

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Thursday, November 12, 1953.

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

**QUESTIONS.****ROYAL VISIT.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In connection with the visit of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II., does the Government intend to issue medals to all school children to commemorate such a worthy occasion?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I will submit the question to Cabinet for consideration.

**GRASSHOPPER MENACE.**

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on November 4 regarding an alleged infestation of grasshoppers between Port Augusta and Whyalla?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—I have a report from the Chief Agricultural Adviser as follows:—

Inquiries have been made from the corporation officials at Port Augusta and Whyalla, and although these officers state that they have contacted some pastoralists in the district recently no mention was made of any infestation of grasshoppers and they have no knowledge of any being in the area mentioned by the Hon. E. H. Edmonds. On speaking to Mr. Edmonds he was unable to advise who originated the report. Mr. D. C. Swan, Head of Entomology Department, Waite Research Institute, recently advised that he had inspected some areas in the Upper North and reported that small numbers of grasshoppers are occurring in some places near Orreroo and Port Augusta. These, however, are not the Chortoicetes—the ones causing trouble in New South Wales. They are the Austroicetes, which he considers are not doing any real amount of damage and will not migrate this year. He considers that while these grasshoppers do not constitute a threat this year, they may form the nucleus for troublesome numbers next year.

**HIGH SCHOOL FOR SALISBURY.**

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—In view of the expansion of the town of Salisbury, has any land been purchased, or is any held by the Government which could be used for a high school in future?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—I assure the honourable member that we have land suitable for that purpose.

**APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2).**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 11. Page 1410.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I associate myself with other members who have congratulated the Premier on the presentation of his sixteenth consecutive Budget, and with that I associate the members of his Cabinet who have done tremendously good work on behalf of the State. The administrative ability of the Ministers has, I am sure, been appreciated by members of the public generally. The position of South Australia is one of which we can all be proud, for on no other occasion has the whole population been in better circumstances or more satisfied with their conditions than they are today. I think this is owing not only to the high prices which have obtained for commodities but, to the general attitude adopted by the Government towards all sections of the people.

I have been particularly interested in the policy followed by the Department of Agriculture, and I offer my congratulations to the Minister, the Hon. Sir George Jenkins, on the fine work he has done for the farming community during the period he has held that portfolio. There was a time when we felt that the department was very largely in the doldrums; certainly there was a lack of co-operation between it and various scientific organizations in particular. That has been entirely overcome and to day all scientific organizations are co-operating with a view to giving the best possible services to primary industries. We have witnessed what I believe to be a very fine move in the setting up of research stations throughout the agricultural areas and, although they have resulted in a somewhat increased expenditure, the areas being served are of vital importance to the State and have special problems. These research stations have been established at Wanbi, Turretfield, Kybybolite, Struan, Minnipa, Willalooka, and on Kangaroo Island. It will be seen that these stations are in areas which have been developed mainly for soldier settlement, and are for the purpose of investigating problems which would normally confront settlers. They will be of great advantage to the State as a whole as well as to those settlers engaged in developing the poorer types of country which were not settled in the early days because of the problems of water and access. So much has already been done that we can feel assured that these areas will provide good settlement. The Department of

Agriculture is to be commended for conducting research at this early stage in order to ensure, as far as possible, that any problems that may arise may be expeditiously dealt with.

I have been interested in the many references made by members to the position of primary producers generally. Mr. Anthoney spoke of the cost of providing transport for school children in the country. This scheme was instituted a few years ago when the department was faced with an insufficiency of teachers and desired to close a number of small schools and transport the children to central schools. In many instances the parents of children attending the small schools were rather hostile at first, but when the benefits of the scheme were recognized the department was flooded with applications for bus services. Parents realized that the children would receive better education than they were receiving at a small school where one teacher had the task of educating about 15 children representing all grades of primary education. Mr. Anthoney said that the cost of such services was £350,000 annually, but actually the cost is £240,000. He also suggested that in these times of prosperity the primary producer should either meet the whole cost of such services or contribute towards it. No provision is made for the conveyance of children residing within three miles of a school but where a bus passes an area within that distance and can transport children it does.

The Hon R. J. Rudall—If there is room on the bus.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—Yes, but those children are not considered when the bus service is established. It will be readily understood that when children have to travel 15 or 16 miles to a school it is desirable that some more economic system than farmers taking their own children to school should operate. Educational facilities in the country are not nearly so readily available as in the metropolitan area and unfortunately country people are not in a position to send their children to schools in the metropolitan area, partly because they cannot obtain board for them and also because of the financial strain involved. In order to provide country children with equal opportunities this system was devised and adopted by the Education Department and it is of great advantage to country people who, to a large extent, do contribute towards the transport of their children, because, in many instances, children have to be conveyed two or three miles to meet the buses. I have frequently approached the departmental officer

responsible for transport and urged that greater facilities be provided but after he has explained the situation I have realized that any criticism of the service would be entirely unfounded.

