LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 21 August 1979

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Business Franchise (Petroleum Products),
Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Amendment,
Supply (No. 2).

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence and proceedings:

Coromandel Valley Storage Tank and Mains,
Loxton Research Centre Extension.

QUESTIONS

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question regarding electricity charges in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently, the Electricity Trust of South Australia announced increased electricity charges in South Australia amounting to 10 per cent, which, as honourable members will realise, is a fairly hefty increase. I should like to receive from the Government information regarding the increased costs incurred by the trust to warrant this rise in electricity charges, where those costs are occurring, and what will be the increased taxes collected by the trust as a result of the 10 per cent rise. Also, if it considers there is an unwarranted rise in taxation collections as a result of the increased electricity charges, will the Government consider a reduction in the tax chargeable on Electricity Trust of South Australia revenues?

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

ETHNIC RESOURCE CENTRES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question regarding ethnic resource centres.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: For the purpose of brevity I will divide my explanation into three parts. First, the Ethnic Affairs Branch of the Premier's Department was opened in Peel Street a year or two ago. The object of that office was, generally speaking, to assist migrants and ethnic communities. At the time, I was pleased to receive an invitation and to represent my Leader and Party at that formal opening ceremony. At the time, I agreed wholeheartedly with the overall concept of that centre, and the benefits of having such a central office were obvious to everyone present.

Secondly, since that time, the Federal Government has adopted the recommendations in the Galbally Report, which includes the establishment by the Federal Government of resource centres in the main cities of Australia, and I understand that one such centre, planned for Adelaide, is to be opened before the end of the year.

Thirdly, I understand that last evening the Ethnic Affairs Branch of the Minister's department opened a resource centre in Campbelltown and that a formal ceremony was involved. However, my Leader, who is the shadow Minister of Ethnic Affairs, was not invited, and I, as the shadow Minister assisting him in that area, was not invited either, nor was Mrs. Jennifer Adamson, whose electorate is immediately opposite the centre.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's not in her electorate.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I did not say that it was: I said that it was immediately opposite. However, there are in Mrs. Adamson's electorate a large number of people with ethnic backgrounds.

When did the Government decide to open that regional resource centre? Are there to be more of such centres, where will they be located, and what are the criteria that the Government is using to decide the siting of such centres? Has any agreement been reached with the Federal Government on the siting of such centres so that the State Government and the Federal Government do not overlap and duplicate this kind of work? Finally, is there any political significance in the fact that, whereas the Liberal Party was invited to attend the original opening in Peel Street, Adelaide, no such invitation was extended to last evening's ceremony?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The honourable member has raised a number of issues. First, he referred to the approval of and support for the information service currently provided by the Ethnic Affairs Division of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, located in the central city area in Peel Street. I am pleased that the honourable member approves of the establishment of that information centre. Secondly, the honourable member referred to the Federal Government's proposal for a resource centre, which he said would be established in the central city area.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not say that.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am sorry if the honourable member did not say that. I suppose I should say that the honourable member said its establishment was being considered in the central city area. Under the Galbally recommendations, the Federal Government is providing funds to establish multi-cultural resource centres (which I think is what they are called), in various States, including South Australia. The Government and the Ethnic Affairs Division adviser have been concerned that this could lead to undue duplication of resources in the central city area, because a number of ethnic information centres are already located in that area. These include the State Government Ethnic Information Centre, various information offices run by banks, the information back-up service provided by the Federal Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Department, and a number of voluntary agencies such as the Ethnic Communities Council (the opening of which was attended by the Hon. Mr. Hill) and the Greek Welfare Centre in Peel Street.

The State Government recommended to the Federal Government that it consider the establishment of the resource centre in a suburban area. I believe Port Adelaide was suggested, primarily because of the lack of this type of service in that area. That submission to the Federal Government has not been accepted. However, I will write to the Federal Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and express this Government's concern

that, if this resource centre is established in the central city area, there could be unnecessary duplication and that the Federal Government should consider locating this service in the Port Adelaide area to avoid such duplication. I hope the Federal Government gives my letter sympathetic consideration.

The third matter raised by the honourable member concerned the office at Campbelltown which, as he said, was opened last night. It is a branch of the central office run by the State Ethnic Affairs Division of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. It was never intended that there should be only one central office to provide information through the Ethnic Affairs Division: it was intended to provide services where there was a need. As the honourable member will appreciate, in the Campbelltown area there are many people of ethnic minority background, but there is a lack of information services or resources of this kind. The division therefore recommended that an office be established in that area.

I do not know precisely when the Government decided to proceed with opening this resource centre, but I imagine that it was some months ago. There is no intention at present to establish other regional offices, although that option is always open to the Government if it sees the need. The criterion used to establish these offices is one of need: in this particular area there are few information centres of this kind, and it was thought appropriate, given the large proportion of people of ethnic minority background in that area, that an office be established at that site.

The Federal Government is not consulted in any formal sense about the establishment of regional offices, but I am concerned to ensure that, in the whole ethnic information and resource area, there is no undue duplication either between Government services and community-backed services or between the different Government services, namely, between State and Federal services. That was the whole rationale behind our recommendation that the Federal Government ought to consider locating its resource centre in the suburbs: to avoid duplication. I am concerned that there ought to be co-ordination and rationalisation to ensure that we are getting the best use of resources between those various categories of groups that provide the service—the voluntary and community-based groups, the State Government, and the Federal Government.

Finally, I assure the honourable member that there was no political significance in establishing the office at Campbelltown, which is clearly an area in which there is a large number (possibly the greatest concentration in South Australia) of people of ethnic minority background and which, up to the present, has not been particularly well served by this sort of service.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding United States plans for a Pacific nuclear dump.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am disturbed (and I am sure that every thinking Australian will also be disturbed) about the following report in the Melbourne *Age* of 19 August, headed "U.S. plans Pacific N-dump":

> The U.S. Government may buy a small unoccupied South Pacific island as a dumping ground for nuclear waste. The favoured site is Palmyra, a 230-hectare atoll rising two to three metres above sea level, 1 600 kilometres south-west of Hawaii. The island would be used to store waste produced by nuclear reactors in Japan and other Asian countries.
>
> Once part of the kingdom of Hawaii, Palmyra is now owned by a Honolulu family. State Department officials estimate the Government could buy it for less than $20 million. If plans go ahead, the island could become the Pacific's first radioactive dump as early as mid-1986. Officials said the main reason for helping Asian nations find a nuclear storage site was America's desire to curb the spread of waste-reprocessing technology that could enable more countries—notably Japan, South Korea or Taiwan—to make nuclear weapons. The officials conceded that creation of a nuclear storage site in the Pacific was likely to arouse opposition.

It is absolutely alarming that any nation, let alone the United States, which has been a signatory in recent weeks to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, should pursue a programme such as this.

Even to float such an idea in the hope that it will receive no objection and will be dealt with and looked on as a necessity of America's technological aims is—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You're expressing an opinion.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I most certainly am.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On a point of order, Mr. President, the honourable member has admitted that he is expressing an opinion, and that is contrary to Standing Order 109.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That's right, although you—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will deal with the point of order. I uphold the point of order and ask the honourable member to deal with his question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I purposefully said that to see whether there would be any response from the other side. I expected that there would be. The area in question is subject to high tides that could completely submerge this island, and Australia is directly affected by the tidal and current flows in the Pacific region. Even such a right-wing person as the Prime Minister of New Zealand (there would not be many people in the Western World as right-wing as he is) is protesting about this dump, saying that it is unthinkable. I do not want to say anything more about America's plans: let it produce its own waste and let it continue to keep such waste and pollute its own backyard. Will the Minister have the U.S. proposals brought to the attention of the next meeting of Attorneys-General; will he endeavour to ascertain the effects of the tidal and current flows from the Palmyra atoll region; will he endeavour to convince his colleagues to have objections made to the Commonwealth and to the highest level of the U.S. Administration; and will he explore the possibility of convincing his colleagues that the matter should be dealt with by the World Court?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am disturbed about the press reports and the proposal to use a Pacific island as a nuclear waste dumping ground, and in this matter I share the views of the New Zealand Prime Minister (Mr. Muldoon). Many people believe that the problems involved in disposing of nuclear waste have been solved, but no-one wants to solve them in their own backyard. Each nation wants to look for someone else's backyard in which to dispose of its nuclear waste. For some time this Government has adopted a consistent policy as one of the primary factors that remains unresolved as regards safety in the whole nuclear cycle, and that is the question of the safe disposal of high level radioactive waste. At present, there is no satisfactory proven technology to enable nuclear waste to be disposed of safely. We are most disturbed about these reports. In specific reply to the honourable member, I do not know whether the next meeting of Attorneys-General is the appropriate place to

take up this matter, but I will certainly refer the question to the appropriate Minister in the South Australian Government and ask him to give attention to the matter referred to by the honourable member.

PHOTOCOPYING MACHINE

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: My question is directed to you, Mr. President. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you a question about photocopying.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am sure that all members know the poor standard of copies put out by the photocopier used by the Legislative Council. It is slow in operation, the quality of reproduction is poor and the type of paper used is almost impossible to write on to make notes. I understand that we have this photocopier only because the House of Assembly obtained a new one because of the faults with this one. Is it possible for the Legislative Council to obtain a modern, good quality, dry paper photocopier so that we are not dependent on a machine that was given to us by the House of Assembly when that House found it unsuitable?

