

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Tuesday, November 16, 1954.

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

**ASSENT TO ACTS.**

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy intimated by message the Governor's assent to the following Acts:—Industrial and Provident Societies Act Amendment, Inflammable Oils Act Amendment, Police Pensions, Prisons Act Amendment, Swine Compensation Act Amendment and Vermin Act Amendment.

**LAND DEVELOPMENT: HUNDRED OF SHORT.**

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement on land development in the Hundred of Short in the South-East.

**CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Sections 115 and 116 of the Act were first enacted in 1948. Section 115 empowers the Renmark Irrigation Trust to construct and maintain drainage works for the prevention or removal of seepage conditions in the district or any part thereof. Section 116 authorizes the trust to impose a drainage rate to meet construction and maintenance costs incurred under section 115. This rate is not to exceed 5s. a half year for every acre of land rated and the rate is to be imposed uniformly on ratable land over the whole district irrespective of whether the land rated derives benefit from the drainage works. The trust has asked that the Act be amended to provide additional powers to levy rates on land which benefits, directly or indirectly, from the drainage works.

The trust has pointed out that the annual cost of the drainage works in existence is approximately £12,500 and that the amount recoverable under section 116, that is, at the rate of 5s. an acre a half year, is only £4,500. The balance of the annual cost must therefore be made up from the water rate which, of course, is a general rate imposed generally on ratable land. It is therefore proposed by the Bill that, after completion of any drainage works, the trust is to decide what land benefits,

either directly or indirectly from the drainage works and is to serve notice on the owners accordingly. From this notice there will be an appeal, ultimately, to the local court of full jurisdiction.

It is provided by the Bill that the trust may, for the purpose of maintaining the drainage works, impose a special drainage rate on the land which derives benefit from the drainage works. This rate is not to exceed 10s. an acre a half year and will be in addition to the general drainage rate of 5s. By this means the land benefiting from the drainage works will bear a greater rating burden than other land in the district. It is estimated that the special drainage rate will return about £3,000 per annum. It is the practice of the trust to submit to meetings of its ratepayers proposals for amendments of the Act and the proposals contained in the Bill were so submitted to and approved by a meeting of ratepayers held in November last.

The Bill is a hybrid Bill within the meaning of the Joint Standing Orders on Private Bills and was consequently referred to and considered by a Select Committee of another place. After hearing evidence the Select Committee reported in favour of the passing of the Bill.

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

**ANATOMY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1255.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—This Bill provides similar provisions to those contained in a Bill passed earlier this session amending the same Act. The first Bill provided for the removal of eyes, and this measure relates to the removal of tissue. The earlier Bill was before the public for a long time and as far as I know little or no objection was raised. The medical profession agrees that there should be similar powers for the removal of tissue to be used as necessity dictates. As the position is properly safeguarded, I see no objection to the Bill and have much pleasure in supporting it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Removal of tissue other than eyes from body of deceased person."

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—During the debate on the second reading I mentioned there

was no definition of "tissue" and raised some other points which I had hoped I would hear about from the Chief Secretary or the British Medical Association. I have heard nothing from the association, and I should like to know from the Minister whether there is any definition of "tissue" other than that contained in *Murray's Dictionary*—there is none in the Anatomy Act. Under the circumstances it seemed to me that the definition in the Bill was rather wide. It may be necessary that it should be so wide to take in any portion of the human body. If the Minister has any further information, I should be glad to have it.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—As the honourable member says the word "tissue" could have a wide meaning. A very wide definition would be required to include every constituent part of our anatomy. The earlier Bill dealt with corneal grafting. With the development of medicine and surgery the use of other parts of our anatomical construction becomes possible. For instance, bone would be considered a tissue, and possibly, with the further development of science, some other parts of the body could be used. The definition "tissue" would cover all these, but similar precautions to those provided in dealing with corneal grafting have been included in this Bill.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I raised certain points during the debate on the second reading and thought that the Minister would have extended courtesy to the Opposition by explaining them. I have noticed recently in this Chamber that when Mr. Cudmore raises points the Chief Secretary and his colleague are always forthcoming with a reply, but if the Chief Secretary wants to be discourteous to the Opposition when they raise points and does not think they are of sufficient importance to give a reply, he can expect no assistance from me.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

#### METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1257.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—When explaining this Bill the Minister set out very fully the reasons for its introduction and members who have since spoken have

amplified the circumstances so that it is not necessary for me to cover the same ground. The control of this institution has been entrusted to representatives of the various organizations concerned in the meat trade in the provision of stock and in its distribution. Certain of those interests have ceased to exist and it has been considered necessary to have representation by others who are named in the Bill. The Act amended by this Bill was passed in 1936 and proclaimed to commence in 1937, and it repealed the legislation dealing with abattoirs that had been in force since 1908. It is interesting to note that the 1936 Act provided for a board consisting of a chairman and six members, but over the years that board has been increased, and it now consists of eight members, including the chairman. An amendment to be moved by Mr. Robinson provides for a board of nine. The general experience of people who have been associated in any way with boards and committees has been that a large number is not always the most effective. Frequently it is found that a board or committee consisting of only a few members might get business done more effectively than a body of greater numerical strength.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The best committee is of three members, with two absent.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I have even heard that said and although I do not accept it in its entirety I know there is a danger of overloading a board of management. I appreciate that it is difficult to get away from the claims of people who might be vitally interested in this board which controls slaughtering, marketing and distribution of meat for local consumption and for export. The latter aspect is very important, and it will be seen that the ramifications of the board have a wide ambit of influence in every aspect of the meat industry.

At present a panel is submitted by the Stock-owners' Association to the board, but the question arises whether that panel is representative of breeders of cattle. If so, it is redundant to state specifically that in addition there should be a representative of breeders. If full representation can be obtained by having a small board it is to our advantage, although we do not want to leave out a very important industry. Perhaps at first glance when we consider breeders of cattle we are inclined to have regard to the far outback areas from which in the past a great proportion of stock has come, and to base our opinions on the circumstances relating to that avenue of supply.

However, it is obvious that some of our inside country, particularly the South-East, has rapidly become an important producer of beef and that it will become more important in the near future. One has only to travel through this favoured area to see that not only are the landholders directing their attention towards production of beef cattle, but are also sparing no time, expense and skill in producing high quality beef. In those circumstances a wider view should be taken of a suggestion that these people and those associated with them should have representation on the board. I support the Bill and the proposed amendment. Under the circumstances I have mentioned I think the extra representation is justifiable and I hope that it will not make the board top heavy and that it will continue to function as satisfactorily in the future as it has in the past.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Members of Board."

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I move—

In paragraph (a) to strike out "the Stock-owners' Association of South Australia" and to insert the following new paragraph:—

(a) one shall be a person who in the Governor's opinion is suitable to represent breeders of cattle and is selected from three persons nominated by the Stockowners' Association of South Australia.

In moving this amendment I am influenced to a large degree by the greater advance that we can visualize in the cattle industry, and in this I am supported by Mr. Edmonds' remarks this afternoon. During the weekend I read a book which dealt with some of the pioneers of the cattle breeding industry who, at great expense and much thought, brought out some of the best breeds of cattle from England and Scotland. I need not enumerate all the stations where cattle have been developed, for they will readily come to the minds of members, but we owe much to these men who risked a great deal of money and showed considerable judgment in the development of the stud stock of South Australia. The time is now arriving when we will reap the full rewards of their efforts. In addition to the big increases in the number of cattle that will come forwarded from our improved pasture lands we are now eliminating the quarantine restrictions around Alice Springs so that cattle may be brought in freely and placed on the very fine pastures that are being developed in the South-East and elsewhere. In April last I took a party of northern farmers through the South-East and the thing

