

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, October 7, 1953.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.**

Second reading.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary)  
—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to increase the salary of the Agent-General. The rate of this salary is at present fixed by Statute at £1,600 a year, and has not been altered since 1931. In 1927, just before the depression, Parliament prescribed a salary of £2,000 for the Agent-General, which figure was arrived at by combining the previous salary of £1,200 with an expense allowance of £800. During the depression the amount fixed in 1927 was reduced first to £1,800, and then to £1,600. The cuts have not been expressly restored, but the remuneration of the Agent-General in recent years has been improved from time to time by the payment of further allowances and exchange, in accordance with votes passed by Parliament. Before Mr. Greenham was appointed the question of his salary was investigated by the Public Service Commissioner in the light of today's requirements and with regard to the amounts received by the Agents-General of other States. The commissioner's recommendation is that the office should now carry a total remuneration of £3,000 sterling, of which £2,000 is to be regarded as salary, and £1,000 as a representational allowance, i.e., an allowance for the expenses incurred by the Agent-General in connection with his official duties as London representative of the State. Upon Mr. Greenham's appointment he was informed that a Bill would be introduced into Parliament to authorize payment of the new rates as from the day when the appointment took effect, namely, August 6. Up to the present, however, he is still being paid at the old rate. The Government has carefully considered the Public Service Commissioner's report on this matter and is satisfied that the proposed remuneration is completely justified. The Bill is therefore confidently submitted to members for their approval.

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

**BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.**

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

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)  
—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill is introduced following on an agreement between the Governments of Victoria and South Australia concerning an amendment recently made to the Victorian legislation, and contains only one provision, namely, that an officer of the Victorian Department of Agriculture shall have the right to attend all meetings of the Australian Barley Board and inform the Victorian Minister of Agriculture as to the matters coming before the board. Although such a provision may at first sight appear unimportant, it is, in view of the events which have happened, essential to the continuance of the barley marketing scheme.

As members know the Australian Barley Board is constituted under laws of both Victoria and South Australia and the board cannot exist unless both the Victorian and South Australian Parliaments pass identical laws as to its constitution and the two Governments agree to make the necessary appointments. The board consists of five members. There is a chairman, who happens at the moment to be a South Australian, Mr. Spafford. There are two grower representatives from this State and one from Victoria. The other member is a representative of brewers and maltsters, and he is at present a Victorian. Thus, in effect, each of the two States provides two ordinary members of the board, and South Australia the chairman. This arrangement is equitable, having regard to the fact that South Australia produces substantially the greater part of the barley handled by the board. Early this year, however, the Victorian Government decided that Victoria had insufficient influence on the board and introduced a Bill providing for an additional Victorian member to be appointed, and also declaring, in effect, that unless the board were re-constituted with the additional Victorian member before September 7, it would go out of existence. This Bill was passed.

The South Australian Government, which regarded the constitution of the board as satisfactory, did not agree with the Victorian proposal and took no steps to amend our Act in order to enable the ideas of Victoria to be carried into effect. But in order to avoid a breakdown in the barley marketing

scheme negotiations have taken place between the two Governments and an agreement has been reached pursuant to which Victoria has further amended its Act so as to repeal the provision for an additional Victorian member, and to substitute in its place a clause stating that an officer of its Department of Agriculture should have the right to attend meetings of the board as an observer. The South Australian Government agreed to amend our Act so as to include a similar provision.

This Bill will carry the arrangement between the Governments into effect, and when passed will be deemed to have come into operation on September 1. Thus, there will be no legal break in the existence of the board, and the barley marketing scheme which has given general satisfaction will be able to continue for the period already approved by Parliament. In discussing this matter the Victorian Minister of Agriculture said that his Government felt it had not been getting sufficient information about the operations of the board, and would like to be better informed. As a result of the representations it was agreed that South Australia should allow Victoria to have an observer on the board, which has agreed to furnish monthly to the Victorian and South Australian Ministers of Agriculture information about its activities, so that both Ministers will be properly informed.

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

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTERS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 876.)

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—Members may recollect that paragraph 24 of His Excellency's speech in opening the Thirty-fourth Parliament stated:—

In accordance with the policy of the Government announced before the recent elections you will be asked to consider an amendment of the Constitution Act to increase the number of Ministers of the Crown from six to eight.

As was pointed out by a previous speaker that is itself ample proof of the necessity for the proposed expansion of the Cabinet. I will be surprised if there is much opposition to the Bill because it is, after all, the members of the Government in the respective Houses who are best informed as to the size and weight of the burden that office imposes on them. The Attorney-General, when explaining the Bill, reminded us that for many years this Cabinet has been smaller than that of any other State

—and very much smaller than most of them, and in that announcement, it seems to me, he scored a very positive point in support of the measure. It is essential that the number should be adequate for the business to be done, but it is not sufficient merely to say that we have fewer Ministers than other States.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—We also have a smaller Parliament.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—That is true, all of which, I would submit, are arguments in favour of rectifying these inequities. The growth of industry and the large programme of development confronting all of us as citizens make it desirable that the two additional Ministers should be appointed. It has been said in this debate that the first occasion on which six Ministers were appointed was in 1873, but at that date our total revenue was under £1,000,000 and our population only about 200,000, or less than one-quarter of the present number. Of all the books, pamphlets and brochures that come to members of Parliament the Statistical Register is one of the best and most interesting; it is really a history of the State in a very few pages, and in reading it again last night in order to check up some figures, I was convinced that, in all its various aspects revealed by the figures, this State has a history of which we should be extremely proud. Therefore, when we reflect on the fact that in 1873, not far short of a century ago when the population was 200,000 and our annual revenue less than £1,000,000, the State was managed by six Ministers, we can see how anomalous the position has become.