The PRESIDENT: I thank the honourable member for his question. This machine was the only one in Parliament House at one time and was handed on to us from the House of Assembly. Although it has served a reasonable purpose, it may be time to investigate the matter and see whether it is possible to have a new photocopying machine provided. However, whether we can convince the powers that be that we need a new machine is another matter.

SPORTS MASSEURS

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I recently asked about sports masseurs?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: According to the South Australian Registered Masseurs Association, there are three courses available to the public which would allow them the opportunity to qualify as sports masseurs. These are, first, the Sport Massage Training Centre; secondly, Noss W. King (McNally's); and thirdly, the Elizabeth Institute of Massage. These three agents are endorsed by the association and, upon completion of the courses, successful applicants are recognised as qualified masseurs by the association. Because of the availability of these courses, the Minister of Recreation and Sport feels it is unnecessary to consider the establishment of one through the Recreation and Sport Division.

ROAD GRANTS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Transport a question about road grants.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have previously brought to the attention of this Council the very poor condition of portions of the Angle Vale and Heaslip main roads. Portions of these roads are in a bad state resulting from an impasse between the Highways Department and Munno Para District Council, each side maintaining that these roads are the other's responsibility. The Highways Department has not found its way clear to make a specific grant for these roads, which are within the District Council of Munno Para and which, it must be said in defence of that council, carry a large proportion of heavy transport away from the Main North Road on its way to Adelaide. In the meantime, the roads get worse and become dangerous as there are deep potholes in them. However, I understand that, if the Munno Para District Council were to give those roads a high priority, instead of a low priority, in their application for grants, the problem may be overcome. Will the Minister look into this situation again and bring back a reply?

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

SALVATION JANE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about salvation jane.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I received a letter from a member of the Minister's staff and enclosed was a copy of the cost benefit analysis that the Minister had had done. I thank the Minister for forwarding that information to me. In the conclusion of the cost benefit analysis it states:

> This paper illustrates that in most circumstances biological control will have greater costs than it has benefits. While the figures may be disputed in detail, the maximum benefit to pastures is unlikely to be more than the $800 000 under ideal circumstances shown in table 3. This compares with a maximum loss to the honey industry of $2 080 000, about two and a half times greater. This order of difference is maintained in three of the four examples calculated from the data presented in the paper.

Having briefly read through the cost benefit analysis, I have doubts about the basis that has been used in it. The Minister has had this cost benefit analysis completed, and in the letter to me from a member of his staff the second paragraph states:

> Mr. Chatterton wishes to point out that the South Australian Government will not ask for any delays in the progress of the C.S.I.R.O. programme which is scheduled to release biological control agents in the spring of 1980.

If the cost benefit analysis is accepted by the Minister and he is going to place some doubt on the programme because of that, it would be wise at this stage for the Minister to indicate to the Council whether he is, at some future stage, going to ask for the programme to be delayed or stopped. Will he also say whether he agrees with the cost benefit analysis and whether he will give final approval for the biological control programme to go ahead if these figures prove to be correct?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The honourable member has asked at least three hypothetical questions. I explained previously that the approach I took at Agricultural Council was not to seek a delay in the biological control programme. The C.S.I.R.O.'s target date is the spring of 1980, and that programme is continuing. I have released the cost benefit analysis to the press, producer organisations, local councils, and to members of Parliament who have asked for a copy of it. I do not intend to comment on it any further, as it seems only appropriate that that cost benefit analysis should now be studied by the people concerned, examining the assumptions upon which it has been based, as well as looking at the calculations and making their views felt if they disagree with the information contained in that cost benefit analysis. I believe that it should be available for public comment, and I hope that that is what we will receive from the people in the community who are interested in the subject.

CULTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General a question about Moonies and other cults in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Considerable publicity has been given in the media over the past few days to a cult called the Moonies. Allegations have been made of brainwashing techniques and other things happening in relation to this cult. An American report cited a case where action had been taken against the Church of Scientology and where damages of nearly $1 000 000 were awarded for psychological damage done to a person through techniques adopted by the organisation in question. We have legislation on the Statute Book dealing with the registration or control of psychological practices. Is the Government examining these matters? Has the Attorney-General's attention been drawn to what is happening in South Australia that may call for attention under the Psychological Practices Act either with the abovementioned sect or any other sect in South Australia?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am not aware of any recent reports of the practices prescribed under the Psychological Practices Act. However, I will ascertain whether any complaints of breaches have been made to my department and report further to the Leader on that issue.

I have received a letter from Senator Jessop, who received publicity recently, about the Moonies. He has asked me to do a number of things, including to investigate their activities and to see whether the whole issue can be raised at Federal level at the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. I have not yet given detailed consideration to the letter, although I certainly intend to follow up the matters that Senator Jessop has raised, and I will reply to him in due course. At that time, I should be in a position to provide the information to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I take this opportunity to suggest to honourable members that, when it is Question Time, I am not to know that they have any other questions to ask unless they give me some indication that they wish to do so. Next time, I may call on the business of the day.

YATALA PRISON

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question regarding Yatala Prison.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In the Stop Press section of today's *News* is the following report headed " 'Drugs at Yatala', says Coroner":

> There was no doubt that trafficking in drugs was taking place at Yatala Prison at the time a prisoner died from a drug overdose, the State Coroner, Mr. K. B. Ahern, said today. He found that Clifford Wayne Cocking, 24, died at the prison on 14 June last year from an overdose of the drug chloral hydrate.

As a result of that finding, is it intended that a police investigation of this incident and the Coroner's finding will be undertaken to see whether this trafficking in drugs was taking place, who were the people responsible, whether it is still taking place, and whether any action will be taken against those who allowed the situation to arise?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I always find myself in a bit of a quandary with members opposite, as they receive their editions of the *News* and, unlike me, because they are not busy answering questions and providing the Council with necessary information, they have time to peruse the *News*. Towards the end of Question Time, some of the more alert of them have read the Stop Press and decide to seek information about matters mentioned therein when obviously I have not had time to consider those matters.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Perhaps the *News* could be delivered after Question Time.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That may not be such a bad idea.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: For the Minister's information, I got my copy of the *News* at 12.50 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That may be so. However, I ask the Minister to continue with his reply and to ignore interjections.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Leader's suggestion may not be a bad one, as it may enable honourable members to give their full attention to the replies being given to their questions. I have not seen the small Stop Press report to which the honourable member has referred. However, I will certainly study the Coroner's findings to ascertain what he has said and whether any action, police or otherwise, should follow. After having the matter investigated, I will ascertain whether any further investigations are warranted.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (on notice):

1. As at 28 February 1978 and 31 July 1979, respectively, how many:
   - *(a)* children were being treated by the School Dental Service;
   - *(b)* registered dentists were employed supervising clinics;
   - *(c)* static clinics were in operation;
   - *(d)* mobile clinics were in operation; and
   - *(e)* dental therapists were employed by the School Dental Service?

2. Since 28 February 1978 how many registered dentists have:
   - *(a)* joined the School Dental Service; and
   - *(b)* resigned or ceased to be employed by the School Dental Service?

3. How many dentists employed by the School Dental Service are:
   - *(a)* graduates of universities outside Australia; and
   - *(b)* graduates of Australian universities in 1977 and 1978, respectively?

4. At Hindmarsh Square and at Somerton Park, respectively:
   - *(a)* how many dentists working for the School Dental Service are employed in administration and training; and
   - *(b)* how many therapists are employed?

5. How many dentists supervise only one clinic and are present at that clinic full-time?

6. How many dentists supervise respectively two, three, four and more than four clinics and respectively:
   - *(a)* which clinics are they;
   - *(b)* how many therapists are employed at these clinics; and
   - *(c)* what proportion of time is spent by dentists at each clinic?

7. At these clinics who is responsible for respectively—referrals, examinations, diagnosis, treatment, planning and carrying-out treatment, and checking to see treatment is in accordance with treatment plan?

8. Are any children treated:

(a) without examination and diagnosis by the supervisory dentist; and

(b) without notification being given to parents?

9. How often are bitewing radiographs being taken?

10. Are parents consulted prior to X-rays being taken and who takes the X-rays?

11. How long are records, including radiographs, stored by the School Dental Service?

12. Should an emergency arise, when a school dentist is not present, who is responsible for the immediate action to be taken?

13. Should a fatality occur or serious injury, who accepts responsibility?

14. Whilst the dentist is absent, is there a supervising therapist in charge?

15. Do therapists contact the dentist by telephone if an emergency situation arises?

16. Are children with special problems, including difficult patients, referred to specialist pedodontists, and, if so, what are the names and addresses of the pedodontists to whom referrals are made, and how many have been referred to each pedodontist in the past 12 months?

17. How much orthodontics is carried out by the School Dental Service, and do patients with orthodontic problems get referred?

18. How is the selection of orthodontists made and, if made from a list, what are the names and addresses of the orthodontists on the list, and how is the order decided, and, if there is a different list for each clinic, what are the names and addresses on each separate list for each clinic, and who makes the decision as to what names shall be on each separate list?

19. How many patients have been referred to each specialist orthodontist in the past 12 months?

20. How many orthodontists are children referred to from the Somerton Park clinic, and what are the names and addresses of these orthodontists?

