

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, May 15, 1956.

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

QUESTIONS.**ADELAIDE-MARINO RAILWAY LINE.**

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Will the Minister of Railways call for a report from the Railways Commissioner regarding the delay in the completion of the duplication of the Adelaide-Marino railway line?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am quite prepared to do as the honourable member requests.

SITTINGS OF COUNCIL.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Can the Chief Secretary indicate whether, after the Appropriation Bill has been disposed of and the Address in Reply debate concluded, it is the Government's intention to continue the sittings of the Council for the purpose of dealing with future legislation?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The programme is that, having dealt with Supply and the Address in Reply, there will be an adjournment before the Council proceeds to deal with the Bills of the session.

GUMMOSIS IN APRICOTS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I ask leave to make a brief statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Recently the Department of Agriculture issued a statement which pointed to the fact that it is the dead wood in apricot trees affected with gummosis which is the host for the spores of this disease. It was stated that five thousand million spores can be carried in one square inch of dead wood and that after a rain these spores are liberated and are wind borne to any open cuts in the trees. Does the department intend to bring down a regulation to enforce the destruction of all dead apricot wood on horticultural properties and wherever it may be dumped?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The honourable member's question is an important one to the fruit industry, and I will refer it to the Minister of Agriculture and bring down a report on what is considered to be the necessary steps to be taken in regard to this problem.

HILTON BRIDGE.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice)—

1. What was the cost of repairs made during the past five years to the Hilton Bridge over the railways goods yards at Mile End?

2. Has the Railways Department any plans for the erection of a safer and more permanent structure?

3. If so, what is the estimated cost?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—

1. £4,653 3s. 4d., and the Highways Department £900 for maintenance of the pavement only, during the last five years.

2. No.

3. *Vide* 2.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of Sessional Committees.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint House Committee.

The President, and the Hons. E. Anthony, K. E. J. Bardolph, and C. R. Story were appointed to represent the Legislative Council on the Committee.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The Hons. E. Anthony, W. W. Robinson, and A. J. Shard were appointed to represent the Legislative Council on the Committee.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is submitted for the purpose of appropriating £1,008,000 for further expenditure during this financial year on urgent and essential matters. During recent years supplementary appropriation towards the close of each financial year has become a recurring necessity, and before commenting on the provisions of the Bill I propose to give honourable members some brief explanation of the

necessity for further appropriation, together with comments on the amounts for which the Bill seeks appropriation.

In the first place departmental estimates are finalized and prescribed to the Ministers during the first week in July. They are prepared having regard to the level of wages and prices and availability of labour and materials at the time of preparation. Any movement of those factors, or any extension of Government services, then, affects the adequacy of provision made in the Budget Estimates. Under the provisions of the Public Finance Act the Governor may authorize the expenditure of £400,000 over and above the amount provided in the Estimates and this is the only provision which the Government has to meet excess expenditure arising from any of the factors I have mentioned.

This year has seen some increases in prices of materials for the operation and maintenance of Government services, some increases in payments for labour, and a better availability of labour which has enabled the Government to extend and improve its services and to improve its services and to improve its maintenance programme. These factors, plus certain commitments unforeseen at the time of preparation of the Budget, involve the Government in an additional expenditure of £1,008,000, the amount of the Bill now before the House.

Clause 3 shows the dissection of this amount.

State Governor's Establishment, £1,500.—The sum of £1,500 is provided under this line. This is to enable the Government to pay certain Government House staff, and will bring procedure in this State into line with practices at other vice-regal establishments in other States.

Printing and Stationery Department, £29,000.—The Government Printer has had a greatly increased volume of work to cope with as a result of undertaking the printing of school books and publications for Government departments. He has been able to obtain staff from overseas, and altogether his staff position is better than for some considerable time. Members will be well aware of the quantity and quality of work done by our Government Printer.

Hospitals Department, £321,080.—Provision is made for payment of marginal increases which have been granted to nursing staff. Costs of foodstuffs and hospital provisions have risen more than was anticipated when the Budget was prepared and these increases are reflected in the increased provision now sought for the various hospitals set out in the

Supplementary Estimates. A further provision of £121,000 is now required for salaries and wages in addition to the original £2,102,318 set down for this purpose in the Budget Estimates. In addition, the following amounts are provided to cover extra cost of hospital provisions, medicines, medical comforts, equipment, etc., as under—

	£
Royal Adelaide Hospital	98,000
Royal Adelaide Hospital—Northfield Wards	14,905
T.B. Services—Morris Hospital, Northfield	5,000
Mental Hospital, Parkside .. .	49,000
Mental Hospital, Northfield .. .	28,000
Port Pirie Hospital	3,000

Expansion of facilities at the maternity section of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital necessitates additional funds for operation, and £7,000 is provided for this purpose.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £24,000.—The additional provision for this department is required to meet the costs of relief granted to a greater number of applicants than was the case last year. This is not unemployment relief, which is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, but relates to relief for deserted wives and children for whom the department has been unable to recover maintenance. Inability to recover maintenance arises from a number of causes, chief of which are that the husband or father has changed his address and cannot be located, or that he is in gaol, or that he is sick or out of work for varying lengths of time and unable to make payments to the department, which is then required to give relief to the dependants.

Department of Public Health, £14,897.—An amount of £1,397 is provided for the purchase of equipment for the Deafness Guidance Clinic, £2,500 for expenses associated with the poliomyelitis services, and £11,000 for the purchase of special caravans which will be used in the proposed anti-poliomyelitis vaccine campaign.