That the responsibilities and duties of members have been increased greatly will not be contested, and even with all the mechanical and electrical contrivances we employ in our offices and homes, with our telephones and wireless, air travel and high speed motors, the post of a Minister is literally a full-time one, with even a short rest at the week-ends usually denied him. This is yet another of the problems that confront the Parliamentary representative who attains the dignity and office of Minister. Revenue and expenditure alike, as our Statistical Register reveals, have increased enormously and this of itself must mean an expansion of the duties of a Minister of the Crown. Fortunately for the citizens of South Australia history shows that the burdens and responsibilities of the high office we are now discussing have not been passed to hands too weak to hold them. As the Attorney-General pointed out, the provisions of section

66, which were originally enacted to meet circumstances existing nearly 100 years ago, are out of harmony with the present practice, under which all Ministers are members of Parliament. We have been told, and I agree, that there can be no question of the need for two additional Ministers when consideration is accorded to the tremendous growth of departmental work in recent years. The amount of work which confronts Ministers is tremendous; members can see for themselves what has to be done. The Ministers in both Chambers have to move among the members, and it is not necessary to make calculations to see that they are hard worked men who are denied a rest even at the week-ends. Not one member who has spoken on this measure has been unappreciative of the quality and efficiency of the Ministers in discharging their duties. We can look with perfect confidence to the selection which will be made of the future Ministers. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—In this State we are in the happy position of being able to amend our Constitution without having a referendum; that is very convenient at times, and on this occasion, if Parliament so wills it, we will be able to increase the strength of the Ministry by two. On many occasions attempts have been made to add to Cabinet strength, but this has been denied for various reasons on every occasion. Although I believe it is necessary to appoint extra Ministers now, I feel this should have been done years ago because we were then in the middle of a very heavy developmental programme, particularly in regard to housing. We should then have had a Minister of Housing responsible for obtaining materials in short supply and other matters related to housing.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—A motion on those lines was moved in the Assembly last session.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I realize that. The Premier was just as eloquent in refusing to add to the Ministry in the past as he now seems to be in increasing it. The population of this State has increased tremendously over the past few years, and this has added considerably to the burden imposed on Ministers. The ideal situation would be to have a Minister for each department; I am afraid we cannot do that, although it is the ideal for greater efficiency.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Does the honourable member suggest we should have a Minister of Fisheries?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Well, that is an extensive industry; the crayfish industry brings half a million pounds a year into the State. As every Minister and member realizes the permanent Government of this State is really the Public Service in whose hands the Minister is, and this is something that cannot be avoided.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—But he can have a mind of his own and carry out the policy of the Government.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—That is so but I still say that the Public Service is the permanent Government, because Ministers and Parliament come and go but the service remains and it is because of the great experience that departmental heads obtain in the exercise of their duties that we are able to carry on Government in this and other democratic countries. It is a responsible office. It is very necessary to have Ministers who are able to influence departmental heads because, as one wellknown constitutional writer has said, it is the duty of a Minister to tell his departmental heads just what the public would not tolerate; I think that sums up the position. He has to have a thorough knowledge of his department and must be able to influence the departmental heads to guide them according to the political programme of the Party he represents because it is the Minister's duty to see that such policy is carried out. Every member will agree that civil servants are loyal to the Minister whatever their own political beliefs. I was struck with the definition of Mr. Ivor Jennings, a constitutional authority, that the qualifications demanded of all Ministers are honesty and incorruptibility. Those are very sound standards, and judged on them our Ministers have been for the most part irreproachable. That applies to all Government administration in this State which has been for the most part incorruptible. Ivor Jennings continued:—

It is not only necessary that he should possess these qualifications, but that he should appear to possess them.

Viewed from another angle, it is not wise to have too many changes in the Ministry because it takes a Minister some time to grasp the implications of his department. There have been many rumours suggesting that the present Minister of Education is likely to relinquish his portfolio. I would regret such a happening. He entered the Education Department at the same time as the new Director was appointed. Naturally the Director took some time to become familiar with the department

and that added to the Minister's responsibility. He has performed outstanding work and has not spared himself. His has been an immense task and the job ahead is also immense. No matter who is appointed he will not be able to add one more teacher to the department.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Don't you think it is a full-time job?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes. It is a big department, and a troublesome one to administer.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—How do you mean—"troublesome"?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—There are many problems within the department, those of accommodation, transfers and staffing.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—It is a difficult department?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—It is troublesome because it is difficult. It is one of the most important portfolios because the Minister sets the policy to be implemented throughout the community. Teachers must try and mould the youth of a country into decent citizens. Without equivocation I compliment the Ministers in this Chamber. The Chief Secretary is tireless in performing his responsible duties. In recent years it has been the custom for Ministers to visit all parts of the State, but they should not be called to the far ends of the State to preside at small functions.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—They visit their own electorates.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—A Minister is entitled to perform functions in his own electorate, but he should not be called upon to preside at small functions when they might easily be delegated to district members. Ministers are called upon to do too much and members are largely to blame. Work is piled on to them, making their tasks heavier. They have little time for relaxation and the appointment of two additional Ministers may lighten their burden.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Do you think there should be a Minister from the metropolitan area?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I certainly do. The time is long overdue for representation from the metropolitan area.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about two metropolitan Ministers?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—With 50 per cent of the people of this State living in the metropolitan area I do not think the appointment of two metropolitan members would be too much. The metropolitan area deserves representation. The Bill is designed to increase the number of Ministers because the present

