

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, June 11, 1959.

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

QUESTIONS.**LAND TRANSACTIONS OF ALIENS.**

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—The 1945 amendment to the Law of Property Act dealt with the subject of regulating transactions for the sale to aliens of estates in land and that Act makes it an offence for anybody to execute any instrument in connection with the conveyance or transfer of land to an alien unless the instrument bears a certificate from the Honourable the Minister of Lands consenting to the transaction. For hundreds of years, it has been a requirement of our law that for a contract for the sale of land to be valid the sale must be in writing and signed by the person to be charged. We therefore have the anomalous position that, although it is necessary to have a signed contract to create a valid and enforceable transaction, it is, under this Act, an offence to sign such a contract until after the Minister's consent has been obtained. This has made dealings with aliens difficult as, every day out of sheer legal necessity, contracts are being signed in contravention of the Statute, with consequent problems arising as to the validity of such documents. Can the Attorney-General say whether, if it is not the intention of the Government to repeal this legislation, the Government will consider supporting a simple amendment to this Act to enable contracts for the sale of land to be signed with aliens but subject to the Minister's consent?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—There are two parts to the question, the first of which is whether it is the intention of the Government to repeal that section of the Law of Property Act which was enacted in 1945. Sometime ago, the Government considered that matter and decided then that it would not repeal that section but, if the honourable member wishes, I am willing to refer that aspect to the Government for further consideration. The other point raised is the holding up of contracts until such time as the consent of the Minister of Lands is obtained. I know from my own experience the difficulties that that produces and I am willing to take up with the Parliamentary

Draftsman the question whether an alteration of draftsmanship may be made to get over the difficulty.

RENMARK-PARINGA ROAD.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—In 1956 the road between Renmark and Paringa was to be raised and sealed, but the 1956 flood caused a postponement of that particular project, and the department found it necessary to prepare new plans so that the 1956 flood level would be maintained. As it is 1959 now, I ask the Minister of Roads whether he can say when that road will be raised and sealed?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am afraid the honourable member's question caught me briefly and, although I have not the information in front of me, I advise the honourable member that the department intends to call for tenders for the two bridges on the Paringa causeway within the next financial year. At the same time it is possible that the road works associated with those bridges will be continued. It is realized that the priority of the North-of-the-River road is our main means of access in case of flood and it is essential to maintain that. It has only been delayed up to the present by virtue of the two bridges in Renmark which have had to be reconstructed.

BUSH FIRE RELIEF SCHEME.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I draw attention to a letter that appeared in the press on May 25 about the bush fire relief scheme. The letter stated that in the Kalangadoo area there was made available some 3,500 bales, estimated to be worth up to £1,000, of hay as a gift to the relief scheme. It also arranged for 30-odd labourers and five lorries to have it carted to the fire destruction scene. They got these five lorries and some 30-odd labourers to do this work one Sunday and sent away the five lorries. About two hours later, while still awaiting the return of the lorries, they had a telephone call to say that officialdom had stepped in and stated that it must be carted by railway and not by road. Does the Minister of Railways know anything about this occurrence and can he say whether his department or his officers were responsible for the action taken on that occasion?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The honourable member informed me some time ago that he was likely to ask a question about this matter, and I have endeavoured to obtain information upon it. The only information I have available is from the Commissioner of Railways, who advises that following a meeting of Cabinet on January 21, 1959, advice was received from the Under Secretary that railway freight charges on items for the South-East account relief of distress arising from the recent bush fires in that area would be borne by the Government. Instructions were issued to the staff covering this advice as well as similar advice concerning the Port Elliot and Victor Harbor areas. I understand that the original relief organization at Mount Gambier was administered by a clerk of the district council, and subsequently taken over by a Bush Fires Relief Committee and later still by the Department of Agriculture. This department had no knowledge of the instance referred to in the letter addressed to the *Advertiser* by Mr. R. K. Kidman. It can only be assumed that the directions to use rail transport for the remainder of the hay were issued by the administrators of the Bush Fires Relief organization at Mount Gambier. In fairness to the honourable member, I realize that that is not a very satisfactory answer to the specific question about who stopped the carrying of this hay by road transport, which is not controlled by the Transport Control Board down there. I am at the moment instituting inquiries to find out why this occurred.

