

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, November 3, 1977

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

QUESTIONS

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding the promised appointment of a resident medical superintendent at Mount Gambier Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On October 13, I asked a question in the Council concerning this matter. That question was prompted by an announcement in the *Border Watch* on August 30, 1977. I will read that report as a means of making this explanation. Headed "Resident medical appointment", the report states:

Mount Gambier Hospital would soon have a resident medical superintendent, the A.L.P. candidate for Mount Gambier, Mr. J. H. Hennessy, announced today. He said this would be followed by the appointment of a resident medical officer.

Mr. Hennessy said the new appointments were Government policy and would be implemented as soon as possible. This policy was initiated by the Mount Gambier sub-branch of the A.L.P. and was backed by the recent A.L.P. State Convention.

Mr. Hennessy said that his own surveys while door-knocking in Mount Gambier during recent weeks had shown there was overwhelming support for these appointments. Mr. Hennessy yesterday continued his door-knocking campaign through the eastern area of the city.

"I continue to be encouraged by the support from the people of Mount Gambier," he said. Mr. Hennessy said that, with his local background, the welfare of people in the Mount Gambier district would be his prime responsibility. "Country people and city dwellers rely on each other—the city people need the products of the rural areas, while country districts rely on the products of our industrial cities. Without a healthy rural sector, the national economy is affected, and the Dunstan Government is very mindful of this," Mr. Hennessy said.

As a result of that, I asked when this appointment would be made. I expected to hear that it would be made fairly soon. Yesterday, I received the following reply from the Minister:

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.

Does the Minister agree that there is some conflict between Mr. Hennessy's statement and the reply that the Minister gave yesterday? Also, can the Minister give any explanation why this conflict should have occurred? Will the Minister also say whether his reply is in contradiction to the policy approved by the Australian Labor Party at the State Convention and, if it is, what will be the consequences for the Minister?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will answer the last question first, by saying that I will continue to be Minister

of Health until I retire. Secondly, there is no conflict whatsoever between what Mr. Hennessy and I have said, as the commission has already been set up. It is, therefore, a matter of the hospital's being incorporated. In fact, I think that, as Mount Gambier Hospital was named in the appropriate schedule, it will be incorporated as a Government hospital. I am sure the honourable member would not like at this stage the Minister to override the decision taken by a board, which will be autonomous and responsible for running its own affairs.

URANIUM

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, regarding the visit to Australia of a British Minister.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members will be aware of the visit of Dr. Mabon, British Minister for Energy, to Australia, seeking supplies of uranium for Great Britain. As the British Minister has outlined in some detail Britain's great need of supplies of uranium for energy purposes for several years, I think commencing in the early 1980's, will the Minister of Mines and Energy, on behalf of the South Australian Government, be prepared to issue an invitation to Dr. Mabon to visit South Australia to discuss the problem with him and with the Government?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring down a reply.

NEAPTR

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the NEAPTR study?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: In investigating means of improving the quality of public transport between the city of Adelaide and Tea Tree Plaza, officers of the Transport Department have considered a wide variety of features. The reservation of a lane for use by buses is one such feature whereby significant improvements can be achieved. In addition to buses, consideration has been given to providing priority to a number of other vehicles. In designing this particular reserved lane scheme, it has been decided to permit only buses, bicycles, motor cycles, vehicles which are to turn left at or before the next street on their left, and emergency vehicles to use the reserved lane. Buses are included because of the very large numbers of passengers they carry. Left-turning vehicles are permitted to use the reserved lane to enable them to make their turns easily and safely and to improve traffic flow on the remainder of the road. Bicycles and motorcycles are included as their riders are more prone to personal injury in the event of an accident, and it is desirable to place them in the bus lane where traffic is less dense.

Except when turning left, private vehicles, including those with high occupancy levels, have been excluded from using the bus lane. This has been done for a number of reasons. Inclusion of high occupancy cars in the reserved lane would require additional surveillance, as police not only have to detect which vehicles are in the bus lane, but also need to identify the number of occupants of each vehicle. In addition, weaving in and out of the lane would increase the potential for accidents. Finally,

permitting too many vehicles to use the reserved lane may diminish its potential ability to improve the operating conditions of those vehicles it aims to assist. However, it should be noted that the proposed bus lane scheme is an experimental project, and, on the basis of experience with its operation, further consideration can be given to the types of vehicle permitted to use the lane.

VINEYARDS

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, about the acquisition of vineyards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: In the past few months, large tracts of vineyards in the Modbury and Hope Valley area have been compulsorily acquired, and I presume this has been done for building purposes, because I believe that already some houses have been built in this recently-acquired area. I am completely opposed to the use of what I believe has an aesthetic and environmental value to our city, and undoubtedly some of our most fertile land is continually being engulfed with buildings of all designs and shapes.

It runs counter to all the planning proposals espoused by our planning authorities and, indeed, it runs counter to the statement made by the Premier when he announced the establishment of a committee through the Agriculture Department to assist in assessing the aesthetic value of vineyards in the metropolitan area. How can the Minister reconcile such land acquisition with the statement made by the Government with a view to preserving and looking after such areas?

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Minister for Planning and bring down a reply.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Health regarding the redevelopment of Whyalla Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Hill spoke on the Public Purposes Loan Bill and made some alarming statements, which might create some fear in the minds of Whyalla people and which included the following statement:

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.

In his role as shadow Minister of Health I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Hill will be distributing such information to obtain political mileage in local newspapers. I am alarmed that a shadow Minister of Health should make such statements and alarm people in Whyalla. The honourable member complained about the lack of flexibility at Modbury Hospital. The Government has been flexible in relation to the Whyalla Hospital, and the honourable member then complained about our flexibility. His position is quite inconsistent and nonsensical.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You've been flexible about Whyalla—you've done nothing for five years.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The Minister will explain why the project, which was promised in 1975, did not proceed in 1977. There are good sound and sensible

reasons for that. The major reason can be laid at the door of the Fraser Government, which closed down the shipyards.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Charlie Jones did that.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: He did not close down the shipyards.

The President: Order! The honourable member can surely come back to making a brief explanation.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: As consistently happens in this Council, the Opposition insists on rudely interrupting and making interjections out of order and leading honourable members astray so that we have to suffer the consequences.

The President: The honourable member is most easily led astray.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That is possibly the story of my life. However, in the interests of allaying the fears of the people of Whyalla whom the Hon. Mr. Hill has most unnecessarily disturbed, can the Minister answer the following questions: Has the Whyalla Hospital redevelopment project been approved by both the Public Works Committee and the Government? Are the funds approved for this financial year sufficient to ensure that the project will start in this financial year? Is it good accounting practice to appropriate funds for the total cost of any project in a year when all those funds could not possibly be used? Finally, did the Government revise the original 1975 plan for a new hospital at Whyalla because of the obvious reduction in the population there that could occur as a result of the Fraser Government's decision to close down one of the city's major industries, the Whyalla shipyard?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I have to agree with the honourable member, who is right again. The claptrap that the Hon. Mr. Hill uttered yesterday was the most contradictory that I have ever heard from him, and that is saying something. The honourable member said that I was inflexible, yet he also told me how I had reappraised the Whyalla project as a result of the Fraser Government's financial cut-backs, resulting in the project not progressing so quickly. The Hon. Mr. Hill said that the full cost of the redeveloped building could be spent in the one financial year. Further, he said that I should have stopped progress on Flinders Medical Centre half-way through that project and reappraised the position. The Hon. Mr. Hill's speeches have been getting worse and worse since antagonism has arisen in connection with the Leadership stakes. As a result, the honourable member is not giving proper thought to matters raised in the Council.