Chief Secretary (Miscellaneous), £15,940.—Under this section are detailed special grants which have been approved by the Government. They are:—

£7,500 to the Anti-Cancer Campaign Committee towards the purchase of the linear accelerator which the Committee is installing in a building which the Government is providing for the purpose at the Adelaide Hospital.

£649 subsidy to the Kalyra Sanatorium towards equipment for carpentry shop.

£6,000 to the Elizabethan Theatre Trust.

£750 to the S.A. Oral School Incorporated towards the cost of erection and equipment of an assembly hall.

£1,050 for the purchase of a Land Rover for presentation to the Flora and Fauna Board.

Attorney-General (Registrar-General of Deeds Department), £7,534.—The volume of business transacted through this department has been greater than was anticipated when the Budget Estimates were framed, necessitating the provision of this further amount.

Publicity and Tourist Bureau and Immigration, £6,671.—This amount is required for the purchase of land at Nuriotpa. This land is known as Coulthard's Reserve and consists of 74 acres which will be converted to a pleasure resort.

Treasurer (Miscellaneous), £11,000.—Government vehicles are exempt from the provisions of the Road Traffic Act which requires all other vehicles to be covered by what is known as third party liability. The Government has decided to effect insurance and to cover itself and its drivers against claims from persons who may suffer bodily injury as a result of collisions or some other vehicular mishap.

Minister of Lands (Miscellaneous), £350.—This provision is for the Botanic Garden Board as a grant towards resurfacing roads and paths in the Botanic Garden.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £206,319.—The biggest item under this heading concerns Adelaide Water District where the Budget Estimate presumed that it would not be necessary to augment metropolitan water supplies by River Murray water during this financial year. As honourable members are aware, water consumption during the past summer exceeded all previous peak consumption and it was necessary to resume pumping through the Mannum-Adelaide Pipeline. Provision for this is included in the £103,000 shown for Adelaide Water District in the Supplementary Estimates. Better availability of labour has necessitated the provision of a further £43,000 for salaries and wages, whilst the higher costs associated with operation of the department require the provision of £20,000 for general office expenses, reimbursement of travelling expenses, etc., £14,000 for Adelaide sewers, and £8,000 for maintenance work in connection with the Morgan-Whyalla water scheme. The sum of £18,319 is provided to refund to the Broken Hill Proprietary Limited an amount paid by the company in excess of the correct amount due for water usage. This overpayment occurred as a result of a defective meter measuring water drawn off at Whyalla, and the refund now made covers overpayments by the company over a period of five or six years.

Aborigines Department, £15,000.—This increase is brought about, in so far as the £10,000 for 'Provisions' is concerned, by the decision of the Aborigines Protection Board to grant relief on a scale similar to the Public Relief Department to unemployed natives. At Point McLeay heavy expenditure has been incurred in reconditioning and repairing tractors and other farm implements in an endeavour to provide facilities for putting greater areas to pasture and, in addition, an increased scale of rations has been on issue to natives on the station. Provision for this is £5,000.

Public Works, £106,000.—In the years which have succeeded the termination of World War II. the Government has been faced with a very difficult problem as regards maintenance of Government buildings in that it has proved very hard to let maintenance contracts because of labour and material shortages. This problem has been heightened by the fact that accommodation shortages have forced the Government to make use of timber-framed structures in many instances. These timber-framed structures have met many problems admirably but they constitute a constant and recurring maintenance problem. During the current year the Architect-in-Chief has found a greater readiness among contractors to tender for these maintenance jobs and the result is that some arrears of maintenance have been overtaken. The funds originally provided are exhausted and the additional moneys are required to carry on with maintenance, as under—

	£
Education Buildings	14,000
Hospital Buildings	39,000
Police and Courthouse Buildings . .	14,000
Other Government Buildings (which includes all Government Offices)	39,000

Education Department, £51,500.—This amount is required to meet increased costs associated with the Education Department. £19,000 is for salaries for additional teachers engaged since the Budget was submitted, and the following amounts are required for the purposes set out for the various schools:—

Primary schools: £12,000 for subsidies and for cost of swimming campaign.
Boys and girls technical schools: £4,000 for subsidies and for cost of swimming campaign.
Technical education of apprentices: £2,000 for purchase of additional material and equipment.
High schools: £4,000 for subsidies and for cost of swimming campaign.
Visual aid section: £3,000 for the purchase of additional documentary films.

In addition £2,500 is provided to meet the cost of bringing additional teachers from England, and £5,000 to meet payroll tax on salaries and wages over and above the amount provided for in the Budget.

Minister of Education (Miscellaneous), £74,200.—Grants to the University and the School of Mines are made on the basis of a budget submitted by these institutions for each calendar year and approved by the Government. The amount of £55,000 now provided as an additional general purpose grant to the University of Adelaide, and the £10,000 to the School of Mines and Industries for payment of salaries and expenses of management, are additional to the grants authorized by the Estimates which were passed by this House with the Budget. These amounts are essential to carry on educational work at both the University and the School of Mines until the end of the current financial year. When the Budget was dealt with by the House a grant of £100,000 was authorized for the Kindergarten Union. The Union has made an urgent request for a further grant for this financial year, and the Government has decided to provide an additional amount of £9,200 for this purpose. This institution carries out a very necessary part of the education system. The salaries of its teachers have been increased and its activities have greatly expanded over the last few years.

