

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, September 18, 1975

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

QUESTIONS

PIG SWILL

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I have been approached by a cartage contractor who, for many years, has been collecting refuse from city restaurants for certain pig farmers. The Agriculture Department apparently has advised him that, as from October 1, the feeding of swill in South Australia will be prohibited. Can the Minister say whether there is any likelihood that this decision will be changed, or possibly deferred? I have also been asked by a butcher, who has been feeding animal offal to his own pigs, whether he will have to comply with the ban after October 1. Incidentally, this butcher asks how he should dispose of his offal (without being rude) if he cannot feed it to the pigs.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: At the Agricultural Council meeting in Canberra early in August, it was agreed by all States that the ban on the feeding of swill to pigs should go ahead from October 1. I think the reasons for this ban are quite well known. It is generally considered that the feeding of swill to pigs is the most likely starting point for the introduction into Australia of exotic diseases. It is also well known that we in South Australia, with the large number of ports at which ships from other countries unload, and load grain, are particularly vulnerable to the introduction of exotic diseases. The ban was announced 12 months ago, in October of last year, and since then the Agriculture Department in South Australia has carried out an extensive extension campaign and has contacted all those people who are concerned in any way: local government bodies, country butchers, poultry processors, hospitals authorities, and so on. The department has also contacted the swill feeders and has supplied them with extension bulletins and details of all the requirements that will have to be met under the ban. Butchers will be permitted to feed offal directly to their own pigs, but they will require a permit; the pigs will have to be consigned directly to slaughter, and not to the market.

PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have had brought to my notice the high accident rate in metropolitan Adelaide in the case of children playing in public playgrounds controlled by local government and other bodies. In the main, the accidents are not caused by the style or design of the playground equipment, but because of the lack of maintenance of that equipment. Jagged metal, splintered timber, and rust have been mentioned to me as being the cause of this unfortunate problem. Does the Government involve itself in inspections in this area to ensure safety for children in such playgrounds? If the Government does not, will the Minister, in the interests of our South Australian children and safety generally, have this matter investigated?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I would not have thought this was the responsibility of the Health Depart-

ment: I think it is the responsibility of the people who control the playgrounds. However, it is a good point raised by the honourable member.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It always is.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have never doubted that for one moment, and I have said it repeatedly, as the Hon. Mr. Hill knows, and loudly, as I do always. However, I will make inquiries and see what can be done.

PETROL TAX

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I understand the Chief Secretary has an answer to a recent question I asked on petrol tax.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government is aware of the problems, which have arisen for a variety of reasons, including those mentioned by the honourable member, which have resulted in licensees being unable fully to recover the licence fee assessed by the Government. In cases where it can be shown that those reasons lead to severe hardship in meeting the licence fee, the Government has reduced the fee and will continue to follow this policy. The Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act was drafted within the constitutional restraints within which State Governments can impose taxes. For these reasons, the licence fee must be based on the sales of an antecedent period. It cannot be levied on current sales.

SHEEP

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture made any progress in his previously stated proposal to confer with other State Ministers of Agriculture to try to introduce a collective bargaining scheme regarding the sale of live sheep to Middle East States so that producers here can obtain improved export prices for live sheep?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: During the first week of September, I went to Western Australia and had talks with the Western Australian Minister of Agriculture about this matter and also the whole question of the export of sheep meat, whether live or frozen. There was a considerable degree of understanding and we agreed on many of the matters. The problem arose in terms of how specifically to do this, to make sure there was no unnecessary competition, and to form a united front for exports overseas. I agreed to take this matter up with the Australian Minister for Agriculture to see whether something could be arranged through the Australian Meat Board, which has power in many instances to exercise some control over exports and export prices. So far, it has done very little in that area. In most cases, it has supplied information about markets but, with a few exceptions, there is little direct interest in the export of meat by the Australian Meat Board; yet we felt that this was the most suitable vehicle by which to present a united front. I notice that in recent proceedings of the Agricultural Council, which took place while I was in Western Australia, some people in the Australian Meat Board are thinking along these lines. There could be some progress in that area.