Turning now to the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Blevins, I point out that the redevelopment programme at Whyalla Hospital has been approved by the Public Works Committee and the Government. The first tender call will be in January, 1978. This relates to the relocation of transportable buildings that are currently on site and are used for maintenance workshops, a nurse training school, a classroom and stores. The value of this work is about \$66 000. The major tender call in March is for phase 1 of the total programme. This will provide a pharmacy, a nurse training school, staff changeroom facilities, and a maintenance workshop. The estimated total value of this work is about \$6 000 000. True, we have not included the total of \$6 066 000 in this year's Loan programme, because there is no way that all of this sum could be spent in the current financial year. I know what the Hon. Mr. Hill would do. His image has suffered in the eyes of people associated with health care. The telephone calls I have received this morning indicate that people have lost faith in him.

PILOT VESSELS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I understand that contracts have been let by the South Australian Government for the supply to the Marine and Harbors Department of two new pilot vessels, to be delivered early in 1978. I believe that the contract is with Dodwell and Company (Australia) Proprietary Limited, based in Sydney. What was the contract price of these vessels, and were tenders called in South Australia, giving the depressed South Australian boat-building industry an opportunity to supply these vessels? If tenders were not called in South Australia, why not?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek the information for the honourable member.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the housing industry?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Minister for Planning informs me that there has been some over-production in the housing industry in South Australia in recent times. During 1976-77 a sizable amount of purely speculative building activity occurred, as demonstrated in recent production and demand figures. The Indicative Planning Council, for example, estimated that an extra 13 500 dwellings would be required to satisfy the increased need for housing (taking into account increases in the number of households and demolition of existing dwellings), but 15 302 were completed. Builders continued to supply housing for a demand which did not exist, and many are feeling the resultant ill-effects.

However, this situation has been exacerbated by the increasing inability of many younger couples to purchase a home. Interest rates remain high and the number of loans approved by savings banks, trading banks, and building societies has declined. Another important source of housing loans is the State Bank, but advances under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement have fallen, in real terms, since 1975. Despite additional assistance from this state Government, waiting lists for housing continue to grow under these conditions. Many prospective homeowners also have to contend with an insecure employment situation. Some builders are even offering to pay premiums on policies insuring potential buyers against unemployment. In addition, real wages have been eroded under partial indexation. Federal Government actions are an important factor in creating this situation. Government spending has been reduced, unemployment allowed to increase and interest rates have been kept at a high level in an attempt to reduce the rate of inflation. However, after two years the inflation rate has not been reduced to a satisfactory level, and devaluations of the Australian dollar have partially negated sacrifices that have been made. It is particularly difficult to understand how reductions in advances made available to the State Bank is helping to lower inflation. In fact, it will probably result in increasing hardship for low-income earners, with consequent effects on the housing industry in future. Stocks of unsold houses will remain a problem at a time when people are placed in over-crowded or inappropriate accommodation whilst waiting for a loan. Some will be forced into dubious agreements with unscrupulous

builders. For many, the policies of the Fraser Government have meant a denial of housing standards that were naturally expected several years ago, and this Government is concerned with the inefficient utilisation of housing that Federal policies have greatly assisted in creating.

RAILWAY OVERPASS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask the Minister of Lands whether he has an answer to my question about the Grand Junction Road crossing, and the new overpass to be built over that road.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The railway overpass on Grand Junction Road will be opened to traffic on November 20, 1977. Access over the bridge will initially be by way of temporary road connections to the existing road. The Grand Junction Road project is scheduled for completion in February, 1978.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to ask a question of the Leader of the House regarding nuclear energy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In recent months, Opposition members have been noted for their bitter attacks upon the Labor Administration in South Australia, in respect of its acquiescence (in a motion passed earlier this year in the House of Assembly) to the mining and processing of uranium. Numerous questions have been directed to Government Ministers by the Opposition as a result of the stand taken by delegates to a recent conference of the Australian Labor Party in Perth. Labor Party members have been ridiculed by members of the Liberal Party, and the Liberal Party stand has been backed by the vast international mining interests in this matter. I draw the attention of Opposition members to the story in the *Advertiser* this morning, regarding documents now being made available, and which have not previously been made available by the Liberal Federal Government, in spite of the Fox committee report contending that there should be wide public debate on this subject. One would think that following that report, a responsible Liberal Government would have made available all papers and documents, which were the subject of an oversea visit by Mr. Justice Fox, during the inquiry.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am not talking about open government; I am talking about an inquiry that was instituted into uranium.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member should stick to the subject matter of his question. This is not the time to make comments about various things.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am replying to the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. Hill and even the Hon. Mr. Burdett. You keep them shut up and I will go on.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has leave of the Council to make an explanation before asking a question of the Minister; I forget which Minister it is. He is making a whole lot of comments. I ask him to address himself to the Minister.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I state as a fact that I have here a little note that tells me that one day the Hon. Mr. Hill in seeking leave of the Council spoke for 25 minutes before asking a question. Why is there one law for the Opposition and one for the Government members in this place?

The PRESIDENT: It does not matter about the length of the explanation as long as it keeps to the point.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: There is one law for them and one for us.

The PRESIDENT: No, there is not.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, there is.

The PRESIDENT: As long as the explanation is relevant, it can be as long as the honourable member likes. It seems to me that the explanation in this case is not relevant to the subject matter of the question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Since I have been so rudely interrupted by members opposite I have been speaking for only 4½ minutes all told. In conformity with the rules of this place, you asked me what was the nature of the question, and I said "nuclear energy". I have not gone off that yet. If I cannot relate a report of Mr. Justice Fox to nuclear matters, there is something wrong somewhere. Before I ask the Minister a question, I draw the attention of honourable members to a report in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Federal Government is being rather short in its treatment of the Australian community about the availability for public discussion of documents that are in existence resulting from the visit overseas of Mr. Justice Fox during the time he was engaged in the inquiry, between the time of the interim report and the final report on his findings. I do not want to take up your time further, Mr. President, but I could speak for a long time on matters related to this question. I do not want to take unfair advantage of your lighter remarks in this place. Suffice it for me to direct a question to the Minister. Will the Leader of the Government, I hope on behalf of all members of this Council, take up the matter with the Premier, and indeed with other Ministers of the State Government, to protest against the withholding of information that could be made public in the interests of the Australian community endeavouring to make up its mind with regard to a very vital matter likely to be raised during the course of the forthcoming election about nuclear energy and the mining of uranium?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is obvious from the report in this morning's newspaper that the Federal Government has been less than honest with the people of this country in saying that all relevant facts in this matter have been put to the people, and yet it is a vital document of public concern. I am surprised that the shadow Minister of Mines did not raise a protest in this place because he would want to be sure of the safety and welfare of all the people of Australia as regards nuclear energy. I will certainly propose to the Government that it instigate a protest at withholding important information from the people.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It is quite dishonest.

