LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 26 August 1981

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

QUESTIONS

CENTRAL MARKET

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the Central Market.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Many people in the community are very concerned about the plans of the Adelaide City Council to redevelop the Central Market. Not only stallholders at the market are concerned but large sections of the community are also concerned because the market is used by people from not just the city of Adelaide area but from the whole of the metropolitan area. The exact situation about the redevelopment is somewhat confused, because the Adelaide City Council claims that it is not redeveloping the market but is asking only for proposals to redevelop it. It seems strange, if it does not have any intention to redevelop the market, that it should seek proposals to do so. Those proposals say that the existing market will remain a vital part of any redevelopment scheme, but many people who use the market do not feel it should be a part, whether vital or otherwise, of any scheme, but should remain in the whole state as it is in now.

One of the reasons that has been put forward for the redevelopment of the market (this is not a reason that has been quoted officially, although it is certainly a common reason suggested by market stallholders) is that there is need for additional car parking space for the international hotel when it is completed. I have been told by an architect that additional car parking space could be made available at the market by building an additional layer on to the existing car park without disturbing existing market facilities below. Of course, the Government has considerable influence on the Adelaide City Council; I am sure that the Minister, in particular, has considerable influence. Also, the Government is involved as a member of the City of Adelaide Planning Committee. What are the Minister's own views on the redevelopment of the market? Does he agree that the redevelopment of the market is necessary? If he believes it is not necessary, will he use his influence to try to stop that redevelopment?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Lord Mayor and one of his senior staff called on me recently and indicated that the Adelaide City Council was considering the question of redevelopment of this area. That call was simply a courtesy call to inform me of one of the many projects that the council had in mind. I make quite clear that I have not consented or approved of any plan for redevelopment whatsoever in this area of the city. It is not my prerogative to make any request to the Adelaide City Council to not plan to redevelop any part of the city. The initiative of general redevelopment schemes is in the hands of the city council and I think it should stay there. As Minister, my approval is necessary at some point in the planning process if the city council wishes to acquire compulsorily any properties within a proposal. I most certainly will not give my consent to such a scheme or to any other scheme without a great deal of deep consideration as to the plan. Naturally, I will keep public opinion in mind at the same time.

McLEAY BROTHERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General a question on McLeay Bros Pty Ltd.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On *Nationwide* last night, further allegations were made about McLeay Bros Pty Ltd, John McLeay and Sons, and Clinton Credits. Reference was also made to David McLeay Pty Ltd. Yesterday I had not requested an inquiry into David McLeay Pty Ltd, as David McLeay left McLeay Bros in 1977. However, *Nationwide* alleged that the property from which David McLeay operated at Hilton was bought by Seacrest Nominees (the directors being David and Margaret McLeay) from Garden Trust for no consideration whatsoever.

It was also alleged that the property at 81 Grenfell Street (the McLeay Bros principal outlet) was sold by McLeay Bros Pty Ltd on 14 March 1980 for $615 000. That was the day that John McLeay and his family severed their connection with McLeay Bros Pty Ltd. This left McLeay Bros Pty Ltd with no real estate.

It also appears that Clinton Credits Pty Ltd bought the property at 97 Coglin Street, Brompton (from which the bulk store is operated now by John McLeay and Sons), in August 1978. However, the statement of affairs of Clinton Credits does not show ownership of any real estate when that company went into liquidation. The circumstances of the sale of that property by Clinton Credits (if it has in fact been sold) should be investigated.

After a news item on channel 10 last night the announcer, at the end of the programme, stated that the inquiry referred only to McLeay Bros Pty Ltd and not to John McLeay or David McLeay. I do not know from where channel 10 obtained that information, but anyone who was aware of the proceedings in Parliament yesterday would know that that was not correct. My constituents were particularly concerned about the circumstances of the break up of McLeay Bros Pty Ltd, and accordingly honourable members will recall that I requested that a special investigator be appointed to inquire into not only McLeay Bros Pty Ltd and Clinton Credits Pty Ltd but also to inquire into John McLeay and Sons Pty Ltd. Further, although David McLeay left the McLeay Bros enterprise in 1977, I believe that the complete circumstances of the break up of the McLeay Bros undertaking should be looked at.

Will the Attorney-General confirm that his reference of the matter to the Corporate Affairs Commission does include a reference to the affairs of John McLeay Pty Ltd and David McLeay Pty Ltd, their associated companies or trusts, and the circumstances of the break up of McLeay Bros Pty Ltd?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: What I said yesterday stands today, and that is that any material that the Leader of the Opposition raised in State Parliament yesterday will be referred to the Corporate Affairs Commission for inquiry and for the purpose of providing information in respect of those allegations.

TEACHING OF POLITICS

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, on the subject of the teaching of politics in schools, and I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing the question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I was pleased to see in the current edition of *Teachers Journal* the formation of a

Politics Teachers Association. Certainly, the great body of ignorance which abounds in the community as to the very nature of government and Parliament is worth dispelling. I draw the Council's attention to the fact that a political scientist, Dr Dean Jaensch, has stated quite categorically that not only is it desirable for politics to be taught in schools but that it is essential that it be taught by people qualified at the level of a tertiary major in political science. I noticed in the *Teachers Journal* an invitation to any person wishing to join or to contribute in any way to contact the newly formed Politics Teachers Association.

My question is: given the very limited amount of influence that the Minister has over the content of education, would the Minister nevertheless seek to exert whatever influence he does have to ensure that Dr Dean Jaensch's views are carried out, namely, that politics should be taught only by people fully qualified with a tertiary major in the subject?

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

LAWRENCE NIELD AND PARTNERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, concerning Lawrence Nield and Partners.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: A short time ago a New South Wales firm (Lawrence Nield and Partners) made an extensive cost study at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Since that time several senior health administrators have contacted me concerning the possible gross errors in the logic and conclusions of the study. The two volume report can essentially be divided into three parts. The first part is descriptive. It is essentially an organisational model. Approximately 280 cost centres are identified and costs allocated to those units. This part is reasonable and unexceptional.

The first part of the second report presents a set of arguments about those costs, how they are generated, and what can be done to reduce them. Two senior officers in the South Australian Health Commission have told me that it uses pathetic reasoning and has little to do with the first report. It uses the Lismore Base Hospital and the Woden Valley Hospital in the Australian Capital Territory for a comparative exercise with the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Neither of these hospitals is anything like the R.A.H., which is of course a large teaching hospital. I am told that the logic of trying to make such comparisons fails completely.

The third part (that is, the second part of the second report) makes recommendations. According to my advice these recommendations cannot be traced directly to either of the first two parts of the report. In the third part, I am told, there are innumerable inconsistencies. For example, one paragraph begins with the words 'We strongly recommend . . .', yet only a few paragraphs later the authors concede 'There is insufficient information to . . .'.

The report ultimately identifies up to $8 000 000 of potential savings annually at the R.A.H. The General Administrator at the hospital has rejected Nield and Partners claims, as have many members of the Hospital Board.

