

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 1, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

FISHING

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 18 with regard to fishing?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. I had the answer to this question last week, but the honourable member did not ask me for it. I have been furnished with figures that have been extracted from departmental records compiled from returns submitted by fishermen of the landed weights of tuna, abalone, shark, crayfish and prawns taken by commercial fishermen from South Australian waters during the last two years. I seek permission of the Council to have the details included in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

FISHERIES PRODUCTION

Species	Period	Period
	July, 1968 - June, 1969 (Landed Weight—lb.)	July, 1969 - May, 1970 (Landed Weight—lb.)
Tuna	7,204,068	3,901,104
Abalone	1,173,098	728,503
Shark	2,674,084	1,813,038
Crayfish	4,926,322	4,537,408
Prawns	1,578,929	2,495,797

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I point out that the statistics supplied for the year 1968-69 are for a period of 12 months whilst those for 1969-70 cover an 11-month period.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister was good enough to get me figures of tuna, abalone, shark, crayfish, and prawn catches. Will he now supply me with figures of the number of boats engaged in those same industries as at June 30, 1968, 1969, and 1970?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to get that information for the honourable member.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: On behalf of the Hon. Mr. Geddes, who is absent at present, I ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General whether he has an answer to the honourable member's question regarding whether the owner of a motor vehicle is personally liable to a claim for damages by a third party in the event of an insurance company becoming insolvent?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Where a motor vehicle is covered by compulsory third party insurance with an approved insurance company, and the insurance company has insufficient assets to meet all its liabilities and is being wound up or has entered into a compromise or arrangement with its creditors, the Gov-

ernment may appoint a nominal defendant in place of the insolvent insurance company. The motor vehicle driver or owner can then claim against the nominal defendant any amount which the insolvent insurance company would have been liable to pay under the policy to or on behalf of the driver or owner of the motor vehicle. Successful claims against the nominal defendant are then paid out of funds contributed by all third party approved insurers. In effect, a pool of approved insurers undertakes the liability of the insolvent insurance company towards the vehicle owner and driver.

DRIVERS' EXAMINATIONS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: My question relates to statements made last week by His Honour Mr. Justice Zelling in the Supreme Court. These statements concerned drivers found guilty of driving offences. Both drivers had psychological tendencies which, reports showed, affected their driving. Of one, the judge said:

The report disclosed a remarkable situation in that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has issued a licence to drive to a person, and I say this not unkindly, who comes within the ordinary accepted definition of a mental defective. I can only say that the result

astounds me, and that some method will have to be devised in regard to the issuing of licences to see that this does not happen again.

Of the other, he said:

A psychological report had been "most disquieting". It showed that the person concerned had aggressive and exhibitional tendencies and a sensitivity to threat, and a combination of these could lead to impulsive and violent behaviour.

Will the Minister not only investigate and advise on this type of problem case, but, bearing in mind the frightful road toll, will he also give consideration to careful investigation of people suffering from other conditions which can affect their own and other people's safety on the road before issuing a licence to drive?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer this question to the appropriate Minister.

UNIONISM

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Under the heading "Unionists Get Preference" an article appeared in this morning's press. I ask my question of the Chief Secretary, because Cabinet is referred to in the article, which states:

An official instruction in the name of the Chairman of the Public Service Board (Mr. M. L. Dennis) has been posted on Government department notice boards to remind departmental heads of their new obligation to give preference to union members. Mr. Dennis says: "A non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well conducted unionist if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work. Cabinet also desires that, where possible, present employees who are not unionists be encouraged to join appropriate unions."

I understand that it has been a practice in the past that, where all things have been equal, a returned soldier is given some preference in employment in Government departments. Can the Chief Secretary say whether this Cabinet directive means that in future a returned soldier, who is equally as competent and qualified as a unionist (or perhaps in some cases, more qualified) will not receive preference in employment in Government departments?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have not read the article in this morning's press, but it seems to be considerably mixed up from what I have considered as preference to unionists. It is to the latter point that I am sure the article has not been expressed correctly, and, rather than making a statement today on the question, I should like to have time to read the article and obtain a considered reply, which I shall try to do tomorrow.

