HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 27 March 1980

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 239 residents of South Australia, all praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act, were presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson and Messrs. Randall and Schmidt.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: TRADING HOURS

Petitions signed by 142 residents of South Australia, all praying that the House oppose the Bill to extend trading hours for retail food stores until 6 p.m. on Saturdays, were presented by Messrs. Lynn Arnold, Crafter, and Millhouse.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions as detailed in the schedule I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

MARKET GARDENERS

In reply to Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (5 March).

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: As requested by the honourable member, details of applications lodged by market gardeners for financial assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act on account of the storm damage on 14/11/79, have been obtained and at 14/3/80, were as follows:

1. Total number of applications received	259
2. Applications for which approval has been given for financial assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967	164
3. Applications still being processed	46
4. Assistance not approved under P.P.E.A. Act for following reasons:	
Not eligible (mainly less than 50 per cent income from farming)	20
Not in need	8
Non-viable (offered household support)	21
	49

In total the amount of financial assistance approved under the Act is $1 664 013, which represents an average approval in each case of $10 146.

In 21 non-viable situations, where assistance has not been approved under the Primary Producers Assistance Act household support has been offered under the provisions of the Rural Industry Assistance Act, 1977. Thirteen applications for this support have been received.

The purpose of household support is to provide assistance for up to one year to non-viable farmers having insufficient resources to meet living expenses and who are in need of assistance to alleviate conditions of personal and family hardship while the farmer considers whether to adjust out of farming.

SEAFORTH CENTRE

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (1 November).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: My colleague the Minister of Community Welfare has informed me that correspondence has been forwarded to the Glenelg and Brighton councils suggesting that a meeting be arranged to discuss proposals to put the establishment of the Seaforth Community Centre on a more formal basis. It is hoped that this meeting will be held in the near future so that the rights and responsibilities of all the parties involved can be clarified. The Government is anxious that the centre should continue to operate successfully for the benefit of many people in the area, and it will continue its support to the project.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. D. O. Tonkin):

Pursuant to Statute—

Parliamenty Salaries and Allowances Act, 1965-1978—Report and Determination of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, 1980.

Ordered that paper be printed.

QUESTION TIME

HOUSING LOANS

Mr. BANNON: In view of the report in today's *Age* that the State Bank of Victoria has increased interest charged on existing home loans by ·5 per cent, will the Premier say whether he has approved, or received a request for approval, in respect of home loans for a similar increase by either the Savings Bank of South Australia or the State Bank of South Australia? Can he confirm that for a family on average weekly earnings of $230 in South Australia seeking a new housing loan a rise in interest of just half a per cent will force them to put down an extra $900 as their initial loan deposit?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The report to which the Leader refers is one which I have not seen but I had heard that that action had been taken by the bank in Victoria. Immediately after the announcement of the increase by the Bank of New South Wales earlier this week I asked the Acting General Manager of the Savings Bank of South Australia and the Chairman and General Manager of the State Bank of South Australia for a report. I am able to report to the House in the following terms.

The Acting General Manager of the Savings Bank of South Australia says that the bank will review interest rates during the coming fortnight. The move by other banks to increase interest rates on investment savings accounts would, of course, cause the Savings Bank to re-examine its competitive position. Any change in deposit stock investment rates offered by the bank may need to be balanced by changes in interest rates on loans for owner-occupied houses. Apparently some confusion has arisen where some borrowers have recently received notices by post notifying a lift in housing rates. These were for other than owner-occupied houses.

The rises resulted from a decision, as the Leader would know, announced earlier this month. It is not likely, in

their opinion, that those rates would be increased in the current review. There is a move by the Savings Bank of South Australia to examine the situation, but I cannot say more than that at this stage. However, I can say that the State Bank of South Australia has examined the matter, and I quote from the General Manager's report to me:

> At this time I am able to say that any increases contemplated will relate only to the general banking business of the bank; they will not affect rates applied to concessional housing loans.

Again, the bank expects that it may well have to increase interest rates paid on deposits with the bank to maintain a competitive fund raising position on the present market. As a consequence, it will be necessary for them to consider rates on housing and other loans forming part of general banking business. But, any increase in lending rates will have to be discussed with the Reserve Bank.

In spite of the cautious approach exhibited by both the Savings Bank and State Bank, housing mortgage loans will not be increased at this stage. I point out that there is an extreme degree of pressure because of the competitiveness of the market. While we sincerely hope that it will not be necessary for them to raise their interest rates for home ownership, for mortgage loans, that still has to be considered a possibility at some time in the future.

As for the additional sums which would have to be found, that is a matter which has concerned my Government. Quite marked changes have been made in requirements for the State Bank's lending. The limit has been raised to $33 000. The amount which can be borrowed has been lifted, and the arrangements for second mortgages have been taken up in one total mortgage package, rather than going to a second mortgage situation. If there is an increase in the home loan interest rate, then I have no doubt that the situation regarding arrangements to be made for deposits and eligibility for State Bank loans will be reviewed.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Dr. BILLARD: I ask the Premier whether there is any indication that there has been more time lost due to industrial disputes since the election of the present Government. Over a number of years South Australia has had a low level of industrial disputation. Repeated claims have been made during that time that this was due solely to the presence of a Labor Government. It would, therefore, be of interest to members to know whether the situation had changed as a result of the election of a Liberal Government.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The question of industrial disputes and the rate of time lost is, of course, a matter that concerns everyone in South Australia. I believe that the South Australian record, since the days of Sir Thomas Playford as Premier, and before, extending right through that period, and through the period of the last Administration, has been one of which South Australians can be very proud indeed. There has been no evidence whatever to suggest, as some people have done in remarks I have heard, that there has been any increase in the rate of industrial disputation, or in the important aspect of how many hours have been lost. I point out that in the September to December quarter, the period of this Government, 30 000 working days were lost in South Australia as a result of industrial disputes.

While that may seem a lot, I am certain that the Deputy Leader recognises that it represents only 4·7 per cent of the national total of 635 900 working days lost and, again, it maintains the very fine record that South Australia has shown in the past. Mr. Speaker, I think this matter is of considerable importance, particularly as it concerns my forthcoming visit to Japan and the United Kingdom. I have been told in my briefings in preparation for my visit to Japan that Japanese industry is particularly concerned with industrial relations, and it will be a very strong point that I will be able to make on behalf of South Australia that in fact our rate is as low as it is. I think that is a tremendous plus for South Australia, and it will certainly help in our efforts to attract investment and industry for this State.

Mr. Bannon: It wasn't achieved easily.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I totally agree: it was not achieved easily. It is something that was built and worked on over many many years, indeed, a number of decades, and it is something that I believe we must guard most jealously. In my view, there is abroad in the community (and this relates not only to trade union members but to members of the community generally) a feeling that people want to see South Australia pull itself out of the difficulties that it presently finds itself in, that they are prepared to make every effort to do just that. There is a spirit of co-operation and of community concern for South Australia which is stronger than we have experienced for many years.

URANIUM

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Is the Government still committed to its policy that South Australian uranium will be sold only under the most rigorous safeguards and codes of practice, and will the signing of the non-proliferation treaty by a customer country under I.A.E.A. arrangements be a prerequisite before any South Australian uranium is sold to that country?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The short answer to that question is "Yes". The requirements of the South Australian Government must complement those of the Federal Government, and if the Deputy Leader cared to do a little research into the matter I think he could not escape coming to the conclusion that the requirements of the Australian Government are more stringent than those of other suppliers of uranium. They are certainly equally stringent; in fact, it is my belief that they are more stringent. One of those pre-conditions is that any customer country be a signatory to that treaty.

PINE TREES

Mr. EVANS: I direct my question to the Minister of Forests. Will the Minister treat the harvesting of those pine trees in the area of the recent bush fires that are of commercial value as urgent? I seek the indulgence of the House to make a longer explanation than I normally make when asking a question.

In recent times I have raised with the Minister the matter of burnt timber possibly costing more to handle because it is not as pleasant to handle by employees, and clothing becomes soiled. The Minister might like to tell me the result of his inquiries in that matter. More importantly, I have had numerous people express concern and fear that thousands of tonnes of timber of commercial value will become useless if it is not felled and processed rapidly.

I am informed that the burnt pine has a commercial value only when it is milled within eight weeks after a fire, whereas more than one month has now passed since the bush fires and little has happened. Because there is no sap flow, the bark adheres to the timber in such a way that it

makes the timber of little economic value, because of the difficulty in debarking. But the biggest threat is a fungus that usually becomes active within six to eight weeks after a fire. Immediately the season breaks, the fungus will become very active, causing the timber to discolour, and its benefit to society to be lost. More particularly, while it is now worth $6 to $8 a tonne on the stump, it will then be useless and there will still be a cost to the already disadvantaged to have it removed

It has been put to me that this is an opportunity for the Government, through the Minister, to take immediate action to put all the resources we can into processing this timber.

I have been informed also that a piece of equipment lying idle at Mount Crawford is ideal for felling in this hilly type of country, and all it needs is to be transported to the fire area, and an operator seconded from the South-East to begin work immediately.

Also, it has been put to me that Softwood Holdings Mill at Kuitpo Colony is under contract to the department, and is still handling Woods and Forests Department logs, which, if left in the forest until the burnt timber is handled, will not be lost to the department. The department should not penalise Softwood Holdings for not handling the agreed quantities of departmental timber by the end of June.

Also, I am informed that the pine posts preservation plant at Meadows is short of timber suitable for posts, and many of the pine trees in the fire-affected area are suitable for treatment for fencing materials. Of course, the fences that have been lost in the fire have created an extra demand for fence posts, anyway. Will the Minister treat this matter with sympathy and as urgent?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Members will recall that a question along these lines was asked in this place a couple of weeks ago by one of my colleagues, at that time seeking recognition of extra payment for work done by employees in the burnt forests. I referred, among other things, in my reply to the inquiries made by the member for Fisher on behalf of his Adelaide Hills constituents. The situation is that the Woods and Forests Department officers are ready and available to assist the victims of that fire in the felling, carting and delivery of the burnt log material.

The department does not own a mill in the Adelaide Hills or adjacent areas, and is totally dependent upon the private sector-owned mills to process and saw logs. They, in turn, are restricted in the throughput of their respective outfits because of licence requirements in that area. We have made available the officers with the expertise to do the work, not at a profit (at which a significant part of our Woods and Forests Department operates), but on a basic cost basis. They, in turn, are, as I said, dependent upon the private millers actually to saw the logs.

We have, this morning, invited private sector millers to submit an application for an extension of their quotas, or amounts of timber that they may process within their milling operations. Frankly, the homework, so far as the Woods and Forests Department is concerned, has been done and the offer still stands. There is a problem with respect to the movement of timber out of those mills, and, unless there is a market for it, naturally a miller will not take it on board. I suggest that the honourable member urge the private sector millers in the Adelaide Hills to make every effort immediately to avail themselves of any opportunity to process and market the logs.

In doing that, we will feed the material to them so as to relieve the victims of the embarrassing situation in which they find themselves. I am aware, and indeed the officers of my department are more aware, of the deterioration factor (the fungus that sets in between the bark and the outer shell of the log and then proceeds to deteriorate the log itself following its being burnt). I am also aware of the equipment that has been referred to by the honourable member, but the equipment and manpower needed to perform the snigging, carting and delivery jobs are not problems. It is at the point of mill that we have a problem because the Government does not own or operate a mill in the Adelaide Hills area. For that part, we rely entirely on private sector millers, with whom we will co-operate.

URANIUM

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: My question is supplementary to that asked of the Minister by the Deputy Leader today. Will the Minister of Mines and Energy please clarify the apparent contradiction and confusion in his ill-considered reply to a question from the Deputy Leader today about safeguards and codes of practice for the export of South Australian uranium?

The Minister's reply seems to be rather inconsistent with other statements that he and the Premier have made on this subject. For instance, the Premier has said that he will discuss the sale of uranium to Japan when he visits that country shortly. I received that answer on Tuesday in relation to a question that I had on notice, wherein I asked the Premier whether he would be discussing the sale of uranium during his visit to Japan. His answer to that question was quite a short and succinct "Yes".

The Minister of Mines and Energy has said that South Australia has an obligation to supply uranium to countries in the Western bloc which have no other source of energy, and he referred to countries such as Japan and France. He also said that the Federal Government's safeguards had worked reasonably well since they were introduced in 1977. I do not know what criteria he used in making that statement. He also said that no contracts would be made until safeguards arrangements with customer countries were finalised. As the Minister indicated in his answer, he is apparently aware that Japan and France are not signatories to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. Even the Minister will agree that it is about base one with regard to any safeguards agreement that legitimately seeks to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons that the country should be a signatory.

Although my question is directed to the Minister, it does involve the Premier also. Will the Premier be asking the Japanese Government to sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty before South Australian uranium is sold to Japan? Is the Minister aware that the Federal safeguards conditions were changed in 1978 to become what is, in effect, an arrangement whereby companies were told to go ahead and that the Federal Government would fix up the safeguards later. I believe that I am quite justified in phrasing the question as I have done as there was confusion and contradiction in the answer given to the previous question. I therefore seek clarification from the Minister.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: With respect, I think the confusion exists in the mind of the member for Mitchell quite frankly. I do not think that one can receive a more simple answer than "Yes". The fact is that South Australia does not have any uranium for sale at the moment. I refer the honourable member to the reports of Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst, the advisers to the former Government in the employ of that Government since 1974, I think from memory, on the Uranium Enrichment Committee. That committee canvassed the whole area of safeguards, and a report was compiled as a result of the committee's overseas tour with former

Premier Dunstan. There seemed to be some confusion in the mind of the former Premier regarding what the consensus view was. The clear consensus view of Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst seems to be (and their reports, by the way, were to hand before any change of Government took place) that the position in relation to safeguards was clear.

In fact, I shall read for the edification of the member for Mitchell what Mr. Dickinson said on his return. This was the report commissioned by the former Government. I might add that the former Premier said that he would table the report but then decided that perhaps it was not propitious to do so. This is what Mr. Dickinson said in relation to the safeguards in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pointing out that—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Answer the question!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitchell cannot receive a more simple answer than "Yes" and, if he cannot understand that, his mind is more than confused: it is in a complete state of turmoil. In relation to South Australia, Mr. Dickinson said:

> The consensus view—

that is the word that is being bandied around—

> which has led to a fair bit of confusion in the mind of the former Premier was that effective safeguards could be operative in the early 1980's in most countries whose Governments had made commitments to honour non-proliferation and International Atomic Energy Agency agreements.
>
> In anticipation of these conditions becoming established, it was also the consensus view that the safeguards required for the sale of South Australian uranium to customer countries could now be drafted and form the basis for detailed discussions with the Commonwealth Government regarding their implementation.

There was also some confusion, I believe, in the honourable member's mind in relation to the codes of practice. Safeguards for the sale of uranium is a different question from that of the codes of practice in relation to the safe mining, milling and transport of uranium. I should like, for the honourable member's edification (because there appears to be some confusion in relation to the codes of practice, and associated sales) to say that the codes of practice have now been drafted and agreement has been reached. They will be entrusted to the care of the Minister of Health, and the Health Commission will be the monitoring authority in relation to the safe mining and milling of uranium.

To clear that cloud which is obviously enveloping the honourable member's mind, I point out that there is a difference between the codes of practice and safeguards. Those codes have now been drafted and will shortly be implemented before we have any uranium for sale, anyway. So, the honourable member's question is a little premature in relation to sales of uranium from South Australia.

