland that the peel, although it had been subject to the juicing process, could be carrying fruit fly eggs laid back in the pest infected interstate source areas. It is both irregular and unfair to condone a potential risk operation while all other importers and transporters of fruit are required to obtain certification.

The South Australian Government, for example, spends hundreds of thousands of dollars per year to protect the State's horticultural industry from fruit fly infestation and to maintain a clean name in exporting to an expanding fresh fruit and vegetable market overseas. I put to the House that it would be disastrous to place this important growth industry in jeopardy.

My remarks were incorporated in a press release early in September. I have not yet had a report from the Government, the Minister or any officer of the Department of Agriculture to fully clarify that position. I suppose it is fair to say that when a member of Parliament goes to press it is reasonable that his counterpart opposite may legitimately feel that he can answer through the press. In this instance, I had considerable consultation with officers of the department both here in Adelaide and in the field at the checkpoint level, and I was satisfied at the time that the complaints and fears that were emerging from industry people in the Riverland were genuine and that it was worth following up.

I have placed those remarks on record with a view to ultimately getting a full report on the investigations, if any, that have been carried out in the meantime. Whether it be related to that movement of peel from interstate to this State or any other exercise that might involve a risk to the Riverland or to South Australia's fruit and vegetable industry, I hope that the department would carry out its job diligently and with every caution that the subject deserves. With those few remarks, I indicate that it is unlikely that there will be any further speakers from this side of the House on this subject and that we support the Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the member for Alexandra for his comments in support of the matter. He made certain comments which I will draw to the attention of my colleague the Minister of Agriculture in another place in due course and obtain his appropriate response. I note that the honourable member commented on one part of the legislation and queried what additional precautionary measures were being sought. I could not fully follow the honourable member in that regard. It seems that the Bill that we are considering does not insert in clause 8 additional precautionary measures other than those that already exist in section 9 of the Act. I will take further questioning on it from the member if he so desires.

As I understand it, it is proposed by the Minister and the department that there should be a period of consultation with the industry concerning this matter. The advice I have is that the department is concerned to see the consultative process related to matters such as this in drafting of notices and motions completed by the end of 1985. That may indeed answer this question and other matters that have been raised by the honourable member. This is an important piece of legislation. It is true that there is a growing volume of fruit and vegetable trade coming down from the Sunraysia district. That would join a lot of other traffic that comes from the Eastern States to South Australia. I note, with your indulgence, Mr Speaker, the presence of, and welcome into the Speaker's Gallery, students from Tibooburra in New South Wales who have joined us today.

The matter of the potential for the export of fruit and vegetables has not, quite frankly, been taken seriously enough by growers within South Australia. Certainly the member for Goyder might concur with me in this matter, as he has in his electorate, as I do in mine, many market gardening enterprises. While the Department of Agriculture and selected growers have made efforts to investigate these markets, the potential is as yet vastly unexplored. I hope that we do not see our transport facilities here in South Australia, either in Port Adelaide in terms of shipping facilities or at the Adelaide International Airport, being the venue totally for interstate produce finding its way to South-East Asian markets, but that we will find substantial numbers of crates and cartons in markets with the label 'Produce of South Australia' on them.

I hope that all market gardeners and those producing fruit in this State will take every opportunity available to them and, with appropriate support from the department and other venues such as the vegetable and marketing associations, they might further explore this avenue. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture's office to the comments made by the member for Alexandra. I thank members for their support and look forward to the speedy passage of this Bill through the House.

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

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendation of the conference.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I take this opportunity to address myself to a couple of issues of importance to the

north-eastern suburbs. The first is the decision of the Labor Government not to go ahead with a child care centre at the Modbury Hospital. This Government and the ALP candidate for Newland in particular have been singing false praises in the north-eastern suburbs about the alleged attention this Government is giving to child-care. Here we have a perfect example of how this Government puts forward a lot of words but is very tardy in taking any action.

I place on record a letter I received from Mr John Connolly, Acting Chairperson of the Modbury Hospital Child Care Centre Working Party. This letter was addressed to me as member for Todd and reads, as follows:

> Concerned parents working at Modbury Hospital have formed a working party towards the establishment of a child care centre within the hospital grounds, to care for children of parents who work in the local area. We are supported by the hospital's joint union committee, fully supported by the hospital administrator and the board of management.

