

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, November 2, 1977

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

## QUESTIONS

## SEAT BELTS

**The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport about seat belts.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS:** Recently, regulations were gazetted by the Government about the compulsory wearing of seat belts. Those regulations covered all motor vehicles, including heavy motor transport. When the regulations were laid on the table, inquiries were made by honourable members received from associations representing the transport industry in South Australia but no opposition was raised to these regulations. However, since then, the Professional Drivers Association has pointed out that there are serious difficulties in applying the regulations dealing with the compulsory wearing of seat belts in some very heavy road transports. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport ask his colleague to examine the case of the Professional Drivers Association with a view, if he agrees with its case, to bringing down variations to the regulations to which I have referred?

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

## BOLIVAR WATER

**The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS:** I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Leader of the Government in this Chamber, with reference to Bolivar water.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS:** I wish to quote a short letter written by Mr. W. R. Miller, Secretary of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association, Adelaide, to the following effect, to the Editor of the *Advertiser*:

Following your editorial "sign of the dripping tap" (*Advertiser* 29/10/77) the hard-pressed gardeners of the Virginia district are still wondering why their plan to use the useful Bolivar water (proved on the Munno Para experimental garden 1968 to 1975) to supplement their failing bores, was fobbed off. This irrigation plan could have been financed with a Commonwealth water grant at no cost to the South Australian taxpayer (*Hansard*, 15/10/70, 19/11/70 and 22/11/72). No satisfactory explanation was ever given with the official refusal to allow this scheme to get under way. It is now evident that locally grown vegetables could be very scarce in the near future due to the severe restrictions on the use of bore water, and the drought conditions over South Australia. Useful Bolivar water, approximately 90 000 000 litres a day, has been flowing into the sea for 10 years. This is an appalling waste in view of South Australia's severe water shortage, coupled with the fact that South Australia is the driest State in Australia.

I have to direct my question to the Leader of the Government, who represents the Minister of Works in this Chamber. To some extent, I also address my comments to

the Minister of Lands, who, as a former Minister of Agriculture, would know very well that representations have been made over the years by the late Hon. Harry Kemp and another former colleague of mine, the Hon. Les Hart, as well as by myself, seeking the use of this recycled water.

The Minister would also be aware of the Munno Para experiments, referred to by Mr. Miller, as well as of the Agriculture Department experiments, which were under his over-sight at the time and which were indeed successful. The Minister was good enough to show the results of the latter experiments, which were conducted by Mr. W. E. Matheson, a Master of Agricultural Science, to the late Mr. Kemp and me.

In view of the present serious drought situation, as well as of the matters raised by Mr. Miller, I ask the Minister to ascertain from his colleague whether further consideration has been given to this matter and, if it has not, whether further consideration will be given to it in the interests not only of growers but also of providing vegetables at economic prices to a large proportion of the population.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** The Government has been concerned about the recycling of Bolivar water; it is not merely the case that the Government has been unable to reticulate this water, as the question of health, which has been of concern to the Government for some time, also enters into the matter. It is doubtful whether it would be safe for fruit and vegetables to be watered from this supply, and this is one of the reasons why nothing has been done about it in the past. However, I will again see what progress has been made. I know that much testing has been continuing for a number of years, and that those concerned are not completely satisfied at this stage that it is safe to use this recycled water.

**The Hon. R. A. Geddes:** Does the safety aspect come under the Health Department?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** Yes. The Health Department has been working in conjunction with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I will refer the question to my colleague.

## BEEF EXPORTS

**The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS:** I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the ban on the sale of beef to Sweden.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS:** In this morning's *Australian* is a report entitled "Blow to meat trade. Sweden bans 27 abattoirs over salmonella." By way of explanation, and for the benefit of honourable members who have not seen this report, I should like to read briefly from it, as follows:

Sweden has dealt a major blow to Australia's troubled \$300 000 000 beef export trade by banning abattoirs in all States because of a salmonella scare. Australia exports beef worth \$27 000 000 a year to Sweden and, although that country has asked for an urgent upgrading of hygiene standards in the 27 abattoirs concerned, there appears little that the Department of Primary Industry can do.

The ban was imposed on October 15 by the food production division of the Swedish Food Authority and is effective "until further notice." Originally Sweden banned only eight abattoirs and sought a response from the Department of Primary Industry in Canberra. This has not been forthcoming, and in the meantime another 19 abattoirs were added to the banned list.

The counsellor at the Swedish Embassy in Canberra, Mr. Leonart Watz, and the Bureau of Animal Health within the Department of Primary Industry, yesterday confirmed there

were bans. Mr. Watz said restrictions had been imposed on the abattoirs because they did not meet Swedish standards and because traces of salmonella poisoning were discovered in the beef earlier this year.

Although the report goes on to say considerably more than that, what I have read is sufficient to explain my question. Will the Minister tell the Council which abattoirs in South Australia have been banned by the Swedish Food Authority; what effect will the ban have on South Australian meat sales and employment at abattoirs; and finally, what steps can be taken to have the ban lifted by raising the standards of the abattoirs to comply with Swedish standards?

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I saw the report in today's *Australian*, and that was the first time I have been aware of this matter. At this stage, I cannot say which abattoirs in South Australia are banned by the Swedish authority, but I will ascertain that. I also find it hard to believe that we can raise the standards any further, because the standards of hygiene and meat inspection in the export abattoirs in South Australia are extremely high. I am surprised by this whole report and I hope that it proves to be as groundless as was the suggestion about salmonella in Australian meat in the United States. That report was made a few months ago and, on closer examination, the United States authorities found that it was the fault not of Australian abattoirs that salmonella was there but of the people in the United States who were using incorrect methods to cook the meat. I hope that the present report can be refuted, because it would have serious effects on the Australian meat industry, including the South Australian meat industry, either directly or indirectly.

#### STUART HIGHWAY

**The Hon. A. M. WHYTE:** The Minister of Lands has indicated that he has a reply to a question I asked yesterday regarding the environmental impact study on the Stuart Highway.

**The Hon. T. M. CASEY:** Further to my reply to the honourable member last week, I have now been advised by my colleague the Minister of Transport that a copy of the environmental impact statement has been placed in the Parliamentary Library. However, if the honourable member wishes to obtain a personal copy, it will be necessary for him to buy a copy at a cost of \$10. The heavy demand for copies has resulted in some delay in supply and the time allowed for comment will be extended by arrangement with the Commonwealth Department for Environment, Housing and Community Development.

**The Hon. A. M. WHYTE:** As I indicated yesterday, the supply of these documents was depleted some time ago (if there ever was a "supply"). I am aware that there is a copy in the Parliamentary library, and I have perused that copy. However, no extra copies are available, and there are in the community people who still wish to make submissions on this matter. Can this situation be rectified by a reprint?

**The Hon. T. M. CASEY:** As I indicated in the reply I have just given, the heavy demand for copies has resulted in some delay in supply. More copies will be printed and the time allowed for comments will be extended by arrangement with the Commonwealth Department for Environment, Housing and Community Development.

#### TYRE ADVERTISING

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

Health, representing the Attorney-General, concerning advertising.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** Currently being shown on television is an advertisement by a tyre company, advertising tyres at reduced prices. In the advertisement certain specific brands of motor car are named. On Monday a constituent who wished to buy a new set of tyres for her car telephoned the firm concerned and asked whether it had tyres for her Cortina, which car was specifically mentioned in the advertisement. On being told "Yes", and after having some difficulty about leaving her children with friends, and so on, she came to the city and was told that the firm did not have tyres to fit her model. She was told that they were no longer available on special (I think they were the words used), and she had tyres fitted and paid the full price for them. That same evening the advertisement was shown again and still showed the particular brand of Cortina.