The other point on which he touched, in a somewhat diverse dissertation that tended to cloud his thinking even further, was in relation to the Premier's forthcoming trip to Japan. He will be talking to the Japanese about prospects in relation to South Australia that will come to finality when we have some uranium for sale.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: As we have seen from replies to Questions on Notice, that's a long time away.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not all that far away, but it is not presently with us. I can only reiterate the answer for the honourable member's benefit, namely, "Yes".

RUNDLE MALL

Mr. BECKER: Will the Chief Secretary inform the House whether there has been a need to increase police surveillance in Rundle Mall and in certain Hindley Street trouble spots and, if there has been, why? As he knows, being President of a health and welfare charitable organisation, I wrote to him some months ago concerning the harassment that a certain charity worker was experiencing in Rundle Mall, together with the problems associated thereto, expressing my gratitude on behalf of the association for assistance the police had given him on many occasions. I understand that even some buskers are subject to harassment from time to time in the mall and that the public is concerned at the activities of people associated with the Hare Krishna movement and the Children of God. I also believe that in other areas of Hindley Street and its surrounds there have been attacks on persons and insulting remarks made to pedestrians using the streets, and that this has been disturbing to interstate and overseas visitors during the festival.

I also understand that certain loutish behaviour near certain premises in Hindley Street has been of concern to the Police Department. It would be regrettable if there was a need for further police surveillance to protect the community. I should be grateful if the Minister could say what is being done to protect members of the community who are being encouraged to come back and visit the city.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member touches on a problem which has concerned the police and, indeed, members of the public who use Rundle Mall, which is a fine part of our city and which is available to the public most of the day and for a large part of the evening.

Since before Christmas the Hare Krishna movement, to which the honourable member referred, has come under the notice of the law. The honourable member also referred to loutish behaviour in those areas. I think it was the night of the emergency sitting of this House, when we sat late, that I and other members of this House when on North Terrace were greeted by catcalls, disgraceful names and references to reproductive organs of special kinds. The legislators of this State as well as the general public should, in a freedom-loving country such as ours, be able to engage in the pleasures that are provided in the main streets of our cities without being harassed or subjected to insults or physical violence. The police have stepped up surveillance in this area. I am advised that this action has been successful and that the situation has quietened. However, when action is taken in one place the trouble—

Mr. Bannon: Amazing!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Leader says that this is amazing. A person of the Leader's standing and who is as broadminded as he is would, if he thought about it, realise that it is not amazing because, when trouble is unearthed it transfers itself to another area. Some queer and dangerous things are happening and people are being subject to all sorts of things. I hope that the Leader will take notice of that.

I appeal to the public of South Australia. If people see something going on that is worrying them, I wish they would co-operate with the police, because the police cannot be everywhere at all times. The criticism seems to be that everyone wants patrols to fix their problems. If the public does not come forward and tell the police where this is happening, it costs much money, which is being spent to no avail.

The answer to the honourable member's question is, "Yes". The police have stepped up their activities in Rundle Mall and have been successful in bringing to book some of these Teddy boys. I could call them some other

uncomplimentary names that would certainly befit their actions. I will bring down for the honourable member a more detailed reply than I am able to give him today about the sorts of people frequenting our streets in places such as Rundle Mall. I know that our friends opposite established the mall, and this Government will ensure that it is a place to which South Australians can go without being harassed, insulted, abused or subjected to physical violence.

URANIUM

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy agree with the views of the uranium protagonists, Mr. R. E. Wilmshurst and Mr. S. B. Dickinson, that the international safeguards system covering the sale of uranium is "far from foolproof"? Since the change of Government, Messrs. Wilmshurst and Dickinson have chosen to claim that they had been misrepresented by former Premier Dunstan as to the findings of the overseas fact-finding mission on uranium of which they were members.

They have said, however, that there was unanimous agreement to a statement prepared for the former Premier in Holland prior to his return. But they have said that his conclusions upon returning were not the same as those agreed to in that document.

Good heavens, I am a little embarrassed by the immodest conduct on the front bench opposite. I know that such behaviour has been legal in South Australia for some years now but not in this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yet, following the examination of that document, I have found that it is Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst who have grossly misled the public. Let me quote from that document, as follows:

> From the very detailed discussions with Governments, technical experts and the nuclear industry in Europe, I must say we have been forced to conclude that at present the safeguards system is far from foolproof.

Finally, the document states:

> The implications of these and other developments is that the South Australian Government cannot responsibly assure the people of this State that uranium development and export is safe.

It would appear then from this document that Messrs. Wilmshurst and Dickinson have bowed to political pressure in order to distort the genuine findings of the overseas uranium fact-finding mission.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Elizabeth not to comment in giving the explanation. The early part was very clearly material by way of quotation from previous reports. His recent remarks were of a commentary nature.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Very well, Sir. It has been reported to me that it is indeed a shame that two men with such distinguished careers and acknowledged expertise in their field as uranium protagonists have chosen to misrepresent their own findings on an important public mission and thus damage their own credibility.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Opposition members never know when they have had enough. The fact is, of course, that the whole history of their involvement in the uranium debate has been one of misrepresentation, selective quoting, such as the member for Elizabeth has today indulged in, and complete falsehood in their representation of reports to the public. Let me remind the member for Elizabeth, because he has been a party to these ("questionable" is not a strong enough words) tactics on the part of the Opposition to misrepresent the facts in relation to the whole uranium question to the South Australian public.

It started off, and has been continued by the Leader of the Opposition, with his complete misrepresentation of my statement in relation to uranium enrichment, when he said I stated that an enrichment plant would be built in 1980. That is a complete fabrication. I said that a uranium enrichment plant could be started by the end of 1980. That is not all that different from the time scale that the Leader of the Opposition and I acknowledged. There seems to me to be a considerable difference in saying that an enrichment plant will be built in 1980 and saying that it could be started. At the time that that advice was given to me, about six or seven months ago, that looked a real possibility. It could be started: in other words, an agreement could be reached for the starting of this project.

Of course, anyone with an inkling of common sense knows that a project of that magnitude would take several years to complete. So, to suggest that I said it would be built with a clear implication that it would be completed and up and going in 1980 is a complete fabrication. Then we had the nonsense, promoted in the Upper House by the honourable (and I say this advisedly) Dr. Cornwall, that Radium Hill was going to become an international dumping ground for uranium. I highlight these facts to indicate the misrepresentation that has occurred again today from the member for Elizabeth.

Then we had the farrago of (I am not allowed to say lies) untruths paraded in this House and to the public in relation to the transport of plutonium to poison the populace in Adelaide. If ever we were subjected to a farrago of complete (again, I am not allowed that say lies)—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Deputy Premier not to use the term even in the manner in which he is using it at the moment.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We had these untruths to instil fear in the minds of the public and to cast a slur on the integrity and reputation of the Department of Mines—a most cowardly underhand attack. Then we had a series of selectively leaked reports, with the intention of the press drawn to particular paragraphs in these reports. We were asked to comment on these reports at the eleventh hour. We managed to change the tenor of one story when this initial tactic was inaugurated by the Leader of the Opposition.

It culminated a few weeks ago in a report being handed to the media with the back page torn off. That report purported to indicate that copper could be mined at Roxby Downs without the uranium. "Confidential" had been stamped on the front and the back pages, and it indicated that the uranium was an integral part of the ore body of microscopic dimensions and that it was complete nonsense to suggest that the copper could be mined without the uranium. That page was torn off and treated as a confidential report when it is available in the Parliamentary Library. So we approach this question in that context. Again, we had a classic piece of selective reporting of the tenor of the Wilmshurst-Dickinson reports today. Again, he has indulged in this filthy tactic of casting a slur on the integrity of highly professional people like Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier has just alleged I have been involved in filthy tactics, and I draw your attention to rules of debate in Standing Order 154 which states:

> No member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion; and all imputations of improper

motives . . . shall be considered highly disorderly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth has indicated that he believes the comments made by the honourable Deputy Premier are unparliamentary and disrespectful to himself. If in fact that is the purport of the honourable member for Elizabeth's request, I will ask the honourable Deputy Premier to withdraw the words which the honourable member finds offensive. However, I point out that the interpretation the honourable member for Elizabeth is placing on Standing Order 154 is not the interpretation that the Chair places on that Standing Order. Does the honourable member claim that the words were disrespectful to him?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, indeed I do, Sir, but in saying that could I ask the Chair to advise the House of the interpretation that you, as Speaker, place on this Standing Order?

The SPEAKER: I accept the honourable member's comments, but it is not my intention to give a full interpretation of that Standing Order at this stage. The matter regarding its interpretation arose earlier in the session while I was not in the Chair. It is one to which I am addressing myself and on which I am taking further advice. On the next day of sitting, I will bring down an interpretation of that clause as I see it, and I will rule on it for the future. I will however, ask the honourable Deputy Premier whether he will withdraw the words to which the honourable member has objected.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of your ruling and request, Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase what I said. What the member for—

Mr. Whitten: Withdraw!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I will withdraw and rephrase it. The fact is of course that the member for Elizabeth has cast a slur on the integrity of Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst in suggesting that they bowed to political pressure. That is cowardly and scurrilous, and typical, I might say, of the member for Elizabeth.

He has been projecting a very low profile for the past few months since the Party woke up that he was an electoral liability, but he is back in full flight again today. All I can say is that the Leader had better watch his back. The fact is that that is a most dastardly imputation to cast upon two people who have given this State signal service. I may say that that imputation is clearly nonsensical, and is borne out by the fact that those reports were written months before the election (an election that the Labor Party now rues, of course) was called. They had no political axe to grind. There was no pressure from the Liberal Party, and the Labor Party did not dream for a moment that the Liberal Party would be in office six months later.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Neither did you.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That adds weight to the point that what the member for Elizabeth is saying is nothing short of a slur on the integrity of Messrs. Dickinson and Wilmshurst. Those reports were written before mid-year. They were written with a degree of courage, I believe, because they knew what the consensus view was, and they probably had an inkling (which we now know is confirmed) of the operations of the policy propaganda branch of the Premier's Department, which had to try to make the facts fit the so-called dicta of the Party. There have been a few interesting sidelights thrown on this uranium question by the committee of assessment, which assassinated the member for Hartley recently. One has only to read what it reveals about the shenanigans of the Labor Party on the uranium question, when it acknowledged publicly that Dunstan was being undermined by his Ministers. We can understand the behaviour of the member for Elizabeth in seeking to impute these motives to Messrs. Dickinson and Wilmshurst when he, I suspect, was one of those very Ministers.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the term "you" is unparliamentary, so is the term "he" when used in the manner in which the honourable Deputy Premier has just referred to the member for Elizabeth. I ask him to come to the point of the answer to the question so that Question Time may proceed.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The "honourable" member for Elizabeth has repeated this behaviour, and it is understandable in view of his behaviour when his Premier was overseas seeking facts. The final point I make is that, if the member would desist from making selective quotes that suit his purposes, purposes that I have outlined, he would find the conclusions of Dickinson and Wilmshurst are abundantly clear, even to a lawyer of his turn of mind. All he has to do is turn to the last page. All he has to do—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I noticed that you spoke to the Deputy Premier about the term "he", and I thank you for that, but he has used that term on three occasions since when referring to the member for Elizabeth, and I draw your attention to that fact.

The Hon. H. Allison: He's got the sex wrong, has he, Jack?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. I was listening carefully to the manner of approach on this subject and I did not take offence at the use of the word "he" subsequent to my drawing the matter to the attention of the Deputy Premier, because it was used in a rather different context and was not being said simultaneously with the shake of a hand. What I referred to previously was the manner in which the honourable member for Elizabeth was being referred to, and the stress which was being placed on the single word "he", rather than "he" in the context of a sentence. I ask all members on both sides to recognise that this is an important forum of the State. It is Question Time, and the conduct of the whole House is in members' hands.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I draw the attention of the member for Elizabeth to the last page, particularly, of Mr. Wilmshurst's report. In the second paragraph, in the conclusion that rounds off the report, he states:

> There is no technical reason, in relation to safeguards or disposal of waste, why uranium mining should not proceed in South Australia.

Dickinson echoes those sentiments.

PAROLE BOARD

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Chief Secretary say whether the Government has made any alterations to the composition of the Parole Board, and what is to be done in relation to reappointment of the present personnel of that board? The Chairman of the board, Her Honour Justice Mitchell, completes her present term on 31 March. The other members of the board will complete their terms on 11 April. Over the years there has been a great deal of interest centred in and around the Parole Board, and at times the Parole Board has had to face rather strong criticism from the public in relation to some of its decisions. There is a great deal of public interest in relation to the board and its operations, and likewise, I believe that some people realise that at times the Parole Board is faced with rather difficult decisions and difficult

tasks. Because of the importance of this matter, I ask the Chief Secretary to indicate what the Government is doing in relation to the Parole Board.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The member for Glenelg has raised a matter that has been the subject of a lot of public discussion since this Government came into office and, indeed, since before it came into office. My predecessor, I think in the last statement that he made in this House, discussed in statistical terms the performance of parole in this State, and I think the first public statement I made was in relation to making an addendum to that.

When one looks at those two statements, one sees that parole, in the main, has been successful. Of course, there have been some horrendous implications that have given rise to great public concern about the question of parole. As has been stated by the member for Glenelg, the present Chairman of the Parole Board, Her Honour Justice Mitchell, will complete her term on 31 March, which is in four days time. The appointments of other members of the board will expire on 11 April. The Attorney-General (Hon. Trevor Griffin) and I have, among other things, had quite long discussions about the question of the Parole Board, and, indeed, about the policy on which we went successfully to the people on 15 September. However, we have been chided in this House for having done little or nothing about that policy. This morning in Executive Council, on the recommendation of the Government, His Excellency the Governor reappointed Justice Mitchell as Chairman of the Parole Board.

We have made one change to the board, namely, we have appointed Mr. Andrew Kyprianou to replace Mr. Pope. The appointments of Mr. Kyprianou and other members of the board will be of a temporary nature and will expire on 31 August. The reason why we have had to do this is well known to members of this House, namely, that the Government has not been able to bring the necessary legislation before the House in the six months that we have been in office to place the terms of our policy on the Statute Book. In addition to Mr. Kyprianou, we are reappointing, as members of the Parole Board, Dr. J. S. Scanlon, Mr. F. R. Curtis, and Mrs. F. M. Wallace for that temporary period to 31 August. This facilitates the provisions of the legislation because, if we do not have a Parole Board, we are without the machinery to consider not only those people who are due for parole but also those who have been released to see to it that they, too, honour the terms of their contract.

It is proposed that, in the Budget session of the Parliament, Mr. Griffin and I will introduce this amendment to the legislation that will give effect to the Government's policies with regard to parole and sentencing. If necessary, we will extend these appointments that His Excellency has announced today, to ensure that the State is not left without a Parole Board.

PETROL THEFTS

Mr. KENEALLY: I address my question to the Minister of Mines and Energy if he has regained his composure. Perhaps valium would assist. Has the Minister received reports from his department about a new and unwelcome development in the countryside, namely, the vastly increased theft of petrol? It has been reported to my office and to the offices of other members that, because Federal Government petrol policy has turned motor fuel into a near luxury, people who have bulk petrol tanks near roadsides in the country are now facing trouble. Instances have been reported to me that these tanks have been tampered with and emptied. In other cases, petrol lines in vehicles have been ripped out to drain tanks rapidly. Petrol "rustling", it has become plain in recent weeks, has grown into a problem of considerable proportions. I am aware that it is not within the Minister's powers to prevent this from happening, but I would be grateful for his confirmation, if the material placed before him by his departmental officers allows him to confirm this.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will do something that I do not usually do. I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is the most sensible we have had from the Opposition today. In one sense, it is misdirected, because one would normally expect that a question in relation to the theft of petrol or of any other commodity would be directed to the Minister in charge of the police, the Chief Secretary. One would have thought that that would be the logical place to direct the question.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: He's had two already.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I see, it is my day today. I think that the logical place to direct the question would be to the Chief Secretary. I have not had a report from my officers. I think that the first Minister who would get such a report would be the Chief Secretary, because the normal recourse for people having petrol stolen from them would be the police rather than the Department of Mines and Energy. Nonetheless, I will inquire of my department to satisfy the honourable member's curiosity.