URANIUM

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about uranium.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I refer to a statement in today's press that British nuclear authorities have been dumping waste material at Maralinga. This statement was given to a court of inquiry regarding the Windscale uranium works in Great Britain. This matter was first raised when these allegations were made in Australia last December. I understand that the Minister of Mines and Energy called for a report on the amount of uranium and other nuclear waste materials that could be at Maralinga.

Will the Minister ask whether that report can be tabled for the benefit of the Council and all people concerned?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question is supplementary to one that I asked earlier. The Premier recently highlighted the need to lay costly foundations in Adelaide because of the unsuitability of our soil for building. One contractor has indicated that he sinks a pier 18ft. deep in some of the more unstable Adelaide soils. Although I do not know whether that is so, this statement was made publicly. Such a practice must obviously affect building costs. One gains the impression that South Australian builders exercise more care and do higher quality work than applies in other States. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister for Planning to draw a comparison between South Australia and the other States in this matter?

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

CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question regarding consumer protection?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government is already obliged to comply with a large number of laws which provide protection for consumers. If the honourable member will supply details of the specific consumer protection legislation that he has in mind, that matter will be considered.

ART GALLERY BOARD

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct my question to the Minister of Health, representing the Premier. Last Thursday, I asked a question, to which I have not yet received a reply, concerning the Art Gallery Board. As that question and the answer thereto are important in the interests of fairness to the individuals involved, I ask the Minister whether he will be so kind as to make every endeavour to expedite a reply for me.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall do so.

TRANSLATORS AND INTERPRETERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand that the Minister of Health has a reply to my recent question concerning translators and interpreters. Knowing that he is anxious to give that reply, I ask the Minister to do so.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am always anxious to answer the honourable member's questions. I was therefore concerned about a report which I saw on television last night and in which it was stated that the Hon. Mr. Hill had several Questions on Notice that had not been answered for some months. I therefore perused the first edition of the Notice Paper this morning, but found that there was not one Question on Notice on it. There seems, therefore, to be some mystery about the matter. I do not think this was caused by anything that the

Hon. Mr. Hill has said, although the report must have sounded good from his point of view. In reply to his question, South Australia will support the proposed national authority. Indeed the Premier was a proponent of the formation of that body.

SECONDHAND DEALERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On August 2, during the term of the Forty-Second Parliament (page 270 of *Hansard*), I directed to the Minister of Health another question, to which I have not yet received a reply, regarding secondhand dealers. Will the Minister investigate the matter and try to obtain a reply for me?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The policy, which has been applied previously, is that if an honourable member's question has not been answered when a new Parliamentary session begins the honourable member involved normally asks his question again so that it can be put in motion.

NUCLEAR REACTOR

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question concerning the alleged incidence of cancer in workers at the Windscale nuclear reactor, which was referred to by the Hon. Mr. Geddes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It was recently brought to my attention by a person who lived in this area for many years that there has been an apparent dramatic increase in the incidence of cancer of the respiratory tract and leukemia in workers at Windscale. Has the Minister any statistics regarding this dramatic increase? If he has not, will the Minister ask his department to seek any statistics that may be available?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not have any figures in my possession, although I certainly will obtain that information for the honourable member.

CRAFT AUTHORITY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct two questions to the Minister of Health, representing the Premier. What were the reasons for the termination of employment of a Mr. Simon Blackall of the Craft Authority about 10 months ago and what was the compensation paid to that gentleman at that time? If the compensation was paid in separate sums, what was the reason for doing so?

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

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, a question on the subject of consumer affairs.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's a bit vague.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My question is supplementary to the answer that has just been given to me.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: All right, as long as it applies to both sides.

The PRESIDENT: Order! On this occasion, I ask the honourable member to be more specific.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My question is supplementary to the reply I was just given about the Government's being subject to consumer protection legislation.

The PRESIDENT: That is more reasonable.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In the reply that I have just been given (and this was the fourth time that I had asked this question), I was told that, if I wished to supply details of the specific consumer protection legislation that I had in mind, the matter would be considered. I am pleased that it will at least be considered. I submit a list of the specific consumer protection legislation which I have in mind, and I will add others to the list later.

These are the ones that I can think of in a hurry. The specific pieces of legislation that I had in mind were the Consumer Credit Act, the Consumer Transactions Act, the Builders Licensing Act, the Defective Houses Act, the Unfair Advertising Act, the Fair Credit Reports Act, and the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act. Will the Minister now consider replying to my question?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As has been indicated previously and now that the details have been given, my colleague will give consideration to it.

BRITISH ART DISPLAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, a reply to my question about why the British art exhibition that was brought to Australia to help to promote Her Majesty's Jubilee Year was not brought to South Australia but was restricted to the Eastern States?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague advises that an exhibition titled "British Painting 1600-1800" is currently on show in Sydney at the Art Gallery of New South Wales (October 7 to November 20). It will also be shown in Melbourne at the National Gallery of Victoria from December 7, 1977, to January 15, 1978. Following that, it will be returned to Great Britain and the various works of art returned to their owners. The exhibition was organised by the British Council for the Australian Gallery Directors Council, and was limited to two showings in Australia. Strong representations were made at the time of planning the exhibition for Adelaide to be included in the itinerary. Unfortunately, this was not possible, as the paintings could not be lent for a longer period than that arranged. Many lenders are reluctant to have valuable works of art on extended loan, and it is understood that Australia was fortunate in being able to secure this exhibition for showing in two venues.

SHOP TRADING HOURS BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is introduced to give effect to the recommendations recently made by the Royal Commission into the Law Relating to Shop Trading Hours and Ancillary Matters. Before explaining the main provisions of the Bill, it is appropriate that I should draw to the attention of all honourable members some relevant matters concerning the whole question of the trading hours of retail stores.

Notwithstanding the fact that this has continued to be the subject of public discussion since the referendum in 1970, legislative provisions relating to shop trading hours have remained unaltered since then.

Last year my colleague the Minister of Labour and Industry commenced a comprehensive investigation into the situation throughout Australia, as the Government considered it was time that the matter be considered in the light of current conditions and attitudes. In some areas the existing legislation had become increasingly hard to enforce and there were indications of a change in public opinion on the matter.

This investigation revealed there were many interests to be considered when contemplating changes in the existing legislation. While many members of the public clearly would appreciate being able to buy any goods at any time of their choosing, it was not quite so clear whether they would appreciate the effects of a complete lack of restriction, which could include increased prices and the disappearance of the local store or delicatessen, with an even greater concentration of shopping services in large centres only readily accessible by private transport.

The interests of those who work in the shops are also of great importance. Any major extension of trading hours could involve a loss of private leisure time which is not readily compensated for, even by increased penalty rates. Shopkeepers themselves also have the right to operate a commercially viable business without having to work unreasonable hours.