Some members have referred to the lower freight rates operating for primary producers. A year or two ago those primary commodities subject to concessional rates—wheat, flour, barley, etc.—were brought into line with other freights. It is interesting to examine the rates that operate at present, and which are based on ton-mile costs. Wheat is 2.59d.; flour and offal—and this is getting away from primary production and back to secondary industries—is at the lower rate of 1.96d. notwithstanding the greatly reduced volume of traffic; barley, 2.86d.; potatoes and onions, 2.35d.; grain, other than wheat and barley, 2.45d.; Leigh Creek coal—and I appreciate the necessity for bringing coal such a long distance as cheaply as possible—.62d., and other coal, 4.16d. Primary producers are paying considerably more in freight charges on very many items. The cost per ton-mile for wool is 5.63d. and agricultural machinery 7.21d. Superphosphate is one commodity that is carried very cheaply—at a cost of 1.39d. per ton-mile. Perhaps this is partly accounted for by the fact that superphosphate from Adelaide has come into competition with that from Victoria, and consequently a flat rate has applied from Tintinara southwards to meet that competition. Whilst Victorian superphosphate is an immeasurably better product the South Australian product is freighted at a lower rate to meet the competition. It is in the interests of the industry that that lower rate is provided. There are very few concessions to primary producers today. Primary producers pay higher passenger rates on the railways than metropolitan passengers. Very much of the land that has been developed in recent years is within an area that has been partly neglected for a long period. There is a strip from Tailem Bend to the Kingston line, about 100 miles long and 50 wide, but the only outlet for the producers there is the railway which runs down one side. As well as the big organizations developing that area, there are also many private interests involved, and the problem is one of getting produce to the market. This difficulty of access is very much in evidence when one tries to get to these properties for developmental purposes. The time has arrived when something will have to be done to provide adequate roads to enable cheaper development to take place and goods to be marketed at an economical price. If a

person has to travel 20 or 30 miles over bad roads in order to develop an area it will obviously cost more than if the roads were good.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Roads increase the value of land.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I agree. A certain amount of the cost of the land in newly settled areas represents the cost of establishing roads. Grants are made by the Government to councils for that purpose, but because of the great length of roads required in much of the district I mentioned it appears that something more should be done. I realize that the money available for expenditure on roads is not sufficient to meet maintenance charges, so it would be desirable to include in the cost of those lands which are being sold an additional charge for road making.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—How would that work with people owning their own properties?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—It would be difficult, but there is the opportunity. Many thousands of undeveloped acres are in the area which would be served. The amount of freehold land in this State is very small, and in this area is less than in other parts of the State.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Much of the land is held by Crown lessees.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—That is so, and there should be a review of the charges so that the roads can be developed. The settler must ultimately pay in order to get access to his property, and the cost would be much less in the early stages because he would then have good roads while he was carrying out developmental work. I think we all agree that the day has gone when people were prepared to go into the country for six months without seeing a town, and taking their supplies with them. Today people who are 30 or 40 miles out want to come into the townships just as frequently as the people five or six miles out, and something will have to be done to develop those roads very quickly. Although I do not think the Government should pay the whole of the cost, obviously it will have to bear some of it. The settlers would be prepared to contribute in their own interests. I have mentioned these matters because there are hundreds of thousands of acres which require good roads if they are to be economically worked and the settlers assured of success. I support the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—In supporting this measure, I desire, as other members have done, to compliment the Premier on his sixteenth consecutive Budget. The press has given much publicity

to the fact that he has been continuously in office for about 16 years, and although I do not wish to take away any of the glory from him, because he has all the attributes of a very great South Australian and displays those attributes in attempting to govern this State in accordance with the policy determined by the Party he represents, there is another side to the matter. When we analyse the political set-up we find that 61 per cent of the electors reside in the metropolitan area and 33 per cent outside it.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Where do the odd 6 per cent reside?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—That is the number the honourable member represents in this Chamber. Consequently we find that this Government, whilst attempting to bolster up its fading stocks, could not have placed upon the Statute Book the major portion of its policy without the support of Labor members in another place and in this Council.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Then what is the honourable member growling about?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am not growling, but placing facts on record so that people will see that the Playford Government really represents the minority of the electors.

The PRESIDENT—Order! I have let the honourable member go as far as I can on that subject. The measure before the House is the Appropriation Bill and not an electioneering Bill and I suggest that the honourable member should come back to the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I thank, you, Sir, for your guidance, but point out with great respect that this Bill covers the Electoral Department.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member may talk on the Electoral Department, but not on the electoral system, which has nothing to do with the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am showing that in the 1953 elections the aggregate overall voting figures, which were counted by the Electoral Department, resulted in the Labor Party receiving 163,000 votes—

The PRESIDENT—Order! The honourable member, under the Appropriation Bill, can discuss the cost of counting those votes, but he cannot continue on the lines he was trying to.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I wanted to give the voting for the Liberal and Country League because my argument would be incomplete and unfair to that Party if I did not. It received 112,500 votes, or 51,000 fewer than the Labor Party.

