

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Thursday, June 19, 1958.

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

**QUESTION.****HILTON BRIDGE.**

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Is the Minister of Railways aware of the inconvenience that has been caused to the many people that traverse the Hilton Bridge when going to Hilton and to the Mile End railway yard? It seems that a far greater time has been taken to repair that bridge than is necessary. Can the Minister give any explanation of the time required to complete the work on that bridge?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I regret the inconvenience caused to the travelling public by the very necessary repair to this bridge. Honourable members will recall that there were one or two accidents there, and apart from those accidents it was necessary to reconstruct and strengthen the bridge to carry modern traffic. It would be quite simple to overcome any problem with regard to delay to road traffic by closing the bridge altogether and erecting another one or strengthening the present one. It has been the policy of the Highways Department to endeavour to keep all roads open while it does the actual work of repair or widening, and this has been the policy with regard to the Hilton Bridge. I do not think it is fair to penalize the people who live immediately adjacent to the bridge, and who really need the use of it, in order to make added convenience or to meet the requirements of people who in many cases live five or six miles on the other side of the bridge and who merely choose that access to the centre of the city. I have made three personal inspections of the bridge at peak hours over a considerable period of time, and I would say that the majority of the hold-ups have been due entirely to motorists who disregard the very large sign asking them to keep the Mile End goods yard road clear. When that road is not kept clear and there is a constable in control at the other end of the bridge, traffic is often banked up for up to a quarter of a mile on either side. In those odd cases there is a definite bottleneck and inconvenience to traffic. When that road is kept open there has been little or no inconvenience beyond a wait of perhaps double the ordinary time of traffic lights. As far as I am concerned I feel that the policy has been a correct one. The bridge could have been completed much more quickly

if it had been closed, but we have kept it open and done our best to maintain the flow of traffic, subject to co-operation by motorists in effecting the speedy release of the traffic. I would add further that the bridge is now nearly completed, and the road surface is expected to be dealt with very shortly.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Would the Minister not think it worth-while to work two shifts if any further work on this bridge is required, or three shifts if necessary? I accept the statement of the Minister in regard to the time taken on the bridge, but three shifts could easily be worked on that bridge and that would minimize the inconvenience to ordinary motor traffic.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I think the honourable member's remark is relevant, but I would inform him that due to the shortage of people in the Railways Department on bridge work it would be practically impossible to run three shifts. The job is now almost completed, so I feel that we can leave that to the oblivion of the past.

**APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).**

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

Second reading.

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

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

The Bill now before the House authorises the further expenditure of £627,339. This amount is required for the following purposes:—

Chief Secretary and Minister of Health (Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department), £72,000.—This additional amount is required as the £138,000 provided on the Estimates for the year, due to circumstances beyond the control of those responsible for administration of relief, proved insufficient to meet the needs of those people who through no fault of their own find themselves temporarily out of employment and in need of assistance from the Government. Although the Commonwealth Government provides assistance for persons unemployed its policy that cash relief is not available until an applicant has been registered for employment for two weeks means that in many cases it is necessary for my Government to provide relief during that period. Moreover, earlier in the year there was an influx of transient labour from interstate, especially Western Australia, attracted by the favourable conditions applying in this State, and these people

needed some relief during the period which elapsed between the time of their arrival and the procurement of employment.

Treasurer (Miscellaneous), £368,019.—At the Loan Council meeting held at Canberra in February last the Commonwealth Government made a special grant to the States of £5,000,000 for the following purposes—

- (a) To assist the States' Budgets where necessary in order to preserve as much as possible of the loan programmes for capital works and relief of unemployment.
- (b) To stimulate employment and, wherever possible, to assist the housing shortage.

My Government decided that the total grant would be made available to the Housing Trust for the construction of houses in country areas, the houses to be let at a rental not exceeding one-sixth of the family income of the tenant, with a minimum weekly rental of £1. To carry out this scheme the Government decided to grant £368,019 to the Housing Trust for this purpose. The trust has let tenders for the construction of 101 houses in the following country towns:—Murray Bridge 5, Mount Barker, Penola, Millicent, Naracoorte, Strathalbyn, Peterborough, Renmark, Berri, Barmera, Loxton, Lobethal, Kapunda, Tanunda, Angaston, Gawler, and Clare each 3, Mount Gambier 6, Port Augusta and Port Pirie each 10, Snowtown 2, Balaklava 3, Burra and Wallaroo each 2, Riverton, Jamestown, Crystal Brook, and Port Lincoln each 3, and Gladstone 1. In addition, construction of houses in the following towns is under consideration:—Pinnaroo, Tailem Bend, Bordertown, Nuriootpa, Kadina, Whyalla, Milatton, Maitland, Cummins, and Streaky Bay. A Bill to authorize the construction of these houses will be brought down later in the session for consideration by honourable members.

The people likely to be assisted under this scheme include war widows, deserted wives and families, servicemen's widows, pensioners, and incapacitated ex-servicemen's families. Two designs have been chosen for the houses, each of four rooms. With one of the designs it would be possible to provide a sleepout which would be detached and movable to meet the needs of a large family. The scheme will enable war widows and others in needy circumstances to remain in districts where they are known and will assist in stopping the drift to the city in search of cheap rental houses.

The scheme will be administered by the trust on behalf of the Government and all rents collected will be paid into a fund from which

more houses will be built. No interest is payable on the money provided, and the trust has undertaken to bear from its own funds the cost of administering the houses, but certain charges (including maintenance and insurance) must be met from the rents received. The average overall cost of each house is expected to be about £2,422. For these houses the trust is now holding 67 applications from widows, including war widows; at present only 25 are held for rental accommodation in the metropolitan area for war widows.

