

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, April 29, 1970

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

### QUESTIONS

#### QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Can the Chief Secretary inform me how many beds are in use at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, what the average daily use of such beds is and what number will be available when the new additions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are completed?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am certain the Leader does not expect me to carry the figures in my head but I will ascertain them for him and bring back a reply.

#### PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Work has not been started on the building of the new hospital at Port Augusta. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the tenders that have been received are acceptable to the Government and, if so, when the work will be commenced?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The tenders for stage I of the redevelopment of the Port Augusta Hospital closed with the Public Buildings Department in, I think, December, 1969. Stage I involved the construction of the main hospital building and a new kitchen block. Tenders for the second stage, involving the construction of a nurses training school and a nurses home, have been advertised, and close with the department some time in the middle of May. A recommendation for the acceptance of the tenders for the work involved in the first stage was submitted by the Director of the Public Buildings Department towards the end of March and is currently under consideration by Cabinet.

#### MINING LEASES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave of the Council to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: During recent months the members of the Opal Miners' Association of Australia have been very vocal in their condemnation of the present mining laws, especially with regard to the granting of large special leases adjacent to the Andamooka and Coober Pedy mining fields. I believe

amendments to the Mining Act were proposed during the last session of Parliament but, owing to drafting difficulties, were not brought forward at the time. When these amendments are drafted and have been vetted by Cabinet, will the Minister discuss this proposed legislation with the Opal Miners' Association before bringing it before Parliament?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member's question falls into two categories. First, he mentioned the granting of a large mining lease in the Coober Pedy and Andamooka areas. I point out that it is a special mining lease for exploration and this type of lease has been granted over many years. No alteration has been made in the policy that was adopted by the previous Government or the Government before it. On a visit to Coober Pedy 12 months ago I discussed with the progress association and the miners' association the question of altering the Mining Act in relation to precious stones, including opals.

I undertook to have their ideas examined with a view possibly to altering the Act in regard to this sphere of mining. I can particularly remember two points that were raised: first, the question of controlling the use of bulldozers and heavy earth moving equipment in the opal mining industry and, secondly, the question of encouraging exploration for opals. A person who explores outside a certain area should have some reward in relation to the size of his claim or some other form of reward.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about when he applies for a production licence? Will he be allowed the whole area?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Not at all. At present the size of a claim is 150ft. by 150ft., and a person is allowed to have only one claim. The opal miners and the Government believe that, when a person explores outside a proclaimed opal field and discovers new areas, he should have the right to peg not only a normal claim but also he should have the right to a reward claim in this area; he should be allowed to peg slightly larger claims. These matters were fully discussed with the progress association and the miners' association at Coober Pedy during my visit. The whole Mining Act is being revised at present and I hope in the present session to bring down to Parliament a complete revision of the Mining Act.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In this session?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It will close soon.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No; I am sorry. I mean the session before the next

election. Twelve months ago I undertook that, after Cabinet had approved any proposals, I would take them back to the miners at Coober Pedy and Andamooka to ascertain their views, and I do not intend to depart from that undertaking.

#### PRISON REFORM

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: When I had the privilege of being Chief Secretary, a detailed investigation was made into prison reform. It was decided that there should be a new women's prison, and I am glad to see that it has been completed. It was generally accepted that the Adelaide Gaol, as such, was to be demolished and a new remand centre created. The Chief Secretary has been reported in the press as saying that that project will be abandoned and that the Adelaide Gaol will (unfortunately, in my view) be renovated. In addition, work is to be carried out at the Yatala prison. Can the Chief Secretary say what progress has been made on renovating the Adelaide Gaol and can he say when the work will be completed?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A statement was made about 18 months ago regarding the Government's proposals about the gaol system in South Australia. A close examination has been made of this question and it has been found that the Adelaide Gaol is a good one for the purposes for which it is required. There was a proposal that the gaol should be disposed of and a new remand centre built, but it is not the Government's belief that this is the correct approach. In our present planning the Adelaide Gaol will remain as the remand centre, close to which will be built the proposed hostel situation where people prior to release can go into release hostels, from which they will be able to go to work. The present situation at the gaol lends itself very well to that purpose. As the honourable member has said, the Women's Rehabilitation Centre has been completed. As part of this programme it will also be necessary to upgrade the Port Augusta and Port Lincoln gaols as peripheral gaols because we are finding that it is costly to move prisoners from outlying areas to the metropolitan area. With this system there will be the Adelaide Gaol as the remand centre, the hostel situation associated with the newly created parole board, Yatala prison as the maximum security area,