Having regard to the conflicting interests, the Government earlier this year introduced into the previous Parliament, a Bill that would have enabled wide public discussion being undertaken on the matter before an independent tribunal, to which all interested parties would have access. That Bill proposed that the Full Commission of the South Australian Industrial Commission would hear submissions from all interested parties and make decisions, based on the evidence presented, on what changes should be made in the trading hours.

In other words, the Bill provided that no change would be made by an arbitrary act of the Government, but would take place only as a result of full public discussion before an impartial tribunal which could properly assess the arguments of the various interests and pressure groups. The object of this procedure was to ensure that the general welfare of the community would be properly protected.

It is now history that, because of the uncompromising attitude of honourable members opposite, the Bill was laid aside. The Government was, however, determined that members of the public should not be denied the opportunity of expressing their views, and the reasons for those views, regarding the changes they considered should be made to the current legislation. Accordingly, on May 20, 1977, His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into, and report on, whether the law relating to shop trading hours in the metropolitan area of Adelaide should be amended or modified. Mr. W. C. Lean, a Commissioner of the South Australian Industrial Commission, was appointed to be the Royal Commissioner.

I publicly express the Government's appreciation to Commissioner Lean for the way in which he conducted the inquiry during the course of which 180 submissions were received, and 98 persons or organisations appeared or were represented before the Royal Commission. A public opinion survey was also conducted of a representative sample of members of the public, on behalf of the Commission. The interest shown in the Royal Commission and the number and variety of submissions made to it clearly confirm the Government's view that the review of

trading hours of retail stores was a matter of such public interest that all interested persons and organisations should be given an opportunity to make submissions.

In announcing the appointment of the Royal Commission, my colleague said not only that all sections of the community would be invited to give evidence before the Royal Commission, but also that the Government would introduce legislation to give effect to the Commission's recommendations. This Bill gives effect to that promise. As recommended by the Royal Commission, this is a Bill for a separate Shop Trading Hours Act to deal exclusively with shop trading hours and ancillary matters.

In order that as much notice as possible is given of the date from which extended trading hours will operate, the Bill specifically provides for it to come into operation on December 1, 1977. This will mean that every shop can have one late shopping night in each of the four weeks before Christmas. A definite date is also included to assist in having all variations to awards, that will be needed as a result of this measure, being made as early as possible.

The closing times for shops as recommended by the Royal Commission are set out in clause 12. On Thursday night each week shops will be permitted to open until 9 p.m., except in the square mile of the city of Adelaide (that is, excluding North Adelaide) where Friday will be the late shopping night. The terms of reference for the Royal Commission concerned the metropolitan area only. However, it is clear that extended trading hours must also apply in the country.

The Bill therefore has application in all country shopping districts. Subclause (2) of clause 12 provides that the late shopping night in all country shopping districts will be Thursday. However, subclauses (6) and (7) of that clause contain a procedure by which the late shopping night in any country shopping district can be changed to Friday if that night is preferred by the majority of persons who reside in the shopping district, and of the shopkeepers and shop assistants concerned.

The Federation of Chambers of Commerce of South Australia asked that shopkeepers in country shopping districts should have the choice of opening on either Thursday or Friday night. My colleague subsequently discussed with the President and Secretary of that organisation the two provisions to which I have just referred and they indicated the provisions were satisfactory.

Exempt shops as recommended by the Royal Commission are defined in clause 4 of the Bill. In his report the Royal Commissioner specifically referred to shops known as "convenience stores" which, in his view, had an unfair trading advantage, and which he considered should cease to be exempt shops. The Government agrees that, with the extended trading hours that will be available, there is no need for any special arrangements for these shops: they will be exempt only if they come within the definition of an exempt shop.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission, there are special provisions relating to the sale of meat. By clause 5 of the Bill the closing times set out in the Act for shops the business of which is mainly or predominantly the retail sale of meat will apply to all such shops in the State, whether in a shopping district or not.

As recommended by the Royal Commission, the late shopping night will not apply to shops in which meat is sold. Subclause (4) of clause 12 provides that these shops must close at 5.30 p.m. on every week day. This is the present closing time and is considered reasonable having regard to the fact that butchers shops open much earlier than most other shops. Because it is impossible to obtain casual or part-time butchers to work in that trade, most

butchers already work about 47 hours a week. Although the Royal Commission recommended that all shops should be able to open until 6.00 p.m. on week days, the Government does not consider it reasonable for there to be any opportunity to further extend the working hours of butchers.

The provisions relating to the creation and abolition of country shopping districts, contained in clauses 10 and 11 of the Bill, are substantially the same as those in the present Act. The main alteration is that the power for the Minister to ask the Returning Officer for the State to conduct a poll of electors is not continued. There has only been one occasion when such a poll has been conducted.

Instead, the responsibility is given, in the Bill, to the local governing authority in the shopping district concerned to satisfy the Minister that any application it makes is supported by the majority of persons resident in the district, and of shop keepers and shop assistants affected by the application.

There is no provision in the Bill for a determination by the Director of the Labour and Industry Department of what is, or is not, an exempt shop, nor for a tribunal to determine appeals against the Director's classification of shops, both of which were recommended by the Royal Commission.

The procedure for defining an exempt shop, contained in the Bill, which places the onus on a defendant to prove that his was an exempt shop, as defined in the Act, makes these provisions unnecessary. Subclause (11) of clause 13 so provides and will obviate the necessity for the department having to classify each shop, and so will considerably reduce administrative procedures without inconveniencing anyone. The penalties contained in the Bill for any shop open contrary to the Act are those recommended by the Royal Commission. Clause 16 of the Bill has been included in the form of the present provision in the Industrial Code, pending a further report from the Royal Commission on its extended terms of reference concerning the trading hours for the sale of petrol. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal and clause 2 provides that the Act presaged by this Bill shall come into operation on the first day of December, 1977. Clause 3 amends the Industrial Code, 1967-1972, by removing from that Act references to control of shopping hours and clause 4 sets out the definitions used for the purposes of this Act and of these definitions the definition of "exempt shop" is drawn to honourable members' particular attention. In summary, a shop may acquire the status of an "exempt shop" if it is—

- (a) a small shop conducted by, say, a family and at no time there are more than two persons including "working proprietors" engaged therein;
- (b) a shop, irrespective of the numbers employed, if it is of a class or kind referred to in subparagraphs (i) to (xii) of paragraph (b) of the definitions;
- (c) a hairdresser's shop in which only the working proprietor is employed;
- (d) a small "convenience" store, that is, one of under 186 square metres in floor area; or
- (e) a shop situated within a squash centre, ten-pin bowling alley or golf club, that sells mainly sporting goods;

however, no butcher's shop, establishment selling new or

used motor vehicles or boats or service stations may be an "exempt shop".

Clause 5 sets out the general application of the Act and from this clause it will be noted that the Act applies to butchers' shops wherever situated but otherwise only to shops within "shopping districts" as to which see the definitions in clause 4. In subclause (2) of this clause certain other exemptions from the Act are prescribed, generally following exemptions granted under the corresponding previous legislation.

Clauses 6 and 7 provide for the appointment of and the exercise of powers, duties and functions by inspectors and are generally self-explanatory, as are clauses 8 and 9. Clauses 10 and 11 deal with what are described as proclaimed shopping districts, that is, shopping districts situated outside the metropolitan area, as defined. Briefly, these clauses provide for the continuation of existing shopping districts with a power to vary them by proclamation subject to formal consultation with local interests. In general the scheme proposed here follows fairly closely the scheme set out in the corresponding previous legislation.