FIRE FIGHTING ACCIDENT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: On January 1, 1975, there was a disastrous fire on Eyre Peninsula. It started near Tod reservoir and burnt through to the sea. I was in the area at the time, and I should like to take this opportunity to express my admiration for the manner in which the volunteer Fire Service saved many houses and farm

buildings, controlled the fire, and prevented the devastation of a much larger area. During the efforts of the volunteer fire fighters, a Mr. W. Smits was thrown from a truck and broke his arm in three places. Mr. Smits was operating under the supervision of a Fire Control Officer when he was involved in this accident, and, as a result, was hospitalised for nine weeks. The Port Lincoln District Council was good enough to pay his medical expenses. The council has made several representations to the Minister's office for financial assistance and reimbursement of the medical expenses as provided by the Fire Fighters Emergency Fund. I now raise this matter nine months later, as the council has to this date received no satisfactory reply from the Minister's department. Will the Minister view this matter with concern to see whether he can rectify it?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will look into the matter and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 28, concerning a statement by the Australian Government Minister of Agriculture (Senator Wriedt)—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He is a good one, too.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Many people are of that opinion—regarding a statement he made dealing with the easing of the ban on the export of live animals?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: No statutory rules have been passed by the Commonwealth Parliament or State Parliament prohibiting the sale of live cattle for export purposes, nor are such statutory rules required. Since Federation, the third schedule in the Customs (Prohibited Export) Regulations made under the Customs Act, lists those goods which are prohibited for export. This prohibition can only be varied under the Act by the Minister of State for Primary Industry or an authorised officer. "Cattle" is item 5 under the third schedule and the Australian Minister of Agriculture (Senator Wriedt), has exercised his powers under the Act to vary the conditions relating to export of cattle from Australia during 1975, as follows:

1. There shall be no restriction on the export of
 - (a) stud cattle;
 - (b) breeding cattle, including dairy cattle; and
 - (c) feeder steers to Japan.
2. As a matter of principle, all cattle for slaughter should be processed into beef prior to shipment. At the present time, however, as Australia is experiencing an abnormal beef market situation which is severely limiting the export of beef from Australia, it is intended that the above principles in regard to slaughter cattle be varied for 1975 as follows:

That the export of a total of 8 000 head of cattle of a minimum 1 000 lb. liveweight from each State and the Northern Territory be permitted in 1975 to Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, Phillipines, Taiwan, Indonesia, Pacific Islands, Papua-New Guinea, Thailand, Mauritius, Reunion Island, except that—

- (a) there is no weight restriction on exports of slaughter cattle from the Gulf of Carpentaria through ports in the Gulf of Carpentaria; and
- (b) no exports of slaughter cattle are to be permitted to the U.S.A., Canada, Mexico, Central American countries and Japan.

These conditions were approved on the recommendations of a working committee representing all sections of the meat industry. A further meeting of the committee will be held in mid-November, 1975, to examine arrangements for cattle exports in 1976.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I address my question to you, Mr. President. Will you report to the Council the result of your discussions with the Speaker in another place and with the Government following my question to you on the first day of the sittings of the Council this session relating to a list of Parliamentary business appearing in the daily press?

The PRESIDENT: I have had only brief conversations about the matter. The general consensus of opinion was that we were probably asking for the impossible. I must say that I have not followed the matter along to the extent of precisely putting the question to the newspapers of this State, which I suppose I should have done. However, now that the honourable member has raised the question again, I will try to obtain a final answer from the newspapers on the matter and let the Council know.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Chief Secretary finally had discussions with the Premier regarding the sittings of this Council over the period until the end of February?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I indicated on Tuesday that discussions had already been held with the Premier and that the Government had considered the matter of sitting dates. It was left with the Premier to confer with the Parliamentary Counsel regarding the availability of legislation for the Parliamentary sittings. Following those discussions, it has been announced that the Council, at its rising today, will adjourn until September 30. It will then sit for three weeks and, after adjourning for the following week, Parliament will resume on October 28 and continue sitting until November 13. The Government hopes to adjourn on that date until February 3 next year and that the session will end on February 19.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: In other words, the eight-month holiday is coming by instalments?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The way that members opposite have been working, people seem to think that they have one long holiday.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Fancy them talking! They sat only 30 days in two years once.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

DEPARTMENT AMALGAMATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Lands say whether the Government intends to amalgamate the Lands Department with the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As this matter has not been discussed in Cabinet, I cannot inform the honourable member of the position.

