

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

HEALTH INSURANCE

Wednesday 1 August 1979

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

COMPANIES ACT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking the Attorney-General a question about the Companies Act being in conflict with the Land Agents Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The provisions of the new Companies Act require at least two directors to any limited company. When Parliament passed the Land Agents Act, provision was made whereby it was the intention of that Act that every director of a company that was licensed as an agent had to be a qualified person. There was a provision whereby an exemption was given to some directors, and I understand that applications have been made from time to time to the Land Agents Board for such exemption to allow some directors to remain directors and yet not be qualified, and that those exemptions have been granted.

However, in recent times some applications along those lines have been refused. The situation in many instances is that a person who is in business on his own account owns and controls a company, which is the actual licensee, and it has been preferable, prior to the new Companies Act, that in those companies that have the one director that director is the qualified principal owning and operating the business. If it is going to be required under the new Companies Act that such land agent companies must have two directors, it simply means that either exemptions have to be given—for example, for the wife of the principal operator to undertake a long period of study and pass (if she can pass) examinations so that she become qualified under the Land Agents Act—or else there is an impasse existing which I think the Attorney-General will agree has to be overcome in one way or another.

I understand that the matter has already been brought to the honourable gentleman's notice. However, because of the great deal of concern that is being expressed by people in the real estate profession regarding this problem, will the Attorney-General comment on the situation and give an undertaking regarding his endeavours to solve the problem that has occurred?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am aware of the problem to which the honourable member has referred. He will be aware that the Companies Act is still the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Health. Discussions regarding the Land Agents Act have been going on between officers of the Corporate Affairs Commission and the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, which falls within my responsibility, to try to come to a satisfactory resolution of these matters. I have not yet received a report on the result of those discussions, although I expect to receive one in the reasonably near future. Now that the honourable member has again drawn the matter to my attention, I will certainly ascertain what has happened, with a view to trying to solve this problem. I will report back to the honourable member and to the Council at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Health, a question regarding health insurance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: All honourable members, particularly the Minister, would be aware of the chaos that has been created in the health insurance field by the numerous changes made to the Medibank scheme by the present Federal Government. This culminated last week in medical and hospital fund organisations saying that the system was fairly close to collapsing. I do not wish to debate the matter, as that would be out of order.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Is that in Australia or South Australia only?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: It is throughout Australia. However, as I have said, I do not wish to debate the matter, as that would be as out of order as the Hon. Mr. Geddes' interjection. I was attracted to a report headed "Half price health plan; \$9 provides family with total cover" on page 9 of today's *Australian*, part of which is as follows:

A prepaid health plan which provides families and individuals with complete hospital and medical cover for up to 50 per cent less than present health insurance fund rates is to be introduced in Sydney on 1 September. Called "family health plan," it is similar to health maintenance organisation schemes which have been operating in the U.S. for 50 years and now have more than 20 000 000 members.

The non-profit organisation, established by the Geoffrey Edelsten Foundation, will be available in other States later. The plan will initially be financed by either a Federal Government health program grant or money received from the foundation, a charitable organisation set up in 1976.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the honourable member that he did say that his explanation would be brief.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Yes, Sir. The report continues:

A spokesman for the foundation, Mr. Geoffrey Gee, said membership would cost a family about \$9 a week and individuals about \$4.50 a week. "The beauty of the plan is that everyone pays a fixed amount for a year's contract—they can budget ahead," he said. "They are then covered 100 per cent for everything. There are no hidden extra costs. There is no illness or emergency we won't cover, chronic and pre-existing illnesses included, and there is no waiting period. The plan offers a wide range of extra benefits such as sexual counselling, family planning and smoking and weight-watching programmes. Patients may visit their doctor as often as required at no charge."

The PRESIDENT: Order! I request the honourable member to ask his question.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I think all honourable members would agree, having heard that brief extract from the lengthy press report, that the thing sounds almost too good to be true. The number of services that allegedly will be available for half the price of conventional health services cover a wide range indeed.

Will the Minister of Health investigate the family health plan and report to the people of this State on the merits or otherwise of the scheme, so that if the scheme is eventually available in South Australia (as the article indicates it will be) people in the community will be able to use the Minister's report to judge whether or not to join the scheme?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the

honourable member's question to the Minister of Health and bring down a reply.

BLUE TONGUE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture about blue tongue disease.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: As the Minister would be only too well aware, there has been considerable concern about a relatively (and I emphasize "relatively") non-virulent strain of blue tongue in cattle in the northern areas of this country. I understand that this disease has been contained in the northern areas and that no evidence of it has been found in sheep in Australia. However, some overseas authorities, notably in New Zealand, have placed bans on the import of Australian sheep into their countries.

Will the Minister ascertain whether it is possible to have a definite assurance issued (presumably by the Federal Agricultural Council, or some other body) stating that no evidence whatsoever of this disease has been found in sheep, thereby allaying the fears of other countries? Further, will the Minister inform this Council of any further progress made in the eradication or containment of this disease?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I assure the honourable member that other countries are kept well informed about the status of blue tongue disease in Australia. However, these countries are not always willing to change their regulations, because of the unsettled situation in Australia. The honourable member is quite correct when he says that no clinical symptoms of blue tongue have been found in sheep: it has been found only in the cattle population, and in a non-virulent form.

This problem has been discussed at the Agricultural Council, and the matter has been explained to other countries, not only New Zealand but also China, for instance, because it, too, has placed a ban on the importation of Australian sheep. The problem involves a continuing process of trying to convince these countries that the sheep situation in Australia is not serious. The eradication of this disease is not a feasible proposition, because the disease has been identified in most of the cattle in a wide belt across northern Australia, and it would involve a huge task. As it is a comparatively non-virulent strain, there is very little purpose in trying to achieve that eradication.

Also, I point out that we do not know how widespread it is among other native animals or among insect vectors; that would be a complicating factor in any attempt to eradicate the disease. It is mainly a matter of trying to contain it in the area in question.

MEDIACTION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about an organisation known as MediAction.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have in my possession a document dated 4 June this year and headed MediAction Proprietary Limited, by Doctors for Doctors, giving the address as P.O. Box 267, Collingwood 3066, Victoria, 171 Victoria Parade, Fitzroy, and a telephone number, and stating:

Dear Doctor,

When you have read the attached introductory newsletter,

we would like you to give serious thought to joining MediAction and enjoying the various benefits offered.

We intend to hold a seminar in the Hotel Australia, Adelaide, at 8 p.m. on Wednesday 27 June 1979 to explain the whole concept of MediAction in greater detail.

In attendance will be a MediAction director, your local field service officer and myself.

The greatest attraction of MediAction is that group negotiation power has achieved a significant reduction in rates charged to members for the various services mentioned in the newsletter. As the numbers increase the negotiation position on your behalf will be strengthened; therefore your attendance at the seminar and your subsequent membership is very much in your own interests. The local field service officer in Adelaide is Mr. Dennis Sandery—

whose address is not given, but I believe it is 71 Waterfall Gully Road, Waterfall Gully—

who can be contacted on telephone 79 1838. He will contact your secretary shortly before the seminar to confirm your ability to attend, and please do not hesitate to contact him if you require any information prior to the seminar.

I urge your attendance at the seminar, so that you, along with your colleagues, can discover the immense benefits waiting for you in the MediAction concept.

I look forward to meeting you and telling you of the success story that is MediAction.

Let me now refer to another document.

The PRESIDENT: That is a much larger document.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, but I will refer only briefly to the headings, otherwise you, Mr. President, will force me to put the document entirely in question form. It is a shocking indictment on doctors who want to involve themselves in this scheme, which is a guide to investment. The document states:

What have you done so far? So far, MediAction has recommended only reinvestments to our members. Qualified research and exhaustive examination of the many projects offered to us reduced the numbers to only these three which met our criteria. The investments so far have been:

- (a) A joint venture in the growing of cotton in Moree, in North-Western New South Wales. MediAction members subscribed over \$300 000 to this project. Investment dollars are tax-deductible and, although the crop has not yet been harvested, growth and yield have been so good that investors can anticipate returns of up to 70 per cent on capital invested. The crop is insured to return a minimum of 25 per cent!

The publication goes on to explain how to invest portfolio money, how to use it as a tax dodge, how much is tax free and how getting money from investments is difficult when not under MediAction. The publication continues:

What if we get sick?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Isn't this a Victorian organisation?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is an Australia-wide organisation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members may confer later, if they wish.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If the honourable member wants to have it inserted in *Hansard*, he will support me in obtaining leave to do so. The document continues:

Another financial service offered to members and approved by MediAction is a specially negotiated income disability continuity insurance. Income continuity, insurance of receipts, or whatever term used, has been inadequate. MediAction has been able to negotiate what we believe are two unique Income Continuity insurance policies—namely, a non-cancellable contract with weekly benefits of \$1 200 per week, and an ordinary personal accident and illness policy up to \$9 000 per week! On top of this, we have managed to get

these policies at discounted rates. As an example, compare our non-cancellable contract for \$1 000 per week benefits for a premium of \$644 p.a. (plus State stamp duty) for a doctor up to age 40. Our ordinary contract will provide \$1 000 per week of benefits for \$562 p.a. premium (plus State stamp duty).