Department of Industry, £17,000.—The principal item in this amount concerns the payment of fares of persons brought from overseas for appointment to positions in the Public Service. There has been a serious shortage of professional men and this shortage of such key personnel as engineers, architects, and draftsmen, has been one of the principal factors which have hindered progress on vital capital and maintenance works. The Government has pursued an active policy of recruitment of technical personnel from overseas, and the increase in tempo on such works is a measure of the success which has been experienced in obtaining suitable officers.

Agriculture Department, £10,000.—During the past summer a further outbreak of Queensland fruit fly occurred at Unley, but fortunately prompt preventive measures avoided a widespread infestation. The provision made in this Bill is to meet the costs of that preventive action.

Minister of Agriculture (Miscellaneous), £40,000.—The grant for the Waite Agricultural Research Institute is paid through the Univer-

sity on a budget submitted by the Council of the University. A sum of £90,000 was provided in the Budget Estimates for the Waite Institute, and the additional amount now granted, viz., £25,000, is required to meet the expenses of the Institute until the end of the present financial year. An additional £15,000 is required for payments associated with the destruction of noxious insects in connection with the grasshopper campaign.

Mines Department, £56,000.—This provision is required in addition to the amount provided in the Budget Estimates to enable the department to continue its exploratory work. Additional drilling has been carried out at the Middleback Ranges in exploration of iron ore deposits, and the drilling results outside the B.H.P. leases are encouraging. Scout drill holes are being put down on Yorke Peninsula in connection with oil exploration. Provision has also been made for drilling and testing uranium prospects within the State.

And now, turning to the Clauses of the Bill. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of £1,008,000, and Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of this amount to the several lines shown. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made. Clause 5 provides that if the revenues of the State are insufficient to meet the payments mentioned in Clause 3, the Treasurer may use loan funds or other public moneys in order to make the payments. I commend the Bill to Honourable Members and move the second reading.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—I support the second reading. I also wish to refer to the absence this afternoon of the Hon. Frank Condon, the Leader of the Opposition, who is ill in hospital. I know that I express the wishes of the members of this House when I say we wish him a speedy recovery and return to his Parliamentary duties. Next to you, Sir, Mr. Condon has had more years' continuous service in Parliament than any other member of this House. That is a fitting tribute to his work and the manner in which he carries out his Parliamentary duties. Mr. Condon's genial and courteous manner has endeared him to every member of this House, irrespective of Party.

I take this opportunity of expressing our pleasure in welcoming two new members, Mr.

A. J. Shard and Sir Arthur Rymill. Although these gentlemen represent different political parties, they will realize that, in the conduct of business in this House, although it is necessary to expound your own political point of view, whatever decision is arrived at here is based on the merits of the various Bills presented for our consideration. Both these gentlemen have played a prominent part in their respective fields. Mr. Shard has represented the workers in the industrial field, and was formerly a member of the House of Assembly. Prior to his election to this Chamber he was secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, the controlling authority of the trade union movement in South Australia.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—One branch of it.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Sir Arthur Rymill has played a prominent part in the commercial and professional sphere in connection with his legal practice. On behalf of the Opposition I wish these gentlemen well.

With regard to the Supplementary Estimates, it is interesting to make a brief review of the practice over the years. In my search for information I discovered that Supplementary Estimates were first introduced into Parliament in 1891. From 1901 to 1915 no Supplementary Estimates were submitted. They were submitted in 1922, but not during the years 1923-1925. They were submitted in 1925 and again in 1927. They were also submitted in 1930 and 1931, and in 1937 and 1940. The latter year was virtually the beginning of the war years. From 1947 to 1956 these recurring Supplementary Estimates have been submitted, and this House has been asked to pass them without being able to give them the necessary consideration. I am not blaming departmental officers, nor suggesting there is anything sinister about this, but I do suggest that those responsible for presenting the financial affairs of the State should have submitted to Parliament full and comprehensive details of the additional expenditure.

Last year we passed Supplementary Estimates for £704,000, and this year the amount is £1,008,000. Last year's Budget, submitted in October, provided for a deficit of £748,000, whereas the actual deficit for 1955-1956 is about £2,000,000. Deducting the cost of £150,000 for the eradication of grasshoppers, which is a very necessary measure, we find that the Government will have a deficit of £1,850,000. I think that the position calls for further explanation than has been given here this afternoon by the Chief Secretary. I

remind the Chief Secretary that it had been the practice of all State Governments over the years that, where there was a deficit or a shortage between the period of collecting taxation or receiving grants, the affairs of government were carried on in the usual financial channels, namely the issuing of Treasury bills.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Have you ever heard of uniform taxation?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am glad my friend has reminded me of that. I remind him that he has never raised his voice in protest against the issue I am going to raise. The Premier takes full credit for the beneficent sums handed out by the Grants Commission to this State. However, the Grants Commission is not responsible to the Commonwealth or State Parliaments, and it can and does dictate to the respective Governments in Australia. We have uniform taxation, and our State Government has made no effort to break away from the legislation. The fact remains that there are other avenues of taxation which this Government pursues in order to get funds. Mr. Cudmore knows that it was only in the last few years that the Grants Commission demanded there should be an increase in a field of taxation which the States enjoyed unfettered before they would consider giving the disability grant to which this State was justly entitled.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—What did they demand?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—They told us to increase the fee for drivers' licences. They also implied that there should be an increase in the betting tax. This Government stands condemned for increasing such taxation if it were not at the suggestion of the Grants Commission. I quite agree with the Chief Secretary that the amounts set out in these estimates have to be paid, but it does not alter the point I have raised that there should be a fuller explanation given to the Parliament, and that those responsible for the compilation of the Budget should attend to this when they are preparing the financial statements for the Government to present to Parliament.