Minister of Works (Engineering and Water Supply Department), £77,000.—This amount is required to pay for additional costs incurred in connection with pumping water from the River Murray through the Morgan-Whyalla main. The provision of £147,800 in the Estimates was insufficient to cover costs as, due to the very dry period between the beginning of the summer and May of this year, it became necessary to pump considerable quantities of water from the Murray through this line to supply the Lower North, Middle North, and areas on Yorke Peninsula.

Minister of Education (Education Department), £320.—This provision is to meet an *ex gratia* payment to a widow as the monetary equivalent of long service leave which the Government decided should be paid on the death of her husband.

Minister of Education (Miscellaneous), £110,000.—The £110,000 now set aside provides for an additional grant to the University of Adelaide of up to this amount. The sum of £800,000 was provided on the Estimates for grants to the University, and this additional amount has now become available as the result of larger grants by the Commonwealth Government following the approval given to what has now become known as the Murray Report.

Clause 2 provides for the further issue of £627,339. Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of general revenue for the purposes set out and detailed above. Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to make payments as directed by the Governor's warrant and to be allowed credit for the amounts so paid. Clause 5 authorizes the issue of money other than revenue or money received from the Commonwealth to make good any deficiency out of loan funds or other public funds. I am sure that all the items in the Bill will appeal to honourable members as being necessary.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I support the second reading, and before directing criticism against certain items

I take this opportunity to congratulate Sir Collier and Lady Cudmore on the high distinction recently bestowed upon them by Her Majesty the Queen. We can all pay a tribute to Sir Collier for the work he has done since having been elected to Parliament 25 years ago—work not only for the people of South Australia, but for those of the Commonwealth. He has been outstanding in debate, and very few members have paid as much attention to the business of Parliament as he has. It is one of the most popular honours ever conferred in South Australia. It is well deserved and I trust that Sir Collier and Lady Cudmore will live for many years to enjoy the friendship of their friends.

I regret that there is a reference in the Bill to extra expenditure by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. Departmental costs have increased in many ways, but I think this additional expenditure is due to increased unemployment. We hear and read a great deal about the matter but I do not think we get a true picture of the position by looking at the Statistician's figures. Many people never register at the unemployment bureau for reasons best known to themselves. Undoubtedly we have considerably more unemployed than the figures show.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The statistics show only a 1 per cent increase in this State.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We have heard a lot about the progress made by South Australia and the Commonwealth generally. I do not deny what has happened here but there is more unemployment in these prosperous times than we have had for years.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—Earlier the Minister of Railways said there were not enough men available to work two shifts on some railway projects.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That may be because money is not available.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—It is the men that are not available.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is not the position. The delay in connection with the Hilton Bridge is scandalous. I do not know of any other job in this State where there has been such delay.

Yesterday I raised the matter of the appointment of an Opposition member in this place to the University Council. We are told that this is a non-Party House. These Estimates increase the grant to the University from £800,000 to £910,000. Mr. Bardolph and I

have brought up previously the matter of Opposition representation on the University Council. The Act provides for three representatives of the Assembly and two of the Council. The Opposition does not want to remove any one now on the University Council but if there is to be increased expenditure at the University there should be an additional representative from this Chamber. The Government should amend the Act in order to give representation to the Opposition in this place. Each year Parliament makes a grant to or subsidizes the amount raised for the Adelaide Children's Hospital, which is an institution that should be regarded sympathetically by every member, but the Opposition is not recognized even in connection with that hospital. Often it receives no invitations.

Reference has been made to reports by the Public Works Committee. It is difficult for the committee to make a recommendation that will please everybody. The committee makes its decisions on the evidence submitted to it. What has happened in the last few weeks? The committee submitted to the Government various reports but on three occasions matters have been sent back for further consideration. It made a report to the Government in connection with bulk handling and then outside people wanted alterations made to the scheme recommended by the committee. This type of scheme entails increased expenditure by the railways and Harbors Board.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—The committee's reports are submitted to Parliament.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—They go to the Government and the Government submits them to Parliament. This matter of bulk handling was referred back to the committee, which considered additional evidence. Then it submitted another report recommending what it thought was the best proposal on the evidence submitted. Despite that, the original recommendation was adopted. That is an extra cost to the Government. A certain work recommended for Cadell is now referred back. I could mention one or two other instances. What is the duty of any Committee? First, it should consider the economic position and see if a reduction in cost can be effected. It also has to consider what is best in the interests of the State. It sometimes happens that a scheme may cost twice as much as the estimate.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Is the honourable member indignant about it or not?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is my duty to point out these things. The State has not

the money to spend in every direction. If a decision is altered and work that costs twice as much is continued, then something else has to suffer. That is my point.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—If there is not the money to carry out the first, how can the second be carried out?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is impossible for any Government to carry out everything.

The Hon. C. R. Story—Can the honourable member say anything about a bridge over the Murray?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I shall need notice of that. It is being discussed at present. It is not an easy problem to decide. If seven different sections want a bridge, can seven bridges be provided? We have to narrow it down to evolving the most suitable solution for all concerned. This can cause a few headaches. I fail to see where we could find money in the next few years to construct the hospitals needed for the welfare of the people. The Government is doing a good job in this respect. It realizes the position, that if the rabbit is not in the hat you cannot pull it out. Therefore, when people complain today about many things that they should have, we realize that different schemes have to be considered.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Does the honourable member agree that we are pursuing the right policy in building these very large hospitals?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That may cause much discussion. A general plan is needed. It is no good looking merely to next year; we have to look years ahead and have a plan that will be acceptable for a long time. That costs money, which is not always available. Therefore, in many of these projects we have to move cautiously and do our best. This Government has spent money not only in the metropolitan area but in places such as Mount Gambier and Port Pirie. It is endeavouring to serve the needs of country towns. It is all very well to say, "Yes, but while you are spending the money in one place you are neglecting other places." When the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is completed it will be something of which we shall all be proud. However, as the cost of labour, materials and everything else has increased, there should be a further survey and examination of present-day costs.