FRUIT FLY CONTROL.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—My question has to do with fruit fly control, which affects to a degree the southern areas I represent. I believe that in at least one other State, following on the ascertainment of a certain outbreak of fruit fly in an area, the trees are stripped of fruit and the follow-up treatment is used whereby they tackle the remains of the flower of a rose bush, technically termed a "rose hip," and they get rid of these rose hips in an area as a preventative of further hatching of fruit fly eggs. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture say whether that procedure is followed in this State or not?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am not aware whether the procedure is followed in this State

but I will refer the question to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, and let the honourable member have a detailed reply.

COST OF OPPOSITION TO BASIC WAGE CASE.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Can the Minister of Industry say how many of his officers were employed at the recent basic wage case hearing to oppose an increase in the wage for employees, and what was the cost of that representation?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—None of the officers who were present at the hearing in the recent basic wage case were employed to oppose the increases. The purpose for the attendance of the officers was to place certain facts and figures before the Commission. If the honourable member looks at the record of the proceedings in that matter he will see that the Government did not set out to oppose the application. Since we did not set out to oppose the application, there was no cost to the Government of doing so.

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 provides an amount to adjust the deficiency that has occurred over the year's administration. It is interesting that, in a Budget representing some £54,500,000, which was approved during the last session, we should find at the end of the year that the provisions that have been caused by some emergencies represent only a little over 1 per cent. I think that reflects credit on the Treasurer and his staff in their budgeting for the State's activities over the year.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Why bring politics into it?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—There would be no Parliament without politics. The honourable member sometimes gets confused as to the difference between politics and Party politics. I am relating facts which have nothing to do with politics.

During the year the Government has had to meet certain expenses which were not provided for in the Estimates and which could not be provided for from the Governor's Appropriation Fund owing to the extent of the amounts concerned.

This Bill authorizes the Government to make those payments and gives appropriation for the amounts so expended. Clause 2 of the Bill provides for the further issue of £646,715 out of the general revenue of the State to meet the expenses set out in the Bill. Clause 3 appropriates the amount set out in the Bill for the following purposes—

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH: POLICE DEPARTMENT, £30,750.—This amount is required to meet the increases in salaries and wages agreed to by the Government for the Police Force after preparation of the Appropriation Bill last year.

SHERIFF AND GAOLS AND PRISONS DEPARTMENT: £12; CHIEF SECRETARY—MISCELLANEOUS: £332.—These small amounts are set down to provide compensation for employees of the Government; in the first instance to an employee whose property was damaged by a prisoner, and in the second case to an employee of the Railways Department to reimburse him loss of wages, travelling and medical expenses incurred through injury received in going to the assistance of a police constable who was in difficulty in attempting to arrest a man who was violently resisting arrest. Included in the £332 is also a reward of £50 which was made to the railway employee.

MINISTER OF LANDS AND MINISTER OF REPARATION: MISCELLANEOUS, £3,800.—This amount is required to purchase some land at Mount Lofty for the purposes of the Botanic Garden.

MINISTER OF WORKS: ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT, £64,700.—The sum of £700 is for an *ex gratia* payment to an ex-employee in lieu of long service leave, and the remainder is required to meet costs of pumping water from the River Murray through the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline in excess of the amount provided in the Appropriation Bill last year. Owing to the abnormally dry period during the first part of the year the Department has had to resort to much more pumping than was allowed for when the provision was made in the last session of Parliament.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION: EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, £383,000.—This provides £150,000 for salaries of teachers engaged over and above the number which was allowed for in last year's provision, and £165,500 for additional boarding and book allowances which were increased by the Government early this year for students attending primary, technical and high schools. A further £48,000 has been set aside to cover increased boarding and book allowances for students at private schools.

