LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 21, 1976

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Appropriation (No. 3),
Art Gallery Act Amendment,
Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 1),
Salaries Adjustment (Public Offices),
South Australian Local Government Grants Commission.

DEATH OF HON. T. C. STOTT

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

That the Legislative Council express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Tom Cleave Stott, C.B.E., a former Speaker of the House of Assembly and former member for Albert and Ridley in the House of Assembly, and place on record its appreciation of his meritorious public services, and that, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased honourable gentlemen, the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I refer to the details of the services rendered by the late Mr. Stott. He was the Speaker of the House of Assembly from 1962 to 1965 and from 1968 to 1970; was first elected as member for Albert on April 8, 1933, and served until March 19, 1938, when he was elected member for Ridley, which district he served until his retirement on May 29, 1970. He was a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee from July 20, 1944, to June 28, 1950, and he was a member of the Executive Committee of the South Australian Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association for 29 years, a Vice-President for 5 years and a life associate since June, 1970.

He was awarded the C.B.E. (Commonwealth list) on June 10, 1954. He leaves a widow, to whom we extend the sincerest sympathy of all the members, officers and staff of the Legislative Council. The late Mr. Stott was a life member of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia and of the South Australian Country Women's Association; he represented wheatgrowers at conferences in Washington (1953), Sweden (1950) and Geneva (1956), and was General Secretary of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation over a long period.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): It is with regret that we note the death of the Hon. Tom Stott. As the Chief Secretary has said, Mr. Stott had a long and distinguished career in politics in South Australia. He was Speaker for two terms in the House of Assembly. He was elected to Parliament in 1933. It is an indication of his strength of character that from 1933 until the conclusion of his career in 1970 Tom Stott was an Independent member of Parliament. If one casts one's mind back, one recalls that in 1933 and 1938 there was a large number of Independent members elected to the South Australian Parliament; of that group, the late Tom Stott was the last to leave the Parliament. He had a very wide knowledge of and a long career in the administration and the politics of the rural industry, having been Secretary of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation, Secretary of the Wheat and Woolgrowers Association, and associated with the formation of the United Farmers and Graziers. With the Chief Secretary and other honourable members, I extend sympathy to his widow.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to add my personal tribute to the memory of the late Tom Stott, who served for a long period in the House of Assembly. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, during the whole of Mr. Stott's Parliamentary career he remained an Independent; that speaks volumes for his tenacity of mind. He had a tremendous service record on Parliamentary committees. In particular, I refer to the long service (29 years) that he gave as Vice-President of the South Australian Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; that must be almost a record. He was well known to members of both Houses. His personality impressed itself on those who knew him during that period. He made a notable contribution to Parliamentary work here during his years of service. We extend our sincere sympathy to his widow. I ask all honourable members to stand in their places in silence as a signification of the carrying of the motion.

Motion carried by honourable members standing in their places in silence.

[*Sitting suspended from* 2.24 *to* 2.35 *p.m.*]

QUESTIONS

TOURISM REPORT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On September 22, I asked questions regarding a report on tourism. Part of my explanation to those questions was as follows:

I understand that another very comprehensive report dealing with the tourist industry generally in this State is in the Minister's possession. I have not been able to verify this point, but I have been informed that the preparation of the report cost about $80 000, half of this sum being borne by the Federal Government and half by the State Government. I think this latter report, which was prepared by Pak-Poy and Associates, is in the Minister's hands. Is he willing to make this report available for honourable members to study?

In reply, the Minister said:

The honourable member said that the Commonwealth Government was involved in this report to the extent of $40 000. I can assure the honourable member that the Commonwealth authorities are studying the report now, and we hope to discuss it with them. Until we get the green light from the Commonwealth authorities, we cannot release it. I do not know what will happen in connection with the report; it depends on the Commonwealth's attitude.

As I have been contacted again by a person very interested in the tourist industry in this State and who wants to peruse this report, I ask the Minister now whether the Commonwealth authorities have, in fact, finished their perusal of the report. Also, does the Minister expect to make the report public and, if he does, when can that be expected to happen?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The report came into my possession from the Commonwealth authorities some 10 days ago. After reading the Commonwealth report on the Pak-Poy report, I discussed the matter with the Premier's Department, which is now examining it. I hope that the

department will send the report back to me soon. Until I receive the findings of that submission to the Premier's Department, I cannot decide what the situation will be. However, I hope to clear up the matter soon.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: All honourable members would be aware of today's high incidence of unemployment. More seriously, they ought to be aware that the rate of recovery in the employment market is, to say the least, most dismal. I remind the Council that I stated some months ago, when Opposition members were talking about the great dream of free enterprise picking up the slack in employment, and relating that to the avowed policy of the present Commonwealth Government of making cut-backs in public spending, that private enterprise did not initiate the construction of harbors, railways, bridges, schools, and so on. This has been brought most forcibly to the attention of all honourable members. Before asking my question, I should like to inform the Council of a statement that has been made by two unions in this State, which could never be regarded, as members opposite seem to regard all trade unions, as being mad militants.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No, that is not so. You should make correct statements!

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Is this an explanation or a statement?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am referring to a press statement issued jointly by the Federated Moulders (Metal) Union of Australia (South Australian Branch), and the Federated Ironworkers Association of Australia (South Australian Branch). Entitled "Heavy lay-offs at big South Australian foundry", the press statement is as follows:

More than 80 per cent of the production of the Bradford Kendall Foundries at Cromwell Road, Kilburn, depends on this type of order.

Nothing about wages and the spiralling of wages affecting production, honourable members opposite may note. The statement continues:

Bradford Kendalls have had to lay off a total of 87 highly qualified workers, involving a wide range of skills. In addition, the firm have not replaced 22 workers who had left through fear of the future and the likely prospect of dismissal. Bradford Kendalls themselves had done their utmost to maintain levels of local employment. The two unions today named the Federal Government as being directly responsible for this total of 109 workers having to join the labour market in the search for other employment. They added that valuable trade skills and expertise would undoubtedly be lost to the State as a result. Of 23 moulders retrenched at Kilburn, now only five were left in the trade. The retrenchments began about three months after the Fraser Government gained office. What happened was as follows:

> On February 19, 1976, 27 workers were put off; on April 9, another 26 were put off; on September 17, another 10 were put off; and on October 15, another 24 were put off. (There were, in addition, the 22 who left and were not replaced.)

The work force still employed at Bradford Kendall now numbers exactly 100. Production at the foundry since February has dropped from 90 tonnes a week to 42 tonnes a week.

It was claimed that a Liberal Government would "turn on the lights". You have certainly turned out the lights for over 50 per cent of the work force in this area of private enterprise employment; you cannot be trusted in the daylight, let alone in the dark. The statement continues:

The unions said that migrant workers had taken a particularly heavy battering but stressed that this was not the fault of Bradford Kendall. Of the 87 retrenched, 58 were migrants. The unions see the reduction in orders for equipment like railway bogies as being not only short-sighted, bearing in mind the need to improve public transport, but callous and heartless when the consequences for workers at the foundry were considered. It would now take the industry years to recover. The situation could, in fact, be accurately described as a Government-induced depression. Workers were being asked to bear an unfair share of the burden imposed by the misdirected economic policies of Treasurer Lynch.

Yet members in this Chamber objected when I said he had short arms, deep pockets, and a shallow mind. The statement continues:

Other South Australian foundries were relatively fortunate, for the present, in that their orders were more diverse and they had not yet had to retrench as heavily as Bradford Kendalls. But their time could come as the effects of heavy cuts in public spending worked their way through the economy. The unions said it was time the public at large knew exactly what had been happening to an important part of South Australian industry and was spreading to other sectors.

Prior to asking my question, I draw members' attention to the Editorial in the *News* today—"The A.C.T.U. should hold off." The headline of that Editorial should be reversed with what we see at the end of it, because they are saying that in this day and age, in October, 1976, it is wage spiralling that is causing all the unemployment and we must reduce, or at least not increase, wages, so that there can be a recovery. Last year this "rag" was saying that the only thing that could happen to cure all our ills was to elect the Fraser Government. I direct my question to the Minister. I was wondering, Mr. President, whether you might call me to order after that rare burst of eloquence.

The PRESIDENT: I was very indulgent. I think the honourable member is about to ask his question.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: We are being indulgent, too, on this side.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You have broken every rule in the book.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Now that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has had his say, may I continue, Mr. President? My question concerns a matter which must increasingly be occupying the attention of the Minister of Labour and Industry—unemployment. Is the Minister aware of the very serious position facing both the workers and management of one of South Australia's largest and most efficient foundries, Bradford Kendall? Will the Minister endeavour to answer this question in such a manner as to highlight or identify those people responsible for the unemployment situation in this country today?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague. I can assure the honourable member that the Government is very concerned about the position at Bradford Kendall at the moment. I am sure that they are in big trouble and none of that trouble is caused by the employer or the employee in this case. The fact is that Bradford Kendall depend heavily on orders for rail bogies, and I might add that the efficiency of our public transport depends on a continued supply of these items. Federal orders have been cut back and reductions in moneys made available to State transport authorities have hit heavily indeed at this Kilburn industry.

While the employers have done their best to keep up the supply of work, they are very much, unfortunately, in the hands of the Federal Government's economic policies. Bradford Kendall depend for 80 per cent of their orders on heavy railway equipment. Unfortunately for the workers at the plant, there is a very direct connection between Canberra policies and the health of the industry. I point out to the honourable member that the Moulders Union and the Federated Ironworkers Association are concerned over what has been happening, and to be fair, so are the employers. The statements as outlined by the honourable member are correct.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Which of his statements?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Foster says that there is a tightening of the screws by the Federal Government, and workers have been retrenched at Bradford Kendall by 87 this year, and production in the factory has dropped from 90 tonnes a week in February to 42 tonnes a week now. One of the unfortunate facts of life is that migrants particularly have suffered in this retrenchment. Of the 87 who were put off, 58 were new settlers in Australia. One wonders why the Federal Government is bringing out so many migrants for this type of work when this sort of thing is happening.

I understand that my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Industry, will be pressing for an increase in orders for heavy railway equipment, and for Canberra to get back on the right track. I trust members on the other side of the Chamber are concerned about this problem, and we all know that they have readier access to their Federal counterparts than we have. Therefore, I trust they will lend a hand and exert pressure to salvage an industry which is so vital to many people in this State.

COPYING CHARGES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have received a circular issued by the Registrar-General's office, which is part of the Lands Department, and it states:

1. In order to cover the escalating costs of our copying services it has been necessary to increase the fees for all types of copying carried out by this office.
2. The present scale of fees has not altered since the inception of the service in 1964.
3. The new fees will be operative on and from November 1, 1976.
4. Scale of fees:

	$
(*a*) Photographic copy of one document or Certificate of Title or part thereof ..	1·00
(*b*) Dyeline prints—	
small plans (353 mm × 500 mm) ..	1·40
large plans (500 mm × 707 mm) ..	2·00
(*c*) Microfilm prints	1·00

5. Certain difficulties may be experienced initially as $1 tokens will not be available for approximately six weeks. It is suggested that firms deplete any existing stocks of 40 cent tokens but these will still be accepted at face value after November 1, 1976.