AIR POLLUTION

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about air pollution?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is true that there are times when the meteorological ventilation of the Adelaide plains is ineffective in dispersing pollutants, sometimes for days at a time. Throughout most of the year air temperature progressively decreases as height above ground increases. Under these conditions polluted air progressively rises, and this is especially true of hot polluted air such as smoke. The atmosphere then appears clean, and pollutants do not remain stationary over the area where they have been produced.

On the other hand, under some meteorological conditions, a layer of warm air overlies a mass of colder air near the ground, and there is frequently a sharp line of demarcation where this temperature difference occurs. It is called a temperature inversion. Under these conditions, smoke and other pollutants rise through the cold zone until they reach the undersurface of the layer of warmer air. They can then rise no further, and they merely spread out in the form of a blanket. This happening is characteristic of cities in valleys or on coastal plains with hills behind, as in Adelaide and Los Angeles.

The inversion layer may be at a height of several hundred feet or up to 1,000ft. or 2,000ft. from the ground. If it is well below the height of any limiting mountain range, it tends to be stationary until meteorological conditions change. When approaching Adelaide from Willunga Hill or Mount Lofty under these conditions, one is looking along or through a layer of smoke-laden air covering much of the metropolitan area, and therefore perhaps 10 miles or more in extent. At the same time a person in Adelaide looking upwards is looking through perhaps 500ft. of smoke-laden air, so that pollution is to him very much less apparent.

When the dark smoke regulations were made, a period was allowed for industry to prepare to comply, and the regulations do not take effect until January 1, 1972. However, many industries have already altered fuel usage and firing methods, at least in part, with the object of meeting the requirements. But it is well known that during the lighting up of furnaces from cold, some emanation of smoke is inevitable. The regulations make allowance for this, but it is the reason why appearances are often at their worst in the morning. Elimination of open burning of refuse, especially motor tyres, and the advent of

natural gas are already improving the position, and further improvement for these reasons is expected to more than offset the factor of metropolitan growth.

KANGAROO FARMING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Several inquiries have been reported in the press recently about kangaroo farming in South Australia. Can the Minister of Agriculture inform the Council of any plans the Government may have to organize such farming in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: At this stage the Government has no plans to farm kangaroos commercially. I personally have received several inquiries from individuals wishing to undertake the farming of kangaroos on a very small commercial scale. I have concurred in their wishes and said I wished them all that could be wished for them in their new venture, because I think this can be done on a small scale at the present time; but, before entering into it on a large commercial scale, I think the matter must be examined further. At this stage the Government has no plans, but the matter has been thought about in certain quarters.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am pleased to receive the Minister's reply. As I read the newspaper reports, I thought that the Government had a firm proposal. In the event of the farming of kangaroos being undertaken, can the Minister of Agriculture say which department will control the number of kangaroos that can be taken?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Off the cuff, I would think that the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation would control that matter.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am sorry to keep harping on this question but I point out to the Chief Secretary that on August 11 the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill asked a question regarding the feasibility study that the Government had undertaken of the proposed State Government insurance office. On August 12 I asked the Chief Secretary whether that information could be made available to the Council in order to assist it in its debate

on the State Government Insurance Commission Bill. On August 20 I repeated my question but I still have not received a reply. As the debate on the Bill is now nearing an end, can the Chief Secretary say whether I will receive a reply before the second reading debate has been completed?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have done my best to get a reply for the Leader but, up to date, I have failed. I will again draw the Premier's attention to the question and endeavour to bring back a reply.

WINE PRICES

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of last week about wine prices?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; I do not have a reply but I will endeavour to get one for the honourable member.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VALUATION)

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time. It makes for greater flexibility in the constitution of the Land and Valuation Court. The original intention that the court should be constituted of a specialist judge who devoted himself to land and valuation matters has not substantially altered. However, it now seems expedient that it should at least be possible for the jurisdiction of the court to be conferred on any judge of the Supreme Court at the discretion of the Governor. This will enable relief to be given to a judge who may perhaps have had a surfeit of highly technical valuation matters.

The clauses of the Bill are as follows: clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 amends section 62c of the principal Act. Subsection (3), which requires that the jurisdiction of the Land and Valuation Court be conferred upon a judge by the instrument of his appointment, is removed. New subsections are enacted that permit the Governor to divest any judge of the jurisdiction of the court and confer it upon any other judge. An amendment is made to subsection (4) in view of the fact that jurisdiction is now to be conferred by proclamation rather than by notice in the *Gazette*.