The newsletter goes on to refer to discounts on motor vehicles such as Peugeot and Mercedes Benz, explains how to acquire a Cessna aircraft at discounted rates, and tells about the leasing of aircraft and about how one can save thousands of dollars on general life assurance. Then there is a financial section and summary. This is the most disgraceful rip-off document concerning doctors and other professions that it has ever been my sorry and unfortunate lot to read. It is a disgrace to the community.

All this goes on in secret, and the person heading this organisation in South Australia has practised for only seven months in this State. I understand that this organisation is involved with a group of doctors operating in Crafers who have practised medicine interstate for two years. Where they came from before that only God knows, and He probably would be ashamed if He did know. Therefore, is the Minister aware of this group of blood-suckers—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Is that a Parliamentary term?

The PRESIDENT: I was distracted and did not hear what the honourable member said.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Minister aware of this group of blood-suckers, known as MediAction—

The PRESIDENT: That is not a Parliamentary term.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Minister aware of this group of vampires?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will not have the opportunity to ask a question unless he comes to order.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If you do not want me to ask my question now I can leave it until I speak in the Address in Reply debate.

The PRESIDENT: I have asked for order. I point out to the honourable member that he can phrase his question in Parliamentary language. He is an experienced politician and it is not necessary to use such terms.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In that case, Mr. President, I seek leave to obtain advice from the Clerk about an appropriate word to replace "blood-suckers" or "vampires". Will you do that for me?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member can phrase a question in an acceptable manner, and I will give him the opportunity to do so.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I could use an Army term with which you would be conversant, Mr. President. However, I bow to the wishes of the Chair in protecting the standards of this Council. I only wish that members opposite, including you, Mr. President, would not concur in these standards that this group wants to impose on people. Is the Minister aware of this group known as MediAction, a group of doctors self-interested in financial plunder? Will the Minister examine the intentions and business *bona fides* of this group and have wide publication made of the names of medical practitioners who become involved in this racketeering scheme?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health and bring down a reply.

LIQUID PETROLEUM GAS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister

representing the Minister of Labour and Industry dealing with liquid petroleum gas.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Before liquid petroleum gas can be more widely used by the motoring public, it will be necessary for an increase in distribution points to be made both in metropolitan and rural areas so that motorists can top up their l.p.g. tanks if they have to travel large distances.

Has the Government approved a policy regarding an increased number of l.p.g. outlets and, if it has, what steps have been taken to advise the industry of its policy or regulatory requirements?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking the Minister representing the Premier a question about policy on Government vehicles.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Premier announced some time ago that the Government was planning to change its fleet of motor vehicles for public servants to four-cylinder vehicles for the purpose of conserving fuel. As far as I am aware, there was no statement made on the Government's policy with respect to motor vehicles for Ministers. The suggestion has been made that the Government has placed an order for new vehicles in the LTD range. What is the Government's present policy on the size of cars for Ministers, and has it been reviewed recently? Secondly, if it has been reviewed, what changes, if any, have been made? Thirdly, has the Government placed an order for new V8 vehicles for Ministers?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: At the time, the Premier announced the Government's fuel-saving measures, which were for a 10 per cent across-the-board cut in fuel consumption in Government departments along with certain other measures relating to the size of vehicles used by public servants. The practical implementation of that policy is still being investigated. At that time the Premier also stated that, in terms of vehicle replacement, Ministers would, from now on, use six-cylinder motor vehicles. That did not mean that there would be an immediate replacement of all vehicles with V8 engines, but that there would be a phasing-in of six-cylinder vehicles for Ministers. That is the current policy of the Government. I assume that, if an order for LTD vehicles had been put in, it has now been cancelled, because the Government has changed its approach and believes that Ministers ought to set the lead in the Public Service in encouraging, within not just the Public Service but also the community generally, an approach to fuel consumption that is much less profligate than it has been in the past.

MEMBER'S REPORT

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the subject of overseas trips.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I wish to quote from a document which was a report made by Mr. Max Brown, who is a member in another place, on his return from a study tour, and I would like to quote a couple of sections. The first section deals with Brazil and states:

Generally speaking, Rio de Janeiro is a beautiful city, but its people, or the general people I saw, could only be described as having doubtful honesty. I described the living in Rio de Janeiro as a rat race and, although that term may not be accepted as the greatest adjective in respect to description, nevertheless, I still believe that it ably describes what I saw. The make-up of the people is an inter-breed between Spanish, Portuguese and South American Negro—colourful, but doubtful.

The report further states:

In fact, it became quite amusing to me to see dogs of all shapes, breeds and sizes being walked along the beach front on leashes held by all shapes, breeds and sizes, and it was very difficult for me to decide which one on the end of the leash I should watch.

It further states:

Incidentally, I was not impressed with the Brazilian Airways (Varig), and would not recommend it to anyone. Like all Brazilians there is no pride, no friendliness, and certainly no helpfulness, and this attitude comes through to the visitor with regular monotony.

Page 27 of the report states (referring to the Greek Islands):

One must immediately note that the said islands are basically archaeological, and one really was not very much different to the other. The way of life was fairly primitive to our standards and the souvenir trade was quite prevalent, but really of not great value. The living quarters of some islanders were caves in the cliffs of the islands, in some cases the only possession being a donkey, and one was not sure whether the donkey lived in the cave dwelling or the owner.

Before asking a question, I point out to the Minister that in my younger days I spent some time in Brazil and therefore know something of the country. I resent very deeply the impression left by Mr. Brown, and I believe that similar resentment would be felt by the people of that country. In view of the serious effect that such statements could have on relations with both countries, especially Brazil, I ask the Attorney-General whether the Government has, on behalf of this Parliament, requested Mr. Brown to issue an apology to the Brazilian and Greek Ambassadors. If not, will the Attorney-General take up this matter with the Government and issue such an apology? Otherwise, I fear that the inference will be that this Parliament agrees with the sentiments so badly expressed by Mr. Brown.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The views expressed by Mr. Brown following his overseas trip were his personal views. I do not believe that in writing his report he intended to adversely reflect upon any group or country. Certainly, the views he expressed were his own views: they do not represent my views, nor do they represent the views of the South Australian Government. I do not believe that there is any need to take the matter any further with Mr. Brown. As far as I am concerned, the situation is as I have stated: they were his personal thoughts, and I reiterate that they are not in any way indicative of my attitude or that of the South Australian Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Leader of the Council whether, as the Government will not take the matter further, the Government will take up with Mr. Brown the question of his personal apology for the statements he made.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr. Brown is his own man.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I thought he was a member of a very united Party.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: He is, indeed. I do not intend to take up the matter with him. I think my statement in response to the Hon. Mr. Cameron's question adequately explains the Government's viewpoint, and the matter is

best left there.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I take it from the answer given by the Attorney-General that he is not going to request Mr. Brown to send a letter of apology and, secondly, that he does not intend that the Government will send an apology.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: There were two aspects to the question, the first of which was whether I would approach Mr. Brown. I have already answered that question in response to a supplementary question asked by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, namely, that it is for Mr. Brown to decide what action he will take following his report. That report was basically a personal document, and in no way represents the Government's view.

The second aspect of the question was what the Government intended to do about the matter in relation to any of the countries involved. I am currently considering that matter. I expect to have discussions with any consular representatives in South Australia who may consider that their countries have been adversely commented on in the report. Indeed, I have already had a brief informal discussion with the Greek Consul. However, I will certainly consider further what the Government's response ought to be to the comments that have been made and to the representatives of Governments in South Australia, or indeed Australia, who may feel in some way offended by Mr. Brown's comments.

PETROLEUM GAS CONVERSION

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Community Development, a question regarding liquid petroleum gas conversions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Following the recent rash of media reports dealing with the shortage of petroleum products in Australia and the suggested need for vehicle owners to convert their vehicles to run on l.p.g., and the statement at the same time by the South Australian Gas Company that there is a long delay in converting motor vehicles, primarily because the conversion kits must come from America, has the Minister taken any action to interest any firm in South Australia in manufacturing the necessary equipment, as such action would not only reduce the waiting period for those who wished to convert their vehicles to l.p.g. but would also help the employment situation?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to ask the Attorney-General a question regarding petroleum.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have noticed this afternoon that the Minister has been asked questions regarding fuel conservation and the price of certain fuels. Fuel prices have been almost doubled by the Federal Government in the past few months. That Government must now be fully aware of the research into pricing that has been conducted in America, and indeed must have considered whether it had resulted in any conservation of liquid fuel. Reports from America suggest that it has had the opposite effect and that, the more that petrol prices were increased, especially coupled with shortages, the greater was the demand for that product.

The Carter Administration has admitted that its experiments conducted in an attempt to conserve fuel by increasing prices have been a dismal failure. On the credit side for America, it has been revealed that fuel savings

have been effected by a reduction to about 50 miles an hour of the speed limit in America.