Clause 12 is, of course, the crucial clause in the measure and sets out the closing times for various classes of shops. In substance it provides for—

- (a) shopping until 9 p.m. on a Friday in the central shopping district, that is, the area of the city of Adelaide that lies within the North, East, South and West Terraces;
- (b) shopping until 9 p.m. on Thursday in all other shopping districts, with a power to vary this provision by proclamation in relation to proclaimed shopping districts;
- (c) shopping until 9 p.m. on every night for establishments selling new or used motor vehicles and boats during the period when daylight saving is observed;
- (d) no night shopping in the case of butchers' shops.

In addition there is included in this clause a general power to vary temporarily any shopping hours by proclamation. This provision again corresponds to a previous provision in this matter.

Clause 13 provides for a series of offences in relation to closing time and apart from some technical redrafting and a substantial increase in penalties corresponds with the previous legislation in this matter. However, the method by which "exempt shops" are dealt with is somewhat different (see subclause (12)). First, it makes clear that the onus is on the shopkeeper to show that his shop is exempt, and, further, that it has been an exempt shop for the week preceding the relevant time; that is, the time at which it is alleged that an offence was committed. This approach has been adopted to ensure that shops cannot change their character over a period of 24 hours so as to enjoy the advantages of unrestricted trading; however, an exception is provided in the case of shops that have been established for less than one week.

Clause 14 almost duplicates a corresponding previous provision with the addition of subclause (4) (auction sales of fine art) which was a specific recommendation of the Royal Commission on Shopping Hours. Clause 15 is a vestigial remnant of the concept of "non-exempt goods" and is intended to ensure that meat, motor vehicles and boats and petrol will not be sold "after hours" as it were. Save that in the case of petrol, provision will be made for "after hours" sales under licence, as to which see clause 16. Clauses 17 and 18 are formal.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I intend to speak straight to this Bill now for one reason and one reason alone: to refute the quite false allegations and

accusations that the Minister has just made in his second reading explanation.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You could do it later.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will do it now. The Minister stated:

It is now history that, because of the uncompromising attitude of honourable members opposite, the Bill was laid aside.

That statement is in reference to the Bill brought before the Council some years ago. The Minister and the Government, who prepared this speech, are carrying on in exactly the same way as they did in the Budget and Loan Estimates debates. The Minister's statement in his explanation is obviously false and intended to create in this Council the same position as that which applied when late closing legislation was previously dealt with by this Council.

There were two matters upon which the two Chambers could not agree. One concerned the sale of red meat during late night trading, and the second concerned the opposition in this Council to the writing into the Bill of awards and conditions for people required to work after 5 p.m. on Friday.

The Minister referred to the uncompromising attitude of honourable members on this side of the Council as the reason why the Bill was laid aside. That is a matter of opinion: I believe it was the uncompromising attitude of the Government on the two important questions in the Bill originally that caused it to be laid aside. To lay the blame on this Council for the Bill's being laid aside is unfair, unjust and playing politics at the lowest possible level. The second point I wish to raise concerns the Minister's following statement:

The Government was, however, determined that members of the public should not be denied the opportunity of expressing their views, and the reasons for those views, regarding the changes they considered should be made to the current legislation.

If any credit is due for allowing people to express their views on this matter it should go to this Council and not to the Government, because the Council forced the Government to reconsider the matter, which it had swept under the carpet, trying to hide it from the South Australian public. That is why I have spoken straight away on the Bill at this stage.

The Government has available to it a large team of public relations people, press officers and huge resources from the public purse that it can utilise in spreading this sort of political nonsense. Council members have nothing; they have no research officers and no press assistants. I am getting sick of continually seeing this Council being blamed for uncompromising attitudes and for forcing the Bill to be laid aside when the real blame, when one analyses it, lies with the Government. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 617.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It is my intention to raise a matter in this debate which I regard as being extremely serious; that is, the Deputy Premier's reply to a question asked in another place concerning the Public Works Committee's annual report. As honourable members are aware, the committee has made findings in the past three years in respect of the attitude of Government departments towards matters referred to the committee.

In his reply in another place the Deputy Premier stated in relation to the committee's comments that some items were being under-estimated by leaving out vital sections and machinery, as follows:

Where a modification causing an increased expenditure of over \$500 000 is involved, I agree with the committee that the project must be referred back to the committee. I believe this is done.

I now refer to a case which indicates that that is not done and that it has not been done. Indeed, I believe that the Deputy Premier deceived this Parliament in making that statement. I refer to the development of the centralised frozen food factory at Dudley Park. That project was referred to the Public Works Committee on May 23, 1974, and reported on by the committee on September 19, 1974. The report stated:

The committee recommended erecting a centralised frozen food factory at Dudley Park, at an estimated cost of \$4 525 000.

In the 1976-77 Loan Estimates (page 9) under the heading "Hospital Buildings" there is the line "Frozen Food Factory, \$6 000 000". I went carefully through reports by the Public Works Committee for the succeeding years, but nowhere did I see any further reference of that project to the committee. On page 9 of the 1977-78 Loan Estimates, under the heading "Hospital Buildings", is the line "Frozen Food Factory, \$1 716 000".

I now refer to this year's Auditor-General's Report (page 163), under the heading "Payments from Loan Funds" and the line "Hospital Services—Dudley Park Frozen Food Factory, estimated cost, \$7 986 000; payments from Loan Account during 1976-77, \$5 606 000; total payments to June 30, 1977, \$6 650 000". The cost of this project has escalated from about \$4 500 000 to nearly \$8 000 000 without any further reference to the Public Works Committee.

How the Deputy Premier can say that, where a modification causing increased expenditure of \$500 000 is involved, the matter is referred back to the committee, I just do not know. I charge the Government with deliberate deception of Parliament and of the people in connection with this project. This project doubled in cost in two years, and it will go on costing more, without any reference back to the committee. The Government has totally ignored the Public Works Committee's findings in relation to costs, and it has treated that committee with contempt.

Another example relates to Parliament House. In January, 1972, the Public Works Committee recommended the carrying out of deferred maintenance on this building, to cost \$1 500 000. It also recommended consideration of erecting an office block on the western side of Parliament House, rather than expensive and extensive alterations to the House itself. The committee did not recommend the extensive reconstruction programme as then envisaged. It brought down its report: it did not hold it back. When the committee considered phase II, not only the recommended \$1 500 000 had been spent: \$3 500 000 had been spent on this project without any further referral back to the Public Works Committee. That sum involved a considerable proportion of the original plans which the Public Works Committee did not recommend—the alterations and extensions to the second floor.

The Public Buildings Department then sought approval for a further \$1 750 000. New furniture, interior design, carpeting, fittings, equipment, and decorations would cost \$800 000. It is stated that the approved expenditure for this year is \$2 000 000; in other words, already we are seeing an escalation of this project above what has been

approved for phase II by the Public Works Committee. So, a total of \$5 250 000 is now to be spent on Parliament House, and a considerable proportion of that sum has not received any approval from the Public Works Committee, which should give approval before such projects proceed. Again, the Government has totally ignored the committee, and treated it with contempt.