Mr. Keneally: Concern!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Concern and curiosity.

Mr. Keneally: Curiosity, on your part.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a curious question being directed to me.

Mr. Keneally: Well, sit down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not in charge of the police. I would have thought that the normal passage of inquiry would be to the police. For the honourable member's benefit, I will check with the Chief Secretary to find out whether there has been any complaint or inquiry to that place or whether any report is available.

TRACHOMA

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Health outline the steps being taken to reduce the incidence of sight-threatening trachoma amongst Aborigines in the State? My question arises basically from documentaries that I have seen from time to time on television, one good one of which was on the Australian Broadcasting Commission recently, outlining some of the health problems among Aborigines in Australia and, I suspect, some are in South Australia.

The newspapers from time to time also carry articles about trachoma amongst Aboriginal people and one has only to move amongst these people to see the results of this disease to realise that we as a Government have a responsibility to them. I therefore ask the Minister to outline this Government's policy on this subject.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Three main ways are being used to detect and control trachoma in Aboriginals in the remote areas in South Australia. The first method is that ophthalmologists from the Royal Australian College of Ophthalmologists visit the remote areas two or three times a year to advise the workers who are assisting Aboriginals to monitor the situation and to generally advise the Health Commission and consult with those who have responsibility for the health of Aboriginals to see that the disease is being kept under control.

It certainly is a disease which has most tragic effects and is spread if there is not good hygiene and health care. Of course, the bacteria is carried by dust and, consequently, any people living in the remote areas are likely to be subject to trachoma.

The second method in which the disease is controlled is that the South Australian Health Commission conducts a monthly review of all Aboriginal children up to the age of five years who live in the remote areas. This is a general health review carried out by European nurses in consultation with Aboriginal health workers. One of the purposes of the review is to detect trachoma and to treat it where it is found.

The third way in which the disease is controlled is that the staff of the Aboriginal Health Unit are trained to be alert to the presence of trachoma and to test every child on a regular basis.

I was recently in the Northern Territory and saw the way in which the Aboriginal health workers are trained to conduct these tests. I, like the honourable member, have seen the effect of the disease, which can be devastating on the sight.

Of course, trachoma is not the only disease having a severe effect on Aboriginals. In the remote areas, particularly where they live in poor conditions off the settlements, they are subject mainly to respiratory diseases, diseases of the middle ear, and ititis mid-ear, and children, particularly infants, are extremely vulnerable. The main way in which the Health Commission is trying to overcome this is by ensuring that the Aboriginal health workers are trained to advise the mothers on how to care for their newborn infants and the developing child, and to pay particular attention to hygiene and to diet.

I was interested to note when I was in the Northern Territory that there was a good sense of co-operation between Aboriginal health workers there and those in the north of South Australia. In the Territory they have one particular day a month on which the trachoma test is carried out in all the settlements.

It was suggested to me that it would be helpful if South Australia were to select that same day so that, where there is interchange and children travel across the border, there is no possibility that they would risk being picked up and they would go longer than a month without undergoing a trachoma test. I appreciate the honourable member's interest. I hope that after I have been to the remote areas in May, I will be able to give him a more detailed report of exactly what is being done.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRISON OFFICERS

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The statement concerns the industrial dispute involving prison officers. The Government is very concerned about the effects of the bans placed on work by prison officers who are members of the Australian Government Workers Association. I have been informed that all attempts by both the Public Service Board and the Industrial Commission to solve the dispute have been rejected by the prison officers. I understand that the prison officers were meeting at 2 p.m. today, and the Government trusts that they will take a more responsible attitude, in the light of the commission's order to lift the bans.

I will outline some of the background details of the dispute. A letter was sent to the Public Service Board issuing a log of claims on behalf of the prison officers of South Australia. That log of claims, which includes 20 items, is as follows:

1. 12 per cent wage increase as per N.S.W.
2. Environment allowance $20 per pay.
3. Double time and a half for all public holidays worked, plus a day in lieu.
4. N.R. to be removed from the roster.
5. 35 hours week.
6. Retirement at 55, full superannuation and pension (voluntary).
7. Sick leave payment at termination of service.
8. 30 days sick leave, cumulative.
9. Departmental transport or taxis for hospital watches.
10. Full pay after three years service.
11. Service allowance $520 per year after 10 years.
12. I hour extra pay whilst on shift in institutions.
13. Increase to 25 per cent shift allowance.
14. Departmental accommodation made available or rent allowance in lieu.
15. Travelling allowance to and from work if not in accommodation.
16. 7 weeks annual leave in line with Northern Territory.
17. Double for penalty rates on Sundays.
18. One hour paid study leave per week.
19. Payment for all departmental courses passed $10·00 per pay.
20. Payment for 2 days as a bonus for the occupational job done by prison officers over the Christmas period, in line with the Premier's decision on police officers.

On 14 March the prison officers imposed the following bans, after a stop work meeting:

1. Ban on all movement of inmates by prison officers to court.
2. Ban on all admissions and inter-institutional transfers, except for patients to Northfield Security Hospital.
3. Ban on the new west gate at Yatala Labour Prison. This is the entry to the new industrial complex and may prohibit P.B.D. employees from entering that job to proceed with that complex.
4. Ban on No. 8 Post—Delivery/supply entrance to workshops.
5. Ban on all re-admittances.
6. Ban on the 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. officer at Adelaide Goal—this officer is specifically for admittances.

In light of that log of claims, which was not formally served on the Industrial Commission but was sent to the Public Service Board, there was a voluntary hearing before the Industrial Commission on 14 March. I will bring to the attention of the House the recommendations of the Commissioner after the hearing, because they highlight the irresponsible nature of the industrial dispute that exists. The recommendations of the Commissioner after that hearing were:

1. That a meeting of prison officers be held as soon as possible.
2. That prison officers lift all bans and limitations forthwith.
3. That the Australian Government Workers Association lodge an application regarding the log of claims with the commission as soon as possible.
4. That the commission will ensure an early commencement of the hearing of the application as soon as the union informs the commission that it is ready to proceed.

These bans were imposed despite the fact that a log of claims had not been formally served on the commission at that stage. Following the voluntary conferences on 14, 17 and 18 March, the Commissioner of the South Australian Industrial Commission handed down recommendations to the parties involved. I would like to go through these because I believe this again highlights the irresponsible

nature of the bans imposed by the association. The recommendations were:

1. That the Australian Government Workers Association lodge an application regarding the log of claims with the commission as soon as possible.

Even on 18 March, that log of claims had not been served. The recommendations continued:

2. That the commission will ensure an early commencement of the hearing of the application as soon as the union informs the commission that it is ready to proceed.
3. That a small working party be set up, comprising representatives of prison officers and the A.G.W.A. on one hand, and the Public Service Board and Correctional Services administration on the other hand.
4. That the working party expeditiously investigate whether there are changes constituting significant net additions to work value which are agreed between the parties.
5. That the working party present this evidence to the commission constituted of myself, for assessment of an interim increase, pending the outcome of a full work value case.
6. That this recommendation is made conditional on the prison officers lifting their bans and limitations.

Again, I stress that these recommendations were brought down by the Commissioner on 18 March, after a voluntary conference. I stress that those bans were not lifted, and although a log of claims was served, it was incorrectly served and has since been sent back to the union or association for correction.

A further voluntary conference was held on 26 March, when again, the bans had not been lifted. I bring to the attention of the House the recommendations, or a statement and summary of the dispute, by the Commissioner involved. He said:

> The bans imposed have:
>
> *(a)* disrupted various court functions;
>
> *(b)* imposed pressure on the police holding prisoners in police cells;
>
> *(c)* imposed hardships on prisoners being held in the conditions prevailing in police cells; and
>
> *(d)* delayed the upgrading of the health standards applying to the preparation of meals at Yatala Prison.
>
> i.e. The people being hurt are people who are not involved in the dispute and who cannot in any way affect the outcome of the dispute. In that regard the bans are irresponsible.

I stress again that this is the Industrial Commissioner speaking. The summary continues:

> In my view the bans cannot achieve the result which prison officers are seeking. My offers as set out in my recommendations have been rejected by the prison officers. The prison officers have rejected:
>
> *(a)* The setting up of a working party which could have resulted in agreement on changes, which could be used as a basis for an interim increase pending a full work value inquiry.
>
> *(b)* The fixing of early dates for the commencement of the work value inquiry. Wednesday 26 March had been reserved for that purpose, although other customers of the commission would have liked to have used that date. This date has now arrived and obviously the prison officers have not made productive use of the intervening period to prepare submissions to commence their case today.
>
> *(c)* As these offers and opportunities have been rejected, this intervening period has been wasted. Instead, the prison officers have used this period to place further bans on the working of overtime and on installing a temporary kitchen at Yatala so that permanent facilities to meet high health standards may be constructed.
>
> The prison officers should clearly understand that the continuation of the bans will not achieve the result they are seeking. They should clearly understand that I will not award any variation to the award without hearing evidence to justify the variation.
>
> The dates for the hearing of this evidence will now be arranged to suit the convenience of the commission and other parties who require the services of the commission. Available dates now extend into April. The continuation of these bans can only further delay the date of operation of any award, if an award is justified on the evidence put before me. In this regard, the continuation of the bans is against the prison officers' own best interests.
>
> Whilst I am aware that an application for a variation to the award has been lodged, I have been notified by the Registrar that the application has been returned to the applicants for amendment because the form of the application was unacceptable. I can only state to the prison officers that, in my view, their own best interests will be served by lifting all bans and limitations and putting their time and effort into preparing evidence and presenting it to a commission hearing to justify the relief which they are seeking. I have no criticism of the conduct of the Public Service Board or the Department of Correctional Services during the course of this dispute. They have been reasonable and restrained in their actions. On the other hand, I believe that the actions of the prison officers has been ill-considered and irresponsible. There is no evidence of common sense being applied by the prison officers.

That was the summary of events handed down by the Commissioner in the South Australian Industrial Commission yesterday, after a voluntary conference. Again, I believe that it highlights the irresponsible nature of the industrial dispute, and that the bans have been imposed despite the fact that there is still no acceptable log of claims before the Industrial Commission.

The other point to which I draw members' attention is that the log of claims which I have read out to the House, and the nature of which members can see, must be approved by the Industrial Commission; otherwise it is against the wage indexation guidelines. I simply urge the various prison officers involved, when considering the continuation of this dispute, to look at the decisions handed down by the independent judge appointed in this case, namely, the Industrial Commissioner. I ask honourable members to take note of that, and of what I believe to be a very unreasonable continuation of the bans imposed and the difficulties they are causing in this State. Finally, I point out that the prison officers are public servants, and therefore they come under the aegis of the Public Service Board and the Public Service Act. Further action in this matter shall be left to the Public Service Board to decide.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BREATHALYSER DOCUMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During the course of the debate early this morning on the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill dealing with the breathalyser, the Minister of Transport made the following statement:

I am extremely disappointed at the action of the member for Elizabeth. He has forced me to table a Government document. I am disappointed because before that I said that there was information I could have used in this debate which would have been to the disadvantage of the Labor Party. It is not of momentous import, but it is good enough.

Although I did not put it in those words, I said that I would not use the information because I did not believe that I should use departmental files for that purpose. In fact, that docket shows that the former Premier had suggested to my predecessor—

and this is the Minister speaking—

that the Labor Government should introduce a form of random breath testing in the first quarter of 1980.

There was then an interjection from the Hon. J. D. Wright, who said, "A former Premier?", to which the Minister replied:

Yes. Mr. Corcoran suggested to my predecessor that a form of random breath testing should be implemented before 1980. The document is tabled so honourable members can look at it and the relevant clauses.

Having taken the advantage of looking at the docket, I find that the minute to which the honourable Minister referred was a draft minute prepared by one of my officers for my perusal. It was never signed by me. It was never forwarded to the Minister of Transport, and even a casual glance through the docket could have shown that it was never forwarded to the Minister of Transport. So, it was never a suggestion from me to my colleague, Mr. Virgo, the then Minister of Transport. I could be kind enough to forgive the honourable member, with his inexperience. He may not have realised that this was the case. But, to add to it, there is a note under where my signature normally would have been, which says:

Discussed with Mr. Corcoran. Not sent. Hold until after election. In meantime ask what Victoria has discovered with their experimental tests.

That is signed or initialled by John Holland, Chief Administrative Officer of the Premier's Department. The Minister, in stating what he did last night, or early this morning, in that debate, in my view misled the House, and at least should apologise to me, if not the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Speaking in the adjournment debate on Tuesday evening, I expressed my disappointment that the Government had apparently decided not to go on with the South Coast notional educational development plan. From the *Hansard* record which is quite correct, by my recollection, I used these words:

More than that, the Government is passing up an opportunity to implement a good plan that would be cost effective. The Victor Harbor corporation is prepared to put money in the Minister's pocket if he is prepared to go along with some semblance of the original scheme.

Of course, I was speaking metaphorically, I am sure that the Minister was aware of that and that he was not suddenly buoyed up with some optimism that he would be able to afford another overseas trip. However, in case it should be interpreted in other places that I was suggesting that the Victor Harbor corporation was prepared to bribe the Minister in order to get this project, I make quite clear that that was not the intent of my remarks.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BREATHALYSER DOCUMENT

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Hartley made certain accusations against me. If the honourable member, when he was Premier, was not treating the relevant minute seriously, why was it allowed to remain on the file?

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Mr. I. P. Lewis be elected to the Council of the University of Adelaide as provided by the University of Adelaide Act, 1971-1978, *vice* Mr. F. R. Webster.

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Mr. G. M. Gunn be appointed to the Standing Orders Committee in place of Mr. F. R. Webster.

Motion carried.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the amendments proposed by this Bill is to enable prosecutions for minor offences instituted by the office of the Corporate Affairs Commission under the Companies Act, 1962-1979, to be disposed of quickly and efficiently under the provisions in the Justices Act, 1921-1979. Section 57a of the Justices Act, 1921-1979, provides a simple method for a defendant to plead guilty to a minor offence without attending at court, and section 62ba allows prosecutions for minor offences to proceed where the defendant fails to attend court. This section also facilitates proof of the charge where the defendant fails to attend. The majority of the prosecutions instituted by the Corporate Affairs Commission are for offences of a minor nature (such as a failure to file documents). Often the defendant wishes to plead guilty or fails to attend, and it is important that the provisions of the Justices Act, 1921-1979, be available so that the court's time is not unnecessarily occupied and delays are not caused in the court list. The relevant provisions of the Justices Act, 1921-1979, have effect only where proceedings are instituted by a police officer or "other public officer".