Australia's Prime Minister is not interested in the economic consequences of world parity prices for oil. Recently, I had the experience, while my tank was being filled with petrol, of the price being increased considerably. Mr. Fraser is merely ensuring that 70 per cent of increases will go towards reducing his Government's deficit. He does not give a hoot regarding the effect on the general price structure in Australia as a result of the stupidity of his and Mr. Anthony's actions.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That's absolute rubbish.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is not, as 70 per cent of increases is going into the Government's coffers. That is one reason why Mr. Fraser is hunting around Africa for more oil, which he is not interested in conserving. Rather, he wants to reduce his deficit so that he can reduce taxation.

The PRESIDENT: Has the honourable member a question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Of course I have, Mr. President. Otherwise, I would not be on my feet. Even honourable members opposite would know that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What's the question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I think that you, Sir, should shut them up so that I can take advantage of the leave that has been granted to me to explain my question. The fact is that Mr. Fraser is using fuel price increases to reduce his Government's deficit.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Question!

The PRESIDENT: "Question" having been called, the honourable member must ask his question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I direct my question to the Minister, bearing in mind that, every time you blokes opposite, particularly those on the front bench, get up to ask a question, you will be treated in the same way.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Question!

The PRESIDENT: "Question" has again been called.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Does the Minister consider that the Federal Government's action in continually increasing petrol prices is aimed at conserving fuel, and does he consider that the effect of this action within the next year on the general price structure of almost all commodities will be disastrous?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The honourable member has raised matters that are of considerable complexity.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That's an understatement.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am not really sure that I am able adequately to answer the honourable member's question. Certainly, the increase in petroleum product prices will have a great effect on the community. Indeed, it will have an effect in terms of inflation, because the production of most commodities involves the use of fuel and energy. The simple fact is that over the next few years, whether or not we like it, petrol prices will increase.

The honourable member has referred to information from the United States which he apparently has, which I have not seen, and which shows that increasing prices had no effect on demand and, therefore, on the conservation of fuel. I should be interested to see more details of those findings before I comment on them more specifically.

ROAD GRANTS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question regarding road grants.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: A report in yesterday's country edition of the *Advertiser* stated that the Government had decreased road grants in various centres on Eyre Peninsula by, in some cases, a huge amount. The allocation for Tumby Bay has been decreased by 39 per cent; that for Port Lincoln has been decreased by 36 per cent; Cleve's allocation has been reduced by 22 per cent; Kimba's has been reduced by 21 per cent; the allocation for Franklin Harbor has been reduced by 13 per cent; and that for Murat Bay has been reduced by 8 per cent. I understand that the total sum allocated to the State Government by the Federal Government for roads has increased if not up to, then close to, the level of inflation. Will the Minister explain why it has been found necessary to reduce road grants to areas on Eyre Peninsula that probably have a greater need than have other areas for increased road grants, when grants made to the State Government by the Federal Government have not been decreased by a significant amount?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will bring down a reply for the honourable member.

NURSES MEMORIAL CENTRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister representing the Premier about the Nurses Memorial Centre and its facilities at Kent Town.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Along with other members I received a copy of a letter addressed to the Premier from the Nurses Memorial Centre of South Australia Inc. The letter not only indicates that copies were being sent to other members of Parliament but also suggests that a brief Parliamentary debate be permitted on the subject matter of the letter.

The letter deals with problems encountered at the Nurses Memorial Centre, which is, of course, the Adelaide headquarters of the nursing profession. According to the letter, these problems began when the centre was first planned and it outlines the difficulties encountered during those early years and the problems which the committee now feels will be encountered as a result of the Housing Trust's Kent Town development, which will be immediately behind the nursing centre, which faces Dequetteville Terrace. Apparently some arrangements were made years ago regarding the availability of car parking space behind the main building. The committee believes that its opportunity to lease some of the building will be seriously hampered unless car parking facilities are offered to prospective tenants. It appears that the Housing Trust's Kent Town development will absorb some of this area that the committee had hoped would be reserved for car parking for those occupying the centre building.

In its expression of serious concern to the Premier, the committee asks for special consideration and asks that the Premier deliberate on the whole matter. Has the Premier or the Government had time to consider this matter fully and what decisions have been made by the Government?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will attempt to obtain that information for the honourable member.

FOOTBALL PARK FLOODLIGHTING

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister

representing the Minister of Recreation and Sport about the lighting of Football Park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I notice on the front page of today's *News* that the Royal Commission recently completed its inquiry into the lighting of Football Park and has recommended that it go ahead. What will be the total cost of the lights at Football Park? What was the cost of the Royal Commission to the Government? What costs were incurred by outside bodies that gave evidence before the Royal Commission?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and bring down a reply.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

On leave being granted today for the introduction of any Bill of which notice has been given, that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable that Bill to be read a second time forthwith.
Motion carried.

ABATTOIRS AND PET FOOD WORKS BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to license abattoirs, poultry abattoirs and pet food works; to regulate the standards of hygiene and sanitation at abattoirs, poultry abattoirs and pet food works; to regulate the quality of meat, meat products, poultry meat, poultry meat products and pet food; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is designed to establish a licensing and inspection system for the abattoirs, poultry abattoirs and pet food works that serve the Adelaide metropolitan area and the major regional centres of the State. Under the Bill, it is proposed that all meat, poultry meat or pet food available for purchase and consumption within these areas will have been produced at abattoirs or works licensed or recognised under the measure and having proper standards of hygiene. All such red meat is also to be subject to inspection in order to ensure that it is fit for human consumption.

The Bill has been introduced together with Bills amending the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973, the Health Act, 1911-1978, the Local Government Act, 1934-1979, and the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936-1977. The Health Act Amendment Bill provides for the making of regulations imposing hygiene standards in respect of slaughterhouses situated outside the abattoirs areas to be proclaimed under this measure. The Local Government Act Amendment Bill removes the provisions in the Local Government Act that relate to meat hygiene, but retains the provisions that require country slaughterhouses to be licensed by councils. The Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973, provides for the establishment of abattoirs boards for areas outside the Adelaide metropolitan area that either establish and operate public abattoirs, as in the case of the Port Pirie Abattoirs Board, or supervise the inspection of meat produced at private abattoirs. The Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill removes from the Abattoirs Act all provisions that do not relate to the establishment and

operation of abattoirs by abattoirs boards but relate to hygiene or the inspection of meat. The Bill amending the South Australian Meat Corporation Act removes the provisions in that Act that relate to meat hygiene, which will instead be regulated under this measure, or that relate to the entry of meat into the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The major problems that this legislative scheme is designed to overcome are the lack of uniformity in the meat hygiene standards that apply in the built-up area of Adelaide and the unsatisfactory meat hygiene standards of a number of country slaughterhouses and abattoirs. At present the high meat hygiene standards required under the South Australian Meat Corporation Act do not apply to the more recently developed parts of the Adelaide metropolitan area and, accordingly, it is proposed that under this measure those standards will apply in abattoirs areas that encompass the whole of the Adelaide metropolitan area and, in addition, the major regional centres of population. With respect to country red meat slaughterhouses, it is proposed that those that are substandard will be required to upgrade to proper standards of hygiene established under the proposed regulations under the Health Act with the major responsibility for enforcement of these standards being vested in the local boards of health and the local health surveyors.

Under this Bill each abattoir situated within an abattoirs area proclaimed under the measure and each poultry abattoir or pet food works wherever situated within the State will be required to obtain a licence and to meet standards of construction, plant and equipment prescribed by regulation under the measure. Each such establishment that is in operation at the commencement of this measure is to be automatically granted a licence, but, if it does not comply with the prescribed standards, will be required to upgrade to those standards within a period of three years from the initial grant of its licence. Slaughtering works established after the commencement of the measure, in order to obtain a licence, must meet certain criteria to the satisfaction of the Chief Inspector appointed under the measure, who is to be the licensing authority.

As already stated, the Bill provides for the regulation of hygiene standards of pet food works in addition to red meat or poultry meat abattoirs. This is considered necessary for the reason that such meat at times enters the human food chain and for the reason that some diseases of pets caused by the consumption of contaminated food are communicable to humans. The Bill also provides for the necessary inspection powers with respect to red meat abattoirs, poultry meat abattoirs and pet food works and the products of such abattoirs and works. Under the Bill, all red meat must, before being made available for purchase, be passed by an inspector as fit for human consumption, which is to be indicated by the branding of the meat. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that different provisions of the measure may be brought into operation at different times. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 sets out the definitions of terms used in the Bill. Attention is drawn to the definition of "pet food works" which is wider than the definitions of "abattoirs" and "poultry abattoirs" in the sense that it includes any works where pet food is produced whether or not slaughtering is carried on there. Subclauses (2) and (3) of

this clause provide for the declaration by proclamation of abattoirs areas.

Part II, comprising clauses 5 to 8, provides for the appointment of inspectors and their powers. Clause 5 provides for the appointment of registered veterinary surgeons as Chief Inspector and Deputy Chief Inspector and for the appointment of persons not necessarily so qualified as inspectors. Inspectors under this clause may include inspectors appointed by the Commonwealth Government.