Clause 3 amends section 62h of the principal Act. This provision enables the judge of the Land and Valuation Court, by Rules of Court, to confer any necessary jurisdiction upon the

Master of the Supreme Court. There is some slight doubt about the right of appeal from a decision of the Master made in the exercise of this jurisdiction. The amendment makes it clear that the rules may provide for an appeal from a decision of the Master to a judge upon whom the jurisdiction of the court has been conferred.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to make good certain deficiencies in the provisions of the Housing Improvement Act. Under Part VII of this Act the housing authority (which under the terms of the Act may be the South Australian Housing Trust or some other body to whom the Governor has committed the administration of the Act) may declare a house to be substandard. A maximum rental may then be fixed in respect of the house or any part of the house. Attempts have been made by some unscrupulous landlords to frustrate the provisions of the Act by charging the maximum rental for the house and charging separately for any furniture or other accessories provided with the house. The Bill seeks to prevent this device. It also makes some refinements upon the powers of the landlord of a house, declared to be substandard under the Act, to eject a tenant from the house. In particular, it provides that a tenant shall not be ejected otherwise than in pursuance of the order of a court of competent jurisdiction. Where the tenant has committed some breach of the tenancy agreement, the Bill makes it a matter for the discretion of the court whether that breach justifies his ejectment. Formerly any breach of the tenancy, however slight, would disentitle the tenant to his statutory protections.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes a formal amendment to the principal Act. Clause 3 repeals and re-enacts section 50 of the principal Act. This section defines what is meant for the purposes of the Act by the word "rental". It is defined as including amounts paid by the tenant to the landlord for the use of furniture and accessories in or appertaining to the house; for the repair or improvement of the house; or for the supply of electricity, gas, water, fuel or other domestic commodity or service in res-

pect of the house. Thus, where a maximum rental is fixed under the Act, the landlord is prevented from making additional charges in respect of those enumerated goods and services. Clause 4 amends section 57 of the principal Act. The purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that the housing authority may, in the same notice by which the maximum rental is fixed in respect of a house, fix the maximum rental for the letting or subletting of part of the house.

Clause 5 amends section 61 of the principal Act. This section deals with the ejectment of a tenant from a substandard house. The absolute right of the landlord to bring ejectment proceedings where the tenant has contravened a term of the tenancy is modified by investing the court with a discretion whether the contravention should or should not justify ejectment. Under paragraphs (c), (d), (g) and (h) of section 61 (1) the landlord is entitled to obtain repossession of the house where he requires it for the accommodation of a relative or employee, or for the purposes of repair or reconstruction. New subsection (3) is inserted to prevent abuse of these provisions. It provides that, where an order for repossession has been granted under any of those provisions, the house may not, without the consent of the housing authority, be let otherwise than to the persons for whose occupation repossession was sought, or before the purposes for which repossession was granted are carried out. New subsection (3a) provides that no order for costs shall be made against a party to proceedings under section 61, unless his conduct has been unreasonable, vexatious or oppressive. New subsection (6) prevents the eviction or ejectment of a tenant otherwise than in pursuance of the order of a court. Clauses 6 and 7 make formal amendments to the principal Act consequential on the enactment of the Land Acquisition Act. Clause 8 repeals section 88 of the principal Act which is now unnecessary.

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

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 1109.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): When I was last on my feet the Council very generously gave me leave to continue my remarks. Having considered this matter over the weekend, and having read the *Hansard* report of my speech, I consider that I could

