

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 1, 1974

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**BRIGHTON TO CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY
DUPLICATION AND EXTENSION BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 412 ratepayers of the District Council of Pinnaroo expressing dissatisfaction with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and praying that the Legislative Council would reject any legislation to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission in respect of the Pinnaroo district.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My question is directed to the Acting Minister of Lands, as Acting Leader of the Government in this Council. Under the present powers of a Government in a sovereign State, what action has the Government taken to overcome the expensive and ridiculous hold-up of steel on the wharves at Port Adelaide?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I assure the Leader that the Government has done everything possible to bring some semblance of sanity into the confrontation at Port Adelaide as regards the movement of steel. I believe that the matter has now gone before the Trades and Labor Council disputes committee and, in the circumstances, there is nothing more that the Government can do. I assure the Leader that the Premier has made direct representations to the unions concerned and has done everything possible to resolve the situation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: What action has been taken?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The action was outlined by the Premier recently, and I am sure that the Leader is aware of what action the Premier took. It would therefore be repetitious if I outlined the action, too. The Premier made personal representations to the unions concerned to try to get them to resolve their differences. I do not know what other action is available at this stage. According to the Premier, no other action is available to the Government. I hope the matter will be resolved as I have outlined.

MONARTO

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands, as spokesman for the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Callaghan report, which I have read with interest, charts the way ahead as regards the future activities of the Agriculture Department in this State. I believe that the Government has accepted the report, and I therefore suppose that the Government intends to carry out most of its recommendations. I think there is some apprehension, at least in the minds of public servants generally and certainly in the minds of members of Parliament and the public, about what the Government's attitude is in regard to moving Government departments to the new town of Monarto. From time to time we

receive fragments when, through questions, some information is squeezed out of the Government. Will the Minister ascertain which departments will be moved from the metropolitan area to Monarto, when it is expected that the moves will be made, and when public servants will be notified of the Government's decision?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I thought it was made public some time ago which departments would move to Monarto—the Agriculture Department, the Lands Department and the Environment and Conservation Department. Further, I believe that certain sections of other departments like the Engineering and Water Supply Department—

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is what I want to know—which other departments?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will try to figure out what the honourable member means and bring down a reply.

PETROL SUBSIDY

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands, as Acting Leader of the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I refer to the Commonwealth Government's reported withdrawal of the price maintenance subsidy on petrol. The effect of the subsidy was to maintain the price of petrol at not more than 5c for 4.5 litres above capital city prices. It is recognized policy that Governments may use public money to prevent prices from becoming unreasonable in regard to a number of different sectors of the community. One of the most recent examples was the setting up of the Land Commission in South Australia to use Government money to prevent home builders in the metropolitan area from having to pay unreasonable prices for metropolitan building land. Will the State Government make representations to the Commonwealth Government calling on it to reinstate the petrol subsidy and, if the representations are unsuccessful, will the State Government itself provide a subsidy to prevent the price of petrol in remote areas from becoming unreasonable?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As this must be a Government decision, I will take up the matter with the Premier and the other members of Cabinet to ascertain exactly what the situation is likely to be.

PREMIER'S OVERSEA VISIT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that there was in today's *Advertiser* a reprimand of the Premier by that newspaper for not as yet providing Parliament with details of his recent overseas tour or, to put it more correctly, tours? Further to my question of July 23, when I asked the Minister for details of his overseas trip, and his reply thereto, I ask whether the Premier has yet completed his report to the Government and, if he has, whether he will make it or a resume of it available to the Council in due course.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot comment on this morning's *Advertiser* report, as I did not see it. However, I think it is most unlikely—

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It was not a reprimand. You can believe that!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think the *Advertiser* would reprimand the Premier in these circumstances, because he, as the Leader of the Government in this State, visits overseas countries from time to time (as do other Premiers throughout Australia) in the interests of the

people of the State. The honourable member was once a Minister of the Crown in the South Australian Parliament and visited overseas, but I do not remember his putting in a report.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No, you are wrong.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If the honourable member wishes the Premier to file a report and table it (whatever the case may be; I will look at his question) I will bring down a reply in due course.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister of Agriculture was in error when he said that, as a Minister of the Crown, I visited overseas. I did not partake of an overseas tour.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You were one of the few who missed out.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are completely out of order.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was not my privilege—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat while I make an observation. Continual interruption while questions are being asked or answered is completely out of order. I ask honourable members to observe this. The Hon. Mr. Hill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Thank you, Mr. President. I was saying that it was not my privilege to visit overseas while I held office as a Minister of the Crown in the South Australian Parliament.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On July 24 I asked the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Local Government, a question regarding the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Has he a reply?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister of Local Government states that ratepayers and any other interested parties have already had the opportunity to make representations to the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Both Houses will be given sufficient time to study the first report of the Royal Commission and the subsequent legislation that will be introduced by the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. All members will be able to make any representations during the ensuing debate on the legislation.

MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to give an explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was reported last year that Memorial Hospital might have to close unless it received aid from the State Government. The matter was further pursued in the press last month, when it was stated in a report that the hospital had been denied aid. The newspaper report further states:

The South Australian Government has refused a subsidy to assist the Memorial Hospital in a \$5 000 000 rebuilding plan.