Ministers are over-worked and if increased efficiency will result the measure will be worth while. I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY (Central No. 2)—This Bill provides for the appointment of two additional Ministers. I do not think any member has any real complaint against the present Ministry. However, I think that in introducing Bills they should provide more explicit information. Frequently members obtain more information from the statements of the Leader of the Opposition than from a Minister's speech, because a Minister presents the raw bones of the actual facts and not the circumstances surrounding the necessity for the measure. In 1837 six Ministers were appointed and since then there has been no increase, although attempts have been made. I was rather surprised that this Chamber refused to agree to past attempts. Ministers should have time, not only to give the main points of a Bill, but to explain the reasons for the introduction of measures.

On previous occasions I have expressed the opinion that the Ministry is too small. When I first entered Parliament I thought that Parliament was too big, but since my association with it I now consider that it is not big enough. Six Ministers have to be appointed from members now eight if this Bill is passed and there should be a fair cross-section of public thought represented. I do not think there are sufficient members even for a small State like this. The highest honour that Parliament can offer members is appointment as Ministers of the Crown. It is an office perhaps not greatly sought after and when a Minister is appointed he has the responsibility of not only administering his department but of implementing the policy on which he and his Party were elected. That is not easy. Members of the same Party in this Chamber do not always agree with the Minister in implementing the policy, but he should see that that policy is brought to fruition. If he is doing his work properly his influence will extend throughout his department. It has been said that Ministers should not attend minor functions in the country, but I take the contrary view. A Minister, by the very nature of his work and the information he obtains through his Ministerial office, is much better informed than the average member of Parliament and certainly any member of the public and I think it is one of the functions of a Minister to make that knowledge known throughout the State. The only opportunity of doing so is by visiting as many places as possible.

The Hon. N. L. JÜDE—Does the honourable member think he should go to a country dance 300 miles from the city? That is the sort of thing I meant.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I do not think he should have to go to a dance, but he should not only take, but be given, every opportunity to attend functions throughout the country wherever he can do any good in enunciating Government policy and guiding the general public in the affairs of the State.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If we ask a man to work 60 hours a week should we not pay him accordingly?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—In a democracy there are varied opinions and bodies of thought. We have pressure groups on both sides of industry and in other walks of life, and everyone tries to put forward his particular viewpoint. My opinion of a Minister or a Premier of a country is that he should be above all such things. He accepts on oath the responsibilities of a leader and Minister of the Crown, and consequently the public should value any statement he makes as an unbiased utterance in the interests of the country as a whole. That attitude has been, I fear, allowed to lapse. There was a time when it was held with good effect, but I think it has been allowed to fall by the wayside somewhat, and the pressure of industrial groups on both sides, and isms of all sorts are confusing the public. What they want is leadership and I hope that, with the addition of two Ministers, the members of the Government will have time to give the country that leadership which it needs and is seeking.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—That turns a Minister into a mere propagandist.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—Not at all. I have said that a Minister should be above that type of thing. He should speak as a Minister of the Crown with authority and knowledge as one of the most responsible citizens of the State and consequently his opinion should be respected. That is the class of man we want as leader and for the welfare of a country such as ours. To an outsider I should say that the way we appoint our Ministers must seem somewhat strange. We do not do so because of a member's technical or general knowledge of any one department usually, with the exception of the Attorney-General's Department. The custom in this and most Parliaments has been to appoint a lawyer to that position, but other Ministers are appointed not for their specific knowledge but rather for their general knowledge, and

it is for their general commonsense that Ministers should be selected. Integrity and honesty should be taken for granted in a Minister and there has been no suggestion of any lack of it in any Minister of the Crown in South Australia. They may have made mistakes in administration, but any member who takes the office of Minister must be credited at least with acting honestly.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—If he has not those qualifications he should not be in Parliament.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—Exactly. It is a wide general knowledge in a Minister that is necessary. Dozens of documents are presented to him daily on which he has to make decisions, and it is the ability to make quick decisions on the facts presented that is wanted, and not necessarily technical knowledge, as has been suggested.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Would the honourable member say that there are no wise men in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—It has been said that wise men come from the east, but I am not concerned whether a member comes from north, south, east or west—the best man should be chosen. It is rather unfortunate that at least one member of the six or eight should not come from the metropolitan area, but the best men available within the Party should be selected without any consideration of locality.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is a wonderful admission.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—That is my opinion. The Ministry should be well balanced although it does seem rather strange that the experience and knowledge that must obtain from residents in a city electorate does not warrant the selection of at least one or two city members. However, most Ministers in our present Government—and I should think in most Governments—live in the city and consequently are not devoid of knowledge of city conditions. The fact that they do not represent the city electorates may be a pity, but I think it may be rectified in the course of time. The last speaker thought that Ministers should be selected for their specific knowledge. My view is just the opposite. Heads of departments are not appointed without having high qualifications and being strong characters and from the very fact that Ministers are not specifically trained they can be influenced by departmental heads if they stay too long in one office. Consequently, one of the reasons why I support the appointment of additional Ministers is the fact that it will not be so