HILLS BUS SERVICE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have been approached by a Mr. Field—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's not the Senator, is it?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No, I have not spoken to him. I have been approached by Mr. Field on behalf of a group of citizens of the Crafers, Stirling and Aldgate areas in connection with a night bus service. Mr. Field explained to me that, after the acquisition by the Municipal Tramways Trust of private bus companies, it was expected that night bus services would be provided on the

former private bus routes where, because of the financial predicament of the companies involved, no night service had previously been provided. Mr. Field contends that on all other M.T.T. radial services such night services exist, regardless of patronage. Further, he contends that the area is served only by a slow and infrequent train service to Bridgewater, and that there is no way for anyone to reach the Crafers, Stirling and Aldgate areas by public transport, even by train, between 6.15 p.m. and 9.30 p.m. on week nights. He states that the entire fleet of bus depot No. 75 (formerly Choat's Passenger Service) is normally idle after the 5.45 p.m. trip on week nights and that a bus service operating at 1½-hour intervals could be provided by only one bus at night. My questions are as follows: first, does the Minister agree with each of Mr. Field's contentions and, if he does not, what is the position relating to each of them? Secondly, will the Minister say whether a night bus service on route 825 could be introduced this year? Thirdly, if such a service cannot be introduced, is it Government policy to introduce a night bus service on this route at any time? Fourthly, if that is Government policy, when does the Minister believe that this could be done?

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

PARLIAMENTARY CONVENTIONS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Does the Leader of the Opposition consider that a very serious threat has been made through a breach of conventions, thereby endangering the Commonwealth Parliamentary processes of this country, as a result of the appointment by the Premier of New South Wales of a person other than the person nominated by the appropriate Party, following an extraordinary vacancy in the Senate? Will the Leader agree that the Premier of Queensland has also breached convention by appointing a person not nominated by the appropriate Party, following an extraordinary vacancy for a Senator from that State? Will the Leader inform the Council of his opinion of breaches of conventions in Australia which have a limited Parliamentary effect in comparison with the conventions of Westminster?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am very pleased to answer the honourable member's questions. I am a total supporter of the conventions of Parliament. Further, I oppose any abrogation or breaking of Parliamentary conventions, because not only must one observe the actual written word of constitutional requirements and Parliamentary procedures but also one must recognise that there is a spirit to be considered as well. I oppose any breakings of the conventions, whether here or in another State. I believe that the breaking of conventions by the Prime Minister himself on many occasions—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Which occasions?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the Chifley Memorial Lecture the Prime Minister clearly said that, as far as the Labor Party was concerned, constitutional matters could be got around and abrogated, and it was the Labor Party's intention to do it. A convention was also broken by the passage of a Bill to allow Senators representing the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory to be elected for three-year periods on a proportional representation basis. I support all the conventions of the Parliament, and I oppose the breaking even of the spirit of the conventions by any person.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interruptions are out of order, particularly during Question Time.

57

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Would the Leader of the Opposition give the Council his opinion on the Commonwealth Senate's blocking of Supply?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not know that that is a question I should answer in a State Parliament.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is not obliged to give an opinion on that.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement to preface the next question to the Leader of the Opposition.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: As the Leader stated quite clearly that he disagreed very strongly, as I took his remarks, with the breaching of the convention, and endeavoured to defend the action of his political colleagues in Queensland and New South Wales, does he not consider that a lecture delivered by any person (for instance, a John Curtin Memorial Lecture or a Ben Chifley Memorial Lecture, or any other lecture) is quite different from an open and defiant breaking and breaching of a convention such as was carried out by the Bjelke-Petersen and Lewis Administrations of Queensland and New South Wales?