the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, and the upgrading of the peripheral prisons in the country areas. In addition, there will be a further area in the South-East, similar to that established at Cadell. This is the Government's present planning.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I thank the Chief Secretary for his reply. However, I already knew most of what he has said. The kernel of my question was the stage that had been reached on work at the Adelaide Gaol.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Work at the gaol is of a continuing nature. To my knowledge, it is at present a very satisfactory gaol, but there will be a continuing programme to upgrade it. Work at the gaol is at a reasonable level and will be continuing. Prison labour is being used to upgrade the gaol.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Can the Chief Secretary say whether progress on the construction of the new Government Printing Office is up to schedule? Can he also say whether it will be available for use before it becomes necessary to demolish the existing Government Printing Office at the rear of Parliament House?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will refer this matter to the appropriate Minister and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As I understand that a contract has been let for the building of the new Modbury Hospital, can the Chief Secretary say whether work on the building is going according to schedule and when section No. 1 is likely to be completed?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I undertook to obtain a full report on this hospital as the result of a question asked yesterday by the honourable member. The report should be available tomorrow.

#### SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICTS HOSPITAL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: When my Party was in Government great pressure was put on us to get things done immediately and many honourable members took the view that the south-western districts hospital should be the first hospital to be proceeded with. I have waited anxiously and patiently to hear some announcement about the planning and

development of that hospital, but I have not yet heard of any decision by the Government on that planning, nor has there been any publicity about it. Can the Chief Secretary answer the following questions: is the planning of the hospital proceeding on schedule; when is the project likely to be ready for presentation to the Public Works Committee; and is it likely to be presented during the term of this Parliament or will it be in the next Parliament?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the Leader appreciates the point in this matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I got plenty of hammering about it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Leader can correct me on this if I am wrong, Mr. President, but I think the Commonwealth Government, through the Australian Universities Commission, made money available for the medical school but it could not be matched by the previous Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, that's not right.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The point is that it is useless going ahead with the building of a teaching hospital until it is needed and until such time as the pre-clinical years are catered for in the university. I think the medical school at Flinders University, in the pre-clinical years, will begin in 1973, and moneys will be made available during that triennium.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think it is 1974.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The date of the commencement of each triennium is a little confusing. However, the hospital at Flinders will need to be ready for teaching at the beginning of 1976. There is not much need to have a hospital before we have people ready to be trained in it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You didn't think that at one time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We have already appointed certain people associated with the new hospital at Flinders. Dr. Shea is overseas at present, and both he and I have been overseas looking at the question of the establishment of a teaching hospital such as we will have at Flinders University. I point out that it will be the first time in the history of Australia that a teaching hospital will be established on a university campus. This needs to be in operation by the end of 1975, and the present planning is designed to that end. I cannot tell the Leader exactly when this matter will be referred to the Public Works Committee, but I can give an assurance that the Government's planning at present is for the opening of the hospital in 1975.

## PARLIAMENT HOUSE

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In view of the fact that it seems likely that an election will be held within the next few weeks, can the Chief Secretary tell me what arrangements are being made for the extra accommodation that will be needed for the increased number of members in this Parliament?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not think it matters very much whether or not an election is imminent, because it will still be this Government's problem to deal with the question of accommodation in Parliament House. I know that this matter is in the capable hands of the Minister of Works, who has been looking at the question, and I will ask him to forward me a report on the present position for the honourable member.

---

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Deputy:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We express the sincere hope that His Excellency the Governor will be speedily restored to the best of health.

3. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

4. We earnestly join in the prayer for Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS moved:

That the Address in Reply, as read, be adopted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Roads and Transport) seconded the motion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

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

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I move:

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

It provides for the appropriation of \$40,000,000 so that the Public Service of the State may be carried on in the early part of next financial year. As honourable members know, the annual Appropriation Bill does not

normally receive assent until the latter part of October and, as the financial year begins on July 1, some special provision for appropriation is required to cover the first four months of the new year. That special provision takes the form of Supply Bills, normally two such Bills each year, and without this Bill now before the Council there would be no Parliamentary authority available for normal revenue expenditure from July 1, 1970. The amount proposed in this Bill, \$40,000,000, is the same as in the first Supply Bill introduced last year, and it should suffice to cover requirements through July and August. Accordingly, it will be necessary for a second Supply Bill to be submitted to the Council in the latter part of August to provide for requirements while the main Appropriation Bill is being considered during September and October.