My sources in the Commission describe it as an appalling report which never should have been accepted or paid for. Yet Lawrence Nield and Associates have now been sent into the Home for Incurables and the Flinders Medical Centre. Is the Minister aware of the widespread and trenchant criticism of the report? Has Lawrence Nield and Partners ever done an exercise before on a large teaching hospital comparable to the R.A.H.? Will the Minister have the report assessed by independent consultants before implementing any of its recommendations? Will she suspend further operations of Nield and Partners pending receipt of their assessment?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply

PHOTO LICENCES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about photo licences.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members will have recently received a copy of a photo licence bulletin, which is obviously designed to promote the sale of its products in South Australia. It is claimed in that bulletin that the New South Wales Government could save over $750 000 by using photo drivers' licences, as compared with the present system used in that State. Of course, New South Wales is a much larger State than is South Australia, and also in that State nearly four out of every five drivers have a one-year licence compared with those who hold three-year licences. That situation does not obtain here. Nevertheless, it may be possible that some saving could be made through the use of this method, although I have some doubts about that possibility.

Will the Minister investigate this matter and establish whether or not the claims of the bulletin are accurate? Will he also investigate the accuracy or otherwise of its statement that Australian voters of all major political Parties are strongly in favour of photo drivers' licences, a statement that also raises some questions in my mind.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

IMPORTED MEAT

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about imported meat.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: One recalls an American food chain a few years ago which sent out feelers to enter the business area in South Australia. If my memory serves me correctly, the then Premier of this State opened that food chain's first outlet, which is known as McDonalds. Members will recall that that company has been the subject of a number of questions in this Council in the past. For the benefit of members of the Council, I point out that this company entered South Australia on the basis that it would take South Australian killed and produced meat. To that end, the then State Government consented to certain modifications to the Samcor abattoirs to meet the requirements of this company. That company, McDonalds, took that meat for about three weeks and then shot off to Victoria to obtain the rest.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Victoria?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Victoria and other States.

The Hon. L. H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Have you ever had a Big Mac, Davis?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Just shut him up, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I have done that. I want the honourable Mr Foster to continue with his question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: On the radio this morning assurances were given to the Australian public. Assurances were also given to America by a Federal Minister that Australian meat exported to America will be uncontaminated in the sense that it will be beef and not donkey, lizard, wallaby, kangaroo or whatever. There is considerable trafficking in a number of animals in relation to meat, not only for export but also for the interstate trade.

Last evening, we heard on television of the disappearance of a prominent shooter from North Queensland. Apparently, no-one has found his body. Have we unconsciously become cannibals in this regard?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: This is nothing to laugh about. There is every possibility that this has happened, foul play having been hinted at. This man may well not have been flung into the desert at all but may have been put through the mincer. The situation has indeed become serious, especially in relation to salami outlets in Victoria, a matter regarding which everyone of us knows the results in terms of loss of life. A factory in Adelaide with a similar name, namely, Tibaldi, has been under a cloud with respect to its operations. This has therefore become a serious matter. We are concerned not only about the type of meat involved but also about its source.

Will the Minister of Community Welfare therefore request the Minister of Health to ascertain and inform the public as to the content and origin of hamburger meat used by McDonalds fast-food burger joints? Secondly, what inspections are made by the Health Department of any of the outlet areas, and at what stage are those inspections made? Thirdly, what liaison or acceptance of factory inspections from interstate suppliers is demanded by the Local Board of Health for South Australian health authorities?

Fourthly, can the Minister say what interstate abattoirs are used and what animals are slaughtered? I refer, for example, to sheep, goats, kangaroos, donkeys, horses, and so on. Finally, to what extent can meat from open field slaughter be detected when placed in the normal food chain, as it is intermixed in the process of deboning and mincing?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague and bring back a reply.

COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTRES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question regarding community justice centres.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: About six months ago, the New South Wales Government established three community justice centres in that State, which centres are staffed by lay people with no legal qualifications, for the purpose of settling community disputes. Disputing parties meet with the mediators in the community justice centres, who try to establish grounds for agreement between the two parties.

The Bankstown centre, for example, which has been established for about six months, has mediated in 100 local disputes since it was established, and in 92 of those disputes agreement has been reached between the two parties. Community justice centres were first established in the United States about eight or nine years ago but, as I understand it, after initial success they have suffered from some criticism there. However, I think that the success of the three centres established in New South Wales justifies further examination of this type of justice centre.

Disputes of a wide variety have been mediated in the community justice centres, and those disputes have involved fencing, barking dogs, defamation, debt, delays in property transactions, and access to children. Is the Minister aware of this New South Wales experiment, and has the South Australian Government considered establishing community justice centres in South Australia?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am aware of the experiment in New South Wales, on which my own officers are gathering material. We are not actively pursuing the establishment of community justice centres in South Australia at present. At this initial stage, I am adopting a 'wait and see' attitude because I am aware that some difficulties arise in the way in which attempts are made to settle those sorts of dispute. I suppose that in some respects one could equate the small claims jurisdiction of the local court with at least some of the functions of a community justice centre. The small claims jurisdiction does have some success in resolving small claims without the involvement of legal practitioners. Even there, there are from time to time complaints about the way in which those claims have been settled, although by far the largest number of them seem to be settled without too much trauma created for any or both of the parties.

INTO THE 80s

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, about the publication *Into the 80s*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: A few months ago the Education Department put out the booklet *Into the 80s*, which purports to set out the philosophy of the Education Department and its directions for the next decade. I referred to this publication considerably in my Address in Reply speech and voiced some of the criticisms that had been made of this document, in particular, that there is no mention made in it whatsoever about women and girls, although such reference would certainly be appropriate in large sections of the document. For instance, in the section on social change and its effect on the schools, it certainly seems incredible to me that one could discuss social change without mentioning the changing role of women in our society and the effect that this must have on the education system. I read the reply made by the Attorney-General in his Address in Reply speech and he gave no attention whatsoever to my remarks on this matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Should he have?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is normal. Yesterday the Attorney claimed that people had not read his speech, or they would have seen that he had dealt with matters that had been raised. I am simply pointing out to him that that is a topic which I raised and to which he did not address himself. However, it has been brought to my attention that an earlier draft of this document did have a large section on women and girls included in it in what would have been two pages in a quarto size document. It may have been even more extensive. Such a section did not appear in the final booklet, which is available from the Education Department.

First, why was the section on women and girls removed? Whose decision was it to move it from the earlier draft? Secondly, if it was deemed inadequate for the booklet, why was it not rewritten and then included? Thirdly, was the Equal Opportunity Officer in the Education Department

consulted about the preparation of this booklet, and did she agree with having no mention whatever of women and girls in it? If she was not consulted about its preparation, why not? Finally, is the Education Department still committed to the elimination of sexism in our schools and their curricula, or has its approach to women and girls in education altered completely, as might be supposed from the complete omission of any reference to them in this policy document?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand that the document is issued in the name of the Director-General of Education. I will refer the question to the Minister of Education, who will discuss the matters that the honourable member has raised with the author, and I will try to obtain a reply.

SHOPLIFTING

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a question about shoplifting.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I was astounded recently to see a report on the extent of shoplifting in South Australia. It has been established that the cost of shoplifting in this State amounts to about $26 000 000, and 60 per cent of that loss is incurred in Rundle Mall, one of the busiest shopping centres in the world. When the segment to which I refer was shown on television, an executive from one of the large retailers, John Martins or David Jones, was interviewed and asked about who pays for shoplifting. He said what all members know—that the consumer generally pays for everything, that the cost of shoplifting is generally tacked on to the price of goods. I was intrigued by his noncholant attitude in regard to this grave problem.