Clause 6 provides the powers necessary for an effective system of inspection and the particular attention of honourable members is drawn to this clause. Included in this clause is the power of an inspector to dispose of any meat or poultry meat that in his opinion was derived from a diseased animal or bird or is unfit for human consumption for any other reason and to brand meat as fit for human consumption.

Clause 7 empowers an inspector to direct that steps be taken to remedy defects in a slaughtering works that in his opinion render it insanitary or unhygienic and to order the works to close down, wholly or partially, in the meantime. Provision is made in this clause for an appeal to the Minister against such requirements of an inspector.

Clause 8 protects inspectors from personal liability arising from any exercise of their powers.

Part III, Division I, comprising clauses 9 to 22, deals with the licensing of red meat abattoirs. Clause 9 defines the word "licence" for the purposes of Division I. Clause 10 is one of the basic provisions of the measure, prohibiting the slaughter of animals for the products of meat in an abattoirs area except at a licensed abattoir. At subclause (2) the present exception to this prohibition is retained, namely, that the occupier of any land outside a municipality or township may slaughter animals for the production of meat for the consumption of persons resident or employed on that land.

Clause 11 regulates applications for licences. Clause 12 regulates the grant of licences in respect of abattoirs not in operation at commencement of this measure and sets out the criteria which the Chief Inspector is to have regard to in determining whether or not a licence should be granted. Clause 13 provides for the automatic licensing of abattoirs in operation for the period of six months preceding the day on which the declaration of the abattoirs area has effect notwithstanding that an abattoir may not conform to the prescribed standards of construction, plant and equipment. Subclause (2) of this clause provides for exemptions from compliance with the prescribed standards for a period of three years.

Clause 14 permits the Chief Inspector to attach conditions to an abattoir licence relating to the hygiene or sanitation of the abattoir. Clause 15 prohibits operation of an abattoir if it does not conform to a prescribed standard or in contravention of a condition attached to the licence in respect of that abattoir. Clause 16 provides for the renewal of licences. Clause 17 provides for the surrender, suspension and cancellation of licences. Clause 18 makes provision for the transfer of licences. Clause 19 requires holders of licences to keep certain records which are to be available for inspection at any reasonable time by an inspector. Clause 20 requires the Chief Inspector to keep a register of licences. Clause 21 prohibits the carrying out of alterations to an abattoir without the approval of the Chief Inspector.

Clause 22 provides for the recognition of abattoirs outside the State, if they are of a standard equivalent to the standard required under this measure.

Division II of Part III, comprising clauses 23 to 36, deals with the licensing of poultry abattoirs. Clause 23 defines

"licence" for the purposes of Division II. Clause 24 prohibits the operation of a poultry abattoir anywhere within the State unless the poultry abattoir is licensed. Clause 25 provides for applications for licences.

Clause 26 regulates the grant of licences in respect of poultry abattoirs not in operation at the commencement of this measure and sets out the criteria which the Chief Inspector is to have regard to in determining whether or not a licence should be granted.

Clause 27 provides for the automatic licensing of any poultry abattoirs in operation for the period of six months preceding the day on which the declaration of the abattoirs area has effect notwithstanding that it may not conform to the prescribed standards of construction, plant and equipment. Subclause (2) of this clause provides for exemptions from compliance with the prescribed standards for a period of three years.

Clause 28 permits the Chief Inspector to attach conditions to a poultry abattoir licence relating to the hygiene or sanitation of the abattoir. Clause 29 prohibits operation of a poultry abattoir if it does not conform to a prescribed standard or in contravention of a condition attached to the licence in respect of that abattoir. Clause 30 provides for the renewal of licences. Clause 31 provides for the surrender, suspension and cancellation of licences. Clause 32 makes provision for the transfer of licences. Clause 33 requires holders of licences to keep certain records which are to be available for inspection at any reasonable time by an inspector.

Clause 34 requires the Chief Inspector to keep a register of licences. Clause 35 prohibits the carrying out of alterations to a poultry abattoir without the approval of the Chief Inspector. Clause 36 provides for the recognition of poultry abattoirs outside the State if they are of a standard equivalent to the standard required under this measure.

Division III of Part III, comprising clauses 37 to 49, deals with the licensing of pet food works. Clause 37 defines "Licence" for the purposes of Division III. Clause 38 prohibits the operation of a pet food works anywhere within the State unless the pet food works is licensed. Clause 39 provides for applications for licences.

Clause 40 regulates the grant of licences in respect of pet food works not in operation at the commencement of this measure and sets out the criteria which the Chief Inspector is to have regard to in determining whether or not a licence should be granted. Clause 41 provides for the automatic licensing of any pet food works in operation for the period of six months preceding the day on which the declaration of the abattoirs area has effect notwithstanding that the works may not conform to the prescribed standards of construction, plant and equipment. Subclause (2) of this clause provides for exemptions from compliance with the prescribed standards for a period of three years.

Clause 42 permits the Chief Inspector to attach conditions to any pet food works licence relating to the hygiene and sanitation of the works. Clause 43 prohibits operation of any pet food works if it does not conform to a prescribed standard or in contravention of a condition attached to the licence in respect of that works. Clause 44 provides for the renewal of licences. Clause 45 provides for the surrender, suspension and cancellation of licences.

Clause 46 makes provision for the transfer of licences. Clause 47 requires holders of licences to keep certain records which are to be available for inspection at any reasonable time by an inspector. Clause 48 requires the Chief Inspector to keep a register of licences. Clause 49 prohibits the carrying out of alterations to any pet food works without the approval of the Chief Inspector. Part IV, clauses 50 and 51, provides a right of appeal to the

Supreme Court against any decision or order of the Chief Inspector made in the exercise or purported exercise of his powers under Part III of the measure.

Part V of the Bill relates to the inspection and branding of meat, poultry meat and pet food. Clause 52 is another basic provision, in that it prohibits the slaughter of animals at licensed abattoirs unless an inspector is present at that time. Clause 53 provides that it is an offence for a person to brand meat unless he is an inspector or is acting at the direction of an inspector. Clause 54 prohibits the sale within an abattoirs area of meat or a meat product unless it was produced at a licensed abattoir or at an interstate abattoir recognised under clause 22.

Clause 55 prohibits the sale anywhere within the State of meat or any meat product that is unfit for human consumption. Clause 56 in effect prohibits the movement between abattoirs areas of meat produced at licensed abattoirs that do not meet the prescribed standards of hygiene at the time they are licensed until they are brought into compliance with all the prescribed standards. Clause 57 prohibits the sale for human consumption anywhere within the State of any flesh or offal produced, processed or stored at a pet food works or any product derived from such flesh or offal. Clause 58 prohibits the sale anywhere within the State of any poultry meat or poultry meat product unless it was produced at a licensed poultry abattoir or at a recognised interstate poultry abattoir.

Clause 59 prohibits the sale anywhere within the State of any poultry meat or poultry meat product that is unfit for human consumption. Clause 60 prohibits the sale within an abattoirs area of pet food produced within the State at an unlicensed pet food works. Clause 61 prohibits the sale anywhere within the State of pet food that is unfit for consumption by pets.

Part V deals with miscellaneous matters. Clause 62 empowers the Chief Inspector to exempt a licence holder from compliance with any provision of the measure or to exempt a slaughtering works from a prescribed standard. Clause 63 makes provision for the service of documents by post. Clause 64 prohibits the furnishing of information, or the keeping of records containing information, that is false or misleading in a material particular. Clause 65 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 66 provides for a summary procedure in respect of offences against the measure. Clause 67 is the usual provision subjecting officers of bodies corporate convicted of offences to personal liability in certain circumstances. Clause 68 provides for the imposition of penalties for continuing offences. Clause 69 empowers the making of regulations.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936-1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill deals with matters consequential to the enactment of the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1979, which provides for the establishment of a licensing and inspection system for abattoirs in the more densely populated parts of the State including the Adelaide metropolitan area. This Bill, therefore, removes from the principal Act, the South Australian Meat Corporation

Act, 1936-1977, all the provisions that relate to meat hygiene and the inspection and licensing of abattoirs while leaving essentially untouched the provisions that provide for the establishment and operation of the corporation's abattoirs. The Bill also removes all controls under the principal Act on the entry of meat into the metropolitan area. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act which sets out the arrangement of the Act by removing the reference to Part VII—Alteration of the Metropolitan Abattoirs Area which is to be repealed. Clause 4 amends the definition section, section 3 of the principal Act, by removing all definitions that do not relate to the establishment or operation of the corporation's abattoirs. Clause 5 enacts a new section designed to make it clear that the principal Act, as amended by this measure, is to be subject to the provisions of the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1979, if enacted. All the remaining clauses effect amendments or repeals that remove references or provisions that do not relate to the establishment or operation of the corporation's abattoirs.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill deals with matters consequential to enactment of the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1979, and the Health Act Amendment Bill, 1979. The Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill provides for the establishment of a licensing and inspection system for abattoirs in the more densely populated parts of the State, while the Health Act Amendment Bill provides for the regulation of the hygiene of abattoirs in any other parts of the State.