not improve on what I have said, so I will content myself with those remarks.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 1105.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): Parliamentary Paper 11A, which has been supplied to honourable members, reflects the very strong financial position of the State Treasury at the present time, a fact of which I believe all members of Parliament in South Australia should be justly proud. I believe that this fact, which is quite obvious in reading this Parliamentary Paper, calls for some examination. The Loan funds that will be appropriated this year for Government works total about \$113,000,000, which I believe is an increase of between 11 per cent and 12 per cent over the appropriations for last year. I believe that this reflects a great deal of credit on the person who was the Treasurer in 1968. I refer to Sir Glen Pearson, who had a most difficult task at that time. It was under his guidance that the financial stability that we see reflected in this document was achieved in the State Treasury. In this speech I do not wish to take any political side whatsoever, but I believe that in fairness to all concerned I must mention the outstanding contribution made by Sir Glen Pearson.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You must be joking.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not joking at all: I am being perfectly genuine in the comments I am making. If the Minister wished me to recount the situation that was inherited by Sir Glen in 1968 in the Treasury I should be only too pleased to accommodate him. In 1965, the Government that took over from Sir Thomas Playford inherited a Treasury that was completely in order. Indeed, that Government inherited a credit balance of some \$1,200,000. This fact can be found in the Auditor-General's Report and in other documents the Minister of Agriculture might care to examine. At the end of three years the State's finances had drifted to the extent that we were about \$9,000,000 over-spent in the accounts of the State.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The Auditor-General's Report does not show what the State was committed for before Sir Thomas Playford went out of office. You have no record of that, and you must consider that if you want to be unpolitical in your statements.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am being quite unpolitical in my statements. The Minister is only dragging a red herring across the trail.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What I said is quite true.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Is anyone prepared to say that any Government, when it takes office, is not committed to certain expenditure created by the previous Government? However, no-one can tell me that a Government deliberately over-commits expenditure when it considers that that Government itself will be forced to face those commitments. The Minister cannot deny that in that three-year period the finances of this State deteriorated until, in 1968, there was the highest deficit this State has ever had in its history. Those are the plain facts. No-one can tell me that when Sir Glen Pearson took over the Treasury in 1968 he also did not inherit expenditures that had been committed by the previous Government. Therefore, the interjection by the Minister of Agriculture falls into the category of a political statement.

I am quoting facts that are substantiated in any document the Minister might like to examine—documents which are available to any member of Parliament and which have been prepared by people who have no political axe to grind. Therefore, I pay my tribute to Sir Glen Pearson, who inherited a very difficult Treasury, and the document now before us substantiates exactly what I am saying.

The document discloses a position for which Sir Glen Pearson was striving during his two years as Treasurer of this State. I know only too well that Sir Glen did not expect to reach, within two years of taking office, the position that we have reached today. When one realizes that the inherited deficit of about \$9,000,000 was reduced to \$4,500,000 in two years, one can gauge his worth as Treasurer. Indeed, I consider that, instead of there being some rather snide interjections on this matter, every member in this Council should be applauding the efforts that were made. The reduction of the deficit occurred in the Budget, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate Budget matters from the matters contained in the Loan Estimates. Therefore, in reference to any one of these documents, one must also take note of what is contained in the other.

When one reads Parliamentary Paper 11A one sees that there is a surplus available to the Government from the previous Administration of some \$13,000,000 in the Loan Account. I trust that the present Government will act

with responsibility in regard to the State's finances. Perhaps I can put in a nutshell the position as it now stands. The present Government has inherited this \$13,000,000 surplus in the Loan Account from the previous Government, and it has available also an increase of \$8,500,000 in the Commonwealth allocation, so it has a total increase of Loan funds available of about \$21,500,000. Out of this, \$4,500,000 is being held to cover previous deficits and about \$4,000,000 is being held to cover any expected deficit in the 1970-71 Budget Account. I commend the Government for taking this conservative attitude to South Australia's finances.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: An attitude they used to criticize previously.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: True, but I commend the Government for taking a realistic attitude to budgeting. For many years South Australia has done extremely well in its allocation of Loan funds from the Loan Council. Every member appreciates that we have received a larger share of Loan funds than has any other State: I think we have 9.9 per cent of Australia's population but our Loan Fund share is between 13 per cent and 14 per cent. I believe that this is not fully appreciated by many members of Parliament or by many members of the public. However, a further factor, to which I believe sufficient publicity has not been given, is that these Loan Estimates indicate a significant shift in the Commonwealth Government's attitude to State finances.