She referred the matter to me and, when I telephoned the firm this morning and explained the facts, the firm said, "We still have tyres to fit the Cortina, but not the current model." They were never included in the special. When I pointed out that this could be construed as false advertising, I was told that the advertising people had checked it out, that it was perfectly legal. I was told that the company had tyres to fit a Cortina, but not the current model, and that the company had tyres on special to fit a current model Holden—

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Which model Cortina?

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** The model just superseded a month ago. It was sold over the past four years, but the tyres advertised did not fit that model. Is this a legal situation? If it is, will the Attorney consider amending the Unfair Advertising Act to stop this sort of practice?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** I shall take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report.

#### BLUE TONGUE

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture, in respect of blue tongue virus.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** On the weekend a report was issued by Mr. Sinclair that was a trifle confusing. Apparently he did say that a virus resembling the blue tongue virus had been isolated in midges collected in the Northern Territory in 1975. I need hardly tell honourable members what a devastating effect this disease would have on the sheep and cattle population of Australia. There seemed to be some confusion as to whether this was a blue tongue virus or a virus resembling blue tongue. There seemed to be further confusion as to how it got into the country in the first place. Has the Minister been able to obtain further information?

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** It is a most confusing situation, because the virus under test resembles blue tongue. It was isolated from biting midges that came from insects from the Beatrice Hill Research Centre in the Northern Territory. The insects, which were tested, showed under test this virus resembling blue tongue. They were collected in 1975; that is, more than two years ago. Subsequently, there has not been any sign of blue tongue in any of the cattle or other animals of the area.

It is a mysterious situation, because this virus has been identified but there have been no clinical symptoms in any of the animals that it normally infects. Presently, a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Animal

Health is looking into the matter and carrying out further tests of cattle in the area to try to determine the true situation. We are all much concerned because of Australia's high reputation in terms of its freedom from blue tongue and other exotic diseases. It would be a devastating situation if blue tongue were to become established in Australia. It would also be serious if we were to lose our reputation, in respect of oversea exports, of being free from blue tongue disease. This matter is now under investigation as no-one can explain how this combination of events and factors fit together.

#### CRAFT AUTHORITY

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I ask leave to make a statement before addressing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, concerning the oversea tour of two former members of the Craft Authority Board.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** During the Budget debate I indicated that I hoped the report of these two people would have been made to the authority and could be brought before Parliament so that it could be perused by honourable members, who could make their judgment as to whether or not the worth of that trip was warranted.

Also, I expected at that stage that the Jam Factory's annual report would in due course (and I hoped soon) be laid on the table of this Council. That was done yesterday, and this trip was referred to in two places in that report. The report, at page 11, states:

An overseas trip costing \$34 796 was made by the former Chairman, Dr. E. Hackett, and his Deputy, Ms. K. LeMercier. Payment included a consulting fee to Ms. LeMercier of \$14 300.

Elsewhere in the report is a statement of the Auditor-General's reference to the trip. The Auditor-General informed the Chairman of Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated as follows:

Although expenditure has now been accounted for, the former board's minutes did not contain specific approval of the itinerary and estimated expenditure, nor were my auditors able to obtain any detailed budget from association records. The expenditure statement now prepared is limited in analysis: (i) on a day to day basis; (ii) by expenditure type.

The report of these two people to the authority has not yet been laid on the table of this Council. Will the Premier bring down that report to Parliament, so that honourable members can peruse it in detail?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

#### URANIUM

**The Hon. R. A. GEDDES:** On October 12, I asked the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, whether representatives from the United Kingdom Uranium Enrichment Company, then visiting Australia, would have the opportunity of talking to the Government. Has the Minister a reply?

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** In accordance with the Government's policy of monitoring development in uranium enrichment, arrangements were made for the URENCO representatives to visit South Australia. They met with the Premier on Wednesday, October 12, and had discussions with senior Government officials the following day. At these discussions, arrangements were made for a continuance of exchange of information in order that the Government may continue to be fully informed on this matter.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about staff appointments at Mount Gambier Hospital?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** With the establishment of the South Australian Health Commission, all Government country hospitals in South Australia will become autonomous. No appointments of medical staff will be made until the full implications of this independence and regional responsibilities have been determined. At that time, incorporated hospitals will be in a position to take the matter up with the South Australian Health Commission and local county groups.

#### BURNSIDE ROAD CLOSURES

**The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS:** Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Transport to my question about Burnside road closures?

**The Hon. T. M. CASEY:** Before agreeing to changing the Burnside road closure regulations, the Road Traffic Board considered that the closures should remain for a minimum of six months in order to assess their effect. This trial period ended in December, 1976, and a further time was necessary to accumulate data and prepare an accident analysis.

On April 14, 1977, the Road Traffic Board approved an alternative scheme reducing the closures from the original 12 to eight. The new regulations were drafted and were to be promulgated. In the meantime the Burnside council had an election and on July 21, 1977, council advised the board that it intended to remove all road closures, with the exception of Webb Street.

The board, because of its responsibility for road safety, was not prepared to rescind all of the existing regulations until council produced an alternative scheme that it considered will at least maintain the reduced accident rate at or lower than the existing level. Burnside council is now preparing a new scheme which, on finalisation, will be submitted to the Road Traffic Board for consideration. The honourable member's question stated that my colleague supported the Anti-Road Closure Committee. This is, of course, quite incorrect.

#### LANDS DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTING

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question concerning Lands Department accounting?

**The Hon. T. M. CASEY:** Further to the answer I gave the honourable member last year, the Director-General has assured me that the matters referred to in the Auditor-General's Report in relation to items (a) and (b) have been corrected, and that the matters in relation to items (c) and (d) are in the process of being corrected.

#### JAM FACTORY

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I direct a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Premier: is it true that one of the three members (namely, the professional craftsmen) in the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated has resigned his office? If so, what were the reasons for the resignation?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** I will seek a report on the matter.

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS:** I ask the Chief Secretary whether he has any information to give to the Council in regard to Parliamentary sittings.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** The Government informs the Council that it will not be necessary to sit next week. After that time, Parliamentary sittings will continue until the second or third week in December, at which time Parliament will adjourn until about the third week in February.

## INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1967-1972. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

For some reason, the making and selling of that most staple of foodstuff, bread, has more restrictions placed on it than has almost any other item of food and drink.

In metropolitan Adelaide, in normal circumstances, bread cannot be baked between 6 p.m. Friday and midnight Sunday. Comparing this with other States we find that Queensland and Victoria have no restrictions at all: if they wish, bakeries can bake 24 hours a day, seven days a week but, in fact, do not do so. Tasmania is interesting in that, while there are no restrictions on the baking of bread, by convention bakeries chose not to. This raises one very important point about this Bill. Nowhere is there any compulsion. If individual bakers or, as is more likely, the industry as a whole, decide that there is insufficient demand, or that costs will be too great, they could choose to preserve the status quo, or set any hours which they think best.

Western Australia has restrictions similar to South Australia, as does New South Wales, although the Labor Minister for Industrial Relations in New South Wales, Mr. Hills, announced in June of this year that he would introduce legislation to remove what he referred to as the farcical restrictions on weekend baking.