A short Bill for \$40,000,000 without any details of the purposes for which it is available does not mean that the Government or individual departments have a free hand to spend, as they are limited by the provisions of clause 3. In the early months of 1970-71, until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, the Government must use the amounts made available by Supply Bills within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates approved by Parliament for 1969-70. In accordance with normal procedures, honourable members will have a full opportunity to debate the detailed 1970-71 expenditure proposals when the Budget is presented.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading of this Bill, which is normal procedure. Whilst it may seem strange to the average member of the public that a Bill providing for an expenditure of \$40,000,000 should go through Parliament without any detailed discussion, it is of course all in order, because the money can be spent only in accordance with the provisions that have been laid down for the spending of it, so far as my understanding of it goes. A Supply Act for the year 1969-70 has already provided for this measure, and all that this Bill does is simply to enable the Treasurer of the day to continue normal payments to the Public Service for the months of July and August. It is a procedure that has been adopted over the years, and I raise no objection to the Bill.

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

### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

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

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I move:

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

Before dealing with the details of this Bill, which appropriates a further \$1,320,000 for 1969-70, I believe it will be useful for me to give honourable members a brief summary of the present state of the Revenue Account and the possible results for the full year. On September 4, 1969, the Government presented a formal Revenue Budget which forecast a deficit of \$2,240,000. This was based on the known circumstances, including provision for salaries and wages in accordance with rates then applicable and an estimate of Commonwealth grants which might reasonably be expected in the absence of further awards. However, it was pointed out that the Government was bound to be involved in additional expenditure commitments as the result of new salary and wage awards, and that the cost could easily be about \$5,000,000. It was a reasonable expectation that award increases of that order might lead to an increase in the taxation reimbursement grant from the Commonwealth of \$1,800,000 or thereabouts. Accordingly, the realistic Budget forecast was that the deficit could increase to between \$5,000,000 and \$5,500,000 in the absence of any special Commonwealth support or other unusually favourable factor.

It is clear now that the cost of salary and wage awards will be much greater than originally forecast, and it appears that the Revenue Budget may be adversely affected to the extent of about \$7,500,000. The two major movements have been a new award for South Australian teachers and a determination by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission in the national wage case of a general increase of 3 per cent of total wages. These two awards were operative from September and December, 1969, respectively. Other determinations have increased the scales for the Police Force, for engineers, and for clerical and other groups.

On the other hand, however, the increase in the taxation reimbursement grant will be much greater than earlier anticipated. The Australian wage level used in calculating the grants is now relatively high, not only owing to the effect of new awards but also because of increasing overtime and over-award payments. Further, at the conference held in

Canberra in February last, the Commonwealth Government agreed to make available a special grant of \$12,000,000 to assist in meeting the Budget problems of the six States this year; our share being about \$1,300,000. As a result, South Australia now expects to receive increases in Commonwealth grants which will go close to offsetting the additional cost of awards handed down since the Budget.

The shipment of grain from South Australian ports has been surprisingly heavy this financial year, having regard to oversea marketing problems and the lower volume of shipment from Australia as a whole. This has led to a marked increase above estimate in freight revenues of the railways undertaking and in wharfage and bulk handling receipts of the harbour services. The continuing recovery in the State's economy, with considerable industrial and commercial development, has also helped to increase a wide range of revenues.

#### Other payments:

On the payments side of the Budget there is a number of variations both above and below estimate, but overall it seems that a firm control has succeeded in holding the aggregate within the original provision—that is, apart from the special matter of wage awards, of course.

#### Summary:

With a full two months of the year yet to go it is too early to make forecasts of the probable end-of-year result with any great confidence. Railway receipts alone could vary by hundreds of thousands of dollars from the present pattern. However, I believe that with a continued firm control of expenditures there are now good prospects of a balanced Revenue Account for 1969-70, with some possibility of a modest surplus to partially offset earlier accumulated deficits now standing at about \$7,500,000.