I point out that the provision for a child-care centre at the Modbury Hospital is unanimously supported by the union, the administrator, and the board of management. They all agree that a child-care centre is a high priority. The letter continues:

> A recent survey conducted within the hospital and in the local area indicated an urgent need for additional child care facilities and, as a result, we propose to build a 60 placement centre operating during the hours of 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. seven days a week.

I point out that the proposed hours for this child-care centre indicate that such a centre would undoubtedly meet a very real need for the staff of that hospital, because as I am sure we are all well aware that hospitals operate 24 hours a day.

At the moment, not only Modbury Hospital but virtually all hospitals in South Australia are having very real difficulty in obtaining professional nursing staff. One of the main reasons for this is that persons who previously left the nursing profession to raise a family are now looking to return to their old profession. However, they are having very real difficulty in obtaining care for their children so that they can return to nursing because, of course, they are required to work outside normal working hours.

In other words, professionally trained people who want to return to their profession are prohibited from so doing because they are unable to obtain child care. The logical solution is to build a child care centre at the hospital itself to operate during the hours that would enable those professionally trained people to return to work. The letter continues:

> The working party is presently preparing a submission for State/Commonwealth funding and we would greatly appreciate receiving a letter of support from you which we would include in our submission.

I was only too delighted to provide such a letter of support, because I am very aware, from approaches that have been made to me directly by staff of the hospital, just how necessary such a centre is. The letter concludes:

> Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information about the project.

Immediately on receipt of that letter I wrote a full page letter to the Minister of Community Welfare here in Adelaide (a member of the South Australian Labor Government) fully supporting the request put to me by Mr Connolly. In that letter to the Minister I outlined in detail why it was felt that such a centre was necessary. I will not read that letter into the record because, unfortunately, time does not permit. I also wrote a full page letter of support to Senator Grimes (Minister for Community Services in the Federal Labor Government).

In that letter to Senator Grimes I set out in detail the very strong and cogent reasons that had been put to me for a child care centre at Modbury Hospital. I was extremely disappointed to receive letters in reply from Senator Grimes and from the Minister of Children's Services (not from the Minister of Community Welfare) indicating that the detailed submission from the Modbury Hospital (which had my full support and that of many other community members) could not be acceded to.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Read out the last paragraph of my letter.

Mr ASHENDEN: I am quite happy to read it out for the Minister. If he wants to wait, he will hear me place on record the reply I received from the Minister of Children's Services. I do not have time to read it in full, but—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: If the Minister waits 30 seconds, he will hear what I have to say, as follows:

> Options are being explored by the Children's Services Office with a view for the further provision of child care facilities in anticipation of Commonwealth funds for that purpose—

and this is the part that concerns me—

> in later funding periods.

In other words, certainly the Minister of Children's Services has acknowledged that he is hopeful that Commonwealth funding will be made available, but unfortunately the Commonwealth Minister's letter does not indicate that such funding is forthcoming. I am really worried that it says 'in later funding periods'—not even in the next funding period. My interpretation of the Federal Minister's letter is that this will occur some distance in the future.

I hope that the Minister of Children's Services accepts that I have represented faithfully and without misrepresentation a letter that was sent to me. I am delighted to see that he acknowledges that, but I make the point that I am very concerned that the representations that have been made have now not been acceded to and, although the Minister of Children's Services has indicated that he is hopeful that such funding will be made available in future funding periods, that is the strength of the answer, if one can call it a strength. I had hoped that a commitment would be given. If it could not be acceded to in this funding period, I had hoped that it would be brought forward in the next, but the letter from the Federal Minister for Community Services does not hold out much hope at all.

I am extremely disappointed that such an important project that would meet the very real needs of many people in the north-eastern suburbs has not been met. I point out that the lack of provision of this child-care facility affects not only those persons who want to return to the work force to provide the desperately needed support in the nursing profession, but also it must affect the care of patients in that hospital if that hospital is unable to obtain the best possible professional nursing care purely and simply because those persons are unable to obtain care for their children while they are working.