A further example is Kilburn Community College. In 1974, the Public Works Committee approved expenditure of \$14 900 000. The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1977, states (at page 103):

Regency Park Community College of Further Education: Construction of this college reached the stage where the department was able to use certain facilities which enabled classes to commence during 1977. To June 30, 1977, funds amounting to \$17 987 000 had been approved for the construction of this college, of which \$14 328 000, including Commonwealth funds of \$6 364 000, had been expended.

The Auditor-General goes on to deal with the School of Food and Catering, for which no cost details were available. There has been an escalation in the cost of the project referred to of \$3 000 000, and there has been no referral back to the Public Works Committee. Once again, the escalation of another project is more than 50 per cent, yet the Public Works Committee has not been asked to give any further report on this project.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No wonder the Chairman of the Public Works Committee was upset with the Government.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I agree. This debate is like the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2). It is just a farce, because we cannot get any details from the Government. We may be able to raise two or three subjects, but we do not receive adequate replies. What has happened at the centralised food factory? What caused a doubling of the cost? Did the escalation in cost invalidate the whole economic justification of that project? The stated justification was that, by having a centralised frozen food factory, the Government would save \$1 000 000 a year. Of course, once the capital cost is doubled, that justification is invalidated. If the Public Works Committee had been given proper estimates in the first place and if it had been able to take into account the present operation of that factory, the project would never have been proceeded with. In view of the fiasco at the Northfield Wards, if the Hospitals Department had taken the trouble to examine its food accounting, it might have been able to save \$1 000 000 without building the frozen food factory. This Government has wasted \$8 000 000 in connection with that factory, with no economic justification.

I am informed that \$190 000 was spent on a decanting unit for drugs, and a further \$100 000 will be spent. It has now been found that items associated with the special decanting unit could be obtained more cheaply on the open market. If that is the case, there has not been proper justification of the expenditure. The Public Works Committee is treated with contempt by departments and by Ministers. It will therefore be necessary for this Council next time to form itself into proper expenditure committees to examine such matters carefully.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why didn't you do it this time?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Government is forcing this Parliament to pass financial measures abnormally quickly. To secure proper oversight of the expenditure of public moneys by this Government, it is absolutely essential for this Council to take a more active role in examining expenditures.

It should not be just a role exercised once a year; I believe it is necessary for this to be a continuing role, and I will continue to press for it during this session, because this Government regards the Public Works Committee as just

a joke. Look at the Deputy Premier's reply, in which he made it plain that he had not even bothered to read the annual reports of this committee. He is more directly concerned with these reports than any other Minister; his department being more directly involved with public buildings. This Government has clearly decided that the Public Works Committee is not worth worrying about. Departments ignore it and are not giving sufficient attention to details of projects it puts forward. In order to bring them back to a position of accountability, it is essential that we make them realise that they must give a detailed accounting of all their expenditures of public funds. There is only one way to bring this thought to their mind and bring them to the point of taking the necessary action so that they have this information up to date, and that is to bring the people concerned before this Council in committees.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why don't you do it now? You could get the numbers!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If we brought them forward now, it would be a waste of time. Next year, when this subject comes before the Council, there will be moves towards this end.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Ren doesn't agree with you, does he?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The honourable member will see who agrees and who does not agree when this matter comes forward. By that time, the public outcry about the actions of this Government will be such that honourable members opposite will agree with me, too.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You'll need us, because you won't get Ren.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That comment is plainly stupid. This Government is one of the worst in Australia for public accountability. It treats Parliament with contempt; it does not answer questions. At the end of this debate, I forecast that we will get the same answers—that a report will be brought back in due course. That is not sufficient. We should know before expenditures take place what moneys will be spent; if costs rise above the amounts indicated, this Parliament should be told why, and the people who allowed that to happen should be brought to account for it. If they can give a reasonable explanation, that is fine; if they cannot, action should be taken in future to ensure that they account for their increased expenditures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: This was argued when the Public Accounts Committee Bill went through. What is needed far more than a Public Accounts Committee is an Estimates Committee.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I agree. The Public Accounts Committee merely takes history into account, not events in the future. I understand that the Public Accounts Committee has taken a short look at the centralised frozen food factory. We have not seen any result of that, and we are unlikely to do so. If we do, it will be some time in the future. Look at Northfield! It is now 18 months later and we still have not heard anything about it. I support the concept of a Public Accounts Committee, although I think it is being turned into a farce, because the Government and departments string it along and do not give it the necessary information to carry out its inquiries. We need information before public moneys are spent. If this Government has any conscience about the expenditure of public funds, it will take note of this criticism. In future, it will support moves to bring this into being.

I could go through the Loan Estimates, and it would be clear that on many items, particularly schools, expenditure has risen above the original forecast or the sum agreed to by the Public Works Committee. It is not good enough for

the Deputy Premier to say that he does not know what the committee was talking about when criticising the way in which money was spent. If there was not a detailed accounting, it was not up to the Minister to go to his departments to find out, but it was up to the Public Works Committee to find out what they were talking about. Surely, that information was available. If the Minister is not prepared to do that, let him look through all the Government documents himself, as have done with the centralised food factory.

How can the department, which built the centralised food factory, say that it does not know of a project that the Public Works Committee refers to, when an example of a doubling in expenditure is obvious? It is right before people's eyes in the Auditor-General's Report. If the people concerned are unaware of that, they are incompetent. Can the Minister give me information on that item? At this stage, as the debate will be closed today, he probably will not be able to do so.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You can keep the debate open, if you get the numbers.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Hon. Mr. Sumner should stand up and speak. Let him move the adjournment of the debate. Can the Minister supply this information? As in the case of the Budget debate, there will be no reply, because that is the way that this debate has proceeded in the past. Unless the Government has a change of heart, it will continue to operate that way in the future, although I give notice that some moves will be made concerning this matter. I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Hill asked questions about the Lands Department, seeking further details on the allocation of \$1 430 000. He wanted to know the reasons 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.

The Hon. Mr. Hill then asked:

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? . . . 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 draw the honourable member's attention to the breakdown of the Loan Estimates for 1977-78, where he will see that for "Lands—Irrigation and Drainage" the total estimated payments is \$1 430 000, broken down into the land ownership and tenure system, \$230 000; land purchases for development and sale, \$120 000; purchase of machinery for the Survey Division, \$590 000; purchase of waterfront holiday home sites, \$40 000; and plant and equipment, motor vehicles, residence, sheds, fencing, etc., \$450 000. In connection with the land ownership and tenure system allocation of \$230 000, the electronic equipment that will be purchased is a Burroughs B1276 computer with ancillary links. It is the first stage of a total land data bank with an on-line inquiry system to supply information currently held in the register books of the Lands Titles Office. The information stored will be valuation information and details of ownership, encumbrances, mortgages, rights of way, annual and unimproved values, land use, property improvements, zoning, and available services, for example gas, electricity and kerbing, etc.