An *ex gratia* payment of £750 is being made to a member of a school committee who was injured whilst performing voluntary work in connection with the committee. A further £5,000 has been provided for scholarships to enable the number of Intermediate bursaries and Intermediate Technical scholarships to be doubled and increased boarding allowances paid to scholarship holders.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION: MISCELLANEOUS, £58,896.—This additional amount will be paid to the University of Adelaide as an increase in its general purpose grant, enabling the State to claim from the Commonwealth the maximum amount of Commonwealth grant for university purposes this year.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS: PRODUCE DEPARTMENT, £48,825.—The freezing works at Port Lincoln were required to slaughter a larger number of sheep and lambs this season than was anticipated when the Estimates were prepared and this amount is necessary to pay wages and other expenses incurred in doing the work.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS: MISCELLANEOUS, £56,400.—Provision has been made to meet charges incurred by Government departments in fighting bushfires and to meet cost of rail freights and wharfage charges on gifts of fodder and clothing made by the public to people who suffered hardship in the fires. An amount of £50,000 is included in this provision as the Government's contribution to the Lord Mayor's Bushfire Relief Fund, 1959. The Commonwealth Government has also signified that it will subsidize the amount contributed to the fund by the State Government.

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 gives power to issue money other than revenue or money received from the Commonwealth Government out of Loan funds or other public funds to make good any deficiency in the Revenue Account brought about by the payments authorized by this Bill. I commend the Bill for consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—The Chief Secretary has given us a very full and good explanation of the lines of expenditure concerned and I feel it unnecessary to go further into detail. I think he has

made out a case for the Bill and I support it. I agree that for the Government to get within one-half of one per cent of the original Budget is a triumph of budgeting, particularly in these days when there are so many variable factors it is almost impossible to anticipate. I have heard older members of this Council say that many years ago there was no necessity for Supplementary Estimates. That may or may not be so. They have also commented that this seems to be an annual event now. I consider that the present method is a good one. If the Government budgeted to cover everything without having a supplementary grant, it would simply mean that items must be padded to cover unforeseen contingencies and I do not believe in that. I have had some experience in local government from time to time in dealing with an inflated budget, and I do not think that is a good way of handling finance. I far prefer the method the Government has adopted in estimating for what it can foresee and then approaching Parliament for additional funds at the end of the year if and when the occasion arises.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—That is like an open cheque.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—It is not. It is the reverse. We know what a flurry there is at the end of the financial year to spend surplus moneys, and if there is too much in hand it means possibly that the money will not be spent in the best direction.

The main item in the Bill is for the Education Department, for which a large sum is spent each year, and I believe well spent by the present Government. The additional grant asked for on this occasion is about five per cent, and that is the only large percentage increase. Particularly in view of what the Chief Secretary said about additional teachers being employed, it is pretty good budgeting to get as close as that. I congratulate the Government on its financial result for the year and in achieving substantially the budget it provided for.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—For a considerable time it has been found that the amounts provided in the Estimates do not prove to be sufficient because of unforeseen circumstances. In several departments money is required for additional salaries and wages. Unless that is to meet rises granted during the year, it occurs to me that that is an item which should be easily determined when the Budget is presented. Officers are on set

salaries, and I should like to know why in so many instances increased funds are required to meet increased salaries and wages.

Another part of the Bill deals with two instances where *ex gratia* payments were made. One relates to a very courageous person who went to the assistance of a police officer involved in most unfortunate circumstances last year. I am in accord with the fullest award being given to anyone who is sufficiently public spirited and has sufficient manliness and courage to assist officers of the law if they require it. I can never comprehend what kind of intelligence a person has when he sees a police officer being manhandled, not only by one, but sometimes by two or three hooligans, yet makes no attempt to come to his assistance, as he should as a responsible member of the community. The sum that has been awarded in this case was earned and would have been justified even had it been much larger. Another *ex gratia* payment was made to an injured member of a school committee. I do not know the circumstances, but presume that the person concerned was rendering service to the department in his capacity as a member of such a committee. I sometimes feel that in these circumstances the fullest investigation should be made before we are too free in handing out *ex gratia* payments. I am not suggesting for one moment that it was not fully justified in this case, but it seems to me to lend itself to the possibility of people thinking that they are entitled to some recompense or reward for services they render. However, as in this case it was giving service to the community through the Education Department I think it is quite justified. I support the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I rise to support the Bill, but I protest at the way these financial Bills are placed before Parliament and the indecent haste with which the Government desires them passed. Towards the end of each financial year when Parliament is called together we always have a number of these measures placed before it, with the request that it is a matter of urgency and that the Government will not brook any delay in the discussion of them. The amount we are being asked to pass today has already been spent, but the fact remains that Parliament could have been called together earlier and these financial proposals submitted so that members could review the items now before them.