The PRESIDENT—Order! I ask the honourable member to get right back to the Appropriation Bill, or I shall have to ask him to take his seat.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I have no desire to contravene Standing Orders, as you know, Sir. The Government is fortunate in having at the head of its various departments men of high integrity and great proficiency to guide and advise it on the legislation we are called upon to deal with. I do not propose to mention all of them, but they are carrying out splendid work on behalf of the people. I pay a tribute to the Minister of Education for the valuable work he is doing in the Education Department, for not only does the department deal with education, but it is fast developing into a transport department.

The Government has not for some years presented a works programme. In recent years we have drifted towards a procedure of merely having presented to us Appropriation Bills whereas when I first entered Parliament a works programme always accompanied the presentation of an Appropriation Bill so that members were able to understand and criticize, if they thought fit, the various items of expenditure. That drift has been accentuated by the activities of various outside organizations that control the financial set-up of the State and the Commonwealth as they indicate to the respective Governments the policies and works programmes they shall follow; indeed, they go further and indicate what the fields of taxation shall be in order that they may receive various grants from the Commonwealth Government, whether it be under the terms of uniform taxation, or in the shape of disabilities grants. I am not saying that any of those bodies have usurped any powers. They have been set up constitutionally, but if we allow this process to go on Parliaments will merely become registering machines for policy determined by outside people who, although they may be of the highest integrity, are not directly responsible to the people.

The Hon. E. Anthony—What does the honourable member refer to?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I have indicated what I mean as clearly as I can.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—The Federal Labor Party?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—If it were not for the Federal Labor Party it would not have been possible to use the great powers of the honourable member as chairman of the Board of Area Management during the war.

It was a Labor Government that asked him to accept the chairmanship in South Australia.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—It was a Liberal Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Well, a Labor Government continued the honourable member's good activities. It is a most extraordinary thing, but members of the Liberal and Country League always seem to know more about Labor's policy than Labor members themselves.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—We know what the Labor Party does not like to confess.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The honourable member's Government attempts to take from our platform planks of its policy which it knows to be acceptable to the people.

The PRESIDENT—I call the honourable member's attention to Standing Order number 189 which says:—

The President may call attention to the conduct of a member who persists in continued irrelevance, prolixity, or tedious repetition and may direct such member to discontinue his speech.

If the honourable member will not abide by the ruling of the Chair I will be forced to ask him to take his seat.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I was merely replying to an interjection.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member should not reply to interjections, which should not be made in any case.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I rather take umbrage, Sir, that you should so direct me when I was merely replying to an interjection, as has been the custom in this place ever since I have been a member. I do not desire to transgress any of your rulings, Sir. I have never done so and hope I never will. The Auditor-General's report discloses that there has been a net increase of expenditure in the Education Department of £1,120,000. No member of the Labor Party objects to that or to any extension of the department's activities. The report further discloses that the average number of children attending schools up to December 31, 1951, was 90,441, an increase of 9,280, or 11.4 per cent above the figure for 1952. This state of affairs applies equally to private schools, and the burden of capital expenditure and fees is not supplemented in any way by the Government. Last year the Government subsidized the efforts of school committees associated with Government schools to the extent of £51,000, but private school committees, doing equally good work and having the same desire for the furtherance of education, but working under

greater disabilities, have received no financial consideration from the Government. Those who send their children to private schools not only pay taxes to the Government for the upkeep of State schools but voluntarily tax themselves, because of their conscientious beliefs, by sending their children to private schools; which is the prerogative of every parent.

The time has arrived when an overall view should be taken of education because unless we have an enlightened and educated democracy all the isms in the world may become manifest in our midst, for those isms flourish only upon ignorance, degradation and unemployment. Therefore, I say that education is one of the greatest barriers we can raise against the isms of the day. The cost of construction of schools, per child, excluding superannuation pensions and charges relating to accommodation, rose from £37 7s. 5d. in 1951 to £41 6s. 4d. in 1952, or 10.6 per cent. I am not quibbling about those charges nor do I desire to see them cut, but I mention them to indicate that they are also manifested in the continuance and building of private schools. The only bright spot so far as private schools are concerned is that the majority of their teachers have taken on teaching in the various orders because they have a special vocation for that particular type of work and their salaries are not nearly so high as those paid to State school teachers. They work more or less on a voluntary basis. During 1952-3, capital expenditure from loan funds amounted to £1,119,945, including £1,107,288 on school buildings. I ask the Minister of Education and the Chief Secretary to consider private school buildings, including those in the course of erection, and visualize what the capital cost would be to the Government if it were the Government's responsibility to build those schools, because if they closed tomorrow the Government would not have sufficient accommodation to house the thousands of children attending them. This matter should not be considered from a sectarian viewpoint, but from an over-all viewpoint because education concerns all sections of the community and those parents who send children to private schools should receive consideration from the Government because they are doubly taxed.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—If private schools were assisted would you agree to a certain amount of Government control?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—That has been the constant cry, but the curriculum of many private schools is higher than that of