There follows a further explanation of the problems the hospital must face because of the unfortunate situation confronting it. Can the Minister say whether the Government's refusal to assist the hospital financially is final or whether, in view of the splendid record of the hospital

and the need for its services by the South Australian community, the matter can be reconsidered?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I assure the honourable member that, in the present financial climate, the decision is final. While I appreciate the good service given by the hospital over many years, I dispute the honourable member's statement about the definite need for the hospital. In the city area, 13.1 hospital beds are available for each 1 000 people, whereas in some places in outer areas the number is reduced to four beds or six beds a 1 000. So, the need is not so great in the metropolitan area for Memorial Hospital to remain open. The Government had to make its decision because of the problems being experienced with Glenside, Hillcrest, the Northfield wards, Port Augusta, Whyalla, and other hospitals. Finance is needed more urgently in those areas, and for that reason we are unable at this stage to grant the request.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I ask the Minister of Health whether he will correct the figures he has just given. He said 13.1 beds a 1 000 people were available within the city of Adelaide compared to four beds a 1 000 in the suburbs. Is he not forgetting that many of the patients occupying the 13.1 beds come from outside the metropolitan area? The figures are completely misleading, and almost mischievous, as given.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not intend to be either mischievous or misleading. The fact remains that, in terms of population, the figures I gave are practically spot on.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Is the Minister willing to seek from Memorial Hospital details of whence that hospital's patients come—whether they are drawn from the country, the suburbs, or the city areas? If the figures show that many patients come from country or suburban areas, will the Minister revise his decision not to provide finance for the hospital?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The answer is "No".

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree entirely with the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Springett concerning the statistics referred to by the Minister. These statistics will be completely misleading to anyone who reads them in *Hansard*. I ask the Minister to expand on and provide additional information about those figures. First, to what areas of the metropolitan area do those figures apply? Secondly, what is the population in that area, and, thirdly, what hospitals have been included to obtain the staggering figure of 13.1 hospital beds to each 1 000 of the population?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will get the necessary figures for the Leader.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I wish to direct a question to the Minister representing the Treasurer, and seek leave to make a brief statement before doing so.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The environmental study report on the Redcliff petro-chemical development contains the observation that the ultimate work force for the Redcliff project will be 1 100 people and, in the words of the report, those 1 100 people will be supporting an ultimate additional 8 000 to 9 000 people who will be supported by the project. This will mean a vast housing project

and the provision of schools, hospitals, medical care, dental care, and welfare needs. Bearing in mind the problem of finance, which may be a short-term problem, it is obvious that if the indenture Bill is to be introduced during the current session those problems may well be within its orbit. Can the Minister ascertain whether a report will be available before the Bill is introduced into Parliament showing how the Government intends to finance these projects, and can he say what time will be available to get the projects (the housing and ancillary services) finished so that the petro-chemical project will be able to advance successfully, if it is to get started at all?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand that Dr. N. J. Bonnin has recently invented a new device for use in hospitals to lift and transport sick and injured patients much more easily and safely than has been possible with equipment now in use. Has the Minister's department investigated this device? If it has, can the Minister say whether action is being taken to install it in Government hospitals in South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not aware of this invention. However, as some of my officers may know something about it, I will seek a report for the honourable member.

ARTHURTON-KADINA ROAD

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question of July 24 concerning the sealing of the Arthurtown-Kadina Road?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague states:

The priority for construction and sealing of the Agery-Cunliffe section of the Agery-Kadina Road is presently such that there is no possibility of assistance being made available by the Highways Department for several years. Subject to the availability of funds, and to the District Council of Clinton giving the work appropriate priority, assistance to maintain this road in reasonable condition will be considered. The road is local and under the care and control of the councils concerned and is considered to be in reasonable condition to carry the traffic volumes using it.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Flagstaff Hill Primary School,
Hackham South Primary School.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 31. Page 178.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I rise to speak in support of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. First, I pay my respects to His

Excellency for opening this session of Parliament. Like other honourable members, I extend my condolences to those people who have been bereaved, especially by the death of men who have had connections with this State in their Parliamentary work. I express my regret at the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, who was Governor-General after the last war; and also at the death of Edgar Rowland Dawes and Ernest Clifford Allen Edwards. The latter I knew, the former I did not. To the bereaved I offer my condolences.

I am intrigued and interested to notice that agricultural matters are high in the list of things mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. I remember that a year or two back comments were made that about two lines were devoted to agricultural matters. I congratulate the Minister on his work and on the fact that the work of his department comes higher up the ladder each year.

I am interested in that paragraph of the Speech to notice that a new dairy product is referred to, a substance called "dairy spread". I suppose one can say it is part butter and part margarine. No comment, when one bears in mind the efforts that have been made in the past to do away with either margarine or the monopoly of butter. Can the Minister say whether this new concoction, as a dietetic compromise between butter and margarine, has received the blessing of those who have a deep concern about the effects of fatty substances on our blood vessels and our bodies as a whole? If not, what will be done about it?

The next thing which interests me very much and which has been mentioned several times in this debate is the rationalization of the use of our presently known reserves of natural gas and petroleum resources. These commodities, petroleum reserves in the broad sense, are valuable products which have rationalized development all over the world, but it is a disturbing fact that we are using those resources, which are not limitless, very fast. Any country with its own oil or gas resources is in a fortunate position while they last, but whether they will last for long depends upon how wisely they are used and how carefully they are harvested. I am glad that an energy committee of appropriate experts will advise how best to use the basic products, such as crude oil, as well as the side products produced as a result of refinement. This is an important step.

Only thus can the fullest use be made of the products, to the best advantage of all people. We are told in the Speech that the Redcliff petro-chemical project is reaching the final stages of negotiation with the Government. We are told that legislation ratifying an indenture will come before this Parliament during this session. May I say here that, bearing in mind the extent, the influence and the effect of petro-chemical works, we are all most concerned that, when an agreement is ratified, every step will have been taken and nothing will have been left undone to ensure the safety of the people and the land around the area of the works. I will mention that again in a moment.