This Bill provides for the repeal of those provisions of the Local Government Act, 1934-1979, which regulate the hygiene of abattoirs or slaughterhouses but does not affect the provisions that relate to the licensing of slaughterhouses by councils. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 551 of the principal Act so that Part XXVII of the principal Act relating to slaughterhouses applies only in those council areas that are not within abattoirs areas proclaimed under the proposed Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Act. Clause 4 amends section 552 by providing that a licence is not required in

respect of a slaughterhouse established by an abattoirs board under the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973, as it would be amended by the Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill, 1979. Clause 5 amends section 554 of the principal Act which provides for the establishment of a slaughterhouse by a council. The amendment provides that a slaughterhouse established by a council must comply with the proposed hygiene regulations under the Health Act.

Clause 6 repeals section 555a of the principal Act which provides an exemption for farmers who carry on limited slaughtering for the production of meat for sale from the requirement under section 552 that a slaughterhouse licence be obtained from the council for the area. The Government has found that this exemption creates insuperable enforcement problems and as a result undermines the hygiene requirements in respect of slaughtering for the production of meat for sale. Farmers will, of course, continue to be able to slaughter for their own consumption and consumption by their employees by virtue of the proviso to subsection (2) of section 552 of the principal Act.

Clause 7 amends section 667 of the principal Act by replacing a reference to abattoirs areas under the South Australian Meat Corporation Act and the Abattoirs Act by a reference to abattoirs areas under the proposed Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Act, 1979. The clause also repeals subparagraph XVII of paragraph 4 of subsection (1) of that section relating to the hygiene of meat in butcher shops which is adequately regulated under the Health Act.

Clause 8 provides for the repeal of sections 871w, 871wa, 871wb, 871x and 871xa of the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, which regulate the operation of abattoirs at Whyalla. These matters will be covered by the provisions of the proposed Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Act, 1979.

Clause 9 amends section 877 of the principal Act by removing powers of inspection by council inspectors in respect of the health and cleanliness of slaughterhouses, butcher shops and shambles. These matters are adequately dealt with under the Health Act.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It should be read together with the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1979, and the Health Act Amendment Bill, 1979. Those two Bills are designed to regulate the hygiene of abattoirs within the State. The principal Act, the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973, empowers the establishment of local boards to either operate or supervise the operation of abattoirs within areas proclaimed under the Act. At present, only the Port Pirie Abattoirs Board owns and operates an abattoir. All the other abattoirs boards essentially supervise the inspection of meat and fix slaughtering fees. This Bill, therefore, is designed to enable the Port Pirie Abattoirs Board to continue to operate the Port Pirie Abattoir and to remove from the principal Act all provisions that do not relate to the establishment and operation of abattoirs by abattoirs boards but relate to hygiene or the inspection of meat. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted

in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Under this clause the principal Act, as amended by this measure, is to be referred to as the "Local Public Abattoirs Act". Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act which sets out the headings to the Parts of the principal Act. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by deleting all definitions that do not relate to the establishment and operation of an abattoir by an abattoirs board.

Clause 5 enacts a new section designed to make it clear that the principal Act, as amended by this measure, is to be subject to the provisions of the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1979, if enacted, and the Health Act, as amended by the Health Act Amendment Bill, 1979, if enacted. The clause also provides for the disposition of the property of abattoirs boards that would be dissolved by virtue of the proposed repeal of Part IVA of the principal Act. All the remaining clauses of the Bill effect amendments or repeals that remove references or provisions that do not relate to the establishment of abattoirs boards or the establishment and operation of abattoirs by abattoirs boards.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Act, 1911-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It should be read together with the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1979. The Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1979, provides for the establishment of a licensing and inspection system for abattoirs situated within areas to be proclaimed under that measure. This Bill provides for the making of regulations under the principal Act, the Health Act, 1911-1978, designed to regulate the hygiene and sanitation at abattoirs situated outside the areas proclaimed under the proposed Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Act, 1979. The Bill provides for the repeal of those provisions of the principal Act that presently regulate the hygiene of abattoirs and instead empowers the making of a comprehensive set of regulations under the principal Act that are to be similar in form to the regulations to be made under the proposed Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Act, 1979. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 87 of the principal Act which regulates the construction and maintenance of cesspools by removing the reference in that section to slaughterhouses. Cesspools at slaughterhouses are instead to be regulated under regulations to be made under section 147 of the principal Act. Clause 4 repeals section 101 of the principal Act which regulates the keeping of swine or dogs at slaughterhouses. Again, this matter will

instead be dealt with under the proposed regulations.

Clause 5 repeals sections 103 to 109 of the principal Act. These sections deal with the inspection of animals for slaughter and diseased animals, matters which will also be dealt with under the proposed regulations. Clause 6 amends section 147 of the principal Act by replacing those provisions empowering the making of regulations with respect to slaughtering and slaughterhouses by more comprehensive powers as regards slaughtering and slaughterhouses situated outside abattoirs areas proclaimed under the proposed Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Act, 1979.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 31 July. Page 199.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and thank His Excellency for the Address with which he opened this session of Parliament. On behalf of my Party in this Chamber I reaffirm and express our loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. It is remarkable that during one of the most delicate periods of human history on the African continent the Queen is able to visit that continent to open a conference and receive such a display of affection as has been shown to her by the people of Africa. It has been nothing short of remarkable.

The affection shown is much deeper than the affection normally accorded to any political leader. Although it is easy to criticise the institution of the monarchy, I ask those people who criticise the institution to examine the advantages that have stemmed from a monarchy, and the advantages that the British Commonwealth has enjoyed by remaining tied to a monarchical system.

I extend to the families of the late Sir Baden Pattinson, Leo Travers, Les Harding, and Stanley Hawker my sympathies and the sympathies of my Party at their passing. Each of those honourable members served his district and the State well.

I was not present at the opening of this session, which was held earlier than expected to deal with a Bill concerning the Cooper Basin. Although I do not wish to deal with that question in retrospect, I will be dealing later in my speech with some of the general questions related to the development and utilisation of energy resources in South Australia and throughout Australia.

I do not believe that any nation of the Western world has so far been able to develop a rational policy on the exploitation, development and utilisation of energy resources to maximise the advantages on a national scale. Recently the world waited with baited breath for the President of the United States of America to descend from his mountain retreat to announce his policies on the provision of energy for the vast American nation.

I think I am right in saying that not only Americans but people throughout the world were somewhat disappointed with the decisions made at the retreat. The Prime Ministers of Great Britain, France, West Germany, and Japan met recently in Tokyo and discussed, among other matters, the question of energy policy for the Western world. Without trying to be critical, I believe that the statements that came from that conference had almost an air of unreality about them. At the Federal level in Australia, political Parties have talked about the energy

problem and the policies that they will be following to provide energy, yet little has been achieved so far in obtaining any rational national policy.

At the State level we see, for example, the stupid head-in-the-sand attitude of this Government to the development of our uranium resources. South Australia has a uranium resource that is almost ready to be mined with a process that is probably the most environmentally acceptable method that we can find, yet the whole project is being held up because this Government has adopted a head-in-the-sand attitude about the development of this energy material.

As Australians, we have done very little at the political end of the scale to produce any alternative to imported crude oil. Most of us realise that by 1985 the import bill for crude oil for Australia will probably be close to \$5 000 000 000 per annum. In modern plants producing alternative fuels, the lead time from the conception of that plant to its coming into production is 10 years or more. Yet, once again the Western world is doing very little (and I stress at the political level) to find an alternative source to crude oil. While crude oil is still probably the cheapest form of energy that we can find and the most convenient in forms of transport, who can undertake to guarantee that another situation similar to that which occurred in Iran will not occur in other Middle-East countries? While a nation like Australia, or for that matter any other nation in the Western world, or even a State like South Australia, does little at the political level to ensure our future independence, we will always remain vulnerable to the whims of any unstable political area that may be a provider of crude oil. It is on this theme that I wish briefly to address the Council.

The standing of South Australia in the English and European financial world is so low at present that it is almost embarrassing in Europe or England to call oneself a South Australian. That is the truth, as any person who has visited those areas recently will know. If one looks at the investors' guide in the *Financial Review* in Great Britain, one sees a map of Australia in which South Australia has been excluded. There is no doubt that what I am saying is correct. This problem—the economic development of South Australia—has been the Achilles heel of this Government. This Government can be highly rated as a producer or handler of its own publicity, but it is low when we examine its economic performance.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What about B.P.?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will come to that in a moment. It is clear that the previous Premier recognised South Australia's need for an economic shot in the arm. He also knew how that shot in the arm could be achieved, and in trying to lay the correct course it was quite clear that he was undermined. In Great Britain there is a gentleman called Wedgwood Benn, and it is recognised that he is the leader of the extreme left and feared by most English people, particularly those who have had some experience in regard to the down-turn in the English economy. However, Wedgwood Benn's politics are conservative compared to the philosophy expounded by Duncan in South Australia. Duncanism has frightened more investors away from South Australia than Wedgwood Benn has ever frightened away from Great Britain. Wedgwood Benn has put forward only perfunctory opposition to nuclear power. Yet, here, Duncan, the leader of the extreme left, has refused to accept facts—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting President. The honourable member is reading a speech by a Senator from South Australia who is so embarrassed with the way he is reading it that he has left the gallery.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins): That is not a point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is perfectly obvious that Wedgwood Benn put forward only a very perfunctory opposition to the question of the development of nuclear power, whereas in this State Duncan, who leads the extreme left, has placed a total ban on the development of this energy resource.