necessary for a Minister to hold one portfolio too long. When a Minister faces up to a new job with the intention of controlling the policy of that department he will be of far greater benefit to the department and the State than if he merely becomes a rubber stamp, which it is possible may happen. Possibly the fact that many of our present Ministers have controlled departments for long periods does not appear to bear out my statement, but in dealing with a subject such as this we must take the long view and not consider the present Ministry only. I feel that the technical knowledge of a head of a department can often influence a Minister if he is too long in the one post and that is one of the reasons why I support the Bill. It will enable Ministers to move from post to post and apply the knowledge they have gained from year to year—a wider field of general knowledge than if they remained in control of one department.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Would you change the chairman of directors of a company every two years?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I do not think there is any parallel. Ministers hold a much more responsible position. The chairman of a company is usually associated with that company all his life; it is his life's work, but a Minister comes to the task in almost middle age. I think the changing of portfolios is a wiser method than the continual occupation of the same post by Ministers for many years. I support the measure for the reasons I have given, and hope that it will provide more time for the Ministers; this will be a benefit not only to the Party but also to the State's policy because the Ministers will have extra time to devote to their duties and reading.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—Obviously there will be no opposition to this Bill, but I should like to pay a tribute to the work carried out by the members of the Cabinet. In 1901 the Ministry was reduced to four and this position obtained until 1908 when it was increased to six; the number has remained unchanged since that time, although there have been unsuccessful attempts to obtain an increase. The present Ministers have worked as a team and have achieved excellent results, but when the development in this State and the increase in population are considered it is obvious that extra Ministers should be appointed. Our population has increased by 13,000 a year and is now 751,000.

I strongly support the remarks made yesterday by Messrs. Condon and Bevan that greater

payment should be made to Ministers because, after all, we will be getting the services of eight very cheaply at the proposed £19,000. These Ministers give up the whole of their time on every day of the week, and deserve ample remuneration. It is pleasing to know that there will be three Ministers in this Chamber and five in the Assembly, because members will remember an occasion last year when there was only one member of Cabinet here, and his task was an arduous one. With three Ministers here, an opportunity will be afforded for them to obtain relief.

I am closely associated with the Minister of Lands and I pay a tribute to his work, because he came into office when this State was carrying out a heavy developmental programme. Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria have boasted of their land settlement programme, but last week it was found that those States are static in this respect and now desire to come under the Commonwealth scheme. South Australia now leads in its land settlement scheme for which I pay a tribute to the Honourable Cecil Hincks, the present Minister, who is to be congratulated on the able and courteous way in which he carries out his duties. I have heard many tributes paid to the Attorney-General, who is also Minister of Education, since he vacated the portfolio of Minister of Lands; he has had a difficult task in carrying out the duties of both portfolios. Today there are 728 schools in this State, 107,926 scholars and 4,381 teachers, an average increase of 3,500 scholars a year. I know this colossal increase must have caused many problems and much additional work for the Minister, who is going to be relieved of that portfolio, and I pay a tribute to him for carrying out his work in such an admirable way.

The Minister of Agriculture has also carried out his work with great efficiency and still gives great service to his department. It must be realized that great progress has been made in the field of agriculture in recent years. He has a very able director and staff, the members of which have great confidence in and admiration for their Minister who, although often criticized as being too old, still has all his faculties. It is pleasing to know that he has fully recovered from his recent operation and is now apparently in better health than he has been for some time. The Chief Secretary has also had a very heavy task in his combined duties as Minister of Health, Chief Secretary and Minister of Mines; if he still retains the latter portfolio his work will greatly increase

because of the important industries at Leigh Creek and Radium Hill. The Minister of Works has performed sterling work in his many portfolios, but due to the progress of this State it will be impossible for him to carry out all these duties in the future. I strongly support the appointment of two extra Ministers.

I understand the Premier will have the task of selecting his Ministers and naturally he will choose efficient men who will work in harmony in Cabinet. Much has been said about the appointment of one Minister from the metropolitan area, but like Mr. Perry I believe he should be appointed on his merits. After all, our present Ministers all reside in the metropolitan area, except the Attorney-General, who lives only a short distance from the city, and they give their services to the metropolitan area as well as to the country. Many demands are made on Ministers for social and other activities and I subscribe to the theory that people in the country as well as those in the metropolitan area should be able to obtain the presence of a Minister at functions, because it is very pleasing for people far away from the city to have a Minister present on these occasions. It is very difficult for any Minister to refuse to attend any engagement at which he is asked to be present.