The PRESIDENT: Standing Order 107 limits the right of members to ask questions of private members in the Council to public matters concerned with the business of the Council in which those private members may be especially concerned. I think that, in the circumstances, the question does not relate to the business of the Council, and I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition is especially concerned with the matter. Therefore, I rule the question out of order.

BIOSPHERE RESERVES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister for the Environment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I refer to an article appearing in *Newsweek* on September 1, 1975, on page 28, headed "Ideas", under the subheading "What comes naturally". I should like to quote briefly from the article before directing my question to the Minister. The article states:

One hundred years ago, six surveyors bedazzled by Wyoming's spectacular wilderness persuaded the U.S. Congress to set aside the Yellowstone area as the world's first national park—and the conservation ethic was officially sanctioned. The park was to be, its sponsors said, "a pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of people." But human traffic has now endangered the very species of plant and animal life that parks were designed to protect, and ecologists working through UNESCO hope to carry conservation one step further. To blunt man's impact on nature, the agency is establishing a global network of Eden-like ecosystems called "biosphere reserves." It goes on to say that these areas will serve as laboratories for scientists of the future, and further states:

Man's own survival, the UNESCO team believes, may depend on preserving today's genetic pools of flora and fauna in protected ecosystems as a hedge against tomorrow's biological disasters.

Later, the article states:

Seven years in the planning, the UNESCO project may eventually include 400 sanctuaries; 40 reserves have been designed by nations to date.

It then is somewhat critical of the response of nations and states:

UNESCO has found member nations less than eager to accept biospheres as a practical necessity.

The conclusion I should like to quote is this:

Indeed, despite a handful of pilot projects scattered throughout the world, the visionary goal of the biosphere program's charter—"to predict the consequences of today's actions on tomorrow's world"—seems thwarted by the one factor that nature has never respected: human politics. And unless politics can be transcended for the good of man, nature may some day have its revenge.

Does the Minister agree with the reported UNESCO belief that such biosphere reserves are necessary for the survival of man; secondly, could he specify what steps are being taken towards the creation of such reserves in South Australia?

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PARLIAMENTARY CONVENTIONS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My personal explanation relates to the first question asked by the Hon. Mr. Foster. I think I have explained the position quite fully and clearly: I support both the written word and the spirit of Parliamentary procedure, and I shall stick by that.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 829.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Budget provides for an expenditure of \$1 051 000 000, as compared with an actual expenditure in the previous financial year of \$820 600 000. The proposed expenditure last year in the 1974-75 Budget was \$744 600 000. Those figures deserve to be highlighted, and I shall repeat them again for the consideration of the Council. The Budget last year was for \$774 600 000, and the actual expenditure was \$820 600 000, an increase during the year over the estimated expenditure of 7 per cent. The estimated expenditure for 1975-76 is \$1 051 000 000, an increase over the proposed expenditure last year of some 36 per cent, and an increase over the actual expenditure last year of 28 per cent. If I am any judge of horse-flesh, the increase in actual expenditure before the year is out will be once again of the order of 30 per cent to 36 per cent. These figures, without any comment from me, illustrate the economic trends in Australia, part of the blame for which must rest with the policies being followed by the Commonwealth Government, and partly the policies being instigated by the State Government.

During the Budget debate last year in this Chamber, it was pointed out that the Budget documents were misleading and that this Government had knowingly misled the people of South Australia with its financial predictions. That allegation, made in this Chamber last year during the Budget debate, was proved to be correct by the Government's own action a few weeks later in introducing savage taxation increases and the almost forced sale by this State of its railway asset close to the end of the financial year. Perhaps I should make some quotation from the Parliamentary Papers now before members to substantiate the point I am making. I quote from Parliamentary Paper 18, the Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., M.P. The first page states:

The Budget forecast for 1974-75 was for a deficit of \$12 000 000, after making provision for two factors which could not be estimated accurately. The first, on the

payments side of the budget, was a round sum allowance of \$30 000 000 for future wage and salary awards. The second, on the receipts side, was the inclusion of a special grant which we hoped might be of the order of \$6 000 000. Then, because of a series of adverse factors, it seemed quite early in the year that the deficit could move as high as \$36 000 000, if no corrective action were taken.