When I returned from overseas recently I picked up the *Advertiser* on the Saturday morning and found that it ran a headline stating that B.P. was taking a \$50 000 000 stake in Roxby Downs. This indicated to me that at last the head-in-the-sand attitude of this Government had come to an end. However, the Government is still arguing that it has made no policy change whatsoever. The only thing more stupid than the Government's position is the statement from the political opportunist from Mitcham, who said that he was alarmed at the B.P. investment in Western Mining. There will be some cause for alarm if the resources of this State are left locked up purely on some political fantasy that he entertains.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He is just endorsing Labor Party policy, isn't he?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is no doubt about that. No matter what political mileage is being made out of this question, the world must turn to the nuclear reactor for a significant percentage of its electrical energy. With all the present knowledge we have of nuclear generation, the industry at present poses less danger than any other form of energy production. As our knowledge increases, the safety of nuclear energy will increase. By 1990, 80 per cent of electrical generation in Europe will be from nuclear reactors. While we have in this State an industrial potential to produce uranium for a world market, and while the world is going to use the nuclear reactor, we twiddle our thumbs and play politics.

Secondly, we must begin to fashion a policy to produce crude oil from other sources—from our shale and coal deposits.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The Liberals closed down the shale deposits in New South Wales. Do you remember? They gave it to free enterprise.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Of course they did, because it was not economical to develop. As coal is by far the best alternative for South Australia, the question of the production of crude oil from coal engaged my attention during a recent study tour. I am not going to waste too much time on this point—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You didn't have to go overseas to learn that; it's all in our library.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In reply to the Hon. Mr. Foster, one could put most of what Mr. Brown said on a postage stamp.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What rubbish!

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster will get his opportunity to speak later. In the meantime, he should keep quiet.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I stress that in this area of policy-making serious attention must be given to this matter, as Australia depends so much on its ability to supply portable fuel. For example, in Europe it is possible to convert most of the transport system to an electric system. The whole rail system in Europe could be electrified, but that would not be possible here. We must rely on supplies of a portable fuel.

Although some research is being undertaken by the private sector in Australia (this is happening in relation to coal in the Yallourn area), there is little policy-making on this matter at the political level. In South Australia, I

believe that the Cooper Basin is the area that will finally offer enormous potential in relation to coal reserves. The coal reserves are said in some published documents to comprise about 3 million million to 4 million million tonnes. The big problem in relation to that deposit is that it lies between 6 000 feet and 8 000 feet deep in the soil.

Is there a possibility of coal liquefaction or gasification *in situ*? If such a process is feasible, we have an enormous resource capable of supplying Australian needs for many hundreds of years. The chemistry of converting oil to gas has been known for many years. We must merely produce the technological equipment for such conversion. So far, the only commercial plants operating are doing so with coal mined from relatively shallow deposits.

Some experimental work has been carried out with gasification of coals *in situ* in Russia and Great Britain, but the results of those experiments have not proved to be encouraging. Most of the experimentation has been carried out on coal in shallow deposits, and with little effort being made to prevent the escape of gas into the atmosphere. Work is being done in Belgium and Germany on gasifying deep coals *in situ*, and this research should be watched extremely closely not only by South Australia but by Australia generally, as the potential for *in situ* gasification or liquefaction seems to offer long-term potential for South Australian coal.

One thing seems certain to me: unless the Western world can produce a competitor to crude oil, the crude oil producing countries will continue with the dramatic price hikes that they have maintained over the past two years. Who can predict whether there will be another price rise tomorrow? I am certain that there will be one soon. I do not think it is reasonable to expect these countries not to go on increasing prices when there is no competitor to hold down the price to something that is reasonable.

The Western world will be held to ransom, and we will be subjected to heavy inflationary pressures because of the demands made for crude oil price rises. Australia has the raw material to allow that competitor to develop. South Australia should establish a small research group, which could devote its time to experimenting on liquefaction, gasification, combustion, and analysis of our indigenous South Australian coals, as I am certain that, towards the end of this century, it could play a significant role in the energy mix of this State and the nation. Unfortunately, when one talks about policy in relation to future energy demands, the inevitable approach seems to get down to a private enterprise versus socialism attitude. That does not seem to be the attitude that should be adopted in relation to this matter.

There is a need for the world to maintain its available resources, so that the advantages to society can be reflected by the efficient utilisation and policy-making effects that one can achieve. In that energy mix, one must realise that we must use the nuclear reactor, coal and crude oil, and that in this energy mix we must have our eyes cocked to the efficiency that can be achieved by using the private sector.

The Hon. Anne Levy: We don't cock our eyes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the honourable member ever seen me do it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! It might be helpful if the honourable Leader addressed his remarks to the Chair and ignored interjections.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We must utilise the efficiency and imagination of the private sector, which could use its entrepreneurial skills. We must also manage our available resources so that society can reap the benefit of good management of those resources.

In developing a policy in relation to energy, one constantly hears the argument that the State should be the owner and controller, and that the private sector should be squeezed out of it. However, in so arguing we are missing the point. All have a role to play in future in relation to the provision of energy, and to reduce the argument purely to that relating to the private sector and the socialist argument is to beg the whole question. This nation, and indeed South Australia, must begin developing a cogent energy policy before it is too late and before we utilise one of our most valuable resources in a manner that we may regret in 10, 20 or 50 years.

At the beginning of this speech, I said that South Australia was recognised overseas as the economic disaster area of Australia. The only people who seem to be ignorant of this fact are Government members. Yesterday, for example, I listened to the Hon. Miss Levy's speech, which was very much devoid of logic. She defended a form of taxation that depends on the lottery of death. All other States in Australia have decided to abolish those forms of taxation, and have either abolished them or are in the process of doing so. Even the A.L.P. Governments in New South Wales and Tasmania have decided to get rid of this form of taxation, yet this Government constantly defends death duties in South Australia.

It will not be long before South Australia is the only State in the Commonwealth levying this form of taxation. Yet the Government goes on defending the fact that it will continue with it. How can South Australia attract investment? Is the picture that I saw in the *Financial Review* in England correct? Does it not reflect the attitude of others to this State?

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: How did B.P. find out about us?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Government changed its policy, because B.P. seems to have received some undertaking? The Government has not answered that question yet. The first question I asked yesterday was whether the Government would make a clear statement about its policy. I believe the Government has not changed its policy, and I would like to know what undertakings have been given to B.P. about Roxby Downs.

Turning back to death duties, I would like to know how this State can maintain a position in regard to investment in this State when very shortly it will be the only State in Australia levying death duties. When speaking yesterday, the Hon. Anne Levy twisted it all around and said that the abolition of death duties was more or less a Liberal plot. She asked how a Federal Government could justify moving out of the death duties field. I remind the honourable member that the A.L.P. Governments of Tasmania and New South Wales are doing exactly that. How can South Australia generate any confidence while we have people like the Hon. Miss Levy and the Government of this State expressing their old-fashioned economic views? The Hon. Miss Levy wants to continue a tax form that relies on the lottery of death for its collection.

The Hon. Anne Levy: They have death duties in the U.S.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Of course they do. If the Hon. Miss Levy would only listen to me for a moment, she would know that the point I am making is that very soon South Australia will be the only State in the Commonwealth that is levying a tax based on the lottery of death. How can the local people of South Australia be expected to invest in this State when it is the only State levying this form of taxation? It is quite simple: the people will not be interested in investing in South Australia when it is the only State levying this type of taxation.

I refer here to the *Christian Science Monitor*, which devotes 28 pages to the economic development of Australia. The article begins by saying:

It is hard to be pessimistic about Australia's economic future. This nation, nearly as large as the United States, minus Alaska, has just too many natural resources in demand by a world possibly facing food and mineral shortages.

The article then goes on to deal with development in Australia. The interesting thing is that in the whole of that document there is not one reference to any development in South Australia. Page after page of the article refers to Queensland, Western Australia, New South Wales and Victoria but there is not one reference to any economic development in South Australia. Therefore, the point I am making is quite valid; the outside world sees South Australia as an economic desert.

I will now quote Sir Robert Norman, who, as a director of the Bank of New South Wales, a director of Chrysler Australia Limited and President of the Australia-Japan Society, was instrumental in negotiating the Mitsubishi investment in Chrysler. At a Chamber of Industry and Commerce luncheon in Adelaide a fortnight ago he said:

Trends in several key economic indicators make disheartening reading. The recorded rate of unemployment (in South Australia) has been consistently higher than the national average. In May 1979 the rate of 7.5 per cent was the highest among all the States. The ratio of registered unemployed to notified vacancies was 33:1 in the same month, again well above the national ratio of 23:1. The most disturbing aspect of the employment market is the dearth of opportunities in the private sector. New employment opportunities have tended to be concentrated almost exclusively in the public sector which accounted for 34 per cent of the State's total civilian employment at the end of 1978, compared with 30 per cent in New South Wales and 32 per cent on a national basis. By contrast private sector employment has actually been dropping.