21. Do children see the same therapist each time?

22. Who gives the oral hygiene instructions and dietary advice and demonstrates plaque and plaque removal and:

(a) are parents always present when this is done;

(b) how often is this repeated; and

(c) if parents are not present, how are they notified of treatment performed and treatment planned for the future?

23. Why are private dentists not contacted for X-rays and records when children are first seen at the school clinic?

24. Why is it necessary to complete a "non-consent" form if parents do not wish their children to be involved in the School Dental Service or if they wish to terminate the services of the School Dental Service?

25. What provisions are made to provide preventive information to parents with ethnic background?

26. What is the average salary for a dental therapist?

27. What is the wage for a school dental officer?

28. What is the detailed total cost per annum for the School Dental Service and what are the details of capital expenditure as well as running costs, including wages, cleaning, materials and repairs for the 1977-78 financial year?

29. What is the total number of pre-school and primary schoolchildren in South Australia and what percentage are enrolled to receive treatment through the School Dental Service?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: As the reply to the honourable member's question is so lengthy, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Reply to Question

1. (a) The number of children receiving periodic dental care was:—

(i) 80 000 in February 1978

(ii) 105 000 in February 1979

A precise figure is not available for 31 July 1979.

(b) Registered dentists employed supervising clinics:

(i) 28 February 1978—24

(ii) 31 July 1979—36

(c) Static clinics in operation:

(i) 28 February 1978—70 (including Coober Pedy Community Health Centre)

(ii) 31 July 1979—97

(d) Mobile clinics in operation:

(i) 28 February 1978—eight

(ii) 31 July 1979—nine

(e) Dental therapists employed:

(i) 28 February 1978—185

(ii) 31 July 1979—221

Totals include therapists who were employed: (1) full-time and part-time in field clinics; (2) as tutors in the School of Dental Therapy; and (3) in the Dental Health Education Unit. Also included are therapists who were on extended leave (accouchement leave, special leave without pay, etc.).

2. (a) Nine.

(b) Six.

3. (a) Six dentists employed by the service have graduated from universities outside Australia, and three of these hold post-graduate qualifications in dentistry from either Australia or the United Kingdom.

(b) Sixteen of the dentists currently employed in the Service graduated from the University of Adelaide Dental School in 1977 (13) and 1978 (3). Naturally, all dentists employed by the School Dental Service have presented their dental qualifications to the Dental Board of South Australia and have been registered to practise in any service or part of the State.

4. (a) Dentists in administration and training:

Hindmarsh Square	Five
Somerton Park	Five

(b) Dental Therapists employed:

Hindmarsh Square	Six (includes full-time and part-time)
Somerton Park	Six (includes full-time and part-time)

5. On 1 June 1979: Five dentists each supervised one clinic and were in the clinic full-time and that clinic was staffed part or all of the time by at least one therapist. Under normal circumstances, it is considered wasteful and unnecessary to have a supervising dentist present in the clinic full-time, since therapists are fully competent to perform the services delegated to them without the ongoing presence of a dentist on the premises (this fact has been established repeatedly around the world). The clinics where a dentist is present full-time are so geographically isolated that supervision of more than one clinic by a dentist has not been practicable.

6. On 1 June 1979: Eight dentists supervised two clinics, 11 supervised three clinics, and 12 supervised four clinics.

(a) The clinics were:

A. Two-clinic category—

Belair	Blackwood	Bordertown
Croydon	Gumeracha	Kadina
Keith	Magill	Maitland
Millicent	Mt. Barker	Mt. Gambier East
Naracoorte	Penola	Prospect
Stirling		

B. Three-clinic category—

Berri	Carlton (Port Augusta)	Clapham
Cummins	Darlington	Dernancourt
East Adelaide	Elizabeth Downs	Elizabeth Park
Elizabeth West	Fisk (Whyalla)	Flaxmill
Fulham Gardens	Hackham East	Hendon
Highbury	Hincks (Whyalla)	Loxton
McRitchie (Whyalla)	Minda	Morphett Vale East
Murray Bridge	Murray Bridge South	Port Lincoln
Port Lincoln South	Renmark	Reynella South
Seacliff	Seaton Park	Strathmont
Tailem Bend	Westside (Port Augusta)	Willsden (Port Augusta)

C. Four-clinic category—

Airdale	Athelstone	Banksia Park
Bevan (Whyalla)	Brahma Lodge	Campbelltown
Christies Beach	Christies East	East Marden
Elizabeth Field	Elizabeth Vale	Ethelton
Evanston	Gepps Cross	Ingle Farm
Klemzig	Le Fevre	Memorial Oval (Whyalla)
Madison Park	Modbury	Modbury West
Mansfield Park	Newton	Nuriootpa
Nicholson (Whyalla)	O'Sullivan Beach	Peterborough
Para Hills	Port Adelaide	Pennington
Port Pirie West	Para Hills West	Parafield Gardens
Para Hills East	Para Vista	Ridgehaven
Ridley Grove	Salisbury North	Salisbury North
Smithfield Plains	Scott (Whyalla)	Solomontown
Stradbroke	Salisbury	Taperoo
Willunga	Elizabeth Grove	Payneham

(b) The number of staff employed as therapists in each of these clinics, in the terms of full-time-equivalents, varies continuously according to fluctuating needs. As of 1 June 1979 there was:

(1) a total of 29 in the two-clinic category;

(2) a total of 60 in the three-clinic category; and

(3) a total of 78 in the four-clinic category.

(c) Dentists generally divide their time fairly equally between the clinics under their control. Therefore the approximate time spent per clinic can be calculated from the number of clinics per dentist. As needs fluctuate, a dentist may give a greater or lesser proportion of time to a clinic. However, irrespective of need, it would be exceedingly rare for a dentist not to spend at least one full day in a clinic over a one-week period. On average, dentists spend about one-third of their time supervising each clinic.

7. In general, School Dental Service policy and instructions to all personnel for referrals, examinations, diagnosis, treatment planning, treatment and other duties, follows closely the guidelines determined by the Australian Dental Association in its manual entitled:

"Dentists' Responsibilities When Directing and Controlling Dental Auxiliaries".

Copies of this manual may be obtained through the Australian Dental Association (S.A. Branch Inc.), or the Federal Office of the Association in Sydney, or the School Dental Service in Hindmarsh Square, Adelaide. Ultimately, it is the dentist who is responsible for every service provided, whether provided by the dentist directly, or by a therapist.

8. *(a)* It is general policy of the School Dental Service that all children receive periodic examinations by the dentist. However, therapists are competent, and are permitted to record tooth decay and place fillings without all of their recordings being checked beforehand by a dentist. It is the dentist's responsibility to be satisfied that therapists under his control maintain a high standard, and to ensure that each child's complete dental needs are met, rather than only the need for fillings as a consequence of decay. Also, it is policy that dentists' examinations be timed to satisfy each child's individual needs.

(b) Children are not treated without the School Dental Service first receiving the consent of parents.

9. The frequency of taking bitewing radiographs is strictly in accordance with the essential needs of each child. Although the number of X-rays taken by each clinic is monitored closely, the number of the bitewing variety has not been compiled separately for the whole State.

10. Whenever parents indicate that they wish to be consulted prior to radiographs being taken, this is done. Frequently, such consultations are undertaken as a matter of general policy at a clinic. Radiographs are not taken unless parents have consented to care.

The dentists may take radiographs. Within defined limits, the taking of certain radiographs may be delegated to dental therapists or dental nurses who have completed special training to perform this duty.

11. Records are stored while the child remains a patient in the School Dental Service. It is also current policy to store patients' records, including radiographs, for five years after patients have ceased to be eligible for school dental care.

12. Patients reporting in an emergency normally are referred immediately to the dentist. In certain circumstances, where a dentist cannot attend immediately, therapists may undertake specified measures of a limited nature to control pain, infection or bleeding.

13. Ultimately, the dentist is responsible. It should be pointed out that there has never been a fatality in the school dental programme. Injuries, however minor, have been so very rare that they could be deemed non-existent.

14. There is no supervising therapist in charge when the dentist is absent. The dentist remains the supervisor "on-call". If, in what would be a rare instance, the dentist could not be reached for some reason, therapists would call another school dentist.

15. It is normal for therapists to communicate with the dentist in an emergency situation, either in person or by telephone. Notably, with the majority of children receiving regular care, emergencies are infrequent.

16. Generally, children with special problems are referred to specialist pedodontists. The specialist pedodontists employed by the School Dental Service are: Dr. J. F. Burrow, and Dr. F. G. Gurling. Their address is: C/o Dental Health Services, S.A. Health Commission, 49 Hindmarsh Square, Adelaide 5000.

Drs. Burrow and Gurling respectively treated 238 and

72 patients referred to them with special problems in the 12-month period (1 July 1978 to 30 June 1979). The number of children referred to private pedodontists is not available.

17. Many patients with orthodontic problems are referred to private practising specialists. In addition, some orthodontic care at a general-practice level is provided in the School Dental Service. About 3 per cent to 4 per cent of patients receive some care for simple orthodontic problems during a 12-month period.