The first estimate for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline was £4,000,000; today the cost has reached £11,000,000. Again, the costs for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital may be justified but they have increased considerably. The same

applies to the South Para reservoir. The costs of these schemes entered into by this State are colossal today. A recommendation may be made by the Public Works Standing Committee today but the work may not be carried out for four or five years and during that period of course costs increase considerably. The estimate of cost for the construction of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline was £3,120,000. We are speaking of duplicating not the whole but the majority of that line and there is a sum in the Estimates today. What will it cost today? Whoever thought, when the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline was constructed, that in so short a time we should be asking for duplication.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Would not that fact alone be a reason for resubmission to the Committee?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is for the Government to say but there should be consideration of the matter by some responsible body or person, to check the details. What was the position before the Public Works Standing Committee was constituted? Costs were never checked. Every Government department used to come along and submit to Parliament the cost of work, which was never checked. Today those costs are checked. There should be a further inquiry by some responsible body to consider today's costs as against what they were four or five years ago. I repeat that the costs must be cut down as much as possible in the interests of the economy of the State. It is all very well to come along here every year and talk about Estimates and interest rates increasing but Parliament should take a firmer hand about the expenses of the State.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—You said that the departmental estimates were checked. What means do you employ to check them?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The actual costs could be checked if the Government appointed a committee to do that work, as has been suggested here on two or three occasions. At present the department concerned submits a case, and the Public Works Committee makes its recommendation on the evidence submitted. I think we all appreciate that the Committee has done very good work.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—We are not questioning that, but merely seeking information.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—When the committee makes a recommendation it is submitted to the Government. The committee never hears any more of it, and the work may not be proceeded with for another three or four years.

My point is that although the recommendation is made, by the time the work has commenced the cost may have doubled. I am not blaming the Government for that, because I know it cannot proceed with work if it has not the money. There should be some system of priority in deciding which work is the most important to the State. That must be left to the Government, because no committee has a right to tell the Government that it must get on with this particular work or some other work. A scheme that is of interest to the Attorney-General is the Yorke Peninsula water supply. The cost of that scheme will be considerably more than it was when the committee made its recommendation. The committee should have authority to go more fully into these matters, because it is futile to make a recommendation on a project which in four or five years will cost twice as much.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—In effect, the recommendation the committee makes is not carried out.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In most cases it is, but at an increased cost.

The Hon. J. L. S. Bice—I suggest the honourable member tell the House the history of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and what it has cost the State.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not think there is a better man in a position to tell that story than my honourable friend. The Mannum-Adelaide pipeline has saved Adelaide; there is no doubt about that. I am not questioning the cost, but merely pointing out to the House what the recommendation was in the first place and what the scheme has now cost. As it is, the scheme has shown a profit in certain respects and has done wonderful work. The position is probably not very far off when we will have to duplicate that pipeline. It is now proposed to increase the capacity of Mount Bold. I think there is more water lost through Mount Bold today than is saved.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Is the reservoir leaking?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—My friend knows that it is not leaking. The water is lost because it goes over the spillway. I now turn to the very important question of sewerage. A number of schemes have been recommended but it has been impossible to proceed with them, again because of finance. The committee should be in a position to tell the Government the priority in which these schemes should be undertaken. They vary in complexity in different localities. In some places it is not very

easy, and it has been suggested that in certain low-lying areas the department should charge extra, and that is a matter which has to be closely investigated. A suggestion was made that the matter could be dealt with in another way. Only a few years ago the metropolitan water district showed a profit of about 11 per cent, but today it does not pay working expenses, and the time has arrived when Parliament must seriously consider that position. The money has been lost in supplying water to country areas. I do not object to the country being provided with water, even though they may show a loss, because there is always a big indirect benefit. Therefore, if the people in the country are to have the amenities to which they are entitled, we must provide for them, even if it is costly.

The Harbors Board has done a wonderful job. It is suggested that the reconstruction of the North Parade wharf should be proceeded with. This project was recommended some time ago and is long overdue, and I hope the Government will consider the position. I am not condemning the Government for having introduced these Estimates, but ask it to consider the matters raised. I sympathize with it because it has been unable to proceed with certain works owing to the lack of finance. I assure the Government that members on this side will give every consideration to its desires and support legislation which will be in the best interests of the State.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I join with Mr. Condon in expressing my appreciation of the honour recently bestowed by Her Majesty the Queen upon my Leader, Sir Collier Cudmore. There is no need for me to extol the honourable member. His services in this Chamber and in other spheres have been outstanding. His knighthood is a fitting honour well deserved, and I am sure that all members, as well as the outside public, are very pleased, and hope he and Lady Cudmore will live long to enjoy the honour.