Two final points are then listed. However, I have been told by people who have received this document that the second point in this circular is incorrect. The present scale of fees, according to the document, has not altered since the inception of the service in 1964. I am told that the scale of fees was updated in 1972 when the charge for photographing one document was increased from 20c to 40c, and this latest increase to $1 is an increase of about 150 per cent.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Is that for just copying one page?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. I am told that similar documents copied outside are copied for half that price.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where is that?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: At any place that copies documents. Further, I am told that Government departments use this service twice as much as any private firm, but the departments are not required to pay fees for this service. I have been told by the proprietor of a small company that the cost resulting from the increased charges will be about $300 a week for one firm. Can the Minister say whether Government departments use this service twice as much as private firms, but do not have to pay a fee for the service? Is the Minister aware that similar copying services could be provided by private enterprise at about half the cost and will he reconsider the decision to increase these charges because of the effect such an increase will have on firms in the private sector using this service?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I remember when the docket first came into my possession, and I remember vividly that it was indicated that this was the first increase since 1964. However, now that the honourable member has raised the question about an interim increase in 1972, I will look at the situation and call for a report to see exactly what is the position. Regarding the outside people doing copying work, I do not know their charges, but I will look into the whole matter raised by the honourable member and reply to him as soon as possible.

WOMEN'S ADVISER

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I understand that an advertisement has been placed in the press for the position of Women's Adviser in the Education Department. Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from the Minister of Education when it is expected that the position will be filled and what are the duties and functions that the appointee will be expected to carry out?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

ITALIAN FESTIVAL

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the Italian Festival?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government supports community and ethnic cultural festivals through grants made available upon the recommendation of the Arts Grants Advisory Committee. Generally, the committee seeks evidence of support from within the particular ethnic population, such as voluntary labour and financial support, before recommending such grants. The Italian Festival was considered to be an outstanding example of a minority population planning, organising and supporting its own cultural activity. Because of that level of participation, the Government made available a grant of $3 000 during the 1975-76 period, and a further $4 000 for the 1976-77 period.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: ENGLISH USAGE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yesterday, when I was speaking in the debate on the South Australian Health Commission Bill, I was referring to a brief synopsis of the Victorian committee of inquiry's recommendations and I quoted, amongst other things:

Subject to the Minister of Health, the commission should have responsibility for conducting and overseeing all health services in Victoria, whether preventative or curative—

At that point the Hon. Mr. DeGaris interjected and the following exchange took place:

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What was that word?
The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Preventative.
The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There is no such word.
The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: There is. It is in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*.
The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No, it is not.
The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It is.

This exchange was not reported in the first *Hansard* proofs this morning, but I have seen the *Hansard* staff, who agree with me that that is substantially the interchange that took place and, with the Leader's concurrence (I am sure we will not have any difficulty there because he is a reasonable man) I have requested that that exchange be included in the final *Hansard* report.

I have with me (and I am rarely without one) the fifth edition of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 1974, and in the preface, the following statement is found:

Again, of the many thousands of old or new scientific and technical terms that have a limited currency some are carried by accident into the main stream of the language and become known temporarily or permanently, vaguely or precisely, to all ordinary well-informed members of the modern newspaper-reading public.

The word "preventative" is in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 1974. In fact, it is a cognate extension of the word "preventive" and the word "cognate" in this instance is used in its special meaning when it is applied to philology. Although I am sure that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris knows about philology, for the information of other honourable members I point out that it is the science of language. There are two matters I wanted to make clear. First, I am an *Oxford Dictionary* man and not a *Webster* man; and, secondly, I admit freely that from time to time my grammar and syntax are not impeccable, but I insist that my vocabulary always is.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Council for the opportunity to make my personal explanation. I have made a mistake: the word is in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, and I said in the debate that it was not in the dictionary. I apologise for that error. However, the *Oxford Dictionary* owes its reputation to the two brothers Fowler, who were experts in philology, experts in the English language and, for the benefit of the Council and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, I should like to read what the compilers of the *Oxford Dictionary* have to say. I refer to Fowler's *Modern English Usage* under the term "long variants" and—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Have you been on the phone to Max Harris?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No; but, if the honourable member wants me to quote more fully from the Fowler brothers I would be only too pleased to do so, because I am one of their great admirers. Under the heading "long variants", and I ask members to note the language to see just how much it applies to the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, the following statement is made:

"The better the writer, the shorter his words" would be a statement needing many exceptions for individual persons and particular subjects; but for all that it would, and especially about English writers, be broadly true. Those who run to long words are mainly the unskilful and tasteless; they confuse pomposity with dignity, flaccidity with ease, and bulk with force; . . . A special form of long word is now to be illustrated; when a word for the notion wanted exists, some people (1) forget or do not know that word and make up another from the same stem with an extra suffix or two; or (2) are not satisfied with a mere current word, and resolve to decorate it, also with an extra suffix;

The explanation continues:

1 and 2. Needless lengthenings of established words due to oversight or caprice.

It is stated that preventative should be preventive.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's suggested amendment.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Council do not insist on its suggested amendment.

The Government was "spot on" in its attitude to this amendment, while the Opposition was "spot off". However, because the Government did not have the numbers in this Chamber, the amendment was carried. Yesterday, not one Opposition member could give any instance where anyone had been harshly treated over the last 15 years. Actually, the administration of the Act has worked very well. The suggested amendment would reduce the effectiveness of the Bill. If a taxpayer is dissatisfied with a decision, he can take the matter to the Ombudsman.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I am disappointed with the Government's attitude to this eminently reasonable amendment. Actually, I think the spots are off the Government, rather than the Opposition. Under the existing section 12c, the Commissioner could grant a concession where tax was already payable. However, under the new set-up, the Commissioner can inflict a penalty where none actually exists at the time. So, there is a reversal of the previously existing situation. I therefore believe that an appeal should be granted to a person who is inflicted with a tax penalty that did not exist before; that is the crucial part of the argument. I am disappointed that the Government has fallen back on the argument that it cannot afford to lose the Bill. Although I am certain that our case was reasonable, regrettably I agree that the Council do not insist on its amendment.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Government has taken an unreasonable attitude but, particularly in connection with money Bills, we must recognise that it is for the Government to govern. All we can do is point out to the Government the error of its ways, and we did that yesterday.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You can do more. You can knock this Bill out.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: We are not going to do that, although the Government has been unreasonable. The Minister of Health has repeatedly asserted that this

matter is taken care of through the functions of the Ombudsman, but I point out that the Ombudsman was never meant to act as a court of appeal for this kind of purpose on taxation matters. For the reasons given by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and having made this stand clear and firm, I believe the Council should no longer insist on the amendment.

Motion carried.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 11 (clause 2)—Leave out "six" and insert "seven".

No. 2. Page 1, after line 14 (clause 2)—Insert passage as follows: One shall be a legal practitioner nominated by the Attorney-General.

No. 3. Page 1—Insert new clause as follows:

3a. Amendment of principal Act, s.7—Qualification for membership of Board—Section 7 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the passage "for appointment as a member" the passage "(except the member to be appointed on the nomination of the Attorney-General)".

No. 4. Page 2—Insert new clause as follows:

4a. Amendment of principal Act, s.12—Quorum—Section 12 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word "Three" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Four".

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

That the House of Assembly's amendments be agreed to.

I have earlier stated the reason why the Government wants to increase the number of members on the Medical Board. The Government wants to include on the board a legal practitioner nominated by the Attorney-General and a member nominated by the Flinders University. However, Opposition members succeeded in striking out the reference to the legal practitioner, although the Medical Board wants to have such a person on the board. It was pointed out that an investigatory committee was to be set up within the board and that it would be desirable to have a legal man as Chairman of what would be, in effect, a subcommittee. In addition, the board considered that it might be desirable to have a legal practitioner on the board to assist it. The amendments put back in the Bill the provisions that were deleted by this Chamber.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): What the Chief Secretary has said has been accurate. We have gone back to the original Bill as it was presented to this Chamber. We do not like the Bill as it is. We did not like it very much without the amendment, but I made the point that the board could follow the philosophy provided in the Dentists Act, whereby there are two separate sections of the board, one an administrative section and the other a *quasi* judicial section.

We were unable to get the amendments drafted in time and we made one amendment striking out the provision for the legal practitioner to be on the board. My information is that the amendment that we would like to have moved here was moved in the Assembly and the Government did not accept it. I ask the Committee to oppose the motion so that a conference can be held to discuss the matter and overcome the difficulty.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield (teller), F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner.

Noes (9)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, C. M. Hill, and A. M. Whyte.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. J. E. Dunford. No—The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 9 Ayes and 9 Noes. It seems to me that an attempt should be made to resolve this issue by a conference of managers and, in order to assist that possibility, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments may not be the best method of constituting the Medical Board.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

ENERGY COMMITTEE REPORT

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

That Question Time be extended until 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Agriculture tabled a report of the State Energy Committee. Because of my particular interest in the report, as the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy, I ask the Minister whether a copy of the report can be made available to me so that I can peruse it.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will convey the honourable member's request to the Minister of Mines and Energy, in the hope that he can comply with it.

BOLIVAR RECLAIMED WATER

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I understand that there are three large users of Bolivar recycled water working under arrangements that are due for renewal in 1978 and 1979, and that those users have the right of renewal for a further five-year period. Will the Minister ascertain whether any more contracts such as this have been contemplated? Also, does the Government intend to make this water available to any other large user or users (at present it seems that only large users who can set up their own equipment are able to use the water) and, if it does, what requirements are laid down for the use of this water?

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

ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY THEATRES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question regarding the Association of Community Theatres?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Association of Community Theatres is an incorporated body, membership of which is composed of many (but not all) of the smaller

amateur and semi-professional theatre organisations in this State. The association received a grant of $3 500 during the 1975-76 period, towards costs of rental, office equipment, and related administrative expenses, upon the recommendation of the Arts Grants Advisory Committee. Actual expenditure has reduced to $2 412, and the balance was carried forward as a surplus towards similar expenses during the current period. The Arts Development Branch has sighted accounts and the auditor's certificate relating to all expenditure during the 1975-76 period.

The only complaint received by the branch about association activities was a recent telephone inquiry by Ms. Pat Lee of Lee's Theatre Club. Ms. Lee indicated that she believed that it was unfair that the association had received a grant, as she had not. She was advised (for the third time) that she could not expect to be considered for a grant until she (like the Association of Community Theatres) actually applied in the normal manner. She then claimed that an unnamed member of the association had complained to her about the association's accounts. As neither Ms. Lee nor her club is a member of the association, Ms. Lee was advised that her informant should either contact the Arts Development Branch or raise the matter for discussion, at an appropriate time, within the association. The branch has not heard further from Ms. Lee or her informant.

The Arts Grants Advisory Committee is reviewing all applications for grants during the 1976-77 period, and has not yet recommended a grant to the association. It is possible, however, that a grant will be recommended, as the association's activities are considered by many member companies and other arts authorities to be beneficial to the development of arts in South Australia.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to simplify the provision of the Road Traffic Act that relates to the compulsory wearing of seat belts. As the Act now stands, a person need only wear a seat belt if that belt has been provided "in accordance with the provisions of the Act". This means that unwarranted difficulties arise when a person is to be prosecuted for not wearing a seat belt. The police must establish that the car was manufactured and first registered after a certain year and that the belt itself complies with certain design rules that are now incorporated into the regulations under the Act. In order to render the seat belt provisions effective and to facilitate their proper enforcement, it is proposed that, if a seat belt is provided in a car, it must be worn. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the restricting words from the relevant section of the Act.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister was kind enough to inform me previously that this Bill was coming before the Council and, as a result of that advice, I have had an opportunity to examine the Bill, which I do not oppose. As the Minister has said today, it is obvious that some simplification is necessary if the police are to enforce the law relating to seat belts. It is proper in circumstances such as this, when problems have occurred, for legislation to be examined to see whether it is too cumbersome.