18. The Secretary of the Australian Society of Orthodontists (A.S.O.) annually makes a list of orthodontists in practice throughout South Australia available to the Dental Health Services of the Health Commission. Every dentist in the School Dental Service is provided with copies of the current list.

The list currently in use is dated 13 February 1979. This list is available through the Australian Society of Orthodontists (S.A. Branch) or from the School Dental Service. The orthodontists are listed alphabetically under the headings of city, suburban and country practices, in that order. The selection of an orthodontist ultimately is made by parents, but the school dentist can use the list to indicate to parents the names and addresses of the various orthodontists. The selection procedure conforms to the policy of the Australian Society of Orthodontists (S.A. Branch).

19. No record is kept of the numbers of children referred to each specialist orthodontist. Every one is considered a private contract between the parents and the orthodontists.

20. This information has not been compiled from dental records. The contract between parents and orthodontist is considered private. The following procedures with referral of children to orthodontists should be noted:

The record book of every child who needs to be referred to an orthodontist is clearly marked at the time of the dentist's examination.

Separately and distinctly, the record book of every child whose parents have been given a dentist's letter of reference to an orthodontist, or who is already under observation or treatment by an orthodontist, is marked also.

The orthodontists' correspondence with the dentist and clinical instructions are stored in the patients' record books.

21. Usually, arrangements are made for children to see the same therapist each time. However, families sometimes move to a new suburb or town, and therapists change from time to time as necessary. Therefore, in the course of time a child may see more than one therapist.

22. Dentists, therapists, and, to a lesser extent, dental nurses, counsel children on oral hygiene procedures and dietary control. In the School Dental Service there is a general emphasis on the involvement of parents in this process. Counselling on toothbrushing is sometimes undertaken on a daily basis at "recess times" for children with special needs, and at other times when parents are not present. There is no policy to restrict counselling only to those times when parents can be present.

The frequency with which dental health education is provided for individual children is in accordance with their individual needs. The method and frequency of communications with parents (that is, in person, by telephone, etc.) is a matter for individual clinic policy according to local and individual parents' needs and expectations.

23. The first information sought from parents on the school dental enrolment form relates to the child's dental history for the two years preceding enrolment, and specifically "dental X-rays" that have been taken.

24. When the School Dental Service sends enrolment forms home with children, forms are sometimes mislaid by the children after parents have signified their consent for dental care to be provided. The receipt of a signed "non-consent" is confirmation that the parent does not wish to enrol the child for care.

25. The School Dental Service enrolment form presents limited information in six languages. In addition, information has been prepared in different languages at clinics where there are significant numbers of parents whose native language is not English. Teachers with special experience among these people frequently assist school dental personnel to communicate information, including educational material regarding oral hygiene, dietary control and other preventive dental practices.

26. The salary ranges for dental therapists with annual increments are as follows:

Dental Therapists:

$
10 141
10 614
11 092
11 572
12 055
12 380

Tutor and Regional Dental Therapists:

$
12 380
12 733
13 472

27. The salary ranges for school dental officers with annual increments are as follows:

Field Dental Officers:

$
14 141
15 074
15 907
16 937
17 871
18 804
19 604

District Dental Officers:

$
19 604
20 293
20 488
21 677

Regional Dental Officers:

$
21 677
22 367

28. Capital Expenditure 1977-78:

	$
Hindmarsh Square School of Dental Therapy and administrative headquarters	130
Somerton Park School of Dental Therapy	1 879
School dental clinics	1 235 710
Instrument and technical workshop equipment	26 031
Purchase of motor vehicles	41 393
	$1 305 143

Recurrent Expenditure 1977-78:

	$
Salaries	4 468 342
Materials and expendable stores	535 711
Administration expenses	129 144

	$
Other (Includes repairs, maintenance, cleaning, R.F.D.S. dentists' charges, A.D.P. charges, travel costs, etc.)	366 339
	$5 499 536
Total cost of School Dental Service, 1977-78	$6 804 679

29. These figures will not be available until February 1980.

ABATTOIRS AND PET FOOD WORKS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 August. Page 270.)

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

That the Health Act Amendment Bill, the South Australian Meat Corporation Act Amendment Bill, the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), and the Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill be considered related Bills to the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill and that the Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to extend the scope of the relevancy of the second reading debate on the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill to include these related Bills.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill, which is the main one in the series that has just been referred to by the Minister, has been in the pipeline for a considerable time. After some years of speculation, the Bills were presented to the Parliament some time towards the latter half of last year. They were introduced not in this Council (which is the Minister's House) but in another place. It is a little difficult to understand why the Government chose to introduce the Bills in another place. Perhaps as a matter of interest and curiosity some explanation of that point may be given. Although this does not matter very much, it may be of interest to honourable members to know why the Government introduced those Bills in another place.

As soon as the Bills were available for public scrutiny, some affected organisations expressed to members of Parliament opposition, others expressed concern, and others the need for amendment. During the period that the Bills were before the House, the views of local government, producer organisations, abattoir operators and indeed a great variety of consumers and consumer organisations that were concerned about increased costs to the community were kept constantly before the House and members of Parliament.

As the viewpoints began to unfold, it became clear that the only way in which the Bills could be satisfactorily resolved was to refer them to a Select Committee, thereby enabling the viewpoints of those concerned to be considered and to enable amendments to be recommended to the Houses of Parliament.

That course of action seemed to satisfy the questioning of those associated with the scope of the legislation. Various members stated during the previous session that the appointment of a Select Committee would be sought, and it was stated that the Bills would be referred to such a Select Committee if it was established. I am satisfied that such a referral should be made.

On what has happened so far today and with the Minister's motion carried unanimously, that seems to indicate the final direction that will be taken by the House. If my assumption is correct, I am pleased that the matter will be dealt with in that way. Since the Bills were first introduced, at least one report has been made available to members of Parliament; that is the Potter report made by the working party on the entry of meat into the Adelaide metropolitan area, dated December 1978 and released in May 1979. In June 1979, following the release of the Potter report, the Premier said at a press conference that the original Bills would be changed and that those changes would overcome most of the hostility shown towards the Bills. Unfortunately, that is not the case as I now see it, because very little change has been made to the original Bills. Some changes have been made, but they are rather minor.

When the Bills were reintroduced they were greeted with continued hostility by many people in South Australia. I am not saying that those people are correct. However, a fundamental change is taking place in regard to meat legislation, and that has a tremendous effect on many groups of people in our community. The contemplation of change has been around for so long that, if these groups of people are not given an opportunity to express themselves to their members of Parliament, we would not be fulfilling our roles as representatives of the public. That being the case, if the Council accepts my view that the Bills should be referred to a Select Committee, there would be no need for me to canvass the major points at this stage. Indeed, it would be foolish to waste time, because there are many points in these Bills that should be canvassed and debated at length. If the Government realistically accepts that the Bills should be referred to a Select Committee, a report will be made by the committee, and the Bills, as amended, would then pass both Houses with a minimum of delay, and I will be perfectly happy. The Opposition has no intention of delaying the passage of these Bills in this Chamber, because it is aware of the need for action to solve the inherent problems that exist in the present ridiculous position of the meat industry.

Although the emotion in the Bill is centred around the question of hygiene, the real urgency lies in gaining the entry of meat into the metropolitan area from abattoirs operating in the rural areas of South Australia. It is staggering and ridiculous that about 40 per cent of the meat entering the metropolitan area at present is slaughtered outside South Australia. As I said, the emotion of the Bill revolves around hygiene, but the fundamental economic question centres on the importation of meat from interstate markets.

The isolation of the Adelaide metropolitan market from the main killing centres in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland makes it completely ridiculous that such a high percentage of meat is being killed outside South Australia; all members of this Chamber should admit that. That meat in many abattoirs outside the metropolitan area of South Australia is inspected by the Primary Industry Department. That meat is killed in South Australia, yet it is denied access to the largest market in South Australia—the metropolitan area. That is an incredible situation and is quite ridiculous.

There are drafting and conceptual questions in the major Bill and the consequential Bills that require very close examination. It would be a waste of time to canvass those matters fully at the second reading debate in this Chamber. If we were to canvass those questions properly, this Bill would have to be delayed for at least a fortnight at the second reading stage in this Chamber. If the Bills are not referred to a Select Committee, the associations and other organisations that have written to me and sent telegrams over the years should be given time to make submissions to members of both Houses, so that the

viewpoints they are anxious to put forward are fully recorded in *Hansard*. I have received between 20 and 30 letters from important organisations in South Australia. Whether or not the Bill is referred to a Select Committee, there will be a delay of at least a fortnight to assess the information coming to us from these organisations.

I have given an undertaking on behalf of the Liberal Party that, because this problem has been building up over five years, there will be no delay in the handling of this Bill by a Select Committee. However, there is also a need for goodwill to exist between all members and all Parties of both Houses so that any problems in these Bills can be overcome quickly. It is also important for a correct degree of negotiation and consideration to be given to these Bills, because they are important to this State. Since these Bills were introduced, this is the first day they have been debated. Whilst they have been mooted for a long time, the Bills have been before Parliament previously—about 12 months ago.