I thought then that instead of Rundle Mall retailers supporting this reactionary Government to 'stop the job rot' they ought to do something about stopping shoplifting in Rundle Mall and in South Australia. I then thought about what could be done concerning this problem. Although I do not have the adequate resources to investigate the matter fully, I am certain that, since shopkeepers generally are not incurring any loss because they can pass such losses on to the consumers, most people in such a position will do nothing at all. I have observed over the years that nothing has been done about this problem. Therefore, I hope that the proposition I will include in my question will receive some support. My suggestion is directed to the industrial relations section of the Government. The Minister, to my knowledge, apart from his strong attacks on the Federal Government on the I.A.C. report, has done nothing since he assumed his portfolio to relieve unemployment in this State. Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs confer with the South Australian retail organisations and the trade unions involved in the retail industry in South Australia with a view to creating more jobs in retail stores and possibly reducing the incidence of shoplifting?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

TRUCKS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question concerning the provision of the owner's name on doors of trucks.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As the Government is looking at the question of deregulation, I draw the following matter to the Minister's attention. Over many years it has been necessary for trucks and other vehicles above a certain weight to have the name of the owner and the tare weight of the vehicle painted on the door. Over the years, these vehicles have often been used mainly in farming areas. Even the utilities that farmers use must now have this information painted on the door. This appears to be a rather ridiculous provision, as these vehicles are not used for any commercial purpose, yet must comply with this regulation. Will the Minister look at this question and see whether some changes are required?

I appreciate that information needs to be exhibited somewhere on large commercial trucks, but at the present time I believe that the regulation is not fulfilling its purpose in regard to many farm vehicles in use. Will the Minister look at the question with a view to changing the law in this regard?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

IVOR SYMONS LIBRARY

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question on the Ivor Symons Library.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: On 22 July I wrote to the Minister about this building, which is currently owned by the Mitcham Council. It is no longer being used as a library, and the council has decided to auction it. Many local residents believe that the property should be kept for community use. I wrote to the Minister asking him whether his department would be interested in taking it over. The Minister replied saying that the use of departmental services in the area did not warrant an office in that location. He also advised that officers of his department had discussed the property with several local community organisations. Since that time, in response to public pressure, the council has postponed the sale of the building until October and is calling for submissions from interested persons regarding its use. I know that at least one group in the area is preparing a submission.

First, with which community organisations did the Department for Community Welfare officers have discussions? Secondly, is it true that within the last 12 months the Mitcham community welfare office has advertised in the local Hills press for office space in the vicinity of the Ivor Symons Library? Thirdly, is it true that officers of the Mitcham community welfare office still hold the view that a community welfare office in that area is necessary and, if so, how does the Minister justify his statement that an office at the location is not warranted? Fourthly, will he reconsider the matter with a view to purchasing the property?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with officers of my department and bring back a reply.

COUNCIL HOUSES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question on the Whyalla City Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In a recent news item in a country edition of the Adelaide *News* an article headed '$10 000 cost for officers' homes' was brought to my attention. I will read briefly from that item to give the Minister some indication of the problem as follows:

Concession rents for nine city council-owned homes occupied by council officers will cost local ratepayers about $10 000 this financial year. The $10 000 is based on comparable Housing Trust rents for single unit homes.

The lowest rent is $12 and the highest $23, but most are about $16. Whyalla Mayor, Mrs A. C. Ekblom, said details of the concession rents were 'privileged information'.

'They are an arrangement between the employer and the employee,' she said.

During the 1979-80 financial year, total rent collected from the nine homes was $6 329 and the expenditure on the homes $10 791. The announcement is certain to anger Whyalla ratepayers.

As a Whyalla ratepayer I am extremely angry. Highly paid officers in the Whyalla City Council are apparently allowed to milk the council funds through subsidised rents. On behalf of the people of Whyalla I protest strongly. My information is that city councils have some authority, although I do not know how far it goes, in regard to charging subsidised rents to attract council officers to certain councils in remote areas of the State. I have no objection to that. However, I believe that Whyalla could hardly be classed in the same category as some of the more remote parts of the State. I would not think for one minute that there would be any difficulty in attracting city council officers to Whyalla without allowing them to extract some further funds from the ratepayers by way of subsidised rent.

I was horrified to read in a news item that the information was classed as privileged information and that the Whyalla ratepayers, in whose pockets these officers have their hands, are not allowed to know how much they are subsidising these already highly-paid people. We are not allowed to know that; we just pay the rates and are expected to shut up while our pockets are being picked. To clarify the matter and to find out whether the Minister considers that this information is privileged—what is funny?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Some Government members are laughing. I am sure that in their council areas the same thing does not go on and, if it did, they would be as irate as I and other Whyalla ratepayers are. Will the Minister give the names and salaries of the Whyalla City Council officers who have housing provided by the council, and will the Minister advise what rents they pay? Are these actions by the Whyalla City Council legal and, if so, does the Government intend to take any action to prevent ratepayers' money being misused in this way? Does the Minister condone the syphoning off of the Whyalla ratepayers' funds in this way for subsidised rents?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The reason that I was smiling was related to the colourful language used by the honourable member when he started to talk about his pockets and those of other citizens of Whyalla being picked in this process. I, too, have had the matter of the newspaper report brought to my notice and have been able to obtain some information about the item.

The Whyalla City Council owns eight staff houses. Seven of these were purchased by the former Whyalla City Commission between 1957 and 1968. An eighth was purchased in 1971 a year after the city council came into operation. In addition, the council has three job-related houses, that is, the nurseryman's house on the council nursery, the caretaker's cottage at the fauna park and the Mount Laura homestead which is a National Trust building.

Of the eight staff houses, rents range from $22.75 to $14.25 per week and these are indexed to the c.p.i. Six of these eight houses have their rental established as part of a salaries package for council staff. The Whyalla City Council has no plans at all to purchase any additional staff housing. In regard to the names of those who occupy the houses, I do not have that information with me but I would assume that the Town Clerk's house would be the one carrying the rent of $22.75.

I point out that the actions and arrangements of Whyalla City Council seem to fall completely within the provisions of the Local Government Act. If the ratepayers, of course, of whom the Hon. Mr Blevins is one, are dissatisfied with their council's policy and arrangements for staff, the recourse is in their hands at election time. They can take the matter, if they wish, as an issue to the public at election time, say, in October next, which is a fairly short time ahead.

I agree that there does seem to be a considerable disparity between what would be a market rent on homes in that area, bearing in mind the rent charged for Housing Trust homes and other properties there, and the rents being paid by staff. Obviously, there is a package arrangement in existence between the employer and employees in regard to both salaries and house rents.

However, I am prepared, in view of the strong feeling that has been expressed by the Hon. Mr Blevins and the fact that he has brought into this Chamber the opinions of other people in Whyalla, to take the matter up with the council, and I shall ask it for a full explanation of what arrangements exist. I will withhold any comment as to whether I condone the practice until I get that full report from the Whyalla City Council.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I wish to ask a brief supplementary question. I asked the Minister what were the names and salaries of the officers and what rents they paid. The reason why I ask that is that, as a ratepayer, I cannot find out. It is privileged information, and I therefore repeat the question. Does the Minister have access to this information, or is local government in Whyalla becoming more and more a closed society?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall endeavour to obtain that information from the Whyalla City Council by writing to the council for it, with my general advice which I will give them and to which I have just referred.