No-one has been more critical than I have been of the tendency towards centralism in Australia, and this tendency is growing gradually not only with respect to matters of finance but also with respect to many other matters. In many of the highly centralized western democracies of the world the move is strongly toward decentralizing. Having had the chance to examine this question recently in Great Britain and in other parts of the western world, I assure honourable members that this pressure is growing and receiving much support and that the movement in these highly centralized democracies is to decentralize authority and financial responsibility. However, in this large country of Australia, covering almost 3,000,000 square miles and with, by comparison, a handful of people, we see this tendency and pressure to centralize not only financial control but also many other aspects of our lives. Gradually, the control of the purse strings from Canberra has been tightening around the throats of the States, and the Commonwealth is

interfering more and more in aspects of State activity in which it should not interfere. I think that this tendency has added nothing to the efficient management of South Australian affairs; indeed, I will go so far as to say it has added to the cost of services provided in South Australia.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Hear, hear! I will go along with that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This whole question deserves a much closer examination than I have given it today. It is a much wider question than one can deal with when confined to the Loan Estimates debate, but I believe firmly that the financial garrotte of Canberra has been used to exercise greater power from Canberra in every aspect of our lives, and I do not level that criticism at any political Party. Although criticism has been levelled at Canberra by the present Premier, I am certain that his criticism has been made for Party political advantage—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Hear, hear!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: —rather than any interest in the fundamental question of decentralization. I am pleased that the Minister of Agriculture, by interjection, has supported my previous remarks, and I trust that he is willing to support the corollary to those remarks. When the avowed policy followed by the Australian Labor Party is to sink South Australian interests finally to the dictates of Canberra, how can one have any feeling towards the exploitation of this position by the present Premier? I most heartily applaud the Premier's statement about offshore control: this follows the attitude I adopted some months ago. However, I should like to think that the Premier's attitude was genuine and not just a political play to impress South Australians.

We all know that it is A.L.P. policy that the States will disappear, that this Council will disappear, that the House of Assembly will disappear, and that we will all be controlled in administrative units from Canberra. I began by referring to the significant shift in Commonwealth philosophy about the States' finances, and this is evident in the documents we are considering. First, there has been an acceptance by the Prime Minister of a change in the percentage growth factor that is available to the States from the Commonwealth. I may be corrected, but I believe the previous figure was an annual increase of 9.9 per cent, whereas the Prime Minister has accepted an annual increase of 12.5 per cent to the States. This in itself is a significant advance for the States

but, in addition, the Commonwealth is providing to South Australia this year more than \$27,000,000, which is contained in the Loan Estimates, free of interest.

I emphasize that, although this is the result of a significant change in the Commonwealth's approach to State finances, practically no publicity has been given to this fact. If the Chief Secretary replies later, I should like some more details of this interest-free sum. Is it to be a grant or is the capital to be repaid? I believe this will have no immediate effect on this year's State Budget (that may or may not be so) but I point out that the interest-free loan of \$27,000,000, which represents a significant change in the Commonwealth's approach to State finances, will have a remarkable impact on all following Budgets in South Australia. There have also been made available to the State other amounts, which, I believe, are to take over part of the existing debt structure. I should like some information from the Chief Secretary on the sums made available for this purpose. So, in the document before us, we see this year a significant change being made between the Commonwealth and the States that not only will assist our works programme but also will have a great impact on future State Budgets. This matter has been overlooked in much of the recent publicity.

Another fact that honourable members will appreciate is that many of the negotiations for this provision were between the Premiers and the Prime Minister in February of this year. As a result of these conferences, we now see before us this change of attitude—the first change for many years in Commonwealth-State finances. Indeed, this is breaking completely new ground, and full credit has not been given to all concerned. I have said that the Loan Estimates show the strong financial position of the State Treasury at present, and I have outlined two facts that have led to this position: first, the work of the previous Treasurer and, secondly, the significant change that has been wrought between the States and the Commonwealth. It is with some pride that I say this has been achieved. However, I express some disappointment, briefly, about projects that I think should be included in this year's Loan Estimates. I know there may well be an explanation of the matters I raise now, but I point out that on page 13 of Parliamentary Paper 11A, under the heading "Government Buildings, Land and Services—\$33,000,000", we see:

Hospital Buildings, \$11,000,000. Actual payments from Loan Account in 1969-70 were \$11,074,000.

As I pointed out, there has been an 11 per cent or a 12 per cent increase in the Loan funds available to the Government after taking into account sufficient to cover accumulated deficits and the holding in reserve of \$4,000,000 for any future deficit. Spending on hospitals in South Australia shows no improvement, while the overall figures for the Loan Estimates show an increase of 11 per cent. This means that expenditure on hospitals in South Australia this year will decline in relation to the overall increases in funds available.