I do not want to see hurried decisions made on this Bill: I want to see adequate rights given to people to express their views—views which, I know, are informed and pertinent and which stem from a long and close association with a complex yet vital industry in this State. I know that the Minister is listening to what I am saying; I doubt whether he will disagree with anything I have said.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Don't count on it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I know that the Minister must play politics, but I mean that intrinsically, in his own heart and mind, he must be agreeing almost entirely with what I am saying. If there is any delay in referring the Bill to a Select Committee, it will be a minor delay, because of the factors I have outlined. Indeed, a Select Committee might even save time, if goodwill exists between all Parties in the Chamber. I have placed on the Notice Paper a contingent notice of motion that the Bill be referred to a joint Select Committee of both Houses, and I will explain why I have chosen that avenue.

First, it was because the Bill was originally introduced in the House of Assembly. The Government may have had good reasons for doing that, but, because the Government earlier withdrew the Bill and has now introduced it in the Council, I believe that I should offer the option of a joint House Select Committee. Secondly, I believe there could be a time saving in having a joint House Select Committee, in that there would be little need for any lengthy debate in the House of Assembly after the Select Committee had investigated and reported to both Houses of Parliament. If the Minister believes that a joint committee is not warranted, I will not move that contingent notice of motion, but will move for a Select Committee of this Chamber to investigate and report on the Bill. I hope that the Minister will indicate his acceptance of the Select Committee proposition as being the only sensible course for this Chamber to take in relation to these Bills.

I believe that every honourable member here would support the concept of an increase in the standards of hygiene in our meat industry. I also believe that every person would support the idea of allowing abattoirs, which have operated and which are under D.P.I. control, where there is a high standard of meat inspection and meat hygiene, to have access to the metropolitan area of South Australia for their product. I do not think there could be much doubt about that. Also, there is a need to be careful that, in applying these high standards across South Australia, we do not adversely affect our small slaughterhouses, which have performed an excellent role over many years.

I know that one can go to small slaughterhouses and find cases where the standard is not as high as it could be. One of the reasons is the inability of Parliament to give some direction and assistance, and to have regulations capable of being interpreted and applied by local government to these areas. It is not the fault entirely of local government or of someone else: Parliament itself must accept most of the responsibility in that regard. There is need for a great deal of co-operation in certain areas. During summer, in many of our holiday resorts, small slaughterhouses have to kill urgently at 4 a.m. to supply the day's needs when an influx of tourists comes to a town. If the butcher had to wait for a meat inspector to be present when he kills, it would be impossible for him to operate. There is a need for some co-operation and understanding of the position in regard to slaughterhouses that have operated in isolated locations in this State.

I believe that these problems are capable of being handled in the Select Committee and that we can come down with a piece of legislation which will satisfy all people who have an interest in these Bills. If the Bill is going to a Select Committee, I do not want to waste any further time. I suggest that the correct procedure in these Bills is to allow those who have a point of view to express that view, thus having it on the record in the form of a Select Committee. I support the second reading.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): I am surprised that so little attention seems to be being paid to the particular needs of the Adelaide metropolitan area in terms of providing adequate standards of meat inspection and meat hygiene. It has been a scandal for a long time that such a large part of the Adelaide metropolitan area (perhaps covering one-third of the population) has totally inadequate standards of meat inspection and meat hygiene. I think that members would agree (and I have shown them photographs of some of the slaughterhouses that are currently supplying the Adelaide metropolitan area) that the standards in some of the slaughterhouses are appallingly filthy. They have totally inadequate protection against flies and inadequate methods of disposing of effluent and offal. There are hundreds of points one can pick in those slaughterhouses that are supplying the Adelaide area that show that they are a serious health risk.

The percentage of meat coming in from those slaughterhouses is small. Most of the meat coming into the Adelaide area comes from abattoirs that have adequate standards and adequate inspection. However, the small percentage of meat coming from those slaughterhouses is certainly a serious health risk to the people in Adelaide, and it should be corrected as soon as possible. The Leader of the Opposition said that these Bills make fundamental changes and that this is why there is a need to delay their introduction still further. It seems to me that there are not those fundamental changes which the Leader is saying he believes the Bills make.

First, in the area with which we are most concerned, the outer metropolitan area, there is now totally inadequate protection. Adequate protection could be achieved by simply amending the Samcor Act and extending the Adelaide metropolitan area to those new areas. That could be a simple amendment, and we can do that.

However, I decided that that would not be an appropriate way of administering standards in the metropolitan area. It seemed to be totally inconsistent to have Samcor as an abattoir with a charter to run a commerical works and also be in charge of the inspection not only of its own meat but also of the meat of its competitors.

If we are to maintain a standard of inspection that is completely neutral, outside the province of commercial decision, it is important that that inspection should be done by some other authority. Therefore, under the legislation now before the Council the Animal Health Branch of the Agriculture Department is stipulated, and that is one of the changes. It does not seem to be a fundamental change, but it is appropriate that we should transfer the responsibility of meat inspection and meat hygiene in the Adelaide area from Samcor to the department. For that reason we have removed all the clauses in the Samcor Act that apply to meat inspection. They have been put together in separate legislation, which will be the responsibility of the department.

The honourable member referred to the need for slaughterhouses in country areas. Of course there is a need for such slaughterhouses, and that is what we intended and that is what is included in the legislation. Meat inspection standards are different in various areas where there are different requirements. In country towns, where there is a more direct link between a slaughterhouse and a butcher shop, where a smaller population is being served by that butcher shop, then the slaughterhouse, which is quite hygienic and which is without meat inspection, is quite adequate. I have often said that. That is what is embodied and intended in this legislation.

Slaughterhouses in country areas and towns should continue without meat inspection but with adequate standards of hygiene for their works. That policy is compatible with the need to protect the population, and it is also compatible with what slaughterhouse owners would require. Other than that, we have the inspection of meat entering abattoirs areas. In spite of what one rural newspaper said about this, it is not a new concept and has been in the Abattoirs Act since it was introduced in 1911.

That is one of the problems that we face in this legislation: there have been many rumours and misconceptions spread in some of our rural newspapers. One country newspaper inferred that this legislation was going to introduce inspection of abattoirs for the first time, but that is totally untrue.

Meat going into abattoir areas has always been inspected. That is why abattoir areas have been established. Other people have implied, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris hinted, that high inspection standards would create problems and put many abattoirs out of business and the like, but that is also untrue. That matter can be easily verified.

I refer to the changes that have already been made to Samcor, the inspection standards there, as part of the overall restructuring of Samcor, the new fees, the new levels of productivity, especially as I agreed, in anticipation of this legislation, that we should have local-kill standards of inspection at Samcor.

Those local-kill standards are operating at the southern works, and those standards are lower than export standard. Obviously, it would be impossible for such legislation to provide one standard for Samcor and another standard for other abattoirs. That situation would be impossible to live with, because other abattoirs, which were killing for the local market, would be allowed to kill to the local-kill standards, which would be less than those for the export standard.

Honourable members are aware of the problems of the export standard of inspection, and they would be aware of the problems at Samcor and other abattoirs. The Primary Industry Department has had problems with those inspection standards because it must try to meet the requirements of the American market, the Japanese market and the European Economic Community market. The standards impose many additional and unnecessary costs on the abattoirs, especially when it would not be the standard we would be imposing here.

The Government has already shown its good faith and established local-kill standards at Samcor. Obviously, it is the sort of standard we would be imposing on other country abattoirs that were supplying the Adelaide metropolitan area.

One matter not referred to by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and about which the Government is concerned (I would have thought that the honourable member would have referred to it, because he frequently refers to the cost of Government services and taxation, etc.) is that the Government has tried in this legislation to reduce costs to the industry as much as possible. This is a most important concept. I refer to the high cost of meat inspection in the other States resulting from the dual inspection of meat, with local inspectors standing next to Department of Primary Industry inspectors.

I refer to the re-inspection of meat crossing borders and the colossal additional costs that apply in Victoria, New South Wales and other States. It is intended that this should not apply in South Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If you allow me leave, I could say a few more things and spell out the lot.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: If the honourable member wishes, but it is necessary to keep the cost of inspection down. The Government intends to reduce the cost of inspections by using Department of Primary Industry inspectors, under contract, and the department has agreed that it will co-operate to ensure that there will be only a single group of inspectors.

Wherever Department of Primary Industry inspectors are available, they will do the additional inspection work. The department has a pool of inspectors so that it can provide inspectors on a short-term basis to cover inspectors away on sick leave or on recreation leave; that, too, will keep down the cost of inspection.

It is also hoped to change the system by providing uniform standards for local-kill and uniform standards for hygiene throughout the State to reduce the re-inspection of meat that is presently occurring, to cut that down so that meat entering the Adelaide area will be inspected on a random basis only, rather than being fully re-inspected, as is now the case.

These are some of the important areas where the legislation provides a much simpler framework for the industry, one that will reduce costs to the industry. The industry pays for inspections, and the industry pays any additional costs when meat is re-inspected.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that he was disappointed that no great changes were made by the legislation, which has been re-introduced in this session. I think that the abolition of quotas to the Adelaide area, the Samcor area, is a major change.

It is a major change as far as the producer organisations in this State are concerned. It is something that producer organisations have been working towards for many decades, and I would have thought that that change in itself was a major change to the legislation that was introduced. It is certainly one of the major areas of hostility that occurred prior to that change being made. A number of local organisations came to me and said, "You are expecting these sorts of things from us but you will not accept them in reverse by letting us come into the Samcor area." That has now changed, and it is now a completely free trade situation. What we are expecting of them, they expect of us. It is an equal situation for all abattoir areas throughout the State. There are no trading restrictions, and they should therefore meet the same hygiene

requirements.