EAST END MARKET

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, on the subject of the East End Market.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: All members, I am sure, are aware that many fruit and vegetable growers in the State are dissatisfied with the operations of the East End Market and believe that they do not have equal bargaining power within that market. They are seeking reform of a number of procedures within the market's operations. There are two commodities on which growers have considerable additional bargaining power. I am referring to potatoes and citrus, for which statutory boards have been set up over a period by the State Government to give growers much greater bargaining power in the marketing of those commodities.

It has been pointed out to me by growers that the Potato Board and the Citrus Organisation Committee both operate through the East End Market and are very strong supporters of the existing marketing system at that market. They see it as something of an anomaly that these two boards, which they feel were set up to protect growers' interests, should be strong supporters of a marketing system biased towards agents and merchants. Is the Minister aware that these two statutory marketing boards have a policy of supporting the present merchant control of wholesale marketing in this State? Is he satisfied that that policy is in

the best interests of growers and, if he is not satisfied, will he use his influence with those statutory marketing boards to change the way in which they market their produce through the East End Market?

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

PRISONS ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the subject of the Prisons Royal Commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On 3 June this year I raised in the Council a problem that had occurred with the Prisons Royal Commission. Mr L. M. Lewis, a Chief Prison Officer at Yatala, was sued for defamation following a written submission to the Royal Commission. One would have thought that this submission was privileged from such an action. The Attorney-General undertook to investigate the situation. Since then I have raised the matter informally with him.

As a result of this, the Attorney has advised me that he will intervene in the proceedings in support of the claim for privilege. However, if the defence of privilege is not successful, Mr Lewis will be subject to a claim for damages, when he acted in good faith. In the circumstances, there is a case for the Royal Commissions Act to be amended to ensure protection for Mr Lewis and, indeed, in connection with many other claims that may arise out of the Royal Commission if the action against Mr Lewis is successful. However, if legislation is not contemplated, action should be taken to ensure that Mr Lewis is completely protected from prejudice in the way of costs and damages.

My questions to the Attorney-General are: will he introduce legislation to ensure that written submissions given to the Royal Commission are privileged, the point being that many actions may now arise out of the Royal Commission proceedings if that privilege does not, in fact, exist? Secondly, if the Attorney-General will not take that action, will the Government undertake to indemnify Mr Lewis for costs and damages, as he in good faith made a submission to the Royal Commission that has now rendered him liable to court action for defamation?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have, in fact, intervened in that court action to support the claim by Mr Lewis that the presentation of a submission to the Royal Commission prior to the evidence being formally given to the Royal Commission is privileged and is therefore not actionable under the Royal Commissions Act or the law relating to defamation. It is essentially a preliminary point that needs to be explored, because the advice I have is that the material presented in that way to the Royal Commission is absolutely privileged.

Rather than canvass the merits of the claim any further, I would prefer to leave it at the point of intervention and also indicate to the Council that, so far as indemnity to Mr Lewis is concerned, that decision would be premature, because there needs to be further clarification of the facts, namely, as to the extent of the publication of the statement prior to its being given in evidence and at whose cost it was published.

Accordingly, I cannot give any indication to Council that any indemnity will be given at this stage but I do indicate that, when the preliminary point has been clarified and a decision given, I will then give consideration to the question of indemnity for Mr Lewis in respect of costs and damages. Regarding the other question as to whether there will be amendments to the Royal Commissions Act, certainly I would be prepared to consider that. Any decision on that would depend on the decision of the court on the preliminary point claiming privilege and I will take that into account and give the Leader an indication of my view once that point has been determined.

HOSPITAL FUNDING

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to the question I asked on 5 August regarding hospital funding?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am advised by my colleague, the Minister of Health, that there is no interim agreement. There is a draft agreement which is still being negotiated with the Commonwealth Government. There is no question of giving up Commonwealth hospital funding. If, and it is by no means certain, South Australia forgoes its agreement, it will be because there is financial advantage in doing so. What might be forgone in direct hospital funding will be compensated for by a specifically identified health grant within the general revenue funding to the State. To suggest that funds are being given up is a mischievous nonsense.

The total sum expected from the Commonwealth over the next four years in respect of hospitals, either under the agreement or through general revenue funding, is expected to be in the order of $540 000 000. Direct Commonwealth hospital funding will continue or be replaced by a specific health grant within general revenue funding. An announcement on the details of a revised cost sharing agreement can be expected by 1 September 1981.

HOSPITAL CHARGES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Does the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, have a reply to a question that I asked on 5 August about hospital charges?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My colleague, the Minister of Health, advises that she announced the new public hospital charges before the Commonwealth Minister for Health's formal approval because: first, health insurance funds needed to know these charges to set new contribution rates; and, secondly, Commonwealth officers had indicated that the charges would be accepted, but that the Commonwealth Minister was not likely to formally approve the charges and declare them for benefit purposes until 31 August 1981.

The charges have not yet been approved. Negotiations with the Commonwealth Government in respect to health funding are continuing. The Minister of Health has already stated publicly that a draft agreement is being considered which enables the introduction of the new hospital arrangements from 1 September 1981 and continues the arrangements whereby the Commonwealth and the State share the net costs of providing health services in South Australia. The issues which relate to the community's decisions about health insurance, access to health services, and charges have been decided and already announced.

HOSPITAL COMPUTERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Does the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, have a reply to a question I asked about hospital computers on 22 July?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My colleague, the Minister of Health, has supplied the following reply:

I refer the honourable member to my statement in the Council on this matter on 22 July 1981.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Does the Attorney-General have a reply to a question I asked on 5 August about handicapped persons?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I assume that the film evening in question was the showing of the film *Best Boy* at the Fair Lady Theatre during Festival Week. Whilst it is true that the showing of *Best Boy* did result in a small profit, it was only one of the activities promoted during Festival Week, and the profit was used to provide two free film evenings at the Glenelg Cinema where the film *Stepping Out* was featured. All donations are kept in a separate fund and are used to supplement the amount of money made available by the State and Commonwealth Governments for grants. In this way we believe that the donations are channelled directly into programmes involving the disabled.

The only exception relates to funds which were provided by business houses prior to the announcement that donations to I.Y.D.P. would be tax deductible. In these cases the donations were stipulated to be for publicity purposes and have been used for the printing of posters, leaflets and bumper stickers, with acknowledgement of the donation on the printed literature wherever possible. At this point in time it is impossible to provide figures in relation to the seminar. However, the fees for the seminar have been estimated to offset costs.

FAMILY DAY CARE

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a very brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about family day care.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: On 4 June I asked the Minister a series of questions relating to the continuation of the family day care programme. The Minister answered all but one of those questions relating to the amount of the financial allocation for family day care positions for the financial year 1980-81 left unspent. My information was that $50 000 earmarked for this purpose was not spent. At the same time, positions in some schemes had been frozen.