The Chief Secretary may like to comment, in reply, on the fact that there is no mention in Parliamentary Paper 11A of provision in the community of an increased number of nursing home beds and geriatric accommodation. I emphasize strongly to the Chief Secretary that the care of the ageing in our community is, to me, one area in which we, as a community, are lacking in sufficient facilities. I do not think any honourable member would deny that we have had, and will continue to have, growing problems in catering for this section of our community. Several projects were in the planning stage six to 12 months ago. These may still be on the drawing board (I do not know) but the document before us does not mention them. I urge the Government not to overlook—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The one at Murray Bridge is going on and the one for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is in our lap at the moment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was thinking not so much of establishing domiciliary care units as providing buildings for the accommodation of the geriatric section of our community. I was thinking more of developing State nursing homes than of providing domiciliary services. It is in the provision of nursing home beds that there is a lag in South Australia. I was hoping to see in this year's Loan Estimates some provision for supplying this type of accommodation. I urge the Government not to overlook the provision of adequate services in this rapidly growing area of need—nursing home accommodation for the ageing and the geriatric section of our community.

Tied in with this comment and closely associated with it is the need to develop rehabilitation services and provide sufficient accommodation to cater for these needs. It is obvious to me that considerable effort is needed in capital expenditure to provide adequately for the needs of the ageing and the geriatric and rehabilitation services. I say this not only

in regard to Government projects (although I believe the Government has a direct responsibility) but because I believe there are many other projects in which there is a need for capital injection into community organizations engaged in these three fields of activity—the ageing, geriatric nursing, and the rehabilitation services. In connection with the Port Augusta Hospital the Treasurer in another place said:

\$700,000 is proposed for further work on the redevelopment of the Port Augusta Hospital to provide modern accommodation for patients, a new kitchen and dining room, nurses' home, boiler house and laundry. The estimated total cost of the scheme is \$3,625,000 and \$154,000 was spent last year. I hope there is no change in policy in this respect.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: None whatsoever.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The previous Government recognized the need for regionalization of many essential hospital services. That Government intended that a group laundry would be established in Port Pirie to service Port Pirie, Port Augusta and surrounding areas. I would think that the laundry referred to in the Treasurer's statement would be only a small laundry to cater for the urgent needs of the Port Augusta Hospital and that the clock would not be put back by building a full-scale laundry at Port Augusta. I assume that that is what is meant, but I should like the Chief Secretary's assurance that my assumption is correct. I hope there is no change in policy in regard to the establishment of centralized regional hospital services not only in regard to laundries but in regard to many other essential administrative services. This policy enables many savings to be made in country hospitals. In connection with prisons the Treasurer in another place said:

\$280,000 is proposed to commence work on a new gaol at Port Augusta, the estimated total cost of which is \$800,000. The rebuilding scheme provides that women prisoners will be accommodated in the existing gaol and \$40,000 is set aside to enable the necessary conversions to be carried out.

I am disappointed that no other progress will be made in connection with prison accommodation. The top priorities in connection with upgrading prison accommodation are to commence work on a new gaol at Port Augusta and to improve and enlarge the accommodation at Port Lincoln. However, I notice that there is no mention of the Port Lincoln gaol. If these projects are carried out we shall eliminate the great cost involved in moving prisoners from those gaols to the metropolitan area because of lack of accom-

modation. I am pleased that the Government has accepted the priorities set by the previous Government but I am disappointed that there will be no move to improve prison accommodation at Port Lincoln.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The programme has not been altered one iota since the previous Government left office. It was never intended to proceed with the Port Lincoln project this year, according to my information.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I said that there had been an increase of between 11 per cent and 12 per cent in the funds available to the Government, but I notice that only one-third of the work needed at Port Augusta has been included in this year's Loan Estimates. I am disappointed that other works are not being undertaken. I refer particularly to the lack of provision for construction of a pre-release hostel in our prison system. This is the most practical approach that can be made, because it would show benefits to the prisoners, the department, the Government, and the community as a whole. There may be very good reasons why the Government has not provided for a pre-release hostel, but I am disappointed that it has not done so. Perhaps the Chief Secretary can comment on this point in his reply. I do not think the Government would abandon the concept of pre-release hostels, because I firmly believe that that concept provides many benefits for the community.