It seems extraordinary that that major change in the legislation should be denigrated in that way. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris says that he does not wish this to be based on hurried decisions. He says that this is why we need to refer the matter to a Select Committee. I find it extraordinary that he should say that these decisions are hurried. I doubt whether any piece of legislation has been so thoroughly investigated or members of the public, as well as members of Parliament, given such ample opportunity to comment and make submissions to me.

A full investigation was carried out by an interdepartmental committee, which looked at the meat hygiene aspects of this legislation, advertising in the press and receiving submissions from all interested parties. In fact, I believe it investigated every slaughterhouse and abattoir in the State. The photographs I showed honourable members were some used in that committee's detailed examination of the situation, and they provided a basis on which we could examine the aspects of meat hygiene.

The Potter inquiry, which has been mentioned in this debate, contacted many people in the State who are concerned with meat trading, although I do not think that it advertised for submissions, and it also contacted producer organisations and major abattoirs that could be expected to have an interest in trading in the Adelaide area. It conducted a full and complete inquiry into the trading aspects. These two inquiries gave everyone involved an opportunity to express his views. The legislation was introduced in November last year, which gave people an opportunity to examine it in detail. We now have the legislation before us again, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris says that we do not want hurried decisions!

It seems incredible that, will all those opportunities, with these committees of inquiry and with the long period that the legislation has been before the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, we should not continue with this debate and pass this legislation. I oppose the motion to appoint a Select Committee: it merely creates another delay to legislation that is needed to protect the people of Adelaide and to provide them with the standard of meat that they are entitled to. It creates a delay that will put severe economic pressures on a number of abattoirs that would like to have an opportunity to trade freely in the Adelaide area. They will not have that opportunity if this legislation is delayed by its referral to a Select Committee.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said that a Select Committee will move very fast and will be able to report back to the Council shortly: if the Council does insist upon a Select Committee, I hope that that will be the case. However, I have found with other Select Committees that it is often difficult to get the members of the committee together, because of other commitments such as the Public Works Committee and the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I am sure that there will be many witnesses before the Select Committee. I think more than 80 people gave evidence to various other committees that looked into this matter, and many of these people would want to give evidence to the Select Committee as well.

The Select Committee will cause considerable delay to the legislation. If it causes that delay, it will cause economic hardship to those abattoirs that are hoping to have the opportunity to compete freely in the Adelaide area against interstate people and others who now have access to the area. It will also cause problems in the outer-metropolitan area, where the health and hygiene standards of meat are totally inadequate. I support the second reading of this Bill and oppose the intended motion to appoint a Select Committee.

Bill read a second time.

MOTOR FUEL RATIONING BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 532.)

Clause 8 passed.

New clause 8a—"Application for review of administrative decisions in relation to permits."

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

Page 4, after clause 8—Insert new clause as follows:

8a. (1) Where the Minister decides—

(a) to refuse to grant, or to cancel a permit; or

(b) to grant a permit subject to conditions, any person aggrieved by that decisiom may apply to a judge for a review of that decision.

(2) An application under this section shall be made by instrument in writing addressed to the judge setting out the grounds on which the applicant objects to the decision of the Minister.

(3) An application under this section may be heard and determined in chambers and without formality.

(4) Where the judge is satisfied that a decision of the Minister should be varied or reversed he may direct the Minister to vary or reverse his decision accordingly.

(5) A direction shall not be given under subsection (4) of this section unless the Minister has been allowed a reasonable opportunity to be heard upon the application.

(6) The Minister shall observe any direction of the judge under subsection (4) of this section.

(7) Where an application has been made to a judge under this section no further application shall be made to the same or any other judge in respect of the same matter.

(8) The decision of a judge upon an application under this section shall be final and without appeal.

(9) In this section—

"judge" means a judge of a local court.

This amendment seeks to provide some machinery by which the Minister's decision in relation to the refusal of a permit, the granting of a permit, the cancellation of a permit, or the granting of a permit subject to conditions may be reviewed. At present, the Bill provides no machinery by which the Minister's decision may be reviewed. I have previously indicated that the granting of a licence, and more particularly the refusal of a licence or the granting of a licence subject to conditions, may be inappropriate in certain circumstances. However, as the Bill is drafted, there is no review of the Minister's decision.

True, the emergency period to which the Bill relates may last for only 30 days, and then a further 30 days must elapse before the next period of 30 days is imposed. However, within that time, particularly if the emergency has already been under way for some time, it is quite likely that considerable hardship may be caused to the community or to people who rely heavily on the provision of fuel for the conduct of their business and the provision of services.

If the Minister is to exercise this power under clause 9 in a way that would severely prejudice the viability of businesses, or that may even accelerate the decline of businesses to bankruptcy without that decision being subject to review, it is a bad law to enact. Therefore, my new clause seeks to provide the machinery for a judicial review of the matter.

The amendment seeks to establish a procedure which is without formality and which gives the applicant an opportunity to present a case to a judge in chambers, and for the Minister to be given an opportunity to reply, and then for a judge of the Local Court to decide whether or not the Minister's decision should be varied. If the judge is

of the opinion that the Minister's decision should be varied, the judge can give a direction to the Minister for that variation to be implemented. It is to be noted in new subclause (3) that it is provided that the matter is to be heard in chambers and without formality.

The question has been raised whether the judge would deal with the matter expeditiously. My experience of the judicial system is that, if there is an emergency, or an occasion when a court must deal expeditiously with some matter, whether for an injunction or for some other order, generally the courts will do everything in their power to facilitate the expeditious consideration of those matters.

Similarly, if this provision was accepted, it would be a matter that would, generally speaking, be dealt with expeditiously by the courts. The very nature of the Bill requires the expeditious consideration of a review of this sort. I therefore commend the new clause as a necessary check on the exercise by the Minister of his power to issue, cancel or issue subject to conditions a permit under the Bill.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I oppose the new clause. Before dealing with it, I refer to two matters that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris raised. The first relates to the development of increased storage facilities, and the second to the encouragment of the development of alternative fuels for motor vehicles. In the past few months, there has been a steady increase in storage facilities in this State, particularly in service stations.

However, consideration of these two issues is taking place at a national level, and clearly this is a problem that affects all of us in Australia. There has been set up a Commonwealth-State Oil Supplies Liaison Committee, on which the Commonwealth Government, State Governments and oil companies are represented. Certainly, in addition to the steps that I said in my second reading speech the State Government had taken regarding these matters, clearly a case exists to take up these issues at a national level, and that committee seems to be the appropriate forum.

I now deal with the Hon. Mr. Griffin's amendment, which essentially provides for an appeal where there has been a refusal to grant, or where the Minister has cancelled, a permit. I oppose the amendment because the essence of this legislation is that it is being put on the Statute Book to deal with an emergency, and it is not usual to provide rights of appeal in emergency legislation.

I said in the second reading debate that similar legislation exists in New South Wales and Western Australia and that in neither of those Acts is there any provision for a right of appeal against the emergency provision. The Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Acts were passed by this Parliament in 1972 and again in 1973. Both those Acts gave to the Minister wide powers similar to those contained in this Bill. Both those Acts were passed during an emergency situation and were brought into operation immediately. In neither case was any right of appeal written into the legislation.

The problem that exists in this area is that we have an emergency permit situation such as that which is contemplated by this Bill, when hundreds and hundreds of permits are issued in a day throughout the State. It would really be an untenable situation if a right of appeal existed or there was a delay in the granting or cancelling of permits. The Government believes that this could make the legislation unworkable.

This is emergency legislation. Even if the appeal provisions were streamlined, as the honourable member claims to have done in this case, it would still involve potential problems for the speedy and effective administration of this legislation. This legislation will only operate, if it were brought into effect, for 30 days. The Minister could not merely extend that period: he would have to bring the legislation back to Parliament. If Parliament believed that there had been abuses within that 30-day period, it would then have the opportunity to fully debate the issue and amend the legislation. However, the essence of the legislation is that it must come into effect quickly.

It is the Government's view that it is not possible to include an appeal provision in this legislation because it would derogate from its effectiveness. Some extraordinary authority must be given to the Government to act in an emergency situation. As I have said, Parliament would have the right to review the Government's performance in the event of any emergency extending beyond 30 days. The Government would not be beyond scrutiny, but would have to come back to Parliament at the expiration of that 30-day period. The legislation ensures that, during the initial period of any shortage or problems with supply, the Government will act quickly for that limited period. I oppose the new clause.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I support the new clause, because grave hardship could be imposed on an individual whose application for a permit is refused. That refusal could bring his business to a complete standstill. I am not impressed with the Attorney-General when he says that a number of applications for appeal could bring the Act to a standstill. In fact, the reverse would seem to be the case because, if a person did appeal, he would still not have a permit. Unless and until that appeal is processed that person does not have a permit, so the appeal procedure will not bring the Act to a standstill.