that struck them very forcibly was the fine condition of the cattle at that time of the year; they were in prime condition, while in some paddocks the sheep were not so thrifty, indicating that the pastures are essentially suitable for the breeding of cattle. Not only will the additional cattle bring revenue to the State, but they will improve the pastures for sheep because we have all heard the old saying, "Eight days for an ox and one day for a sheep," indicating that long grass is suitable for cattle whereas sheep require the less mature growth. In moving for an additional member on the Abattoirs Board I do not think it will be detrimental to any other branches of the stock industry because I believe that he will co-operate with the other members of the board, although there primarily to watch the interests of the cattle industry in such matters as better trucking or watering facilities or better feeding; or he may be able to advise the board when to provide for additional slaughter-men because of the numbers expected to come forward, or perhaps that there will be more than will be required for local consumption and that provision may have to be made for exporting beef. The main thing is to have someone on the board to watch the interests of the cattle industry. To emphasize my point, I remember quite well when in 1938 I had the privilege of being a member of a Committee under the chairmanship of the late Mr. Gerald Pope, whom I regarded as one of the most knowledgeable men in the meat industry in Australia. This Committee, which toured the State, consisted of Mr. Pope as chairman, Mr. Alec Kidman, Mr. George Lovelock of Smoky Bay and myself. The question we were asked to investigate was whether it was advisable to establish additional freezing works, but we came to the conclusion that the position could be met by increasing the killing capacity of the Metropolitan Abattoirs from 50,000 to 70,000 lambs a week. We made that recommendation in May 1939, but it was not put into effect by the board because it had some doubt whether exports to Great Britain, then regulated by a quota, would warrant extension of the works. Those with a knowledge of the industry will recall what happened later in the year. It turned out to be an adverse season and the stock came along in such numbers that there was what could only be described as pandemonium at the abattoirs. As a result of this, on September 21 of that year, the Government appointed a Select Committee of both Houses consisting of Sir Wallace Sandford as chairman, the Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, E. W. Castine

and John McInnes, and Messrs. H. D. Michael and R. W. Pearson to go into the question. I shall refer only to that portion of the Committee's report, which was presented in August 1945, relating to the board. It said:—

It should be remembered that, as has been pointed out, the abattoirs at Gepps Cross were originally designed and developed to supply meat to the city and suburbs. The board was, for years, selected entirely by the constituent municipalities and district councils, and even when it was decided by the Government that the works should be extended to handle meat for export the municipalities were represented by three of the six elected members. Thus the "municipal" outlook would tend to persist and although the board has reduced charges and has increased facilities to the advantage of the producer of stock for local sale and export, and others also, the feeling appears to have been steadily growing among stock raisers that their interests have not received the direct and sympathetic consideration which they contend they deserve. This is, in no small degree, at the root of the present unrest and responsible for much of the criticism voiced from various centres. Indeed, it may be said that it was primarily due to the agitation of producer interests that committees were set up in 1938 and 1943 to inquire into the demand for the establishment of country freezing works, followed by the appointment of this Joint Committee in 1944 . . . the committee is convinced that nothing short of an overhaul of the constituent parts of the board will suffice.

The Committee accordingly recommended one additional producer representative on the board. Although members may claim that my proposal will make the board unwieldy, I have made inquiries from those in a position to know and they think that the cattle representative would be to the advantage not only of the industry but would bring to the board a wider range of knowledge. I may point out in passing that the Australian Meat Board consists of 12 members under a chairman appointed by the Government and includes two representatives of beef producers, one of mutton producers, one of pig producers, three of exporters of lambs, one of the Meat Industry Employees Union and one of public utilities. If we had three representatives of the lamb industry and two of the cattle industry we would have an overloaded board. All that is proposed is one representative of each industry. I believe that would bring greater knowledge to the board and be an advantage.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD—It will be remembered that there was considerable discussion on the constitution of the board which was expected to have a very direct bearing on the problems then confronting the abattoirs. The Minister in charge of the Bill at the time expressed his support for the

South Australian Chamber of Rural Industries and I believe the opinion of all honourable members was that such an organization might be expected to provide a field from which could be selected suitable board members. Mr. Densley by interjection questioned the representation of the industries whose members were to be on this board and indicated that possibly they might not be so specialized as members considered desirable. From this it would appear that the chamber did not provide the knowledge required. Mr. Robinson knows the requirements of the position, and his opinion is that a board of nine would not be unwieldy in the circumstances, and consequently I will support his amendment, hoping that the board's experience will be more satisfactory under the new construction than under the conditions previously ruling.