From what I have been able to gather regarding this matter, it seems that, to enable the police to enforce the law relating to offences under the Act, experts would have to be flown from other States to give evidence on whether or not the design of the actual seat belt in question complied with the design rules that previously would have been approved by one of the Australian Transport Advisory Council groups. If this procedure was applied on every occasion, it would be cumbersome indeed. I therefore support the second reading.

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1647.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: This is a hardy annual, which gives power to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, formerly known as the Commissioner of Prices and Consumer Affairs, to keep a watchful eye on the prices that consumers in this State must pay. One well knows the history of this legislation, which was first enacted by the Playford Government in 1948. Although Australian Labor Party members always voted for that legislation, many Liberal and Country League members opposed it, as they always considered that it was a breach of the principles that their Party supported.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I didn't think they had any principles.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If the Hon. Mr. Foster had principles like those members did, he might be of greater benefit to the Parliament and to his own Party. The powers that were given to the Prices Commissioner, as he was then called, in the early days have been whittled away, until the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch is now a watchdog and has little power to do more than keep a check on prices. It is sad that the powers that the authority had have been whittled away, because it was only 18 months or so ago that the South Australian Prices Commissioner was responsible for fixing the price of petrol in South Australia, which was adopted across Australia as a guide to the price of that vital source of power to the public. Even that power has been taken away from him now, and there is a free choice of the price of petrol in this State and in other States.

One would think that, as this is a hardy annual type of Bill, changing the date from 1976 to 1977 and giving the Commissioner power until 1977, it would be a simple Bill but, unfortunately, there are some flaws in it, on which I wish to speak. First, may I comment on the definition of "consumer", which is very long and involved. It is not easy to follow. The new provision contains 99 words, in an attempt to define "consumer". It is ironical that in the principal Act the definition of "service" consisting of 50 words is being amended to provide for a definition of "services" containing only seven words. The new definition states that "services" will "include rights and privileges of any kind", and that is all it says, whereas the definition of "consumer" contains 99 words of conflicting language. The Parliamentary Counsel suggests he is defining "services" in the interests of clarity; but he does nothing about clarity in the definition of "consumer".

However, the most important thing to debate is new clause 5, which I shall read for the benefit of honourable members. It states:

Section 22a of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsections:—

(4) There shall be implied in every contract for the sale or supply of grapes to which a person bound by an order under this section is, in his capacity as such, a party—

(*a*) a condition that the vendor shall be entitled in respect of the sale or supply of the grapes—

(i) to a consideration equal to the consideration stipulated in the relevant order;

or

(ii) the consideration fixed in the contract,

whichever is the greater;

and

(*b*) such terms and conditions as are determined by the Minister relating to the time within which the consideration shall be paid and to payments to be made by the purchaser to the vendor in default of payment within that time.

This presents a vexing problem. This new clause will certainly help the grapegrower, because it means that the Minister, on the advice of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, shall indicate to the wine producer the terms and conditions under which the wine producer shall pay to the grower, when he shall make those payments to the grower and, if the wine producer cannot pay within the prescribed time, what penalty shall apply.

This means that the Minister could have access to all of the economic or financial strength of a particular wine-producing company, should it be in financial difficulties and unable to make payments to the grower. This means also that, at the whim of the Minister, should he be capricious, he could make the terms and conditions for the whole industry almost impossible. It is also rather peculiar that under the principal Act co-operatives do not come under the control of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch and there are many co-operative wine-producing units in the State, particularly in the Riverland area. It is interesting to observe that many of the co-operatives do not make their final payment for the grapes they have bought from the growers for a particular season for as long as five years, so there is a delay of five years before the grower receives payment. The implied threat of this amending clause is that the private enterprise wine producer will be obliged to pay to the grower what the Minister directs him to pay and when he directs him to pay, and one would imagine it would certainly be within 12 months.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Do you think that 12 months is unreasonable?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is not written into the Act but it is usually 12 months.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: No, but do you think it is unreasonable?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I do not think it is unreasonable that it should be paid within 12 months, but would it not be more reasonable if the co-operatives could also be instructed to pay within 12 months?

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Yes.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Let us have it right across the board instead of amending the Bill to include only one section of the industry. I understand that the wine producers are in favour of the growers being paid within 12 months.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Most responsible winemakers do pay within the year of the vintage, but there are one or two winemakers who are using this to finance their operations at the expense of the grapegrowers. One winemaking company sent a letter to its growers saying it would not be able to pay until February, 1978, which seems to me to be unreasonable.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I thank the Minister for that interjection; it helps me to make my speech. We are aware that there are in every walk of life people who cannot toe the line or accept their moral or financial obligations, but my point is that this clause will encompass the whole trade. It may make it embarrassing for all the trade; it is like throwing a sprat to catch a mackerel. Surely there is a better way of going about it, a better way in which the industry should be advised that it shall, before it makes its contract with the grower, state when its payment will be made. Under the existing provision, the Minister could have the right under the Act to say what fine and what interest rates could be imposed by firms that have not paid.

I understand there are three or four wine producers, as the Minister has said, who are not playing the game with their payments to the growers. There are 42 members of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, so we are bringing in an all-embracing clause, affecting 42 members, when we are trying to catch four or five members who are not playing the game.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: I do not quite see the logic of that. It seems to me that, if they were required (I do not know what the Minister would put in his requirement) to pay within 12 months, the majority of the winemakers would already have paid and it would be no hardship to them. Only the three of four members who are not playing the game at present would be affected.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The point is: who is to say that a capricious Minister in the future would not say that the wine producers must pay within six months or three months? It is accepted within the trade at the moment that they are paying within about 12 months of the vintage.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Do you know of any other case where a Minister can direct the members of one private concern to pay another?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: No, I do not. I cannot give any particular reference to that type of problem. The point I am trying to make is that the Government is concerned about four or five companies that are not playing the game. We should be concerned with the total prosperity of the industry, and I am assuming from the statements I have received that there are 42 registered or affiliated members of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, and I guess there are others on top of that again. Probably about 50 wine producers are buying grapes from growers in any one year.

We have established the fact that the majority pay the growers within the 12 months after vintage, and we are trying to stop those who are not playing the game. Why cannot there be an instruction to the industry as a whole that it shall be obliged to pay within 12 months, and make it statutory or obligatory to pay in equal instalments, say quarterly, within the 12 months? Then, if any company fails to oblige, the Minister can impose a fine. This clause does not say that they will pay within 12 months, but it says the Minister will determine when. I would reiterate that a Minister who has little love for the wine industry could make things difficult for it.

The consequences would be that many of the wine producers could purchase their grape stocks interstate, and they claim they could purchase them more cheaply than in South Australia. It could mean, if a producer had his cellars full of red wine, that he could say, "I will not buy any red wine grapes this year. To heck with these

instructions." Many growers could suffer, particularly growers in the immediate vicinity of that particular winery. There are many other industries, particularly primary industries, that have similar problems with payment for their produce.

The cereal boards, particularly the Wheat and Barley Boards, can take anything up to five years to pay for wheat, and anything up to three to four years to pay for barley. This has been going on for a great number of years. It has been on occasions responsible for hardship to individuals within the cereal industry, and it is of small comfort to go to your banker and say, "I have pool No. 4 still to be paid for", and he says, "So what? When are you going to be paid for it?"

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: The Wheat Board has overcome that problem now.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes, and without an Act of Parliament instructing them to do it. The dried fruit industry has also had to make its payments in the same way. It is only with the sale of the dried fruit they can get the financial impetus to get the progress payments to the growers. I am pointing out that with the payments over an extended period the industry can manage its own affairs, but let there be a penalty for the industry if it does not manage its affairs properly.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Does not the present situation make nonsense of controlled prices if somebody buys grapes in 1976 and then pays for them in 1978? As I mentioned earlier, one winery has told its growers they will not be paid until 1978. In effect, it is borrowing money from the grower and will be repaying, with inflation, at much less in real terms to what the grapes are worth this year, and in this case it has made a mockery of the concept of a determined price for grapes fixed by the Prices Commissioner.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I thought we had agreed on this point. I do not think it is right. I believe the industry should pay within 12 months from vintage.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The grower could sue.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes. The difficulty with the grower having to sue is that not many of the growers are in a financial position to do that because they are desperately short of money. Would it not be better that the Minister be able to impose a penalty on the wine producer if he does not abide by the instructions to pay within 12 months, instead of the grower having to sue? I believe that the industry should pay, and it should pay within a reasonable time. I do not agree that the industry should live under the shadow of the cloud of the Commissioner or the Minister, not knowing what terms and conditions the Minister will impose, and not knowing if the Minister would from year to year alter such conditions.

Only about four companies are not doing the right thing. Is it not better that we get hold of the four companies and instruct them what to do in the future rather than control the whole industry? That is my theme, and I hope during the next week to find ways, with the help of my colleagues of incorporationg an amendment to make this a reality.

I support the rest of the Bill. Some strange things appear in it. The fines which had minimum and not maximum have now got minimums and maximums in it. It seems a reflection on the court, because usually the court has had an instruction as to what the minimum fine shall be. It is not usual for the court to be instructed as to what the maximum shall be.

It extends the principal Act into 1977, when honourable members can debate the problem again. It also amends the figure of $2 500 to $5 000 as the sum the Commissioner can adjudicate on. As was contained in the second reading speech, many a second-hand motor car is well over the $2 500 bracket and within the $5 000 bracket, and that is a necessary amendment under the wretched terms of inflation. Let me conclude by saying that the wine industry is a growing industry and one which is vital to the State and to those who have invested in it. As the Minister of Agriculture knows, there have been many new plantings in the past few years, and there could be problems of over-production if the seasons and other factors are good.

The industry is dependent on principles of supply and demand, particularly with sales of wines. It is an industry, with its growth factor, that we must treat with care so as not to load it with economic problems which could cause it to slow down. The Minister knows that this State can produce extremely good wines and I therefore hope that the Government will look at the argument and the point I have been trying to make so that we can make the industry meet its obligations. Let the industry do this in a voluntary way and let the Minister have the authority to impose penalties on those sections of the industry who do not come up with the payments for produce that they take from growers, who are also entitled to financial support. I support the Bill.

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

METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE ROAD WIDENING PLAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1654.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Honourable members will recall the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan Act of 1972 which tried to achieve the long-established road widening scheme in South Australia that made more efficient land acquisition possible. The effect of the principal Act was that anyone who intended to improve land which the Highways Department intended to acquire had to obtain the consent of the Minister of Transport to effect those improvements. The road widening plan was to be produced by the department and people whose properties abutted the arterial roads and highways throughout metropolitan Adelaide could see whether their properties were affected or not. That arrangement, which was agreed to by Parliament in 1972, was satisfactory.