I well remember that, when I made a prediction last year, the Budget was between \$30 000 000 and \$40 000 000 out (and subsequent papers showed that it was \$36 000 000 out), the Ministry in this Chamber criticised my predictions most strongly. Within a matter of three or four weeks, the predictions I made were proved correct. The allegations made last year about the Budget proved to be correct, as evidenced by the papers subsequently presented to Parliament and the Financial Statement of the Treasurer (P.P. 18) that each member has. In its financial policy, this Government has shown itself to be in fact a willing stooge for the constitutional aims of the Federal Australian Labor Party, which has proved so disastrous to the people not only of this State but also of the whole nation. Much political capital was made by the Government on the deal made with the Commonwealth relating to the transfer of the State railway system (or, anyway, the most significant part of the State railway system) to the Commonwealth. Once again, I quote from page v of Parliamentary Paper 18 on this matter:

As to 1975-76 and the future, the total of \$25 000 000 of special grants actually received on account of 1974-75 is to be built into the base of the financial assistance grants and escalated in accordance with the formula. The State has now withdrawn its application for a special grant in 1975-76 and, hopefully, will have no further need for special assistance. However, it is not possible to see the future so clearly as to be able to say that South Australia will never be claimant again. The way has been left open for us to make a submission to the commission in respect of a future year if South Australia's financial position should deteriorate relative to that of New South Wales and Victoria and if the making of such a submission should appear to be in our best interests.

When one compares this statement with the wild claim made recently that South Australia would be \$800 000 000 better off by transferring its railways to the Commonwealth, one does not have to be a mathematical genius to detect there is something wrong somewhere. That \$800 000 000 benefit over 10 years happens to be about \$80 000 000 a year; and yet, in Parliamentary Paper 18, we see that still it may be necessary for South Australia to make a claim on the Grants Commission.

This Government will maintain reasonable financial stability in its accounts over the next nine to 12 months, but within the next 18 months it will again be in financial difficulties and will again in that time be seeking a submission to the Grants Commission. The Government has accepted Medibank and the railway transfer with a flourish of publicity, which has not given the facts to the people of South Australia. Both deals in the long run will prove to be financially less attractive to this State than the publicity machine controlled by the Government would lead us to believe.

Turning to the Revenue Account for the year 1975-76, I would like to present to the Council the following analysis in State taxation. The actual receipts in 1974-75 were \$224 900 000. Estimated receipts in 1974-75 were \$209 600 000, an increase of actual receipts over estimated receipts of \$13 300 000, or an increase of 6.5 per cent. The estimated receipts in 1974-75, as I have said, were \$209 600 000. The estimated receipts in 1975-76 are \$275 500 000, an increase in State taxation receipts estimated for 1975-76 of 31.6 per cent. One must not overlook, when examining this escalation of State taxation increase of

31.6 per cent, that this is after the removal of the petroleum franchise tax as well. Even with this tax removed, we shall see an estimated increase in taxation in South Australia of about one-third over the last financial year. So, in effect, the increase in other collections will be higher than the average proposed increase overall of almost 32 per cent. Perhaps a more dramatic comparison can be made by looking at the estimated State taxation figures over the last four years as presented in documents to this Council.

In 1972-73, estimated revenue from State taxation was \$107 800 000; in 1973-74, it was \$137 700 000; in 1974-75, it was \$208 900 000. In 1975-76, the estimated State taxation return to the Treasury is \$275 500 000. So, from 1972-73 to 1975-76, the increase in State taxation will be the staggering sum of \$170 000 000: or, if one likes to look at it in another way, 2.7 times what it was three years ago. It is almost a threefold increase in State taxation in three years. These phenomenal increases do not take into account the phenomenal rise in Government charges—charges for services such as water rates, sewerage rates, etc. This means a continuing rate of escalation of State taxation running at 35 per cent a year, if not more. Any person who is prepared to examine this matter will see that it is quite impossible for a community with a relatively static population, as South Australia has at the present time, to continue to be loaded with such an increase in the rate of State taxation. I think any person who examines that for a moment will see that what I am saying is correct. That cannot go on with a static population: a rising taxation burden of 35 per cent a year is almost double the inflation rate which in itself is bad enough.