If the appropriations approved by Parliament in the principal Appropriation Act early in a financial year are not sufficient in any particular category to cover the Government's actual commitments during that year, it is then necessary for the Government to call on other sources of appropriation authority. There are three such sources: namely, a special section of the main Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a supplementary Appropriation Bill.

In the main Appropriation Act is a special section which gives additional appropriation to meet increased costs due to awards of wage fixing bodies and to meet any unexpected

upward movement in the costs of pumping water through the three major mains. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover the larger part of the costs of awards, though it has been possible for some departments to meet portion of these costs out of the original appropriations. It has not been necessary, at least to the present stage, to call upon the special authority to cover excess costs of water pumping.

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund, which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover the expenditure of up to \$1,200,000 in addition to that otherwise authorized. Of the \$1,200,000, up to \$400,000 is available, if required, for new purposes: that is, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. The appropriation in the fund is being used this year to cover some smaller excesses above departmental provisions and the costs of a number of new purposes, but it is not sufficient to provide for all the expected claims for additional appropriation.

Therefore, the Government has decided to put before you a supplementary Appropriation Bill to cover the expected excess expenditure in three areas of the Budget and to relieve the fund accordingly. The proposals are for additional appropriation totalling \$1,320,000 as follows:

	\$.
Hospitals Department . . . . .	300,000
Minister of Education—Miscellaneous . . . . .	770,000
Minister of Roads—Miscellaneous . . . . .	250,000
	<hr/> \$1,320,000

The details of the appropriations listed in the Bill are as follows:

#### Hospitals Department:

The costs of many items essential to the normal operation and maintenance of Government hospitals are now running at a level higher than provided originally. The Government will ensure that drugs and other supplies continue to be available as required to provide those essential services and that the requisite accounts are met without delay. Accordingly, appropriations of an additional \$190,000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and \$110,000 for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are included in the Bill.

#### Minister of Education—Miscellaneous:

After consultation with the States, the Commonwealth Government has appointed Mr.

Justice Eggleston of the Commonwealth Industrial Court to advise it as to the appropriate levels of salaries it might support for academic staff in Australian universities retrospectively from January 1, 1970. Mr. Justice Eggleston carried out a similar inquiry in 1964, while in 1967 the Australian Universities Commission itself made the necessary investigation.

The South Australian Government proposes that the salaries of academic staff of the South Australian Institute of Technology should also be reviewed and increased from January 1, 1970, and in this review will have regard to the order of increase eventually approved for university staff.

At this stage it is, of course, not possible to say either exactly when the result of the inquiry may be known or precisely what order of salary increases may be proposed. Nevertheless, it is most desirable that some provision be made in this supplementary Bill so that, if additional grants are required before June 30, adequate appropriation will be available to cover the increases retrospectively to January 1. Accordingly the Bill contains provisions of round sums for grants as follows:

	\$
University of Adelaide . . . . .	400,000
Flinders University of South Australia . . . . .	150,000
South Australian Institute of Technology . . . . .	125,000

The arrangements for the sharing of the additional costs between the Commonwealth and the State for the two universities under universities legislation, and for the Institute of Technology under advanced education legislation, are similar: that is to say, in each case for the Commonwealth to provide 35 per cent and local sources 65 per cent. The Commonwealth contribution, which will require further legislative authority, will be credited to Crown revenues when received.

The original provision for a grant towards the operation and maintenance of the services of the Kindergarten Union was \$627,000. During the year the union has adjusted salary scales having regard to the new teachers award and the general 3 per cent determination, and has incurred additional costs in meeting certain long service leave entitlements. The Government has agreed to make additional grants of \$55,000 this year towards meeting the salary and leave costs, and is proposing supplementary appropriation accordingly.

Members will probably recall the legislation which made the Public Examinations Board an autonomous body. Whereas in the financial

year ended March 31, 1969 (that is, the period covering the 1968 public examinations) the board was a responsibility of the University of Adelaide, it operated as a separate entity for the period covering the 1969 examinations. In the original Estimates it was expected that the board's expenditure budget of about \$200,000 in the 12 months to March 31, 1970, would result in a deficit of about \$80,000, and provision was made accordingly. Having regard to a recent review of the board's operations, to some costs for computer services in the previous year actually billed in the present year, and to the desirability of now providing for 15 months' operations to place the board's accounts on the basis of financial years ending on June 30, it is necessary for the available appropriation to be increased by \$40,000.

Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government—Miscellaneous:

During the debate in Parliament in August, 1969, the Government, in accepting most of the proposals set out in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, stated specifically that it did not accept the proposals for the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway. However, the Government stated that its policy was to continue to authorize land acquisition along the M.A.T.S. routes, based on hardship considerations. Unfortunately, there is no power at present in the Highways Act to authorize such expenditure. While the Act empowers the Commissioner of Highways to acquire land and property for future road-works and to use moneys in the Highways Fund for that purpose, it does not extend to the acquisition of land and property in cases of hardship in areas where it is possible, but not certain, that a road may be approved at some future time upon a route recommended but as yet not finalized. The Government has now taken the initial steps to have amending legislation drawn up so that the powers of the Commissioner under the Highways Act may be suitably extended.

In the meantime the only authorities available to the Government to enable settlements to be made with people who may incur hardship in the areas of the originally proposed Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway are a special Parliamentary appropriation in a supplementary Appropriation Bill or the use of the Governor's Appropriation Fund for a purpose "not previously authorized". The special limited section of the fund for new purposes has been used as far as practicable, having regard to other requirements, for settlements up to date. The authority of \$250,000

sought in this Bill will be applied to make good the amount drawn against the fund and to authorize further necessary settlements in the next two months. When the Highways Act is amended, provision will be made for the recovery to Revenue Account of any amounts spent from Revenue Account under this authority. The total additional appropriation for the purposes I have explained is \$1,320,000.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$1,320,000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum and sets out the amount to be provided under each department or activity. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds or bank overdraft if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1969. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. Except for the amount of appropriation sought, and the period covered, this Bill is the same in all respects as the supplementary Appropriation Bills passed by Parliament in recent years. I commend the Bill for consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading of this Bill which appropriates a further \$1,320,000 for 1969-70. It can fairly be said that the Chief Secretary has gone to some length to explain the detail of the Bill, so that one might be excused for accusing him of making a good, political window-dressing speech.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think he has something in mind?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think he has.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Like the Governor's Speech yesterday.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Bill deals with one or two items that have concerned me for some time. I think the people generally do not realize the high cost of hospitals and health. Originally, the Royal Adelaide Hospital was allocated \$2,853,000; now a further

\$190,000 has been provided. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was allocated \$1,743,000; now a further \$110,000 is needed. I do not want to criticize those figures, but I have been perturbed for some time at the gradual increase in medical health benefits and the cost to members of the public of keeping themselves insured.

The Commonwealth Government has been trying to do something in this regard but it does not seem to have met with much success. The public, which is the meat in the sandwich, is being hurt the most. Since the advent of hospital benefits, three sections of the community have benefited greatly. The first to benefit were the doctors, for whom it has been and continues to be a land of milk and honey. The hospitals, be they community or subsidized, have also fared reasonably well, as have private hospitals, too. They have not had many bad debts. When benefits are increased, usually before the patient gets any benefit the hospital fees are increased by a similar amount, and sometimes more. Pharmaceutical benefit societies and chemists have also benefited by this scheme. How much longer can the public be expected to pay increased contributions to these mutual benefit societies? It is no small amount that people pay today. Responsible people must pay these fees, because the average person simply could not afford to be sick unless he contributed to a benefits organization.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you any answer to the problem?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have some ideas, but I do not wish to explain them now. I think that the fees paid are too high and that hospital and doctors' charges are too high. I agree that everybody is entitled to a fair living standard, but this trend to increase charges has been a continuing one. I had been paying \$4.80 at the chemist for tablets I take for a slight disability I suffer but, about a week ago, their cost was increased to \$5.25, which is about a 9 per cent increase. I was not too pleased about this. I will not buy these from the chemist any more, as I have inquired and will now be able to buy them wholesale. However, not everyone can do this. Doctors, hospitals and chemists have become too greedy. Sooner or later hospital benefits schemes will collapse because fees are too high for the average family to pay. These fees are not a particularly heavy burden on me at this time, but I still consider that I am paying too much, and I am not alone in that respect. I wish the Commonwealth Government every success in its

efforts to safeguard patients, although members of the Australian Medical Association are doing their best to see that they do not lose their corner. There is no stronger trade union in the world than this association, and its members are looking after themselves. I wish the Commonwealth Government well in its efforts to keep down the fees.