There are arguments as to whether or not there is, in fact, a demand for fresh bread at weekends. The sales recorded at the outlets which sell country-baked bread on Sundays would seem to indicate that there is. Also, on page 17 of the report of the Bread Industry Inquiry Committee of October 30, 1974, it states:

The need for early baking and delivery is attributed to consumer demand for fresh bread at small shops and supermarkets. It is alleged that the availability of fresh bread in shops when they are first opened, attracts customers.

If fresh bread attracts customers early to shops on weekdays, then surely it would do the same at weekends.

The success in Victoria is apparent. Unrestricted baking in Victoria has been in operation for almost 10 years, and has gained very wide public acceptance. Hot-bread shops have proliferated and the demand for fresh bread, both from these outlets and others, is such that industry officials in Melbourne last week told me that, while both management and workers would like to see a return to five-day, or even six-day, baking, neither was prepared to promote such a move because of the strong public opposition there would be.

The question of price has inevitably been raised. Mr. Bobridge, of the Bread Manufacturers Association of South Australia, is reported in the *News* of October 27 as

saying that seven-day-a-week bread baking would mean that the price of bread would increase by 10c a loaf. It appears that Mr. Bobridge is attempting scare tactics so that housewives will oppose this move. If the argument is that the introduction of unrestricted baking hours would mean a 20 per cent increase in price (and that is what it would amount to), how is it that in Victoria there are not only unrestricted hours but also no price control: bread prices are the same as in South Australia.

In fact, prices in Victoria are usually lower because discounting of bread is a common practice. It is not like South Australia where union pressure in January prevented supermarkets and other businesses from discounting bread by placing a ban on delivery. There seems to be a conflict inherent in the fact that, while one section of the trade union movement is eager to promote, for example, discount sales of petrol, another section, in defiance of the principles of restrictive trade practices legislation, is fighting to keep the price of bread up.

In fact, the effect of this particular bit of union pressure is to ensure that the large chains, which are usually the targets of unions, make a greater profit. Discounts ranging up to 24 per cent are given to supermarkets, but they are not permitted to pass discounts on to the customer.

Concerning the price of bread, I find the opinion of Mr. Max Austin, of the Bread Manufacturers of New South Wales, more credible than that of Mr. Bobridge. He stated in June that all-week baking and selling of bread would mean a price increase of 2c, not 10c. If any price increase was greater than that, it would show that the bread bakers award in South Australia needed revision. The Bread Industry Inquiry Committee, of which Mr. J. Fryer, Secretary of the Baking Trades Employees Federation (S.A. Branch) and Mr. F. A. Evans, Secretary of the Bread Carters Industrial Federation (S.A. Branch) were members who signed the report, which was tabled in Parliament, compared the South Australian award with the position in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. The committee came to the following conclusion:

The South Australian award results in on average higher, but also a much wider range of gross weekly earnings for bakers in this State. It also means that in giving a justifiable wage increase to bakers earning only marginally above the award rate, much greater earnings increases are given to bakers receiving the penalty payments. This results in large wage cost increases for plant bakeries which have no option but to pass them on to the consumer through higher bread prices. We therefore recommend that the award be restructured so that the award rate is higher and penalties other than the shift loading are removed. This will lead to a narrower range of gross weekly earnings. It will also mean that when future award increases, which are justifiable for bakers on lower wages, are granted, there will no longer be disproportionate increases in the gross weekly earnings of bakers involved in early starts, who already receive good wages. Overall wage cost increases to plant bakeries will therefore be lower, and this will help prevent higher bread prices.

This is an eminently sensible recommendation and, as I said, was signed by Mr. Fryer as a member of that committee. On Friday of last week, the same Mr. Fryer stated that, if this Bill passed, he would press for quadruple time for weekend baking. Already the award provides for treble time for weekend work in those exempt areas where it is permitted. In Victoria, the award provides for double time for weekend work.

The price of bread has risen faster in South Australia than in any other State until it is now as dear as anywhere in Australia. In 10 years, while the general cost of living as

measured by the consumer price index has just over doubled, the price of bread has just over trebled. It appears that the award position, achieved by union pressure, has caused this unenviable position.

The Government agrees that there is a demand and a need for increased baking hours. In July, 1976, Cabinet strongly supported a plan to extend baking hours from 6 p.m. on Friday to noon on Saturday. In an unprecedented back-down five hours after making the announcement, the Minister of Labour and Industry, in response to pressure exerted by the large bakeries and the unions, rescinded the decision. The Premier at that time said that he thought that the proposal to extend baking hours in the metropolitan area to noon on Saturday would work. Despite this, he was not allowed to do it. Outside pressure saw to that. In this case the pressure came from both management and union, but the person forgotten in the whole exchange was the consumer.

I have referred earlier to pressure exerted by unions, but it is obvious that undue pressure is also exerted by management, and in this regard it is fitting to examine the structure of the bread industry in metropolitan Adelaide. Of the 30 bakeries in the city, eight bakeries owned by four companies control 80 per cent of the market. Another four bakeries have 11 per cent. So this means that 12 bakeries, or eight companies, control 91 per cent of the market, while the other 18 bakeries share 9 per cent.

While I am the last one to decry the principle of free enterprise (in fact, this Bill is in support of that principle), it is obvious that a powerful group such as this can exert a disproportionate influence, as was evidenced last year. I offer no solution to this question, but mention it to point out that this influence, together with that of the unions, is denying consumers in this State a benefit which experience in other States shows is a desirable one. As I mentioned earlier, the person who is forgotten in this whole exchange of people looking after their own interests is the consumer.

I come now to the clauses of the Bill, which is very short and simple. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 194 of the principal Act.

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

#### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1976. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

For many years Adelaide's restaurants and hotels have rightly enjoyed a very high reputation. From the beginning of the liberalisation of our licensing laws in 1965, we quickly adopted the very enjoyable practice of wining and dining in pleasant surroundings. Although South Australia has very liberal licensing laws (restaurants, for example, have unrestricted hours) there is one thing which needs to be added to give us what I consider would be a near-perfect system. That is to provide for restaurants where patrons can take their own liquor.

The cost of eating out has steadily escalated in recent years, and one of the major causes has been the prices charged for wines. There are two main reasons for these charges. The first is the cost to restaurants of licensing fees. These are assessed on the basis of 8 per cent of liquor turnover, and for most restaurants the fee is such as to add significantly to the overhead costs. The second is the ever-present high and increasing cost of wages. As honourable members will appreciate, wine waiters and waitresses work mainly in hours which involve penalty payments, and

consequently this is another expensive overhead for licensed restaurants. A third reason for high wine prices, which fortunately applies to a minority, is simply blatant over-charging.

In addition to these charges, licensed restaurants must carry a stock of liquor, which entails a substantial outlay of capital. It is possible, under present licensing laws, for a licensed restaurant to allow patrons to bring their own liquor, and at least one well known restaurant does this. I understand that the particular restaurant started it on a Monday to Thursday basis, but it proved so popular that it now operates on a seven-day week basis, and it is necessary to make reservations some weeks in advance.

However, the overheads and capital outlay which I mentioned still apply, so it is not the ideal solution. In fact, in the terms of the licence under which it operates, the restaurant must record what liquor is taken in, and pay 8 per cent of its value in licence fees. In addition, any liquor not consumed must be left, as it is illegal, under a restaurant licence, to take liquor off the premises.

There is a solution to that particular anomaly, that is, to ensure that no liquor is left to take home. However, that may not necessarily be the wisest solution. The obvious solution is to create a new kind of licence, and that is what this Bill seeks to do. It adds a "limited restaurant licence" to the Licensing Act. B.Y.O., as it is usually called, is common in both New South Wales and Victoria, so it is possible to see some of the pitfalls and avoid them in South Australia. In New South Wales, for example, no licence is required at all. Any cafe or pizza bar, if the proprietor so desires, can allow patrons to bring their own liquor. It is very easy to see that this could lead to a most undesirable situation.