Let us look at revenue other than State taxation. The estimated return from public undertakings in 1974-75 was \$153 600 000; in 1975-76, there was a drop to \$134 100 000, a decline because of the transfer of the railway system to the Commonwealth, I presume. For recoveries of debt services, the estimate for 1974-75 was \$47 250 000; for this financial year, it is \$51 000 000—a reasonable escalation in recoveries of debt services. For other departmental fees and recoveries, the estimate for 1974-75 was \$74 600 000, but this financial year it is \$164 300 000—an incredible increase in departmental fees and recoveries of almost \$90 000 000. The main items concerned with this huge increase are as follows: recouped from the Commonwealth for public relief, \$900 000; recouped from the Commonwealth for education, \$10 500 000; rents for officers of the Education Department, school fees, etc., \$700 000. For hospitals, there is a total increase in revenue of \$66 000 000. I should like to go through those items before I finish on this matter. I will come back to hospitals. These are the main items leading to the total increase in the revenue statement and the estimated increase of \$90 000 000 for hospitals. Last year the actual receipts for hospitals amounted to about \$27 799 000, yet the estimated receipts for this financial year amounted to \$91 900 000. The following table shows the major areas of increase in connection with hospitals:

HOSPITALS	
1974-75 Actual Receipts \$	1975-76 Estimated Receipts \$
Australian Government share of net operating costs	46 000 000
Contribution from Hospitals Fund	11 500 000
Medibank bed-day receipts	13 000 000
Nursing home benefits	100 000

HOSPITALS—continued

	1974-75 Actual Receipts \$	1975-76 Estimated Receipts \$
Patients' fees, etc.	17 992 364	10 000 000
Receipts under Australian Government domiciliary care and paramedical services schemes	537 175	1 200 000
Receipts under Australian Community Health and mental health schemes	659 013	3 000 000
Receipts under Australian Government hospital benefits scheme	2 219 542	150 000
Receipts under Australian Government pharmaceutical benefits scheme	3 545 601	600 000
Receipts under Australian Government tuberculosis scheme—	1 114 331	600 000

Those are the main items which account for this staggering \$66 000 000 increase in estimated receipts. I intend to comment further on the question of Medibank later in my speech. Commonwealth Government reimbursements in 1974-75 were estimated at \$268 000 000, and in 1975-76 the sum is estimated to be \$422 000 000, an estimated increase of 58 per cent. However, in 1974-75 actual receipts from the Commonwealth amounted to \$312 000 000, an actual increase of 35 per cent. In allocating the estimated sums in respect of Ministers, I refer to the following table:

INCREASED PAYMENTS

MINISTER	1974-75 Actual Payment \$	1975-76 Proposed Payment \$	Percentage Increase
Premier	9 400 000	12 800 000	36
Chief Secretary	41 600 000	48 800 000	17
Land	9 900 000	10 000 000	—
Works	60 500 000	70 900 000	17
Education	214 300 000	260 000 000	21
Agriculture	9 900 000	11 400 000	15
Labour and Industry	2 740 000	2 900 000	6
Environment, Planning and Development	4 600 000	5 500 000	19
Marine and Harbors	7 460 000	8 130 000	9
Community Welfare, Prices and Consumer Affairs	20 300 000	26 870 000	35
Tourism, Recreation and Sport	1 610 000	2 350 000	46
Health	130 800 000	196 500 000	50
Mines and Energy	4 600 000	5 200 000	13

To complete the total allocation of Budget items, I point out that an allowance is provided of \$98 000 000 to cover increased prices, and wage and salary increases that have not already been catered for in the Budget. This item covers almost 10 per cent of the total Budget allocations. The general pattern of the Budget follows the same pattern followed by the last four Budgets of this Government, that is, a continuing increase in the non-productive areas and an actual decline in the expenditure of the departments concerned with development and production. That has been the pattern of this Government's allocation of resources over the past four years, and it has not changed. There has been a tremendous expansion in non-productive departments, while in areas where productive activity is fostered expenditure has declined in true money terms over the past four years.