Some years ago I was admitted to hospital. The day I was admitted, hospital benefits increased to such an extent that, although I thought I would get back \$10 more than the charge, the account showed that the hospital's fees had been increased by \$12. This trend has continued and it is unfortunate. I sympathize with the public in this matter. It is interesting to note that two of the most essential things of benefit to the public in this Bill are things where extra money is needed. The first of these is hospitals. If a person is ill, he must be made better. The other is education. Who does not want his children to have the best possible education? These calls on the Government for these two services are being increased, and someone must pay for them. Surely, we are paying enough income tax, but from the tax we are paying are we receiving the proper proportion to do the work the State is called on to do? I do not wish to debate this matter today, because there will be time in the future for this and I might be wasting words. If the event I confidently predict comes to pass we might have other people in Government or something else might happen. This is a warning that I want to sound. It has been perturbing to me to see the continuing disproportionate increases, particularly in health and hospital charges.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about water rates?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, they are going up, too. I join issue with the Chief Secretary on one statement in his explanation which I maintain is pure political propaganda and will not stand investigation. He said:

The continuing recovery in the State's economy, with considerable industrial and commercial development, has also helped to increase a wide range of revenues.

I am not saying that there has not been some commercial development, but I say without fear of contradiction that the statement that there has been development in industry will not bear much investigation. It is said that the economy is recovering. However, the masses are not benefiting, because it has been obvious over the last few months that many people do not think their economy is in a very sound position.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: You wouldn't be window dressing now, would you?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, I am telling the truth. If the public were enjoying a sound economy, we would not be having the industrial problems which we have in this State today and which, in my opinion, are the worst we have had for many years.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Not only in this State.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: One would have to go back many years to find examples of so much industrial disturbance in this State. What is the real reason for it?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The workers have lost confidence in the Government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. They have lost their living standards, and they want more money to meet the increased costs they are facing. If they do not have the extra money that they need, it is idle to say that the economy of this State is in a glorious position.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: It would be due to conflict within the unions, too, wouldn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not think so.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: I have a little book here that might interest you.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask the honourable member to have a look at who prints it. I also point out to him that that particular section of the industrial movement gives a good deal to the Liberal Party. I know the philosophy of those people. I also know that unless there is unrest amongst the workers we do not get the troubles in the industrial movement that we have today.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Isn't this more likely to happen in times of prosperity?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have known strikes and unrest among workers when times have not been prosperous. The honourable member cannot tell me that people stay away from their work only when they are getting enough to buy the things to keep body and soul together.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: That wasn't the point of my interjection.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I can tell the honourable member that when it comes to industrial matters he would have to be pretty good in putting forward his case. I wonder where this industrial unrest is going to finish.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: It wouldn't be caused by the new President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, would it?



The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not within this State. The organizations concerned are small ones over which Mr. Hawke, the person the honourable member is referring to, has no direct control whatsoever.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: No direction, either.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is so. The organizations concerned are the smaller ones which are battling to get somewhere near their former position comparable with other unions and with the same unions in other States. I can tell honourable members where all this trouble starts.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Over-employment.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; it began at the very time the Commonwealth arbitration authorities adjusted awards on a percentage basis about 1949, and they have been going along ever since foolishly granting increases on the same basis. As a result, the haves who already had it are getting more, and those who were not in a good position in 1939 are getting less. That is the kernel of all the problems.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: What Government was in power then?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A Liberal Government in the Commonwealth sphere and a Liberal and Country Party Government here. I think it was in about 1949, when Sir Robert Menzies was Prime Minister, that the metal trades case was before the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, and the award that was brought down was based on 1939 figures. From that time we have had problems, and the position of the groups that were on lower margins has been deteriorating ever since. Therefore, whether there be full employment or otherwise, or prosperity or bad times, this state of affairs will go on. I was with the Bread Carters Union when this rotten award came in. At one time we were on the same margin as the fitter and turner, \$5.20 a week, but the position has been drifting until today the fitter and turner is about \$10 a week better off in his margin than the bread carter is.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That award had a retrospective effect, too.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes; because the bread carters were in a rotten position in 1939, they lost ground.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think the bread carter and the fitter and turner should get the same?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The bread carter has to live; he has to feed and clothe himself and educate his children, and he has