I see that we shall have this legislation before us this session. I ask honourable members to remember that such multi-national organizations as oil companies are basically responsible for the development and distribution of oil and its side products. Without these multi-national organizations, very little basic exploration and development would take place anywhere in the world. Unfortunately, when these companies succeed and prosper, certain forms of government condemn their success and regard it as a wicked thing; they are vocal in their determination to acquire the fruits of the labours of those companies, their

interests and their investments, and take them all over for the country in which the petroleum products were originally found.

It is right that the Government of the country concerned should have an important proportion of the return from that work, but I see no reason why these companies, which have high standards of care for their workers, should be condemned as though they were doing something wrong in carrying out their developments. I ask whether the full range of the hazardous possibilities has been completely studied and whether appropriate plans to ensure the safety of the ecology as well as the protection of the work force and the residents living in those parts of the country that could be affected by spill-overs and uncared for waste have been considered.

An enormous number of people will be in trouble if proper precautions are not taken. Last week the Hon. Mr. DeGaris made a point on this matter in his Address in Reply speech. Bearing in mind the disastrous consequence resultant on faulty control or lack of strict control, could we be told whether the Government is able to give this Parliament a definite assurance that all the necessary measures of safety are being provided, after every known potential hazard has been studied and taken into account? I wonder how many of us are aware of what petrochemicals really are. According to the International Labour Office *Encyclopaedia of Occupational Health and Safety*, the term "petro-chemical" was coined in 1945 by a group of plant manufacturers whose products were related to the petroleum and chemical industries. The term is now used to designate the products of that branch of the chemical industry which uses the following substances as raw materials: (a) gaseous hydrocarbons; (b) liquid hydrocarbons; and (c) solid hydrocarbons.

Petro-chemical research was started during the First World War. The first petro chemical product was probably a substance known as ethylene glycol. This dates back to 1919, just after the First World War. More than 100 main products result from the break-down of crude oil; all these 100 products or more are essential to maintain modern society's way of life, but it behoves us not to treat lightly the dangers attached to the use and preparation of petrochemicals. The first petrochemical, involving ethylene glycol, has several hazards. It is irritating to the eyes, skin and mucous membranes. When heated, or when it comes in contact with acid, it emits highly toxic sulphur fumes, so that the substance should be dealt with in a closed plant with exhaust ventilation which prevents the escape of harmful fumes. Suitable protective equipment for personnel is required. This sort of thing is common and mandatory for many chemical products. Of course, there are other hazards, too.

We do not know how many active petrochemicals the Government is planning to separate at Red Cliff Point. However, it is certain that many of the petrochemicals will have potential hazards that will require measures such as those I have outlined. These hazards are too severe to demand less than total care. We know, for instance, that not a few of the substances, if not guarded against, create the risk of causing certain types of cancer.

This is not the time and place normally to go into details about the petrochemicals that will be produced at Red Cliff Point. However, petrochemical products include plastics, sugar, leather, various kinds of rubber, printing ink, solvents, textiles, detergents, and paints. The time to go into the risks associated with these materials normally would be when we have before us the Bill seeking

the ratification of the indenture agreement. However, with such an important subject we cannot wait too long. I should like to know what provision has been made to date and whether it is complete. Further, I would like to know what medical knowledge was used by the Government in association with its advisers in drawing up and preparing the appropriate complex documents.

I should like now to say something about occupational health in general. Occupational health, like its counterpart community health, has become increasingly a multi-discipline science, with its edges blurred off into numerous fields. These include a good understanding of and close relationship with personnel management. They include also toxicology, pollution occurrence and control, industrial relations training, welfare, safety and public relations, as well as the continuing traditional art and practice of clinical medicine. This vast expansion into many fields has created many potential problems in the field of occupational health. The toxicity problem has enlarged the scope of potential dangers many-fold as the years have passed by.

A toxic substance may be toxic only in certain circumstances. The toxicity that affects people may act acutely or chronically. It may affect a person locally or it may get into the body generally and systemically and become widespread in its effect throughout the body. Many questions have to be asked and answered before a balanced opinion can be formed about the potential harmfulness of any given substance. Here we come back to Red Cliff Point and the petrochemical industry. Have all the questions been asked and have all the answers been found as regards the production and effects of these chemicals?

Regarding waste products, hazards to the health of the disposal operators have to be guarded against. Of course, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris pointed out last week, the risk of potential pollution of the total environment cannot be forgotten. This last problem can vary between being mildly irritating and highly lethal. It is so much more dramatic when one thinks of the total environment being polluted. When thinking about that, we must not forget that individual persons can be affected to individual degrees and in individual ways.

Doctors specializing in this occupational branch of medicine have to work in close harmony with the workers and trade unions as well as with management. The occupational doctor works in a sphere in which, to be successful, he must be acceptable to both sides of industry and be recognized as sympathetically orientated to both sides. The doctor must not be unduly favourable to either side. Advanced industrial countries have increasing numbers of doctors working in the industrial scene. As South Australia becomes more industrialized it will need an expansion of its occupational health services. This will involve not only doctors but also nurses, safety engineers, first-aid people, and all the other ancillary people who go to make up the occupational health team.

It is not possible to over-emphasize the risks to which an unknown number of people could be exposed if proper care is not taken. At the same time, the disturbance of nature's fine ecological barrier can be achieved easily, and with permanently irreversible effects, if things go wrong and are not guarded against. We are told from time to time that this is a pace-setting State. I submit that this is one field in which we should stop and think what we are doing before it is too late. We have no desire to be the pace-setter in relation to industrial diseases.

I turn now to a sphere which is of vital concern and in which all honourable members are interested, and

increasingly so nowadays: our present medical system for the public generally. I am not thinking of the clinical and technical achievements that have been made because, compared with those in other parts of the world, they cannot be faulted. At present, the basic problems seem to be providing a medical service which is acceptable, which is economically sound and which it is within the capacity of society to produce for its people. The quality of the service is a vital component. What can we afford?