The Government has now introduced this amending Bill which, first, clarifies the meaning of "building work" in the principal Act. The Government is saying that building work will now be defined in the same way as it is defined in the Building Act, and I have no quarrel with that proposal. Other aspects of building work are covered in the Building Act, and the Minister has attended to those items and matters dealing with excavation work. Also, there might be other minor work and provision is made for that minor work to be excluded from the legislation.

I am most concerned about clause 4, and the change brought about by this clause is that in future the department will not be specifying only the land it intends to acquire; in other words, it is the land involved in proposed road widening, as the land that shall be shown on the plan includes land that shall possibly (and I emphasise "possibly") be required for road widening purposes, as well as

another six metres taken back from that new proposed boundary. Any proposed building on that area will have to be consented to by the Commissioner. The public disclosure that the department wishes possibly to acquire land is of grave concern to me.

I have no objection whatever and I believe that it is a proper course to be adopted for a Government department to disclose publicly that it intends in the future to acquire certain land, and that the land is defined so that if the department continues to acquire the land the landowners can be advised some time ahead of the department's intentions. I have no objection to that situation.

However, regarding proposed legislation providing that people must not build on land possibly required by the department, that is a different position altogether. That is a different matter because the department can change its mind and decide not to proceed to acquire the land and ultimately the landowner is left where the matter started.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What happens in the case where a landowner builds and the Government wants to purchase that land? Compensation payments must be made.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not so much concerned about the matter of compensation as much as the principle I wish to develop, because it is a serious breach of the rights of the individual. For example, if the front section of a property is marked down for possible departmental acquisition, what happens to a person who wishes to sell his property? He will find his property valuation is adversely affected as a result of the uncertainty of the actions of the department. It is not only a matter affecting the Highways Department and it is not only a matter associated with this Bill: generally, in recent years, this situation has been developed by several Government departments. They write to landowners saying, in effect, "Ultimately our department may wish to purchase your property for some public works." This is an unfair approach for a Government to adopt, and the Government must accept the blame for this position. I am not blaming the respective departments, because the Minister and the Government are responsible for such departmental decisions.

In these situations people find their property valuation immediately drops, and this stress is most unfair to individuals. The position causes an injustice to individual landowners when this procedure is adopted. Further, if a landowner has received any such advice that his property might possibly be required for road widening or acquired compulsorily in the future by a Government department, this disclosure must be made if the landowner ever intends to sell his property. Indeed, it must be made not only on ethical grounds but also on the ground of the current land agents legislation.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It would be on the plan, anyway.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the case of the Highways Department, it would be on the plan. I do not mind its being on the plan if the Highways Department is going to proceed, because everyone will know where he stands. Either the department should be made to proceed at the owner's request, if that situation applies, or the department, under legislation, should be bound to proceed within a specified time.

In regard to this Bill, I am particularly concerned that a person can see from a plan that his property is affected by a road widening scheme, but the Commissioner does not have to say, "The front of your land which abuts the highway will be needed for road widening": the Commissioner need only say, "It may possibly be needed for road widening." That seems extremely unfair and it is taking the question of compulsory acquisition too far.

A delicate balance has to be struck between the individual owner's rights and the community's rights, and it is not easy to define the point of balance exactly. I believe that acquisition principles are being taken too far in a Bill such as this. Under this Bill, the owner may experience serious financial consequences and great uncertainty. In many instances we are dealing with people's homes, not commercial properties.

It is not fair that people should have a shadow of the future cast over them, with neither they nor the Government certain whether an actual acquisition will take place. Will the Government consider this position and lay down specifically in the plan the actual land that the department will acquire? It can also stipulate a further 6 m in, because the Government naturally would not want improvements to be built on that margin of land, because ultimately the property's improvements would be too close to the ultimate boundary and the widened highway.

I do not have any quarrel about the 6 m margin, but I have a quarrel about giving the department the right to cast its net too wide. The Bill's provisions may sound good from the Government's viewpoint, but some of them are unjust from the individual's viewpoint. Departmental officers, in good faith, advise property owners that their properties may be acquired, in the hope that early advice may assist the owners, but in many cases it does not assist them: it puts them in a state of uncertainty.

I know of cases where people's health has been affected in these circumstances. Such cases occurred at Bedford Park some years ago, because property owners there did not know where they stood. They found that property values had dropped several thousand dollars because the department had said that it might acquire their properties in the future. Parliament ought to do everything possible to avoid this kind of injustice.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It is very difficult to plan in the long term. How do you overcome that problem?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister should say to his department, "We should know where we are going in connection with road widening." This has been going on since 1949, when a far-sighted measure was introduced by the Playford Government. It was approved in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, and it is one of the several measures in that report that the Government is proceeding with. I cannot accept that a plan that has proceeded in metropolitan Adelaide since 1949 should now cause so much uncertainty that the department does not know what land it wants to acquire. I stress that I am not criticising the departmental officers, for whom I have great respect. I am criticising the Minister and the present Government; they must bear the responsibilty.

The Government should say to the department, "Calculate the land that you want to acquire for road widening purposes, and bring down a plan along those lines." A distance of 6 metres would need to be taken back from the boundary. People ought to know that situation, and ultimately the department needs to acquire certain land.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Would you put a specific period on it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister must consider the time factor at the same time as he examines his land acquisition legislation. If my memory is correct, I believe that the Government, through the Governor's Speech at the opening of this session, announced that the land acquisition legislation would be updated. In today's world, that kind of legislation ought to be under review almost annually.

Great changes are being made in land acquisition legislation throughout the world, particularly a change from the now old-fashioned concept of only market value being paid to a dispossessed owner. Further, there are considerations of reinstatement. Also, there are considerations of social workers being involved in advising people of comparable houses in comparable suburbs, as well as on all forms of compensation, including the reinstatement of people in new accommodation, even with fixtures and fittings such as carpets, curtains, and so on, identical to those in the house which they have had to leave. All these headings must be considered in modern acquisition legislation, and dispossessed owners must be compensated for those items.

Therefore, when the Minister asks me whether I would put a time limit on these things, I can only say that it is a subject that needs to be studied, as do many other matters, when the overall matter of land acquisition is considered.

Regarding road widening legislation, I point out that if a time limit is placed on the matter that the Minister has raised, it will be a check on the department's going too far ahead with its plans: in other words, casting its net for 30, 40 or 50 years ahead. I think there is good sense in planning not to be too futuristic in this regard.

Bearing in mind the funds that are channelled into the Highways Account, I do not think the department would be embarrassed if a time limit was placed on the acquisition of land for road widening purposes. Not everyone would rush in and want to sell immediately. Over a reasonable period of time, the position of the fund would not, in my view, embarrass the Government or the department. However, that is somewhat of an aside because of the interjection that was made.

The point to which I return regarding clause 4 is that this is the first time, to my knowledge, that it is intended to advise landowners by a procedure within a new law that their properties or part thereof may possibly be required for road widening purposes or for any other public purpose.

It is unjust to write this sort of provision into the legislation, and I do not think the Bill should be passed in its present form. As this aspect of the Bill should be amended, I intend in Committee to try to achieve that change. I do not see any objection to the other parts of the Bill, which somewhat simplifies the parent Act in relation to the definition of "building work". I support all clauses in the Bill other than the one on which I have laid much emphasis.

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

URBAN LAND (PRICE CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1590.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): Two years ago, the Government introduced into the Parliament a Bill imposing price control on certain urban land and applying price control to all new houses. It was the opinion of the majority of Council members that the Bill should have been withdrawn and redrafted. However, the Government did not take that advice, but pressed on with the legislation in the Council.

In April, 1973, a report (known as the Speechley report) was made by a special committee within the Premier's Department, which outlined a course of action that should be taken in regard to legislation for controlling urban land prices. Generally, the Council agreed with the recommendations of the Speechley report and moved amendments to the Bill, not necessarily following exactly the same course as the Speechley report, but close to it. The amendments introduced in the Council included:

1. The removal of the clauses imposing price control on the construction of new houses.
2. The "controlled area", defined in the Bill as the metropolitan area, can be expanded by proclamation. The Council amendment changes "proclamation" to "regulation", so that, if the controlled area is to be expanded, Parliament is able to examine the proposal.
3. The retrospective clause, whereby the controlled period begins as from May 16 is deleted—

remembering that the Bill was introduced some time in November—

The controlled period is to begin from the day of the proclaiming of the Bill.

4. Redefinition of the meaning of "vacant allotment".
5. New subdivisions, on market for the first time, are excluded from price control.
6. Mortgagee sales are excluded from price control.
7. The Bill provided for a maximum increase of 7 per cent a year in the price at which urban land can be sold without consent. Certain costs incurred in the sale were excluded from consideration.

When the Bill was first drafted the long-term bond rate was 6 per cent; with the increase in the long-term bond rate to 8·5 per cent, the 7 per cent figure is no longer relative. The Council amendment changes 7 per cent to 2 per cent above the long-term bond rate.

8. When application for consent is applied for, a Council amendment provides that the Commissioner must make a decision within 14 days. If no decision is given within 14 days, then consent is deemed to have been given. (This amendment is designed to prevent delays in consents.)
9. An appeal against the decision of the Commissioner has been included in the Bill—an appeal lying to the Land and Valuation Court.
10. A final clause is included, limiting the operation of the Act until December, 1974, thus bringing it into line with the present Prices Act.

It also fits in with the Government's stated intention that the Bill is only a temporary measure.

Those were the amendments that the Council made to the Bill. After a long conference, certain of those amendments were accepted, whereas others were modified. I should like now to comment on the final agreement, and in this respect I refer to the weekly report of the Legislative Council dated November 23, 1973, as follows:

1. Price control will apply to urban land sales of vacant allotments in the metropolitan area, as from November 20. (In the original Bill, the application of control was retrospective to May 16.)
2. There will be no price control on a block sold for the first time after November 20 (except new subdivisions), but price control will apply on the second sale after November 20.
3. When price control applies to an allotment, the sale may be made without consent of the Commissioner if the price is less than a rise of 9½ per cent a year (at compound interest) plus an allowance for rates, taxes, and other land charges. If the price escalation on the second sale exceeds 9½ per cent a year compound interest, plus other charges, application must be made for consent to the Commissioner.
4. New subdivisions: Allotments in new subdivisions created after November 20, 1973, will be under price control, at the first sale of the allotment, with certain exemptions. The Commissioner has to fix the price of newly subdivided allotments, based on a fair margin of profit. The exemptions to this are the subdivision into allotments of a parcel of land under a half hectare (1¼ acres) which will be free of control and landowners who have held the land under subdivision for more than five years, where the price will be fixed by the Commissioner, shall not be based on "fair margin of profit" basis, but on comparable sale values.

5. A vacant allotment of residential land is the only land which can come under price control in the Bill. Any allotment which had erected upon it at any time any dwellinghouse shall not be a vacant allotment.
6. The controlled area is, for practical purposes, the metropolitan area. The area canot be extended, except by regulations, which must come before Parliament. The original Bill could extend the area by executive proclamation.
7. Mortgagee sales: These have been excluded from control.
8. Allowable increase in sale price, before consent required (as mentioned earlier), is 9½ per cent compound interest, plus costs (rates, taxes, stamp duties, etc.).
9. New house price control: These parts have been deleted from the Bill.
10. The Bill must lapse not later than the end of 1976.