The Licensing Court has no power over such premises, the only control being the normal Health Act, so that, provided the place is clean, there is no control whatever over the consumption of liquor. This is a most undesirable situation, which could be remedied with a proper licensing provision. This is not to say that there are not many B.Y.O. restaurants of a very high standard in Sydney; there are, and I am sure that many honourable members would have patronised them. However, because, of no effective control, many are far from a high standard. In the introduction of this Bill, I am determined that any restaurant which obtains such a licence maintains a standard which is in keeping with the generally accepted standard for the serving of good food and wine. By placing the matter in the hands of the Licensing Court, this will be ensured.

In Victoria, a licensing system prevails, and on the whole the system works well. However, one or two anomalies have crept in that I have tried to provide for in this Bill. One is that some unscrupulous proprietors are breaking the law by selling liquor. Usually, when patrons go to B.Y.O. restaurants they take red or white wine but nothing else. Certain restaurants are then offering port or liqueur, and charging for it, which is illegal. The Liquor Control Commission in Victoria is aware of this problem and is attempting to police the Act as thoroughly as it can. This Bill attempts to overcome this problem in a way which I will explain when dealing with the clauses of the Bill.

Another small point that is causing concern is the fact that restaurants with the B.Y.O. licence are calling themselves "licensed B.Y.O. restaurants". Although this may be technically correct, it has brought complaints from normal restaurant owners, particularly where the word "licensed" is printed in much larger characters than "B.Y.O.". Under regulations now being introduced in Victoria, the word "licensed" will not be allowed to be

used by holders of B.Y.O. licences. I hope that, when the Licensing Court is administering this section of the Act, it will take note of this and order accordingly so that this problem will never arise in South Australia. Apart from these comparatively minor points, the system is working very well indeed in Victoria, and has wide public acceptance. Victoria can serve as a model for South Australia in this matter.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 14 of the principal Act by adding a seventeenth class of licence, a "limited restaurant licence". Clause 3 provides for a new section 31a, which sets out the details of the licence. It provides that the hours of B.Y.O. restaurants shall be unrestricted, as are licensed restaurants. Paragraph (b) of new subsection (1) tries to overcome the problem I mentioned earlier concerning restaurants selling liquor. It is a common practice in both Victoria and New South Wales for the patron to ask a member of the staff to go to a nearby hotel and buy liquor for him.

So that the restaurant cannot simply keep a stock of its own and supply from that, this section provides that, in these circumstances, the liquor must be purchased from the holder of a full publican's or a retail storekeeper's licence. In other words, the onus will be on the proprietor or patron to prove that the liquor was indeed bought from a licensed publican or a licensed retail storekeeper.

New subsection (2) empowers the court to impose any conditions it thinks fit, and gives it power to limit corkage or any other charges. There seems to be a slight difference of opinion on the question of corkage in Victoria. It depends on to which restaurant one goes. However, I am told that most restaurants in Victoria charge either no corkage or a minimal fee such as 20c. Clause 4 amends section 37 of the Act, which deals with fees, and sets a fee of \$50 a year.

Clause 5 amends section 82 of the principal Act, which deals with the power of a company to hold a licence, and adds "limited restaurant licence" to the prescribed licences. Clause 6 amends section 168 of the Act by exempting limited licensed restaurants from being forced to supply food and lodging, in common with ordinary licensed restaurants. I commend the Bill to the Council.

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

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Read a third time and passed.

#### BEVERAGE CONTAINER REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris:

That the regulations made on June 23, 1977, under the Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976, exempting certain classes of containers from the provisions of the Act, and laid on the table of this Council on July 19, 1977, be disallowed.

(Continued from October 26. Page 456.)

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** This motion deals with the regulations made under the Act on June 23, 1977. There is also on the Notice Paper another motion dealing with regulations made under the same Act on June 2, 1977. The motion on which I am now speaking deals with the exemptions that the Government wishes to declare from the operation of the Act, namely, beer bottles, deposit-bearing refillable soft drink bottles, wine casks or sacks, and glass containers used for alcohol and non-alcoholic ciders.

The second set of regulations, which is not the subject of this motion, was made on June 2, 1977, and dealt with the application forms for people who wanted to establish collection depots. It also prescribed the amount of deposit, namely, the maximum amount allowed by the Act of 5 cents. We should be clear about the fact that this motion deals with only the set of regulations exempting from the operation of the Act the containers to which I have referred. In his speech, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris did not deal with those regulations, but he made a general attack on the legislation.

As the motion was to disallow those regulations, one would have thought he would address himself to that, but he did not do so. It is clear that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris cannot make up his mind about this Act. On August 3, when he spoke on a similar disallowance motion, he referred to the legislation as a legislative disaster, yet, if one examines the record, one finds that he voted for precisely this legislation at the second reading stage in 1975.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** What about 1974?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** In 1974, the Leader opposed it. That reinforces my point that he cannot make up his mind about where he stands. Obviously, he is confused. Obviously, he has changed his mind as time has gone by, and one wonders what is his attitude to this matter. We know that consistency is not much of a virtue in politics, but the honourable member does not even pretend to be consistent. He supported the matter after an election and, now that it has been introduced, he is attacking it. He voted for the Bill after it had gone to a conference.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** He was a manager at the conference.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Yes. He said that a maximum deposit of 5 cents should be written into the legislation, and that was done. He also said that the introduction of the Act should be deferred until June, 1977, that the question of a packaging tax should be referred to the Environmental Protection Council for consideration, and that the Government should introduce fines for indiscriminate littering. It is interesting to note what the Government has done on these matters. The Act was not introduced before June, 1977, legislation dealing with on-the-spot litter fines was introduced, together with a campaign for better packaging so as to reduce the litter problem, and the matter of a packaging tax was referred to the Environmental Protection Council. For the benefit of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and other members, I will read the conclusions reached in that investigation. The report states:

The Environmental Protection Council is of the opinion that there are no sound reasons for imposing a tax on beverage containers within the State of South Australia. Further, the Environmental Protection Council is of the opinion that the application of such a tax on an Australia-wide basis, whether on all beverage containers or on non-deposit bearing containers alone, has no advantages as a method of controlling problems associated with beverage containers or as a way of raising revenue.

The Environmental Protection Council believes it may be possible to establish a general packaging tax as a way of raising revenue but only after a much more thorough analysis than it has felt necessary to undertake in relation to this inquiry and on a national basis.

That aspect of the agreement from the conference was carried out, and the report indicated that there was no validity in imposing such a tax, despite what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had said consistently during the debate. The Government has fulfilled its part of the agreement in every respect. It is difficult to understand what the honourable

member is on about in moving for disallowance of these regulations. He is attacking not the specific regulations but the whole legislation. In the final part of his speech last Wednesday, he stated:

I reiterate my opposition to this type of legislation; I do not believe it has achieved anything in South Australia, except to increase significantly the cost to the consumer, and it has changed very little in the way of litter control.

It is clear that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is trying to destroy this legislation by disallowance of the regulations. He feels that the Government is in some way looking to the Council to disallow the regulations, for in his speech last Wednesday he stated:

The Government is under some pressure at least to make some changes in the regulations, but I believe that it is waiting for the Legislative Council to disallow them.