The Minister said that he would ascertain whether this figure was accurate, but as yet I have not received a reply. The financial year has ended and I believe that in the meantime some positions which had been frozen have now been filled. Is it true that $50 000 allocated for family day care positions was not spent at the time I asked my question on 4 June? If so, was that money subsequently allocated? If not, how much was left unspent as at 30 June and why? Finally, how many family day care positions were frozen as at 30 June and in which schemes?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The questions are in some detail and I will obtain answers and bring down a reply.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides $310 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Honourable members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for $260 000 000 and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. This second Bill is for $310 000 000, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to $310 000 000. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON URANIUM RESOURCES

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended until Wednesday 28 October 1981.

Motion carried.

PLANT VARIETY RIGHTS

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. B. A. Chatterton:

That this Council believes that the introduction of plant variety rights is not in the best interests of Australia and calls on the Minister of Agriculture at meetings of the Agricultural Council to oppose the legislation introduced into the Federal Parliament by the Minister for Primary Industry.

(Continued from 19 August. Page 435.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I oppose the motion. The Hon. Mr Chatterton, on Wednesday 19 August introduced a motion into the Legislative Council which states that p.v.r. is not in the best interests of Australia and calls on the Minister of Agriculture to oppose the legislation when discussed at Agricultural Council. I believe that this motion is premature. The general public is only now becoming fully aware of the pros and cons of this proposed legislation, and I am therefore anxious that these arguments be fully developed before this Parliament takes an irreversible course. There are some advantages which cannot be ignored and to neglect these at this time may be unwise.

The broad philosophy of p.v.r. is the same as that of the patent system in that it gives a person ownership of plant material, just as a person can gain ownership of an invention. It falls outside the concept of patent law, in that p.v.r. can be granted for a naturally occurring substance that cannot be disclosed in the same way as an invention for which a precise specification can be written.

The criterion for obtaining p.v.r. is simply that the plant material has not been used before, that it is identifiable and sufficiently uniform and stable. With p.v.r. the breeder (inventor) does not need to have performed an inventive act other than would be expected to occur in the normal exercise of plant breeding skills. An invention on the other hand is a material end-point of a new idea.

A scheme to introduce plant variety rights into Australia has been under serious consideration for more than six years. Currently, a Bill has been tabled in the Federal Parliament that proposes to introduce a scheme limited to give protection to breeders of ornamental plants, horticultural plants and plants for use as pasture or fodder. The

major field crops are thus excluded. The Bill will remain tabled for public debate until the autumn session of 1982.

A total of 45 other countries recognise plant variety rights. The State Governments are divided in their support, a fact made apparent at the last meeting of Agricultural Council. Western Australia originally vigorously opposed the proposal as a whole but now would probably support the Bill, provided that the major crops and annual pasture species were specifically excluded. Victoria generally supports the Bill, but Tasmania would prefer other alternatives to be considered, such as breeders being able to recover costs from seed sales. Both New South Wales and Queensland want more time to obtain informed public opinion.

The Australian Wheatgrowers Federation originally gave no support to the proposal but recently has changed sides, and is anxious to have field crops included. It is now believed, however, that this changed attitude at the national level has caused considerable concern within some of the affiliated State organisations. The United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia are strongly opposed to the inclusion of field crops.

The proposal to introduce plant variety rights is naturally being given strong support by horticultural bodies, nurserymens associations and seed producers of pasture species who believe that it will give them access to a wider variety of species.

The general public is not well informed, but a few groups, such as the Soil Association, the Nature Conservation Society and Freedom from Hunger, are strongly opposed, believing that basic plant breeding material will become the property of giant corporations and that it will be difficult, particularly for developing countries, to purchase new and improved crop cultivars. Considering this lack of consensus, it would probably be wise to allow further South Australian public debate, and in that case the Hon. Mr Chatterton's motion is premature.

The honourable member's arguments are considered technically sound for major field crops and pastures and can be summarised as follows. First, private breeding will probably concentrate on cosmetic breeding, that is, producing a new cultivar which is as close as possible to a variety that is already commercially successful but sufficiently different to obtain p.v.r. in its own right. Secondly, plant breeding is dominated by public breeders in Australia. There is little capacity to stimulate private breeders.

Thirdly, claims have been made that funding plant breeding from royalties is a more equitable method than from tax revenue. The honourable member rightly claims that public institutions will still have to do the basic breeding work. This is, of course, in accord with the major field crops. As farmers raise research funds by levying themselves on a production basis they would be paying twice if p.v.r. was established.

Fourthly, the Hon. Mr Chatterton rightly claims that major crop developments have not been held back by the lack of breeders access to gene-pools. Vines and lucerne are two recent examples, he quotes, of new varieties being developed in South Australia for our needs without being restricted because p.v.r. prevented breeders access to new material.

Fifthly, the Hon. Mr Chatterton also believes that it would be administratively wasteful to retrict p.v.r. to a few horticultural and ornamental crops with the possibility of extending it to other crops continually hanging over our heads. On these grounds, he opposes the Bill currently tabled in the Federal Parliament and still under debate at Agricultural Council.

These are sound grounds on which to oppose the Bill being extended to crops other than horticultural crops and ornamentals. However, they do not answer the proponents' claim, which appears to be correct, that Australia is currently being denied improvements in horticultural crops and ornamentals because there is no protection.

It is also incorrect to argue that private breeders in large companies would deliberately produce varieties requiring massive inputs of fertilisers or crop protection chemicals. It is not feasible to manipulate plants to such a degree, and, if it were, growers would soon learn not to purchase such varieties. It is probably also unwise to condemn the proposed scheme on the basis of costs. The Bill, as tabled, proposes that the scheme becomes self supporting once established.

In summary, the honourable member has some sound arguments in regard to field crops but there are strong arguments to the contrary in regard to horticultural crops and ornamentals. This is the main point: the very reason why the Bill has been tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament is to enable further public debate. It would be a shame to stifle such debate to some extent by expressing the belief of this Council mentioned in the motion at this stage and endeavouring to bind the Minister now. He should be left free to consider the public debate. The honourable member has contributed substantially to such debate, and doubtless his motion and the debate on it and the publicity it has received will stimulate further debate.

This Council should not express its belief until such debate has concluded and should not try to urge the Minister to take a particular course before he has had the opportunity of considering not only honourable members' views, which were well expressed, but also other views that may come forward. For those reasons, because I believe that the motion is premature, and because it does not adequately address the advantages to be gained in the horticultural and ornamental crops, I oppose the motion.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PENSIONER DENTAL CARE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its serious concern at the inadequate dental care of pensioner patients. The Council deeply regrets the failure of the Government to implement its specific election promise to upgrade public dental services. In particular, it deplores the decision of the Government to abandon plans to train and register clinical dental technicians or dental prosthetists to deal directly with patients requiring full dentures.

The PRESIDENT: Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Neglect of the dental care of low income and pensioner patients and their dependants in Australia in the past 30 years has been an international disgrace. By standards generally accepted in developed countries, our record in this area is one of the worst in the world.

It is clear that fee-for-service dentistry as it is presently organised simply cannot meet most of the requirements of the disadvantaged in our community. It is equally clear that the Federal Government has taken a deliberate and characteristically callous decision to abdicate all responsibility in this field.

The Tonkin Government has been a consistent supporter of the so-called 'user-pays' policies of the Fraser Government. It has accepted that health care, including dental health and comfort, is a State Government responsibility. Today I wish to compare the torrent of words with the reality. In August 1979 the Liberal Party issued its health policy during the State election campaign. On dental health it stated, *inter alia:*

We recognise the need to urgently upgrade the organisation of public dental services. The existing services to pensioners at the dental hospital will be improved. We will phase out the need for pensioners to travel long distances to the dental hospital in Adelaide. We will provide service to pensioners at dental surgeries close to such persons' homes.