I thought the Bill, which contains only five items, would have taken a different form. The items seem to me not to cover errors in calculation or in the preparation of the Budget, but definitely extraneous matters which cropped up since the Budget was introduced. We are told that £627,329 will be needed to cover the various items. In some instances money has been received from the

Commonwealth Government, and in others evidently the money is to come from State revenue, but the Chief Secretary has not told us what will be the effect upon this year's financial position. In the absence of any official statement, I think the deficit will be greater than was forecast in the Budget. I am surprised and disappointed that £72,000 over and above that estimated is necessary to provide for unemployment relief. I do not consider that South Australia is suffering from a depression, but on the other hand is enjoying reasonable prosperity. Therefore, it is disappointing that it is necessary to provide this amount for charity for the welfare of children and other necessitous people to whom the Government feels it is called upon to give assistance.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—There has been an influx of population.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I agree, and that is the reason for the expense. The amount involved is 50 per cent greater than was considered necessary 12 months ago. No doubt the money allotted has been wisely spent by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. An amount of £368,019 is provided for the building of houses in the country by the Housing Trust. I have no objection to the scheme and think the Government is wise in adopting this policy. The Commonwealth grant is presumably free of interest, which gives the State an asset from which it is not proposed to extract full interest but only sufficient to cover the care and protection of properties. The scheme covers the whole State and is a good one. The money was granted for the purpose of building homes in South Australia, and the State Government has handed it over to the Housing Trust to spend. We cannot get away from the fact that it is a charitable act on the part of both the Commonwealth and State Governments. I am pleased that the additional expenditure incurred in bringing River Murray water to Adelaide is not more than £77,000. It was forecast by the press that there would be an increase in water rates because of the excessive pumping this year. We have had a dry year and without the scheme the water position in Adelaide would have been desperate. The benefit derived from the extra expenditure is satisfactory indeed.

The sum of £320 in connection with the Education Department is an ex-gratia payment following legislation passed last session.

It is only a small item. There is to be additional expenditure of £110,000 on the Adelaide University. For some time this institution has been demanding additional money every year. The two Houses of Parliament are represented on the University Council and these representatives know what the University proposes in effecting improvements. I represent this Chamber on that council and I think the additional expenditure of £110,000 is justified. Recently the Murray Commission appointed by the Commonwealth Government investigated the position of all universities in Australia and I think the Adelaide University has done well following the presentation of the report. For years Mr. Rowe was Vice Chancellor and he was most active in the development of the University. He has now retired after giving 10 years of service and I think it was one of the best 10 years of service ever rendered by a Vice-Chancellor.

When I was first a member of the University Council the expenditure was about £400,000 to £500,000; now it is about £1,000,000. The report of the Murray Commission recognized the work done at the University over the last 10 years. I think the development there has been greater than at any other University. The grant to be made to our University will not be as great as to universities in other States. It trains top men in the sciences and arts but there is another field of training where institutions are necessary. I refer to the technological people who serve industry without being top men. Consideration should be given to this type of education. If it were left to me I would say that these lower grades are even more important to the State than the top grades. I do not depreciate the value of these higher grades but the development of technological knowledge in South Australia seems to warrant more consideration than it has received. The Commonwealth universities are to receive increased grants, but in the second grades of education there is reduced expenditure. This type of education is necessary for the development of industry. Although I am pleased that the extra money is to be spent at the University, the expenditure in relation to the income of the State is getting higher and higher. It is a matter that will have to be carefully considered. I am surprised that there has been no additional expenditure to cover increased costs in other fields. I presume, therefore, that the costs outlined in the Budget last year have been sufficient and if that is so I congratulate the Government on the control it has exercised

over its finances during the 12 months. Items in this Bill are mostly not a burden on State taxpayers but deal with Commonwealth grants. I support the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the second reading and join with other members in offering felicitations and expressions of goodwill to Sir Collier Cudmore, who was the recipient of a high honour from Her Majesty. I endorse the kind sentiments expressed for him and Lady Cudmore and hope they will have a long life to enjoy the honour bestowed upon them.

I do not propose to go into detail in discussing the Bill but there are one or two observations that I want to make. The Chief Secretary explained the increased expenditure by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. Sir Frank Perry said South Australians were living in an era of comparative prosperity. I do not gainsay that but the unemployment figures are illuminating. The total number of persons unemployed in Australia at May 30 was 65,964, of which 45,331 were men and 20,633 women. The total in South Australia was 5,163, of which 3,586 were men and 1,577 women. It has been suggested that this increased number is due to the arrival of persons from Western Australia, but it does not add up for me that 5,163 people came to South Australia in order to get relief.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—It was not said that they all came from Western Australia.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is clear to me that in actual fact the picture of prosperity continually painted by the Premier is not correct. Those on unemployment relief in South Australia number 2,085.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—How many under Labor Governments? Give us the whole story.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am coming to that. I do not completely blame the present Government. The major portion of the blame for the unemployment situation in Australia can be clearly laid at the door of the Menzies Government, and this Government is of the same political complexion. I say that because the Commonwealth Government today controls the purse strings of the Loan monies to be handed out to the States for developmental and public works. That is the financial dictatorship, exercised by a Liberal Government, controlling what developmental work shall proceed in the respective

States. Honourable members know the stand I have always taken with regard to the Loan Council, the Financial Agreement, and the activities of the Grants Commission in its approach to and consideration of the claims of the mendicant States.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—They have not been too generous.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—They have not been generous. We have reached a stage in our democratic governmental set-up and our Parliamentary institutions where the major power of governing a State or country is in the hands of a few people like the Grants Commission, who are not responsible to Parliament or to the people of Australia and yet who are the people to determine what action shall be taken in developmental or other work in the mendicant States.

I pay a great tribute to the Children's Welfare Department which will receive £72,000 of the amount that we are asked to pass this afternoon. The department does excellent work but another side of children's welfare in South Australia is the work carried out by the denominational orphanages operated by the respective denominations. The Protestant children's homes do work of equal value in protecting and guarding our young people who, through no fault of their own, come from broken homes or who perhaps because of the death of their parents become orphans needing care. That applies to other denominational orphanages but there is no provision in any Act of Parliament whereby these people can be assisted in capital expenditure on extensions of their respective buildings or in the maintenance and continuation of their particular work.