State schools and I cannot see how the question of Government control arises. It is merely a question of whether children are receiving the same standard of education disseminated in State schools.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—When you enlist they don't ask what school you went to.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. Everyone joins in one united army for defending Australia and our way of life. I have no desire to deny the provision of free school transport to country children. On November 3 I asked the Minister of Education what it cost to transport children to area schools and his reply disclosed that the average cost per child per school day is 2.69d. Not long ago, because of financial difficulties, the Tramways Trust increased concessional fares to school children and has muled parents, of whom I am one, of £7,000 a year. Parents have been obliged to pay increased fees for their children attending private schools as well as higher charges for school uniforms and school equipment and, as country children receive travelling concessions, I think consideration should be given to providing lower fares for children attending schools in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Don't you think that country people should contribute toward the cost of transporting their children to school?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am not going to be the arbiter of that.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Many country parents do contribute.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I believe that is so. I feel that there should be some basis of equalization whereby those attending private and public schools in the metropolitan area should pay lower concessional fares. I mention these matters in the hope that the Government will consider the injustice that is being meted out to parents of children attending private schools. In 1941 the Industries Development Committee was appointed to investigate applications by industries for financial assistance.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Were they to be new industries?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Not necessarily, because assistance has been sought for the extension of old industries. I can recall one large industry which handled primary produce being guaranteed to the extent of £602,000.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Couldn't the shareholders have done something?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Not at that stage, and it was necessary to assist that industry which, according to recent reports, is doing remarkably well. Another major concern which the committee has been asked to assist is the pyrites industry at Nairne, and it has been guaranteed to the extent of £800,000. Mr. Anthony asked why reports were not submitted to Parliament, but confidential information is disclosed to the committee and it would not be fair for that information to run the gamut of publicity in Parliament. There is nothing sinister about it, but all applications are subject to close investigation by the committee to see whether the provision of assistance will benefit the State. I am fully confident that the pyrites industry will become one of the major industries in South Australia.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—When assistance is provided has the Government any control?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The Government is properly protected and in practically every instance it takes a first debenture over the undertaking. The committee also recommended a guarantee of £80,000 for the purposes of stepping up our brick production.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Did not one of those industries go through the hoop?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—A small company in the country did, and about £1,500 was lost. However, during the period of its operations that company did supply a much needed want in its area.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Is that the only loss that has resulted from the committee's recommendations?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I believe so. That information can be obtained from the Auditor-General's Report which the honourable member so extensively quoted yesterday in regard to Roseworthy College. The committee has a creditable record and I pay a tribute to its members.

Funds employed by the Electricity Trust as at June 30, 1953, were £37,215,837, an increase of £6,687,677 over the previous year, and about £27,000,000 in excess of the amount employed in the undertaking when it was acquired in 1946. When the measure to acquire the company was before the House members were told that the Government could buy out debentures in five, 10 or 15-year lifts. I have searched the Auditor-General's report but can find no trace of debentures being bought back by the Government with the result that the community is today paying interest rates ranging from 4½ to 4¾ per cent or an average interest rate of 3.9 per cent, on the capital invested.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—That is not a high rate.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am not suggesting that but when the Bill came before this Chamber we were given to understand that it was a public utility and would be run as such and not be left as a vehicle for investment. However, the income for the last financial year was £6,844,556 or £1,195,609 more than the previous year, and this was due to the full effect of tariff increases from February 1, 1952. The average revenue derived per unit sold rose from 2.45d. in 1951-52 to 2.71d. in 1952-53. Interest rates rose, and although I am not suggesting that they should not have risen, I say that the full provisions of the Act should have been brought into operation by the Government because the five years has elapsed. However, no effort has been made to buy back the debentures held by private enterprise. In the Auditor-General's report it is stated that there has been a decrease in the cost of equipment and hiring out.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Does the honourable member suggest that the Government should borrow money at a greater rate than 3.9 per cent to buy back the debentures?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No, but the Attorney-General knows that two or three years ago money was borrowed from the Savings Bank at 2 per cent, after enabling legislation was passed. I suggest that the various amounts the Government receives from the Commonwealth for disabilities grants could be used to buy the debentures instead of allowing the 3.9 per cent to be paid. When this legislation was introduced it was said that it was going to be the Utopia of the people of this State because of the abolition of meter rents and the lowering of charges because of the development of Leigh Creek coalfield, but we have been sadly disillusioned, because these things have not happened. The Auditor-General's report contains this statement:—

The reconciliations with financial controls, of the value of stores held for issue to capital works, as well as for operating and maintenance purposes, have not yet been completed. Investigations, which are in progress, indicate that many discrepancies, which have resulted in the value of stores in hand being in excess of financial controls, have occurred and the general position of stores accounting is unsatisfactory. However, in forwarding the balance sheet and revenue statement, the trust has advised that the management stated that in their opinion these discrepancies will have no substantial effect upon the profits disclosed for the year.