In his speech the Chief Secretary mentioned hospitals. I am not a carping critic of Government institutions and have always maintained that it is not the function of the Opposition to provide only destructive criticism. It should also advance constructive ideas, and it represents the ordinary man in the street who desires to know what is being done in Parliament.

I pay a compliment to those responsible for the conduct of our hospitals and I may be pardoned for mentioning one or two gentlemen in the medical profession particularly, namely, Dr. Rollison and Dr. Southwood; they, with their assistants and the honorary medical staff are performing a great humanitarian work. However, in examining closely the reasons for increased costs in these institutions it is clear that although this Government claims to have controlled prices, it makes an admission in the Supplementary Estimates that it is the cost of foodstuffs which is responsible for the increased expenditure. Perhaps the Chief Secretary, in closing the debate, may inform us what the Government has done to arrest the high cost of living which is reflected not only upon the breakfast table of the people but in the running costs of these institutions.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—You have only to look at what Labor Governments are doing elsewhere to get your answer.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I know the Chief Secretary will endeavour to tell us why this Government has not controlled the inflationary spiral of prices which is reflected in the rising costs of these institutions.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—You do not object to the increase in wages?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I was not referring to wages but to the cost of foodstuffs. Quite a number of people engaged in our hospitals are still underpaid and I am pleased to see the amount which is included for increased wages to nurses. They are a noble band of women to whom money is not the main attraction, as they take up nursing with some sense of vocation. I do not think my honorable friend desires to twist my meaning, but if he does he has made a sorry attempt.

Every member knows where the Australian Labor Party stands on education. Its members have always advocated a greater and freer system of education and therefore I do not object to the items contained in the Bill under this heading. However, I wish to make one plea. The private denominational schools in this State are going through the same vicissitudes with regard to the upkeep of their buildings and the payment of their lay teachers as the Government schools, and some consideration should be given by the Government, if not to a direct payment of teachers, to a subsidy to the parents who desire to send their children to denominational

schools. There should be some such method as is applied to industry, whereby money is loaned for the establishment or expansion of an industry on a guarantee by the Government to the trading banks. Such a method would provide an opportunity for these denominational schools to supply the ever-growing demand for school accommodation and thus assist the Government in the education of the young people of South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Are you advocating a Government advance from loan money?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The private banks of South Australia have rallied to the support of the denominational schools and loaned them money, because they are carrying out an important job and at least giving the children some knowledge of the religion which their parents embrace. If all these schools were closed tomorrow the Government schools would be unable to accommodate the students so, from an economic point of view, that is a factor which should carry some weight with the Government.

The Chief Secretary said that £12,000 is to be provided to enable the Government to bring professional officers, such as engineers and architects, from overseas or other States to fill vacancies in the Public Service. My criticism of this line is that it has become necessary to import these people because of the conditions operating in the Public Service which cause many professional men to seek to improve their status by accepting higher paid positions in private practice.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Does the honourable think that it is conditions only which have brought this about?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I said that they have sought higher pay in private practice, and as an erudite teacher of former days the honourable member should know what salary is paid to the teaching profession and to these other professional officers. Unless the Public Service is made attractive I fear that it will be necessary to continue to import professional men from England or the other States in order to fill the vacancies in the Public Service.

My next reference is to the amount overcharged to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. I did not say that it should not be repaid, but I ask why it has been allowed to go on for so long as six years. Surely there must have been some lack of supervision somewhere. I suppose that but for the awareness of the company's well-trained staff this

would have gone on for a further six years when a much larger amount would have had to be repaid.

Although supporting the Bill the Opposition requests the discontinuance of this method of presenting the Supplementary Estimates and desires a full Budget in order that members may review the whole of the items of expenditure. This war-time atmosphere in respect to the expenditure of public money should not be continued.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—Generally speaking the matter of the Budget and finance is primarily the consideration of another place and not of the Legislative Council. The State Treasurer sits in the Assembly and all the details are supplied to that House. We can thank the Chief Secretary for giving us so much more detail than you, Sir, will remember was supplied to this Chamber in years gone by when it was asked, as it were, merely to endorse the Appropriation Bill. However, in those days this Chamber had its own method of dealing with the matter. It simply held up the Appropriation Bill until well on in the session and thereby kept some control in that way. Generally, however, the details of the appropriation have never been considered, either here or in the Old Country, as a particular matter for the second Chamber. Latterly we have had these recurring Supplementary Appropriation Bills in order to allow the Government to pay for added expenditure which was either unforeseen or which, for some reason, could not be included in the Budget. I was very interested in Mr. Bardolph's remarks when he said that he hoped this new idea of the last 10 years would not be gone on with when he had already told us that it started in 1901.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—But there were many gaps between the period.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Yes. It is not, as he showed, a new idea. There are circumstances which happen, both here and overseas, in the general financial set-up which make it impossible for Governments to foresee everything that will happen in the future. Mr. Bardolph said that he objected to this method of considering the Supplementary Estimates because we had to put them through without due consideration, but whose fault is that? He has had any amount of time to consider them. Those of us who read *Hansard* have known for a week all that was in them, and if they have not been given due consideration it is the fault of members and no-one else. He further went on to say that he wanted ample time to