Let me disabuse his mind on that misconception. The Government will regazette the regulations if they are disallowed by this Council, and the Government is not waiting for them to be disallowed so that it can be got off the hook. The Government intends to proceed with the implementation of this legislation, and the reasons for that have been stated in previous debates. We are concerned about litter control, and we believe that this is the effective way to deal with it. We are also concerned about the general problem of resource conservation.

I will deal now with the specific criticisms made by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. He said that the 5c deposit was too high. It is interesting to note that these regulations do not have anything to do with the 5c deposit, and he is using them to make a general attack on the legislation, doubtless hoping to score politically. That is an example of his each-way bet. Despite the fact that the clear implication of the conference recommendation was that there should be a 5c deposit, he is trying to have that reviewed. The second aspect of the Leader's criticism dealt with collection depots, and I will give some figures about the number of cans going through those depots. Consolidated Alloys, of Edwardstown, handles 25 000 cans a week. The Wingfield bottle depot handles 25 000 to 30 000 a week, and McDonald and Company, in Sturt Street, handles 25 000 a week. Some others show similar figures. About 95 per cent of cans collected are being returned to Can Recycling (S.A.) Coca-Cola, and I understand that this company has already handled more than 1 000 000 cans that have been returned from depots. How the Leader can complain and say that the legislation is not working is beyond me. When this legislation came into force, 80 can collection depots existed, 25 in the metropolitan area and 55 in country areas. Port Noarlunga and Port Willunga were then not catered for, but a depot has now been established at Moana. By October 25, 1977, 84 depots existed, 25 in the metropolitan area and 59 in country areas.

The area of the State has been adequately covered through the provision of can collection depots, although the Leader referred to a problem in the Far North. True, problems did exist, but officers of the Environment Department who recently visited those areas of concern have agreed with local people to establish depots at Marree, Coober Pedy and Kingoonya to cover those areas. The Leader also referred to industrial plants, giving examples of inconvenience, through the deposit system, of recycling cans in such plants. That was another reason, the Leader said, why the legislation should be destroyed.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** I never said that.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** This is what the Leader stated:

I reiterate my opposition to this type of legislation; I do not believe it has achieved anything in South Australia, except to

increase significantly the cost to the consumer, and it has changed very little in the way of litter control.

That shows his opposition. He is trying to destroy the legislation.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** One can oppose something without destroying it.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** What about the Leader's following statement:

The Government is under some pressure at least to make some changes in the regulations, but I believe that it is waiting for the Legislative Council to disallow them. When that happens, it will embark upon its usual abuse of the Legislative Council on the question of disallowing regulations.

He then stated:

... the Government has three options: immediately to regazette the regulations as they are at present; to gazette new regulations that are more realistic, or to drop the scheme altogether.

It is clear from the Leader's opposition to the legislation that he would prefer the Government to drop the scheme altogether. However, I assure him that the Government has no intention of doing that. The Leader also gave examples of problems in industrial plants and canteens, but there are other examples of where the system works well, and there are several means of dealing with problems experienced in industrial canteens.

I understand that some employees are collecting cans and taking them back to the collection depot, using the refunds obtained to aid their social clubs or giving the funds to charity. A company could charge 5c less for the can and could collect cans from the canteen and return them to the collection depot. That does not seem to be a great problem for a company. It does not seem to be beyond the wit of private enterprise to devise some systematic means of returning cans to the collection depot.

However, if that is too difficult, especially with large industrial undertakings, such a company could apply to the Minister to be licensed as a can collection depot, and that would clearly overcome the problem. The Leader gave one absurd reason for the problems in industrial plants when he stated:

The management frowns on material leaving the premises because of security problems.

In other words, management is concerned that workers may take from the premises the can they brought earlier in the day for drinking, and that security problems would be raised. Will workers poke material in the can to smuggle it out of the premises? Can the Leader say what security problems will arise? He has not given any examples.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** You don't know much about industrial premises.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Is the Leader accusing workers of pilfering from industrial premises, saying that they will use the cans to lift material from premises?

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** Yes.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Is that the Leader's security problem?

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** That's one of them.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I am glad to know what the Leader is saying: he is afraid that the workers of this State will pilfer material, but it would have to be small material to fit into the one or two holes in a can.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** That's one of the problems.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** How that can create a security problem is beyond me. It is so pathetic that it hardly requires further comment.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Why should there be no deposit on beer bottles?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The honourable member was at the conference and voted for the legislation. Presently there is an 86 per cent retrieval rate for beer bottles.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Why should there be no deposit on beer bottles?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** There are no bigger hypocrites in this Council than the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. Carnie, who sold out their principles for \$25 000 to pay off their election expenses.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I must ask the Hon. Mr. Sumner to come back to the subject matter of the motion.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The question of the Liberal Movement's merger with the Liberal Party ought to pain honourable members opposite.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I think this exchange has gone far enough, and I ask the honourable member to come back to the subject matter of the motion.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Now tell us about no-deposit beer bottles.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** It is obvious that the Government will keep any new legislation under review to ensure that it is achieving the objects underlying it; in this case, those objects are resource control and a reduction in the litter problem. If, in the future, it appears that the legislation is not doing the job in respect of beer bottles, echo bottles, etc., and if the retrieval rate falls, I am sure the Government will consider the matter.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** What about the bottles that will have accumulated? They will be there forever.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Government does not want legislation that does not achieve the two objects and, if it is clear that the legislation is not achieving those objects, the Government will do something about it.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Tell us how you kicked out the head of the department.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** We know what the Hon. Mr. Hill and you, Mr. President, did in connection with the Liberal Movement.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I must ask the honourable member to come back to the subject matter. As far as I know, the Liberal Movement has disbanded.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Mr. Robin Millhouse is continuing the battle. He is the Opposition, and the Liberal Party is trying to silence him.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** What is happening in connection with Horwood Bagshaw?

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

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I could deal with Horwood Bagshaw and with the state of primary industry.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr. Sumner is out of order in discussing these things, and I will name the next honourable member who interjects. I ask the Hon. Mr. Sumner to conclude his remarks.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I have been wanting that protection all afternoon, Mr. President. I share your disgust at the irrelevant interjections of honourable members opposite.

**The PRESIDENT:** They will cease now.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I am happy that you, Mr. President, have brought me back to the subject matter of the motion and that you have told honourable members opposite not to interject. To say that the legislation is a legislative disaster is nonsense. Obviously, there have been some minor problems as people adjust to the new legislation; that is not surprising because, in the introduction of any new scheme, there has to be an opportunity for people to become accustomed to it, particularly in connection with a scheme of this kind, which largely depends on changing people's attitudes. I

reiterate what I said in my second reading speech when this Bill was before the Council in 1975, that this is a significant step in the control of litter and resource conservation. It will make the people of South Australia more aware of the problems of resource conservation. This will help to bring to people's attention the problems faced as a community. It will mean some increase in personal inconvenience to me, as much as to anyone else. However, that small inconvenience of having to cart cans back to a depot every now and again is in the interest of a wider, more important issue, to ensure a change in community attitudes to our current profligate waste of the world's resources. I oppose the motion.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 1. Page 556.)

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** When the Minister introduced this Bill into the Council on October 27, he was not particularly interested in the speech presented with the Bill. He exposed himself to ridicule in making the statement that he did. For example, in his explanation of the Bill, he said:

I would remind members that on August 16, 1977, the day before Parliament was prorogued, I introduced such a Bill and the accompanying Loan Estimates.