A laudable project that has been established here, which I do not think has been equalled in any other part of Australia, is the Polish Orphanage in Royal Park conducted by the Sisters of Resurrection. Some sections of the community criticize our New Australian citizens but the Australian Labor Party has always welcomed them because they have come largely from Communist-ridden countries to this fair land of Australia, of which South Australia is a part, to breathe that clean air which we free-born Australians breathe now. When they came here they decided to build an orphanage for those young children—in many cases orphans—who were brought out by their relatives and then, as their relatives' families grew in number they found it was necessary to have some haven where these children could be protected and cared for. Be it to their eternal

credit, the Polish people of this State contributed £10,000. The orphanage received by way of mortgage £16,000 from one of our banks in order to complete the building. It has been completed and they are caring for 35 little mites there, not only Polish children of their own particular denomination but children of similar ages of every denomination.

I know the financial trials those nuns suffer but, in spite of that, the orphanage is open and is receiving young future Australians and caring for them. They find themselves in this position. Having borrowed the £16,000, it is beyond their present resources to meet the interest commitments. The bank concerned has been most considerate. It has extended from time to time the interest payments. As interest payments accumulate they have to be met and the bank in this case has been most considerate in connection with the work carried out by these nuns. I have searched the statutes in connection with this matter but can find no provision whereby these denominational homes can be assisted by the Government unless it be by some *ex gratia* payment. I mention that today in the hope that the Government, when an approach is made, will consider this matter and give the necessary support to alleviate the difficulties I have mentioned.

As regards housing, I have always expressed the opinion that the Housing Trust is one of the most efficient housing authorities in Australia on the constructional side. Its administrative side may be open, in some instances, to criticism but on its constructional side it has no peer in any other State. It is supreme in its constructional and building ability and planning. In that respect this Government is most fortunate.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—They established it?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I know they have established it. The Government must agree that it would not have been possible to establish the Housing Trust and give it all the powers that it enjoys and utilizes had it not had the support of the Opposition both in another place and here. This Government is most fortunate in having such an efficient Housing Trust and can bask in the reflected glory of the efficiency of that trust. The measure before us today in dealing with the small amount for the building of these homes brings to my mind the necessity of carrying out an expansive policy of decentralization in South Australia. A glance at the figures of the total populations in the respective capital

centres reveals an alarming position. At the last census at June 30, 1954, the total population of Australia was nearly 9,000,000. In the six capital cities there were no less than 4,817,000 people. Thus, 54 per cent of the total population was crowded together. I will not weary you by quoting the figures for all the capital centres but Adelaide's population at that date was 484,000, or 61 per cent of the population of South Australia. From 1947 to 1958 not only did the population of every capital centre increase in numbers but it increased proportionately within its own State.

Lack of decentralization policy has not been mentioned by the Government in this proposal. We are living in a changing world, in an atomic age, and every conference held, whether in the United States of America or in Great Britain, comes to the same conclusion. *The Times* of London published a report after one of these conferences saying that the only way to deal with the atomic danger was to dig in or get out. Now it has gone further than that for the particular area which may be the subject of bombing. Every scientist and person who is capable of speaking on this issue with some authority indicates now that the only secure and safe way is to adopt a policy of decentralization, that instead of concentrating on our coastline and capital cities, which have become overcrowded, we should get out into the various areas where the damage will not be as vast as it would be in a densely populated centre.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—But if the Government does that it will lose its stranglehold on many of the country seats.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I can conceive that but apart from that aspect of it we come to the economic side. There has been much ballyhoo over the radio and in the press about the township of Elizabeth. Honourable members will remember that some members of the Premier's own political Party rejected the Bill when it was first moved and it was through the good graces again of the Opposition in the Assembly and here that the Bill was passed. Having constructed many homes in Elizabeth the Government then had a look round for the establishment of some industries. Then we read and heard that General Motors-Holdens had bought so many hundred acres from the Housing Trust for the purpose of setting up a section of their manufacturing works in that centre. That may be all very well, but what about some of our country centres? One that springs



readily to mind is Wallaroo. I may be told by persons representing that area that it is not necessary for me to intrude my views; but the Vehicle Builders Union led a deputation to the Premier asking whether the Government would attempt to establish some portion of General Motors Holdens industry at Wallaroo, particularly as it possessed a deep-sea port unequalled elsewhere in Australia.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—There is only a depth of 26ft. at Wallaroo.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes, but that is quite sufficient to accommodate vessels of the tonnages that will come to Australia.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—I do not question that.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—If the honourable member wants to get technical about navigational matters he should attempt to become more conversant with the subject. I compliment the new member for Wallaroo in the House of Assembly (Mr. Hughes) on his activity in approaching the Premier and fighting for the establishment of industries in that district. It is to be hoped that something will be done for that area.

I believe in maintaining our existing institutions, whether they be the Parliament, University or the School of Mines. The University is doing and has done a most useful and efficient service over the years. Sir Frank Perry stresses the necessity for the payment of the proposed additional amount of £110,000 to it. The Adelaide University is one of the most richly endowed in the British Commonwealth, but because some endowments are from long-term loans at low interest rates they do not bring in enough to cope with existing exigencies. If this additional money is to be granted, not only members of Parliament but a financial expert representing the Government should also be represented on the University Council.

Sir Frank referred to the laudable work performed by the Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Rowe, but we may never find another Mr. Rowe. The next Vice-Chancellor may have a vastly different policy from Mr. Rowe, but if a Treasury official is represented on the council we will be fully informed of how the money Parliament votes is spent. We do not know why this amount is required. The Chief Secretary merely referred briefly to the Murray report.

During the war the Chifley Labor Government granted the University a large sum on a pound for pound basis for its building programme. I do not think the University or this Government was asked to repay that

money. This Government may claim that the increased building accommodation was necessary because of the influx of returned servicemen to the various faculties and that as a result it was purely a Commonwealth matter, but nevertheless the buildings are now there and stand to the eternal credit of that particular Labor Government. It is time this Government took stock of how money is being spent at the University. Recently students' fees were raised and I do not oppose that because it seems to be the tendency to increase prices these days.