Sweden is often quoted as the ideal country regarding the provision of social and medical services. Since becoming socialized some 20 years ago, its national costs for medical services have risen from \$305 000 000 to \$2 770 000 000 in 1972, which is a nine-fold increase. Associated with this cost rise is a growing distaste for the ever-increasing bureaucracy and a growing displeasure with the deterioration of the doctor-patient relationship. There is also a dislike of the disruption of the continuity of care of patients, a situation that is already reaching us here. Doctors in increasing numbers use services that carry out night and weekend work. This may grow in the coming months and years, and is not looked upon with much enthusiasm by patients.

I realize that this is not the time to open up the whole matter of the national health service *vis-a-vis* a private one. Suffice to say that the Commonwealth Government and our State Government have the same political ideology. This means that, however good our facilities and services are, doctrinaire policies insist that they must become Government agencies and nationalized, if not in one step, then bite by bite until there comes the day when there is nothing left outside the control of Government beyond a few tatty odds and ends.

Many improvements are required in our medical services on behalf of pensioners and families on low incomes. However, the rooting out of the good with the bad just for theoretical policies is the worst possible form of administration. We are all told that the Government is not nationalizing medicine but is simply intending to introduce a national health service. These are nice words, which were used in 1946-48 when Britain's health service was introduced. Today Britain, like Sweden, is crumbling under the burden of the embryo which has grown into a monster and which supplies a service of its own dictating. In Sweden the stage has been reached where one out of every 115 20-year-olds must become a doctor if services are to remain the same as are being given now. This is a subject that needs airing, and I am sure it will be aired from time to time.

From medicine in industry and medicine in society generally, I take the liberty for a few minutes of asking honourable members to join me in their imagination while I refer to part of the world where there is no argument whether health services shall run along a certain line. These services are so miniscule compared to the need and the size of the population that even an occasional visit from a doctor is hailed as an event. One finds that there is only one doctor to every 1 000 or fewer people in Australia. However, in the developing countries such as those on the west coast of Africa and in Ethiopia, there is virtually only one doctor to every 100 000 people. In 1972, Ethiopia had a population of 26 000 000 people with only 374 doctors to care for them. These are regular doctors and do not include those who have gone there to help in relief operations to combat the disaster that has occurred in that country.

The average annual income of the people in that part of the world is about U.S. \$100; 90 per cent of the people

work on the land and produce coffee, sugar cane and cotton in the hotter regions. In the middle zone they produce maize, wheat, barley, tobacco, potatoes and oil seeds. Industry is at the initial stage of development, and they are beginning to produce textiles, foodstuffs, tobacco, beverages, cement, leather, shoes, wood products, and so on. Salt, gold and iron are the principal minerals, and in the south-east they are drilling for oil. Again, the so-called wicked multi-national companies are doing the drilling and will combine with the Ethiopian Government in servicing any oil found. Once it is discovered, it will revolutionize that part of the world not only economically but also politically.

Ethiopia's balance of payments has been in deficit for the past 10 years. Like many other countries that are still developing, it has a disproportionate number of air-fields (72), although these have probably enabled the country to be opened up at a speed that would not have been possible, say, 60 or 70 years ago. In Addis Ababa there is one large international airport. In some parts of Australia, rain may not fall for, say, three or even five years, but this country and its people are more developed and organized, whereas most of the people in Ethiopia are simple nomads who live off of their one-crop-a-year economy. Therefore, if and when the rains fail the crops also fail; the harvest is then non-existent and, because there is no food, the people die. This picture is not really related to one country only: it could involve a swathe that cuts across the northern part of Africa from the Red Sea to the Atlantic in the west.

In this area it is a disaster picture that has been commonplace for the last few years. A disaster is declared, and international aid is invoked. Organizations such as the Red Cross, Oxfam, Austcare, Unesco, Unicef, and so on right through the alphabet, come to the aid of these people. Various groups help them, and shiploads of grain for food and seeding, drugs and dressings, doctors and nursing sisters are sent to help them. South Australia played its part in this respect. All these things were given and people were sent there to give relief in the immediate disaster period. But it is useless to regard them as other than emergency stopgaps. Agriculturists to help improve methods of working the land and the drilling of wells to provide more plentiful water supplies are most important for the future if these people are to survive and develop their own country for themselves.

Over and above all this, I am quite convinced that the one single item really needed is a family planning programme as a method of population limitation. The interesting thing to me is that, in some parts of the country in Ethiopia, simple people are asking for some method of contraception, recognizing from their experience that too many mouths to feed means no hope of survival at all and they would not be able to survive further droughts and famines with large families.

I have deviated, in what I have said, from the Speech by His Excellency, but I thought I would introduce a little balance to keep in the back of our minds when we hear so much about strikes for \$A20, \$A25, or \$A30 more a week. It leaves a feeling that something is wrong somewhere when we can live in comparative luxury, demanding more, when only half a world away are people in need and in want to a measure no-one in this country could ever know.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I support the motion of the Hon. Mr. Chatterton in reply to the Speech which, in a rather sketchy manner, outlined the intentions of the Government. I join with other members in wishing

His Excellency and Lady Oliphant the continued vitality that has taken them over most of the State and endeared them to many people. I feel deep regret at the passing of H. H. Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, a man who spent his life in the service of his fellow man. The late Edgar Dawes was only a name to me, but it is obvious that he was a man of great character, and I extend my sympathy to his family. I have personally expressed my sympathy to the Edwards family, but I should like to record here my appreciation of the sincerity and tirelessness of the late Ern Edwards, with whom I worked very closely during his term in Parliament.