Last week I travelled practically from one end of Eyre Peninsula to the other and heard nothing but praise for this Bill because the people in that district feel that the appointment of two extra Ministers will bring them closer to the Government. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I have listened with great interest to the debate on this Bill, and, although I do not propose to traverse any of the ground so popular in those addresses, I say without equivocation that I entirely support the remarks made about the probity of our present Ministers and their ability and devotion to duty. I feel that this period of tremendous expansion and prosperity in this State is associated with the men who hold these portfolios. Members should take a long range view of this Bill and not have regard for their friends or the Party associated with it. The argument in favour of an increase in the Ministry seems to be on two grounds; firstly, the vast increase in the work of the Ministers and secondly, the physical and nervous strain to which they are subjected. On this aspect I draw the attention of members to the high death rate in Parliament, particularly among prominent Labor

leaders, something I believe caused by the excessive strain imposed upon them in their high office, both in the Commonwealth and State spheres. Every Minister of the Crown in every State suffers from strain, and one of the great factors causing the strain is that they work not 40 hours a week but practically every day in the week. Much of this is involved in unnecessary touring around the State attending week-end functions, many of which though important to local people are but trivial when the whole picture is viewed. The main advantage in attending these functions is that it enables a Minister or a member to make a statement of public policy or give an account of what has been done. Years ago *Hansard* was published in the daily press. I do not know if the Government subsidized that practice but if it did in these days it would have two effects. It would inform the public of everything that transpired in Parliament and it would have a beneficial effect on members because they would realize they had a State-wide audience and would bring forth their best.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Broadcasting would have the same effect.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—That has been tried and I think it is a dismal failure. There is sparring and jockeying for positions to be speaking when broadcasting takes place. It represents a colossal boring of the public which has to listen to it.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Don't you think it would be different in this State?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—We are all apt to sink to the common level.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Don't you think South Australia would improve the standard?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—No, although I have great faith in South Australia. The publication of *Hansard* in the daily press would relieve Ministers of the necessity for much week-end work. It is possible that the success and stability of South Australia throughout its history may be due to the fact that it has had small Ministries and compact Governments. If one considers those States with large Ministries I doubt whether one feels an immediate impulse to adopt the numbers they have. One of the prime arguments for the appointment of additional Ministers is that Ministers have too much work. I suggest we could overcome our difficulties by giving them much less work to do. I am diametrically opposed to some of Mr. Perry's opinions because I would like to regard our Ministers

as chairmen of directors of their departments. The Hon. F. T. Perry—They have a wider field.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—It depends on the company. Without wishing to hurt anyone's feeling I feel that we might consider bringing more business into Government and less Government into business. I would like to feel that the State had investigated every avenue and had considered taking some of these affairs out of Government hands and returning them to private enterprise.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are you referring to the Tramways Trust?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—Why not? It does not pay as it is and it might pay some other way. I cannot help thinking of the Electricity Trust which has become a spectacular business. I rather feel that if private enterprise were supplied with the same amount of finance—some £37,000,000—it could probably make a fair splash too and I venture to suggest that it might be done at less cost. If such steps were taken it would greatly relieve the present strain on Ministers in maintaining the Government's interests in the projects. Its policy could be dictated to private enterprise, and funds made available for the fulfilment of that policy. Ministerial supervision or control could operate so that the Government could ensure that the policy was properly carried out. The management would be left to the initiative of private enterprise and the project would be assured by the provision of public funds. The matter would still be in the hands of Parliament if supervision were maintained by Ministers as chairmen of directors. Some people have suggested that the cure of some of our evils would be that Parliament sat continuously. I believe that sitting as we do, and not at such times as some contend we should, we are not avoiding our responsibilities. To solve the mental agitation that has been apparent in Parliament in the last few weeks, I give for what it is worth the suggestion that, instead of saying every Minister in future shall be a member of Parliament, every member of Parliament shall be a Minister.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—I do not wish to speak at length because most matters have been adequately covered by previous speakers. I endorse all that has been said about the integrity, honesty and ability of the present Ministers. I believe that they have been helped very considerably by the co-operation and integrity of the Leader and

members of the Opposition in this Chamber. That mutual feeling among members makes the situation easier and more easily worked and is appreciated. The reasons for the necessity for appointing two additional Ministers have been well discussed and I will not go into them except to say that it is rather remarkable that all the things which have been invented to make life easier have simply succeeded in making it doubly difficult. The telephone, typewriter, dictaphone, motor car, and even aeroplane, which were designed to enable us to do things more quickly and to enjoy more leisure, have made life more complicated. That applies particularly to Ministers of the Crown who, because of those facilities, have become much more accessible and their work has increased.

One aspect which has not been referred to is that when a member becomes a Minister he does not thereby cease to be a member. Whilst he has imposed on him the duties of a Minister he still has his responsibilities as member for his electorate. That is a particularly weighty responsibility for members of the House of Assembly, because in that House a system of single electorates operates. I reside in the district of Yorke Peninsula which is represented by the Minister of Lands, the Hon. C. S. Hincks. It is a never failing source of wonder to me that he is able to keep in such close contact with his electorate, particularly as he has so many portfolios which demand his time and ability. It is obvious to anyone knowing the amount of work he does that the strain is more than any person should be expected to bear. A quotation has been made to the effect that "once a Minister, never a member." My experience is rather the opposite. It is a great advantage to a district to be represented by a Minister. It enables its voice to be heard on occasions when otherwise it would not be heard. In considering this measure we should remember that whoever is appointed to the Ministry will still have his responsibilities as member for the district he represents.