It is all very well for the Chief Secretary to say that it is essential that this amount be passed. Over £500,000 is involved, and whilst he eulogized the Treasurer in the reflected glories of the activities of the Treasury, the fact remains that the Treasurer has a responsibility to the electors of South Australia; we in turn also have a responsibility to electors because public money is being expended and we are, in effect, charged with the responsibility of being the watch dogs in that direction.

I say not that this money has been spent wrongly, but that over the years the respective departments have appeared to look upon Parliament merely as a rubber stamp concerning the items that are submitted to us from time to time. The Government has had ample time to call Parliament together instead of rushing these measures on the first or second day of sitting and expecting us, in the compass of one or two hours, to pass over £500,000 contained in the measure before us.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—In the very few years I have been in Parliament I have been intrigued at the repeated suggestions of the indecent haste with which things are done in Parliament. Members always talk about indecent haste on prorogation night, but after all, the business of this House is absolutely in the hands of members.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Don't delude yourself on that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—We have plenty of time to deal with the business, and there is no reason at all why we could not come back next week if the honourable member really wished to do so.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—I am quite agreeable, but I do not think it would suit many country members.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I should have thought that for one who was so worried about indecent haste on this particular Bill the honourable member would have prepared something in order to give the House some real benefit of his knowledge. I think that a Government that can get to within less than 1 per cent of a £54,000,000 Estimate is not doing too badly when we consider that several determinations have been made during the year. For instance, the Teachers Salaries Board has awarded increases, and there are many other things that have been itemized for us. The Treasury and the departments handling their particular Estimates have done a very good

job. I cannot see where this so-called indecent haste comes in because, as I say, there will be plenty of time to deal with items later if we wish.

I was pleased to see the *ex gratia* payments on these Supplementary Estimates and I, like previous speakers, pay a compliment to people who are prepared to come forward and very often risk their own lives, as this particular gentleman did. I agree that people who are prepared to do this sort of thing should be properly compensated.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Wasn't the £9,000,000 passed yesterday to pay wages and salaries?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I think that those who wanted to speak yesterday were given plenty of opportunity, and I think most who spoke put their case to the best of their ability. I am also pleased to see that more money is provided for education. I do not suppose we shall ever see the day when there is not an ever-increasing demand for education. Included in these Estimates is an amount for school bus hire. The Government can never fix, from one year's end to another, the amount required for the hiring of school buses because the routes are changed from time to time and special allowances have to be made to contractors. I do not see how we can get very much closer in these Estimates on that item.

A further amount of £15,000 is provided for the Port Lincoln freezing works. We all realize that primary production is one of the most important parts of the economy of this State, and although secondary industries are a nice adjunct to our economy, we should never forget that primary produce makes this State and gives it a stable economy.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—That used to be so years ago, but not now.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I do not think things have changed very much. Maybe we have spread a little glitter on the lily, but I do not think the lily has really changed very much, and I still believe that the primary production side is the one which we should develop in order to see that our economy is stabilized. I compliment the Government on getting to within less than 1 per cent of the Estimates. We have had an extremely good year. The deficit of approximately £1,500,000 this year will mean that our Treasurer will have to ask the Federal Government for a little larger cut from the turkey. The State's power of raising its own revenue is extremely

restricted, and it is the Federal authorities that we will probably need to look to for a little more assistance to balance our Budget. I have very much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I certainly cannot agree with Mr. Story when he suggests that we have had plenty of time on these matters and that every honourable member in this Chamber has had time to examine and study what is before us. The purpose of the suspension of Standing Orders is to enable an explanation of the various items before us to be given by the Minister himself. We should all have plenty of time to examine these items and prepare anything we may wish to say upon them. As it is, the time available is limited. Now that the resolution to suspend Standing Orders has been moved to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without further delay, it would be inappropriate at this stage to suggest that we adjourn the matter. I would sooner move the adjournment of the debate rather than support the Bill at this stage but, if I attempted to do that, I could imagine what would happen.