While supporting the motion seconded by the Hon. Mr. Creedon, I do not agree with several of his comments. A one-House centralized power controlling the whole of Australia would produce a most chaotic situation. The Hon. Mr. Hill gave some good examples of why this would be so, and I shall not go further than to say that I agree entirely with him on this contentious subject. It supposedly works—quite well in Red China, but I sincerely hope it does not happen here.

Paragraphs of the Governor's Speech makes brief mention of primary industry and of how well the cereal growing season has advanced. The Governor's agricultural adviser told him of the very real possibility of losses that might occur because weather conditions might again be conducive to rust. It is worth mentioning, too, that the agricultural adviser on entomology is concerned that this could be a plague year for locusts. However, these are normal gambles attached to farming over which we have no control. We have the assurance of the Minister of Agriculture that his department will make available insecticides should locust hatchings be sighted. The department will also continue attempts to breed rust-resistant strains of wheat.

The problems confronting primary industry, however, are man-made, and no influence of the elements is as devastating as depressed prices. The price of wool must improve dramatically, or no longer will it be a viable product to produce in many areas. The last wool sales recorded an average price of 122.7c a kilogram, a price far less than wool was bringing four or five years ago, when the cost of production was only a fraction of what it is today.

The same can be said for meat, especially for beef. The thing that concerns the producer today is that, while he receives only half of what he received 12 months ago for a beast, the people who consume it are paying as much as they were paying when beef was a viable proposition. This is one of the things the Government must analyse, and it should do its best to make use of a depressed market so that the consumer demand can expand rather than the high cost of production always being passed on somewhere between the producer and the consumer, with no rebate to either.

I spoke of the cost of production as compared to present prices of wool, and I shall give a couple of examples of commodities that have contributed to this phenomenal cost of production. I can cite the instance of a plough which, 18 months ago, would have cost about \$3 000 to \$3,500, but which was quoted two months ago at a price of \$5 052. It was also quoted on a fortnight's delivery. After a wait of seven weeks the intending purchaser was informed that he could have the plough in a month's time, but it would cost an extra \$1 000. When we consider that firms without any control at all are able to increase the price of a plough by \$1 000 a month we get some idea of the way in which our cost structure is

spiralling—and it is spiralling without very much attempt to have it curtailed.

I quote from a publication of the Automobile Association of Australia, which makes several pertinent points about the way the cost of parts is escalating and asks for some concrete reason why such prices should be demanded. The report states:

A.A.A. also criticized non-serviceable or integrated components. It quoted the example of the distributor shaft of the imported VW 1600 "Super Bug." Estimated cost of the individual component was \$9 but the motorist had to buy the whole distributor at a cost of \$39.20. The trunnion nut for the gear lever ball retention in a Ford Escort had an estimated cost of about \$2.50 but the motorist had to buy the whole gear lever assembly, including even the dust boot, at a cost of \$15.31.

A few days ago I asked a question in this Chamber on this matter to find out why price control does not apply to these commodities when it applies to many other commodities.

Despite anomalous prices and the cost spiral, members of the Commonwealth Government would have the public believe that primary industry is of little consequence to the nation's economy and that Australia could import its food requirements. I point out to all members that every other nation in the world is currently finding it more and more difficult to feed its own population. Other countries are becoming more and more conscious that farmers must be kept producing, regardless of whether they are subsidized or not.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Our own balance of payments shows that.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes. Even Iron Curtain countries are disbanding their huge collective farms. For example, in Czechoslovakia people are again being reinstated on farms and, progressively, they are being provided with an incentive bonus based on their production. On the other hand, in Australia, despite politicians tripping round the world regularly, we still learn by trial and error. Why cannot we learn from the experiments and experiences of so many other countries which have proved the failure of many schemes?

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: We have to know what is happening on the Riviera.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: We have not had a report on that yet. The loss of the superphosphate bounty was a devastating blow to primary industry, because it was felt by many primary producers that the Government should have been doing something about reducing the cost of meat and other products, especially dairy products, required by the community, and that the superphosphate bounty should have been increased, because of the recent steep rise in the cost of superphosphate.

When it is realized that about 8 per cent of the Australian workforce produces between 50 per cent and 80 per cent of our export income, it would not be asking too much (and it would not be more than common sense) to ask that this section of the community be subsidized to obtain greater production, enabling it to supply its goods at a better price to the consumer. Taxation incentives, which were designed to provide more water and to subdivide and develop land, have been removed. Only recently the Commonwealth Government expressed concern about the action taken by the Wool Corporation in buying about 60 per cent of the wool presented at the last wool auction.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Thank goodness.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I agree. I cannot understand why, when we know from past experience that the current

depressed wool price will probably soon rise, any complaint is made. We have all seen these fluctuations, and I am surprised that the Commonwealth Government cannot see its way clear to buy this wool now. There is no problem in storing wool; it is a cheap and easy commodity to store. It does not deteriorate, and the Government would be making a wise investment if it bought huge quantities now and sold them on a rising market, which no doubt will soon eventuate.

The same tactics, I believe, should have been employed when there was a wheat glut. I said then, too, that if we had spent money on silos and had stored the wheat then available (instead of introducing wheat quotas) Australia would now be recouping millions of dollars on its investment.

Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech referred to rationalization in the use of our natural fuel resources from the Cooper Basin. No-one would disagree to that suggestion. Reference was also made to the undertaking of vigorous exploration to prove the area in the next decade and to determine its full potential. However, I find this statement to be somewhat in conflict with the comments made about the Redcliff project and the report by the Environment and Conservation Department. That report stated that the size of the proposed Redcliff plant could not be ascertained at this time, because resources were not fully known, and the one factor that was unresolved was the availability of the feed stock.