That is the legislation that finally passed through the Council, with that agreement reached. If the Government claims that the Bill has been effective, it must give credit to the Council for the work it did on the original legislation. Although I do not believe that price control achieves very much in any society, as time passes further anomalies appear that were not considered at the time of the Bill's original passage through Parliament. From my understanding of the debates and the negotiations in 1973, there was no intention of the Government to include price control on land zoned for other than residential purposes.

That was as I understood the Bill when it came in in 1973, but I am informed that the legislation, probably through some ambiguity in the Act, applied to commercial and industrial land. As I have said, if we look at the principal Act, we see that it states that it will apply to residential allotments; but then, in the definition of "residential allotments", we see that it applies to any land below a certain area. Therefore, the ambiguity in that legislation has brought into the net of urban land price control commercial and industrial land.

The fact that, since the Act was proclaimed, that land zoned for commercial and industrial purposes had been brought under control has resulted in some difficulties, which I would like to bring to the attention of the Government. If a company wishes to purchase land for industrial or commercial expansion, but wishes to hold that land for, maybe, two or three years to cater for its projected needs but then finds it does not require it, the company may wish to buy land somewhere else; it may already have bought an established factory, to which it can move, and it is then forced to lose money on the resale of that property. I would suggest that for the commercially and industrially zoned land in the proclaimed areas there is no case for the application of urban land price control. Leaving aside for the moment that point, where urban land price control is applying to commercially and industrially zoned areas, the provision of the Act entitles the vendor of land to which the Act applies to recoup certain expenses—landbrokers' fees, solicitors' fees, rates, and conveyancing charges. The vendor is denied, however, the right to recover land agents' selling commission. To me, it is necessary that the vendor engage the experience of an agent in marketing, so it becomes a necessary expense for the vendor, even though this expense of commission on resale is not a fact that has to be taken into account when establishing price control for a block of land.

One must also remember that the Bill passed Parliament in 1973, when interest rates were 3 per cent lower than at present, together with an inflation rate that has been as high as 18 per cent. The inflation rate in 1973 was lower than that, at 15 per cent or more. There has been considerable talk lately of the principle of indexation. If we compare the interest rates in 1973, when the Bill came in, and the present inflation rate with the position in regard to what charges are allowable to be taken into consideration when the control of prices is arrived at, we can see that the principle of indexation should apply in relation to this Bill. Surely that principle should apply to the 9½ per cent maximum allowable under the principal Act, particularly when agents' commission is not an allowable factor in the computation of the controlled price.

If honourable members recall the point I made, where amendments were made to the Bill and the compromise that was reached on those amendments in conference, I should like to give a hypothetical case, although I am sure actual cases are occurring. I give this case of a person holding building allotments to which urban land price control applies. Alongside is the Land Commission or a private developer, who has to seek approval for his prices from the controlling authority, based upon the costs of producing those blocks. Owing to the formula applicable to the individual, perhaps with his two or three blocks, they will be controlled at prices below the prices allowable to the Land Commission or private developer.

This hypothetical case illustrates that in some cases the individual is disadvantaged by the application of two separate prices for two separate organisations and a private individual. This is a hypothetical case, but I have no doubt that that applies elsewhere in South Australia. It is logical that it should apply, because we are applying two different formulae to two different groups, based on two entirely different factors. How to overcome the problem should be of some concern to the members of this Chamber. I am prepared to support the Bill, but I will be looking at amendments along the lines of the two questions I have raised. I know that questions will be raised by other honourable members, but I ask the Minister in charge of the Bill to examine those two matters that I have raised: first, the question of industrial and commercial land; and, secondly, the fact that we are living in a different atmosphere with different conditions applying economically than applied in 1973. I would ask him to look at those two questions and reply to them when he closes the debate, and then I will consider my position concerning amendments to what I consider to be the two existing anomalies in this Bill. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIBRARIES (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1592.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I rise to support the motion, and in doing so will preface my remarks on the Bill with a few observations on the importance of libraries which are playing an ever-growing role in our lives. Libraries give unlimited pleasure to those seeking information or relaxation. They are storehouses of centuries of literature and knowledge. They are custodians of our history and social mores. Rudyard Kipling, now taking his place among the greats in English literature, when speaking to a dinner of the Royal Academy in 1906, recounted an ancient legend about a man who had achieved a most notable deed and wished to explain to his tribe what he had done, but when he rose to speak he found he lacked words, a feeling not unknown to many honourable members.

Thereupon, another man rose, a man who had taken no part in the notable deed, who had no special virtues, but had the magic of words. He described the merits of the notable deed in such a way that the words "became alive and walked up and down in the haunts of all his hearers":

Thereupon, the tribe, seeing that the words were certainly alive, and fearing lest the man with words would hand down untrue tales about them to their children, took and killed him. But later they saw that the magic was in the words, not in the man.

As Kipling said, "The record of the tribe is its enduring literature." We have progressed a long way since that legend, but there is no real substitute for literature as the record of the way people have lived and thought, have loved and fought, have achieved and failed over the centuries from the beginning of time. Literature is a bridge between the centuries. We find from literature that people have not changed much in the last few thousand years. Think of the words of an early Anglo-Saxon writer 1 500 years ago who described the ruins of an old Roman city half buried in the jungle somewhere in England and how he described what he imagined:

There stood courts of stone. The steam hotly rushed, with a wide eddy. Between shut walls, there were baths hot to bathe in. That was a boon indeed.

I remember the same feeling when I first saw the heating room of a Roman bath in England. When I attended a funeral this week I remembered the words written in the seventeenth century by Sir Thomas Browne in his treatise, when he said "When the funeral pyre was out and the last valediction over," and this is what this man said in the treatise, which is ageless:

The iniquity of oblivion blindly scattereth her poppy and deals with the memory of men without distinction to merit of perpetuity. Who can but pity the founder of the pyramids? Oblivion is not to be hired. The greater part must be content to be as though they had not been . . .

We, too, are the same beings as he described—"ready to be anything in the ecstasy of being ever and as content with six foot as with the Moles of Adrianus".

Today we are living in what is popularly called the technological age; there is a necessity for the ready supply of technological literature. Hardly a person in the community does not need to absorb more and more information, almost daily, in an ever-intensifying range of technical and semi-technical matters. The enormous cost of purchasing books has for some years been beyond the capacity of most people in the community. From the fishermen with new types of gear to handle, to the housewife with a deep freezer, or to the electrician or medical practitioner, both trying to keep up to date with new developments, there is a growing and continuous demand for expensive current literature which is not being met.

So many books listed in oversea catalogues never appear on the shelves of our booksellers, and understandably so, as few persons can afford to pay from $18 up to $50 for any book which they may read only once or twice at the most. Australia is in a poor position in this regard. The bookseller on request will order a copy of the required book, but the time of delivery is often nine or 10 months later, by which time the interest or the need has gone. So the library fulfils a very real need in the community. The importance of public libraries is made quite clear in the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Public Libraries, the Lawton report, presented in February of this year to the Federal Parliament, and I would like to quote just two things. The report states:

The user judges the library by a simple test: is the wanted book or piece of information available promptly? From examination of submissions, from statistical evidence and from study of local and overseas experience it is evident that public libraries in Australia do not satisfy this expectancy. In proposing solutions the committee strongly emphasises the need for all levels of government to accept a total approach to planning for libraries and to avoid piecemeal renovation.

If public libraries are to provide satisfactory service, then, following the clarification of the role of the public library,

(*a*) national, State and local plans for public library service must be developed, which recognise the need to develop the infra-structure of libraries in Australia;

(*b*) finance must be available, directed to:
  (1) developing the quality of public library staff and determining the numbers required;
  (2) improving the resource materials in public libraries;
  (3) improving the methods used in public libraries and ensuring support services are available to them;

(*c*) change must be initiated through:
  (1) marketing and promotion, with the objective of achieving greater public awareness of services available from the public library;
  (2) an action research and demonstration programme, with the objective of introducing new, improved methods of providing public library service;
  (3) a research and development programme, which should include the development of improved evaluation methods and their application to provide for continuous evaluation of all proposed programmes.

From that same report I refer to the funds made available by each State for their public library services. Once more, South Australia has the lowest expenditure of all mainland States. The following table sets out State expenditure on libraries in 1974-75:

STATE EXPENDITURE

	Total $ m	Per capita $
New South Wales	19·194	4·04
Victoria	13·410	3·70
Queensland	5·561	2·83
Western Australia	4·208	3·86
South Australia	3·604	2·96

In the light of that statement, is it any wonder that Colin Lawton of Adelaide University's Adult Education Department was recently quoted, referring to South Australian libraries, as saying:

No State in Australia is so badly provided with public libraries.

Library services in South Australia have been the subject of much criticism over the years, and I can sympathise with those Ministers who had tried unsuccessfully to get more funds channelled into library resources. The previous Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson) has been quoted as saying (rather acidly):

People interested in libraries lack political clout.

Mr. Lawton, in his statement reported in the press last month, further stated:

This State has not judged libraries as a priority need. Money can be found for the increasing needs of the State theatre and opera companies, and for regional art centres in several parts of the State.

He continued:

If the South Australian Government is concerned about people's enlightenment then surely libraries are an important factor.

The slogan chosen by the Australian Library Promotion Committee for Australian Library Week last month was "Libraries are great, mate!" As honourable members will

agree, a most erudite slogan, but Mr. Lawton said that South Australia's slogan could more truly have been worded thus:

Libraries might be great, but they're in a poor state in this State, mate!

In his statement Mr. Lawton further pointed out:

1. Half South Australia's population has no public library in its local government area.
2. West of Adelaide, between Marion and Port Adelaide, there is only one library.
3. There are no libraries in Prospect, St. Peters—

let us whisper it—

and Norwood.

4. On Eyre Peninsula there is no library south of Whyalla.
5. There is only one library in the Riverland area.
6. In the South-East there are only two libraries.

He said Adelaide City Council was the only capital city council not running a public library. I like his final comment:

Libraries are not ivory towers of learning. They are becoming more like citizens advice bureaux, places that have current up-to-date information available.

They could be described as filing cabinets not only of the history of the ages but of the latest technical information on an infinite number of subjects.

Turning to the Bill itself, I draw honourable members' attention to the Unesco Public Library Manifesto, which states:

The public library must offer to adults and children the opportunity to keep in touch with their times, to educate themselves continuously and keep abreast of progress in the sciences and the arts. The public library is a natural culture centre for the community, bringing together as it does people of similar interests. It should link itself with other educational, social and cultural institutions, including schools, adult education groups, leisure activity groups and with those concerned with the promotion of the arts.

In a paper presented to the Biennial Conference of the Library Association of Australia, 1973, Mr. Douglas Savige, Field Officer, Public Libraries Division, Library Council of Victoria, spoke of the need for integration of library facilities for a school and a community and gave compelling reasons why the role and functioning of schools, especially school libraries, should be reviewed. He stated:

School libraries and public libraries should relate to the community in a way that university, college and special libraries cannot.

We do not get enough use from school buildings, furniture and equipment, and we certainly do not obtain the maximum benefit when these facilities are used for only 40 weeks a year. This is the same argument I presented many years ago regarding school swimming pools and their summer use, and this matter was rectified. Dr. Genn, Senior Lecturer in Education, University of Queensland, takes that view further and maintains that a school is a generator of community among the citizens. He states:

As well as being a generator within itself for the students and teachers in the school, a school is also, potentially, at least, a generator of community among the citizens.