The lack of employment opportunities and slow rate of economic expansion has been reflected in a net loss of population through interstate migration. In 1978 South Australia was the only State to record a net migration loss. The loss attributable to net overseas and interstate migration amounted to 1 700 compared with gains of 26 000 and 7 000 in New South Wales and Victoria respectively.

I point out again that there was a net migration loss to South Australia of 1 700 compared with 26 000 and 7 000 in New South Wales and Victoria respectively.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Is that necessarily bad?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Of course it's not bad! If we keep on going there will be nobody left in South Australia at all. Sir Robert Norman continues:

Economic conditions in South Australia have been mirrored strongly by the prolonged recession in the building and construction industry. Building approvals, commencements and completions have all fallen substantially during the past two years, and the industry continues to operate well below capacity.

Hesitant consumer spending remains a major problem. Sales of retail goods and new motor vehicles have not kept pace with national growth rates. On the other side of the coin, as it were, South Australians have increased their personal savings in banks and building societies at a much faster rate than have residents in other States.

According to the June quarter survey of industrial trends conducted jointly by the Bank of New South Wales and the Confederation of Australian Industry, South Australian manufacturers were generally less optimistic than the national consensus in respect of their own rate of operation, the general business in the next six months, and capital expenditure plans for the year ahead.

The seeming lack of business confidence and apprehension about the likely extent and direction of Government intervention in corporate and consumer affairs have had unfavourable repercussions on the investment climate.

On the mineral front, that catalyst for so much investment elsewhere in Australia over the past two decades, South Australia is distinctly behind the other States. This cannot be blamed entirely on the capricious distribution of mineral resources. Whereas the pace of development for the open-cut copper prospect at Kanmantoo or of the steaming coal prospect at Lake Phillipson is dictated by mineral economics, political considerations have to be taken into account when assessing the major copper/uranium prospect of Roxby Downs.

. . . Another field in which South Australia has lagged in recent years is new investment in mineral-based processing ventures such as the development of aluminium smelters in the Eastern States and Western Australia. At present manufacturing industry in the State is largely being channelled into the expansion of existing companies rather than the establishment of new ventures.

. . . Further evidence of the State's lack of growth is provided by its borrowing programme. In 1978, the Loan Council authorised each State to raise loans on the international capital market for approved infrastructure projects. Of the \$1.8 billion approved as the total sum to be raised over seven years to finance 12 projects, South Australia accounted for only \$186 000 000, and that was for the still tentative Redcliff project.

They are the exact comments made by Sir Robert Norman. He had the courage to point out the truth of South Australia's decline under this Government. Those comments confirm precisely what has been said repeatedly by the Opposition over the last few years.

Let us not forget what was said by Professor Ted Wheelright of Sydney University, who is Australia's foremost Marxist economist, a former economic adviser to the Whitlam Government and doyen of the Annual Convention of Labor Economists.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Who said he was a Marxist economist?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has asked a question. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris need not reply. If the Hon. Mr. DeGaris wishes to give the honourable member an answer he will; if not, the honourable member will stop interjecting.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Professor Wheelright said on A.B.C. radio as recently as 27 May that South Australia was "depopulating" and that its economy was "stagnating"; they were his actual words.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I challenge you to say outside the House that he is a Marxist economist.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As far as I am concerned, I am informed that Ted Wheelright is the foremost Marxist economist in Australia. He did not say the same thing about the other mainland States. In fact, he made a point of saying that Western Australia and Queensland were progressing at such a rate that, increasingly, they had less and less in common with South Australia.

The McCabe newsletter, an independent bulletin that does not carry a brief for any particular interest in this State, states in its latest issue:

South Australia needs a real kick, but where it will come from is difficult to say. It will need the Premier, Mr. Corcoran, to do something positive, as South Australia runs the risk of becoming Victoria's most westerly country city.

Sir Robert Norman, Professor Wheelright, and the McCabe newsletter are all indisputably correct, for the evidence overwhelmingly indicates a further decline in South Australia and strong recovery in all other States. It

is a matter of absolute concern to every member of this Parliament and every person in this State because, unquestionably, if one moves around Europe, one realises that South Australia is looked on as the State suffering severe economic disabilities on the Australian scene at present. What this Government must answer for is the fact that, by comparison, whichever indicator one cares to use, there is an economic malaise in South Australia that must be corrected as quickly as possible. I support the motion.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will raise several matters, the first of which is the question of road traffic accidents in 1978. A report recently released by the Road Traffic Board contains some alarming figures indeed. The report raises the question of whether this State should consider more drastic action against people responsible for drink-driving offences. I am not talking in terms of whether gaol sentence should be more severe, but whether drastic enough action is being taken as regards the detection of such offences.

I will quote from some of the statistics that have been raised by the board. In its report regarding the total number of people killed last year in accidents involving road vehicles, six people were killed who had a blood alcohol content below .08 per cent (in other words, below the legal limit set); 14 had between .08 per cent and .149 per cent; 25 had a blood-alcohol content of .15 to .249 per cent, and eight had over .25 per cent. No person killed had no reading; in other words, not one person killed did not have an alcohol reading at some level. Sixty-seven people killed had unknown levels, because, as I understand it, they were examined in country hospitals, which until six months ago were generally not conducting tests on people involved in vehicle accidents.

Of the total number killed in all road accidents, including motor cycle, cycle, and pedestrian accidents, 14 killed had below .08 per cent; 27 had between .08 per cent and .149 per cent; 44 had between .15 per cent and .249 per cent; 20 were above .25 per cent, which is an extremely high level; and 186 were unknown, again, for the reason, as I understand it, that country hospitals until recently were not collecting statistics.

In the report, on page 72, are some interesting figures on the time of occurrence of alcohol-involved accidents. The report shows a dramatic increase in the number killed after 7 p.m. I will read out the figures of the time of occurrence of alcohol-involved accidents, namely, 119 ending 6 p.m.; 112 ending 7 p.m.; 149 ending 8 p.m.; 132 ending 9 p.m.; 134 ending 10 p.m.; 165 ending 11 p.m.; 165 ending midnight; 247 ending 1 a.m.; 125 ending 2 a.m., and then they drop away. That clearly shows that there is a grave problem, arising mainly after sunset.

What has the Government done about this matter? We have perpetual propaganda emanating as to what the Government is doing to curb the road toll. Yet, on contacting the Licensing Court today, I find that, if you wish to obtain a new hotel licence or if you are doing major alterations to an old hotel, there is a regulation that, for every 20 square feet of bar floor space, or 60 square feet of lounge floor space, the hotel must provide 270 square feet of car park. If ever there was an encouragement to people to drive to hotels, it is that regulation. I regard the regulation as anachronistic in view of the situation we now find. We know what the effects of alcohol are in terms of the road toll, yet we are continuing to insist on a space for people to leave their cars and drive away, in most cases in some state of intoxication and, in many cases, resulting in the death of people. Does the Government intend at any stage to review this situation?

The second and most important matter is that I ask the

Government to review the situation whereby we do not have on-the-spot breath testing of drivers on a random basis, because I do not believe that the situation has improved since the Police Force has been detecting people for minor offences and conducting the breath test. I believe that they should go further. I urge the Government to examine this problem and to consider introducing a much tighter control on breath testing, perhaps on a random basis throughout the State. We cannot afford to lose people at this rate. If the situation occurred in war time, people would be alarmed indeed, and there would be massive publicity, but somehow people do not seem to realise that it is a matter of grave importance when people are killed on the road. It is a great waste of human life.

I understand that the figures for this year have reached an even higher level than they reached for the same period last year. Despite the problem last year, the situation is now getting out of hand again. The figures in the report indicate the major reason why people are driving when they are incapable of driving. Most people before being killed are incapable of driving, and no-one who has not imbibed at this stage has been killed.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is the percentage of accidents involving alcohol?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am willing to provide this document to the Attorney-General later.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In Tasmania it showed about 75 per cent.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The chart on page 74 shows the frequency of alcohol levels or drugs in drivers, riders, cyclists and pedestrians found to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs when involved in road accidents. I will be happy to provide that information to the Minister.

On page 75 is a chart showing the involvement of alcohol in accidents, including fatal accidents, and it gives a total rundown. The number of 0.08 accidents for the urban area is 966, for the rural area it is 391, a total of 1 357, from a total number of 49 231 accidents. I hope that information assists the Minister. The Government may have taken some steps, but they are insufficient, as is shown by the figures provided.

Recently I have been involved in an altercation with the Minister of Health about the School Dental Service. I was somewhat surprised at the Minister's violent reaction in accusing me of being the receiver of a stolen public document. I had no idea that the document was so valuable or that it had been stolen. I understand that it has been freely available within the dental profession for some time, but perhaps the Minister's officers have not been properly informed. The document does not indicate that it is confidential, that it is not for the eyes of members of Parliament, or that the public should not see it.