The CHAIRMAN—I take it that under the amendment there will be one additional member on the board?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—That is so.

The CHAIRMAN—As the Act provides in one or two places that there shall be a specified number of members of the board there would have to be additional amendments if this amendment were accepted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I am not quite clear what the honourable member's objective is, and since we last met I have not had an opportunity to go further into it. I have nothing to do with the administration of the Act, and would therefore like to seek some direction. It is a mistake to have too large a board. This is not the practice in private enterprise. The larger such a board the more unwieldy; often large boards do not lead to efficiency. I make that comment without prejudice to the amendment. As pointed out by you, Mr. Chairman, further consequential amendments would be required. Therefore, we should have proper amendments on the file covering the whole position. In the circumstances I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT ADVISORY COUNCIL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1259.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—To me this is a most interesting Bill, but I feel that the title is not quite correct. After studying the measure and trying to find out everything I could about it, I think the title

should be "A Bill for an Act to hand over all transport in the metropolitan area to the Government," because that is the effect. I approach the Bill with an underlying prejudice against new councils, boards and committees. Therefore I have found great difficulty in deciding whether I am in favour of the measure or not. That is not usual with me, because I can generally make up my mind as soon as I see a Bill, but this one is extremely difficult. The Minister of Local Government was good enough to tell us that there was provision on the usual lines for quorums, remuneration, staff and the appointment of a secretary and so on. In other words this Bill will set up another department. We all know what happens in such matters. As soon as an outside chairman and the secretary are appointed and permission given to select the staff, in no time we shall have a really decent sized department to conduct the affairs of this advisory council. What we have to decide is "Is it necessary or desirable to have this advisory Council."

I was interested to see that in the House of Assembly there was practically no criticism of this Bill; in fact nothing but support of it. Mr. Condon is this Chamber found nothing to criticize. Of course he did not, because it is just another step towards the nationalization of everything, which is Labor policy. However, there is much for us to criticize before we agree to this legislation. At first I was against it. Then I made inquiries and I have come to the position in which I ask whether this is inescapable and whether we must have this body superimposed on the officials of the railways and tramways. At present there are three transport services in the metropolitan area—the suburban railways, the Municipal Tramways Trust and private buses licensed by the trust. I have made inquiries, but have found that the Railways Department does not keep accounts to show whether the suburban lines are losing compared with the railways as a whole. That is because so many of the charges overlap, thus making it impossible to provide the information. However, we know that last year the railways lost £3,645,755 and the Tramways Trust £795,742, of which £700,000 was made up by the Government. Bus services operated by private proprietors made a profit for the year. These figures have been obtained from the Auditor-General's report because unfortunately the reports of the railways and the trust are not yet available.

It is interesting to note in the Auditor-General's report that trams carried 1,330,000