These were bold, unequivocal promises. They were promises, like so many others of this Government, made in the first fine flush of a campaign. Let us examine the reality. On 24 December 1979, the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson), announced that a Committee of Inquiry into Dental Services had been established. The Minister was repeating an exercise done 12 months earlier. In May 1979, the Review of Dental Services in South Australia had provided a blueprint for dental services in the 1980s. However, the Minister was determined to put her own ideological stamp on any considerations. Accordingly, we had yet another committee and yet another review.

During 1980, while the committee was involved in its review, three small public dental clinics for pensioners and financially disadvantaged persons were established. These were at the Flinders Medical Centre (February 1980), the School of Para Dental Studies, Gilles Plains (April 1980), and the Parks Community Health Centre (July 1980). As a first step this was commendable, although it should be pointed out that this initiative was generated by the previous Administration. By the time the committee of review produced its report in August 1980, the Government was already in deep financial trouble. This problem was gravely compounded by the Minister's decision to enthusiastically support her Federal counterpart in shifting the financial burden of health care back to the States.

Figures produced by the South Australian Council of Social Service in May 1980 show why three small dental clinics alone cannot even make a dent in the problem. A.B.S. figures which they produced show that 211 600 South Australians over the age of 15 years wear full upper and lower dentures (22 per cent of the population). About a further 4 per cent of the population—more than 50 000 people—have no natural or false teeth at all. The committee of inquiry put the massive problem in perspective when it said at page 26:

Although there is insufficient data available to provide a complete picture of dental health among adults in South Australia, the extent of the need is much wider than the supply and maintenance of dentures. Whilst most publicity has surrounded the availability of dentures for aged pensioners, the majority of people in the other disadvantaged groups, including the unemployed, will require a broad range of preventive and restorative services.

The numbers of these people who can be classified as disadvantaged can be estimated as follows: first, more than 140 000 persons in South Australia hold a Pensioner Health Benefit Card; secondly, an estimated 40 000 are in receipt of unemployment benefits plus an estimated 7 000 wives dependent on their husband's unemployment benefit as the sole family income; and, thirdly, approximately 60 000 'low income earners' as currently specified who qualify under the Commonwealth Government's means test for health cards under the new scheme. Spouses would account for another 30 000 in this category.

In estimating these figures, I have left out dependent children, on the rather optimistic presumption that school dental services will continue. On conservative estimates, the number of pensioners, unemployed and 'working poor' totals 270 000 persons. In other words, more than 250 000 South Australians have little or no access to dental treatment based on a private practice, fee-for-service basis because of their inability to meet the cost.

It is little wonder that the demand at public dental clinics is so enormous. What has happened with the establishment of three clinics in addition to the dental school is that the demand has simply been spread around more. It is playing with statistics to suggest that the demand is now lower at the dental school. The Government has simply spread its waiting list into the suburbs. The committee of inquiry did suggest ways in which the problem could be solved in both Adelaide and the country areas. It recommended several combinations of public dental clinics in recognised hospitals and subsidised fee-for-service. It is interesting to note that in 1980 it said:

. . . expenditure on public clinics in recognised hospitals would qualify for cost-sharing on a 50:50 basis with the Commonwealth Government.

What is the position now? It would be very interesting to hear an updated summary on that when the Minister replies. Has the Minister been able to retain that provision in the renegotiation of the agreement, or has it been given away? In any case, of course, it is almost a hypothetical consideration in the present climate. There is little likelihood in the remaining period of its sorry term that this Government can take any initiatives in this area. All the reports, all of the studies, all of the recommendations are worth nothing without the Government's being able to find the money. Initially, about $3 000 000 a year would see a dramatic improvement in the dental service for disadvantaged and pensioner patients. It is estimated that this would fall to approximately half that amount within two years. But the Government, on its own admission, is now literally broke.

I turn now to the question of dental technicians and dental prosthetists. Dental technicians in South Australia have been dealing directly with the public for more than 40 years. They have been making and supplying dentures direct to patients. Certainly, there has been a widespread demand and a community acceptance of the practice. Yet it is still illegal under the Dentists Act. Technicians have legally provided dentures directly to the public since 1957 in Tasmania, since the mid-1970's in Victoria and since 1978 in New South Wales. I will return to the operation of the dental prosthetists scheme in New South Wales later.

In 1976, the Parliamentary Labor Party in South Australia appointed a Caucus committee to investigate the desirability and feasibility of granting dental technicians the right to deal directly with the public—so-called chairside status. That committee heard extensive and exhaustive evidence from all interested parties. These included the dental technicians themselves, the Australian Dental Association (S.A. Division), the Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry and senior dentists with the South Australian Health Commission. It visited dental laboratories and the dental school. I was a member of the committee during the entire period, as of course was the Hon. Miss Levy.

Some reservations were expressed about the ability of technicians to recognise pathological conditions of the oral cavity in patients presenting to them. Members of the committee fully investigated these objections and satisfied themselves that, subject to satisfactory requirements for registration, this would not be so. As I will show later, this finding was later endorsed by Mrs Adamson's committee of inquiry. Consideration was also given to the quality and cost of service in the provision of dentures. It is obvious that this is an area in which some dentists in general practice do not possess a superior degree of skill. This is borne out in the Annual Report of the New South Wales Department of Consumer Affairs 1979-80. It is significant that in the report the Commissioner notes that most complaints against dentists investigated by the department in that year related to fitting dentures for the elderly. The report stated:

The main and continual area of dissatisfaction concerns the fitting of dentures.

It is obvious from the number of complaints that come to members of Parliament in South Australia (and I am sure

that members on both sides have had that experience) that a similar situation exists here. The other major complaint from pensioners is the very high cost.

Ultimately, the Caucus committee recommended that a scheme be introduced for the training and registration of dental technicians and clinical dental technicians or dental prosthetists. The major reasons were: first, the price differential. It was estimated that dental technicians could supply dentures direct to patients at a consistent saving of 30 to 35 per cent. In this respect it is interesting to note that the technicians were quite willing to be subject to price control; secondly, there was a strong and continuing demand for the services of clinical dental technicians, and, thirdly, it was considered that, subject to suitable qualifications and experience, it was unlikely that the oral health of prospective patients would be prejudiced. On the contrary there was a strong feeling that patients who might otherwise be subjected to pain and distress caused by worn and ill-fitting dentures would be more likely to avail themselves of the services of clinical technicians because of the cost savings.

It was conceded that in an ideal situation clinical technicians or prosthetists should provide dentures to the patients at chairside under dental supervision. However, this could only be achieved in the event of Federal funding being available. That was unlikely at the time. The possibility since has become even more remote.

After long and careful negotiations between the South Australian Health Commission, the A.D.A. and the Dental Technicians, a Bill was prepared for the South Australian Parliament. Ironically, the then Minister of Health was carrying the Bill in his briefcase on the fateful day that Parliament was prorogued for an early election in 1979. That legislation proposed that a board be established to register dental technicians and advanced dental technicians or prosthetists. Dental technicians were to undergo a course of technical training. They would be qualified in all areas of prosthetics, including advanced crown and bridge work. However, they would not be allowed to deal directly with patients. They would work in a laboratory situation on the instructions of a dentist or dental specialist.