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

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

It is necessary to widen this category so that those persons who are permitted by section 382 of the Companies Act, 1962-1979, to institute prosecutions under that Act are included. The Bill will have this effect by including the Corporate Affairs Commission itself and its officers and employees. It is intended that a Bill will be

introduced into Parliament amending section 382 of the Companies Act, 1962-1979, so that officers and employees of the Commission will be able to institute prosecutions without the specific authority of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. As a result the personal involvement of the Commissioner will no longer be required in the issuing and conduct of proceedings for minor offences thus saving considerable time.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes an amendment to section 27a of the principal Act. Section 27a simplifies the procedure for serving a summons on a defendant where a complaint is made by a police officer or other public officer. This amendment substitutes a reference to a public authority for the existing reference to a member of the Police Force. Clause 3 amends section 57a of the principal Act. Paragraphs *(a)*, *(b)* and *(c)* make amendments similar to the amendment to section 27a and consequential amendments. Paragraph *(d)* replaces the definition of "public officer" with definitions of "public authority" and a new definition of "public officer". The definition of "public authority" includes the Corporate Affairs Commission thus ensuring that all prosecutions instituted by the Commission itself can be dealt with expeditiously. The definition also includes those authorities listed in the old definition, the employees of which were defined as "public officers".

The new definition of "public officer" includes police officers and any officer or employee of a public authority. Because police officers are included in the definition of "public officer" the reference to members of the police force in the principal Act is no longer necessary. As can be seen in the earlier amendments the reference to a member of the police force or any other public officer has been replaced by reference to a public authority or public officer thus considerably widening the effectiveness of the provisions concerned. Paragraph *(d)* makes a consequential amendment to subsection (12) of section 27a. Clause 4 makes the necessary consequential amendments to section 62ba of the principal Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purposes are to provide for the admissibility of documents produced from microfilm records, to empower the Corporate Affairs Commission to act as a delegate of the National Companies and Securities Commission and to make a number of minor amendments to the principal Act. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

In the near future the Corporate Affairs Commission will introduce a system under which microfilm records will be made of documents lodged with it. When a copy of a document is required for use as evidence in court or for any other purpose, a copy will be made from the microfilm record and not from the original document. To avoid the possibility of any argument that this is not a copy of the original document, and therefore not admissible under section 12 (5) of the principal Act, a definition of "copy" will be included in section 5 of the Act.

Another similar problem relates to the production of records in pursuance of the order of a court. Under the new system of filing it will be impracticable to produce the original document and the Bill therefore enacts a new subsection (5a) of section 12 which provides that the Commission may produce to the court a copy obtained from the microfilm of the document concerned. Production of such a copy will satisfy an order for the production of the original document.

The States and the Commonwealth have entered into a co-operative scheme for the purpose of enacting uniform laws relating to companies and the securities industry throughout Australia. It has been agreed that each State will enact uniform laws for the purpose in their respective jurisdictions and that the laws of each State will be administered by one body named the National Companies and Securities Commission. The enabling legislation establishing this Commission has already been enacted by Federal Parliament. It is intended that the National Commission will delegate its powers and functions under each State Act to the appropriate authority in each State. In South Australia it is intended that the Corporate Affairs Commission administer the new laws, when they have been enacted, as the delegate of the National Commission. To enable the Corporate Affairs Commission to do this it is necessary to give it express power. Clause 20 of the Bill has been included for this purpose. The other provisions of the Bill make various other minor amendments to the text of the principal Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 corrects a reference to a section number in section 3 of the principal Act. Clause 4 inserts into the definition section of the principal Act a definition of "copy". "Copy" is defined to include "reproduction" which in turn is defined in such a way to include copies made from microfilm. Clause 5 removes paragraph 9 (1) *(a)* from the principal Act. This paragraph provides that a person who was registered as a company auditor under the repealed Act may be registered as a company auditor under this Act. The "repealed Act" is the Companies Act, 1934, and this provision is obviously no longer necessary. Clause 6 enacts new subsection (5a) of section 12 of the principal Act. The purpose of this subsection is to provide that production of a copy of a document produced from microfilm will satisfy an order for production of the original document.

Clause 7 replaces subsection (3a) of section 21 of the principal Act. This subsection provided that an alteration of the memorandum of association of a company would take effect seven days from the date of the resolution or order making the alteration. This provision was inserted by the Companies Act Amendment Act, 1979, but it has been found to create problems in the administration of the Act. The new subsection provides that a resolution or order altering the memorandum will take effect on registration by the commission or at the expiration of seven days after lodgment with the commission, whichever occurs first. The registration of resolutions and orders of this kind are given first priority by the Commission and delays rarely, if ever, occur. However, if a delay of more than seven days does occur the company lodging the resolution will be protected by the new provision.

Clause 8 makes amendments to section 26 of the principal Act consequential on the removal from that section, in 1979, of the references to "private company". Clause 9 amends section 54 of the principal Act, which by subsection (7), provides that officers of a company that are in default under the section are guilty of an offence. The amendment provides that the company itself will also be

guilty of an offence under the section if default occurs. This brings the section into line with other similar provisions. Clause 10 makes clerical amendments to section 77 of the principal Act. Clause 11 removes subsection (2) from section 79 of the principal Act for the sake of uniformity with interstate legislation. Clause 12 removes two transitional provisions from section 127 of the principal Act. These provisions have served their purpose and are not longer required.

Clause 13 removes subsection (7) of section 157 of the principal Act. This provision has no application in South Australia. Clause 14 substitutes the word "subsection" for "section" in section 218 (1) *(aa)* (i) of the principal Act. Clause 15 changes subsection (3) of section 223 of the principal Act so that a person who applies before the Supreme Court for the winding up of a company must lodge notice relating to the proceedings with the commission. The clause also adds a new subsection to section 223 of the principal Act which provides that failure to comply with subsection (3) of that section will be an offence. Clause 16 makes a drafting amendment to section 309 of the principal Act. Clause 17 amends subsection (9) of section 346 of the principal Act to relate the reference to paragraph *(f)* to subsection (1) of section 347.

Clause 18 amends section 382 of the principal Act to streamline the machinery whereby informations and complaints are instituted and prosecuted under the Act. At the moment paragraph *(b)* of subsection (1) of section 382 enables the Commissioner or an officer or employee of the commission authorised by the Commissioner to lay an information or make a complaint under the principal Act. The requirement that the officer or employee be authorised by the Commissioner creates problems of a practical nature in the administration of the office of commission and the prosecution of the offence in court. The amendment by removing the requirement for authorisation avoids the need to prove the authorisation in court. Paragraph *(b)* adds a paragraph to subsection (4) of the section that will facilitate proof of the fact that the information or compalint has been laid or made by the Commissioner or by an officer or employee of the commission.

Clause 19 substitutes a reference to the commission for a reference to the Registrar in section 384 of the principal Act. Clause 20 empowers the commission to act as a delegate of the National Commission. New paragraph *(b)*, inserted by this clause, empowers the commission to authorise any person to exercise a power or authority or perform a function or duty delegated to the commission by the National Commission. This is necessary because the commission's functions and powers are exercised through its officers. Clause 21 replaces paragraph 5 (4) *(i)* of the ninth schedule in order to achieve uniformity with interstate legislation.

The Hon J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CREDIT UNIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health: 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

Nearly three years has elapsed since the Credit Unions Act came into operation. During that period, the effectiveness of the Act in its practical application has been closely monitored. Gradually a list of matters needing some clarification or adjustment has been compiled, and these matters, together with some additional material requested by the credit union movement itself, are now sufficient in number to warrant amendment to the Act. The object of this Bill is to effect these sundry amendments, the import of which will be explained as I deal with the detail of the clauses of the Bill.

The Registrar of Credit Unions, the Credit Union Stabilization Board and the Credit Union Association of South Australia have had extensive consultations in relation to the Bill, with the result that all of the provisions of the Bill have the support of the credit union movement through the association.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on a day to be proclaimed. Clause 3 provides a definition of "member" which makes it clear that when the Act uses this word it means a person who has joined a credit union by being allotted a share in the union. Clause 4 provides that where loans made to directors and other officers and employees of credit unions or associations are reported to the Registrar, such information is not to be made available to the public. The same situation also applies in relation to reports made to the Registrar where a director has declared an interst in a contract with the credit union or association. Clause 5 obliges the Registrar to acknowledge receipt within 14 days of applications from credit unions for registration of alterations to rules. This amendment was requested by the Credit Union Association.

Clause 6 further clarifies that a member of a credit union is a person who holds shares in the credit union. This amendment is designed to prevent credit unions from having "associate members" who do not contribute to the credit union by way of purchasing shares. The substituted subsection (3) removes an anomaly, in that the section as it now stands refers to a member's liability being limited to the amount unpaid on his shares, whereas the actual requirement is that all shares in credit unions be fully paid.

Clause 7 clarifies that a member of a credit union has only one vote on any resolution. There has been some confusion in this area, as some persons apparently hold joint shares as well as shares in their own name, or hold more than one joint share. It is not intended to allow the situation to develop whereby a person is able to obtain multiple voting rights and so be in a position to manipulate a general meeting of the credit union. New subsection (5a) recasts the wording of the existing subsection (5) so as to place a positive requirement in relation to the repayment of share capital in priority to deposits.

Clause 8 is consequential upon the amendment effected by clause 7 in relation to voting rights. Clause 9 obliges a credit union to lodge with the Registrar copies of all mortgages granted by it as security for amounts borrowed by the credit union. This is intended to ensure that any person who inspects the public file can obtain a better picture of the financial position of a particular credit union. Clause 10 removes the obligation upon officers and employees of a credit union to report to an annual general meeting any loans made to them by the credit union. This has been seen as an unfair invasion of privacy where an officer or employee is granted a loan on exactly the same terms as any other member. It is provided that any such loan must be reported to the Registrar. The common law rule that requires a director, as a person in a fiduciary

position, to disclose to a general meeting of members any financial interest in a contract with the credit union in order to preserve the validity of the contract is specifically negated. However, if a director is granted a loan at a concessional rate of interest, that concession will still have to be approved by a general meeting pursuant to section 61 of the Act. Furthermore, if the rules of any credit union actually require a director to report loans to an annual general meeting, then he must comply with such a rule.

Clause 11 provides more flexibility in the provisions relating to liquidity. The amendment will permit a credit union's liquid funds to drop below the prescribed percentage (currently 9 per cent) provided that an average daily liquidity computed over a month does not fall below the prescribed percentage. As the section now stands, a credit union whose liquid funds normally stand at 12 per cent could be liable to prosecution if on one single day the funds happened to fall to, say, 8 per cent. This is unduly restrictive, as funds can fluctuate quite considerably from day to day. Clause 12 clarifies the intention of the Act in relation to transfers of surplus funds to reserve accounts. It is made clear than any surplus can first go to reducing any current or accumulated operating deficit. It is also provided that allowance may be made for other prescribed matters (e.g. long service leave payments) before the surplus is calculated. It is made clear that dividends paid to members are excluded when calculating the surplus.

Clause 13 provides that a credit union need only seek the approval of the Registrar to the purchase of real property where the cost would exceed 5 per cent of the total of the paid-up share capital of the credit union and the amount held by it by way of deposits. As the Act now stands, approval has to be sought for every purchase of real property. The same requirement for approval is extended to the carrying out of improvements to any real property owned by a credit union, so that there is some control over large expeditures of funds in this area. Clause 14 provides that unclaimed moneys are to be paid to the Credit Union Stabilization Board instead of the Treasurer. It is appropriate that such moneys should be channelled back for the benefit of the credit union movement.

Clause 15 empowers an association of credit unions to lend moneys to the members, officers or employees of its member credit unions. It is desirable that officers and employees should be able to obtain loans from a body that is more capable of independent scrutiny than their own credit unions. Any loan made to an officer or employee of the association, or of a member credit union, must be reported to the Registrar. Loans made to an officer or employee of the association do not have to be reported to a general meeting of the association, except where the rules of the association require a director to report any loan made to him. Clause 16 provides that certain further sections of the Act apply in relation to an association in the same manner as they apply to a credit union. These extra sections relate to the filing of annual returns, and the supervisory powers of the Credit Union Stabilization Board.

Clause 17 provides that a credit union officer who offends against this section is not only guilty of an offence that carries a penalty of $1 000, but is also liable to the credit union for any profit thereby made by him, and any damage thereby suffered by the credit union. This liability is consistent with a similar provision in the Companies Act. Clause 18 prohibits voting by proxy at a credit union meeting. Clause 19 obliges the Registrar to acknowledge receipt within 14 days of copies of special resolutions lodged with him pursuant to this section. Again, this is an amendment sought by the Credit Union Association. Clause 20 amends the section dealing with the financial accounts of credit unions so as to bring the provisions more into line with accepted accounting procedures and terminology.

Clause 21 provides for some controls over the manner in which the auditor of a credit union may resign. It is proposed that the consent of the Registrar must be sought for any such resignation, thus bringing this area into line with the corresponding provisions of the Companies Act. Clause 22 provides that any report made by an auditor, whether at an annual general meeting or at any other time, must be made in accordance with the provisions of this section. Clause 23 provides for at least two members of the Credit Union Stabilization Board to be chosen from a panel of names submitted by the Credit Union Association of South Australia (or any other prescribed association). If the association fails to submit a panel of names, the Minister may make the necessary nominations. Clause 24 provides authorised officers of the Credit Union Stabilization Board with investigatory powers similar to these powers vested in the Registrar under the Act. Clause 25 empowers the Credit Union Stabilization Board to exempt a credit union which is under the supervision of the board from certain provisions of the Act that place stringent controls over the monetary policies of credit unions. These controls are inappropriate and, in some instances, counter-productive, where the financial affairs of a credit union are subject to the board's direction.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): 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 Consumer Credit Act contains a number of provisions under which civil consequences are attached to contravention of or failure to comply with a provision of the Act. For example, section 28 (3) provides that a credit provider who carries on business without a licence in contravention of the provisions of the Act is not entitled to recover credit charges under credit contracts entered into while unlicensed. Sections 40 and 41 provide that credit charges are not recoverable under credit contracts that do not comply with the requirements of those sections. These civil penalties are often out of proportion to the gravity of the offence, and the principal purpose of the present Bill is to provide a simple means by which a person who has offended against a provision of the Act may obtain relief against the civil consequences of the illegality. I should emphasise that the various criminal penalties that may result from non-observance of the Act will remain unaffected.

The Bill also makes some significant administrative changes to the principal Act. The office of Registrar is abolished and a new office of Commercial Registrar is established. The Registrar presently exercises an amalgam of judicial and administrative duties. Under the new arrangements those functions will be separated: the judicial functions will be exercised by a special magistrate

and the administrative functions by the occupant of the new office of Commercial Registrar to be established by the Bill. The opportunity is also taken to make a few other minor amendments to overcome problems that have arisen in the course of its administration. I should point out that this Bill and the corresponding amendments to the Consumer Transactions Act are interim measures only. A comprehensive revision of these important Acts is presently under consideration, and it is hoped that Bills for this purpose can be introduced later in the year.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the definitions of "revolving charge account" and "sale by instalment". The Credit Tribunal has recently decided that the effect of the present definition is to prevent the maintenance of a single account to which heterogeneous charges, some arising under consumer contracts and others not related to consumer transactions, can be debited. This result is very inconvenient and was certainly not intended. The amendment therefore removes from the definition the reference to "consumer" contracts. A corresponding amendment is made to the definition of "sale by instalment". The definition of "the Registrar" is replaced by a definition of "Commercial Registrar".

Clause 3 amends section 18 of the principal Act. The present provision under which certain jurisdictions may be delegated by the Chairman to the Registrar is replaced with new provisions under which those jurisdictions may be delegated to a special magistrate. Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment. Clause 5 establishes the office of Commercial Registrar in lieu of the previous office of Registrar. Under the new provisions powers and functions of an administrative nature may be assigned or delegated to the Commercial Registrar.