As most honourable members know, I am not carried away by the magnificent word "reform". Today, everything must be reformed! We must closely examine any changes that should be made in our community, because change for the sake of change will lead us into difficulties. However, from every angle the establishment of pre-release hostels is a practical and urgent measure. At this stage, I pay a sincere tribute to prison officers, who are far-sighted and interested in their work. If we look at our prison system as a means of rehabilitation, we shall realize that our first step must be to establish a pre-release system.

My final and most bitter disappointment is that no provision at all has been made for a new headquarters for the Mines Department. The work of that department over very many years has been outstanding and, during the past two years, it has experienced a tremendous increase in its workload. Because those employed in the Mines Department have been working under archaic conditions for so long, it

is impossible to maintain any continuing standard of service in the accommodation at present available. As every honourable member knows, it was the aim of the previous State Government, the Commonwealth Government, and private individuals that a mineral science centre should be established at Glenside. It was essential to the development of this centre that a modern headquarters for the Mines Department be built in association with it at Glenside. Irrespective of the final outcome of the proposal for a mineral science centre, provision should have been made this year for a new departmental headquarters to be commenced. It would be an expression of confidence in the proposal for an outstanding mineral science centre to be established in South Australia.

There are probably many other matters on which I could comment, but I have touched on the matters on which I should like the Government to comment. No doubt, other honourable members will speak on other areas to which Loan funds have been devoted. However, the fact remains that in the Loan Estimates an increase of between 11 per cent and 12 per cent is made available this year. This increase has resulted from an increase of \$8,500,000 from Loan Council sources and a \$13,000,000 carry-over enabling the Government to cover previous deficits and an anticipated deficit in the Revenue Budget this year.

However, with all these provisions being made, the Loan Estimates this year show an increase of between 11 per cent and 12 per cent. This increase reflects a great deal of credit on previous Administrations in this State and also on the Commonwealth Government because in these Loan Estimates we have evidence of the first significant change in that Government's attitude towards the State's financial situation. I support the second reading.

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

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 1107.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading. The Bill could perhaps be described as a somewhat technical financial measure dealing with, as the Minister said in his second reading explanation, three main matters. The first matter is the one that was referred to by the Leader in his speech today on another Bill, namely, that, for

the first time, the Commonwealth Government has agreed to make available to this State grants exceeding \$27,000,000 a year for capital purposes in lieu of loans and to assume responsibility for existing State indebtedness at about the same rate. I think this is something that all honourable members welcome. I hope that it will be the start of a long process whereby over the years considerable relief will be given to the State Treasury for interest and debt charges. Because of these new arrangements it is necessary to amend the principal Act in order further to amend the definitions of "borrowed moneys", "borrowing", "public debt", etc., and the Bill does this.

The second reason for the Bill's introduction is that it includes a new formula for the expenditure of excess moneys, other than as provided for in the Budget. As honourable members know, the Governor has power by warrant to authorize the expenditure of certain moneys up to a fixed amount. In lieu of that fixed amount (originally \$200,000 a year), the Bill provides that the amount of excess expenditure that may be spent on the Governor's authorization will be 1 per cent of the total Budget appropriations. This seems to me to be a reasonable provision: it should not make an inordinately high sum available. Of course, the amount will vary from year to year, depending on the Budget figure. I see no objection to that provision.

The third reason, as mentioned by the Minister, is that opportunity has been taken to correct certain outmoded procedures and to repeal some of them. In this connection, the Minister told us that complete agreement had been reached between the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer. As no doubt all honourable members have complete confidence in those two officers, anything they have agreed on will certainly be regarded *prima facie* as being completely acceptable to them.