On the other hand, advanced dental technicians or clinical prosthetists would be required to do an additional course. They would be registered and qualified to deal directly with patients in the supply and fitting of full dentures.

In addition, there was the usual 'grandfather' clause for registration. Existing technicians who had practiced for some years and could satisfy the board concerning their competence were to be granted a period during which they could apply for registration. The proposed courses were to be conducted by the Further Education Department.

It is interesting to note that at that time the South Australian Division of the A.D.A. had reached an accommodation with the South Australian Health Commission and the dental technicians. Immediately following the change of Government, however, they embarked on a course of second chance. I regret to say that their action appears to have been almost entirely a move for income protection and maintenance. It is impossible to reconcile their change in attitude between August 1979 and October 1979 on any other basis.

The Minister's committee of inquiry ultimately recommended in August 1980 that the scheme should not proceed. This was done on quite spurious grounds. Dealing with Illegal Dentistry, at 3.6 on page 65, the report states:

> The dental technicians organisations estimate that about 85 per cent of dental technicians in South Australia contravene the Dentists Act (1931-1974) by performing some illegal dentistry. Whereas the overwhelming majority do so on a part-time basis, it is estimated that about 16 dental technicians are engaged full-time in the illegal supply of complete (full) dentures to the public.

The committee then proceeded to estimate the number of people who were supplied with full dentures by technicians. This figure was written down to a conservative 30 per cent. Yet in appendix 14 the committee discarded the existing market, and completely failed to take into account those people who currently go to dental technicians for their prosthetics work and dentures.

In an extraordinary piece of logic, it presumed that the present clientele would be retained by the technicians but took no account of the existing cost saving. In estimating its cost saving figure it simply presumed a figure of an additional 10 per cent of people going to registered technicians. Not only will this Government not proceed with legislation to register technicians but Mrs Adamson also has indicated that the provisions of the Dentists Act will be enforced and that technicians dealing direct, as well as being denied registration for chairside status, will be prosecuted. Those two positions obviously cannot be reconciled. The committee also conceded (and I quote directly from the report):

> that dental technicians with suitable training would be capable of dealing with the public in the construction, fitting and repair of complete (full) dentures.

However, on cooked-up figures it denied them the right of registration. Furthermore, the Minister now says she will treat them like criminals. Unfortunately, a shonky deal appears to have been done with the A.D.A. for price maintenance.

Let me indicate to the Council just some of the sort of people, the consumers, from whom the demand for registration of dental prosthetists for chairside status comes. Brigadier R. A. Stewart, State Social Secretary of the Salvation Army in South Australia, in a letter to the South Australian Secretary of the Dental Technicians Association, Mr Howard Harris, said on 17 March 1980 (St Patrick's Day):

> The matter of the replacement of dentures for pensioners and underprivileged people has been a matter of concern for many years, because people in this group mainly are not able to afford the cost of new dentures, although greatly in need.
>
> It would be greatly appreciated if legislation could be passed so that the general public could deal directly with a dental technician when requiring dentures.

The State Secretary for the Aged and Invalid Pensioners Association of South Australia (E. J. Fryar) wrote to Mr Harris on 22 February 1980 as follows:

> I was directed to inform you that we consider that the direct access ... is advantageous and the cost something which the pensioners can afford. We entirely support this action.

Mrs Nan Sellick, Organising Secretary of the Housewives Association Inc. (S.A. Division) on 24 March 1980 stated:

> It is now our pleasure to confirm our verbal advice, fully supporting your move to bring South Australia into line with the other States ... we feel strongly that the service provided by the technicians would be more than invaluable to all concerned and we wish you well in your submissions for the cause.

Kevin Stewart, New South Wales Minister of Health, the man responsible for the dental health of one-third of the population of Australia, in writing to Mr R. F. Scott, O.A.M., President of the Dental Prosthetists Association of New South Wales, on 4 June 1981 stated:

> The Government is indeed heartened to see how well the legislation is working and to see how well the Dental Technicians Registration Board is proceeding with the task of carrying out the requirements of the statute. It is now patently clear that the opposition which was raised at the time this Bill was introduced into Parliament was not soundly based and in fact was prompted by unsubstantiated forecasts of patient dissatisfaction and fears which have since proved to be totally without foundation.

It is interesting to note that there is a price difference of $121 in the fee scales for full upper and lower dentures between dentists and prosthetists in New South Wales.

Finally, I refer to a letter from R. J. Hamer (the former Premier of Victoria) dated 7 July 1981 to Mr James A. Jeffrey, president of the Dental Technicians Association of Victoria, as follows:

Thank you very much indeed for your letter on behalf of the Dental Technicians Association of Victoria on the occasion of my retirement as Premier of Victoria. I did appreciate your generous comment.

I have valued the association with the dental technicians from time to time over recent years, and I agree with you that the profession has made some striking advances and is now better organised and in much higher standing than ever before. The association throughout behaved in a highly responsible and sensible manner and this made all the easier the co-operation and support which we were very ready to give you. Any such support or encouragement which I have been in a position to afford to your goals has been most willingly and gladly given, and I would like to respond to your good wishes and reciprocate with warmest regards and best wishes for your future success.

Obviously, the Minister of Health in New South Wales, Mr Kevin Stewart, and the former Premier of Victoria, Mr Dick Hamer, both of whom had been in Parliament during the introduction of legislation in those States and both of whom had had dealings about the dental procedures and the organisation of practice, were entirely satisfied and remained entirely satisfied.

The original proposed Bill, with one minor amendment, is currently on the Notice Paper in the House of Assembly. It has been introduced there by my colleague the member for Napier. When all else failed, the present Minister argued that the Government could not afford the cost of this legislation. With respect, that is absolute rubbish. Once the Bill is passed, it could be proclaimed in stages. In that way, technicians who are already competent and practising chairside could be registered at virtually no cost.

This Minister, or her successor, could decide whether to proclaim the sections relating to further training and registration at some time in the future. Personally, I would prefer the entire Bill to be proclaimed at the one time and for education for technicians and in advanced prosthetics to be a package deal, but what I have said would overcome the real problem of what we should do in the short term for those people who have been earning a living *bona fide* by providing dentures over a number of years.

It seems wrong to declare these people to be outside the law, when the public at large perceives them to be providing a genuine service to the people. It would at least give existing practitioners, those whom the Minister would brand as outlaws and criminals, a chance to practice within the law. I ask all members to support this motion and to urge our colleagues in the House of Assembly to support the proposed legislation.

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

CASINO

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. J. R. Cornwall:

That the Legislative Council requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee to inquire into and report on the implications of the establishment of a casino in South Australia and what effect and potential a casino may have on the tourist industry in this State. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 530.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I oppose this motion. I believe that we are all aware of the reasons behind it. A member of another place indicated that he intended to introduce a private member's Bill to allow a decision to be made on whether a casino should be licensed in this State, and I believe that the main reason for the motion before us is that Labor members consider that he has stolen a march on them and is getting publicity that perhaps they would like to get. That is not a proper way to conduct affairs in the Parliament.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: That's almost small minded, isn't it?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I think one could call it small minded. I think that poor Mr Peterson in another place has been subjected to not entirely kind treatment, and I believe that this motion is another attempt to thwart him regarding a Bill on which Parliament can decide whether a casino should be licensed in this State. I believe that we have open minds. We have always had open minds. I cannot see how a Select Committee report is going to have any effect if there is a conscience vote, unless we put everyone in the Parliament on the Select Committee. We all have to do our own investigations and work out whether we approve the licensing of a casino.