At present £14,250 is divided between the Ministers. It is proposed to increase that amount to £19,000 for eight Ministers and if that were divided equally between all members, which I presume will not be the case, each Minister would receive £2,375. I believe, with other members, that that amount is too small. I mention this particularly for the benefit of members of the public who may believe that the emoluments attaching to Ministerial office are much greater than they are. That amount



is subject to income tax deductions in the same way as all moneys earned are, and the rate of tax is the same as bears upon any other member of the community. That is the misconception in many places because some other Parliaments of the Commonwealth provide certain tax allowances to members. That does not apply here.

Another reason why the Bill is deserving of consideration is that we have long since passed the stage where government consisted of merely providing police protection, health services, education and roads. Today the responsibility of the Government goes far beyond that and the responsibility of a Minister is not simply of attending to problems as they arise and trying to solve them. He has to formulate developmental projects and look into the future and design and plan to meet the emergencies and contingencies that will arise. The success of this Government is due, in no small measure, to the fact that it has seen the need for development and has made tremendous strides in that direction.

Members have referred to the calls made upon Ministers to attend relatively small functions throughout the length and breadth of this State. Whilst I agree that on occasions unreasonable requests have been made, which are difficult from the point of view of the Minister concerned, it must be remembered that much of the success of this Government has been due to Ministers travelling around the country and keeping in close contact with those they represent. They have acquired first-hand knowledge, as opposed to knowledge they might otherwise have obtained from some report from a governmental officer or department. Wherever I go the people are most anxious, and indeed regard it almost as a privilege, to speak to a Minister regarding their problems and to meet him personally. If the increase in the size of the Ministry will enable, in some measure, that state of affairs to continue it will be all to the good of the democratic system and will ensure a continuance of that stable and sensible Government we have enjoyed for many years. I support the measure.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE (Central No. 1)—This is an important measure, for I am convinced that the Ministers controlling the various departments have been overworked. My sympathy goes out in particular to the Minister of Education. He has a hard task indeed. Schools are scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land and this one

Minister is supposed to go about and see them all so that he may know what is required and not have to rely simply on reports that may come to him. Moreover, I think he is the right man in the right place; this, of all the portfolios, demands a highly educated man. He recognizes that education is knowledge and knowledge is power and appreciates to the full the importance of his office. I trust that he will continue to be Minister of Education in the newly arranged Cabinet. In addition, he holds the portfolio of Attorney-General and how he manages to combine the both is a continual source of astonishment to me. It is whispered that one Minister is to be appointed to control the tramways. If that is true I do not envy him his task. We have been told what was done in 1873 and at various times since, but that does not influence my opinion. We are here to legislate in circumstances as we find them, and I believe that two additional Ministers are well warranted. One of the most astonishing features of this Bill is that for once we are unanimous. I do not know whether this is the first time in the history of Parliament, but it must be very nearly so. Irrespective of our political beliefs we all think that this is a fair and just measure.

Mr. Cudmore suggested that some consideration should be shown the Leader of the Opposition to help him in carrying out his many duties. How he manages to do all he does astonishes me, as I have no doubt it astonishes every other member. He speaks on almost every Bill that is introduced, and I can say without fear of contradiction that in his knowledge of the wheat and flour industries he has no peer. His speeches are always interesting and to the point, and how he finds time to prepare them I do not know. The Leader of the Opposition in both the Senate and the House of Representatives has a secretary, and our Leader here should be helped in that direction. Perhaps a full-time secretary is not necessary, but he should have some secretarial assistance at least during the Session to help him in research work in the preparation of his subject matter. I wish the Ministers to be appointed every success and have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)—I thank members for the close attention they have given this important Bill. I do not wish to traverse all the arguments that have been put forward. They have been many and varied and all have been interesting, and

on behalf of my colleagues and myself I thank members very sincerely for what they have said regarding our work.

The PRESIDENT—This Bill, being an amendment to the constitution of the Houses, will require the question for the second reading to be carried by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the Council before the Bill can be proceeded with. I have counted the Council and there being present an absolute majority, I shall now put the question—That the Bill be now read a second time.

Second reading carried without a dissentient voice and Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 880.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The number of applications for the fixation of rents dealt with by the Housing Trust during the past 12 months shows the necessity for the continuance of this legislation. In quarterly adjustments of the basic wage rent has always been an important factor, but now that the Arbitration Court has decided that there will no longer be quarterly adjustments it is all the more necessary that the protection afforded tenants in the past should be continued. The recent decision of the Federal Arbitration Court on the question of basic wage adjustments is closely allied to the matter under discussion, because there will now be more reason to protect tenants against an increase in rents; also we will shortly be faced with an increase in the price of bread, cakes and other things. Although I am in favour of certain relaxations, I think the Bill goes too far for the reasons I have mentioned.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It was a principle in fixing the basic wage that rentals should be fixed on the basis of one day's pay.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Exactly. Because of the Arbitration Court's decision it is more important to continue this legislation today than it was a month ago. Asking £3 5s. a week for renting a trust home is a big hardship, and although we are told that the trust must recoup its expenditure such a rent is too high.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—That would not apply to private houses.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It might when the Bill is passed. The Bill removes all control over hotels and business premises, and there will be considerable relaxation in the case of dwellings. New dwellings will be freed from control, and a three-year lease agreed to by landlord and tenant will be outside the provisions of the Act. In genuine cases this provision will be all right, but very often, under fear of losing a house, contracts are entered into in haste. Although this does not apply to the majority of landlords, we must, as we have done before, legislate for the minority; genuine people need have no fear. There will be modifications of the Act giving additional grounds in regard to notices to quit. If the court makes an order the tenant must vacate the premises. All these things are in the interests of the landlord.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Such an order can be made only when a comparable house is provided.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That may be so, but one magistrate may give a certain decision whereas another may take an opposite view. My colleagues and I are still handling as many cases today as in the past, which shows that, although the housing position has improved, there is still a considerable demand for homes. While that demand exists a certain amount of protection must be given to both sides. The Act authorizes an inspector of the trust to require a lessee or lessor to give information as to such matters as rent; clause 17 extends this provision to former lessors and lessees. It is proposed to exempt from control future leases of houses which have not been let at any time since September 1, 1939, the onus of proving this being on the defendant.