The next matter that I would like to address is the absolutely incredible manner in which this Government treats the Tea Tree Gully council. Last week in a grievance debate I pointed out how the member for Newland, the member for Florey, and the Australian Labor Party candidate for Newland took a deputation to the Minister of Local Government requesting that she overturn a decision of the democratically elected Tea Tree Gully council and, without any consultation whatsoever with the Tea Tree Gully council, the Minister did that. She did not approach the council to get their side of the argument and she did not even inform the council that she had overturned its decision. She advised the member for Newland that she had done it and the member for Newland went straight to the press. The first that the council knew of it was when the press contacted them. That was appalling.

What else did we find last week? The Minister of Water Resources accepted an invitation from the Tea Tree Gully council to open a solar heating unit at the swimming pool. Ten minutes after he was due to arrive to perform this ceremony an apology was received that he would not make it. It is an absolute slight and disgrace for a Minister to accept an invitation to open a facility and then, 10 minutes after he was due to perform the ceremony, to ring through to say that he could not make it. How appalling!

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): The first matter that I wish to address is the inordinate delay in a decision from the Premier about whether or not he will provide funds for the redevelopment of the Keith Institute. This matter has progressed at a very civilised level of discussion between representatives of the Keith Institute and the Tatiara district council. The Keith Institute Committee's President, Mr James Darling, in discussion and correspondence with the Premier's Department, obtained earlier this year an undertaking that the Premier would meet representatives of that committee in May, but, one or two days before the Premier was due to meet them, he broke the engagement.

Notwithstanding that, I raised the question of the funding of the Keith Institute for the first time at the end of the Estimates Committee discussion. At that time the Premier undertook to give a reply to the Keith community within weeks (not months). I certainly have not been advised and, unless it has been in recent times, they have still not heard. I would have thought that as a matter of courtesy the Premier would advise me of his decision, had he made one, so I stand here to complain about the inordinate delay of the Premier in failing to respond to the submission put to the Arts Department by the Keith community, a submission that is supported not only by everybody in that community, but also by the Tatiara district council to the extent that, in addition to the money that it will contribute towards the capital cost of the project (estimated to be about $410 000), it is also prepared to put in $9 000 per year over 10 years.

I think it is despicable that the Government can pull white rabbits out of the hat the way it has done in recent months. I refer particularly to the Noarlunga area, where centres that cost in the order of $400 000 or $500 000 (namely, child minding centres and women's health clinics and the like) have been approved. At the same time, he has had a responsible commmitment made by a local community requesting support for facilities that will be of greater use and advantage to a larger number of people than facilities of the kind to which I have just referred in the southern suburbs and which have only been referred to the Government by a very small number of people, certainly not representative of the entire communities that will benefit from expenditure, as is the case relating to the Keith Institute. I call on the Premier to stop prevaricating and give us an honest answer.

The next matter I wish to address is one on which I am happy to report that the Minister of Education responded to this day. He has given me a positive assurance and I intend to keep him to that. I refer to the discrimination against children from isolated country secondary school, be they high schools or area schools, when applying for apprenticeships in the Public Service. I refer to the current policy (that I thought was properly in place) that secondary school leavers in the communities I have just referred to will be given equal access (and there will be no discrimination against them) in their applications for apprenticeship positions in Government departments.

As recently as the night before last parents and students meeting at the Kingston Area School were told by an officer of the Technical and Further Education Department that, notwithstanding the letter of assurance dated 11 March that I have from the Minister of Education that clarifies his letter to me of 29 November last year, under no circumstances would any secondary school pupil who on leaving school but who had not participated in a prevocational course be denied a Government departmental apprenticeship. I think that is appalling. It shows one of two things: either the Minister of Education and the Minister of Labour, with whom he assured me he had spoken, are not keeping their word (and I believe the Minister of Education to be a man of integrity), or, alternatively, other Ministers in this Government simply are not communicating with officers of their departments.

That is typical. It would not be the first time that I have come across instances of that. I now call on all Ministers to honour the word and the undertaking given by the Minister of Education (and through him the Minister of Labour) that children from those secondary schools, on leaving school and applying for apprenticeships in Government departments, will not be discriminated against. They deserve a fair go. They are too far away from technical and further education colleges to be able to participate in the already overstretched resources of those TAFE colleges in providing these prevocational courses.