This document is addressed to the Commissioners of the South Australian Health Commission. Headed "Report on Dental Health Branch", it concerns the schoolchildren of this State. It is important that parents and people throughout South Australia are entitled to see such documents. How many other such documents are hidden in the Government archives where the people cannot see them? I wish to refer to the paragraph to which the Minister took such exception. I can understand his becoming upset about it, because it indicates a serious situation about which the public has been kept ignorant. This document is signed by Dr. H. Kennare, who is head of the School Dental Service. He states:

When the organisation was smaller it was difficult but possible to maintain a minimum of quality and budgetary control by the central administration. Provision has been made for these functions to be delegated to regional and

district authorities, but the service does not have enough suitable personnel, trained adequately for these tasks. Problems and, in fact, real dangers are evident in risks to the safety and well-being of children enrolled in the School Dental Service when adequate direction, control and professional support are not provided for dental therapists who form the main core of the work force. The present shortage of experienced and competent management at the regional and district dental officer level is a cause for anxiety concerning the safety and well-being of our patients, and for the work satisfaction and well-being of all other personnel.

If the public is not entitled to know that that situation exists, I am surprised at the perpetual claim by the Government that it has open government. If that situation still existed, the public would be entitled to know about these circumstances. That document is dated 28 February 1978.

I have asked several Questions on Notice on this matter. The Minister in reply to my statements said that, although the situation existed, the Government had taken action to overcome it and that everything was now fine. I will be interested to read the answers to my Questions on Notice, which will show whether or not this situation has been resolved. I believe the Minister will find that it still exists.

It is time that we had a total revision of our thinking on the School Dental Service. Perhaps it will show that the service is providing a decent service, and I would be the first to say that that was good, but the situation might not be so clear. I now refer to the South Australian Health Commission Progress Report, February 1979 (page 11), which states:

The Minister of Health (Mr. Banfield) has announced that it is the Government's intention to continue expansion of the Schools Dental Service to provide dental cover for all children in the State up to the age of 15.

That may or may not be the Government's intention but, before it expands the service, the public and Parliament are entitled to know whether proper steps have been taken to show that the dangerous situation confronting children still exists, and an examination should be made to see whether the scheme is going in the right direction.

We have been told continually that this scheme is based on the New Zealand scheme, which has existed for almost 50 years and which works well. The figures that I intend to give will probably cause alarm to some honourable members, but we have to look at the experience of other places. The *Australian Dental Journal* of April 1977 (page 144), dealing with international correspondence under the heading "News from New Zealand", states:

A verbal report at the 1976 meeting of the Federation Dentaire Internationale in Athens quoted figures from the World Health Organisation's recently completed collaborative study. It was reported that, in the frequency of edentulousness in the 35-44-year-old group of people—that means people without teeth (for the benefit of honourable members who do not understand the term)—New Zealand "trailed the field".

The World Health Organisation figures are as follows:

Country	Percentage of population aged 35-44 years, also edentulous
New Zealand	35.8
Australia	11.8
Norway	5.8
Federal Republic of Germany	2.0
Japan	0.0
U.S.A.	10.0
Denmark	10.0

I understand that the Australian figures were obtained in Sydney, which has not, and certainly did not have at that time, a school dental service. However, New Zealand has had a dental scheme for nearly 50 years and now has three times the number of people without any teeth at all in the 35-44 age group than has Australia.

That figure gives much cause for concern, and one cannot but help ask why that is so. What has gone wrong? Is it because people are getting something for nothing, and so they cease to worry about it? Does it result from a lack of family involvement in the treatment programme so that people, once they pass out of the School Dental Service, have ceased to worry? Have they never had to worry about making a dental appointment so that they have never had to think about it as parents, and their parents have not been involved enough? That figure is the cause for grave concern.

I am not criticising this State Government alone, because I am fully aware that this service is being financed by the Federal Government and that, in many instances, the State Government has been acting under the direction of the Federal Government. I believe that this is an apolitical matter. This subject goes across the Party boundary, but it involves children and their future.

We already have 10 000 pensioners waiting for dentures at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the last thing we want is a scheme that adds to that. I am concerned that the figures in New Zealand indicate that it is a possibility that in 20 or 30 years time we might have an increasing number of people in this position. That is the worst thing that can happen. It concerns me that perhaps we are spending far too much time, effort and money on this scheme, providing it with insufficient staff, and getting to the stage indicated in the 1978 report, where insufficient supervision has taken place, at the same time leaving pensioners without teeth and without the ability even to chew their food, thereby affecting their health drastically. The Minister indicated that the Government was following the policy of the Australian Dental Association in regard to supervision. I refer to a document which is a dental health policy statement of the World Dental Congress. Page 6 of that document states:

Auxiliaries should carry out the tasks for which they are qualified under the responsibility, direction and direct supervision of the dentist.

I stress those words "direct supervision", because that is where the problem lies. In the early stages of the school dental service, it was the policy that the therapist had to carry out work under the direct supervision of the dentist. However, since then the words have been changed. I quote from a publication of the South Australian Health Commission's Dental Health Branch. The information supplied for parents and children attending Magill school dental clinic is as follows:

Dental therapists by law must always work under the direction of a dentist.

There is a big difference between "under the direction of" and "direct supervision". One term implies that the dentist is present, while the other term implies that the dentist is giving some sort of direction. What is happening is that the dentists are supervising up to four clinics, some of which are many miles apart. I understand that some areas—Mount Gambier, Millicent, Penola and others—are being supervised by one dentist. The same situation exists in the city. If the situation arises where a child is in trauma in the chair, who is responsible for diagnosing the problem and doing something about it? Therapists have not got the training to cope with emergency situations, and the dentist may not be within reach in time. That is why Dr. Kennare said that children were in danger.

The other point made clear in the document is that parents should be consulted before treatment takes place. Without blaming the member concerned, I have been informed by a member of this Parliament that his young child was treated without direct consultation with him. If that has occurred in one case, then it has occurred in many. I know that other people have had the same thing happen to them. We cannot allow a watering down of provisions set out in these documents. If parents get these documents and are told to sign, if they do not want their children treated, or if a parent decides to allow children to be treated, the dental clinics themselves should stick strictly to what is said in the documents. What is done should be under the direct supervision of a qualified dentist. On the mechanical side of treatment, I have no doubt that most therapists are very competent, but that does not alter the fact that they are not trained for every purpose. They are trained well on the mechanical side, but they are not trained to cope with every emergency and should not be left with that responsibility. It is unfair to them and unfair to the dentist who is supposed to be supervising them. I hope the Government is not going to wait until there is a problem before it does something about it. A dentist cannot supervise more than one clinic at a time and have the control that he should have.

The next question I wish to raise concerns hospital spending. I was interested to read in the *News* of 30 July that the Royal Adelaide Hospital had slashed spending by \$4 400 000 last year. Referring to Mr. Hooper, of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the report states:

Reductions have been achieved without any lowering in the quality of clinical services.

Further down the report states:

The number of inpatients last year increased by 13 per cent to 38 394.

But the total of "bed days" for inpatients had increased only 2 per cent to 366 000.

This was achieved by improving efficiency so people stayed in hospital for a shorter time—an average 8.4 days compared with 9.3—in 1977-8.

In casualty, the hospital had 75 162 attendances compared with 72 814 the previous year. Outpatient attendances remained the same.

Over a considerable period the Opposition has been raising the question of inefficiency within the Hospitals Department and the fact that taxpayers' money has been wasted. Here we have a situation where one hospital has slashed spending by \$4 400 000 and intends to cut it further next year. According to the Administrator of that hospital, it has made absolutely no difference. How much wastage has occurred? It is a fair indication that what the Public Accounts Committee and the Opposition have said for many years is exactly right: there is huge inefficiency and wastage within that department. If that is for one hospital, it is probable that the figure put on the total wastage by the Opposition, \$20 000 000, must be a minimal amount compared with that actually wasted. It is totally unfair to the taxpayers of South Australia and to the Federal Government, which has had to subsidise this amount, for this Government to allow that situation to continue. If that is a relative figure, that hospital alone, in the 10 years that this Government has had control of it, has probably wasted about \$40 000 000.

There appears to be a very slack attitude on the part of this Government towards taxpayers' money. I am fed up to the back teeth and I am sure that the people of South Australia are sick of hearing this Government say, "The reason we are not providing services any more is that the Federal Government is not giving us enough money". The fact of life is that the State Government has not been using

the money wisely. It seems to lose sight of the fact that any money handed back by the Federal Government is taxpayers' money. There appears to be an attitude of irresponsibility towards public funds that has gone on for many years. It is time that the people in South Australia started to rise up and tell this State Government that they will not go on providing an endless supply of money for it to pour down the sinks of hospitals or whatever. If ever there was an indication of inefficient administration by this Government, it was in that article. I would like to see a complete survey of just what wastage has occurred over the 10 years that this Government has been in office. If the final figure was arrived at, I am sure the people of this

State would call for an early election, whether or not the Government wanted it, and the people would elect a Government that could manage the finances of South Australia.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.30 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 2 August at 2.15 p.m.