I am also unimpressed with the Attorney-General's reference to other States. If the legislation in other States does not provide a right of appeal, which is a fairly natural right in a matter of substance and importance such as this, that is still no reason why we should not have it in South Australia. I suggest, particularly at the present time when there is such a dependence on fuel in business, that if a person is unjustly deprived of a permit and is therefore gravely disadvantaged, a right of appeal is quite proper. I repeat that, unless and until such an appeal has been successful, an individual does not have a permit, and he cannot obtain any fuel. I support the new clause.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Attorney-General said that the matter would always come back to Parliament if an emergency continued and that the Government's decision and the administration of the legislation would therefore be subject to review. There is no provision in the Bill for any report to be made to Parliament at the conclusion of any emergency period which would make the Government's action subject to review. There is nothing to stop the Government, at the conclusion of the emergency period, from reimposing a further 30-day emergency period after a lapse of 30 days.

It is quite likely that a period of emergency could be proclaimed when Parliament is not sitting. If Parliament is not sitting there is no opportunity for members to raise the question of the Government's administration of the legislation in an emergency. Therefore, it is incorrect for the Attorney-General to say that the Government's activities may be subject to scrutiny, because there is no provision for that in the Bill. I support the Hon. John Burdett when he says that, until the review has been considered and a decision made by a judge, the Minister's decision on a permit must stand and that, until such a decision is made, the Minister's position is preserved. In those circumstances, a right of review is not unreasonable, even though an emergency may last for only 30 days. It is

perfectly proper to have a right of review, and it is necessary to have some check on the exercise of this power by the Minister.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I support the new clause. The Minister quite properly claims that hundreds of permits will be issued almost daily if rationing occurs. However, that does not necessarily mean that there will be hundreds of appeals. Those people who deem themselves to be harshly treated under the permit system and who find they are faced with extreme financial difficulties will tend to be the ones who appeal. I do not accept that there will be a great number of appeals as envisaged by the Government if the new clause is inserted.

Secondly, although it is true that 30 days is a short time, there will be cases, as mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Griffin in his second reading speech, where people get into considerable difficulty before that time. Some people could be in a difficult economic situation before the 30-day period started, and those people should have a right of appeal, because they could face bankruptcy if they were treated harshly by the Minister under the permit system. The problems faced by these people may not have arisen within the 30-day period but may have begun a long time before that period. Therefore, the 30-day argument in that situation misses the point.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Griffin said that there was no provision for any scrutiny. I have suggested that there must be scrutiny by Parliament after 30 days. There is no provision for a report but, if the Government wanted this legislation to continue beyond 30 days in an emergency, it would have to come back to Parliament to get an extension.

If it did not, the emergency provisions could not continue, and clearly in that case Parliament would have full opportunity to scrutinise the Government's administration of the Act in the preceding 30 days. If it did not like it, it could do something about the legislation. I refer here to clause 5 (4). If the emergency continued beyond 30 days, the legislation would have to come back to Parliament, unless the Government was prepared to have 30 days of rationing, 30 days of no rationing, 30 days of rationing, and so on. That would be an untenable position if there was an emergency of the kind envisaged by the legislation. If at the end of 30 days the Government wanted to continue the emergency situation, the legislation would have to come back to Parliament, which would review the administration of the legislation and the legislation itself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If a serious crisis occurred in which in the interests of the community the rationing period must be extended, Parliament would be faced with a serious problem with regard to any appeal provisions. Supposing, as a result of a crisis, the rationing period must continue and Parliament could not interfere with the continuation of that rationing period: a person would have no right of appeal when probably he should have that right. I do not think we can use the question of the 30-day period as a means of saying that there should be no appeal provisions. The Attorney-General should reconsider the matter from the point of view that, if we get a serious situation where rationing must continue, Parliament would not have any power to review the matter, because emotion would be such that Parliament would have to continue that rationing period.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, and D. H. Laidlaw.

Noes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner (teller).

The CHAIRMAN: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

New clause thus inserted.

Clause 9—"Directions in relation to the supply of rationed motor fuel."

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

> Page 5, lines 4 to 6—Leave out "any body corporate carrying on a business involving the supply of motor fuel in relation to the supply of rationed motor fuel" and insert "any person in relation to the manufacture or supply of motor fuel".

This clause empowers the Minister to give directions, if in the public interest to do so, to any body corporate carrying on a business involving the supply of motor fuel in relation to the supply of rationed motor fuel. Curiously, the Minister may give directions to a body corporate only in time of an emergency, but it is likely that there are individuals to whom directions should also be given in order to overcome the emergency situation or, at least, to deal with the distribution of fuel during that period. Shortages of supply can occur for a number of reasons.

There can be shortages of supply from overseas or from refineries, and there could be shortages of supply because of industrial disputes that affect the production of motor fuel or other spirit. There could also be shortages of supply caused by the picketing of works where motor fuel is produced or from which it is distributed. In those circumstances, it seems to me appropriate that the Minister should have power to give directions not only to the body corporate on whose premises the fuel may be situated, or whose plant may be affected by any industrial dispute, but also to individuals who may be involved in the dispute or who may prevent the supply and distribution of motor fuel. Therefore, my amendment widens the power of the Minister so that he can give directions to individuals, as well as to bodies corporate.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I oppose the amendment. During the rationing period this clause gives the Minister the power to give directions to an oil company concerning the supply or rationing of motor fuel. Under the amendment the Minister would have the power to give a direction to an employee of a refinery or a service station as well as to an employer. The honourable member suggests that the Government could interfere completely, if it wished, in the day-to-day running of the oil companies in this sort of situation. The Government believes that it is sufficient, in dealing with such emergencies, if it has the power to direct the oil companies and then to allow the oil companies to carry out those directions in their normal manner.

The Government believes that it is inappropriate to give the Minister the power virtually to direct the whole of the company's operations in this sort of situation. The Government does not believe that the power needs to go that far. I would be interested to know whether the honourable member has consulted the oil companies about this amendment and, if he has, what their response was.

In the previous amendment the honourable member sought to limit the powers of the Minister by providing some sort of appeal review provision from a Ministerial decision, and now he seeks to vastly increase the powers of the Minister in dealing with oil companies or their employees. It is unnecessary to have such a clause. The legislation would be best administered by the Minister giving the direction to the oil companies, and the companies could then ensure compliance with the

Ministerial decision through the normal procedures.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: What would be the use of a direction under this clause, as it now stands, if the direction were made to a body corporate, namely, an oil company, as suggested by the Minister, if the employees of that company refused to carry out that instruction? The direction would be useless, yet technically the body corporate would be committing an offence and would be subject to a penalty of $10 000. Obviously, the directions of the Minister are ultimately carried out by persons, and the amendment sensibly seeks to put the situation on that basis.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Minister has suggested that the object of this clause is to allow the Government to give directions to an oil company, but such companies are not the only bodies corporate involved in the supply of motor fuel. Many retail outlets are independent suppliers, all of whom are separately incorporated. Under this clause the Minister would have power to give directions to them as well as to the oil companies. If the directions are to be given to those bodies corporate, why should they not be given to the individuals who may be causing the shortage of supply of motor fuel? It is curious that the bodies corporate should be involved, that the oil companies should be controlled and subjected to the direction of the Minister, yet there should be no control on those who may be creating the shortage.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, and D. H. Laidlaw.

Noes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner (teller).

The CHAIRMAN: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

Page 5, lines 7 to 9—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclause as follows:

(2) A direction under this section shall be given—

(a) by instrument in writing served personally or by post on the person to whom the direction is addressed; or

(b) by publication of the direction in the *Gazette*.

The present subclause provides that a direction shall be given by instrument in writing served personally or by post on the body corporate to which the direction is addressed. My amendment seeks to extend that so that there can be publication of the direction in the *Gazette*. It is conceivable that in an emergency the ordinary course of the post will not be sufficient to draw attention to the Minister's direction.

It is also quite likely that if it is served by post it will take at least several days to be delivered. Therefore, I move the amendment, which will extend the options open to the Minister for giving notice and to include notice in the *Gazette*.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

Page 5, line 10—Leave out "body corporate to which" and insert "person to whom".

This amendment is consequential on a previous amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

Page 5, line 25—Leave out "body corporate that" and insert "person who".

This amendment is similar to the previous amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Actions for injunctions and mandamus against Minister."