consider them. We have had ample time in this case, whereas in other sessions it has been quite the reverse. Sometimes we have had a little rush, but on this occasion that does not apply. The honourable member also spoke about Treasury bills, loans and things like that. We all know that today they are controlled by the Loan Council, and this council has no more to do with the issuing of Treasury bills than say the football umpire down at the oval. Last year we had a Supplementary Appropriation Bill for £704,147, and this year it is for £1,008,000, a considerable increase, but considering the general instability of the economic structure in Australia it is surprising to me that it is not even more compared with last year. We know that full employment was greeted by some people as a very wonderful thing, but it has its difficulties and, as shown in the Minister's statement, it creates great difficulties for a Government which has a programme and would like to be able to carry out certain engineering and other public works during the year. But we did not have the necessary number of employees, and then something happened and more became available. That is one of the reasons why the Government has been spending the extra money—to keep on employing everyone who wanted employment. Would my friend object to that?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Some of these people cannot get a job in their Labor governed States.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—That is quite true and they come here. My honourable friend, Mr. Bardolph, would not object to what I consider the proper thing—that the Government should carry on with its public works and employ the people. That is why we have practically no unemployment in this State. The Government is to be complimented on having seized the opportunity to proceed with its public works. As to the amount of £321,000 provided for hospitals, I understand that no less than £121,000 of this was required for salaries and wages, in addition to the amount originally provided. Surely Mr. Bardolph would not object to that?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—I did not object.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—You complained about the amount. It is obvious that under existing economic conditions it is very difficult for the Government to forecast in August, which it is asked to do, everything that will

happen and the money it will require to spend before June 30 in the next year. To my mind all such things as price control make it more difficult. It seems to me that we must either remove controls or control everything, otherwise how can an accurate estimate be made of what the position will be in 10 months? The Government is also hamstrung by uniform taxation. If South Australia had its own taxing powers under its own control I believe we would pay less taxation than we do today.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You have made no move in that regard.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I have always said the same thing. The Commonwealth Government collects the taxation and we have to do some of the spending, and do it according to the dictates, to a great extent as Mr. Bardolph has stated, of the Grants Commission. Therefore, I should like to see the day when we are responsible for collecting our own taxes and for our own expenditure. There are one or two matters on which I shall ask questions in Committee, which is the proper time to go into details. I support the second reading and congratulate the Government on the fact that this appropriation is not higher than it is.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—If we are not prepared to give due consideration to the matters contained in the Bill, we should not later level criticism. I do not criticize any of our Government departments or our public servants. They are doing their job to the best of their ability under the circumstances prevailing and with the finances provided. Supplementary Estimates are becoming a hardy annual. This was mentioned by Mr. Bardolph, who said that the practice had not been continuous since 1901, as Mr. Cudmore would like us to believe. The explanation apparently is that extraordinary unforeseen expenditure occurs which was unexpected at the time the Estimates were introduced, and therefore it is necessary to provide additional funds.

I was rather intrigued with Mr. Cudmore's statement regarding uniform taxation. It was not so long ago that our present Prime Minister offered to hand back to the States their taxing powers if they were not satisfied with what they were receiving under uniform taxation, but it is interesting to notice that every State Premier including our Premier refused to accept this offer. Therefore, they must think that uniform taxation is not such a bad thing.

The Hon. E. Anthony—There was no unanimity on the part of the Premiers on that occasion.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I admit that, but if the South Australian Government was anxious to have its taxing powers returned, it should have voiced an opinion accordingly and not rejected the opportunity. It is only wishful thinking to say that a considerable reduction, or even a reduction, would occur in State taxation if we had our taxing powers returned. We would then have both the Commonwealth and the State Government levelling taxes. If the power were returned I do not think we would be able to collect sufficient taxation to carry out our public works and meet the cost of our services. I was interested in the Chief Secretary's explanation of why it was found necessary to have a further appropriation for the various departments. I feel that over the years the Government has had a remedy for these things, but has not availed itself of it. The Chief Secretary mentioned that £1,500 was made available for the State Governor's establishment and explained that the greater proportion was for staff and staff salaries at Government House, the object being to place their salaries on a basis comparable to that operating in other States. I am very pleased that at last the Government has realized that it must do something about the conditions, and wage rates of people in this State to bring them into line with employees in other States.

The Chief Secretary explained that a considerable amount of the additional £29,000 for the Printing and Stationery Department has already been expended in the payment of fares to overseas technicians and in salaries. In almost every department mentioned in this Bill extra amounts are needed for salaries and wages, and I construed from the Chief Secretary's remarks that this has been necessitated by having to bring people to this State to maintain the efficiency of those departments. It appears to me that this has been brought about because of the niggardly attitude of the Government. We know there has been competition for the services of highly skilled technicians in particular, who are urgently sought after by private enterprise. Private firms have offered higher remuneration and better conditions than the Government has been prepared to pay, so the employees have terminated their employment with the State and have gone to private industry. We have been told that open competition is what counts, so I feel that the Government should have entered into competition with industry in

an endeavour to keep departmental heads and technical officers. Many officers have left the service and gone overseas.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—They are not the only people who have gone overseas.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I admit that, but if the amount provided in this Bill to bring people from overseas had been spent on better conditions for existing employees, probably many of them would not have left the service.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Unfortunately, it would not have applied only to the key men, but all would have had to go up correspondingly, would they not?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They have not gone up correspondingly over the years. If all wages went up because the top men's wages were increased we would not have the present arguments over wages. If we want to keep highly-trained men we must recognize their qualifications and pay them accordingly, otherwise they will leave the Government employ and go elsewhere.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—The reverse also happens.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—But the State Government departments have suffered this sort of thing for years.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Does it necessarily follow that the people from overseas are replacements? Perhaps they are additions.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Any Minister, if he were honest, would admit that he has lost men because they could obtain better wages and conditions in private employment. A considerable number of these men are replacements. If the Government did as much as private industry to retain employees it would have sufficient applicants holding necessary qualifications without having to go overseas for them.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—I think you will admit that conditions are not quite comparable.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Why are they not comparable? If private enterprise is in a position to do it, why cannot the Government also do it? We have even had to go overseas to obtain school teachers. Many of them come here, fulfil their contracts for six years or perhaps more, have a change of climate, gain experience from working here and then return overseas. Where is the inducement to our young people with the necessary

qualifications to take up teaching? They see what is offered, compare it with what is offered in private enterprise and as a result do not accept Government employment. Because of that we have to go overseas to recruit teachers.