The organization has become unwieldy, and whenever it needs money it pushes up the charges, which is possible because there is no competition. That also applies to the Tramways Trust, which has increased fares and shortened sections, yet last year the Government had to provide £700,000 because it was in financial difficulty.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Would the member suggest that the Electricity Trust should be handed back to private enterprise?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No, I suggest it should be properly managed. A board should be established to control railways and other transport, with a Minister responsible to Parliament. Labor advocates the co-ordination of all transport services, and placing them under the control of a Minister who will be able to determine a policy. Neither the present Tramways Trust nor the previous one has done that. The recently appointed trust is attempting to obtain some order out of chaos, and I have the greatest sympathy for them in their difficult task, but the responsibility is with the previous members for their short-sightedness in not foreseeing the conditions which would confront the undertaking. They should have attempted to balance the budget instead of asking for such a large grant. It was mentioned yesterday that a loss of 2d. was made on each fare, and this has been brought about by the attitude of ineptitude which has been pursued by people who have been in control of the various sections of our economic set-up. I repeat my personal felicitations to the Premier on his achievement as Treasurer.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I might very well begin where Mr. Bardolph left off by extending felicitations and congratulations to the Government of South Australia.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—I only mentioned the Premier.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—Well, for the magnificent job it has done in managing this State.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—I did not say that, either.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—We have been discussing the record Budget, and a record period in the history of this State. By that term I mean general prosperity, because the State income has never been higher. It has been rather interesting to note the almost innumerable angles from which the matter has been approached and the innumerable points of view that appeal to various members. It is

rather staggering to note the enormous increase in the Budget figures in only a few years; it seems only the other day when Sir Richard Butler produced the then record Budget of £13,000,000. In 1940 the estimated expenditure was about £13,000,000; in 1943 it had risen to £15,000,000, and today it is over £50,000,000. We are living in a time of ever-increasing demand for amenities by the various individuals and bodies constituting the public of this State; better roads are demanded, extensions of electrical energy, water reticulation, and hospitalization is firmly embedded in the minds of the public to such an extent that our hospitals are unable to cope with the demands made on them.

The vote for education this year is five times greater than at the commencement of the period I am reviewing. I remember very well when, as a member of another place, a vote of £1,000,000 for education was approved and created a great impression. Concurrent with the increase in the amenities provided for the people of the State, the Government has been involved not only in what can be called the ordinary developmental work on primary producing properties, but in establishing and assisting many new industries. Whereas a few years ago there were practically no secondary industries in South Australia and we were looked upon as a primary producing State, we now have enormous industries such as Holdens, British Tube Mills, I.C.I., and the new sulphuric acid works, to mention just a few. This development has placed an entirely different aspect on the general character of the State.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Some of our industries are going out.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—The honourable member has my deepest sympathy for the position in the milling industry. Perhaps some secondary industries have overstepped themselves. All these increases in public amenities and the development of new industries in which the State has been directly involved in the provision of housing have absorbed all the enormously increased State income in that period, so that instead of having a substantial credit we are hoping that we will keep out of the red. Every aspect of administration has been well criticized during this debate and my prime objective in speaking this afternoon is to draw the attention of the Government—and I hope of the public also—to what I am about to say. I do it without rancour and merely ask the Government for sympathetic attention. I refer

to the treatment meted out to all those public-spirited men who undertake the administration of the various scientific, educational or philanthropic trusts that fall into their hands, or which they have volunteered to undertake.

There was a time when there was a stratum of wealthy gentlemen who could undertake these jobs and do the work with, as it were, one hand tied behind their backs. Heavy taxation has almost obliterated that stratum of society and the younger generation, instead of being to some degree the idle rich, now have their noses very close to the grindstone and have no time to devote to subjects which, a couple of generations ago, they would have been expected to undertake. The bodies to which I refer are those which receive Government grants to make their existence possible, and there are three with which I am associated—the Royal Zoological Society, the Royal Institution for the Blind, and the Fauna and Flora Board. I assure members that the gentlemen who constitute those boards are almost invariably men who, in their own vocations, are pressingly busy, or men who are more or less retired and are carrying on this work of love because they have been associated with it before. I want it to be quite clear that the time these men give to the interests of their various boards is time that is very ill spared from their other pressing avocations, or else time snatched from their scant hours of leisure. It is not done without cost, as all this work is done entirely on a voluntary basis; in fact, in most cases the expenses come out of the private pockets of those who hold responsible positions.

The proper functions and obligations that could be expected of these men is to manage the bodies with which they are entrusted, as it were, as small private businesses but they never seem to be able to get from the Government sufficient money to manage their businesses without a great deal of soul-searching worry. It is not fair that the citizens should impose upon these people the added worry of financial trouble so that they have to scrimp and save throughout the year in order to make both ends meet and keep their fixed assets in some sort of order, as well as the job of actually managing the business. I am sure members will realize that their obligation is not only to conduct their trusteeship in such manner that the premises concerned are pleasing to the eye, but to preserve the underlying principles and ultimate objectives for which their trust may have been founded. It will be taken for granted that these bodies, every individual member of which is a man of the highest honour and

responsibility, do not make any request to the Government without carefully going over every item with the idea of bringing it down to the irreducible minimum in order to justify every penny they ask for.