fewer passengers last year than the year before and that the licensed buses carried 551,000 more. It seems to me rather extraordinary that in the whole of the debate on this question no mention has been made of the Paine Royal Commission on transport. On examining this report, I found that for the years 1939 to 1949 the population in the metropolitan area increased by 26 per cent but that the number of passengers increased by only one per cent. The reason for this is obviously that people were using their own transport. The Paine report took into account figures up to the end of the 1949 financial year but since that date I am sure the traffic figures have remained static although population has increased very much indeed. These facts have to be taken into account when trying to make up one's mind whether this council should operate or not.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You said this legislation is socialistic. Do you think it will be defeated?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I will answer that in my own time. The huge transport losses are a worry to us all. There are some who might say glibly, "Why not charge enough on the trams to make them pay?" The obvious answer to that, apart from the figures I have quoted, is that there is a stage at which passenger resistance is met, because they will find some other method of travelling. I doubt whether we can possibly go as far as to say, "All right, let them." At the moment every passenger of the tramways is carried at a loss of about 2d., and who pays for this? The taxpayers of the State.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Who pays for the water losses?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—My honourable friend always introduces the question of country and city water rates but I think he will find the position has changed considerably so I do not think there is any analogy. The Government, as the custodian of the taxpayers' money, is compelled to ask whether these losses are justified and if it is possible by some co-ordination or by some over-riding council to prevent some of them. Of course, any that are avoidable should be prevented. This Bill suggests what is to me a very curious method. Firstly, it provides for a Government council consisting of a chairman and two members appointed by the Government and, if the Electricity Trust and Housing Trust can be taken as precedents, the chairman will be a Government man; secondly, the council will inquire only into matters referred to it

by the Government; thirdly, the council will report to the Minister of Railways in the same way as the Railways Commissioner does today; and fourthly, the Minister will submit the reports, presumably to Cabinet, and the Governor may make orders on any recommendation contained in those reports. One honourable member interjected during the earlier part of this debate that the council could not do anything without reference to Parliament, but as I read the Bill that is not so, because although it provides that reports have to be laid on the Table Parliament can do nothing but read them.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—It can if money is required.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—That is so. The Commissioner of Railways and the Tramways Trust have very wide powers under their Acts and except for details of administration, appointment of officers and things like that, this Bill will take away the main portions of their power; the Government will have power to give them directions on policy. I point out that the Commissioner of Railways is an incorporated body and has to be treated in the same way as the Municipal Tramways Trust. This means that the broad policy will be dictated by the Government. If the council is given this power, I cannot help hoping that the first order the Government will give is to stop trams turning at the corner of King William Street and North Terrace. The question of whether we should inaugurate this curious set-up, interfering with the people having powers under their own Acts, and then superimpose this council is a very important one, because it will mean Government dictatorship of transport.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—The honourable member supported amendments to the Highways Act.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—That is so. I wonder where the members of the council will come from and whether they will have to neglect their other duties. I ask what is in the mind of the Government, the Minister particularly, as to who shall be the type of people who will comprise this body. I also wonder whether this scheme has been tried anywhere else, and ask who has considered the effect of it and of what will happen. As I have mentioned before, I feel that members are entitled to know what was in the mind of the Minister when introducing a Bill of so far-reaching an effect as this.

The Bill contains a provision that the council shall have the powers of a Royal Commis-

sion. It is unusual to put such a provision in this form, but all it does is to give the council powers such as have been given to the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee and other bodies. As I see it, this is only a short cut. I am not keen on a small council of this type having the powers of a Royal Commission. The taxpayer has to meet all these losses. There may be avoidable losses. For instance, the council may be able to say that trains shall not run to Grange and buses will go there instead. I imagine that is the sort of thing that will happen.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Could not that be done without the council?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—The Government could do it. Whether or not it works satisfactorily will depend, I think, on the persons appointed, but I have the gravest doubts about its success. I would have preferred appointments for a limited period, say three or five years, so that we could see whether it was necessary, but as I read this Bill it is to be a permanent body. Therefore I want to be quite clear that it means the handing over of the whole of the metropolitan transport to the Government to run, because the orders that can be given by the Government pursuant to the council's reports will have to be carried out by the persons concerned. I am not opposing the Bill at this stage, but I hope to hear a good deal more from the Minister in reply before we vote on the second reading.