If honourable members new to this Chamber desired to contribute something to the debate, at this stage they would not know anything about the subject matter before them. They have had no previous experience and so would be at a great disadvantage if they tried to make a useful contribution this afternoon. The only alternative they have is to sit still and say nothing. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Bardolph who protested about the haste in pushing these money Bills through. We cannot do anything about it. It is becoming known that the Legislative Council acts as a rubber stamp. That is how we act when dealing with money Bills, whatever happens.

It has been said that the Government could be complimented on attending immediately to the matter of increased salaries and wages. The £9,000,000 passed for Supply yesterday was mainly for the purpose of paying salaries and wages until Supplies can be passed by both Houses later. We passed that yesterday.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—No.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Then what was the £9,000,000 for?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—It was a Supply Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Before us today is an item "Salaries and Wages." In the

last Parliament certain sums were budgeted for salaries and wages for the various departments. There has been under-budgeting. That is a natural corollary to what has occurred. It should have been possible to budget for the correct amount, even for salaries and wages. Apparently, we must have budgeted correctly, or over-budgeted, for salaries and wages because no line appears here for "Salaries and Wages." "Salaries" is not listed under "Miscellaneous" either. It is a corollary that adjustments must be made. Two salary increases have occurred in the Public Service. One is an increase of 15s. in the basic wage (approximately 11s. 3d. for females), and the other arises from a recent determination by the Public Service Board. Officers on the higher ranges will benefit, not the others, by the Board's decision. All it has done is to bring salaries in South Australia approximately on a par with those paid over a period in other States. If the lower paid public servant gets anything out of it, he will be lucky. He will, of course, get the 15s. basic wage increase if he is over 20 years of age.

Under "Minister of Education" there is a sum of £150,000 for various items bundled together. It would be impracticable to itemize all of the additions required for such things as maintenance, reimbursement of travelling expenses, excessive board, etc. One item is "School Book Allowances." At the last election the Government announced that there would be an increase in book allowances for all school children. It did that to offset the policy enunciated by the Labor Party, which said that, if it were returned as the Government, it would legislate for free books for all school children. In answer to that, the Government said, "We shall not do that, but we shall increase book allowances to all school children." The impression was that all school children would benefit by an increased book allowance if the Government was returned. The Government has been returned and is, to some extent, giving effect to its announced policy. If everybody in this State had believed that all children who previously received the allowance would benefit from the Government's promise, they would be sadly disillusioned because many students in South Australia do not get a book allowance at all. We understood it was going to be for the benefit of all school children.

As I understand the position, unless a child obtains his Intermediate certificate, he gets no book allowance. If a child continues at

school without that certificate, even if he gets his Intermediate certificate at some time in the future, he has lost his opportunity of qualifying for the book allowance anyhow; he does not get it even then. There may be brilliant students who, as far as the Intermediate standard goes, could obtain seven subjects with seven credits, but they must obtain a pass in one particular subject irrespective of how many others they pass in and what standard they reach: It is imperative to obtain a pass in English before a certificate can be obtained. By not qualifying for a certificate, he immediately becomes incapable of benefiting from a subsidy for school books, which was previously £4 and is now £8. He is debarred from any future book allowance. Many parents did not know that previously, but they know it now. The Government makes a statement that it is going to double the book allowance, but we find that restrictions are involved.

An instance was brought to my attention today of two children who had sat for their examination. Claims were made upon the department. One was granted, the other was not. An inquiry was made and it was said, "One child has got his certificate; he passed in English." The answer was, "No. Although his marks were obtained in the other subjects, they were so high that it was considered he should have an opportunity of going on instead of being kept back." It was decided that a mistake had been made. The first child who had been given a grant was then informed that he was no longer entitled to it because a mistake had been made, and so the grant was taken away. It is wrong to supply subsidized school books for school children as under the Government's policy, with strings attached. If we want to set the standard up to Leaving, Leaving Honours or right through to the conclusion of their education, let us say so and stick to it, with no strings attached. The Government should come straight out and say they are paying £8 a year as a book subsidy and that subsidy should be given to all students.