He goes on:

In a pluralistic society, the school stands out as neutral ground, a place which might well be the meeting place and the learning place where education in the wider sense, for all age groups, might be fostered. It seems reasonable to work the school's plant on a double shift, and to exploit the buildings and facilities for the benefit of all citizens who need and who want to grow as persons and as social beings.

It was with interest that I noticed in last Tuesday's *Hansard* that the Minister of Education in reply to a question stated:

Two formal applications have been received for the establishment of community school libraries. They have been received from Pinnaroo Area School and Cleve Area School.

The Minister continued:

Because of the limitation of finance and the few firm inquiries so far received, it is expected that no more than six community school libraries will be established in this financial year. The locations will depend on the applications received.

Honourable members know how valuable is our own Parliamentary Library. It keeps members supplied with the literature and information they require, and the cost of books and periodicals alone amounts to $8 118 a year, $119·38 a member a year. Outside Parliament the people of South Australia have available to service their requirements through public libraries only $2·95 a head a year. So, there is a big difference between what the public has and what we in Parliament House have at our disposal. It is clear that the people whom we represent are telling the truth when they claim that they are being insufficiently supplied with library facilities. I support this Bill in the hope that libraries in this State will soon be vastly improved.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1663.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS I support this rather complex Bill with some misgivings. Perhaps, as some honourable members have said, we are committed to a Health Commission in South Australia because the matter has been discussed for such a long time. However, I am concerned about some aspects of the Bill; for example, I consider that the number of commissioners is excessive. I also am concerned about the question of "decentralisation", which I would prefer to consider as the possibility (perhaps the probability) of centralisation—central control. I also query the suggested contributions by local government, the relationship between the commission and the Minister, and some aspects of the incorporation of hospitals. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall said:

Frankly, at present we have a Health Department which, although doing very good work, has grown up like Topsy: it is a hotch potch.

I presume that the honourable member was using that as further evidence in support of this Bill. The Hon. Mr. Whyte referred to a former Minister of Health, the Hon. Mr. Shard, who undertook an oversea trip to examine health matters in many countries. The Hon. Mr. Shard returned to South Australia very pleased with the set-up here. With great respect to the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, a professional man, I believe that the Hon. Mr. Shard's opinion would be very valuable.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think the Hon. Mr. Cornwall thought that, because the present system provided for a great deal of autonomy, it was a hotch potch?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Perhaps. I believe that the system we have had here has been very good, and it remains to be seen whether this Bill will improve the situation. I have great respect for the Hon. Mr. Shard. Of course, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall is a professional man, whereas no-one could accuse the Hon. Mr. Shard of being an academic, but he was a man of great experience and wisdom, as I am sure the present Minister of Health would agree. In this case, I believe the Hon. Mr. Shard was correct when he expressed pleasure with the situation in this State. Clause 3 provides:

The objects of this Act are to achieve the rationalisation and co-ordination of health services in this State and to ensure the provision of health services for the benefit of the people of the State upon principles that allow for—

(*a*) the establishment or continuation of hospitals and health centres under the administration of autonomous governing bodies.

I query the word "autonomous", because I believe that this Bill provides for a considerable centralisation of power. The autonomy of the governing bodies of hospitals will be open to considerable doubt. Clause 8 provides:

The commission shall consist of the following members appointed by the Governor upon nomination of the Minister:

(*a*) three full-time members; and

(*b*) five part-time members.

I do not necessarily consider that the commission should consist only of three full-time members, but I query the need for five part-time members; possibly it would be better for the commission to have five members, of whom possibly three could be full-time members. Often, inefficiency and delay, through differences of opinion, are associated with committees that are too large. Clause 15 provides:

In the exercise of its functions, the commission shall be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister.

Why have a commission at all if it is to be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister? I accept that the commission, in the final analysis, should be responsible to the Minister of the day, but I do not agree with the wording of this clause, which gives the general control and direction of the commission to the Minister. The commission should have considerable autonomy, and the bodies working under it should have more autonomy than they appear to be given under this Bill. The first portion of clause 16(1) should be at the beginning of the Bill, because it seems to be the main reason for the Bill and, if the Bill does what this phrase states, it should be supported. Clause 16(1) commences with the words:

The function of the commission is to promote the health and well being of the people of this State . . .

I do not think any members of this place or of another place would disagree with that objective, but whether the Bill achieves it remains to be seen. Clause 18 refers to the appointment of advisory committees, and I should like these committees to be given more to do and possibly expanded, with the actual reduction of the number of members of the commission. Clause 26(1) provides:

The Governor may, by proclamation, incorporate a hospital under the name specified in the proclamation.

Then the clause continues to provide various conditions under which a proclamation shall be made. Subclause (4) provides:

The Governor may, by proclamation, alter the name of an incorporated hospital.

I do not think there is much autonomy about that. If the boards are to be autonomous, I do not think the Governor or the Government should be able, by proclamation, to alter the name of an incorporated hospital, unless for a good reason. The Hutchinson Hospital in my area came into being as a result of the provision of the facilities by the late Mr. Hutchinson, and I should hate an outside body to say, "You have to change the name of that hospital to Gawler Hospital." Doubtless, other hospitals would come under the same qualifications, in that they were commenced by the generosity of a far-sighted citizen. I feel that that subclause is unnecessarily restrictive.

Clauses 27 and 28 deal with the powers of the hospital boards and with the management of the hospitals, and I do not see anything there with which I disagree. Clauses 33 to 37, which deal with accounts, reports and audit, seem to be normal clauses and I do not disagree with them. In Division VI, headed "Hospital fees", clause 38 (1) provides:

The Governor may, by regulation made upon the recommendation of the commission, regulate the fees to be charged by any incorporated hospital in respect of any service provided by it.

I believe that the responsible hospital boards that have successfully managed our hospitals for many years should be given more autonomy than is given in the clause, which means that they can be told what they should be charging.

One of the main portions of the Bill to which I object is Division VII, headed "Rating for hospital purposes". Four clauses in this Division deal with the power of the commission to require contributions, the duties of councils to contribute, and the power of the commission to recover contributions if the councils do not contribute.

I have received many telegrams, as I believe other members have, complaining bitterly about this situation, having regard to the changed circumstances in hospital finances today. On Tuesday the Hon. Mr. Hill gave instances of the cash and reserves on hand in the various hospitals and drew attention to the fact that there was about $6 500 000 in various accounts of various hospitals. Whereas previously the hospitals were frequently in much financial trouble, no-one could say that that obtained today.

I am concerned that in this State, which I understand is the only State in which contributions are required from local government, we are asking councils to contribute up to 3 per cent of their annual rate revenue to hospital funds. This is a duplication of tax. Ratepayers will be paying a tax that they have already contributed in a general way, and I oppose that. I have had information from various parts of the State and I have tabulated it. I do not propose to read it now but I assure the Council that I have received evidence of much opposition to these clauses. If clause 39 is deleted, as I hope it will be, clauses 40, 41 and 42 also probably should be deleted.

The telegrams seeking complete abolition of Division VII have come from people who have contributed to hospitals for many years and people who have served on hospital boards for a long time. One came from a district council that is itself the hospital board and has done much work in improving hospital facilities in its area. It is not a matter of irresponsible objection to a tax but a matter of widespread objection by responsible people who have worked for many years for hospitals and the various voluntary functions of hospitals. I support the Bill at the second reading stage but I disagree with many of the clauses that I have mentioned.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I support the second reading. I will listen to the debate but as at present persuaded I could not support the Bill in its present form. It may be able to be saved by surgery but, if it cannot be suitably amended and if I cannot be persuaded in debate, I will vote against the third reading. The Hon. Mr. Whyte pointed out that the Bright committee report took more than two years to compile. The Bill as originally introduced varied considerably from that report.

The Hon. Mr. Carnie pointed out that the Select Committee recommended far-reaching alterations that have been implemented, but the Bill is still far from perfect and one wonders whether it is possible to achieve a reasonably satisfactory Bill along these lines. At first glance, the arguments for an external health authority advanced in the Bright report are persuasive. However, even the

desirability of a commission can be doubted. If the Health and Hospitals Departments were combined, we would have a good start. Also, in almost every other country in the world the health and community welfare departments are combined. The Corbett committee said the following:

This committee wishes to comment on one of the Bright committee's recommendations. This concerns the proposal that the work of the Health Department should be set up under a statutory authority, removed from the control of the Public Service Act. We believe that recommendations made in the present report overcome many of the problems that the Bright committee envisaged in the authority's being a Public Service Department.

It is clear that that committee considered that, if its proposals relating to the Public Service were implemented, the need for the Health Department to be removed from the Public Service Act would largely be overcome.

The commission will have considerable dealings with the Education Department and the Community Welfare Department, and it is important that such negotiations be on an even footing. The commission, which will not be subject to direct Ministerial control, will be in a much stronger position than the two departments, and this is undesirable. The commission will be a centralist monolithic structure with considerable powers. I am concerned that there is no real direction in the Bill that local government will be properly considered and involved. I am aware of the existence of clause 3 (*e*) and other references to local government, but there is no reasonable guarantee that local government will be adequately involved.

We in this Council are indeed fortunate in having amongst our members that distinguished doyen of local government, the Hon. Cecil Creedon, and I look forward to hearing whether he thinks local government is adequately protected and involved by the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I think we are all looking forward to hearing him.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: That is so. I now refer to a letter of yesterday's date from the East Torrens County Board of Health, which illustrates a lack of guarantee that local government will be involved. The county board is comprised of the local boards of health of Kensington and Norwood, Burnside, Campbelltown, Payneham, St. Peters, and East Torrens. The letter reads:

I have been directed to invite your attention to the composition of the proposed Health Commission Bill now before the Legislative Council by the members of this autonomous statutory authority.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Are all those blokes members of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I would have no idea.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Yes, you would.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have no idea of the political affiliations of the writer of this letter or any of the 12 board members.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I wonder what the politics of the Mayor of Norwood might be.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I could tell you.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The letter continues:

This board was established in 1899 as a regional authority to carry out many of the requirements of the Health Act over the six local governing authorities listed above, covering 70 sq. miles. It has diligently carried out its responsibilities under the Health Act, as have other similar regional type authorities, established by local government in eastern urban Adelaide.

The 12-member board, while appreciating the preliminary comment (3(*e*) of the Bill) "the continued participation of voluntary organisations and local government authorities in the provision of health care; . . . ," believes the proposal lacks specific detail in the future protection of local government's involvement in health services.

The board further believes that greater encouragement could be given to other local government instrumentalities to amalgamate to provide similar services, which, by experience of this authority (and similarly the eastern councils drainage board and East Torrens destructor trust), could be effective and less costly in areas already existing under the provisions of the Health and Local Government Acts. Assurance is not contained restrictively in the Bill to guide the commission in the future role of regional health authorities involving local or county boards of health.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) N. J. WILSON
Secretary/Public Health Officer

The Hon. Mr. Hill yesterday gave a number of examples of ways in which local government is at present effectively and efficiently involved in the delivery of health services. Another example is the role of local boards under the Health Act in the planning, design and inspection of private and charitable nursing homes, hospitals and rest homes. This has been particularly important in recent times because of the trend towards hostel-type accommodation. Nor is there any guarantee in the Bill that proper use will be made of voluntary organisations.