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

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

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

The Hon. N. L. Jude for the Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time. The Bill authorizes the expenditure of £40,525,326 which, together with an amount of £12,456,674 already appropriated by special legislation, makes up the total of £52,982,000 which the Treasurer has estimated as the total payments for 1954-55. Receipts for the year are estimated at £51,049,000, so that the prospective deficit for 1954-55 is £1,933,000. A few years ago, at the request of the Grants Commission, the Treasurer agreed that, whilst the State was assessed for grants on a balanced Budget basis, surpluses which might accrue to consolidated revenue account would be available from year to year to meet any deficits.

On the other hand, the Grants Commission agreed that in those years when the State experienced a deficit, provided that deficit was carried forward in consolidated revenue account, the Commission would, in a subsequent year, make a recommendation to the Commonwealth Government for a grant sufficient to reimburse to the State the amount of that deficit. In fact, in respect of the years 1947-48, 1948-49, and 1949-50, when the State did experience deficits, the Commission recommended grants sufficient to liquidate them. The surpluses attained during the last four years were as follows:—

	£
1950-51 .. .. .	230,000
1951-52 .. .. .	89,000
1952-53 .. .. .	25,000
1953-54 .. .. .	1,810,000

making a total accumulated surplus at June 30, 1954, of £2,154,000. The Grants Commission, in assessing the requirements of the State for 1954-55, has now taken account of these accumulated surpluses amounting to £2,154,000, and in its report this year has, in effect, said that the grant recommended is £2,250,000 which, with the amount of £2,154,000, is considered by the Commission to be necessary to meet the financial needs of the State for 1954-55. The Treasurer has therefore budgeted for a deficit on consolidated revenue account for this year of £1,933,000, and as this deficit will be financed from the accumulated surpluses amounting to £2,154,000 it will be seen that the Treasurer estimates there will still be a surplus in consolidated revenue account at the end of this year of £221,000, which will similarly be taken into account by the Commission in making the assessments of future years.

In accordance with my practice over recent years I now propose to give members some information regarding the State's account for the year ended June 30, 1954, and some explanations of the Bill now before the Council. Last year receipts amounted to £52,376,000, and payments to £50,566,000, resulting in a surplus of £1,810,000. When introducing the Appropriation Bill last year I indicated that the Government estimated that the surplus on consolidated revenue account for 1953-54 would be £10,000. Actually receipts for the year exceeded the Budget estimate by £1,021,000 and payments fell short of the Budget estimate by £779,000, so that the surplus was £1,800,000 greater than was anticipated. Receipts from State taxation exceeded the estimate by £636,000, principally as the result of increased receipts from succession duty, stamp duty, and

betting tax. Receipts from public works and services exceeded the estimate by £331,000 which was due to bouyant railway revenues and increased interest recoveries.

On the payment side the increase in labour turnover and the fact that some materials were in short supply prevented the achievement of targets which had been set for maintenance and extensions of services in various departments, with the result that payments from revenue account during the year were £779,000 less than the Budget estimate. In the House of Assembly the Treasurer has commented on the improved financial results in the railways operating account. The Auditor General in his report has intimated that there was an improvement of over £800,000 in railway financial results in 1953-54 as compared with 1952-53. I think it proper, Sir, that the attention of this Chamber should be drawn to the very noteworthy achievement of the Railways Department in the improvement of its operating results.

#### ESTIMATES FOR 1954-55.

Receipts on consolidated revenue account for 1954-55 are estimated at £51,049,000, which is £1,327,000 less than actual receipts last year, and this reduction is due to a substantially lower special grant from the Commonwealth Government. Succession duty receipts are estimated to return £168,000 less than last year when there was a far greater than average number of individual successions over £10,000. Last year was considered to be a peak in such occurrences and it is unlikely that the same incidence will be maintained this year. It will be recalled that two years ago the Government decided to increase the exemption from succession duty in the case of widows and of children under the age of 21 years from £500 to £2,800. A Bill will shortly be before this House to increase further the exemption in respect of widows of children under 21 years of age from, £2,800 to £3,500. The exemption in respect of widowers and adult children will be raised from £500 to £1,500 and there will be a consequential reduction for legacies not exceeding £5,000 to persons within these two classes. These amendments will involve the Government in a substantial loss in revenue but will relieve hardship in certain cases.