I can imagine what would happen with this Select Committee. I am inclined to agree with Mr Peterson that members of the committee, to prepare what is called an intelligent and constructive report, would have to visit other States where casinos are operating, and the net result would be a rather protracted Select Committee. In the end, members would not be bound by the report of this Select Committee, anyway.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: And you would have lost a packet.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. Most members, in their Parliamentary lives, have been to Tasmania or some other place where there is a casino and have seen casinos in operation. I am sure they can make up their minds and listen to submissions by members of the community, which have been made and which will continue to be made. There will be public debate on the Bill and, as the matter is one of conscience, I believe that it should not be subjected to a lengthy Select Committee, the purpose of which is to have Mr Peterson's moment of glory stolen from him.

If the Bill is passed in another place, this Council will have the opportunity to debate it. I believe that we should await the outcome of the debate there and see what the result is, and not support, in the Hon. Mr Cornwall's words, political grandstanding in this Council, when the matter has not been debated in the place where it was initiated by the member for Semaphore. I oppose the motion and call on all other members to do so as well.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE secured the adjournment of the debate.

COOBER PEDY (LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXTENSION) BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Bill, 1981, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1980.

Motion carried.

CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Cremation Act, 1891-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this short Bill is to remove from the Cremation Act the provision that requires a crematorium to obtain the approval of the Governor to any variation of its cremation fees. The Government endorses the views of the Enfield General Cemetery Trust and the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust that the requirement for approval of fee increases is both cumbersome and anomalous, as neither burial nor cremation fees are now subject to price control, and there is no such statutory requirement for approval in relation to cemetery charges, which are at a similar level to cremation fees.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals the section that deals with approval by the Governor of scales of fees fixed by crematoriums.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 529.)

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: In rising to speak to this Bill, I must say that the Opposition does not have any problems about supporting clause 2, which amends section 94 of the principal Act. As it stands, the Act causes grave inconvenience and embarrassment to would-be voters when seeking a declared vote. The average person would believe that by presenting themselves at a polling place and asking to make a declaration, they could do it on the spot. They find it almost unbelievable that the presiding officer cannot accept their declaration. Sometimes they are quite hostile when told that they could not get a vote until they had found the returning officer or his deputy and made their declaration.

This Bill gives authority to the presiding officer and will certainly restore harmonious relations between the voter and council polling booth attendants. Clauses 3 and 5 deal with the hours of voting. In South Australia, we have had a hotch-potch of polling booth times and of opening and closing times. Those responsible for enacting legislation in the past to establish times for the commencement of polling booth activity were obviously of one mind as far as opening times were concerned. For Federal, State and local government elections 8 a.m. was settled on as the opening time but, when it came time to quit, the time became confused and there were differences of opinion. We find that 8 p.m. was a popular time to close polling booths for Federal and State elections, but local government could close at 6 p.m. outside the metropolitan area; within the metropolitan area polling places stayed open until 7 p.m. These amendments to sections 120 and 804 of the Local Government Act will remedy this matter and all local council polling booths will close at 6 p.m. The Opposition can offer support for these clauses as it did for the amendments to section 94.

I now turn my attention to what may turn out to be quite a controversial part of the Bill, that is, clause 4, which substitutes a new section for section 755b. For the moment we are opposing the repeal of this section and its replacement with a new section. We feel that, if the Government wants to expedite the matters that I raised earlier in my speech, it should break this Bill into two parts.

Like the Government, we are anxious to see the matters of declaration of a vote and polling booth hours dealt with immediately so they may become operative at the coming October elections. The problem of declaration of interest is not a matter that has to be dealt with immediately. It has been with us for a good many years and a few weeks more will not make a great deal of difference. To some degree the present section 755b is at least understood and accepted by most councillors. I have chaired council meetings where councillors have declared an interest of even the most trivial connection, and it is probably better that way, for it brings any interest, no matter how minor, to the attention of the community. The new section contains all of section 755b plus a number of definitions, which are not all that clear. New section 755b (2) reads:

> In this section—
>
> 'interest' in relation to a non-profit making organisation means an interest arising by virtue only of being a member, trustee, officer or employee of the organisation:

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Are you talking about new section 755b?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Yes, the amending clause. For the benefit of honourable members, I will read out section 755b as it now stands. It states:

> For the purposes of sections 52 (1) *(d)*, 147 VIII and 755, a mayor, chairman, alderman or councillor shall not be deemed to be interested in any matter by reason only of the fact that he has an interest in, or takes part in any capacity in proceedings of, a non-profit making organisation that is a party to any contract or dealing with the council or that is affected by any discussion before or vote by the council.

That provision in section 755b has been transplanted into the amending clause. I draw honourable members' attention to new subsection (2), which has been added to the old section. That subclause refers to an 'employee'. I do not know how long one can employ an unpaid employee, and I draw that to the attention of honourable members.

Often, an officer such as a Treasurer or Secretary receives an honorarium. I know some community workers who work harder for community projects than they do for personal gain and who would draw no line in seeking advantage for the organisation of their favour. With the added incentive of a wage or honorarium, I consider that the risk of improper conduct is too open and that this warrants further investigation. 'Non-profit making organisation' is defined in new section 755b (2) as follows:

> 'non-profit making organisation' means—
>
> *(a)* a body, whether incorporated or unincorporated and whether constituted by or under an Act or otherwise—
>
> (i) the principal purpose of which is not to engage in trade or secure a profit;
>
> and
>
> (ii) that is so constituted that its profits (if any) must be applied towards the purposes for which it is established and may not be distributed to its members;

I refer to the word 'trade', which appears in that definition. Although they may not be its principal purposes, certainly trade and profit are major parts of most community organisations. I think of all the bottle and paper drives, fairs, raffles and cake stalls. They are certainly trade for profit, for the benefit of members, and, if a member of an organisation is a member of the local council, why should he not declare in council his interest in any matter affecting such an organisation? Money as such may not be distributed personally to members, but certainly any benefits from the funds raised are at the disposal of members. The definition of 'non-profit making organisation' continues as follows:

> *(b)* a body that is a governing body of, board of trustees for, or committees of any kind established by or for the purposes of, a body referred to in paragraph *(a)*.

I refer also to trustees and governing bodies. They may be responsible to a religious group or a private school, and could well have among their members professional men, such as architects, or property owners, who may also be members of the local council.

Matters may arise that indicate an expansion programme of the church or school, which programme could come in conflict with the council's planning and building by-laws or, indeed, with its health matters. Why should not that council member who is also an honorary member of that trusteeship or governing body declare his interests?

The Opposition considers that the new section is far from clear in its implications and, consequently, that it needs more time to be thoroughly researched. We have no hesitation in supporting changes to sections 94, 120 and 804, but ask that the Minister reconsider action on section 755b. We ask again that the Minister split this Bill so that we can have more time to deal with section 755b.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.16 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 27 August at 11 a.m.