I was amazed to discover that no effort has been made to put this State on a comparable basis with every other State in two matters. Firstly, no effort has been made to bring the basic wage here into line with that in every other State, all of which have legislated to provide for quarterly adjustments. These adjustments have been necessary because combines have increased prices. An instance of this is the recent increase of a penny a pound in the price of sugar, and many other commodities have also risen in price. This State has not provided for long service leave, although every other State has done so. From time to time the Premier has told deputations that South Australia will not lag behind other States, yet we are lagging behind all other States in the two matters I have mentioned. As the Government has recognized the principle that it should bring the State Governor's establishment into line with other States in relation to wages and conditions, I hope it will follow that principle in other directions. Unless it does, we will continue to lose highly-skilled men from the Government service.

Provision is made for an extra £60,000 to the Department of Mines for research into mineral deposits. Boring experiments carried out by the department have proved their worth because iron ore has been discovered. I hope the Government will operate the deposits instead of handing them over to the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. Ltd. to exploit. I feel that this amount will be wisely spent. I agree with Mr. Bardolph that the Government should to some extent subsidize new schools being built by various denominations, because these schools save considerable Government expenditure. The State Government must save millions of pounds on education because of the operation of these denominational schools. They are erecting substantial buildings which will endure and are not resorting to the expedient of prefabrication. It would not be asking too much for the State to relieve these private denominational orders by assisting in the cost of these school buildings.

Under the heading of the Chief Secretary's Department an additional amount is made

available for hospitals. That is highly commendable. The amount appears to be £321,000, but when we realize the magnitude of the hospital services in the State and the progress that has been made over the last few years that amount can be readily understood.

I felt that I could not allow the Bill to proceed into the Committee stages without those few criticisms. It is not criticism of the administration of any of the departments or of the departmental heads, because I feel they are doing a good job. My criticism is levelled at the Government, because its policy is wrong. If proper consideration were given in these matters we might not be called upon to pass such a sum as we are asked to do today.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—As has been mentioned in this debate, the passing of Supplementary Estimates has become the usual thing, and not unusual as it was in the early part of this century. The times are different and expenditure is far greater. I think Supplementary Estimates of £1,008,000 should give us some cause for thought. Our revenue is in the region of £50,000,000, and looking at it from that point of view the Estimates were out to the extent of 2 per cent. That does not appear to be very large on a percentage basis, but when we look at it in terms of the amount that we are short in revenue it is a very serious thing in a State as small as South Australia. I cannot quite reconcile the statement in the Governor's Speech with the amount of the Supplementary Estimates. I gathered from the Governor's Speech that we were £500,000 short, but in the Supplementary Estimates we are asked to pass £1,008,000. That makes the deficiency over the year £1,008,000, and I take that to be correct irrespective of the fact that the Supplementary Estimates are £500,000 more than stated in the speech. If that is so it means a difference of 4 per cent, and we are living beyond our means to the extent of 4 per cent on our annual income.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You mean the State is?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—The Government of this State is, unless they have other sources of revenue which are not mentioned in the Supplementary Estimates. I know that application will be made to the Grants Commission for the deficiency and that it will probably be granted, but the fact remains that without help from another source we are living beyond our income to the extent of 4 per cent. I listened with interest to the

speeches by Mr. Bardolph and Mr. Bevan. It seems to me that if they were on the Treasury benches the amount that we are asked to pass today would be a great deal more. We all want to see everybody living as happily and as contentedly as possible, but some of the things advocated by those members this afternoon, if put into force, would be very costly and would create greater difficulties than we are facing at present.

I am rather surprised at the Government's introducing these Estimates without forecasting revenue. I think the Chief Secretary should have given that information to the House to enable us to grasp the overall picture of the State's finances.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You are supporting the Opposition's contention now?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I would be sorry to identify myself with some of the remarks of the honourable member. I feel that conditions in South Australia warrant a clearer statement than the Chief Secretary has given us today. I have always regarded the Government and its officers as a very well informed body of people, and in a position to give some lead to the people of the State on the conditions which we will probably be facing within the next 12 months. We did have some such lead from the Prime Minister a month or two ago, and his reasons were very ably and clearly stated. We are facing the same problems in South Australia as the people in the other States. I would have liked to see some statement of the considered opinion of the Government and its officers of the trends that are developing. I am not in as good a position as the Treasurer or the officials in the Government to give such an opinion, and would hesitate to do so, but I think it is one of the duties of a Government to forecast these trends within the knowledge available to it. I hope that when the Supplementary Estimates have been disposed of and we get our proper Budget, more information on those lines will be given to the Parliament and the public than has hitherto been given.