Over a period of years we have had Supplementary Estimates brought before this Council each year and the amount involved is increasing each year. Why? Is it because the Government is not correctly budgeting in the first instance or is it because expenditure has suddenly increased during the year? Whatever the reason is, the fact remains that each year the amount involved in the Supplementary Esti-

mates is increasing. Possibly if the Government introduced a system of parking meters it could derive revenue in that way and prevent this sort of thing.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition) moved—

That the debate be now adjourned.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (4).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, F. J. Condon (teller), and A. J. Shard.

Noes (14).—The Hons. Jessie M. Cooper, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, G. O'H. Giles, A. C. Hookings, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin (teller), A. J. Melrose, F. J. Potter, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, C. R. Story, and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I did not intend to speak this afternoon but after listening to the Deputy-Deputy-Leader of the Liberal Party I desire to say a few words. What I have said all along has been established: This is not a House of Review but a House of politics. The two Bills we have discussed occupied a number of hours in another place and the discussion went into the night, but when they come to this so-called House of Review we are expected to pass them in five minutes. How can members ally their consciences with that? I repeat what I said yesterday: let us not be so hypocritical.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Your colleague, Mr. Bevan, says it does not matter because we have no power.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—My honourable friend started this and if he starts anything here I am obliged to go on with it. This Council has to recognize this: that Bills relating to sums amounting to £647,000 should be seriously debated. Yesterday the amount involved was £9,000,000, yet how many members spoke on the question of spending that amount of money over a period of three weeks? I say they are not concerned.

My chief reason for rising is to make a strong complaint on a matter that concerns the Chief Secretary. During a previous session this Council passed a Bill authorizing the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner of Police. That appointment has not been made. Why? Earlier when a Commissioner of Police was appointed from outside the Police Force I expressed myself in terms that did not meet

with the approval of members opposite. Now, in all fairness, I desire to compliment the present Commissioner of Police who has done a fine job. However, I still ask why, after Parliament has passed an Act authorizing the appointment of a Deputy Police Commissioner, no appointment has been made.

Parliament should always have the greatest admiration for members of the Police Force because generally they do a wonderful job. I ask again: why the delay? Has it occurred to allow time for somebody to get out of the road or is there some particular person who has to be appointed? Some years ago a Commissioner of Police was appointed three years before he reached the retiring age. He was subsequently granted an extra term of five years and I think it is well-known that terms generally expire 12 months before retirement. Why do we have all this favouritism? Is it because a certain man is not worthy of the position? I have heard many rumours on this subject, but I prefer not to be guided by them, but to have an explanation from the Chief Secretary to satisfy me.

Whatever is said on this subject members cannot get away from the fact that this House passed a Bill authorizing the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner of Police and that appointment has not yet been made. I do not intend to carry the matter any further at present, but I feel that the police deserve an explanation.

I now come to an item the Minister of Industry and Employment shelved this afternoon. Every time a case is before the Federal Arbitration Court to improve workers' conditions and wages it is opposed by the South Australian Government.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—That is not a true statement.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is, and the Minister will have his opportunity to deny it. In the last two cases before the court Mr. Chamberlain, Q.C., represented the Government to oppose any increase in wages, and did not the Government send him over recently to oppose a 23s. a week quarterly adjustment? My honourable friend will say that Mr. Chamberlain went over there only as an observer. While he was there he conferred with other representatives who were opposing the increase. What did it cost the Government to send him over? From my knowledge of industrial matters, this Government has