Clause 6 amends section 28 of the principal Act. This section presently prevents the recovery of credit charges where the credit provider was unlawfully carrying on business without a licence at the time the contract was entered into. Credit providers can of course carry on business without a licence where they do not charge more than a prescribed rate of interest upon outstanding debts. It is felt that where the credit provider does not fall into this exempt category, he should not be deprived of credit charges in respect of those contracts that do not impose credit charges exceeding the prescribed rates of interest. Clause 7 confers upon a consumer an explicit right to recover back credit charges that have been illegally exacted. The proposed new subsection (6a) corresponds to section 40 (9) of the principal Act.

Clause 8 enacts section 60a of the principal Act. This is the major amendment proposed by the Bill. The new section provides that a person may seek from the tribunal an order for relief against the consequences of contravention of, or non-compliance with, the Act. A single application can, if necessary, be made in relation to a series of acts or omissions of a similar character. New subsection (3) provides that where the tribunal is satisfied that the contravention does not warrant the consequences prescribed by the Act, it may make an order for relief against those consequences. New subsection (4) sets out criteria to which the tribunal should have regard in determining an application. New subsection (5) provides that relief may be granted upon such conditions as the tribunal considers just. New subsection (6) confers rights of appearance in the proceedings upon the Commissioner and other persons who may be affected by an order. New subsection (7) provides that relief may be granted in respect of events that occurred before the commencement of the amending Act. New subsection (8) provides that an order will operate to the exclusion of any contrary provision of the Act. New subsection (9) provides that relief may not be granted against any criminal liability or penalty.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): 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 main function of this small amending Bill is to ensure that the South Australian Waste Management Commission established under the principal Act has power to establish and operate bank accounts. Although the general provisions under which the commission is established are expressed in terms which are arguably wide enough to authorise establishment and operation of bank accounts, the Government feels that the matter should be put beyond doubt. The Bill also rectifies a small printing error which has been noted in the principal Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 substitutes the word "section" for an incorrect usage of the word "Act" in section 7 of the principal Act. Clause 3 repeals section 40 of the principal Act, which gives the commission power to invest, and substitutes an expanded provision dealing with the commission's funds. This provides that moneys received by the commission shall be paid into a fund and applied by the commission in the furtherance of its objects. The commission is also empowered to invest, and to establish and operate bank accounts.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): 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

Its intention is twofold. First, an amendment is made to the financial provision contained in section 19 of the principal Act which will empower the Museum Board to borrow money for the purposes of the board. Secondly, the Bill inserts a new Part into the principal Act dealing with meteorites. The purpose of this Part is to preserve meteorites that fall in South Australia for scientific research and for the benefit of the people of this State. In recent years there has been a rapid increase in the commercial trade in meteorites. This has resulted in the

collection of large numbers of South Australian meteorite and their sale interstate and overseas. This has occurred despite Commonwealth customs legislation that prohibits the exportation of meteorites. It has been recognised by the museum authorities in each State that co-operation is necessary between the States to reduce the movement of meteorites interstate and overseas. Part of this co-operative effort is the enactment of protective legislation in each State. Legislation similar to the provisions in this Bill has already been enacted in Tasmania and Western Australia and legislation is intended for the other States.

The effect of the new Part is that all meteorites that have fallen to earth in South Australia before the commencement of the Act and are not owned by anyone, and all meteorites that fall in South Australia after the commencement of the Act will belong to the Board of the South Australian Museum. However people who own meteorites at the commencement of the Act will be able to retain ownership if they register the meteorite with the board within one year. Thereafter the board must be notified of any change in ownership of the meteorite. This will enable the board to keep track of meteorites in private ownership.

The Bill makes certain provisions to facilitate the finding of meteorites. There is an obligation on a person finding a meteorite to report it to the board. The board may pay a reward for the delivery of a meteorite to the board or the provision of information that leads to the finding or recovery of a meteorite. A person who has been authorised by the board is entitled to enter private property to search for or recover a meteorite.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 3 of the principal Act. Clause 4 adds two new definitions. The word "meteorite" is defined to include all meteorites except tektites. Tektites are small non-crystalline meteorites that fall in great profusion in a belt that passes across the State. The museum already has the largest collection in the world. Because of the large numbers of tektites available and the existing collection there is no need to bring them under the protection of this legislation. Subclause *(c)* simplifies and widens the definition of "the State collection" so that meteorites will be included.

Clause 5 makes consequential amendments. Clause 6 enacts new Part IIA. New section 16a deals with the vesting of meteorites in the board and the requirements for registration and notification of changes in ownership. Subsection (5) will confine the operation of this section to meteorites that fall to earth in South Australia. Subsection (3) makes it an offence to fail to notify the board of a change in ownership or possession of a meteorite that is privately owned. Subsection (4) enables a court, when convicting a person for a failure to notify, to order that the meteorite be forfeited to the board. New section 16b relates to rewards for the delivery of a meteorite or for supplying information leading to the finding of a meteorite. Subsection (2) requires a person finding a meteorite to notify the board and provides a penalty if he fails to do so. This subsection has effect only where a person knows that what he has found is a meteorite. New section 16c provides for the entry onto land of persons authorised by the board for the purpose of searching for, examining and recovering meteorites. Subsection (2) requires notice to be given to private owners before entry and subsection (3) provides a penalty of five hundred dollars for anyone who obstructs an authorised person exercising powers conferred by the clause.

Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act so that in future it will be an offence to sell, damage or destroy or be in possession of a meteorite owned by the board. However possession for the purpose of delivering a meteorite to the board will not be an offence. Clause 8 amends sections 18 and 19 of the principal Act. The subsection added to section 18 is an evidentiary provision which will place the onus of proving in any proceedings that the board did not own a meteorite on the person making that allegation. The amendment to section 19 adds three new subsections which constitute the borrowing powers of the board. Clause 9 makes a consquential amendment to section 20 of the principal Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEAT HYGIENE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 March. Page 1800.)

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the Bill, which has been introduced to make certain changes in connection with meat hygiene, and in doing so I recognise that the Bill has received overwhelming support from both the industry and the community. Because of that, I think it is appropriate that I should address my remarks to several specific points in the Bill rather than take the lead that has been given by some members of the Opposition in filibustering and extending the debate.

There are several matters with which I believe the Select Committee has come to grips, matters which over a number of years the former Government was unable to tackle in a positive manner. I support the comments of the Minister and the member for Salisbury, who referred to the responsible attitude of all members of the committee in tackling this task. Indeed, the recommendation in the report that was recently tabled in the House go a significant distance towards solving the problems that have bedevilled this industry for many years.

Those points include the establishment of a Meat Hygiene Authority comprising three persons: the chief inspector, a representative of the Minister of Health, and a representative of local government. We will not have the situation proposed in the previous legislation where one person (namely, the chief inspector) would have sole discretion and responsibility in the administration of the legislation. No one person should be able to dictate such powers in legislation. Indeed, it will work far more effectively and efficiently in administrative terms for the committee of three to respond and administer the legislation now before the House, if it is successful in its passage.

The committee considered that it was unnecessary to define abattoirs areas in the State when it applied restrictions on slaughterhouses, as has been recommended in this report. Therefore, the recommendation that the whole State be regarded as a free trade area for meat slaughtered in licensed abattoirs is, I believe, a positive step forward. Certainly, it opens up the possibility for country abattoirs, such as those trading in Port Pirie and other country areas, to trade into the major market for the supply of meat, the metropolitan area of Adelaide. This is rightly so, because, if they undertake the capital investment and are prepared to undertake the strict hygiene standards and employ them within those meatworks, they, too, should have the capacity to enter into the major meat market in Adelaide, if that is their wish. By doing so, I am sure that some country abattoirs will gain the capacity, in output terms, to become more

viable than they are at present. It will give them the capacity to trade and open up employment opportunities in some country areas.

I turn now to the recommendation made by the joint committee that the present requirement for reinspection of red meat entering this State be discontinued. That is an initiative that is long overdue. Certainly, there is no credible basis for continuing the practice which we have seen in the past and which put on the consumer and the industry generally extra cost burdens at a time that they could be ill afforded. It is taking the initiative in an area which will give the lead, hopefully, to other States to follow suit, and thus remove from one sector of the industry one of the cost burdens unnecessarily imposed in the past.

I turn now to what I believe was the excellent manner in which the committee undertook its task. I have highlighted the three specific points that the Select Committee tackled; they were the problem areas found when reviewing the situation in previous years. Credit must go also to the Chairman for the fair-minded but firm manner in which he conducted meetings of the Select Committee. I make special reference to that, because it was an important factor in the committee's coming to its very positive deliberations and taking the initiative it took as a result of its report. The report, and subsequent Bill, introduce practical common sense in the Bill's application, particularly as it relates to the country areas of South Australia. Certainly, hygiene standards are not to be forfeited or reduced but are, rather, to be implemented because they are workable and achievable.

The previous Bill introduced regarding this matter would have destroyed many of the small country businesses with its demand for inspectorial services. I believe that that was one of the intents behind the previous legislation. That was impracticable because of the sparseness of locales of the butcher shops, slaughterhouses and country towns. Therefore, the cost per unit output was significant, and could not be spread across a large number of animals, thus reducing it to an economic base. The needs of country communities had to be understood, and I believe that the Select Committee has achieved that goal. Certainly, as a result, the small business sector has received in this section of the industry a reprieve and future protection for survival.

There is a need to upgrade some slaughterhouses, but an upgrading process has been deferred because of a lack of clear guidelines. It is, therefore, necessary for this Bill to have a swift passage so that regulations and conditions can be established, and so that current confusion in the industry can be dispelled. The Select Committee recommended (and the Bill indicates this) significant flexibility in administration and interpretation by the authority of this legislation. This will enable the special needs, and localised community needs, to be individually assessed. Similarly, this flexibility will enable the same needs to be considered in relation to slaughterhouse operations.

The Bill recognises the cost burden that has been extremely detrimental to small businesses in the last decade and, therefore, allows the upgrading process to acceptable hygiene standards to be implemented over an extended period, that is, achieving the required hygiene standards without putting severe restrictions on, or closing down, enterprises entirely because of the lack of available funds, or severely restricting cash flows in those businesses.

I should like to refer to specific points in the Bill, the first of which relates to local government, its role and responsibility. As the Minister pointed out when tabling the report, I pressed strongly during all hearings of the Select Committee to obtain due recognition and involvement of local government in the administration of this legislation.

Although the Bill does not include the recommendations suggested by the Local Government Association, it does enable local government participation, first, on the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority, the ultimate administrative body, and, secondly, in the administration as it affects slaughterhouses. It enables local government to have a direct voice, and rightly so. However, I believe it appropriate to highlight that several submissions suggested that local government was unable, and indeed had refused in the past, adequately to police laws relating to local residents; that is, local government adopted the soft option because of personalities on the local scene. Despite those suggestions, I firmly believe that local government will respond positively and ensure that the provisions of this Bill are adhered to. Let local government clearly understand that failure in this regard will inhibit, on future occasions, consideration being given to transferring powers to local government. It was envisaged by the Select Committee that, if a local government authority did not accept that responsibility, the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority would assume control in that area.

The first criteria is the hygiene standards, and that is a situation that ought to be clearly understood. Certainly, from a cost, ready availability of the inspectors and practical point of view, it will be more appropriate that the provisions of the Act should be enforced at a local level rather than a central point in Adelaide.

It will no doubt take some time for current slaughterhouse owners to decide on their course of action when the provisions of this legislation are known; thus, a time frame has been recommended for this to take place without duress. The committee envisaged that in some circumstances in small towns several retail outlets may consider operating a joint slaughterhouse to reduce duplication of capital costs. Indeed, the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority will have the flexibility to grant a licence under such circumstances.

There is some confusion in the industry because of the length of time that this subject has been under review. It is therefore imperative that the authority commence its task of advising those seeking clarification without delay. Additionally, the authority will have the capacity to vary the suggested output level of 5 000 sheep equivalents per annum, where it is so appropriate to do so, and in the interests of the industry concerned.

Also, the Bill takes several positive steps to stop so-called back-yarding or, referred to in other terms, as "the gum tree slaughterhouse". The Bill requires that slaughtered meat be branded, and failure to comply with this requirement will indeed induce the significant fine of $1 000. Additionally, to slaughter animals for meat other than at an abattoir or slaughterhouse will result in a fine of up to $3 000.

The exceptions to this rule relate to primary producers killing meat for their own requirements. Certainly, the committee clearly understood that on occasions meat will be killed privately for requirements of local charities, and the like. It is intended not to inhibit that but rather to stop the practice of people having a second income by regularly engaging in the practice of the killing of animals for meat and obviating the normal hygiene standards that ought to be observed in such an operation.

The Bill's requirements indicate that certainly positive steps will be taken to ensure that those requirements are met. As a result of this legislation, the hygiene standards of the meat industry in this State will be significantly

increased. Certainly, to succeed and to meet that objective it will require willingness by all sections of the industry to work closely with the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority. The Minister has indicated that indeed industry has advised him already of its willingness to work with the proposed legislation.

At the outset of my remarks supporting this legislation I indicated that I did not intend to repeat those points mentioned in the speeches of the Minister and the member for Salisbury, or points made by industry leaders who have supported the general direction of the Bill and what the Bill intends to achieve for the improvement of meat hygiene and the standard of meat hygiene in this State. Suffice to say that I concur in the sentiments of both former speakers in that respect.

I have highlighted several points in relation to the Bill. I trust that the Bill will have a swift passage through the House and this Parliament so that the impediments that exist at present for people who are taking their own initiative can be overcome and so that we can embark forthwith on the task of ensuring that South Australian citizens have meat of very high hygiene standard and at a cost that is not prohibitive. As I have said, this can be done by removing some of the burdens on this industry at the moment.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): I support, in most aspects, the second reading of the Bill. However, I believe that amendments will be moved to some parts of the Bill. I realise that I cannot refer to them at the moment, but I intend to speak on them later. I was interested to hear the remarks made by my colleague, the member for Salisbury, concerning the condition of slaughterhouse yards and abattoirs which were inspected by the Select Committee.

The Select Committee apparently inspected only abattoirs in Victoria in the area around Melbourne. Possibly it would have been better if the committee had gone further afield and looked at some of the country abattoirs and slaughter yards. I have been in many of these slaughterhouses and abattoirs throughout Victoria and in some areas of South Australia, mainly the South-East and the Riverland areas. I have had vast experience with the so-called gum-tree slaughterhouse referred to by the member for Salisbury and the member for Rocky River.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The clause known as the gum-tree clause has been withdrawn from the Bill.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I thank the Minister for reminding me that that clause is no longer in the Bill. However, I am speaking on the Bill generally, and I want to express my views about certain findings of the committee. I have had a very good look at the situation of these gum-tree slaughterhouses, or gum-tree killing pens, and I have found that not only do the people on the properties where the meat is slaughtered eat the meat, but also this meat is supplied to people in towns and cities.

Some of this meat has been slaughtered under very unhygienic conditions. In some cases, the animals' throats have been cut while just standing on sand and not in a hygienic place. There may be a rope or a chain with hooks on it, which is usually swung over a gum tree. Also, I refer to the matter of the very unhygienic way that sheep, and in some cases cattle, are washed down. I was very much interested in the comments made by one of the committee members regarding the committee's having seen carcasses washed down with a rag and a drum of water.

I have seen that take place many times, but it was only for consumption on the property. They used fresh clean water and a clean rag, and washed the animal down with very little water, the reason being, I have been told that until the body of the carcass is set, excess water can cause it to deteriorate. They wash the animal down, pull it to a sufficient height so that dogs or foxes cannot reach it, and it is left to hang and set overnight. It is taken down the following day, cut up, and, in some cases, delivered to some of the towns and even as far as into the city.