The Minister did not introduce a Bill, nor did he introduce the accompanying Estimates on that date. The Premier introduced that Bill and the Estimates in another place. The Minister is a responsible senior Minister, and is the Leader of the Government in this Council. He took a speech out of his case without reading it or showing any interest in it whatsoever. It is about time that he tightened up his presentation of material so that this kind of thing does not occur again. It is ridiculous to have presented here in the Council, recorded in *Hansard*, a speech which started in that way; the remarks made were identical to those made by the Premier in another place. The Minister did not take the trouble to put them properly in order before he presented them.

I strongly criticise the remarks of the Treasurer in explaining the Loan Estimates for the 1977-78 year for the same reasons that were referred to in this Chamber when members of the Opposition criticised the Treasurer's remarks in the introduction of the Budget material a week or two ago. The speech was full of Party political electioneering. It is not proper that a statement from the Treasurer, irrespective of Party, should be presented in this manner. For instance, I take one sentence from the remarks of the Treasurer:

The considerable sums which the Government was able to put aside from that arrangement will be completely used to lessen the impact on this State of the most ill-conceived and ill-directed economic policies Australia has seen since the great depression.

He criticises the Commonwealth Government and its policies. Elsewhere the Treasurer states:

Indeed, we now have a Federal Government which is completely isolated from the mainstream of economic thinking and which seems determined to reduce the standards of living for all Australians in the forlorn hope that somehow this will bring about national recovery and prosperity.

That is absolute rubbish. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. People in Australia have seen that the battle against inflation is being won. Therefore, the policies



which are so roundly criticised by the Treasurer are proving to be the correct economic policies for Australia and for this State. It is inappropriate and completely wrong for honourable members to read what can only be described as political garbage in a responsible document like this. The Treasurer went on to say:

In the case of Adelaide's water filtration scheme this long-term high budget plan is subject to constant uncertainty because we cannot get a simple answer from the Federal Government as to its future funding intentions.

The water filtration plant is a very important matter to most people in the Adelaide metropolitan area. There are people looking forward to the day when they will have clean water through the pipes in their homes. They are sick to death of hearing the Premier and his Ministers blaming the Federal Government for this situation. The Government should say that an extra \$75 000 000 in untied grants has been allocated from the Commonwealth Government under its successful new federalism policy this year. South Australian people expect their Government and its Treasurer to allocate some of that untied money to this water filtration scheme.

People in this State expect the Government to give the filtration scheme a much higher priority than the Premier is presently giving it. It is no good blaming the Commonwealth Government because the filtration scheme is not progressing at the rate that it should, simply because the Commonwealth Government has not provided enough money. This year it has provided 17.4 per cent more in untied grants to this State than was provided last year.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** The Commonwealth Government has provided for water filtration and this was not asked for.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** It has. It is not from that amount which has been provided and tied to the scheme; the total increase of \$75 000 000 is there to be used at the Government's own initiative in works to which the Government gives its priorities. I condemn the Treasurer for again referring to the Federal Government and criticising it because the water filtration scheme is not progressing as fast as it should. I hope that in future the Government changes its priorities in regard to untied moneys and allocates more of its funds to improving Adelaide's water, because the majority of people living in metropolitan Adelaide are sick to death of the dirty water they have to put up with. If the change is to take place at the present rate, there will be many suburbs where people will have to contend with this problem for many years.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** This could have been done years ago.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** That is quite right. The plans for this scheme were formally laid by 1970. The explanation that has been given us of the allocations of money for capital works provided in this Bill reveals to me that there is, to a degree, in this State very poor management of our capital works programme. We are in an era when some restraint and great care must be exercised by the Government, when, with inflation now under control and the great battle against unemployment in front of us, in my view there will be signs in the new year that the position will be improved considerably.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** Rubbish! You are the only one who believes that.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** That is not rubbish; it will be improved considerably in the new year. There should be no extravagant expenditure on capital works. We are in an era when great care must be exercised in regard to our priorities, in the way in which every cent of this capital works funding is to be spent.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** Do you consider yourself an economist?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I could do a better job than you could. There are examples in these Estimates of extravagance, and they relate particularly to the Public Buildings Department and the proposed expenditures through that department. On the work in regard to office alterations and improvements to office space for Government employees, I notice that Parliament House will have another allocation of nearly \$1 500 000 for a second phase of alterations. I think it is about time this matter was discussed fully in Parliament. We all know that much money has been expended here in the last few years, some of which was necessary but some of which has been spent in such a way as to deserve the highest criticism.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** What is that?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will tell the honourable member one item that cost an enormous sum of money—the air-conditioning plant that has been installed in this building.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** It does not work.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** It pumps out hot air in the summer and cold air in the winter; that is how it is working. It is all very well for the Minister of Lands: he probably has an air-conditioned office elsewhere, so he would not know. As regards the air-conditioning plant and the expenditure on it, in the last few days I have been talking about things being scandalous, but this innovation in this building is a scandal; it hardly ever works. I have not the exact figures of the cost but it would be enormous. Then I read in this document that Parliament is now being asked to approve, and we are being asked to support, a reference to further work in Parliament House. Under the item "Other Government Buildings", the expenditure from Loan Account in 1976-77 totalled \$27 497 000. Major works completed during the year included the Education Centre, the first stage of upgrading Parliament House, and the establishment of dental clinics at 15 schools. Some people think that the work here in Parliament House has been completed. Further on under the heading "Parliament House", \$1 414 000 has been allocated for further renovations and upgrading of Parliament House.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** What on earth could they do?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Exactly. I, too, ask: what on earth could be done here that would cost nearly \$1 500 000 further to improve Parliament House? I ask the Minister in charge of this Bill, when he replies to this debate, to give details of what is proposed to be done here and whether it is likely to cost that vast sum of money. If one or two items have to be done I have no objections, but I think extravagance must not be seen here in Parliament House in the expenditure of public money. As much money has already been spent and as the accommodation, in my view, is quite acceptable, I fail to see how a further \$1 414 000 can be spent. I therefore believe that that is an example of extravagance of the kind to which I referred a moment ago.

Getting back to the Public Buildings Department and the matter of extravagance, I find, for example, that we are being asked to approve the following expenditures for this current year: "Grenfell Centre—alterations for—Minister of Agriculture, \$21 000; Agriculture and Fisheries, \$269 000; Attorney-General's Department, \$3 000; Government Information Centre, \$1 000; Planning Appeal Board, \$528 000." (I am still referring to alterations that will be made in the Grenfell Centre.) Then "Premier's Department—Accommodation for Publicity Branch, \$210 000; Public and Consumer Affairs Department, \$430 000; Tourism, Recreation and Sport, \$2 000."

That is \$1 464 000 that will be spent on alterations within one building in the city of Adelaide—Grenfell Centre—for accommodation for these departments.

Most honourable members know that Grenfell Centre represents the most luxurious accommodation of any office block in the City of Adelaide. There is nothing like the socialists when they come to power: they seem to buzz around, as bees do around a hive, the most extravagant and expensive accommodation.

**The Hon. T. M. Casey:** Do you remember the Agriculture Department, over the years under a Liberal Government, was in a most shocking state? Surely we should not deprive public servants of decent office accommodation.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I do not object to that but why do we have to go to the most expensive and extravagant accommodation in Adelaide—and that is the only building about which I am talking? Then, commensurate with that high standard, the alterations to fit in must be nothing but the best. We are almost talking in figures comparable to the cost of a new building, but this is only for floor coverings, cupboards, partitions, and other fittings in the building.

The Minister of Lands, trying to defend the Government, should be ashamed of himself, because he has over the years had his feet on the ground and should not be carried along with these theoretical ideas of the socialists, who say, "Where is the most expensive building?" Having found it, they fit it out in the most expensive and extravagant way, because "nothing but the best is for us."