This Government should seriously consider establishing—not necessarily immediately—a second university at some centre because the present economic working of the University is not in accord with the activities being carried out. I am not decrying any of the professors. There was a time when the professors received extremely low salaries and I raised that matter in this House. Whatever money is spent on education, so long as it is spent wisely, is not wasted and while we give money by way of grants to the University it should be commensurate with the money given to the School of Mines. It is all very well for the Murray report to suggest largely cutting out finance to the School of Mines, but as Sir Frank Perry pointed out this afternoon education of a technical nature is just as important as the academic training supplied at the University. I hope I will have an opportunity of further elaborating on this topic later.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—I do not propose to make a lengthy contribution to this debate nor do I intend to exercise my privilege of digressing from the actual content of the Bill and the Supplementary Estimates themselves except to join very sincerely with other members in expressing my congratulations to my colleague, the Honourable Sir Collier Cudmore, on the honour the Queen has bestowed on him. I shall not go into details on that because my own feelings, and I think those of other members of this Chamber, were so well put by Mr. Condon that the best thing I can do is adopt everything he said.

The Supplementary Estimates are redolent to me of one thing, and that is the Government budgeted well this year, and as I think Sir Frank Perry said, the items we are here to deal with are really supplementary items in that they could not be anticipated when the Budget was cast, and in every case have arisen since that time. The Chief Secretary gave

very clear explanations that were satisfactory to me of the details, and I think the only thing missing was that he could not tell us what the deficit was likely to be. I used the word "deficit" rather than "surplus" because I have seen references in the press to this matter, and it seems that there will be an over-all deficit, although not of a great amount.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Have you had a look at the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I heard the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, but I did not know we were debating the Address in Reply at the moment. I intend to reserve what suggestions I have to make to the time when we are dealing with the Address in Reply, because I believe that is the proper time to make suggestions of general import and moment, although I do not know that they are always accepted, and indeed I do not know that anyone ever looks at them again, but at least one can try to see if one can make any impact in respect of matters of moment to the individual member.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Speak for yourself.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I will speak for myself, and I will not refer to flour milling, but keep purely to matters before us. The first item in the Supplementary Estimates relates to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department and, as the Chief Secretary explained, mainly relates to unemployment relief. In common with other members I regret that there is a need for further assistance in this regard, although in relation to the magnitude of assistance for unemployment, or what that assistance could be if unemployment became really bad, the amount on the Supplementary Estimates is only a comparatively small sum, I am thankful to say. Certain members of the Opposition have referred, in this House as well as in other places, to unemployment, not only in this State, but in Australia generally, but they are very prone to exaggerate these things, not only here, but elsewhere. Mr. Bardolph mentioned something about there being no politics in what he was saying, but I am inclined to think there are politics in the exaggeration of unemployment in this country. None of us like to see any unemployment; we would like to see every person who is employable in employment, not only in some employment, but in employment to his own liking, but it is one of the misfortunes that the jobs available do not always match the labour force at the time.

If we had statistics before us we would probably find there are more jobs vacant than

there are unemployed, but unfortunately the capabilities of those unemployed are not always the particular ones required for a particular job. If members compare the length of "Situations Vacant" columns in our two daily newspapers with the length of those columns last year they will find there are more situations vacant today than 12 months ago, at least as far as advertising is concerned. This does not altogether bear out some of the cries of unemployment we hear from time to time. Our Government is supplementing the Federal scheme for the relief of unemployment, as the Chief Secretary explained, in the interim period before the Federal grants are available, which in my opinion is very desirable because naturally these people have to be tended and cared for until the Commonwealth unemployment benefit is available.

The item relating to the Housing Trust is a major one, but we all know how important housing is. It is of fundamental importance to everyone and if money is available for it, and the need for housing still exists, which of course it does to a very great extent, I am sure every member approves of the expenditure of money in this direction. The explanation given for extra expenditure on the Morgan-Whyalla water main was that there was greater pumping than expected on account of the exceptionally dry season we have just gone through. That explanation is, of course, fully acceptable because nobody could anticipate that the season could be as dry as it was, and I think the Government is to be congratulated on the fact that, despite all the pumping on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, no further money or grant is required in connection with that line, because the Estimates have apparently carried sufficient funds for that purpose.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—It was anticipated that pumping would be necessary.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—Yes, and rightly so, and I think the Government is to be congratulated on anticipating that work to the extent that it did, because I think the pipeline continued pumping a good deal longer than most people expected. As members have previously said, what a boon that pipeline has been to Adelaide, because if we had not had it we would have had by far the worst water restrictions Adelaide has ever had. I do not think there can be any doubt about that.

I do not propose to comment on the minor item under the Education Department, which speaks for itself. I would just like to make

passing reference to the major sum of £110,000 granted to the University. The Minister explained that that was in consequence of the Murray Report, which as we all know came out after the Budget was cast, and I think both the Federal and State Governments can be congratulated on acting so promptly in relation to that report. The Federal Government immediately accepted it and took major steps toward implementing it. This State Government is now following suit. The Adelaide University is a great credit to this State and, if my recollection of the report is correct, that was more or less acknowledged by the Murray Commission, which said that the Adelaide University had done a wonderfully good job in all the circumstances. Like everyone else, they are always asking for more money but I think they have been well done by. If one looks at the magnificent buildings of our university—the newer ones as well as the old—one sees that they bear out my statement that the university physically is a credit to the city of Adelaide and the State of South Australia. Further, I believe that what goes on inside the university by way of academic life is a great credit to it.