There will be 13 visual display units for use to obtain the information and these units will be located in the Registrar-General's Division, the Valuer-General's Divi-

sion and the Surveyor-General's Division of the Lands Department. Further visual display units will be made available later and will be located in various other relevant Government departments such as Engineering and Water Supply, Planning and State Taxes.

As regards the other matter dealing with the purchase of machinery for the Survey Division, a stereo plotter will be purchased for the Mapping Branch, at a cost of about \$212 000; there is also another stereo plotter for which the allocation has gone on to the lines but it will not be available until next year. That will cost about \$170 000.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I thank honourable members for the attention they have given this Bill. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said there was not sufficient time to look at its details.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not say that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Well, I humbly apologise, but that was my recollection. Anyway, it was said of a previous Bill that he had not had time to study it. I was going to draw his attention to a Bill that passed through Parliament last night. It was reported in an early edition of the *News* that, although he had not even seen the Bill, he had already condemned it. I suggest there are occasions when the Hon. Mr. DeGaris knows about certain Bills but does not have time to consider them.

I come first to the point raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris about the Financial Agreement. It is true that some questions have been raised about the interpretation of Part III of the Financial Agreement and about whether the agreement might cease to have effect in the early 1980's. However, the way in which this matter has been put by the Leader seems to me to overstate the views expressed by Gilbert, Sawyer and others. As I understand the situation, these commentators have not put a firm view that the Financial Agreement will come to an end: they have merely raised the question whether such an interpretation could be put on Part III as would effectively bring the agreement to an end.

This matter has been discussed informally between Treasury officers of the several States and, on occasion, with officers of the Commonwealth Treasury. The view of Treasury officers is that Part III of the Financial Agreement will continue into the future and that the question raised by the various commentators is rather academic. The Government sought the opinion of the Solicitor-General in relation to this question. We have received from him a report which I do not propose to comment on at length at the moment. Suffice it to say now that the Solicitor-General has advised that, in his opinion, unless the existing agreement is abrogated in the meantime, the Loan Council will continue, and will retain its power pursuant to clause 3 of the agreement, so long as the obligation upon the States and the Commonwealth to make sinking fund contributions continues pursuant to clauses 12b and 12c, respectively, of the agreement—that is, in perpetuity. I trust the Leader will be satisfied that the agreement will continue.

The Leader asked in what better way these funds (the State Government Insurance Commission funds) could be invested than in public undertakings such as the Electricity Trust. The answer is that there is no reason at all why funds of S.G.I.C. should not be invested in E.T.S.A. capital works. Nor is there any reason at all why funds from the Savings Bank of South Australia, from the Superannuation Investment Trust, from the Public Trustee, and from a number of other comparable sources should not be used to finance the capital works of the Electricity Trust. In fact, funds from these areas are being called on regularly by way of debenture loans to the trust for capital purposes.

However, the essential point which must not be overlooked is that under the gentleman's agreement (part of the overall Loan Council arrangements) the semi-government borrowing authority of the Electricity Trust is constrained within approved aggregates in each financial year. All borrowings by the trust, whether they be from S.G.I.C. or from the other bodies I have mentioned, must be held within the totals approved by Loan Council under the gentlemen's agreement. This is an effective limit on the direct borrowing by the Electricity Trust each year. I think those are answers to the two main questions asked by the Leader.

In relation to the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Hill about untied grants, it is not reasonable to look at the increase in untied grants—that is, in the State's entitlement under income tax sharing arrangements—in isolation. The relevant fact is what increases the States have received in total funds—that is, the total of untied grants, of Loan Council allocations, and of specific purpose funds. Certainly the increase in untied grants in 1977-78, taken in isolation, appears favourable. But obviously the Commonwealth had this in mind when it limited the increase in Loan Council programmes to 5 per cent and when it placed tight constraints on specific purpose funds. To set this matter in perspective, I quote a paragraph from the Treasurer's Budget speech:

The increase in the aggregate of Commonwealth payments to South Australia between 1975-76 and 1977-78 is about 20 per cent. An annual increase of about 10 per cent is well below the rate of inflation and in that two years we have lost in real terms something like 7 per cent principally as a result of Commonwealth cuts in allocations for hospitals, transport, water filtration, and a host of other community services.

Coming to the question of providing for hospital facilities, I think the honourable member was on shaky ground. It has been made apparent that the Hon. Mr. Hill, the shadow Minister of Health, has recently been to a number of functions concerned with health and hospitals and he must appreciate that at those functions he has heard nothing but praise for the present Minister of Health and his understanding of the situation.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Just a moment!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He has heard nothing but public praise and appreciation of the way in which the hospitals have been treated for many years.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Would you like to hear what I have heard?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There has been nothing but praise for the Minister of Health.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What an egotist!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is a pity that honourable members opposite have not got a much younger shadow Minister than the Hon. Mr. Hill, somebody around about 18 years of age, so that, if and when the time ever comes when there is a Minister of Health from members opposite, they will have learnt and will understand the need to look after the health of the people, and they will have an opportunity to see how to get things done. By the time that comes about, the Hon. Mr. Hill will be doddering along and merely saying, "The boys have done a good job." It is a pity.

The Hon. Mr. Hill must acknowledge the public praise that has been given. Members opposite have to take a bit of knocking over. This applies not only locally but throughout the country, where we can hold our heads up higher than we could when we took over from the Liberals when they went out of office after a good run for many years. Let us look at the interest that members opposite showed when they were in Government, what they thought about the health and welfare of the people of

South Australia. We see that the expenditure in 1964-65 by the South Australian Hospitals and Public Health Departments totalled \$17 400 000 in a total State expenditure of \$224 800 000—in other words, around about 7·8 per cent.

That was the extent to which the Liberal Party was willing to look after the hospitals in and the health of the people of this State. One should compare that with the efforts of the present Government, which is allocating about 21·3 per cent of its Budget for this purpose.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What did you say? Say that again.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government is allocating 21·3 per cent of its total Budget expenditure for the running of our hospitals.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What was the total vote?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There is something wrong with the Leader if he cannot work out the sum.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It is 21 per cent of what?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is 21 per cent of the total Budget. The honourable member can examine that Budget and work out what the Government is spending.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You're reading what has been prepared for you.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, I am not. The honourable member cannot refute the fact that 21·3 per cent of the Government's total Budget is being allocated to the running of our health services. That compares with the figure of 7 per cent of the former Liberal Government's Budget which was allocated for this purpose.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: How much was it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member can look at the documents. Although they have been laid on the table since earlier in the session, honourable members opposite still have not read the papers. It is no wonder that they cannot come up with answers. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins, the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris now admit that they have not seen the figures. Despite that, those same honourable gentlemen run outside and tell all sorts of stories.

I have never heard a more contradictory statement than that made by the Hon. Mr. Hill, who said that, because the expenditure on Flinders Medical Centre had reached a certain percentage of the Government's total health services allocation, the Government should have pulled back. He said that we should have stopped in the middle of a building project such as that at Flinders, because a high percentage of hospital expenditure had been spent there.

The Government realises that a plateau will be reached and that, if work on certain projects has been commenced, more money must be spent on them in one year than is spent in another year, as happened at Flinders. After we had dug some holes out there, the Hon. Mr. Hill wanted us to pull out. He then went on to refer to the inflexible Minister, saying that this was why Whyalla had not got a hospital.