to drive a motor car, handle cash, and all the rest of it. The Liberal Party in about 1949 promised certain things: Sir Robert Menzies said that he would see that the people got something. However, it was the greatest wrong ever done to the lower paid range of workers that I have known in the industrial movement. They are the real reasons for the problems today, and the men within the unions concerned are bitter about it. This is what has brought about over-award payments and a certain amount of collective bargaining. The people who are affected by these awards have lost faith in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Any honourable member not aware of that position should make inquiries outside this Council. I support the Bill and wish it a speedy passage.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I am especially interested in one item on the Supplementary Estimates, that dealing with the amount of \$250,000 to be made available to the Highways Department for land acquisition. I paid particular attention to the explanation given by the Chief Secretary concerning this expenditure, and I note that, in part, it is to be used for the acquisition of properties for proposed roadworks under the M.A.T.S. plan. Part of the Chief Secretary's explanation reads:

However, the Government stated that its policy was to continue to authorize land acquisition along the M.A.T.S. routes, based on hardship considerations.

The Chief Secretary was referring to proposals discussed during the debate on the M.A.T.S. plan and to the fact that the Government did not at that stage intend proceeding with certain sections of the work but withdrew proposals relating to the Hills Freeways and the Foothills Expressway. Apparently the amount of \$250,000 covers hardship cases, and I believe that it is to be spent in acquiring properties along these two freeways which were abandoned when they were discussed in this Council last year. The Chief Secretary went on to say:

Unfortunately there is no power at present in the Highways Act to authorize such expenditure. While the Act empowers the Commissioner of Highways to acquire land and property for future roadworks and to use moneys in the Highways Fund for that purpose, it does not extend to the acquisition of land and property in cases of hardship in areas where it is possible, but not certain, that a road may be approved at some future time upon a route recommended but as yet not finalized. The Government has now taken the initial steps to have amending legislation drawn up so that the powers of the Commissioner under the Highways Act may be suitably extended.

I understand that under the Highways Act the department has authority to acquire property

for the purpose of roadworks, whether the work takes place today or in five years' time, and that normally that expenditure would be charged to the Highways Fund. However we are now being told that it is illegal for the Highways Department, or the Government, or the Minister to acquire land in hardship cases for road widening, new roads, or a future highway when acquired for future use. If that is so, then many illegal transactions have been conducted by the Highways Department. A great deal of property was acquired for proposed freeways when I held office that would not have been possible to acquire legally if the Chief Secretary's explanation is correct. Many people, knowing perfectly well that their properties were on a proposed route, approached the Highways Department asking that their properties be acquired because they wanted to purchase properties elsewhere.

It could be said that many of those properties were acquired under hardship conditions at that time; now we are informed that the Government, or the Highways Department, had no authority to purchase. I query that, because my interpretation of the Highways Act is that the Commissioner has authority to acquire properties for roadwork, whether it be for a freeway or for roadwork—

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: As long as he pays for it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, but the Chief Secretary has stated in his explanation that the Highways Act will be amended because the department has no authority to acquire properties in hardship cases. It is my belief that the department has the necessary authority to acquire land or property for future use in connection with a freeway or road, or for the widening of an existing road. I prefer to use the term "freeway" rather than the general term of "roadworks". If the department does not have that authority, then many illegal transactions have taken place in the acquisition of property by the Commissioner of Highways and in the use of the Highways Fund.

With regard to my original comment on the amount of \$250,000, I understand that moneys will be made available, if not from general revenue then from surpluses of Loan moneys, for this purpose. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude is well aware that under the Highways Act any moneys made available from the Highways Department or the Highways Fund for work carried out must be paid back into general revenue. I intended to raise that matter with

the Minister of Roads and Transport, but the Chief Secretary in his explanation has said that any money made available to the Highways Fund for roadworks must be paid back into general revenue by the department; that explained the matter I intended to raise.