I have compared the Bill before us with those of last year and the year before. This Bill is identical with that of last year except that this one contains no reference to fruit fly, because this year that matter was anticipated in the Budget itself, whereas last year fruit fly recrudesced rather unexpectedly. Much work has already been done in that regard this year. Indeed, if one compares this year's Bill with last year's and that of the year before not only does one find the words identical, but each word is in its identical place in each line. That is not only a compliment to the printer who has been able to set out the words so accurately, it is also a compliment to the draftsman of the Bill that he has remembered to alter in every instance the words "nineteen fifty-seven" to "nineteen fifty-eight" and that he has remembered to alter in every instance the figures, because those things are easily overlooked.

I am reminded of a telegram I received, when I was Lord Mayor of Adelaide, from a visiting high dignitary who had just left Adelaide. It was to the effect that he thanked the Lord Mayor of Adelaide for his reception; that he found the city of Adelaide a beautiful place to visit; and that he wished the Lord Mayor of Adelaide to kindly convey his grateful thanks for the welcome given him by the citizens of Perth. That is the type of error a draftsman

may fall into and, although the secretary of that dignitary apparently altered "Perth" to "Adelaide" in three instances, he missed the fourth one; but in this Bill the draftsman has made no such error and it is all technically very much in order. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I will not follow the example of Sir Arthur Rymill who, after commencing his address this afternoon by saying that he would not delay the House to any extent, spoke at some length. I have very little comment to make and will certainly not take half as long to say nothing as Sir Arthur did. I desire, however, to make one or two comments. I have listened with interest to the comments by previous speakers and the explanation given by the Chief Secretary on the first item in these Estimates which provides for monetary relief, medicines and other things. We have heard comments in this House from time to time that there is very little, if any, unemployment in this State, but we now find that it is necessary to incur additional expenditure of £72,000 to help in some measure the distressed people who apply to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, the main reason being that they are unemployed.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—You say that, but the Bill does not say that.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The Bill refers to "monetary relief," but the explanation given by the Chief Secretary uses the phrase "unemployment."

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—I do not think £72,000 indicates much unemployment.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I admit that it is only a drop in the bucket, but it gives the lie to the fact that we have no unemployment. The policy being followed by the present Government in this State has aggravated the position. Although it does not come out with a policy of retrenchment in the various departments, it commenced to do so as far as the Engineering and Water Supply Department was concerned, and it was only because of strong representations not to retrench employees that many of them were found work at Port Pirie. One must admit that work was found for them, but a policy of retrenchment had been started and it was only aggravating the position. We find the self-same thing today at the Islington workshops; there is actually no retrenchment there, but there are no replacements either. Tradesmen at the workshops previously had a mate or tradesman's assistant,

but today they cannot get that assistance because no other men are being employed to fill those assistants' places. The position is being aggravated at Islington by the leasing out to private industries of work which could and should be done by the staff at Islington.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—What is wrong with that?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—A lot. We have in this State a workshop which is fully equipped with machinery and which can be fully staffed if so desired to do any class of work which is required in our railways. In addition to that, it would be considerably cheaper for the Government to carry out its own work than leasing it out to other industries. For instance, the workshops would not have to pay the tax on steel which a private industry has to pay, and over a period of, say, 12 months that item alone would amount to a considerable sum. We have the experienced tradesmen at Islington who understand the work and what is required; they do not have to learn the work. They are carrying out some repair work on the diesel engines, but there is no reason why those diesels could not be built at Islington in the first instance because there are skilled men there to do the job. The materials must be available, and for the life of me, I cannot understand the policy which is being followed at present, unless it is to bolster up private industry. It is assisting employers in other States and having the opposite effect here, and it is adding to our expenditure on these items.

Another item under the heading "Minister of Education" relates to long service leave, and this brings me to a criticism which I desire to make regarding the Public Service Act. Under this Act long service leave is not a right but a concession, because the Act merely says that the Commissioner "may" grant long service leave. There have been instances where an employee has completed as much as 20 years' service, and perhaps just before reaching the retiring age he has done something which in the opinion of the heads of the department warrants severe disciplinary action and perhaps dismissal, and irrespective of his service he has no right to long service leave. That seems wrong to me. I consider that once an employee has qualified in years of service, nothing that he does in the future should deprive him of that right.

Private industry in this State is governed by the Commonwealth Arbitration Act and the Industrial Code, and the courts determine the working conditions. At the moment there

is an Act relating to long service leave in private industry in this State. The greater number of employers in this State have agreements with the trade union movement, and when an employee has completed his qualifying period under any award or determination, he is entitled to long service leave irrespective of what he does.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Which do you think is better: the State Act or the Federal Code?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—At the moment I am not discussing that question. I made my contribution when the Long Service Leave Bill was before this Chamber, and I have no intention of going back to it. What I am pointing out is the inadequacy of the long service leave conditions in the Public Service Act. I was hoping that some time in the future the Government would take some action in this matter, but I listened attentively to the Lieutenant-Governor's opening address and heard no mention of any proposed amendment to that Act. I feel that Government employees should be treated in the same way as a private employee is treated, and after they have completed a certain qualifying period they should become entitled to the appropriate long service leave. Quite recently my notice was drawn to the case of an employee who reaches the retiring age this month. This man is an employee of the Harbors Board, and he would have completed 10 years' continuous service with the board by the middle of August. He has had previous service with the Government, but because it was in broken periods it is not recognized for the purpose of long service leave. He was informed that on reaching 65 he had to retire in accordance with the Public Service Act. He made representations to get long service leave, but was told that as he had not completed 10 years' continuous service he was not entitled to it.