Without detailed knowledge of the inner workings of the Treasury one may perhaps be puzzled by the wording of the Bill, but one can be reassured because they are correct and necessary in the eyes of the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer. Consequently, I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

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

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMEND- MENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 26. Page 1044.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I was prepared to speak to this Bill last Wednesday

when I criticized the Minister to some extent for trying to have it passed on the day on which he made his second reading explanation. By interjection, the Minister suggested that I seek leave to continue my remarks. Although I am prepared to speak again today, the Minister has told me that he is having an amendment drawn up but that he will need a little time to have it prepared. Therefore, I seek further leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 26. Page 1045.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): It does not afford me any pleasure to support any measure that will create a further financial burden on an already over-taxed pastoral industry, which is the industry that pays the wild dogs tax. Although the Minister has clearly indicated the reason for introducing this measure, the increase in rates will not be accepted happily. It is not clear to me whether it is the Minister's intention to increase the operative rate or whether it is his intention only to increase the maximum rate. If it is his intention to increase the operative rate, it may not be so easily followed.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The rate has been fixed for this year.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: At 15c?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Yes.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Then that will be of some benefit. I can quite understand that it was necessary to increase the maximum rate because of the depletion of the fund and also because of the Government's intention to contribute on a \$1 for \$1 basis to keep this fund viable and to provide some bounty for scalps. It is interesting to note that about one-third of the State is exempt from this rate. The line of demarcation runs from roughly just above Port Pirie east to a point just east of Terowie, south to Robertstown, east again to Morgan, and then along the Murray River to the New South Wales border. All of the country north and west of that line of demarcation pays this rate of 15c a square mile in respect of all properties of over four square miles.

I believe that the control of the wild dog is a matter of both State and national importance and that it should not be left to a few pastoralists to provide this protection for the whole of the State. This also applies to

another Act that is closely related to this one, namely, the Dog Fence Act. I believe that the Governments of later years have gradually been realizing the importance of the eradication or control of the wild dog and have very slowly come to the party. Today we see the present Government's intention to increase this \$1 for \$1 contribution and this is a very commendable step, and I am sure it is an indication that the authorities are becoming more and more aware of the part they must play in the control of this vermin, which could cause havoc if not closely checked.

I think the Minister referred to the wrangles that have taken place over many years going back to 1955. Actually, I think they went back really to the years immediately after the Second World War, when it was noted that people who had previously been working practically full time as doggers were finding better and easier employment in much more pleasant circumstances in the inside country. At that time the scalp rate was only \$2, and that offered no inducement to people to continue as doggers. In fact, we reached the stage where there was not one recognized professional dogger in this State.

After a great deal of negotiation, some compromise was reached within the various State groups that were called to a conference in Adelaide in May, 1969, and it was decided to increase the bounty to \$6 a head. This action had such a marked effect that the wild dog population was decreased by 19,500 in 12 months, and it seems a pity that, after having made such inroads into the dog population, we cannot continue the campaign, because this vermin holds a very real threat to the pastoral industry in this State. It is to be hoped that as soon as the Minister can see his way clear to do so he will once again increase the bounty from \$4 to \$6 and that he will offer the same bounty for pups. I can understand that the bounty had to be reduced, but I thought it was an incorrect move to reduce the pup bounty to \$1. I spoke at some length on this matter during the Address in Reply debate, and I hope that the Minister takes particular note of the points that I made. There have been suggestions that some people allow pups to live just a bit longer and to grow a little larger and thereby qualify for the \$4 bounty. Up to the present time, the eradication of the dingo has not been interfered with by the conservationists, who apparently think that, compared with other animals, they are vermin and should be controlled.

Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum rate from 15c a square mile to 25c a square mile. I have no objection to this. I believe there would be some resentment if the operative rate was also increased to 25c a square mile. I hope it will not be necessary to do this in order to bring the fund back to a viable position and, what is more, to increase the bonus. I thought the Minister did a very good job in pointing out the necessity for this increase and, since the Government has been good enough to go along with a \$1 for \$1 subsidy, I can see no reason why the maximum rate should not be increased to 25c a square mile. The fund itself was built up to a very substantial point and, with the accumulated funds and the revenue that was expected, it was estimated that 12,000 scalps could be received at \$6 each. Of course,

when we reached the point of receiving 19,500 scalps in one year we found that the fund was more than depleted and the Government had to come to the rescue. It has now taken the steps outlined by the Minister to rectify the position and can grant up to \$50,000 to the fund, if necessary. I make the point once again that I consider the scalp bonus should be reinstated at \$6 at the earliest possible moment and that the operative rate should be kept as far from the maximum as possible. I support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.41 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 2, at 2.15 p.m.