I am concerned at the Chief Secretary's explanation that certain transactions conducted by the Highways Department in the past were illegal. I understand that legislation will be introduced to make them legal. I suggest that the Minister should seriously consider making any legislation retrospective so that past actions of the department may be made legal. I do not believe that those transactions were illegal, and it is my contention that the department had the authority to act as it did. Similar transactions were carried out when Sir Norman Jude held Ministerial office, and again during my term of office, when acquisitions under hardship conditions were made because of the requests of owners of property at that time.

I have in mind a proposed freeway in the Findon area where a considerable amount of property was acquired by the Highways Department. That property will not now be used for that purpose because, under revised proposals, that route contained in the 1962 plan will not be proceeded with but will be replaced by the Noarlunga Freeway. However, the property was acquired by the Highways Department and paid for out of the Highways Fund under hardship conditions.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: For years the department has been acquiring land even though it was merely for a planned road.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, the proposal has been abandoned, but the property has been acquired by the department. Eventually the land will be disposed of by the department and the money will be returned to the Highways Fund where it rightfully belongs. But these transactions have taken place and if, as the Chief Secretary has intimated, they have been illegal, something ought to be done to amend the Act. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Roads and Transport): I, too, support the second reading. I shall reply to some of the comments made by the Hon. Mr. Bevan. First, we must be sure about the meaning of the phrase "the Highways Department acquiring property". The transactions to which the Chief Secretary referred in his second reading explanation are not those of compulsory acquisition: they

are simply those involving the owner of a property having to sell it.

In that case, his position is assessed by departmental officers, and the department decides, in some cases, that the owner is suffering hardship as he cannot sell his property for a fair and reasonable sum on the open market because of public announcements that have been made about road proposals. So it is true that the Highways Department does acquire land, but it does so by way of private treaty and private negotiation with the particular property owner.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This procedure is preferable to compulsory negotiation in all acquisitions.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I agree it is the preferable way to do it. Over a long period the department has preferred to treat with property owners. Secondly, I shall deal with the honourable member's opinion of the legal position. The Government has received an opinion on this matter from the Crown Solicitor and is acting on that opinion. The Crown Solicitor's opinion is that, when those properties along the two routes mentioned in the second reading explanation are negotiated for by the Highways Department and a money settlement is involved, the money should not come from the Highways Fund.

It may be that the Crown Solicitor in forming his opinion took some notice of the fact that these two particular routes were not in the overall plan approved by Parliament, whereas in the days to which the Hon. Mr. Bevan referred road plans did not come before Parliament for debate, as the M.A.T.S. proposals did.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Under pressure.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In days gone by the Highways Department did negotiate privately for land, and settlements were made; but in this issue referred to in the second reading explanation, we have obtained an opinion from the Crown Solicitor on the matter and are acting upon it. The opinion is that the money at the present time cannot come from the Highways Fund, so we propose in the next session of Parliament to amend the Highways Act so that in fact we can take the money from the fund.

However, in the meantime it has been taken from the Governor's Appropriation Fund and up to a certain aggregate amount it is right

and proper that it be taken from that fund; but we need this supplementary amount to tide us over until the end of June; we need this sum of money to make settlements in the case of properties involving hardship for the owners. The Government believes it is not fair that people along these two alignments should suffer hardship, so it wants to help them.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You should act now by going along the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: At the moment we have no intention of doing that. Going back over the history of this matter, the honourable member knows that the Government did not accept those two routes. It has submitted to the State Planning Authority that, in its preparation of its new metropolitan town plan, it must take into account the future traffic needs through the southern and eastern regions of metropolitan Adelaide. The Government will take no action and make no decision until it obtains that supplementary report for metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If we accept that, there is no logical reason why a property on these proposed routes should be acquired.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know what the honourable member means by "logical reason" but I tried to point out a moment ago that we believe we have a duty to people whose properties are affected, and this route travels through such areas as Hackney. If the honourable member wishes to lay it down that these people should suffer in their property values and that the Government of the day should turn its back on them and let them suffer, let him get up and say so; but the Government's attitude to such people is that we want to do the right thing, and we intend to do the right thing.

We have run into a problem here and have brought it to Parliament. In the Supplementary Estimates we are seeking a sum of money to tide us over until the end of June. Later, when we amend the Act, that sum will be repaid to the Revenue Account, as mentioned in the second reading explanation.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, April 30, at 2.15 p.m.