The Fauna and Flora Board, although it has been given a slightly increased grant this year, until then, I am horrified to say, has never been granted by the Government enough to pay the wages of the Chase. Flinders Chase is, perhaps, not looked upon with very much appreciation in South Australia, but the scientific world abroad regards it as a very valuable sanctuary because it preserves so much of our original flora and fauna. It has a very much higher scientific value in the eyes of the scientific world than it has in the eyes of the South Australian public, but the Government grant has not been sufficient to pay wages and the Chase has had to depend on what income it can scratch together from small donations, and sometimes from the sale of skins when it is the policy of the board to thin out the animal population to prevent overcrowding or the spread of disease. There is always a public outcry when this is done that we are preserving animals for our own ends, but when the late ranger retired after 27 years of service the board did not have enough to buy him a drink; indeed, had we not been able to draw on this year's grant we would not have been able to pay his wages. This year we asked for £3,500 and have been given £2,500.

The Zoological Society is in much the same position. The board of management was asked to make every possible economy and went further than was asked, and voluntarily made both ends meet by reducing the staff by three or four men. We are still carrying on without an assistant to the director. We compared our situation with that of the Zoological Societies and Gardens in other States and found that where necessary they have received what seems to us enormous sums in the last year or two. In Western Australia it is a Government department, and in Sydney it has the benefit of enormous public attendances as well as the philanthropy of Sir Edward Hallstrom. Melbourne, however, is much like Adelaide, but it had a very substantial additional grant. We asked the Government to increase our grant from £6,000 to £10,000, and were then asked if we could buy our own truck out of the little money we had saved by not having enough staff. Having bought the truck we were given only £7,500 to do a job which we estimated would cost £10,000.



I say in all seriousness—and will continue to say it indefinitely if necessary, which I hope will not be the case—that it is not fair that a Government knee-deep in prosperity should continue to add the burden of financial worry and responsibility to numbers of public-spirited men who voluntarily, and at no expense to the Government, undertake the management of these educational, scientific and philanthropic bodies. It has been the practice of the Fauna and Flora Board, ever since I have been associated with it, to pay its own expenses for inspection of Flinders Chase. The cheapest one can do that for is from £20 to £25, and it is not fair to expect a retired University professor to spend £25 of his own money to go to K.I. to look after the Government's interests. I say again, and completely without rancour, that all I ask for is a sympathetic hearing from the Government. These long-suffering people have not delegated me to speak on their behalf, but I know what they are doing and I take this opportunity of saying that I think the Government could have granted the few more thousand pounds asked for by these most conscientious men without doing the State any harm.

In much the same vein I think we could very well afford a private secretary for the Leader of the Opposition in this place. We all realize that the public expects a member of Parliament to work himself as close to the bone as possible, but I do not think that anyone expects him to work himself to death. All members of this Council know the tremendous amount of work Mr. Condon does with his own lily-white hands; that the speeches he delivers during the day he has to prepare overnight, and I think almost the least we can do to recognize the monumental services he has given to Parliament would be to give him some secretarial help. I have no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber will always be worthy of his hire, and although many great tributes have been paid to the Liberal and Country League Government, those of us with long experience in Parliament realize that no Government can be a good Government unless it has a good Opposition. It therefore behoves the Labor Party to see that it keeps as good men as possible upon its benches, just as it behoves my own Party to do likewise.

I believe I am the last speaker on this Bill and if that is so I hope I will enjoy the privilege, often accorded the last speaker, of having my remarks remembered whereas some earlier remarks may be forgotten. I hope therefore

that the Chief Secretary, in concluding the debate, will turn his loving care in my direction. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I would like briefly to express my appreciation of the tone of the debate which is about to conclude, and for the attention members have given to this Appropriation Bill which has been described as containing the largest appropriation ever placed before Parliament. During my time here I have seen a tremendous increase in Government expenditure. I can remember when £13,000,000 was a record, but now the amount is about four times as much. Although members usually express consternation at the amount and trend of public expenditure, almost without exception they find a reason why it should be increased. That is one of the problems of government. Expenditure must be carefully watched. People will always point to the way in which the Government can do more but I have not yet found any enthusiasm amongst taxpayers to provide more money. The comments made by members on this Bill will be noted, and their criticism is welcomed because there must be discretion in such a large expenditure. I thank members for the way in which they have addressed themselves to the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Appropriation of general revenue."

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The proposed expenditure for the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department is £480,431. In this department there has been a tremendous growth of work, and the children's welfare side deals with about 3,000 children in about nine institutions. I wonder whether there could be a grouping of the children in a smaller number of institutions. The farm at Struan may be a place to which some of the children could be sent. A grouping would mean a saving of considerable expenditure. Years ago I was a member of the Children's Welfare Council and in those days the chairman and members were unpaid. I do not suggest that the present board members should not be paid, but there could be inquiries with a view to effecting economies. I understand there are about 1,000 people on relief now, and I wonder why there should be so many when the State is so prosperous.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—There has been constant pressure from both inside and outside Parliament for the unfortunate children to be segregated so as to keep the criminal and subnormal types away from the others. This work cannot be done without increasing expenditure. The department does more work now than when the honourable member was associated with it. I pay a tribute to the work of the board. The remuneration paid to the members by no means compensates them for the time they give to the work. It is still practically an honorary board, and it is not easy to get people to engage in such activities. The board is conscientious and enthusiastic.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—My remarks were not directed at the board, and I am not concerned about the payments made to the members. I was thinking of the number of institutions which look after the unfortunate children; perhaps there could be a saving in expenditure if they were grouped. The matter is worth investigation.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In the interests of economy, has the Government considered merging the Land Tax and the Stamp and Succession Duties Departments? If there were a merger some of the officers could be transferred to other departments.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The honourable member might just as well suggest merging the Land Tax and Income Tax Departments because the work is quite distinct. The two departments have nothing in common and different work is done by the officers. We are always looking for economies but there is no opportunity in the honourable member's suggestion.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 (inclusive) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's suggested amendment.

#### TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION BILL.

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

#### SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3) (GOVERNOR'S ALLOWANCE).

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide an annual allowance to the Governor for payment of the staff at Government House. The cost of paying and maintaining this staff has recently been carefully investigated by officers of the Treasury. They are satisfied that, having regard to the present general level of salaries and wages in South Australia, the existing allowances are insufficient for this expenditure. The need for an increased allowance does not arise from any increase in the size of the staff but from the fact that under present conditions suitable employees can only be retained if their rates of pay are commensurate with what they can earn in other employments open to them.

As the Government has previously said on a number of occasions, Ministers do not desire that any Governor should be out of pocket by reason of holding the Vicé-Regal office. The Government therefore feels that it has no alternative but to seek Parliamentary approval for a further allowance. The amount proposed in this Bill is £2,650 a year which has been arrived at after obtaining full information from the Commonwealth Employment Office as to the rates now being paid to domestic staff in South Australia. The allowance will be payable as from the first of July this year. If at any time the Lieutenant-Governor should assume office as the Administrator of the Government, the Treasurer may direct that the allowance, or such part of it as the Treasurer deems just, shall be paid to him. The Bill contains a standing appropriation of revenue to enable the allowance to be paid from year to year.

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

#### SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable the trustees of the Savings Bank to appoint officers and to fix their salaries without obtaining the approval of the Governor. Section 19 of the Act, which deals with the appointment of officers and

the fixing of salaries, provides that the appointment of officers and fixing of salaries by the trustees are subject to the approval of the Governor. The section has contained this provision since it was originally enacted in 1861. These provisions are a source of trouble and inconvenience both to the trustees and the Government. The approval of the Governor must be obtained for the appointment of every subordinate officer or employee, and for every alteration of their salaries and wages pursuant to awards, agreements and determinations in force in the bank. As can be imagined a large amount of correspondence and much work and trouble are involved.

The trustees have approached the Government with the suggestion that the approval of the Governor should only be required where an officer is appointed to a position the maximum salary of which is outside the automatic salary scale in force at the bank at the time. They propose that in this case the appointment and the range of salary to be paid should be subject to the approval of the Governor. The Government has accepted the suggestion as it sees no good reason why the trustees should not have a free hand in the appointment of their subordinate officers. The Bill therefore by clause 3 re-enacts section 19 of the principal Act with such amendments as are necessary to provide for the appointment by the trustees of officers without the approval of the Governor, except where an officer is appointed to a position the maximum salary of which is outside the automatic scale in force at the bank. A provision in the original section requiring appointments and removals to be published in the *Gazette* has been dispensed with, being regarded as unnecessary. Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment to section 20 of the principal Act. In other words, the object of the Bill is to remove what in practice is really an absurdity—that the Governor and the Executive Council should be concerned with the appointment of typistes, clerks and ordinary subordinate bank officers. We still retain control over the principal officers of the bank.

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

#### DA COSTA SAMARITAN FUND (INCORPORATION OF TRUSTEES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 11. Page 1402.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The object of the Bill is to incorporate the trustees of the Da Costa Samaritan Fund which was established 55 years ago

under the will of Louisa Da Costa as a trust for the benefit of convalescent patients of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. At that time the estate was calculated at £6,000 but the assets in December, 1952, amounted to £75,000. The Bill, which contains 26 clauses, is important and is designed to assist the trustees. It is fitting that we should refer to the generosity of persons who do much in the interests of humanity. Louisa Da Costa and her brother spent considerable time in South Australia.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Her brother did, but she didn't.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—She did, and she died at the age of 91. I have obtained my information from a copy of the *Adelaide Observer* of 1898. Under the heading "The Adelaide Hospital" the following article appeared:—

In the *Register* of April 9 a cablegram was published stating that Miss Louisa Da Costa who died in England on March 1 had bequeathed all the real estate in Adelaide which she possessed in her own right for the establishment of a samaritan fund for the benefit of convalescent patients leaving the Adelaide Hospital. The will provided that the Governor of South Australia should be instructed to carry out the objects of the testatrix. Sir Powell Buxton is now in possession of a copy of the will and informs us that he proposes to appoint as trustees Sir John Colton, K.C.M.G., Mr. W. Gilbert, M.P., and Mr. Maurice Salom, who are the Commissioners of Charitable Funds under the Act of 1875 for the proper investment of charitable funds. His Excellency suggests that the best arrangement for meeting the wishes of the testatrix would be for the income to be handed to and expended by the committee of the present samaritan fund, although he has no power under the will to request that condition. Sir Powell expects that the income will be about £200.