Yet we read that this exploration will be spread over the next 10 years. How viable is the Redcliff project? How genuine is the Government in its undertaking there? Several problems must be faced, and I refer to the availability of feed stock and the time involved in this project to determine finally the amount of feed stock available. Also, a careful examination should be made of the project in terms of pollution. How can we ascertain the amount of natural fuel that exists? I know of no body which can give us a true reading. On the one hand we have the Government, which is anxious to sell anything it can to balance its Budget, and on the other hand we have companies that are just as anxious to sell every part of their product. Therefore, it is difficult to get a true assessment of how much gas we really have and whether, in ten years time (say, when the Redcliff project is working), we will be able to tell our sons that there is an indefinite supply of gas in South Australia.

All fuel oils and natural fuel supplies are in short supply throughout the world. Therefore, I must ask whether having this multi-million dollar project to produce petrochemicals from our gas supplies is really a wise move. It has several weaknesses (perhaps not weaknesses but complexities) that I should like to see spelt out much more clearly than they have been in the report from which we are able to get our knowledge at present.

We know that petro-chemical plants and uranium enrichment plants are two of the world's greatest sources of pollution. The quality of our life in South Australia means more to me than a quick buck to the Government from our natural gas resources. There is no real doubt in my mind that the environment and the ecology in that area in which the complex is supposed to be built need protection. The Leader in this Council spoke of brine ponding, and local people in that area would agree with what he said. This is a porous type of country and it could not be expected that it would hold water in sufficient quantities for it to dry and be in a fit state to be returned to the gulf.

In paragraph 6 and, again in paragraph 14 of his Speech, the Governor mentions land acquisition for Monarto and land acquisition generally. In this Redcliff site we have an

example of how we have to be careful of what can be done by the Government through its land acquisition powers. I cite the case of Mr. A. W. Reilly, who claims that his freehold lot No. 154 in the hundred of Winninowie was acquired for the petro-chemical complex. He claims that he has spent 18 years of his life thoroughly researching the ecology, the geography, and all the potentials for creating a tourist haven. It is something of a lifetime dream, and also a family project. He has spent much money and is sure that he could turn that area, commonly known as Chinaman's Creek, into a tourist resort of great potential. But Mr. Reilly claims that, without due notice and (to use his own term) in the most unethical manner, he was deprived of this area of land, although it was freehold and was not really within the area originally assigned to the consortium.

One would have to consider whether the consortium itself had ideas of progressing with the 18-hole golf course and the yachting and ski-ing facilities envisaged by Mr. Reilly's project. He is a thorough and capable gentleman, and has given me a dossier of his findings which, should any honourable member be interested, is available for perusal. It is all indexed and contains a copy of the correspondence between him and the various Ministers, members of Parliament, and department heads with whom he is trying to negotiate a better deal. He says that compensation is not his concern: he wants his land back to proceed with his project, which in no way could be detrimental to the Redcliff project.

Another case of land acquisition that comes to mind is that of Mr. Elston, whose name, I think, has been mentioned previously in this Council. However, I think it is my duty to bring this matter again to the notice of honourable members. Mr. Elston, having put his block of land on the market to be sold by auction, was told, 1½ hours before the sale, that the sale could not proceed because the Highways Department all wanted to acquire his land for road-widening purposes. That stopped the sale. His land was valued and he appealed against the valuation, eventually getting \$3 000 more than was originally offered him by the Highways Department. However, the department, having acquired the land, then leased it back to the very person to whom Mr. Elston himself had been leasing it. So far, I do not think there has been any road-widening project there. Mr. Elston is, of course, justly annoyed with the authorities, believing he has had a miserable deal. I agree entirely with him.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think it may even have been illegal.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It may be. If all that he claims is true, I believe he has had a very shoddy deal. I know that the man has not finished with the case and I hope that somewhere along the line he can obtain justice.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I believe the Act refers to using the land "for the purpose acquired for".

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It sounds a little like the Burbridge Road case.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yes.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In paragraph 9 of his Speech, the Governor details the priorities for national highways and suggests that, some other areas of road grant will be considerably reduced. It is pleasing to see, now that we have to make reductions (and surely our nation is in such a plight that we would all agree that some reductions may be necessary), the continued granting of money for the Eyre Highway, the South-Eastern Freeway, and possibly the Stuart Highway (though perhaps that is ominous for the Stuart Highway). Nevertheless, they are mentioned,

and mention is made also of the construction of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway line and the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line. If the Commonwealth Government agrees to make that money available, as it said as far back as five years ago that it would, surely there should be no opposition from this State Parliament. I think we have always said in this Council that we should be so pleased to see the completion of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook line.

We will hear much more about the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Very few South Australian councils agree with the commission's findings, and they have a right to voice their opposition. I realize that no referendum will be held in this connection, but I sincerely hope that the suggested boundaries will be revised to make them more suitable to councils that have made representations. Some people in local government know a good deal more about their areas than do the members of the Royal Commission. It is claimed that the amalgamation of councils will streamline the amount of plant and the number of officers necessary to perform roadworks. The Royal Commission has made some council areas so much bigger that it would be necessary to establish even more depots than there are at present. This matter will come before Parliament before this session is finished.