Motor vehicle taxation is expected to yield £633,000 more than last year because of the operation for a full year of increased motor vehicle registration fees and other charges which became effective from January 1, 1954.

Receipts from stamp duty and racing taxation are again expected to increase in 1954-55. Harbors revenue will increase as a result of higher charges which came into operation on September 1, 1954. A Bill to amend the Waterworks Act will be before the House shortly. This amendment will provide machinery to permit variation in charges for water supplies on country lands.

The total estimated payments for 1954-55 amount to £52,982,000, of which £12,456,674 is authorized by individual specific appropriations. The balance of £40,525,326 is the amount dealt with in this Bill, and for the information of members I will comment briefly on the expenditures which this Bill authorizes. The amount provided for the Hospitals Department in this Bill, £3,051,000, is £203,000 greater than last year's payments and includes provision for the commissioning of the first part of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Provision is also made for the employment of the staff necessary to provide adequate medical service to the public and for the purchase of essential medical equipment. The amount of £121,000 shown in the Bill for the Department of Public Health includes provision for the operation of the State's expanded tuberculosis services, including the purchase of equipment and expenses in connection with the State X-ray health service.

**CHIEF SECRETARY (MISCELLANEOUS),** £1,125,000.—This provision is required to meet grants and subsidies to various hospitals, health organizations, and other sundry institutions. It is £151,000 less than actual expenditure last year when special grants totalling £203,000 were made by the Government towards the provision of additional accommodation for homes for aged persons, and £85,000 was expended in connection with the Royal visit. As a result of the acceptance of the Government's offer to subsidize capital additions last financial year the various religious and other bodies, which have accepted the responsibility of caring for the aged, are fully committed at present in meeting their responsibilities under approved schemes, and it is unlikely that they will be able to embark on further schemes this year. There are some smaller homes whose schemes were not finalized last year which may be in a position to proceed with those schemes this year, and if this is so the Government will consider representations from such organizations for an extension of the scheme of grants which operated at the close of last financial year. The State scheme of assisting in the provision of accommodation for homes for aged persons is not connected in any way with the

Commonwealth scheme as announced by the Prime Minister several months ago. The principal payments to be made under the appropriation of Chief Secretary (Miscellaneous) are as follow:—

	£
Adelaide Children's Hospital . . . . .	245,000
Anti-Cancer Campaign Committee . . . . .	21,000
Burnside War Memorial Hospital . . . . .	21,000
Home for Incurables . . . . .	45,000
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science . . . . .	100,000
Keith hospital and equipment . . . . .	7,600
Mothers' and Babies' Health Association . . . . .	44,000
Penola hospital . . . . .	8,000
Queen Victoria maternity Hospital . . . . .	77,000
S.A. Blood Transfusion Services . . . . .	29,000
Tanunda War Memorial Hospital . . . . .	5,000
Terowie District Hospital . . . . .	2,300
Whyalla hospital . . . . .	10,500
Wudinna hospital . . . . .	2,500
District and Bush Nursing Society . . . . .	13,000
Kalyra Sanatorium . . . . .	60,000
Minda Home . . . . .	5,000
Northcote Home Preventorium . . . . .	4,200
Crippled Children's Home, Somerton . . . . .	2,000

Conditional subsidies to hospitals will this year require £115,220 compared with £109,790 actually paid last year. An amount of £89,343 is provided for special subsidies to hospitals for purchase of equipment and for additions, the amount of similar subsidies paid last year being £53,360. The sum of £29,000 is provided in connection with provision of ambulance services, £7,500 for the Royal Institution for the Blind, £10,000 for the S.A. Institution for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb, and £9,000 towards the provision of an annexe to the War Memorial to perpetuate the memory of those who lost their lives in World War II.