The Act was passed in 1941 and there have been several amendments since then; the present legislation operates until the end of the year, and this measure will apply until the end of 1954. In future the legislation will apply only to dwellinghouses and caravans. The Housing Trust is required by the Act to fix the rent of dwellings and business premises and any landlord or tenant may apply to the trust to determine the rent payable. The number of rent fixation cases dealt with in 1953 was 7,801; this shows the importance of continuing this legislation. The number of cases dealt with in the previous year was 9,105 and in addition 170 cases were determined as compared with 1,205 in 1952. The administration costs for the year were £22,050, and for the previous year £21,521, of which £19,900 was

recoverable from the Commonwealth Government. During the year 3,164 houses were completed and occupied, of which 1,506 were sold and 1,658 let to tenants. Due to increasing costs the trust is finding difficulty in selling houses, particularly the timber-frame houses imported from overseas, and as a result was obliged during the year to let 354 houses originally intended for sale. It is impossible for the ordinary person on a low wage to purchase a house without financial assistance, and to ask a man on the basic wage to pay £3 5s. a week rental is wrong, considering that a similar home a few years ago would have been worth perhaps less than 15s. per week.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—A comparable rent today would be 46s.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—These are extra reasons why we should be careful in relaxing the legislation. The trust has entered into contracts for the purchase from the United Kingdom and Europe of components for 3,382 timber-frame houses. The housing scheme over the last few years has been a big one and one would have thought we should have caught up with the shortage; although the position has improved people for many years have been housed in places which were really unfit for them.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Of course there were no houses built for six years during the war.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Quite so, and the conditions under which people had to live were bad; in some cases homes intended for one family had to house three or four families. Although much has been accomplished, there is still a lag, and for that reason this legislation should continue. Section 43 of the principal Act refers to persons who, after having owned premises for a period of 12 months, can give one month's notice to quit subject to the hardship and other provisions of the Act, and if the court agrees, they can obtain possession of the property. The Bill reduces the period of ownership from 12 to six months, thereby shortening the period the owner is required to own the property before he can give notice, but I think that, when we shorten the term, we should lengthen the period of notice required from one month to three months, which would give the tenant who is likely to be affected as a result of such notice a better opportunity of securing alternative accommodation. This Bill was slightly altered in the

House of Assembly and further amendments were submitted to make it more reasonable, but they were defeated. Although some people do not like this legislation we must face up to the position, and, although it may be hard on one section of the community, it must be remembered there is another section to be considered. Therefore, Parliament has the responsibility of showing leniency where necessary. I approach this Bill with an open mind realizing, as a public man, the difficulties of many people and I rely on my judgment of the numerous cases which have been submitted to me. I am prepared to consider any reasonable suggestions, but candidly my personal opinion is that this Bill provides too much relaxation and goes too far. However, there is still much good in it and I support the second reading.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—Landlord and tenant legislation was a war-time measure introduced when many were overseas fighting and there was a shortage of labour. During the war we got behind with the building of houses and since then there has been a great shortage of building materials and labour and we have not been able to overtake the war-time lag. This legislation has caused some hardship to one section of the community, the property owners, but it has been a great blessing to another section which has profited materially from controls imposed during that period of shortage. We have now reached a stage when it is possible to provide some relaxation. I shall not discuss this measure clause by clause because the Chief Secretary fully explained the Bill and left no room for doubt. I intend to deal more particularly with generalities.

For a long time no increase was permitted in rents and property owners were penalized because of rising costs of repairs and maintenance and increased rates and taxes. About two years ago some measure of relief was provided and increases of 22½ per cent in rents were permitted. Today, some further relaxation should be permitted and these amendments go a long way towards achieving that objective. For instance, where a lease is entered into for a term of three years or more the property is exempt from the provisions of the Act, and any building, the erection of which is completed after the passing of this Bill, is also outside the provisions. Under section 49 (6), the hardship provision, the term of ownership has been reduced from five years to two years for giving notice to quit and the term of

notice is 12 months. I believe that nine months' notice would be sufficient, but the House of Assembly thought otherwise. I am prepared to accept that as we must be reasonable. Although many have been deprived of their homes for some years, the additional three months will soon pass and they will be able to secure their properties.