always sent an officer to the Federal Court to oppose any application by workers. I do not think I have a better friend in this House to support me in this than Mr. Shard.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—The Government has never sent an officer over to support an increase.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is so.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—The Government need not have implemented the recent basic wage increase if it had not wanted to, but it did so immediately, and this is all the thanks it gets.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It was compelled to do it by law. Can my honourable friend deny that on every occasion an application is made to restore quarterly adjustments or for an increase in the basic wage the Government does not oppose it? The Minister is silent.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—You have changed your grounds to quarterly wage adjustments. You were not speaking on that a moment ago.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not change my grounds. The Bill provides for a further grant to the Adelaide University which I heartily support. On several occasions I have advocated additional Labor representation on the University Council and have always been told that the Government would consider it. The Government is spending a huge sum every year to keep the University on its present high plane, and to do that there should be additional Labor representation on the council. That is not done because this is a House of politics. By the division held this afternoon we can see what can be expected in future. Although I do not blame honourable members for voting as they desire, do not let them throw dust in the people's eyes. I now come to the question of conditions at Port Lincoln, which has been a losing proposition. Until an attempt is made to rectify the position, losses will continue on the West Coast.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—What is the remedy?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Extra works, probably at Wallaroo and Port Pirie.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—How will that improve the position at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Reduce the cost there and not allow the place to be idle so

much as it is today. I ask honourable members to study the Auditor-General's report showing what has happened at Port Lincoln over a period of years. I realize that there must be provision for works at Port Lincoln, but what has to be realized is that we cannot get shipping to go to that port. I congratulate the Government on the very fine job being done in establishing the Cadell prison farm, which will be an acquisition to the State. This afternoon I was refused the right to have the debate adjourned, and undoubtedly it will not be the last time. This Council should no longer be called a House of Review.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I am glad to be able to congratulate the Government upon the remarkable and very creditable degree of accuracy attained by the Treasury officials in estimating the State's annual expenditure in such a way as to need such a small supplementary increase. One gathers from some speeches this afternoon that some honourable members have had no experience of the extraordinary difficulties associated with budgeting for expenditure in big businesses. For a business the size of South Australia with its huge expenditure, to budget to such a narrow degree of accuracy is extremely creditable. These Supplementary Estimates are an annual event, but that is only to be expected. We are to be congratulated, because it is only the natural outcome of the very rapidly expanding and healthy business of the State. If our prosperity were going downhill instead of up then it is possible that the amount in the original Budget would not be spent.

I listened with little gratification to speeches, delivered by some honourable members who are not at the moment present, in which they complained volubly of the way these matters are placed before the House and of members being asked to agree to them without sufficient time to consider them. I would not be very proud if people thought I had made such a statement. The public has the idea, fostered by the cheaper press, that Legislative Councilors are not worth their pay because they sit on so few days a year. They work out the number of hours the Council sits and how much an hour members thus receive, but I remind the public that members do not work only on sitting days. They are kept busily occupied in the affairs of the State through-out the year. I assume that every honourable member agrees with that, because the alternative is to say that we work only on the days Parliament is sitting. The acceptable corollary is that we

should know what is going on in the State's affairs, and the fact that the expenses incurred in the development of the State and the carrying on of its affairs have been exceeded by £500,000 should have been quite apparent to us long before the introduction of these Supplementary Estimates this afternoon.

I think it was the Honourable Mr. Bevan who expressed a welcome to new members and some sympathy with them at the lack of time and the haste with which these Estimates were put through. I also wish to welcome the new members, who during yesterday and today have had an opportunity to listen to very typical speeches by our friends from the other side of the Chamber. I think that every member of the Opposition who has spoken is capable of a much more constructive type of speech than he has favoured us with on this occasion.

One line on the Estimates concerns the Botanic Garden, which has acquired some land at Mount Lofty. Going through the Botanic Park this afternoon—and I am striking while the iron is as hot as it can possibly be—I noticed much clearing and thinning out of the trees in the main body of the park in progress. I am very much afraid that some of those old antiquated gum trees will fall before those clearers. I know those old trees have no great beauty; they are not symmetrical, and to the people who do not understand them they appear dangerous, but some of those trees may be bordering on 1,000 years of age. People have written in the press about trees like the famous old gum tree at Glen Osmond being 100 or 200 years old, but I know of trees, and you do too, Sir, (some of them on my own property) whose age is very well-known; although they are well over 100 years old they look like saplings, and some of the older ones on the property must be well on towards 1,000 years of age.

I think that merely because these trees are not symmetrical and not of themselves things of great beauty it is a shame to chop them down and fill their places with exotic trees. It is right in our own Botanic Park that we should preserve some of these ancient trees that can never be replaced, at least not in the foreseeable future. I hope that these remarks will be heeded by the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture or whoever it is that controls the Botanic Garden, and that if it is not too late the axeman's hand will be held and these old trees preserved. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN 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.