I do not think that the Select Committee inspected the meatworks at Naracoorte, which have been virtually built over the past eight years and which should be one of the more modern type of abattoir. These meatworks have made a big difference to that section regarding meat hygiene, because it meant that, even though the licences that the meatworks held were mainly for export, any local butchers in the South-East could have their meat killed on payment of a fee, thus assisting hygiene standards in meat supplied in that area and in a lot of other areas near Naracoorte. To my knowledge, these works still exist, although I left Naracoorte more than four years ago. I think that the meatworks still operate and that system would still exist.

I have been told by the Minister that this system has been removed from the Bill, so that the Bill protects against tree-house slaughtering except in cases where people slaughter for their own consumption. Some people slaughter sheep in shearing pens, mainly because of the grating where the blood can run out underneath the shed. A shearing shed would possibly be the most unhygienic place one could find in which to kill and dress a carcass, because of the manure and bacteria in the shed. I know a lot of that meat was supplied to towns around the area. I am pleased that the Bill no longer allows such killing to be carried out. I am also pleased that the Bill provides for a chief inspector, a nominee of the Minister of Health, and a nominee from local government who, in most cases, would be the council health inspector. I will have more to say about the Bill in Committee.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill. The whole history of the meat hygiene legislation has been a very chequered one and one subject to much public debate, particularly in the rural areas and in outlying communities. The Bill has much merit and will, in general, receive wide community support. I say that because the original intent of a Bill proposed by the former Government about three or four years ago would have been rather devastating to country areas, particularly to country slaughterhouses. It was suggested that country slaughterhouses be phased out of existence. There were to be major regional abattoirs, and all meat for country towns would be delivered by freezer vans. Naturally, that was sufficient to upset any country person, let alone those actually involved in the meat-killing industry.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: They went cold on that idea.

Mr. BLACKER: I think the previous Government did. The Bill now before us is a reasonable compromise, because it enables existing country slaughterhouses, provided that a certain standard of hygiene is maintained, to continue in existence and to supply their own retail outlets. Power exists for the authority to insist on full meat inspection in the event of a large retail outlet in one of the closer metropolitan areas.

The country abattoirs, as we know, will be able to enter into the metropolitan market. To me, that has considerable advantages, particularly regarding employment. However, I raise one query. The Minister has indicated to me that it is not his intention to upset the format of a service works. The major abattoir on Lower Eyre Peninsula is the Samcor works at Port Lincoln. That is a service works, as is the Gepps Cross works. Those works have been maintained by the State. They have been uneconomic, running at a loss, but the State has

maintained them for emergency situations. I cite as an example a serious drought, when it is necessary that large numbers of stock be killed at give-away prices, and some facility would be available for that operation.

If our service works were to become a fully commercial works, competing on the same basis as a commercial works such as Metro or Northern Butchers, we would no longer have the facility to be able to cater for the slaughtering of large numbers of stock in drought periods or in the event of a large fire, when it is necessary for large numbers of stock to be processed at short notice.

It is imperative that that sort of facility be maintained somewhere within the State. I raise one other query on which the Minister might be able to comment and that is in relation to Samcor works particularly as they operate two premises, one at Gepps Cross and the other at Port Lincoln. Naturally, I am more interested in the Port Lincoln abattoirs, in my district. Not long ago Samcor buyers were actually buying stock in the Port Lincoln market and road freighting it live to Adelaide for processing at the Gepps Cross abattoirs. I believed that was bad. Employees at our particular works were upset, because they believed the work was taken from them, and as such they had good reason to complain.

I could not help but sympathise with them and when I made further inquiries it was proved to be the case that Samcor buyers had purchased stock at the Port Lincoln saleyards and at neighbouring saleyards at Cummins and Ungarra and had road freighted that stock to Adelaide. An explanation was given that it was necessary that that stock be purchased to fulfil a contract. I can understand that to a certain point but there we have a facility capable, willing and able to be able to process the stock at Port Lincoln and surely it must have been cheaper to process and freight carcasses to Adelaide to fulfil that particular export market order than to freight them live. A fear I have is that, with both of these abattoirs becoming more obligated to compete in the commercial field, we could see one facility operating at the expense of another. That is something that we cannot tolerate. This Bill provides for the establishment of a Meat Hygiene Authority with a three-man committee.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: A three-person committee. They may not all be men.

Mr. BLACKER: I accept the comment made by the Minister: a three-person committee. The Minister is quite right there, one never knows. Acting as an adviser to that Meat Hygiene Authority will be the Meat Hygiene Consultative Committee. In broad principle, there will be the licensing of abattoirs and the licensing of slaughterhouses. The abattoirs will be able to process meat in the presence of a meat inspector and it will be branded accordingly, whereas the inspection of meat from a slaughterhouse will be done on a random basis and likewise marked accordingly so that it can be identified at any time as meat coming from a particular place. No doubt during the operation of this legislation some anomalies will occur and I am sure the House will treat these anomalies with the respect that they deserve.

I commend the Bill as a Bill that makes a genuine and sincere effort to rationalise and control an industry that at times has become a little out of hand. Comments have been made about the unhygienic methods of slaughtering. It has been suggested that some sheep have been killed in the sheep yards at shearing time. Most people who live in country areas have been brought up on meat killed in such conditions. Whilst I do not know that I am necessarily under-nourished, I think I am the smallest member of my family and, if this is any indication of what farm-killed meat will do, then be that as it may. I can do no more at this stage than commend the Bill to the House and trust that it serves the purposes intended by the Minister.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I am sure, Mr. Acting Speaker, you will acknowledge that in the 10 years I have been here I have won for myself an enviable record as a spokesman for the rural industry. You would recall some of the more notable contributions I have made during that time. As such, it would be appropriate for me to speak to the Bill. In due modesty, I must say that the contribution by the member for Salisbury would entitle him now to be regarded as the leading spokesman on the Opposition benches on this important industry. I must compliment him on his contribution. I do not intend to debate the Bill in detail but I wish to make some comments that come from my representing two local government areas that each has an abattoirs within its responsibilities.

Before mentioning the Port Pirie abattoirs and the Port Augusta abattoirs, I must say that the Government and the Minister are to be congratulated on having this legislation placed before us. I can recall that the Hon. Gab. Bywaters, when he was Minister, started to struggle with this complex and difficult subject, and the Hon. Ross Story, the Hon. Tom Casey and the Hon. Brian Chatterton, during their periods as Minister of Agriculture, sought to introduce legislation that would meet with the approval of the industry, local government, and consumers generally.

It was not until the present Government came into office that all that work has come to fruition. That is not to say that the previous Ministers I have mentioned did not during their periods in office strive hard to rectify many of the anomalies and difficulties that the meat industry in South Australia was facing. It just goes to prove that in some of these more complex areas the drafting of legislation can be difficult: as times change so do the requirements of the various groups within an industry.

I have a fairly thick file in my office that indicates the amount of correspondence that flowed between the abattoirs boards in my district and the Minister. Whilst there has always been a spirit of co-operation between the two bodies concerned, there was a time when it was believed this problem could not be solved. I am happy to say that this legislation will go a long way, if not all the way, towards meeting the problems that the smaller country abattoirs saw themselves facing. I think the most iniquitous situation that previously applied was in relation to the inspection charges. It was almost a *Blue Hills* saga at Port Augusta. Charges were brought before the court against local butchers for the evasion of the inspection charges, so bringing into Port Augusta meat that was illegally for sale. The abattoirs board at Port Augusta believed that it was its responsibility, as it might, to enforce the Act that applied and there was a continual conflict between the abattoirs board and the local butchers.

Hopefully, this has now been overcome. We had the problem of bringing prime cuts of meat into the cities of Port Augusta and Port Pirie demanded by the hotel, motel and restaurant trade. The legislation we had made the bringing of such cuts into the towns fairly difficult, or so at least the butchers thought. They sought to evade the regulations. Hopefully, this will not now apply. I have been speaking more particularly of Port Augusta, but the problems in Port Pirie were similar. Both abattoirs in the north, at Port Augusta and Port Pirie, would have liked to retain their own areas.

I noted in the member for Rocky River's remarks that he believes that, now that the Adelaide market has been opened up to country abattoirs, there is an incentive for

those abattoirs to be more efficient, with a greater product throughput, so they might be able to grab a bit of the metropolitan market. The reverse remains true, that the Samcor abattoirs might be able to take a bit of the country abattoirs market. These people are confronted with this problem. They are not over-confident that they will be able to meet the challenge that exists, but hopefully they will be able to survive.

It is very important to local industry, local employment, and the local community, that these abattoirs survive and provide a product to those communities at competitive prices. Reinspection charges are the subject of an amendment to be moved by the member for Salisbury, to which I will speak in Committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: I was just wondering where the Minister was moving, because I would hate him not to hear my pearls of wisdom. The other problem that I have been assured has been adequately coped with in the legislation is in regard to the employment of inspectors. Peculiar circumstances applied in Port Pirie, where the inspector was an employee of the abattoirs. When he was not performing his inspectorial duties, he was employed by the abattoirs in other areas. This was an important economic factor in an abattoirs struggling to survive as economically viable. I have been assured that the Port Augusta position—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. KENEALLY: This speech is so good I am prepared to wait a little longer for a few more members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will direct his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: Absolutely, and I believe honourable members should be in the Chamber to hear what I have to say. I appreciate the action of the member for Gilles in trying to assist me with audience participation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think there is anything in the Bill about audience participation. I ask the honourable member for Stuart to refer his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am doing my best, but I seem to be interrupted from all quarters. I have only about 30 seconds more in which to speak. I was speaking about inspectorial duties at small abattoirs. I have been assured by the member for Salisbury, and reassured by my reading of the Bill, that the problems that the smaller abattoirs thought might exist in that area have been adequately taken care of. The Minister and the Select Committee are to be complimented.

The report is comprehensive and seems to have come to grips with the problems in the industry. I am sure that as the year goes by areas of concern will arise that will need to be looked at. I am confident that suitable action will be taken there. I do not wish to say anything about slaughterhouses. That area does not directly concern me, except in so far as they compete with smaller abattoirs. Again, I am assured that that area has been well catered for. Local government has been given the necessary authority to ensure that meat that comes from these slaughterhouses is of a quality acceptable to the authority and, as such, is acceptable to consumers, who, after all, are the people about whom we are concerned. I support the Bill, and hope that when we go into Committee I will have an opportunity to speak to one or more of the clauses.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I intend to cover some points, but briefly. Remarks by the several speakers in this second reading debate reflect a fair appreciation of the Government's intent; they have obviously noted the contents of the Joint House Committee report tabled in this place two or three weeks ago. They have obviously given some attention to the Bill, which was prepared more recently. The general attention, the appreciation of our objectives, and the efforts expended by members on both sides of this House are not only comforting to the Government, but are also recognised in relation to this matter.

With those few words with respect to speakers in this place, and, hopefully, their colleagues in the other place, linked with the rather outstanding support we have had from industry and the community, I think we have been given a leave pass now to proceed, having not only achieved the written objectives for the functioning of slaughtering premises, processing and distribution of meat in South Australia in the future, but having also achieved our objectives politically, which were incorporated in public commitments in our capacity as an Opposition Party, announced in policy on coming into Government, and now demonstrated in the form of legislation in office.

Whilst the member for Stuart has referred to previous Ministers and to the tremendous amount of work they put into preparing legislation for this industry, I, too, would like to recognise the efforts of our predecessors over the past 10 years or so and, indeed, the more recent efforts of my immediate predecessor, Brian Chatterton, as Minister. I know he genuinely set out to provide a Bill with the same objectives and with a few other frills.

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

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Oh, go home, for God's sake.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Agriculture will cease interjecting.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I do not really propose to remark at length on this subject now. I think I have covered the areas that I proposed to deal with. I have paid due recognition, along with the member for Stuart, to our predecessors and their efforts. I was about to pay my respects and some degree of tribute to my immediate predecessor, Brian Chatterton, for his efforts in this matter when we were rudely interrupted by one of his colleagues. Be that as it may, it is on the record that in this matter we as a Government respect the efforts made by and the contributions received from a whole host of people in and out of this industry and on either side of politics, and at last an improvement is on the way. I sincerely hope that the Bill will pass in the next hour or two, be returned from another place without delay, and then be proclaimed at an early date in the future, so that to it may be attached a schedule of appropriate regulations, under which the consultative committee, comprising members of the industry and interested parties, may be established in order to assist the authority, and so that generally the mechanics required to implement the objectives in this Bill can be set in motion.

It will then be possible for free trading among abattoir operators in this State to take place in a truly competitive way; slaughterhouse proprietors will know precisely what is required in respect of their premises; local government which is an essential and appreciated ingredient in the application of this measure, will be able to make its contribution; and all other parties including the inspectorial force required will know where they stand and have the guidelines available to them to put into effect what we propose in this instance.

In conclusion, I appreciate the assistance that I

personally have had from all of those parties and persons involved in the lead up to this measure, which I think represents a significant achievement by the Government since coming into office only a few months ago.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. TRAINER: Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Members will note that on page 2, lines 41 and 42, the words "meat inspection depot" appear. Of course, the meat inspection depot refers to the process of reinspection which was anticipated by the Select Committee would not continue after agreement had been reached between Victoria and South Australia. Indeed, this definition would, we hope in many ways, be a doomed definition. I understand the Minister would be agreeable that at a future time, perhaps soon, an amendment to this Act would be moved, after agreement had been reached, to delete that definition and further references to meat inspection depots in this legislation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Are you moving your amendment now?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: No, I am merely saying that when this Bill becomes an Act and when agreement is reached between the Victorian and South Australian Governments, we hope that the Select Committee recommendation calling for the cessation of meat inspection fees will be adopted and at such time that meat inspection depots will no longer become necessary. At a future time, when this measure is already an Act of Parliament, it could then be amended to delete such references to meat inspection depots.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I appreciate this point. I believe the explanation in some detail may best be given when the proposed amendments on file are proceeded with. I think it ought to be placed on record now that negotiations on this subject have already been commenced between the Victorian Minister and me. As the honourable member has quite rightly pointed out, until simultaneous agreement is confirmed between South Australia and Victoria—

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I will deal with the matter when the amendment on the subject raised by the honourable member is moved.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Terms and conditions of office."

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

Page 5, line 34—Leave out "not exceeding" and insert "being not less than two years nor more than".

This amendment is designed to provide for the staggering of appointments of members of the authority. For example, three members are to be appointed initially, and, if one is appointed for two years and the other two for, say, four years, at the end of a fixed term, without a staggered minimum or maximum arrangement, the whole three will be subject to re-election at the same time. I have spoken with Opposition representatives about this matter, because it was clearly an omission on my part in the first instance that these few words were not inserted. I apologise for the delay caused because of my overlooking that point. It is a machinery matter that should be observed and I look forward to the Opposition's support in this matter.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The amendment moved by the Minister does have the support of the Opposition. It is a logical one and it would have been a pity if it was overlooked.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8—"Allowances and expenses."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am not aware of the way in which these allowances are determined for authorities. Could the Minister give a brief explanation of what is the traditional practice for determining allowances and increases in those allowances? I realise he will not be able to give actual amounts. Also, how are persons who are permanent public servants paid?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I really do not know the answer to that question. The only reimbursement figures of which I am aware are those that apply to certain statutory authorities serving our department at this time. The Public Service travelling allowance rates are payable to members of such authorities and committees who are employed in an administrative or advisory capacity. I do not know what those figures are, but reference to the Public Service rate will reveal that.