I was somewhat intrigued with the newspaper reports of July 30 concerning the brawl at a Port Adelaide hotel. I was intrigued because it appeared to me that the Aboriginal woman who was arrested while talking to Senator Cavanagh through a public telephone should be congratulated on her initiative. She must be very smart, because she left a brawl and telephoned a Minister of the Crown—a somewhat unusual action. The practice is to telephone the police, but in this case the police were there. So, this woman was able to go to a public telephone booth and find the Senator's telephone number; that takes some doing, because in my experience one is very lucky to find a telephone book in a public telephone booth. Further, one is extremely lucky if one can decipher the numbers in the book by the light of the booth. The lady was also lucky that Senator Cavanagh was not far from his telephone when she rang. A report in the *Advertiser* states that Mr. Tilmouth, who appeared for the 16 Aborigines arrested, said that the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Senator Cavanagh) had become involved in the matter. Mr. Tilmouth is reported as saying:

I believe Senator Cavanagh wants to look into this matter, perhaps with a view of conferring with the Attorney-General (Mr. King) to have these charges withdrawn.

That part is all right, but the thing that concerned me was the headline in the *Australian* of July 30—"Black arrests made in panic, says Cavanagh". The article in the *Australian* is as follows:

The Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Senator Cavanagh, said yesterday that some arrests had been made in panic by South Australian police during a brawl between 300 Aborigines and British seamen on Saturday night.

This is a slur on the South Australian Police Force. To accuse them of panicking is to say that they were so frightened that they could not perform their duties properly. I should like Senator Cavanagh to know that I have the greatest respect and admiration for the South Australian Police Force, which is recognized throughout the Commonwealth as being perhaps the best force in Australia. I do not think it was fair of Senator Cavanagh, if he had that complaint to make about the Police Force, to dash off to the *Australian* to make the accusation. I support the motion.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I have said previously (and it is always true when I say it) that I have not intended to intervene in a debate. I did not intend to intervene in this debate until last evening, when my wife asked what seemed to me to be a very interesting question. She asked, "How, if you wanted to, would you go about altering a capitalistic system to a socialistic system?" Well, Mr. President, this seemed to me to be a pretty formidable question, which would probably take weeks of pondering before one could give the answer. But then I thought of all that I had been reading in the newspapers recently, and I felt capable of answering the question at once. So, I embarked on a reply.

First, I said that one would encourage inflation until it gradually became vast. This would have the effect of stopping people from becoming little capitalists (I remembered that Mr. Dedman had once said this) by stopping all incentive to save, as people would know that their savings would become worthless in no time. It would also destroy the value of all existing savings and wealth, except land and perhaps company shares, but those, of course, could be easily dealt with. Next, I said that one would control prices, not wages—thus adding to the chaos. After that one would advocate flat wage increases instead of percentage wage increases—the same amount in dollars for everyone, whatever the responsibility or capability of the person concerned. Then in no time, with a decent (or perhaps one should more correctly say "indecent") rate of inflation, everyone would be on about the same wage level.

As regards land, I quote: "Impose a capital gains tax, thus preventing land being a hedge against inflation." A capital gains tax would also have the result of giving the Governments concerned a vested interest in stimulating inflation, both by taxing the inflationary factor in all investments (land, company shares, etc.) and continually putting everyone into a higher tax bracket. As regards companies, the specification would be to have laws so that a tribunal would stop companies from replacing in full their steeply rising costs, thus gradually rendering them profitless. Then it could be said that the system had failed, and one could reduce the value of company shares to practically nothing.

I have dealt with inflation. The next ingredient would, of course, be high interest rates. This would be totally contrary to stated Labor Party policy, but it is another vital short-cut to Socialism. What happens when we get high interest rates? First, high interest rates prevent young people from buying their own houses, thus encouraging them to think that the capitalistic system is no good. High interest rates undoubtedly reduce profit. They must stop incentive in private enterprise; they must increase the prices of goods and services, and they must wreck the value of company shares.

The third ingredient would be to make money as scarce as possible, and even unobtainable at almost any cost. This would mean that business would not have the wherewithal to expand and then, of course, private enterprise could be accused of having no enterprise. Fourthly, confidence in capitalism can be sapped by statements from high places, statements such as that the banks are likely to crash. Does all this sound familiar to anyone?

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Extremely familiar.

The Hon. SIR ARTHUR RYMILL: Fifthly, tax hell out of everyone except those who have a large aggregate vote, thus also sapping all incentive for hard work. Next, make everyone totally and exclusively reliant on the Government for their health, care and welfare. Then, reduce the rural community to the breadline. Although this may sound silly, because we all need to be fed, they are the

small capitalists (most of them are, although there are the big ones, too) and must therefore be dispensed with at all costs. There can be no doubt about that in this specification to which I am referring. After all, collective farming can be ordered for the people's welfare when all else has been proved a failure.

Next (perhaps this is earlier in the categories) reduce the defence forces to a minimum so that ultimately there will be no-one to defend the country internally, let alone externally. Also, offend all our traditional oversea allies so that they lose interest in our country's welfare. I thought these out very quickly; they are only a few of the ingredients that I could think of quickly. There are also others that I hope honourable members will ponder. Above all blame everyone but oneself for all the ills from which the country is suffering and particularly blame the actions of former Governments, saying, "We did not create the situation: it was thrust upon us."

Finally, I should like to state that true Socialists are near-Communists, whatever the unrealistic or those who will not face up to it may care to say. I thought on December 8, 1972, which happened to be my 65th birthday (and, to save honourable members having to work it out, that means that I am now 66 years and seven months old), that Australia was possibly the most stable and prosperous country in the world. However, incredible things have happened in the short-time since then. Unless the ordinary people of this country soon awake from their up to the present feather-bedded and electric-blanketed slumbers, I fear for the future standard of living of every section of the populace.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): Briefly, I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. I was delighted to hear the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill make his contribution as it is only on rare occasions that we hear from him, particularly in reply to His Excellency's Speech. What he said today was much food for thought. Some of the things he said had substance; on others, he was treading on thin paper. Nevertheless, I found his speech quite enlightening compared to some of the speeches I heard during the debate. I like to hear an honourable member make a worthwhile contribution in a debate of this kind rather than get up and criticize merely for the sake of doing so, without backing up his criticism with facts.