Although we have clauses 3 (*e*) and 16 (*h*), nowhere in the Bill is there any real direction that voluntary agencies will be involved. I believe that in this and many other fields there is no requirement at all that voluntary agencies, local government or regional bodies will be involved.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It is merely alluded to in the second reading explanation.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Exactly, as well as in the reference which I have mentioned and which is fairly vague. I believe that in this and many other fields there should be more co-operation with voluntary agencies, which are often efficient and economic and which always achieve the desirable objective of involving the people in the community.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You ought to get someone else to write your speeches for you.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Does the Hon. Mr. Foster not agree with what I said?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You and your bloody voluntary agencies!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I believe that voluntary agencies should be more involved in this.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You and your bloody voluntary agencies! Why don't you name them?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In this field, I refer to the voluntary agencies engaged in the delivery of health services.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Who and what are they? Tell us who they are.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: There is a whole list of them.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Why don't you tell us who they are?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not going to read the whole list.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I bet you won't.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member knows perfectly well that, if he looks through the list of agencies affiliated with S.A.C.O.S.S. he will see who they are. I do not think there is sufficient guarantee that local or regional involvement will be possible.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Who foots the bill?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: If the honourable member is referring to voluntary agencies, I can tell him that they generally foot the bill themselves, and that is why they are much more efficient.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: In all hospital welfare projects?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member has asked me a question and I am trying to answer it. Will he please let me do so?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You won't. You're just babbling on.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Voluntary agencies foot a large part of the Bill themselves, and that is why they are more economic.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You read out the organisations, and say what they get by way of subsidies and what they raise themselves.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Voluntary agencies raise a large part of the money themselves, and they provide many services that are not paid for at all. They are extremely efficient, and they should be used more by Government in the provision of health, community welfare (sometimes consumer affairs), and similar services. If honourable members opposite do not agree with me in that regard, they will have an opportunity to say so.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Give us some figures.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I would like to, but I cannot give the figures because a value cannot be put on their time.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Give us an example.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He won't.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: There are thousands of examples.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Well, just give us one.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I refer to all voluntary boards of management throughout the State, particularly Government-subsidised hospitals and all their auxiliaries.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: As a lawyer, you've got a trained mind. You would probably reel off a thousand of them if you could.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: There are the auxiliaries of the Children's Hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and so on. The main thing I say in this field is that, if the Hon. Mr. Foster, the Hon. Mr. Dunford and others—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Meals on Wheels started back in 1950.

The PRESIDENT: Order! All interjections are out of order.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They are, too. Will the honourable member give way?

The PRESIDENT: I do not know whether or not he will.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will not give way.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You will not give way because you do not want to hear the truth.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Hon. Mr. Foster has not yet spoken in this debate, nor has the Hon. Mr. Dunford.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I will, too.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: If they really are opposed—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He will be more definite than you are.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: —to the involvement of voluntary organisations—

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: On a point of order, Mr. President, I take exception to that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! What point of order are you taking?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He is saying we are opposed to voluntary organisations; I am not. If he has any information on that, he should give it to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Of course you are against voluntary organisations, and you know it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I take exception to that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I do not know whether it is the hour of the day or the day of the week, but it seems to me we are getting into a situation where a whole lot of argument is going on unnecessarily. There is an honourable member who has the floor—the Hon. Mr. Burdett. If other honourable members want to make comments, they can ask him to give way. I do not know whether or not he will, but there will be a time later in the second reading debate and in Committee when all these points can be made. The Hon. Mr. Burdett.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The point I am making is that I consider there is no specific provision in the Bill about voluntary organisations and there is nothing stating that they be properly involved. I am suggesting that voluntary organisations in the delivery of health and welfare services have in the past been, and should in the future be, given a go, as they are of great benefit to the people of this State; but it appears to me, from the interjections from the Hon. Mr. Foster and the Hon. Mr. Dunford, that they may doubt that proposition. If they do and are indicating a doubt about voluntary organisations being involved for the benefit of the State—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: We do not want you making snide remarks.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have just warned honourable members. The Hon. Mr. Burdett.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The next point I make is—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No. I have not been given a chance in this debate so far and I intend to have it now. I do not intend to give way.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I thought people in your profession did a lot of that.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: There is not much work in your profession.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: There is, as a matter of fact. The next point I wish to make is that I do not think there is sufficient guarantee that local or regional involvement will be possible.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What's the difference?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Clause 3 (d) relates to regional authorities. It is interesting to note that in regard to regional authorities there is no follow-up provision in clause 16. I make clear that I oppose regionalism of the Whitlam type.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What do you mean by that?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I oppose any move to do away with the States and have a central control in Canberra administered through regional bodies which would have precious little say in decision-making; but I do believe in trying to achieve genuine local involvement. As the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has said, I believe that hospitals should have more autonomy. So, to summarise what I have said so far, the Bill does not spell out in sufficient detail the involvement of local government, voluntary organisations, and regional or local bodies. When there is a powerful organisation, as this commission will be, it rarely happens that it will delegate or part with its powers: it will stick to its powers as a flea sticks to a camel's back. The way this Bill is drawn, it is likely that this commission will not delegate or part with many of its powers; it is more likely that it will jealously try to preserve them.

My next concern about the Bill is that it gives very great powers to the commission but does not specify in any detail what those powers are. It is dangerous to give great power without setting out the details. All honourable members (and the Hon. Mr. Creedon in particular) will be familiar with the Local Government Act, which is very long and complex; it sets out in minute detail everything a council can do. If a council wants to know whether or not it can do a certain thing, it looks at the Local Government Act. If the power is specifically given, it can do that thing; if not, it cannot. This doctrine of *ultra vires* has been questioned, and it is argued that a council should be able to do anything not specified by Act of Parliament—but that is another matter.

Councils are constrained to the matters set out in the Act, and this mammoth organisation, the Health Commission, has its powers set out in general and vague terms. They are so wide as to comprehend almost anything. The powers should be spelled out in detail as to what the commission can do. From reading this Bill, we would not really know. There was some interchange yesterday between the Hon. Mr. Cornwall and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris about whether South Australia followed the New South Wales or the Victorian pattern. There are certainly many points of similarity between this Bill and the New South Wales legislation.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: That is not true; for a start, the powers of the commission are different.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: There are many points of similarity.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: As a shadow Attorney-General you are not doing too well.

The PRESIDENT: Order! These personal reflections must cease.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I adhere to the point I have made, that there are many points of similarity between the South Australian Bill and the New South Wales legislation.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He won't give way.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In any event, it is only in New South Wales that such an Act has been in operation for some time. Speaking to people in New South Wales who have had some experience of the operation of the Act, I get the general answer, "Don't do it this way; be guided by the mistakes we have made." But the Government has not been prepared to learn and has fallen into the same trap. I turn now to Part II of the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you referring to a specific part of the Bill?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am referring to Part II of the Bill, dealing with the establishment of a commission of eight members. There are to be three full-time and five part-time members. This seems to me to be an unwieldy commission. I would think, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, it would have been better to have a small commission of three or five, and a large general consultative council truly representative of people involved in health services. There is provision in the Bill for consultative councils in specific areas, but that is all. I think if there were a general consultative council it would, in practice, make its presence felt more than would the part-time members of the commission. If there is to be an eight-man commission, with five part-time members, it should be properly appointed.

Under the Bill all eight members are appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. All are Minister's nominees. At least two of the part-time members should be nominated by interested areas. We now have the very familiar pattern of all members being appointed for a term not exceeding, in this case, seven years. However, the term could be six months, making the members very dependent upon the Minister. We have had similar provisions recently in the Grants Commission Bill and the Poultry Processing Bill. I think it is time that the Government got into its head that, in general, although there may be some exceptions, members on this side of the Council will not tolerate all members of boards being Ministerially appointed, nor indeterminate terms. If the Government would realise this it would save the time of the Council. If it would formulate its legislation properly in the first place, it would save members on this side of the Chamber the tedious work involved in moving amendments on every occasion when legislation of this kind is introduced.

I refer to clause 39, as have other honourable members, providing for rating for hospital purposes. Honourable members have received dozens of telegrams, letters and telephone calls from councils objecting to compulsory contributions from councils.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You organised much of that. You have organised them.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: That is not true.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: People on your side of the House have organised that. I had two phone calls yesterday to confirm that.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer to the Hon. Mr. Foster's interjection. I have not organised—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Your Party has organised it. If you have been kept in the dark, too bad, but you over there have organised it.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have not organised any of those communications, and I am not aware of any that have been organised. I have seen communications from almost all councils in South Australia. I did not see one from the Gawler council. I believe in local government.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You believe in running it. Nothing else.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Hon. Mr. Creedon said some time ago that local government is the form of government closest to the people.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: If the people elect it.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: What local government says should be considered in this place and should be listened to, and it is unjust to single out one particular category of taxpayer, namely, the ratepayer. We have gone a long way in this State towards a social welfare State; perhaps we have gone too far. If the taxpayer is to be required to pay for services such as this it should be all the taxpayers, and not just in specific areas—not just the ratepayers. It appears in this Bill that the Government wants to impose a separate tax on the ratepayer as opposed to the general taxpayer. The Government is also promoting other legislation to enable residents of council areas to vote at council elections whether they are ratepayers or not. This seems to me to be strangely inconsistent.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is like the matter you had yesterday.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am coming to that. Finally, Mr. President, there is no doubt that the commission is a very powerful body and there should be some curb on its powers, and it may be that the Hon. Mr. Foster will be happy, in view of his impassioned outburst yesterday, if we provide for a right of appeal.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I was pointing out to you your inconsistency in your amendment yesterday on another Bill and your absolute and total hypocrisy on previous Bills.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I take exception to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Foster that I am absolutely and totally hypocritical and I call on him to withdraw that remark and apologise.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What did I say to cause you offence?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: You called me a total and absolute hypocrite.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Burdett has objected to the use by the Hon. Mr. Foster of the suggestion that he was guilty of total hypocrisy in connection with the Bill yesterday. I call upon the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If I may explain: if he heard correctly, as others in this Chamber certainly did, it would be offensive to the honourable member if I directed it to the Hon. Mr. Burdett. I did not do so. I directed it to members on the opposite side of the Chamber, and that does not make it offensive. If he calls me a communist, it is offensive, but if he says we are all communists on this side of the Chamber it is not.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The remark was directed at me.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It was not. If the honourable member wants me to withdraw the remark I withdraw. I will take issue with the Chamber the week after next. If I say that you are all hypocrites, that does not give you the right to object, but if I say you (meaning a particular member) are a hypocrite you may object. To satisfy his childishness, I withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: The use of these terms, whether the honourable member reflects on an individual member or members as a body, is unparliamentary and I call on the honourable member to withdraw his remarks.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I did withdraw, Your Honour.

The PRESIDENT: I hope the honourable member will not use these expressions again in the Council.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: On a point of order, Mr. President. Is it in fact unparliamentary to refer to a Party or Parties as hypocrites?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member was not talking about a Party, he was talking about members of this Council.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: As a body, with respect.

The PRESIDENT: It is a hypothetical question. Any use of those terms is unparliamentary when they reflect on members.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They didn't reflect.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: They did.