Section 45 provides that if a person buys a tenanted house for his own occupation he cannot give notice for 12 months, but under clause 8 that period is reduced to six months. The hardship provisions still apply. Property owners have for a long time suffered considerable hardship because of rent control. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the rentals of Housing Trust homes—about £3 a week for a moderate building. Many private owners have been able to receive only 30s. to 35s. for comparable homes. The proposed amendments are fair and reasonable and in keeping with the economic position of today. Controls have been removed from building materials and we are reaching a stage when other controls can safely be removed. The legislation is to be extended for another 12 months until December 31, 1954. From inquiries I have made at the Housing Trust I believe the housing position is improving rapidly. Last year 9,007 houses were erected as compared with 7,715 the previous year. I believe that in the near future, and probably by December 31, 1954, we can reasonably hope that the economic position will be such that we can abandon these controls.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—I still receive replies from the Housing Trust in respect of applications lodged three or four years ago.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I inquired into that aspect, but I believe the position is improving rapidly. This legislation will be examined again next year and it may be possible then to let it lapse. Until then, I believe it is necessary to control rents and evictions and I support the second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 836.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—In my opinion the fruit fly campaign is not being carried out either in the best interests of the taxpayers or of the

residents concerned in so-called infested areas. Under the present system if an outbreak occurs an area approximately one mile in radius is proclaimed and the whole of the fruit in that area is stripped, notwithstanding that no cases of fruit fly infestation may have occurred in the outlying parts of that area. Many districts in the eastern suburbs have suffered great hardship in recent years, as valuable fruit required for home consumption has been lost to householders. In such a large fruit growing area the quantity of fruit lost amounts to a huge sum. Later I will refer to actual costs. Whilst a certain amount of good may have been done we must consider whether the present methods should not be relaxed to some extent. Of course, if the department can prove that it is essential that the methods used in the past should be continued I suppose we must pay heed to its advice, but I am expressing the views of the people who are affected. This loss of fruit must have the effect of causing a shortage in many lines, such as lemons, oranges, apricots, etc., with the result that the supply to the public becomes limited and the price of these lines of necessity rises, thus placing a burden on the whole of the community. Notwithstanding what may be stated to be the policy of the experts it appears to me and many others that the more prudent policy would be to proclaim a much smaller area and concentrate activities therein. Traps could be installed in the outlying areas and strict supervision maintained over them, and should any further infestation occur the additional area could then be stripped. This would result in huge savings to taxpayers and overcome the intense irritation now being evinced by residents. Additional savings would also be made if there were greater supervision over stripping operations. The various clauses simply provide for a continuance of the legislation for a further period, but clause 6 has retrospective effect to what has happened since last January. Members have always had some horror of retrospective legislation, but in this case I think those affected are entitled to sympathetic treatment.

The campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean and Queensland fruit flies in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, involving the confiscation of growing fruit, the spraying with insecticides and the payment of compensation for loss sustained by individuals due to the confiscation of fruit and other causes has cost the State £687,596 to June 30, 1953. Of that sum

£106,541 was expended during 1952-53. The following table shows the details of expenditure:—

Nature of Payments.	For the Year ended June 30, 1953.	To June 30, 1953.
	£	£
Eradication expenses—		
Stripping and disposal of fruit, spraying, etc.	93,577	537,976
Compensation to owners of fruit destroyed ..	12,761	149,356
Fruit Fly compensation Committee—Expenses ..	242	1,122
Total payments ..	106,580	688,454
Against which revenue has been received for—		
Hire of plant, etc.	39	858
Net cost .. .. .	£106,541	£687,596

A special committee consisting of a judge, an officer of the Department of Agriculture and a representative of the people who have suffered loss or damage was appointed under the Act to consider and determine claims for compensation, and the following table shows the claims received and compensation paid to June 30, 1953:—

Season.	Number of Claims.		Com- pensation Paid. £
	Received.	Disallowed.	
1947 .. ..	1,066	23	18,288
1948 .. ..	1,794	19	17,620
1949 .. ..	4,664	138	50,167
1950 .. ..	5,705	333	50,516
1951 .. ..	1	—	17
1952 .. ..	1,683	22	12,748
	14,913	535	£149,356

I think some of the suggestions that have appeared in the press are worthy of consideration and certainly demand a reply. Why

should the proclaimed area be extended to one square mile, as I think concentration of activities in a smaller area would prove more effective? As I have said, the close supervision of numerous traps outside this smaller area should be adequate at least until there is evidence of further infestation. It is beyond question that the fruit fly can cause vast damage and that it is necessary to take all reasonable precautions, but it is very hard on the person who has gone to considerable trouble in cultivating his garden to lose all the fruit and vegetables in which he takes so much pride and which are such a useful adjunct to the housewife.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—It is disheartening.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Of course it is. However, we cannot take a one-sided view of this important subject.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Do you think we will ever stop the fly from coming in?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is very difficult, although I think we have been very fortunate in the prevention of the introduction of pests of various kinds from other States and this is largely due to the steps taken by the department. I am hopeful that some good will come of this legislation, but I trust that Parliament will give some thought to the requests of the people affected to ameliorate their hardship as far as is possible consistent with adequate protection for the State at large. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 8, at 2 p.m.