I support the Bill authorizing the increases, which are mainly in the Hospitals Department and the Public Works Department. I do not think any of us can criticize any expenditure which safeguards the health of the community. I feel that the money has been wisely spent on that department, but I point out that it will be a recurring expense out of revenue. These trends are very serious. I hope that those responsible for handling the finances of this

State will give close consideration to the problems facing the country and the people, and safeguard the expenditure from revenue in an endeavour to see that it does not exceed the Estimates which, at one time of the year, represented the considered opinion of the Government. I hope that the Supplementary Estimates in future will get back to the early days of this century, as indicated by the Honourable Mr. Bardolph. I support the Bill.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—There have not been many years since the war in which Parliament has not had to introduce Supplementary Estimates, and I think the reason for that is fairly plain. Even in our private budgeting it is difficult to make an estimate of any sort. How much more difficult must it be for Governments in these very unstable times? While we regret the need for the Supplementary Estimates, Parliament must have control over finances and see that the money is properly spent. It is the Government's duty to see that Parliament is provided with as much information as possible, and on this occasion it has not been lax. We have been told how the money is to be spent. All departments are growing in importance and their expenditure is increasing. It is regrettable that we have to go outside for key people, and have, for instance, to import teachers from 12,000 miles away. It is a great misfortune that not sufficient people in our State or the Commonwealth are available to undertake this task. Other jobs are apparently more attractive. Many boys are undertaking dead-end jobs instead of training for a profession, as was done in the years gone by. They accept the well-paid jobs now, but this will lead them nowhere. The Education Department is doing its utmost to keep up its teaching strength. Many people enter the department purely from a patriotic viewpoint to help the Government, and they are doing a fine job. The fact remains that there are in the department a number of poorly-trained teachers, and perhaps it is not their own fault. The department is doing its best to get along with them. The educational outlook is not very good. The department is doing its utmost to recruit teachers within the State, but is forced to try to attract people from beyond the State. We cannot criticize the department when it is doing its utmost. There are fewer teachers attending the Teachers Training College now because of the greater attractions outside.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Why don't you attempt to change the policy so that the

younger people with the necessary qualifications are attracted?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—It is easy to say that. It is not the actual pay which necessarily attracts the teachers to the department, but their love of the work. Teaching and nursing are avocations and attract many people who feel it is their calling and duty to undertake such tasks.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—They are penalized economically.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I do not think they are. The teaching profession is better paid today than ever before.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—That is not correct on a percentage basis.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I think teachers will admit they are better paid than ever before, although I admit that there are shortcomings in the department, such as the need for better housing for the teachers in the country and better amenities for suburban schools. All our sympathies go out to the department and the Minister who are doing their utmost to improve conditions. Honourable members opposite have criticized uniform taxation. I can remember our Premier not long ago advocating the return of State taxation, but how much support did he get from the other Premiers? I do not think he was supported by one of them.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—When the Prime Minister told him that he could have uniform taxation back he never made any effort to get it through Parliament.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—He was a lone Premier crying in the wilderness. No other Premier joined with him in advocating the return of taxing powers, and so he had mighty little hope of bringing it about. It was a war measure and a Labor Prime Minister promised that the powers would be returned to the States after the war, but that promise has never been honoured.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You said that the Premiers did not want it.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Unfortunately, some did not. I endorse the honourable member's remarks concerning the absence of Mr. Condon. We are sorry he is not here with us today in his usual place. I wish him a very early return to his Parliamentary duties. One symbol of responsible Government is the power of imposing taxation. A Bill to provide for such State powers would receive

my support. I was very pleased to see that the Government had purchased a property in Rundle Street to provide better accommodation for some of its officers. For many years I have protested that some departments of the public service are badly housed. At last the Government has seen the wisdom of making the recent purchase. It is a very wise move and will provide much accommodation for several departments. The present accommodation is not only inconvenient to the officers, but also to the public.

The Education Department is growing and its expenditure continually increasing, but money for this purpose is money well spent. I should like to see a further advance in adult education, a question which is receiving the consideration of the Minister of Education. We have to look ahead and face up to the new question of automation in industry. To do that we must educate the people and give them an opportunity to learn other trades. The metropolitan technical schools particularly should be kept open in the evenings to attract people to classes so that they can fit themselves for the coming era of automation.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Where will we get the teachers?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Undoubtedly we will get them. I believe that many teachers would not mind giving an hour or two of their time in the evening to teach people to fit themselves for the new technological era and help them to train for some new avocation.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Should that be necessary in addition to the present curriculum?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The present curriculum would not take a person far enough. As far as I know none of the technical schools is in a position to train people to meet this challenge. The University is directing its engineering students along these lines. It is a position we will have to meet and I hope the community will be prepared to meet it when the time comes. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I thank honourable members for the consideration they have given the measure, which seems to have followed the usual course. Once again I emphasize that this is not a Budget, but merely a provision to provide for increases of expenditure in some Government departments. It is not a balance sheet, or an attempt to anticipate revenue and expenditure,

which are dealt with by the Treasurer in his Budget speech. The object is to provide for excesses in certain departments, and is in no way in conflict with the Governor's speech as to how the State's finances will finish at the end of the year. Therefore, I do not feel called upon to usurp the responsibilities or privileges of the Treasurer in explaining where this State is destined to go. I heard certain remarks made in horror as to how our money is being spent because Parliament is asked to grant certain increases in expenditure, 99.75 per cent of which I suppose is made at the request or at the instigation of some honourable member to meet a popular public demand. These things have to be paid for; that is quite usual. I listened with interest to Mr. Anthony's remarks about the Education Department, and after doing so I am wondering what will be the attitude of members who criticized the expenditure and what the future of the country will be when they are asking for extensions to and the overloading of a department that is already more than holding its own with the standard of Australia. If members desire further time I am prepared to give it so that they will understand what they are saying instead of making remarks such as were made in this debate. Nobody feels greater responsibility than I when considering expenditure, and that applies to the whole Cabinet. It is easy to suggest that we should spend this and that, whether on hospital services or education, but it is time there was a little more responsible thinking as to who is to pay for it. I feel rather proud of the fact that in a Budget of over £50,000,000 there has been the necessity for provision of an additional 2 per cent only. I think that is good budgeting, and we should give credit to those responsible that we can achieve that result in such a large expenditure.