It is the Hon. Mr. Chatterton's department that will take a huge lump out of this \$1 400 000 to which I have referred. If that is not enough, Parliament is also being asked to approve expenditure of \$320 000 for the Environment Department in the building across the road known as the Gateway Inn. No doubt they will secure accommodation with a northerly aspect and a magnificent view—again, an example of having nothing but the best. These are huge sums of money simply for accommodation.

I noticed that the upgrading of the old Attorney-General's Department building is to cost \$307 000. That building was in a dilapidated condition, although I understand that, since the Attorney-General has moved out, much work has been done there. The sums to which I have referred comprise only part of the expenditure detailed in the schedule and we are up for over \$2 000 000.

**The Hon. B. A. Chatterton:** Have you been into the Agriculture Department offices?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Which ones, the old ones?

**The Hon. B. A. Chatterton:** No, the new ones. They are ordinary standard offices.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** They are not ordinary office accommodation. The building is the most expensive and luxurious in town. In fact, it is the highest rental building in the city.

**The Hon. B. A. Chatterton:** The accommodation in it is not luxurious.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Perhaps I should ask the Minister whether the work was put out to private tender. If the Minister is saying that it takes \$269 000 to alter a building for the use of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, plus a further \$21 000 for accommodation therein for the Minister of Agriculture, I say simply that that is far too much money to spend.

There are in the schedule other items one could not help but query. I refer, for example, to the Public Health Department's Savings Bank building accommodation, which will require the expenditure this year of \$80 000. The Hospitals Department's Wales building is to take up

another \$92 000 this year. I should like the Minister to tell me whether, with the advent of the new Health Commission in about another month, the commission, for the purposes of proper communication and efficiency, will try to house itself in the one building.

If that is so, I query whether there is a need to spend this sum of money, on behalf of the Public Health Department, on one building, as well as the money to be spent on another building on behalf of the Hospitals Department. I also ask whether, when the Health Commission is established, these people will walk out of that accommodation and be housed elsewhere. I ask the Minister to answer those questions.

One could go on and on in relation to this list of Public Buildings Department expenditure. Finally, I cannot help but refer to the expenditure of \$3 200 000 under the general heading "Minor alterations and additions". That does not tell Parliament very much at all. With expenditure of that magnitude, further detail is required so that members of Parliament, who must consider this year's allocations, can make a proper, informed decision on whether Parliament should approve this expenditure.

I return to the point that I made earlier. In these difficult economic times, the Government should surely forget all its political tripe about criticising the Federal Government, and support those who are seeing the light at the end of the tunnel.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Look at its own faults.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** That is so, and put its own house in order. When extravagance of this kind is being forced on the State, I can only expect that our Treasurer intends to adopt policies that are completely opposite to those adopted by Mr. Fraser, that it will proceed with the expenditure of these vast sums of money, and not spend our money in the most economic and proper manner, bearing in mind present-day conditions.

The only other comment that I wish to make relates to the appropriation for the Minister of Health. I refer to the sum to be spent on Flinders Medical Centre. This year, it is being allocated \$9 110 000. That is by far the largest single sum that is to be spent on any hospital building this year. The time has now come when the South Australian public is beginning to question the total sums of money that have been spent at the Flinders Medical Centre compared to the total sum being spent on all other hospitals throughout the State.

For example, the Treasurer says in the documents now before honourable members that he is going to defer the commencement of work on the Para hospital, the new hospital that has been proposed for Elizabeth. Running true to form, he blames the Federal Government. That is a lot of rubbish.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** Why is it a lot of rubbish, when the Federal Government cut back on what was originally promised? We were cut back something like \$7 000 000, so why is it rubbish?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Because of the point that I have just made. The Minister and his Government have received an extra \$75 000 000 in untied grants this year.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** We had been promised money for hospital buildings, and we planned accordingly. Then, the Federal Government came along and cut it back by about 60 per cent, but you say that is only so much rubbish.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** No, I am saying that the Minister cannot blame the Federal Government when, at the same time, it gave the South Australian Government \$507 000 000 in untied grants this year, an increase of \$75 000 000 over last year's allocation.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** Which projects would you scrub off?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** If I had charge of this matter, I would bring forward vastly different documents from those that have been produced.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** Which projects would you chuck out?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** If the Minister wants me to go through these matters again, I refer to the \$1 500 000 proposed for stage 2 of the work to be done at Parliament House.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** Don't you think it needs to be up-dated? Do you want the place to fall down around us?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** This place has quite luxurious accommodation. The Minister would not know, because he is not here often.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** Your colleagues have continually complained about the accommodation here, to the extent that your Leader in another place wanted a suite outside Parliament House.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** That is a lot of rot. As one alternative to house extra staff, the suggestion was made that perhaps an office could be made available outside this place. He did not include alteration of outside accommodation.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** It may have been necessary.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** In the building across the street, the Environment Department is spending \$320 000 this year just to alter offices. I certainly would put my scissors through many of these items, and I would go to private enterprise for many of these public works and would get them done for about 20 per cent less money. If we were managing the Treasury, there would be a different approach to management of financial affairs from the one in this document. I will deal now with the Flinders Medical Centre, and the Hon. Mr. Blevins will be interested in this.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** A new hospital is not being built at Whyalla.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** No, and the reason is the same as applies to Elizabeth.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** We had \$8 000 000 to upgrade our hospital.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** I would like to see that figure in the Estimates.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** Don't you reckon we will get it?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** The Hon. Mr. Blevins listened to his Premier on the hustings at Whyalla before the 1975 election, when the Premier said, "You will soon be having your new hospital." Again, at the election this year, the Premier was in Whyalla promising a hospital.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** He didn't promise a hospital at all.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Parliamentary Paper No. 20, at page 9, shows that this Parliament is being asked to provide this year for Whyalla Hospital, stage 1, an amount of \$700 000.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** How long do you think it will take to spend \$8 000 000?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** I want to be fair. Another item provides \$8 000 for redevelopment of Whyalla Hospital, so the Hon. Mr. Blevins can tell the people of Whyalla that we have passed our Loan Estimates, allowing \$708 000 for this year.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** Do you suggest that we appropriate \$8 000 000 this financial year?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** No.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** What you are saying is absolute nonsense. What are you going to cut out of Flinders Medical Centre?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Flinders Medical Centre has become a monster amongst hospital buildings in this State, because it is taking so much public money that other hospitals, such as Whyalla and Para Districts, either cannot be started or can be commenced only at a rate that is far too slow. The blame for this lies at the door of the present Minister of Health and the present Government, and the blame goes back about five years to the time when this inflexible Minister and this inflexible Government were unable to foresee that the original plans for Flinders Medical Centre needed either reappraisal or deferment as a longer-term project.

The writing was on the wall for two reasons. First, it became apparent that the population forecasts made when Flinders Medical Centre was conceived would not come to fruition, and any Government with the ability to be flexible in public expenditure would have reappraised the position. Surely it should have learnt a lesson from Monarto, for which the population forecast did not come to fruition. The Government decided to go on with its plans for Flinders and it spent vast amounts of money. Of the total amount spent on hospital works, the percentage that went to Flinders was far too high and, as a result, many other hospitals in metropolitan Adelaide or in country areas have suffered. That is why I say the building is a monster. It is continuing to take far too much of the hospital allocation.