Sitting fees are about $70 per half sitting day for the Chairman and $55 per half day for each member. In certain circumstances, where long distances are travelled, a standing fee of $200 per annum is payable to such committee members to provide some token recognition of the time that they spend travelling. That is separate from the reimbursement that applies for their actual travelling costs incurred. Other than the schedule which I have outlined, I am not aware of any specific or special fees that apply to others serving the Government in similar capacities.

I do not know what fee is in mind for payment to the three proposed members of the authority. I now turn to the point that the honourable member raised in relation to a public servant being paid when working in his capacity as a public officer. Knowing how well our officers are paid, and because of indications given to me, I understand that they receive nothing extra.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate that advice, but I understand that there are certain authorities and committees within the State Government that provide for payments of public servants at a rate lower than payment for non-public servants. If this is not the case in the Department of Agriculture, that is fine and the question is answered. However, I was intrigued by this matter because this is an authority which will have on it one non-public servant. I appreciate that this is something that will arise when the Act is promulgated and the regulations are determined.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: To clarify this point, I am not in a position to pursue the question of monetary payments any further. However, I can assure the honourable member that, while this subject has anything to do with my department, and while I am Minister (and he knows that I am a reasonable fellow), the people who serve in that capacity will be reasonably treated. If he wants any further details, I should be happy to seek them from the department or my officers, who are ever ready to assist.

I am now told that public servants receive no additional pay, so any one or more public servants serving in this capacity are covered in the ambit of their salaries as public servants. The number of committee members who might come from outside the Public Service might, in this instance, be nil if the nominees choose to select a public servant.

The association representing local government in South Australia has the opportunity to nominate one of the

authority members, and is not restricted in relation to which section of the community that representative may come from. It may well be, I suggest from some little local government experience, that it probably will not be from the Public Service, but it could well be that the Minister of Health, in that person's capacity as nominee within the terms of the Act, may select or nominate a public servant.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 and 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Validity of acts of the authority."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

Page 7, after line 4—Insert subclauses as follows:

(2) No liability shall attach to a member of the Authority for any act or omission by him, or by the Authority, in the exercise, or purported exercise, of his or its powers or functions, or in the discharge, or purported discharge, of his or its duties, under this Act.

(3) A liability that would, but for subsection (2) of this section, lie against a member of the Authority shall lie against the Crown.

The amendment refers to the granting of certain powers of immunity to members of the proposed South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority, enabling them to undertake the activities that the Bill provides for them, and, in so doing, in the lawful exercise of those duties, being able to do it without any personal liability. It is added in at this stage because in similar Acts of Parliament that create authorities or boards that provide for validity of Acts for the proceedings of authorities, it is in most cases concluded that the immunity for individual members is also incorporated. The wording of the amendment is almost identical to that of an amendment which was moved relating to the Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill that we passed in this House not very long ago. I anticipate that, because the House acknowledged the principle in that instance, it will be acknowledged in this instance also. I appreciate the Minister's advice and hope that the amendment will be passed.

Amendment carried; clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Meat Hygiene Consultative Committee."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I referred briefly in my second reading speech last night to the constitution of the meat hygiene authority. The aspect that we need to note is that this consultative committee should be as broad as practicable for the purposes of the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority, given the needs that it has at any one time. I therefore hope that the authority and the Minister will at various times recognise the need of having the growers, processors (namely, the employees), the employer and also the consumer representatives. I know that this matter was one of some debate and that it was not always given the due probity necessary in the Select Committee. I hope that that is the Minister's intention.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The point has been taken.

Clause passed.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman, can a member take a point of order from another member's seat in this Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. I understand that an honourable member who sits on the Opposition front bench and who is in charge of the House for the Opposition is entitled to rise from a position other than his own if he is nominally in charge of the Opposition.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I take it that the member has his Leader's authority to be here to represent Opposition members on the front bench. He and his colleague are the only Opposition members present in the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. I am of the view that the honourable member referred to does have his Leader's authority to act for the Opposition in this matter.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Inspectors."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Clause 18 refers to the appointment of inspectors and, as has been referred to by numerous members, the authority will be enabled to appoint inspectors who are in fact employed nominally or notionally by other authorities and, indeed, by local government. The Department of Primary Industry was referred to. My question refers to those areas of the State that are not covered by local government; in other words, those areas of the State covered by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust. This becomes particularly significant with regard to slaughterhouses because they are the areas which in many cases are geographically remote with small populations, and they rely heavily on the provision of slaughterhouses. Where will these inspectors come from and who will be appointed? Is it anticipated that the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority will conduct negotiations with the Outback Areas Community Development Trust for the use of staff who may be suitably qualified for inspection purposes? Is it anticipated that perhaps in this regard alone the meat hygiene authority will employ its own inspectors? It may deal with only a small proportion of the State population. However, that should not in any way undermine their importance and needs. Any information that we can obtain on this will be of interest to members and to you, Sir, because it applies to most of your own constituency.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I draw honourable members' attention to clause 18 (1) *(c)* which provides for the appointment of a person to be an inspector under the Act. Indeed, whether it be Port MacDonnell in the extreme South-East, Ceduna, Oodnadatta, or anywhere else, within the State's boundaries, provision exists for the appointment of inspectors both within and outside of local government areas.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Obviously, any inspector appointed to the Outback Areas Trust will be appointed under the provisions of clause 18 *(c)*. I want to know where they will come from. Will they be inspectors presently employed by the trust, if it has any? Will they be inspectors directly employed by the authority itself, or will they be employed by a neighbouring local government authority, such as Whyalla or Port Augusta? Has any attention been given from which of the three sources I have suggested the inspectors will come, or will they be from another source altogether? It is interesting, because it could indicate that the authority will have to employ extra staff over and above the secretarial assistance to which it was expected it would be limited.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am not aware of the numbers of qualified inspectors in South Australia, whether they are in extreme demand, whether there is a shortage, whether if one shakes a hollow log, half a dozen would fall out from it, or whatever. It is the authority's responsibility to ensure that inspection is available to its licensed abattoirs directly and via its delegated authority to local government as and where required. Indeed, it is generally the authority's responsibility to ensure that these services are available outside the local government proclaimed areas as well as inside. I would imagine that a chat with Mr. Connelly, Chairman of the Outback Areas Trust in South Australia, would result in some satisfactory arrangement for the purposes of recruiting inspectors, as

required, if they are not aleady available in and about those relatively few premises that are to be licensed in the outer areas zone of the State.

Clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

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

Motion carried.

Clause 20—"Offence to slaughter animals for meat except at licensed abattoir."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I had not proposed initially to raise this matter, because I understood that the small point I am speaking of is being corrected. I rise because the member for Peake asked me about the short title and, just in case other members have a similar question, I believe that the matter could be clarified without any unnecessary waste of time. The short title should read, "Offence to slaughter animals for meat except at licensed slaughtering works", covering both abattoirs and slaughterhouses. At present, it refers merely to abattoirs. I believe that the matter was being attended to.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Conditions of licences."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: This clause was touched on in regard to limiting the maximum throughput of slaughtering works, giving the authority the power to do that, and we spoke last night about the type of figures suggested. There has not been much debate about regulating the sale or supply of meat or meat products produced at slaughtering works. That is a pity. I would have appreciated the comments of more country members in whose districts this matter is prominent. Perhaps it does not affect the metropolitan districts, although perhaps marginally it has the potential to affect the Salisbury District.

The aspects being looked at by the Select Committee in making recommendations were that perhaps the authority should be empowered to limit the supply of meat from slaughterhouses to retail outlets owned by the slaughterhouse as one possibility. Another possibility was to limit the distribution of meat from slaughterhouses to certain geographical confines. The one set of parameters considered possible was that the geographical confines be the local government boundaries for the area. There are problems, and that is why it is felt that the Bill should not be entirely definitive in that sense because, if it were to cover all possibilities, it would be much longer than it is now.

I am thinking of the limitations on and discrimination against a slaughterhouse operator within a small district council in geographical area, as opposed to a large district council. Obviously, the slaughterhouse owner in the former would be limited to his potential customers, whereas the one in the larger council would have greater possibilities. The authority should be empowered to do that. It may set a geographical limit not totally prescribed by the political boundaries but by distances from the slaughterhouse so that a radius of, say, between 20 or 30 miles from the slaughterhouse could be set.

That radius would be determined not so much on a strict basis for all slaughterhouses, because conditions might vary. A slaughterhouse which provided chilling capacity at the slaughterhouse and which had transport to the retail outlet of a proper kind might be able to operate within the wider radius. It would have been worth while for country members to add their comments to this portion of the Bill because, in many ways, the regulations and controls on slaughterhouses will be one of the major areas of attention from those affected by the Bill. If there is to be any concern, I imagine that such as there is may well come from this section. Therefore, the opportunity to have heard them would have been appreciated by me and, I imagine, by the Minister, who will have to handle these concerns when they come before his department.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I do not envisage a great deal of concern or worry to the authority. Regarding the conditions anticipated for regulations covering slaughterhouse structures, etc., I think the honourable member must be almost as tired as are the rest of us, because he has overlooked that, attached to the committee's report, was appendix 6, a schedule of the conditions which were recommended that the authority should adopt relating to the very subject he has raised.

I do not know whether the honourable member's colleagues have read it or shown any interest in it. I can assure the honourable member that members on this side of the House representing both metropolitan and rural seats have been issued with a copy of that report and its attachments, and I am aware of the interest of many members after they have read them. The documents cover the subject well.

Regarding the authority's powers to determine the throughput, I think common sense will prevail and I believe that the throughput that obtains now with existing licensed premises will be duly observed and opportunities to continue trading with similar throughputs will be observed by the authority. I do not see any hassles in it.

The other limiting factor in clause 24 refers to the supply of meat or meat products to, in effect, their own butcher shops. That is a fairly governing factor in its own right and I cannot understand why any Opposition member would want to query it now. I know it is the Opposition's right to do so, but this Bill has been around for years. The principles desired by previous Governments have been collated into a document which was circulated among and discussed, via the media, personally and publicly in and out of this place for so long now that I believe we all have a fair grasp of it. I believe we could wind this up if Opposition members co-operated, as they have co-operated over the last week or so.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am well aware of what was in the appendices. What I was asking for was comments on those appendices.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 47 passed.

Clause 48—"Inspection of works, meat, etc."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the fact that the Minister is pleased that we have gone through many intervening clauses without question. I think in many ways they are not significant enough to debate here. One aspect of clause 48 that has not been mentioned particularly is in relation to *(g)*, regarding the branding of meats. It was believed important that all meat for sale should be branded meat so that whence it came could be identified. It was also believed by the Select Committee that the brand and colouration of the dyes should be different as between abattoirs and slaughterhouses so that quite clearly not only customers but also inspectors at the meat sale point and the retail point could identify from where the meat had come.

We mentioned in passing the gum tree slaughterhouses, etc., and the fact that they would have a further barrier against them in terms of providing meat for retail sale, because naturally they would not be eligible for any form of branding or stamping. That implies that slaughterhouse operators would be charged with a fair degree of responsibility, because whereas abattoirs will have the

brand in the possession of an inspector, independent of the ownership and management of the abattoirs, slaughterhouses will have a brand within their possession for use for operation of the slaughterhouse in question, and therefore they will have to show responsible behaviour that that brand is not misused. Naturally, I imagine that Samcor would be concerned that there is no evidence ever of the brand being provided to any gum tree slaughterhouse.

I do not believe that that is a real danger, because it would not be worth a slaughterhouse operator's risk of losing his licence to be caught having allowed such a thing to happen. However, I am informed by a constituent in my district, who has worked at slaughterhouses over some 10 years, that there have been isolated incidents at least in the previous decade, or perhaps 20 years, at licensed abattoirs, or other places where brands are used, and the brands should technically have been in possession only of authorised inspectors. They have apparently, allegedly, deliberately been left around for use by unauthorised personnel. Of course, it will be one of the jobs of the inspectors of a more administrative nature to make sure that does not happen.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Obviously, the inspector visiting slaughterhouses in the donga or outback from time to time is not going to be responsible for branding meat at slaughterhouse premises. The slaughterhouse proprietor or his on-site agent would be required to brand the meat before it left the premises. If he abuses that trust, he is subject to being delicensed. If the honourable member thought about that point, he would realise not only that due care will need to be exercised but also that one would expect it to be exercised.

Clause passed.

Clauses 49 to 64 passed.

Clause 65—"Regulations."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

Page 24, after line 35—Insert subclause as follows:

(2a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, no fees shall be charged or recoverable in respect of the inspection of meat produced at a recognised abattoir and brought into the State on or after the first day of July, 1980.

This amendment relates to the abolition of reinspection fees, with regard to meat coming into this State from interstate. This matter has been touched on by speakers in this debate, but at this point we become more closely concerned with the actual means of providing for legislative enactment of repealing of fees. I understand that the Minister will be giving advice on how he, the Government, or the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority sees the programme. Nevertheless, we feel it is very important that some points be made and that this particular clause be embodied within the Act itself.

There seems to have been no disagreement on either side of this House that reinspection fees do not serve any useful purpose. It has been alleged, over many years, that reinspection fees are there for health reasons. However, evidence would suggest that health reasons are by no means paramount. I suggest that the real reason is more likely to be some form of trade barrier that could come within the confines of the constitutions where ordinary straightforward trade barriers cannot. Indeed, as the member for Peake mentioned, the health aspect of reinspection is totally negligible. The ability to identify health problems in carcasses that have travelled long distances, after all the viscera have been removed, is almost so small as to be non-existent.

I and other members of the Committee have been told that reinspection fees, as they presently exist, represent a tidy source of revenue for the appropriate authority. That is perhaps one of the only other justifications for them. Evidence was informally provided of one example of reinspection meat coming to Adelaide with a rate of 2·2 cents a kilogram for interstate meat, netting the authority some $400 and that the actual work involved in earning that money meant opening the door, smelling the contents, and determining that the inspector did not reel backwards in near faint.

Having determined that, and having determined that no carcasses were lying on the floor or against the wall of the van, where they could be bruised, he would spend the bulk of the time involved in the inspection merely stamping the carcasses. Whilst that would result in individual sighting of each carcass, it could not be regarded as an effective overview for health purposes. We were told, and I think the Select Committee was satisfied by this, that the operative means of controlling meat coming into a wholesale or retail outlet is the buyer. The buyer will decide whether the meat is of fit standard. If the buyer is not so convinced, he will not accept delivery of the load, or he will, if necessary, call in an inspector to inspect the load rather than relying on inspection of every load coming through. If the buyer took delivery of the meat and found it bad after accepting delivery, the sanction would exist that in all probability he would not go to that supplier on a further occasion, and the supplier would suffer the economic sanction that would make him improve his standards.

The one area in which a health risk can take place for meat coming in over long distances is that resulting from a breakdown of the refrigerated van. Basically, it was felt that most meat coming from recognised abattoirs had left the premises at a standard acceptable to the inspectors on site, and should arrive at the further premises, all things being equal, at the same reasonable standard. However, the one danger point is the possibility of breakdown of the refrigeration equipment.

The Select Committee was interested to hear on its inspection trip to Victoria that mechanical devices are available to enable the consistency of the refrigeration equipment in a van to be measured, so that on arrival it would be possible for the buyer to identify whether that refrigeration had worked at the required level for the entire trip. The introduction of such monitoring devices will reduce even further any incidences of spoilt meat arriving at another place.