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I oppose this clause. It provides that the Minister should not be subject to any action to restrain him from doing anything under the legislation or to compel him to do anything under the legislation. That, coupled with the fact that previously there was not any right to have a Minister's direction reviewed, puts him, as I indicated in the second reading debate, above the law. Although it may be for 30 days only, within that time quite momentous decisions can be taken by the Minister, which are not subject to judicial review. Although it is an emergency situation, I do not believe that this State has yet got to the position where the Minister, in those circumstances, ought to be above the law and not be subject to judicial review. It is important, even in those circumstances, that the Minister, in acting, knows that his actions must be reasonable and that, if they are not reasonable, they will be subject to judicial review. That is an important principle that ought to be maintained. For that reason I oppose this clause, which absolves the Minister from that liability.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I oppose the deletion of this clause for reasons similar to those that I gave to the Committee in relation to the first amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Griffin.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: When the 30 days are up, Parliament could be in the position of not being able to do anything but continue the legislation in an emergency. In such circumstances we would be left with passing a Bill with no appeal provisions and with this clause included. It is not valid to argue that the Bill is only for 30 days. We must consider the position where the legislation may have to be extended. If it goes on the Statute Book as it is now, there is no way that Parliament can insist upon a change in any of its provisions. That point should be borne in mind by honourable members when voting on this clause.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It is not true to say that Parliament could not review the situation at the end of 30 days. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris raised the point that, if at the end of 30 days Parliament was called together, it might believe that, because of the emergency situation, it could not interfere with the legislation. Parliament would presumably believe that, because of the crisis caused by the lack of fuel (this seems to be a justification for my argument in relation to no review of Ministerial decisions and my argument for retaining clause 11, namely, that we would have a crisis situation), there was an emergency situation and the Minister ought to have power to act speedily in that emergency situation. I do not accept that Parliament could not review this situation after 30 days.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It couldn't.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: There is power to review the legislation. The Government would have to bring down new legislation to extend this Act. If Parliament thought that the Minister's administration of the Act had been such that there had been abuses, it might not want to throw the whole Act out, but surely it could move amendments to overcome the abuses. That option would be available to Parliament at the end of the 30 days. We have a situation where it is necessary for the Government to act quickly for that period. It is legislation with a definite cut-off date. I do not accept the honourable member's proposition that there could be no review at the end of 30 days.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If, after 30 days, the Government brought in a Bill extending the provisions of this Act and if Parliament decided that there would have

to be some changes made in regard to the appeal provisions and the blanket powers of the Minister, to which changes the Government said "No", Parliament is then in the position of either throwing the Bill out altogether and having no powers to ration or accepting the position that there will be no appeal or leave this clause as it is. While the Minister says that Parliament would have the right of review, in the end it comes down to the point where Parliament would have the right to say only that this Bill stops here and now, or we have to back off and not insist upon any changes. Parliament would have no power to insist upon any changes in 30 days time if there were conditions that warranted a continuation of the rationing period.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I feel strongly about this issue. It surprises me that the Government claims that it is a democratic Government when it is putting a clause like this on the Statute Book. The Minister is claiming time and time again that the Government wants the power to act quickly in a crisis. The crisis we are talking of is one concerning a shortage of fuel. What if the Minister does not act quickly? What if the Minister does not like the colour of an applicant's eyes? What if his department has had trouble with the applicant in the past, and the Minister wanted to get his own back? In these circumstances the Minister simply puts the application to one side. What if he acts in humbug against that citizen? If this clause remains in the Bill, that citizen has no rights at all against that Minister in regard to taking out a writ of *mandamus* against the Minister. Putting the Minister above the law, as the Hon. Mr. Griffin said, is the most undemocratic process I have ever seen in legislation before this Parliament. I strongly oppose this clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner (teller).

Noes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, and D. H. Laidlaw.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. To enable the matter to be further considered, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Clause thus negatived.

The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the Hon. Mr. Foster wants to hold a debate with an honourable member, he may do so outside this Chamber. However, if he does not want to take notice of me, I will do something about the matter.

Remaining clauses (12 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Clerk of the Council to deliver messages on the Bill to the House of Assembly when the Council is not sitting.

Motion carried.

ABATTOIRS AND PET FOOD WORKS BILL

Adjourned debate (resumed on motion).

(Continued from Page 565.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this Bill and the other related Bills be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. E. Dunford, and C. M. Hill.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): As I said during the second reading debate, I oppose the appointment of a Select Committee. I said previously that the legislation had been the result of two committees of inquiry and that the matter had long been before Parliament. I also said that the appointment of a Select Committee would cause further delays, and that the Council could deal with this legislation in the normal manner. I therefore oppose the motion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is amazing how quickly word gets around of what is happening in Parliament, because today I have been besieged by telegrams, letters and other forms of communication demanding that a Select Committee be appointed.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You organised them, mate, that's why.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am sure that there has been no organisation as far as I am concerned. This involves a free expression of opinion by the people. I believe that it is right for the Council to appoint a Select Committee. There will be no delay in coming to a decision on this matter, provided that the members of the Select Committee go about their work in a spirit of goodwill and co-operation.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, K. T. Griffin, C. M. Hill, and D. H. Laidlaw.

Noes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton (teller), J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner. .

The PRESIDENT: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. I consider that the Bill warrants a Select Committee, and accordingly I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

That the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the Select Committee be fixed at four members, and that Standing Order No. 389 be so far suspended as to enable the Chairman of the Select Committee to have a deliberative vote only.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I oppose the motion. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris should be honest and at least inform the Council of the source of the telegrams on his desk. All those telegrams have come from local government areas. The vote to be taken in this Chamber will unfortunately be on the basis—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The motion before the Chair concerns the quorum.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, Mr. President. I wish to amend that motion. I move:

Leave out "fixed at four members" and insert "all members".

Members opposite want a Select Committee, but they never turn up at the meetings.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Members opposite demand, over the protests of Government members, the setting up of Select Committees. When these Select Committees are set up, Government members, in the main, have to carry members opposite. If members opposite want Select Committees they should have the courage to attend the meetings. The Leader of the Opposition should not argue that the quorum of the committee should be any less than the committee of the whole. If they want a Select Committee, members opposite should be prepared to

serve on that committee.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Hon. Mr. Foster's amendment seconded?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I second the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is seconded. Does any member wish to speak to the amendment?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If this amendment is carried, the deliberations of the Select Committee will take twice as long as normal.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is what you want.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is what you are achieving.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I am not on the Select Committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Members on this side want this committee to do its work quickly.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you want witnesses to attend?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We want to know the full facts of the matter. If members opposite are successful in their plan to foul up the Select Committee and cause it to take much longer to deliberate, the blame lies with the Government. The original motion for the quorum follows the normal precedent.

As we all know, there are times when a member has to be absent from a Select Committee through sickness, as happened to me only a few weeks ago. If a member cannot attend a Select Committee because of sickness, then, according to the Hon. Mr. Foster's amendment, the committee could not sit. In that situation there could be witnesses in attendance who have come from the country and possibly travelled hundreds of miles, yet the committee would not be able to take their evidence. The Hon. Mr. Foster will deliberately foul up the operations of the committee and will cause it to deliberate for much longer than is needed. The blame for that lies totally on the shoulders of the Government.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I totally agree with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Mr. Hill. If this amendment is carried (and I am sure the Minister is embarrassed by it) then every time a member is not in attendance, because of a car crash or for any number of reasons, the committee will not be able to sit.

It was only last week that the Opposition was being criticised for delaying another Bill by having a Select Committee that took too long: now, an amendment has been moved that would only prolong any deliberations by a Select Committee. The amendment was moved in jest, and unfortunately it was seconded. I ask the mover to withdraw the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have had a telegram from the Secretary of the South Australian Chicken Meat Council and letters from abattoirs not associated with local government.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Which ones are they?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not intend to state them.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Of course you don't. You ought to table them, if you have any courage. They're probably phoney like the petitions were.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Minister has received a letter from MacPherson Meat Industries in Mount Gambier and a letter from the Mount Schank Meat Company. Most of the telegrams are from local government, but there are communications from other than local government. The amendment is no more than a nuisance measure, and I believe that it is probably the direct opposite of the motion, anyway. If no quorum is established, all members must be present, but it has always been the case that a quorum has been established. If the mover wants to drag the committee on until 1983 or 1984, his amendment is the exact way of doing it. Every member knows that, in any committee, there are times when a member must leave or when illness or some other occurrence prevents a member from attending. I am sorry that the amendment has been moved and seconded.

Amendment negatived.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 25 September.

Motion carried.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on 1 August. Page 272.)

Bill read a second time and referred to the Select Committee on the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on 1 August. Page 270.)

Bill read a second time and referred to the Select Committee on the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 August. Page 271.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am pleased that this Bill, together with the other Bills with which we have dealt, is to be referred to a Select Committee, because the Local Government Association, which represents local government in this State, is most anxious to put its case to Parliament, and the only way it can do that is through the machinery of a Select Committee. Therefore, local government will be able to do just what it wants to do, as an association: it will be able to come to the Select Committee and put its case in regard to this Bill and the other Bills. I emphasise that that association strongly supported the need for a Select Committee, and it is pleasing to see that this Chamber has agreed to that course.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the honourable member for his contribution. Local government bodies have been consulted in drawing up the legislation and have provided information to the various committees that were established.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Can some of the conversations be toned down so that some of us can hear the Minister.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: On several occasions we have offered the services of Agriculture Department officers to explain the legislation to them, and I am surprised that there has been a last-minute move to have a Select Committee established. There have been offers of co-operation, but I think that there have been problems within the local government organisation itself. When the Government first asked it to comment on the legislation, it replied with detailed comments directed at other

legislation. There has been some confusion within the organisation in trying to get its own house in order. I assure the honourable member that local government has been consulted and that there have been numerous consultations not only with the Local Government Association but with the local government bodies involved with abattoirs boards. That has been very complete and full.

Bill read a second time and referred to the Select Committee on the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill.

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 1 August. Page 271.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have checked the Bill thoroughly with the principal Act and with the Minister's second reading explanation and have found that the Bill does what it purports to do. Having regard to the inter-related Bills, it is necessary that, in common with the other Bills, it be referred to a Select Committee. For that reason I support the second reading and the referring of the Bill to a Select Committee.

Bill read a second time and referred to the Select Committee on the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.3 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 22 August at 2.15 p.m.