The Public Purposes Loan Act, 1958, provided £1,000,000 for the purpose of making advances to home purchasers through the State Bank pursuant to the provisions of the Advances for Homes Act. This Act was amended in the last session of Parliament to increase the maximum advance permissible under the Act from £2,250 to £3,500 with a 15% deposit, and £3,000 with a 5% deposit. The amendments to the Act were assented to by his Excellency the Governor, and came into operation on December 1, 1958.

Since that date 2,180 applications have been lodged with the Bank by persons desirous of taking advantage of the more liberal advances provided by Parliament. Prior to the passing of these amendments applications for advances under the Act were received by the Bank at an average rate of approximately 26 a week, and over a period 1st December, 1958 to date this weekly average has increased to 78. Of the 2,000-odd applications received by the State Bank 1,911 have been approved—1,325 under the Advances for Homes Act, and 586 under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The Bank still has just over 700 applications which it is investigating as fast as possible. Loans are only made for the erection or purchase of new houses, no re-financing of homes being undertaken for some time as the funds available are all required to provide for new homes.

From July 1, 1958 to date over £1,500,000 has been advanced by the Bank under the Advances for Homes Act. It is estimated that advances made for the year will total at least £1,700,000 against a provision in the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1958, of £1,000,000. It is also estimated that at June 30, 1959, the State Bank will have undertaken commitments on loans approved pursuant to the Advances for Homes Act but not fully advanced at that date amounting to over £1,300,000 compared with a normal commitment in past years of approximately £300,000 to £400,000. It is therefore desirable that Parliament should appropriate the moneys required to meet these abnormal commitments. The total of £1,550,000 is therefore required to enable the bank:—

- (a) To meet advances totalling £700,000 over the amount provided in the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1958; and
- (b) To be provided with funds to meet its above normal end of the year commitments. Provision of this amount will ensure that all funds provided for next year will be available for additional new homes.

I believe that the amendments to the Advances for Homes Act which increased the maximum permissible advance have not only materially assisted the building industry, which was slowing down at the end of last year, but have also enabled many people who could not previously finance a home to now obtain the necessary funds to build or purchase a new home for their families. To provide the funds necessary to enable the bank to carry on with the advances required until June 30 this Bill empowers the Treasurer to arrange for the borrowing of £1,550,000. This amount will be used in the following ways:—

- (a) £700,000 for advances during the financial year ending on June 30, 1959, will increase the amount provided in the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1958, from £1,000,000 to £1,700,000.
- (b) £850,000 will be paid by the Treasurer to the State Bank to be held by the bank and applied by it in payment of commitments on loans approved pursuant to the Advances for Homes Act but not fully advanced as at June 30, 1959.

During 1958-59 the Government is finding, for the purpose of making advances to home owners through the State Bank and through building societies, over £4,000,000. These advances are being made under the provisions of the Advances for Homes Act and the Home Builders' Fund provided for under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Clause 6 gives the Treasurer power to borrow a sum of £90,000 which has been advanced by the Treasurer pursuant to the Public Finance Act for the purchase of school buses by the Education Department. The authorizing of this amount by Parliament will enable the cash reserves of the Treasurer to be reimbursed the amount already advanced for the purpose indicated. Clause 7 provides the appropriation necessary to make the payments authorized by this Bill. I commend the Bill for consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition) moved—

That the debate be adjourned.

The Council divided on the motion—

Ayes (4).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, F. J. Condon (teller), and A. J. Shard.

Noes (14).—The Hons. Jessie M. Cooper, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, G. O'H. Giles, A. C. Hookings, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin (teller), A. J. Melrose, F. J. Potter, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, C. R. Story, and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Members of another place want to get home and perhaps are wondering how long we will keep them, so I do not want to delay this matter, but my opinion is fast gathering that this is not a House of Review, but a House of Party politics. A Bill was introduced this afternoon for the expenditure of £1,000,000, and the review by this Chamber took 2½ minutes, so members should not be hypocrites and say this is a House of Review; they should admit that it is a Party House.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.9 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 21, at 2.15 p.m.