One of the illogical factors that we saw was that, under this legislation if we were to leave reinspection of meat to go on as it has been, if meat came from Victoria to Mount Gambier, for example, a relatively short distance, it would require reinspection. However, meat travelling perhaps from the Flinders District to the Adelaide metropolitan area, a much greater distance, would not require the same reinspection. We felt we could not justify the requirement that the one consignment of meat should be reinspected when the other consignment need not be reinspected. The two situations do not tally.

If we accept that provision—and the Select Committee seemed to accept it—we cannot accept that the reinspection of interstate meat can be justified on health grounds, and we fall into the danger that it will be accepted not as a trade grant but as a revenue raiser or as a trade barrier.

The Minister has done good work in attempting to achieve agreement from Victoria, which is the major trading State for South Australia, New South Wales being relatively insignificant. We appreciate the work and the promptness with which it was done during the proceedings of the Select Committee, and we hope the same

proceedings will go on as promptly in the days ahead, prior to and after the proclamation of the legislation. Nevertheless, we felt that, given the clearness of the evidence presented to us and of the decisions we made, it was essential that we could nominate a date, and say that at a certain time meat inspection fees should cease.

The evidence given to the Select Committee seems to be very solid, that an agreement was imminent. I do not believe the Select Committee would have been so fulsome in its recommendations had it not been convinced that the recommendation was imminent. Therefore, that is how it appears in the Select Committee report. That report has come to this House and I believe that, in our consideration of it, we will also have thought that that agreement is imminent. It might have been a different situation if we had been given information that the major trading State at a long distant time was prepared to consider discussions on the deliberations about this matter. In other words, that would have been so qualified as to mean absolutely nothing. We do not believe that that was the information given to us by the major trading State. Therefore, the nomination of a date will help ensure that this State and the State of Victoria may seek to conclude an agreement quickly. We appreciate the problems that might take place if an agreement was not reached by 1 July 1980. There are problems that local producers may for some short interim period suffer an economic disadvantage. I refer to the interstate traders. That situation would only increase the pressure on the Minister and his department to ensure that the agreement was reached as soon as possible.

We want a speedy agreement between the State of Victoria in particular and this State. We want a speedy introduction of the decision to abolish reinspection fees because we cannot justify them. The member for Rocky River himself agrees with that point, as I believe all members do. Therefore, we would like to tie this matter down within the Bill, rather than leave it purely to the authority, the department or the Minister without any other guarantee than the Select Committee's recommendation.

I hope the Minister and all members will see their way clear to support this amendment. I believe this would be a very brave and innovative step for the Parliament. There has been so much talk for so long about how increasingly valueless the reinspection fees are.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am merely replying as briefly to this as the Minister replies to questions. We spent some time in the Select Committee on this matter, which I believe is important. This is the crucial amendment of all the amendments we have debated. We did not permit the debate to go on at great length on any other amendment, but this one I think we should consider at length. I apologise if that is upsetting members. We cannot lightly take the decision to abolish reinspection fees, I believe it is a decision we must take after due consideration and thought. This State can gain for itself political kudos within the community of Australian States by taking such a move.

It will recognise that it will not put up with ridiculous and unnecessary levies where they cannot be justified, and instead will move only for the imposition of levies and fees of one sort or another that are in fact important, useful and worthwhile. It will raise the esteem of the fee-making power of this Parliament, and that is something that can only be for the good.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: We are unable to accept the amendment. As desirable as it is to dispense with reinspection services on meat traversing between the States mentioned, until agreement is confirmed by those respective trading States and that confirmation is simultaneously applied, it would be irresponsible of us to set out to be a party to such agreement. Negotiations with the Minister of Agriculture in Victoria are in train.

This could also lead to a situation in which, if we dispensed with the reinspection requirements in South Australia on a given date (in this case the date proposed in the amendment is 1 July 1980) and a subsequent acceptance and a proclamation date for closing all such services applying to other States came six months, or 12 months later, our own abattoir traders in this State could be at a distinct disadvantage and subject to paying the ongoing reinspection fees in neighbouring States while their competitors based in those States were able to trade into this State without fee. I think the honourable member recognises the difficulty here. His suggestion is highly desirable, and extremely ideal, but just not practicable, and therefore not acceptable in this otherwise practical Bill. I do not think it is necessary to explain this any further.

I can assure members that discussion that has already taken place quite deliberately and directly with the Minister of Agriculture in Victoria will be pursued with him with a view to getting his Government's support in the dispensing of reinspection system. Accordingly, and again in the interest of South Australia generally, I think it is necessary that such negotiations commence also with Mr. Day, the Minister of Agriculture in New South Wales and, I think equally importantly, with the Minister of Agriculture in Queensland. We do not presently receive large quantities of meat regularly from New South Wales and Queensland, but the chances are that we could receive large quantities of meat from those States in the future, so we want to make sure that the same secure agreement is achieved. We cannot agree to the amendment. However, I take the point made by the honourable member that at the time agreement is confirmed we should proceed to dispense, in accordance with the agreement, with a practice which is clearly undesirable and which we should not proceed with any longer than we have to.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I support the amendment, which is fair and just. The Minister of Agriculture has admitted that it is virtually useless having a second meat inspection. It is a waste of money, as my colleague said, and costs $400 a truckload. The Minister will be well aware that once the viscera, which includes the liver, has been disposed of (and I do not claim to be an expert on sheep and cattle) it is difficult to tell whether an animal is diseased, because one of the main ways of telling whether an animal is diseased is by inspecting the liver.

As my colleague said, this inspection would be only a rubber stamp. I cannot see why this section is in the Bill, and I urge the Minister and the Government to rethink this matter. Indeed, I recommend that the Minister delete paragraph *(t)* from clause 65 (2).

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Given that advisers are readily available to the House today, we may perhaps be given some information from the Minister regarding the amounts of meat that come from other States. The Minister has mentioned the situation in Queensland and New South Wales, and it would be interesting to know whether we have already received meat shipments from Queensland, for example. I know we have from New South Wales, but I am not sure about the Queensland situation. It would also be interesting to know the relative proportion of meat that comes from Victoria. I understand (and I stand to be corrected) that the proportion of the total amount coming into this State from Victoria is by far the overwhelming majority of all meat traded into this

State. Therefore, any information that we could be given in this respect would be most edifying.

I refer also to the freight disadvantage that the interstate producers experience. It has been suggested that there will be an unfair economic advantage to those trading meat from other States with the abolition of the reinspection fee. Of course, any meat traded over a distance has a freight disadvantage because of the distance. There would not be an economic disadvantage with regard to meat traded from a local abattoir because the levy of 2·2 per cent per kilogram that presently exists is over and above the freight disadvantage that those abattoirs have.

An abattoir trading from Victoria into Adelaide, for example, has to meet the travel costs of that distance whereas abattoirs trading in Adelaide do not have to meet that cost. So the levy of 2·2 per cent per kilometre becomes relatively superficial on top of that. Therefore, the only disadvantage that we can see relates to South Australian meat which is supplied to Victoria and on which, therefore, in a return journey there is an equal freight disadvantage compared to the meat coming from Victoria if the reinspection fees are to be abolished.

I should like some indication regarding the flow of meat between South Australia and Victoria, and vice versa, is at various times of the year. Does meat go from this State to Victoria at equivalent times of the year when meat comes from Victoria to South Australia? Are there surpluses and shortages of meat supplies within South Australia that match the surpluses and shortages within Victoria, and between the two of them do they in fact provide an evenly balanced supply and demand situation with regard to meat? For example, there may be a surplus of meat in January in this State and a shortage in Victoria. Therefore, the Victorian producers would not be exporting meat into South Australia at that time. They would not therefore incur that economic advantage that has been referred to, and it would be offset by any disadvantage that South Australian producers may have when trading into Victoria. So, the time of the movements of meat into South Australia from Victoria becomes important.

I hope the Minister is listening when I tell him that the monthly figures are important, and not the overall annual figure. I hope that the Minister will consider answering this point. I do not believe, if it is correct that there is an imminent breach in the agreement, that we cannot take this step.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I refer the honourable member to the brown-covered report known as the Potter Report 1979 which is in his file and in the file of every member who served on that Select Committee. If the honourable member has lost, burnt or mislaid that file, and therefore the report, the permanent member of the staff of this Chamber who served us well on that committee is at present in this Chamber and has a copy of all the evidence that was received by the Select Committee. I suggest that the honourable member should do a bit of homework. Every single question raised by him is totally and effectively answered in the Potter Report. If it is not covered in the body of that report, it is in the appendix adjacent to it. The member for Salisbury should lift his game a bit. He has been going extremely well up until now but he is starting to muck it up in big lumps.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is the greatest load of patronising rubbish I have heard in this Chamber for some time. The honourable member for Salisbury may have access to documents that would answer the questions he has asked of the Minister, but I point out to the Minister that there are other members who will be required to vote on this amendment and who do not have ready access to the information that the Minister has suggested that we should rush off to look at. The questions asked by the member for Salisbury are reasonable and should be answered by the Minister so that all honourable members can make a decision. I ask the Minister to answer the questions so that members can make a decision.

Mr. Randall: What are the questions?

Mr. KENEALLY: If the member for Henley Beach was not present to hear the member for Salisbury ask his question, that is his fault. The Minister was here and I was here, and the Minister knows what the questions are. Why is the Minister not prepared to give any answers?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am not in a position nor am I prepared to seek out the detailed statistical answers that are required in the multiple questions raised by the member for Salisbury. Those answers are all incorporated in the report that was tabled with the evidence of the Select Committee three weeks ago. That report was immediately available on call to every member and to any member of the public. If the member for Stuart thinks that I am going to stalk around this place with a stack of evidence a foot thick in my hip pocket in order to answer a whole series of statistical questions set out in figures, words and graphs and to break the Standing Orders of this House by showing, for example, a picture of a graph (which I am unable to do, as he well knows), he can have another think.

The evidence has been available to honourable members since last November. The Potter Report was produced at the direction of the honourable member's own Party when it was in Government. It is a good report and sets out in great detail the answers with respect to the movement of quantities of meat traversing between the several States of Australia. That report also sets out all the answers and details requested by the honourable member. As I have said, the information required by the honourable member is already publicly available.

Mr. KENEALLY: I take it then that the Government's opposition to the amendment moved by the member for Salisbury rests on the difficulty that it foresees within the time scale involved.

The member for Salisbury simply asked the Minister to advise the Committee of the flow of meat between South Australia and Victoria so that information on the difficulties which the Government foresees and which lead it to oppose the amendment can be readily available to the House. It is not good enough for the Minister to say, "We are opposed to the amendment and the reasons that we are opposed to the amendment are on page 41 of the document. If the member wants to see it, he can go over to my office and see the document". That is the reason the Minister gave me when I asked him why he was not prepared to answer the question raised. If the Minister believes that the arguments he has are sound and valid, they should be readily available. I do not believe that we should need to go through a lengthy argument about whether or not the Minister should give the information. This occasion should not have arisen. If the Minister had been prepared to give the information asked for we would probably have moved on some time ago.

If this matter does drag on, it is because the Minister is refusing to provide the information to the Committee. It is simply not good enough to say that that information is available in a document that members can seek out. It is the Minister's responsibility to provide that information to the Committee if it is asked for. If we are going to have Ministers saying to the Committee that the member can go out of the library, we shall have to wait or adjourn the Committee until the member goes to the library, looks up the information and comes back to report whether or not he agrees with that information. That is ridiculous. I am

not as well informed on this matter as the members who were on the Select Committee and no-one would expect me to be. I believe that it was quite a brilliant Select Committee. For my benefit, if not for the benefit of the member for Salisbury, the Minister should provide the information to the Committee, so that I can vote in a well-informed manner.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise to support clause 65.

The CHAIRMAN: We are currently debating the amendment moved to clause 65.

Mr. MATHWIN: I therefore oppose the amendment to clause 65 because I believe the clause is a compehensive clause and covers all the subjects necessary. It is all very well for the member for Stuart to enlighten the newer members of his Party on the procedures of what ought to happen in relation to Ministers who answer questions from members on specific clauses. The member for Stuart's memory is not that bad. Has he failed to remember what his Ministers did when they were in Government?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think that the matter that the member for Glenelg is raising regarding previous Ministers' answers is a relevant matter before the Committee. The honourable member must link up his remarks.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am disappointed in the situation. You have allowed an enormous amount of scope for the member for Stuart, who told us what the Ministers ought to do and even directed them and gave them some sort of direction as to how they ought to operate in this Chamber as members of the Government. That member himself would know and be fully aware that we, when in Opposition, were often told to go to the library and seek out information because it was available in the library. There is nothing wrong with that, and if the honourable member is quite honest with himself, his Party and this Parliament, he would admit that. He is trying to defend his new member, who is still wet behind the ears, from procrastinating on this clause for 25 or 30 minutes.

He has tried to protect his colleague by saying that he should be able to request the information, when the honourable member actually has the information on his own file; this information has been available to him since last year. I know that the member for Salisbury is a quick talker; I thought that he might also be a quick reader and perhaps he might have a quick wit. I do not really believe that the honourable member has not read the report; I would be surprised if he has not read it, because I have much respect for the member for Salisbury. That is more than I would say for some other members opposite.

I sincerely believe that the honourable member has read the report and has done his homework well. I do not support the amendment; it does nothing to improve the situation, or to help the people in the industry; it does nothing for the operation of the law that is to be made. All Bills have regulations, but what the member for Salisbury intends is superfluous. This aspect is covered in the Bill as it stands, and I suggest that the member for Salisbury, who has done his job, will no doubt be congratulated in Caucus on Tuesday. His only failure may be, if my suspicions are correct, that he has not read the report, but I believe he has read it.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I listened with interest to the comments made by the member for Glenelg because he made one correct point; he implied that I had read the report, and that is correct. The honourable member has perceived what I did several times, in one form or another. I fed Dorothy Dix questions to the Minister, giving him the opportunity to have inserted in *Hansard* the information that should be contained there. The evidence of the Select Committee is substantial indeed and it would be unreasonable to expect that all members, beyond those who served on the Select Committee, would have read the whole evidence.

Therefore, it is highly likely that the information contained in the Potter Report, which is a very important part of the evidence, could well have been overlooked by many members. The opportunity to provide that information in *Hansard,* in a shorter form than the debate that appears in the evidence, is useful. I do not believe that this is impossible to achieve. The Minister has been co-operative in answering other questions regarding points that I wanted recorded in *Hansard.* The Minister took advantage of the staff of the Department of Agriculture; he obtained information. The Potter Report contains important information, but if one did a round robin of the House, in reality it would be found that not all members (indeed, perhaps not even a significant minority and perhaps not even the member for Glenelg) would be aware of all the details of the Potter Report.

It is true that members who served on the Select Committee (the member for Rocky River, the Minister and I) are aware of those details, and perhaps some other members are also aware of the details, but it is not the purpose that this Bill should be voted on by only three members; the vote should involve all members in this House. Earlier, I asked the Minister to read into *Hansard* various comments about different aspects. I ask the Minister to comment generally on another aspect of the Bill, because there are many issues in the committee's recommendations that do not appear directly in the Bill.

Therefore, they have to be read in this alternative form. I am amazed at the umbrage that the Minister has taken about this point. The question is not meant in that light. The amendment is not being supported by the Government, but the points I made were not meant to be taken in a spirit of discord with the Minister. They were meant to be taken in a spirit of true debate, and seeking information. That cannot happen if members will say that they have seen information existing elsewhere and that they will not bother to make any specific reference to it here. I am sorry that it has gone that way. It was not meant in that sense and I hope that the Minister takes the point I have made in that regard.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Chapman (teller), Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Langley and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Rodda and Wotton.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 1 April at 2 p.m.