The next matter to which I refer also concerns the Minister of Education. It relates to a reply that he gave to my question on notice No. 191 about the Children's Services Office. The Minister pointed out that the majority of appointees to the regional manager and regional adviser positions in the Children's Services Office are variously qualified in education, child care, family day care, out-of-school hours care, toy libraries, play groups, or whatever: I ask whether or not some of them are part-time.

I understand that is the case. I also want to know why early childhood education qualifications are not accepted as a prerequisite for someone who is to be engaged in administering the affairs of early childhood education. I think the Government's policy in determining that it is not necessary for people directly responsible for the provision of early childhood education who do not have qualifications in that field is stupid and foolhardy. It is like saying that a fitter and turner or a cleaner can have an engineer's job, or for that matter that a slaughterman can have a job as a general practitioner.

Furthermore, I would like the Minister to point out how qualifications in early childhood education are inadequate. Will he tell the people who have those qualifications—who obtained them in good faith believing them to be relevant to their specific area of professional interest—where those qualifications are deficient? Will the Minister also tell those people what they should do if they want their qualifications to stand and be recognised? Furthermore, what deficiencies are there in the qualifications of social work, psychology, parent education and counselling of the type that the Minister has accepted as adequate in their appointment to administrative positions in the Children's Services Office?

The other two matters that worry me are matters of policy which have inflicted great distress on many people. I refer to the racist policies being pursued by the Federal Government, or the inane policies in relation to racial matters being foisted upon it by its union buddies. The first matter involves the ban on mail deliveries from South Africa. This is causing a great deal of concern to those people in South Australia who migrated from South Africa because, like me, they regard apartheid as abhorrent. The Postal Union has determined our foreign policy that there will be no processing of mail from South Africa and that is crook.

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

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): I refer to a matter raised in this House by the member for Todd on 10 October during the grievance debate, when he referred to the interaction between the Tea Tree Gully council and the State Government over two recreation centres called Turramurra and Burragah—one of them located in my current electorate and the other in my next electorate.

I intend to give a short history of the situation. On 8 May 1985 the *Leader Messenger* newspaper carried the headline 'Sports groups outraged by centres plan'. The article indicated that there was strong opposition by various organisations to the bid by the Tea Tree Gully council to offload (the paper's term) the recreation centres to SACRA (the South Australian Community Recreation Association).

On 29 May the story took a different turn with the realisation by the council that, before it could lease the two recreation centres, it would have to hold a public meeting and seek approval (a requirement under section 457 of the Local Government Act). Under this provision the council did not have to go to the Minister and did not have to approach the State Government in any form whatsoever. In that same issue of the *Leader Messenger* it was reported that the town clerk (the City Manager) had indicated that the council would call such a public meeting of residents as soon as the terms and conditions of the lease had been agreed by both parties, that is, the Tea Tree Gully council and SACRA. So far so good. The council had decided that a public meeting would be called where both sides could have a say and a democratic decision could be taken by the ratepayers of the city based on the information forthcoming at the meeting. At that stage a number of people approached me indicating their opposition to the scheme, as was their right. I agreed with them, which was my right, and I expressed my point of view in the *Leader Messenger*.

Soon after this two separate developments took place: one was the discovery by the Tea Tree Gully council that the staff of the two centres could not be handed over to SACRA with the centres, but that they had to be able to exercise an option of staying with the council. I understand that all of the centre staff took that option to stay with the council, obviously preferring the devil they knew to the devil they did not know, which is a sensible position to take.

I felt sorry for the council at that time. Obviously, the salaries of the individuals working in the centres were the single largest component of the running costs of the centres. It now looks as though council would still have to pay those salaries and, moreover, would have a number of people on staff whose skills did not match the skills that the council required. In fact, I fully expected at that point that the council would be unlikely to proceed.

The second development that took place at roughly the same time was that council could take an alternative route, namely, that of requesting the Local Government Minister to allow council under section 379 of the Local Government Act to enter into a contract with SACRA. Council, probably mindful of its stated intention to hold a public meeting, asked the Minister for a contract for 12 months, at the end of which a public meeting could be held and presumably a leasing arrangement entered into.

I was approached soon after this letter was sent to the Minister by people who felt that the Minister was being given information only from one side, and I was asked to lead a deputation to the Minister to ensure that she was aware of the opposition to the proposal. It appears that this deputation and my reading of it aroused the ire of the member for Todd.