Mr. Bardolph mentioned that the Grants Commission was dictating what State Governments had to do. If members perused the reports of that commission they would find it difficult to discover any clause to that effect. The commission was set up to report to the Commonwealth Parliament and make certain recommendations on the results of investigations into the budgets of the respective States. On the one hand there are three non-claimant States, and on the other hand three claimant States. The report indicates the standard of collection for public services, the rates of taxation in certain quarters, and points out for the information of the Commonwealth Government whether the State stands in credit or debit. It arrives at grants which are usually

accepted by the Commonwealth and made to the States. There is never any mention that a State can afford to carry on by having itself debited. As a result of administration we have been able to provide facilities and social services at a very reasonable rate, but we cannot expect to collect money from the Commonwealth while we avoid our taxation responsibilities. If we can do without certain taxation, then we do, but it is purely for Parliament, of which every member of this honourable Chamber has the full responsibility, to see that we either carry out those responsibilities and collect the revenue to do all the things advocated or on the other hand call a halt and see whether we will live within reduced means. I do not think it can be justifiably claimed that the Grants Commission takes over the obligations of this or any other House.

During the debate it was said that we have fewer teachers in training than ever before. The figures that I obtained rather hurriedly indicate that in 1950 there were 679 teachers in training, in 1955, 1,044, and this year there are 1,340. I am astounded that any member of this Council should make such a haphazard remark.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Who said that?

The Hon. SIR LYELL McEWIN—I do not know if the honourable member realized what he was saying, but that was what I gathered out of the discussion. I have provided these figures because I desire to get somewhere near the facts, particularly in view of the trend of expenditure. From page 96 of the report of the Grants Commission, members can inform themselves how our expenditure is going. In relation to education and schools, the per capita payment in New South Wales is 129s. 6d., in Victoria, 107s. 7d., in Queensland, 96s. 9d., and in South Australia, 110s. 8d., so we are above the average of non-claimant States, only one of which has a greater expenditure than we have. We must realize that we have had to curtail expenditure. If I suggested there should be fewer hospitals, would I get any support? Where do we get the money? I think we will need £8,500,000 this year to maintain our present standard, and I leave it to members to decide whether that will be forthcoming.

I do not intend to make a Budget speech but just to mention these few points in order to provoke a little responsible thinking, and perhaps enable members to be in a better position to debate some of these matters when we are discussing the Budget. I am pleased to see that South Australia is holding its own

very favourably in relation to hospitals, both in services and in costs. I think we are the only State at present not charging patients in public hospitals. How long that can continue is another matter, but for the last 10 years no charge has been made in any public hospital in this State. This has been done because of careful and prudent administration. If hospital services are to be extended further we will have to find the necessary staff and money to carry them on. That is all I can say about that matter. Nobody gives his services free; everyone expects payment and has to be paid. The present-day approach is that people should be paid according to their services. If we desire extensions to social services and other Government activities we must be prepared to be confronted with Supplementary Estimates at the end of each financial year. While there is a greater demand made on the Government it can be expected that this will not be the last of such Bills to be presented to Parliament. That is the realistic approach to the measure under discussion. I thank members for their consideration of this matter.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Appropriation of general revenue issued under this Act."

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—When referring to the Education Department the Chief Secretary said that £20,000 was for subsidies and cost of swimming campaigns to be carried out in primary, boys and girls technical and high schools. Is it the policy of the Government or the department that it is to be the responsibility of the State not only to teach people to read and write but also to teach them to swim? Is it necessary that the department should pay to teach all these people to swim?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—The expenditure would indicate that the department has considered it wise that as far as practicable everyone should learn to swim, and that their ability to swim should serve them in good stead in lifesaving where drowning is involved. This campaign has extended fairly extensively over the country. It is quite general now for requests to be made for assistance to establish swimming pools throughout the country as a result of the extension of water reticulation. It has been thought advisable by the department to subsidize the campaign. The Education Department has employed instructors who have taught

children from private schools as well as Government schools. The amount provided for primary schools is £12,000, for boys and girls technical schools, £4,000, and for high schools, £4,000—a total of £20,000.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I am obliged to the Chief Secretary for his explanation, but I would like to say that I am not in favour of this. It seems to me that there are more and more demands for the Government to do everything for everybody. Surely it is the responsibility of parents to teach their children to swim. Is no responsibility to be left to parents? We provide children with free dental treatment in schools, and it seems that the time will come when we will be asked to teach them to eat and drink. I think it is quite wrong, and I protest against it. I do not think it is the duty of the Government to take all responsibility away from parents. There is no argument about the desirability of children being able to swim. The aborigines teach children to swim by throwing them into the water when they are two. I suggest we should try to leave

something to parents, and I therefore enter my protest against this expenditure.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—There is one aspect of this matter which may be lost sight of, and it is that assistance from the Government is in the nature of a subsidy to help people to help themselves.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Not in this instance; it is for the instruction of children.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I took it that Mr. Cudmore's objections were against the Government's giving financial assistance to the teaching of swimming, but I understand this item to be for the establishment of facilities, and I know that is a matter of subsidy so far as the Government is concerned.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, May 17, at 2 p.m.