The PRESIDENT: Order! In my opinion they did reflect.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: You are ruling, Mr. President, that the use of the word "hypocritical" is unparliamentary in all circumstances?

The PRESIDENT: I am not at all. I am saying that the use of the word by honourable members in this Council, that an individual is a hypocrite, or that members generally are hypocritical or a bunch of hypocrites, without any explanation or reason to back that statement up is unparliamentary. It is a term of abuse.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The member who has been addressing the Council referred to a debate I took part in yesterday, and he said he was coming to the Hon. Mr. Foster. I used the word "hypocritical" on several occasions yesterday, and I put it in the correct context, and you, Mr. President, never murmured or batted an eyelid, and I ask why you do it today?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He gets away with all sorts of things in this Council.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I don't get away with anything in *Hansard*. *Hansard* has a duty to perform of recording what is said and no more.

The PRESIDENT: If anyone wants to call another honourable member a hypocrite and can get up and explain why he is a hypocrite, then I will allow it, but I am not going to permit this as a general term of abuse, which I consider it is. I hope that all honourable members in future will not use it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You said I get away with all sorts of things in *Hansard*. That is not true!

The PRESIDENT: I did not say that.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You did say it.

The PRESIDENT: I said that you get away with all sorts of things in this Council.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is not true, either.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Is it unparliamentary to say someone deliberately misleads the Council?

The PRESIDENT: We shall be here until the early morning if we deal with hypothetical examples.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is not hypothetical. I refer to page 1535 of *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: If there is some explanation at that time when the expression is used, I cannot see anything wrong with that, but some of these words are being bandied about in this Chamber without anything to back them up.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I take a point of order. Since the point of order was raised by the Hon. Mr. Burdett, the Council has been interrupted for the last five minutes, but I have noticed the hypocritical attitude of the Hon. Mr. Burdett: he has not stopped laughing. I have not seen him laugh in this place previously. I think you, Mr. President, should look at who is taking the point of order. The Hon. Mr. Foster is absolutely correct; he did not mean anything personal but, ever since I have been a member of this Council, I have never seen the Hon. Mr. Burdett as happy as he is now.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The situation should be brought to the attention of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: The sooner we get on with this debate the better.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I make the point that I frequently laugh in this Chamber when I have cause to, and there have been antics in the last five minutes that have caused me to laugh, as I have done on many other occasions. As I have said, I will support the second reading, but I cannot support the third reading of the Bill unless it is substantially amended in Committee. I support the second reading for the purpose of discussing the Bill in detail in Committee.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I support the Bill, especially as I want to refer to the provision dealing with the 3 per cent levy on local government rate revenue. I have not gone thoroughly into the period over which this method of hospital funding has operated, but I believe it has operated for about 50 years.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Since 1919.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: However, I know and understand the reason why this burden is placed on councils. Doubtless, the original object was to save the Government of the day some money. Although Governments of the time made noises about supporting hospitals, they were really not anxious to provide hard cash for hospitals. Therefore, if hospitals were keen to obtain new buildings or make additions to their premises they had to raise the initial capital sum and, hopefully, the Government would provide the balance through subsidy.

Many small hospitals found the going tough, because they were often catering for a patient class which could not afford hospitalisation. Consequently, hospitals were often in financial difficulty. The levy on councils helped hospitals in a couple of ways. First, it helped keep hospital fees down to a level that the majority of patients could afford and still pay their bills. Secondly, it helped hospitals with their maintenance programmes. True, the 3 per cent levy does not raise a great sum, especially if one considers the extent of funds received by hospitals from councils in past years, but it did help in a little way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The levy has been as much as 15 per cent.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: That may be the case, but I have not checked back. However, recently the sum provided by councils has been small, except in relation to larger metropolitan councils, but I am referring to the position of country councils, especially those from which we have received telegrams. Only one council that I recall has sent me a telegram in favour of the levy.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Which council was that?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I think it was Kadina council. That council favoured the retention of the levy. If there were any complaints about the levy in the past from councils they were hardly audible but, as soon as this Bill surfaced, councils as a group began to send their telegrams. I think that is a rude way of communicating. The method of communication should be by letter or by personal telephone call. A telegram saying that a council does not support an issue or asking for a member's support in a matter is not—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You're being hypercritical.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: That may be so, but the Bill has been around for a week or two and councils should have made up their minds long before yesterday and today, when we have received telegrams. Did councils bother to consult with hospital boards about their respective efforts? Were hospitals ever asked how much they depended upon or were likely to depend upon council funds? Did councils consult ratepayers to determine whether they thought a hospital was necessary and whether they objected to their council contributing towards their local hospitals? The answer to those questions is probably that they did not.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You're not suggesting that, if the levy goes out, hospitals will close in country areas.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I suggest that if hospital boards do not obtain some council support (they will certainly not obtain Federal Government support) there will have to be much more fund raising, but I will come to that aspect in due course. Had councils questioned their hospital boards, they would be aware that these funds are absolutely necessary. Meagre as they are, they are important to the future welfare of hospitals and the general benefit of ratepayers. I can sympathise with councils, and I have sympathy for their request that the levy be abolished. In the past three years most councils have received large funding through the Commonwealth Government but, according to the 1976-77 Budget presented by the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Lynch), and contrary to the promises made by the Liberal Party before the last Federal election, funds granted to local government have been curtailed by about $80 000 000 this year, and spending on hospitals and all kinds of welfare programmes has been reduced as well.

All communities need these services and members know that someone must pay. It has been suggested to me that, instead of a levy as provided in the Bill, a percentage of income tax collections should be used for this purpose. The Federal Government has agreed to councils being granted a small percentage of income tax revenue, but we have already seen how the Federal Government avoids its promises. For example, I refer to the recent Medibank levy, which is a personal tax, but it is applied separately from income tax, and councils will obtain no benefit from it. I have no doubt that, if councils could get the Federal Government to agree to using income tax to fund hospitals, the share provided to councils in any future Federal Government grants would fall short by the amount that the Federal Government had provided for hospitals which we have known as "subsidised" hospitals but which are now generally known as "recognised" hospitals. While I may seem to be taking sides with hospital boards, I must, in fairness to councils, criticise some hospital boards, in that they do not invite councils to nominate representatives to be present at board meetings. In most cases, hospital boards invite Mayors or Chairmen of district councils to their meetings, but often they are unable to attend the meetings. The hospital boards' rules do not permit anyone to attend in place of the Mayor or Chairman.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Is that the position in Gawler?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Yes.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Are the councils discourteous?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I am saying that the hospital boards are discourteous, in that they do not ask councils to nominate someone to be present at board meetings in place of the Mayor or Chairman.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Isn't that written into their constitution?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The rules of the guilty hospital boards should be changed to provide that hospital boards must invite a council representative to be present at their meetings. The levy, about $990 000, may not seem to be a large sum to some honourable members, but it is a large sum to the hospitals concerned. In some cases the actual amount passing between councils and hospitals may be quite small, but it can always be invested and used for future development. We must remember that it is no longer possible for recognised hospitals to make a profit or a loss. We do not want to return to the situation that applied about 10 years ago, when our hospital system was badly run down. I sympathise with councils, but I also have sympathy for the hospital boards. Regarding the criticisms that have been levelled at the voluntary system, I point out that some groups in Gawler work hard to raise funds to assist hospitals. The Gawler Hospital receives $25 000 from councils, whereas contributions from voluntary organisations amount to only about $3 000. I commend these organisations for raising even that sum, but it is clear that it is not easy to raise the kind of sum necessary for large hospital projects.

I agree with the Hon. Mr. Burdett's statement that local government should be listened to, but, if local government claims that it is capable of running more services than it is allowed to run at present, it is time it proved it can do these things by being willing to pay its way. The honourable member said that the levy falls on one class of people, but we must remember that the voting system

for councils applies to one class of people. If it is good enough for only one class of people to get the vote, it is fair enough to make them pay.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Whom are you talking about?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Most people pay rates. Even some Housing Trust tenants pay rates.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Cameron.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am not sure about the Government's attitude to voluntary organisations and I am in even greater doubt about the Bill's provisions dealing with such organisations. The Health Commission will have very wide powers, and its interpretation of the measure is therefore important. Will the trend be toward greater use of local government people or will power be centralised? There really is no specific requirement, and that is my concern. The composition of the commission will be the key to the success of the commission, and this gets back to the more fundamental problem of who selects the members of the commission. At present, the selection of commission members is in the hands of the Minister and his departmental advisers. There could be eight people of similar thinking, all selected by the Minister. Their thinking could determine how the commission works.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: The Hon. Mr. Hill said the opposite.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We make up our own minds.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: We have some independence, but Government members have none. They sit there, directed from somewhere (down below, I think), and they have no opportunity to say what they really think. Apart from education, the question of health services is the most sensitive area in any community. Local involvement, a key factor in this field, will finally decide whether the commission is an advantage.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The PRESIDENT: I do not think so.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Sit down. The honourable member has had twice as much to say as any other honourable member. One does not need to give way to him because of the way in which he prattles on all day.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You can't even name the voluntary organisations. Who originally supported Meals on Wheels?

The PRESIDENT: Order! We will get nowhere if this rag-tag talking continues. The Hon. Mr. Cameron has the floor, and I think he wants to make a powerful but short speech.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. President. I have no wish to continue this debate for too long. It is extremely difficult to make a reasoned speech in this Council with the continual interruptions that occur. I repeat that the key to the success of this commission will be the personnel who finally form it and their attitude towards the extreme powers that they will have. If those commission members decide not to go in the direction of local involvement, they will, as I understand the Bill, be able to do so. If they do, it will be a sad thing.

It is a pity that the course of action to be taken by the commission's personnel is not more tightly controlled in the Bill. True, there are advantages in having such a commission, and I trust that the people who finally become a part of it will see the need for local involvement, and that the commission will not be a centralist one but that it will go outwards into the community. This is terribly important in health care.

Regarding local councils, I was amused to hear the Hon. Mr. Creedon refer to the 3 per cent levy as a burden on councils. That is just what it is. It is time that councils were relieved of this burden, as it was described by the Hon. Mr. Creedon. As a council member, I am sure that the honourable member does not regard the sums of money that councils must hand over in this respect as being paltry sums. I should like him to convince his Gawler ratepayers that the sum that they are levied for this purpose is a paltry one. Although it may be a small sum in a certain country area, it does not mean that it is not as heavy a burden in that area, which has a small number of ratepayers, as it is in another area that might have a larger population.

I was surprised that the Gawler hospital specifies who is to be appointed to its board. That is the first time that I have heard of this method of selection. I trust that the Hon. Mr. Creedon, in his high office in Gawler, will be able to persuade those people to abandon that course of action. Councils have representatives on boards, and they would be aware of what was happening if they had a representative who was worth his salt, because he would tell them.

The time has been reached when I trust the Government will see the need to remove this burden, as the Hon. Mr. Creedon described it, and that that part of the Bill will be removed. Although I support the second reading, I indicate that amendments placing certain restrictions on the method of selecting the board personnel will receive my support in Committee.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1976. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I do not intend to give a second reading explanation, because the explanation is exactly the same as that applying to the Impounding Act Amendment Bill, which came from the other place recently. On examination, we found that the amendment passed by the House of Assembly should have been in the Local Government Act as the correct place. This Bill places the amendment in the Local Government Act.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 2, at 2.15 p.m.