**PUBLICITY AND TOURIST BUREAU AND IMMIGRATION,** £239,450.—Provision has been made under this heading for increased subsidies to municipal authorities for development of tourist resorts, for subsidies towards the development of various recreational areas, and, in particular, for a grant to the corporation of Glenelg in connection with the Patawalonga Creek diversion and improvements.

**TREASURER (MISCELLANEOUS),** £4,436,865. The principal items for which provision is made under this heading are as follows:—

Contribution of £50,000 to Advances for Homes Insurance Fund towards meeting claims for earthquake damage, which follows a grant for similar purposes of £20,000 last financial year, and will enable all claims by persons who suffered damage as a result of the earthquake to be finalized.

Contribution of £222,000 to the Commonwealth pursuant to the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement which amount is recovered from the South Australian Housing Trust and credited to Revenue.

The sum of £78,000 is provided for administration and maintenance costs in connection with the temporary housing scheme. This is £25,000 in excess of the amount actually spent on this item last year, and the additional provision is required to meet the cost of repainting temporary dwellings and effecting other necessary maintenance.

The sum of £3,200,000 is provided as a special transfer to the railways and this amount represents a reduction of £800,000 as compared with the amount so transferred last year. The contribution towards the working expenses of the Municipal Tramways Trust is £600,000 for 1954-55 compared with £700,000 for 1953-54. This amount is based upon the annual operating expense budget of the trust.

The amount shown in the Bill for Lands Department is £513,015, which is £41,000 greater than actual expenditure last year. The provision includes £38,000 as a contribution towards this State's share of losses on valuation in the irrigation war service land settlement areas, and is payable to the Commonwealth pursuant to the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act of 1945.

The sum of £1,821,000 is provided for the Engineering and Water Supply Department compared with £1,671,000 actually spent last year. All possible haste is being made with the installation of the pumping plant in connection with the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, the operation of which is urgently required to augment the metropolitan water supply. Provision is also made for the operation and maintenance of bores in the metropolitan area.

Under the heading "Public Works" £853,000 has been provided for repairs, renovations, painting, alterations, additions, etc., to various Government buildings, and minor investigations to be carried out by the Engineer-in-Chief. A sum of £4,981,000 is provided for the Education Department. This amount is £330,000 in excess of actual expenditure last year and the excess is required principally to meet the salaries of additional teaching staff which is so urgently needed in State schools.

A total of £767,200 provided against the line "Minister of Education (Miscellaneous)" is required for grants to the University of Adelaide, to the School of Mines and Industries, the Kindergarten Union, the Institutes Association, and various other organizations of an educational character. A sum of £478,900

is provided to finance the expanding services of the Agriculture Department, where every endeavour is made to provide specialist advice and assistance to primary producers. For the Mines Department £650,000 is provided in the Bill compared with an actual expenditure of £528,000 last year, and the increase is largely required in connection with the search for new uranium prospects and for the testing of samples of ores from such prospects.

The amount provided for Harbors expenditure is £1,460,850, which is £153,000 greater than actual expenditure last year. The increase is required for the purpose of overtaking maintenance deferred from last year and earlier years. Payments in connection with railway operation and maintenance are estimated at £14,628,982, which is £264,000 greater than actual expenditure last year, and is required to meet labour and material costs occasioned by expanded business and for maintenance work on locomotives, rollingstock, and permanent way.

Dealing now, Sir, with the Bill itself, clause 2 provides for the further issue of £23,525,326, being the difference between the total of the three Supply Bills passed (£17,000,000) and the total of the appropriation required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the details of the appropriations to the various departments and functions. This clause also provides that increases of salaries or wages which become payable pursuant to any return made by a proper constituted authority can be paid and that the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of money necessary to pay the increases.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys authorized by warrants issued by the Governor from time to time and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorizes the use of loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1954, or at a rate in excess of the rate in force under any return made by the Public Service Board or any regulation of the Railways Commissioner. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.35 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 17, at 2 p.m.