The second reason why I am accusing the Government of displaying the worst kind of inflexibility is that it knew of the big changes being introduced in regard to health care. It knew that the emphasis for the latter part of the 1970s and the early part of the 1980s was being put on more community health centres and more community nursing. It knew that the emphasis was being put on keeping people at home. It knew that the great thing was preventive medicine by which people would be prevented from getting sick rather than on building hospitals for those who got sick.

The writing was on the wall five years ago showing that this was the trend. There was a de-institutionalising trend, and we should have had more regionalisation of development and a rationalisation of health services in the same way as the rest of the world was having them. The Government did not show flexibility at Flinders and went on spending vast amounts there. That is why the people of Whyalla are suffering and why the Para Districts Hospital has to be deferred.

The Minister ought to know that there is a big body of thinking in the medical fraternity about too much money being spent at Flinders. If he had changed his plans five years ago, it would not have happened. I am not saying that at any particular time building work at Flinders should have stopped, but five years ago the Government should have decided that there would not be the need for this development as quickly as had been expected in the original planning. The Government should have extended the completion of Flinders over a longer period, thus spreading payments over a longer time. Then it would have had funds now for other work.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** We have funds now for Whyalla Hospital.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** There are funds only for starting it. The honourable member knows that the hospital was promised in 1975, but he is not game enough—

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** What utter, stupid rubbish!

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr. Blevins is out of order in interjecting. He can take part in the debate later. He will not make his points by interjecting.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will quote figures in support of what I have said regarding the high proportion of money for hospital buildings that is being channelled to Flinders. The net amount spent on Flinders Medical Centre by the South Australian Government and the proportion of the total Loan funds spent on hospital construction in recent years is as follows: in 1971-72 there was a net amount (that is, the total amount spent by the Hospitals Department, less funding from the university) of \$778 000, being 5.9 per cent of the total expenditure on hospital buildings in that year.

**The Hon D. H. L. Banfield:** That was because it was the commencement of construction. That is about how much was initially spent on Whyalla. Do you agree?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I agree that that was the year of commencement of the Flinders Medical Centre. In 1972-73 (and I am taking my figures from the Auditor-General's Report) \$3 033 000 was spent, being 25.1 per cent of the total hospital allocation. In 1973-74 the net amount spent was \$7 714 000, being 44.2 per cent of total hospital expenditure, and in 1974-75, \$11 381 000 was spent, being 48.5 per cent of the total hospital funds spent. The following year the graph reached its peak: in 1975-76, \$20 190 000 was spent on the centre, being 64.8 per cent of the total funds spent on hospitals.

Is it any wonder that many of our hospitals were crying out for funds? In 1976-77 the net amount spent was \$9 076 000, being 29.1 per cent of the total hospital allocation. In other words, about 30 per cent of the total funds available for hospitals was spent on the Flinders Medical Centre in that year. In the 1977-78 financial year it is estimated that \$9 110 000, that is, 32.3 per cent of the total hospital allocation, will be spent on the centre. However, in this financial year that figure will be reduced slightly because of funding of an unknown amount received from the university. That will bring the percentage down one or two points. Therefore, in this financial year and in the past financial year about 30 per cent of the total funds available for expenditure on hospitals will be or was spent on the Flinders Medical Centre.

Net payments of about \$50 000 000 have already been made, and payments so far (I refer to page 165 of the Auditor-General's Report) have been about \$60 000 000. Those figures do not include the current year but honourable members can see what an enormous proportion of funds for hospital building has been absorbed by the centre. I firmly believe that the present Government has been in error, that it should have seen earlier that population changes were not as expected when planning was first conceived and that it should have been flexible enough to accept, with the great trends in preventive medicine and community nursing, and the like, that emphasis and expenditure on community health centres and similar developments would be required. Therefore, if it was still considered necessary by experts that a final complex such as the Flinders Medical Centre as originally planned was required, the plan should have been amended so that a much longer-term programme could have been put into train.

I refute again all the accusations made by the Minister and the Hon. Mr. Blevins because, if that change in plans had been decided upon, there would have been funds for the Para hospital to be started, and there would be more funds available for Whyalla and for improvements in other hospitals where improvements are urgently required. I had the honour to inspect Kadina Hospital but, when I visited

the geriatric ward, I was most upset and astounded that the Minister could not find sufficient funds to upgrade that ward.

I understand that that is the situation in respect of many country hospitals. If planning had changed in respect of Flinders, funds would have been available for other purposes. I believe that situation has resulted from an error in planning by the Minister and the Government.

In 1975-76 expenditure on the centre was more than \$20 000 000, yet there is evidence from the figures I have given that the sum required by this project may be settling at about 30 per cent of the total funds available for hospitals. I hope that that can be changed so that funds can be made available for other purposes. I turn now to a matter concerning the Minister of Lands. I should like further details on the allocation of \$1 430 000 and to know the reason for the following statement by the Premier:

That amount provides for the purchase of mapping equipment and electronic equipment for the land ownership and tenure system.

What is meant by the land ownership and tenure system? Can the Council be given more information about the mapping and electronic equipment that will cost \$1 430 000? The amount required by the Minister's department has not changed much since the previous year. More than \$900 000 is no longer required because some of the department's activities have been transferred to other departments administered by the Minister of Works and the Minister of Agriculture.

Although some activity has been transferred from the Minister's department, there was little change in the sum required. With reduced activity it seems that the Minister is going in for technical advances. I have no objection to approving mapping and electronic equipment provided that I know what it is for. However, I do query the expenditure of such a large sum on the land ownership and tenure system.

I believe that the Loan programme reveals slack financial management and control. I am convinced that we should have less extravagance in spending on offices for Ministers and their activities.

I would never countenance public servants working in second-class accommodation. I can recall being quoted in the Public Service Association's journal in connection with this matter. When the Hall Government bought a site at the corner of Grote Street and Victoria Square and proposed to erect a building there for public servants, I criticised the accommodation in which some public servants were housed. I thought that improved accommodation should be enjoyed by public servants.

The Government is asking for millions of dollars to be spent on partitions, carpeting and alterations. I believe that the allocation to which I have referred is extravagant and improper, and I hope that the Government will exercise greater care in future, especially in economic times like these. A proper apportionment of funds for hospital buildings could not be made because of the drain on hospital finance occasioned by the adherence to the programme at Flinders Medical Centre. I stress that that programme was decided in about 1970, when population trends and the provision of health care were vastly different from what they are today.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** You would have gone somewhere else and left a hole out there. You would have stopped and started.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I condemn the Government for not adjusting to the trends to which I have referred. If the Government had shown more flexibility, the rate of advance at Flinders Medical Centre would not have been as it is today and, by the same token, more expenditure on

hospital buildings elsewhere could have been undertaken, resulting in those buildings being more advanced.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** You were going to build a 100-bed hospital at Modbury, but more recently you have been complaining about the accommodation there.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Before an election some time ago the Minister sent a bulldozer into a vineyard at Modbury to pull out a couple of grapevines, thereby getting publicity. Fancy using the sick people of this State for political purposes! These thoughts are not only my own but also those of many medical people who are concerned that a disproportionate share of the resources of this State is being allocated to Flinders Medical Centre at a time when there are urgent needs elsewhere.

I hope the Minister will further consider the matters I

have raised in regard to Flinders Medical Centre. About 30 per cent of the provision for hospital buildings is allocated, and has been allocated over the last two years, to Flinders Medical Centre. It may not be too late to make some planning adjustments so that regional and suburban hospitals can receive satisfactory allocations. If this is done, the apportionment of our funds for hospitals will be better than it has been in the past.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.33 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, November 3, at 2.15 p.m.