Miss Da Costa and her brother, Benjamin Mender Da Costa, were among the pioneer colonists of South Australia. In the early 1850's they lived in lower Grenfell Street where Mr. Da Costa carried on business as a general merchant. Other institutions benefited from the generosity of these people and St. Peter's College received £20,000 and Holy Trinity Church and the Blind, Deaf and Dumb Institution also received legacies. A ward in the Royal Adelaide Hospital today is named after Louisa Da Costa. Mr. Da Costa had property in Grenfell Street, Rundle Street, and in some parts of the outback. It is very interesting to read what the persons concerned accomplished during their sojourn in South Australia. They rendered a valuable service to the people of this State, and not only because of that, but because it is

desired that the trustees should be protected this measure has been introduced. This Bill must be referred to a Select Committee, and realizing that, I am containing my remarks on the second reading, as members are fully aware of the procedure that will be followed when evidence is taken. Although perhaps many of these clauses are consequential, some are important and warrant the consideration of those in authority. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—The history of this bequest is very interesting. I received information that Miss Da Costa did not live in this State, but perhaps that is wrong. The bequest was a most munificent one, and we should do honour to people who, after living in this State and making money here, have left their estates to such funds. This property is a very valuable one. Strangely enough, however, the original bequest of Miss Da Costa was £6,000, but values have increased to such an extent that it is now worth nearly £100,000. This indicates how much this State has prospered over that period. In the first place, the estate was administered by the Government, and it is a credit to them that no portion of it was disposed of. The property is situated in Rundle Street, and the rents from it today are substantial. The Bill deals with the incorporation of the trustees, and will relieve them of many responsibilities. It will provide safeguards by enacting that the trustees must render proper accounts to a Government auditor. I have much pleasure in supporting the measure.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—It was interesting to hear the remarks made by members who preceded me, particularly the Leader of the Opposition. It is very desirable that the trustees should secure the protection for which they have asked, and it is quite reasonable on the other hand that the Government should stipulate that a selected auditor shall be appointed to check the balance sheets and figures. I am surprised that the persons who have been trustees of this estate for all these years have been satisfied to carry on in what seems to me, as a person without legal training, a somewhat dangerous position. This measure is eminently desirable, and I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. R. J. Rudall, K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, W. W.

Robinson, and Sir Wallace Sandford; the Committee to have power to send for persons, papers, and records and to report on November 24.

#### TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Trustee Act, 1936-1950.

Read a first time.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to enable the terms of superannuation or benefit funds established by private undertakings to be varied by a vote of the employees interested in the fund. A considerable number of employers in the State have created superannuation or benefit schemes in the form of trusts for their employees. It has been brought to the attention of the Government that in the course of time these schemes frequently require alteration to bring about more effective administration or to meet new circumstances, and that in most cases an alteration cannot be made without obtaining the consent of every beneficiary to the alteration. This is a costly and difficult procedure, and often almost impracticable. The Government believed that these schemes have a real value in the life of the community and that they are worthy of assistance. That such schemes would of their very nature require alteration from time to time is borne out by the very frequent alteration which it has been found necessary to make to the Superannuation Act.

The proposal in the Bill is that a scheme should be capable of being altered by a three-quarters majority vote of the employees concerned present and voting at a meeting of which all such employees have had notice. In addition, the rights of a pensioner, annuitant, or other person actually in enjoyment of benefits under a scheme are safeguarded by a provision that such rights are not to be prejudicially affected without his consent. The matters which I have mentioned are provided for in a new section 35b of the principal Act, which is set out in clause 3.

Subsection (1) enables the trustees of an 'employees' benefit fund to alter the instrument creating the fund subject to the consent of the beneficiaries. Under the section "beneficiaries" means persons who are entitled or prospectively entitled to a benefit under the

terms of a fund by virtue of their employment, and are actually in that employment. The subsection also provides that the consent shall be obtained by a vote of beneficiaries at a meeting of which two weeks' notice has been given to every beneficiary, and that consent shall not be deemed to have been given unless a three-quarters majority present and voting at the meeting are in favour of it.

Subsection (2) provides for a person nominated by the trustees to preside as chairman at a meeting of beneficiaries unless and until some other person is elected as chairman by the beneficiaries. Subsection (3) provides that a certificate given by the person presiding as chairman at the time the beneficiaries voted shall be *prima facie* evidence that the meeting was duly summoned and the consent duly obtained. Subsection (4) provides that where

an instrument is altered pursuant to the section, the property of the trust shall be held on the trusts of the instrument as altered. Subsection (5) provides that where a person is entitled in possession to a benefit under a fund, his rights shall not be prejudiced or diminished without his consent in writing. Subsections (6) and (7) provide that the section shall apply to every benefit fund unless it is expressly provided that it shall not apply. It also applies to benefit funds created before or after the passing of the Bill. Subsection (8) contains definitions of various terms.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.10 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 17, at 2 p.m.