Mr Ashenden: And the Tea Tree Gully council.

Mr KLUNDER: I advise the honourable member to wait and not interject. He expressed himself by saying that I should 'know full well that the State Government has no place in the affairs of local government'. Further, he indicated that I and others asked the Minister of Local Government to 'step in and stop the Tea Tree Gully council, a democratically elected body, from implementing its decision'. Finally, he stated, 'Incredibly, the Minister decided to step in and prohibit the Tea Tree Gully council from proceeding with the decision that it had made legally.' None of this was correct. The Tea Tree Gully council—

Mr Ashenden: Talk to the city manager.

Mr KLUNDER: I am talking to the House at the moment, and I advise the honourable member to sit there and listen. The council had originally made a decision, namely, to lease to SACRA, under section 457 of the Local Government Act, and this included a public meeting, for this did not require ministerial approval. Council then changed its mind and asked the Minister to make a decision in favour of council under a different section of the Local Government Act—section 379—which would avoid the public meeting for 12 months or, as was said to me, until such time as it would be too late for the public meeting to make a meaningful choice.

But, according to the member for Todd, the Minister, when asked for a decision by the council, apparently needed to be reminded at the same time that 'State Government has no place in local government' and that she had no right to 'prohibit the Tea Tree Gully council from proceeding with the decision that it had made legally'. The only decision that it could legally make was to ask the Minister for a decision to either approve or disapprove a request by council, and council asked her to make that decision.

She did so: she denied the request. Although the member for Todd may not have liked her decision and may argue that it was incorrect, the thing that he cannot argue is that she had no right to make a decision. Yet, that is the line he has taken. Moreover, to argue that she would always have to rubber stamp the decisions of council, no matter what they were, makes a mockery of section 379 of the Local Government Act.

I remind the honourable member that that section has been part of the law of the land since 1929, and he had a fair chance to make alterations to it if he wished to. The most charitable interpretation that I can put on this state of affairs is that the member for Todd was not in possession of all the facts when he made his speech.

The second point that the member for Todd raised was that in the deputation which I took to the Minister there was no representation from the council. When council made its various decisions, namely, to lease to SACRA under section 457 of the Local Government Act and then later to approach the Minister under section 379, it did not inform me. I hasten to add that council was under no obligation to inform me, and I did not expect it to do so.

When council wrote to the Minister, members of the council gave their side of the story—again, a quite proper way to proceed. My constituents asked me to lead a deputation to enable the Minister to gain a balanced viewpoint: in other words to hear their side as well as that of the council. I do not apologise for acceding to that request. I imagine that the member for Todd would have been the very first person to scream about interference if his constituents had asked him to do something and he had to tell them that he was not able to do so. As I see it, a major decision by the council (that is, in relation to a ratepayer owned property and a council service to the community) is now back where it belongs, namely, with the people of Tea Tree Gully.

I now refer to the substance of the situation. The Tea Tree Gully council offers in these two centres a relatively cheap and accessible service to the community. Many sport-

ing clubs play there: many parents and friends watch the players, and, as I am sure the member for Todd is aware, the atmosphere is very pleasant. The cost of this service which some years ago was about $50 000 has dropped steadily, and the proposed deficit for this financial year was of the order of $28 000. Incidentally, since one officer, whose salary was included in this amount, is apparently no longer on the pay-roll, the deficit is more likely to be under $10 000. In the meantime, attendance figures improved by 33 per cent in Turramurra from 1983-84 to 1984-85, and during this time attendance at Burragah increased by 14.5 per cent.

If this continues, the break-even point will soon be reached on operating expenses and, of course, one could not expect SACRA to be interested in an operation that makes a loss and can be expected to continue to make a loss. In other words, a ratepayer owned facility looks as though it is financially improving while at the same time it is offering a valuable service to the area involved.

If that facility went, under contract, to SACRA, it is odds on that the successful team of staff that is currently running the centres involved would not be available in 12 months time to take over the running of those centres again if a public meeting then decided against SACRA. Therefore, in 12 months a real decision would not be possible. It seems to me entirely desirable that the public which owns the facilities should be making the decision regarding the SACRA proposal at a time when the choice is a real one.

Motion carried.

GROUNDWATER (BORDER AGREEMENT) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 4.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 5 November at 2 p.m.