True, a new hospital was promised for Whyalla. However, the "inflexible Minister", as he was referred to by the Hon. Mr. Hill, reassessed the position, and, in conjunction with the people of Whyalla, decided that because of the closure of the shipbuilding industry in that city, it would be better to redevelop the Whyalla Hospital. Yet the Hon. Mr. Hill says that I am inflexible!

The Hon. Mr. Hill would have liked the Government to commit itself for the Para hospital, when Commonwealth Government funds for this purpose were cut back by \$7 000 000. The honourable member would have had the Government dig a few holes out there at the expense of the Flinders Medical Centre. He did not say that the

Flinders Medical Centre had more than justified its existence. Its development was undertaken to provide medical and hospital facilities for the rapidly expanding communities in the southern and south-western regions.

In addition to the normal medical and hospital services, the centre provides vital emergency services for road accident victims as well as for all other accident and emergency medical cases in the southern beach areas.

The Hon. Mr. Hill said that the Government should not have provided the facilities to which I have referred. In the meantime, however, he runs down to the Christies Beach area, and says that a hospital should be built there. Would the honourable member have stopped progress on Flinders Medical Centre so that a community hospital could be built at Christies Beach? Is that the sort of planning on which the Liberal Party depends?

The Hon. Mr. Hill was going to subsidise this community hospital on a \$2 for \$1 basis. One moment, the honourable member says, "Do not provide beds. Pull back." Then, the next moment, he dashes down to Christies Beach and says, "We will put a hospital down there, and you will have to provide part of the money for it." Despite all that, he says in the Council that the Government should not have provided so many beds at the Flinders Medical Centre.

I should like to refer to the demand made on the hospital to ascertain whether the Government was justified in continuing with that scheme. The demand on the Flinders Medical Centre has grown continually during the development of the hospital, which now has an occupancy rate in excess of 90 per cent. Sometimes, it exceeds 100 per cent; doubling-up has had to occur there. Despite this, the Hon. Mr. Hill says that we should have stopped the building of this medical centre. Obviously, the demand for it does not worry the honourable member one little bit, because he thinks that the Government should have pulled back.

The Government is constantly reviewing the State's needs in relation to hospitals and medical services, and it will continually try to meet those needs. That is indeed different from what the Hon. Mr. Hill would do: he would put a hole in the ground here and another one elsewhere, spreading the whole thing out. I refer now to the Government's decision regarding the Para District Hospital. The decision to defer construction thereof was taken reluctantly when the Federal Government decided—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Here we go again.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Is the honourable member trying to tell me that that did not happen? The Hon. Mr. Hill knows very well that the Federal Government decided to reduce this year's hospital development grants for the whole of Australia from \$108 000 000 to a lousy \$50 000 000. Does the honourable member deny that the Federal Government reduced its grant to that extent? That is why this Government has had to defer construction of the Para District Hospital.

The Hon. Mr. Hill says, "Do not keep blaming the Federal Government." However, when the State Government has an undertaking that it will be allocated a certain sum of money, and the Federal Government welches on that undertaking, what must happen to the planning that has been done?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I will tell you, if you keep quiet.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member will have his opportunity to do so. He cannot deny that the Federal Government reduced its hospital development allocation for the whole of Australia from \$108 000 000 to \$50 000 000. The Hon. Mr. Hill says that we should provide more beds, spend more money, but not

blame the Federal Government when we are cut back by about 50 per cent of the promised allocation from that Government. We hear members opposite complaining that our Government has to raise finance somewhere but that we should not blame the Federal Government for the cut-back in the programme. The significant reduction resulted in the State's losing about \$7 000 000, and it was these funds that it had been expected would be available that were to be used for Para Hospital. The planning of Para Hospital is continuing to full documentation stage so that, when the financial position improves, an immediate start can be made on the construction of this facility.

Regarding Whyalla Hospital, the decision to defer the construction of a new hospital at Whyalla was made having regard to the uncertain industrial position in that area. Nevertheless, expenditure is being undertaken to upgrade the existing hospital so far as possible, in order that the facilities available to the people at Whyalla are as good as the Government can provide. As I say, this is being done after discussion with people in that city. How could the Hon. Mr. Hill say yesterday that we were using the sick for political purposes? They were the words he used. What was he doing at Christies Beach if he was not trying to use the sick for political purposes?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I was talking about Modbury.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If we had gone back to what the Liberals wanted at Modbury, we would have had a 100-bed hospital there now and we would not be able to cater for the sick.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We knew it was rubbish, and you did not believe us when we told you. You now realise that it was a lot of rubbish, and I thank you for that admission. It is not often that you make these admissions, but you are showing flexibility by saying that the programme was rubbish. If the hospital had been built as a 100-bed hospital, there would be inconvenience there now.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You don't take bulldozers on the site.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You did not take bulldozers anywhere, and we were in a mess because of that. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Hill should have seen how the Liberals left Glenside. The way the Liberal Government allowed Glenside to deteriorate was a public scandal.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It took you a long time to do anything.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it did, because of what we had to do. We have done in 10 years more than the Liberals did in 30 years. We had to rebuild Royal Adelaide Hospital and Glenside Hospital. We had to provide Strathmont and we had to provide facilities at Enfield. We had to upgrade the Northfield wards because of the total neglect by members opposite when they were in Government. However, we got started, and I have explained why he have had to spend so much money. The Hon. Mr. Hill implies that we should not take bulldozers anywhere, that we should not have gone ahead with Flinders Medical Centre, that we should build a new hospital at Whyalla, and that we should not complain about a reduction in funds from the Commonwealth. Members opposite did practically nothing in this area. Their expenditure in their Budget was 7.8 per cent, compared to over 20 per cent in ours.

Regarding the matter that the Hon. Mr. Cameron has raised, I will get the information for him. The Hon. Mr. Hill raised the matter of the \$3 200 000 provided under the heading "Minor alterations and additions". This is the financial provision for minor works generally ranging in value from \$1 000 to \$50 000 for clients of the Public

Buildings Department other than the Education Department, the Further Education Department, and the Hospitals Department. The principal clients involved in the provision are the Community Welfare Department, the Police Department, and the Correctional Services Department. There is also a significant provision for changes in, and new, office accommodation. There is a vast number of these minor projects, and to separately identify them would require voluminous correspondence. This provision in the Budget is the normal annual provision for the purposes that I have outlined. The Hon. Mr. Casey has dealt with the matters that concern him, and I will get the information for which the Hon. Mr. Cameron has asked.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister, in due course, give me the calculations to substantiate the claim about the

21.3 per cent that he mentioned in his reply as being the appropriation for health and hospital services?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I made clear that the figure was from the Budget, not the Loan Estimates. I was pointing out that the honourable member's Government's concern for health and welfare was 7 per cent of that Government's Budget. However, I can still get the figure for the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will peruse *Hansard* tomorrow. To my mind, the Minister did include hospitals. However, I do not want to quibble on that point. I ask that the Minister give me further details on how he arrived at the 21.3 per cent.

Schedule passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 15, at 2.15 p.m.