I later intend to deal with the health line, involving an expected increase in Government expenditure of \$66 000 000. I believe, and hope to show, that there will be no improvement in the standard of health and medical services in South Australia in the next financial year. Indeed, I agree with the statement which was reported to me by the designers of Medibank, that standards of health and hospital services in South Australia will decline.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: How do you know?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member should talk it over with Scotton and Deeble. These standards will decline.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It is declining at Elizabeth because of the attitude of doctors.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Policies adopted by Government affect people and, if that is the case, the Government must bear some of the blame for what is happening throughout South Australia, whether it be at Elizabeth or elsewhere. Scotton and Deeble have said regarding the subsidised hospital system in South Australia that there will be a decline in the standards of service here. Because of Medibank, there will be an increase in the cost of the service provided in South Australia, and anyone who is willing to examine that question carefully will find that what I am saying is true.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why did the other States accept Medibank?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Because, as I pointed out in reply to a rather odd question from the honourable Mr. Foster, when the Commonwealth Government's only aim is to control absolutely, State Governments are forced financially to accept its determination. It should be a matter of concern to this Parliament that this State accepted Medibank without the agreement being presented to Parliament for consideration. The people of South Australia know nothing of what is contained in the Medibank agreement. Even the Minister's own release to the press and to the South Australian public was misleading. That has been borne out in debate in this Council. I intend to make a close examination of the health line to show the Minister that what I am saying is true.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Apart from Tasmania, which States presented the agreement to Parliament?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not know what happened in the other States; that does not matter. I know that in Tasmania the agreement was presented to Parliament and debated. If that had been done in South Australia, the public would have been able to see exactly what the Medibank agreement was about. If one studies the facts one finds an increase in expenditure of about 50 per cent on health services, and I claim that not one extra bed, not one extra doctor, and not one extra increase in standard of service will be seen for that 50 per cent increase in expenditure. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL LAW (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendments without amendment.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTRY)

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.

This short Bill, which is in the usual form for a measure of this nature, provides for an increase in the number of Ministers of the Crown from 11 to 12. Its only operative clause, clause 2, provides for this increase.

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

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGULATIONS)

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It relates to planning regulations whose validity has been thrown into doubt by the decision of Mr. Justice Wells in the Myer Queenstown case. It was decided in that case that any significant discrepancy between planning regulations and the recommendation of the authority or council on which they are based would be sufficient to invalidate the whole of the regulations. In fact, for some time the policy of the State Planning Office has been to amend regulations that are recommended by councils in order to bring them into substantial conformity with the most recent models. If, as seems to be the case, these editorial amendments are sufficient to throw the validity of the regulations into doubt, then there must be many planning regulations, in addition to those promulgated for the Port Adelaide area, whose validity could be questioned. Mr. Justice Wells further decided that interim development control under Part V of the principal Act cannot subsist concurrently with planning regulations. He held that, if at the time the Government purported to make planning regulations interim development control was in force, the regulations would be suspended until the expiry of interim development control. In fact, planning authorities have, until the present, acted on the assumption that interim development control can subsist concurrently with planning regulations. There is therefore an urgent necessity to validate what has occurred in the past. Clause 2 therefore provides that, where the Governor has, before the commencement of the new amending Act, made or purported to make planning regulations, the regulations shall not be regarded as invalid by reason only of a difference or discrepancy between those regulations and a recommendation of the authority or a council, and no suspension in the operation of the regulations shall be deemed to have taken place by virtue of Part V or Part VA of the principal Act; the regulations are to be deemed capable of operating in relation to the same land concurrently with interim development control. This is a retrospective amendment, and accordingly a new subsection is inserted preserving the interests of Myers in the judgment given in action No. 1017 of 1975 in the Supreme Court.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 30, at 2.15 p.m.