I made representations on his behalf to the Minister and received a reply that one might expect: "The Act lays down certain conditions, and although we may have a borderline case here, we would have other borderline cases there; it is very unfortunate, but nothing can be done." I feel that an injustice has been done to an honest employee because he was not allowed to complete 10 years' service, although he had only about another six weeks in the Government's employ to do so.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Which Act would you alter?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The Public Service Act, under which this man is employed.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Can he be employed after he is 65?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I do not see that it is mandatory for an employee to complete his service at 65, because we have known instances where employees have been retained after that age under special circumstances.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Recently, too.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—This employee was told the retiring age was 65. I made a suggestion that it might be possible to forget that he had reached 65 until he had finished 10 years' continuous service. Then it could be remembered that he was 65 and he could be retired. Surely discretion could have been used in this case. If the Public Service Act provided for *pro rata* long service leave this man would have been entitled to nine-tenths of the long service leave due after 10 years' service, and he is justly entitled to that. I hope that the Government will examine the Public Service Act in the near future because there are other anomalies in it which I shall refer to later this session. I was interested in a question and answer given this afternoon about the Hilton Bridge, if one can call it that because some people now call it "the big dipper." The Minister was asked whether he could indicate when the work on this bridge would be finished because it has taken a long time to do about 100 yards of it. The Minister of Railways had an inspection made of the work because of complaints he had received about it.

The Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore—On a point of order, Mr. President, is there anything in the Appropriation Bill which touches on the Hilton Bridge or the expenditure of any money there?

The PRESIDENT—Under the Bill we are considering, honourable members may talk about anything they like and my ruling is that the honourable member is in order.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—This bridge is a death trap in its present condition. If I can avoid travelling over it I do, and so do many others. The danger is not greatly aggravated, as the Minister said it was, by motorists not taking notice of the signs. This bridge has become one of the main inlets into the city from the Adelaide Airport. It may not be used much by buses from the airport, but it is by people going to and returning from the airport and by other vehicular traffic from the west of the city. About seven-eighths of the roadway is closed, so there is only a

small portion over which one can drive. Motorists have to use extreme care if they use this bridge.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How long has the road been blocked now?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—For the last 10 months that I know of, and it may be another 10 months before the present work is completed. If there had been an earlier inspection and closer supervision of the work much of the trouble could have been avoided, especially if one-half of the bridge had been reconstructed at a time. The Minister said the difficulty could have been overcome by closing the road and completing the bridge. That would have been much better and resulted in less inconvenience to motorists. I would hate to be the police officer stationed on that bridge to regulate and control the traffic. Between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. a great volume of traffic passes over the bridge and cars are banked up for a considerable distance. Something must be done to complete the work soon.

I have other criticisms that I could put before the Council, but it may be more appropriate to voice them later in the session. The Supplementary Estimates contain a reference to the Housing Trust's country housing scheme, with which I wholeheartedly agree. However, the amount provided, £368,019, is not a large sum because there is still a great demand for houses, and it is just as great in the country as in the metropolitan area. The rent of Housing Trust homes should be decreased. If these homes came under the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act the same rentals would not be charged. There is no control over the rents for trust homes. I do not consider that up to £3 15s. a week should be demanded for a five-roomed trust home. Surely the amount of capital now flowing back to the trust in rentals would warrant a reduction. I know it can be argued that the cost of trust homes in the country is affected by the transport of materials and other added costs, but I still consider that its homes could be provided at lower rentals. The considerable amount being returned to the trust in the form of rentals should be sufficient to more than meet interest on capital, and leave a handsome profit. Trust rents should be periodically reviewed.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—Honourable members have taken the opportunity during the debate to refer to matters of particular interest to them, and these will receive due consideration by the Government. Criticism has been directed to

the line providing funds for unemployment relief. It seemed to me that these speeches suggested that the amount was included because of the serious unemployment situation in South Australia. When introducing the Bill, I thought I explained that such was not the case, but that our position is healthy. It is rather a coincidence that although we enjoy this condition we have unemployed. This position has been created because conditions were not so good in other States and consequently there was an influx of people from those States seeking to better themselves. A natural corollary is that there must be some delay in their getting established in new employment. A considerable proportion of the amount was used to take care of these people, who had come here, not because conditions were not good, but because they offered something brighter than they enjoyed in their own State.

It was stated that I had not given sufficient information to the House as to the effect of the Supplementary Estimates upon the budgetary position. I did not think it was necessary to reiterate something which had already been communicated to the House very clearly by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, who delivered a most interesting address at the opening of this session. For the benefit of those who apparently did not hear it, I draw their attention to His Excellency's remarks appearing in paragraph 23:—

My Ministers expect that the deficit on Revenue Account for the current year will not exceed the amount estimated in the Budget. Most of the money included in the Supplementary Estimates has been provided by the Commonwealth Government, and therefore expenditure in unforeseen directions has been reduced

to £259,000. That is upon a Budget of more than £70,000,000. So, it indicates excellent administration for the year, especially when we have in mind that the value of wool for the period declined by about £130,000,000 to £140,000,000, our wheat yield was only about half the usual harvest, prices for primary products declined and markets were unfavourable; and yet our budgetary position has not been affected to any serious extent—the amount involved represents one-third of 1 per cent of the Budget figure. This is really an outstanding result in a year when we could say that things had been unfavourable. We had almost a record low rainfall, coupled with unfavourable markets.

I gathered from the remarks of some honourable members that they agreed that the financial results had been satisfactory, and that there was no need for criticism of the Government because it had been forced to ask for an additional amount. I thank honourable members for the attention they have given to the debate.

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

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON TOWN PLANNING APPEALS.

A message was received from the House of Assembly agreeing to the Council's resolution and intimating that the Assembly members on the Joint Committee would be Messrs. Coumbe, Stephens and Fred Walsh.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, at 2.15 p.m.