The Hon D. H. L. Banfield: That is what Sir Arthur was referring to.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: We should be able to look forward to an interesting speech from you, then.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If the honourable member wants me to reply fully, I will do so. However, I said that I would speak only briefly to some of the points made during the debate that I thought were worthy of mention. Honourable members asked many questions, one of which concerned me, as Minister of Agriculture, directly.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You can say what you like, because on present form you will not be reported in the paper.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If the honourable member wants to make a speech, he still has plenty of time to do so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No, he has had his say.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Hon. Mr. Springett has referred to the butter oil spread, legislation regarding which is to be introduced this session. He asked whether this composition would affect the cholesterol count of people and, if it did, what I would do about it. I do not think this saturated product will please the medical profession,

which prefers people to use poly-unsaturated products. However, I believe that people should have the choice. If they choose to use a poly-unsaturated product, that is their choice and, if they want to use a saturated product, that is also their choice.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: That is, one way or the other.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is so. If people do not want it, they can buy something else. I assure honourable members that all their questions will be dealt with and considered, and I hope that they receive speedy replies to them. I thank the mover and seconder of the motion. As time passes, those new members will, as was pointed out by honourable members opposite, develop more confidence and contribute something to the future debates of the Council. I thank you, Mr. President, for the way in which you have handled some of the debates, interjections, and so on. I am sure that His Excellency will be pleased to receive honourable members next Tuesday.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that His Excellency the Governor has appointed Tuesday next, August 6, at 2.30 p.m. as the time for the presentation of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill, if approved by Parliament, will enable the Mental Health Act to be updated, consolidated and reprinted under the Acts Republication Act, 1967. The Bill also removes from section 3 of the amending Act of 1960 two subsections which have not been capable of incorporation in the principal Act, and enacts a new section 19a in the principal Act which would have the effect of preserving any rights and powers that would have existed under those subsections.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 3 (2) and (3) of the Mental Health Act Amendment Act, 1960. Those subsections, which were not incorporable in the principal Act, were enacted as transitional provisions consequential on the repeal of section 20 of the principal Act. That section had provided, *inter alia*, that a medical officer resident in an institution became entitled to six months leave of absence after each period of five years continuous service whilst in residence in any institution or institutions.

Section 3 (1) of the 1960 amending Act repealed section 20 of the principal Act but, as there were then some medical officers to whom that section applied, their rights were protected by section 3 (2) of the 1960 amending Act while subsection (3) of that section provided that the period of service in respect of which leave had been taken pursuant to section 20 of the principal Act or pursuant to section 3 (2) of the 1960 Act was not to be taken into account for the purposes of any claim for long leave of absence under any Act relating to the Public Service. However, as those two subsections were not given a "home" in the principal Act they now stand as substantive enactments of the 1960 amending Act, which therefore would have to be reprinted as a separate public general Act unless they are repealed, in which case it would be necessary to enact as an enactment of the principal Act a saving provision to safeguard the rights of persons whose rights to leave under the repealed enactments are still alive and have in fact been recognized by the department.

Clause 3 enacts a new section 19a which in effect safeguards the rights of those officers and also re-enacts the provisions of section 3 (3) of the 1960 Act which would apply to all officers in the Public Service to whom those

repealed enactments applied. Clause 4 makes a grammatical alteration to section 41. Clause 5 inserts "or" after subsection (1) (b) and after subsection (2) (d) of section 98. The insertion of that word after those paragraphs is consistent with the wording of those subsections.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 31. Page 179.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the Bill, for which the Government seeks a speedy passage because of problems that have arisen recently as a result of a certain court case. The Bill amends section 64 of the principal Act, that section dealing with proceedings by municipal and district councils in respect of certain offences. The court recently held, as the Minister said, that section 64 required a report of a possible traffic offence to be laid before a council before the issue of a notice inviting an expiation fee from the alleged offender. That practice in the past has been carried out not only by the Adelaide City Council; the provision covers all councils. The former practice, from the administrative as well as other viewpoints, was a simple one, but the court has held now that it was not legal and so the Statute is being changed by this Bill in order that the procedure can continue in the future as it has in the past, and that in the future it will be lawful under the Police Offences Act. That is the purport of the measure.

The Bill also provides that those who might claim that irregularities have occurred in the past because of this court decision will not be given the opportunity to take action against the council for the recovery of money they have paid or for damages. In all the circumstances, that is not an unreasonable provision. The Bill also deals with the question of affixing a notice to a vehicle. That, of course, is usually done by inserting the notice under the windscreen wiper of a car. That procedure was not previously defined in section 64. This is one of the changes that has become urgent because of a recent court case. The matter should

be put in order as soon as possible and, accordingly, I not only support the measure but hope it has a speedy passage through the Council.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 31. Page 179.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): This is a short Bill associated in some ways with that just passed by the Council. It alters the Road Traffic Act as a result of a recent court case, which received much publicity. The Government is now of the view that it is possibly arguable (and I use those words from the Minister's own explanation) that under the present law, when a council inspector places a notice on a motor vehicle, he is interfering with that vehicle without the consent of the owner.

Of course, it was never intended that an inspector, taking such action and placing a notice on a vehicle, was interfering with that vehicle without this consent, and this small amendment corrects that position. I believe that a person carrying out his function as a council inspector or a police officer should have the statutory power to carry out his work as long as he is acting within the area covered by the appropriate legislation. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I express my appreciation to honourable members for facilitating the passage of this Bill and the previous Bill through the Chamber, and I especially thank the Hon. Mr. Hill for the attention he has given these measures.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.16 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 6, at 2.15 p.m.