

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Thursday, August 27, 1959.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**SUPPLY ACT (No. 2).**

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the Act.

**QUESTIONS.****METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY.**

Mr. HAMBOUR—This morning's *Advertiser* contains the following statement by Mr. I. R. Elliott, General President of the South Australian Dairymen's Association, in connection with the need for a vigorous promotion programme to increase milk sales:—

Mr. Elliott urges Lakes area producers not "to take up the task" before it is necessary "in fairness to those within the city milk area who are committed to a big investment in land and premises whose return should not suddenly be reduced."

The matter has also been referred to the Metropolitan Milk Board. In view of the fact that the producers mentioned in the article are receiving 6s. 4½d. per lb. for butter fat, will the Minister of Agriculture ask the chairman of the Milk Board to consider protecting producers who are receiving less than 4s. 6d.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I am not quite clear on the connection the honourable member made between producers receiving 4s. 6d. and those to whom Mr. Elliott was referring. As a general statement I can say that producers in the Meningie-Narrung area have known for some time that they are likely to be brought into the metropolitan producing area after a certain period, which will be some time ahead so they will have an opportunity to put their dairies in proper condition to meet the added requirements of hygiene that the whole milk supply of Adelaide will demand. That has been arranged, although the date has not been specified.

**STUART ROYAL COMMISSION.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In view of the adjournment of the Royal Commission on the Stuart case, will the Premier state whether the Government will see that a further respite is granted to Stuart, who otherwise would be hanged on Monday?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Normally it would be the duty of the solicitor for Stuart to apply to the court for that to

happen. I presume that that action will be taken, but as far as I know it has not been taken yet, although it has been the subject of a conversation between myself and the Crown Solicitor, and I presume action will be taken, probably tomorrow. The respite would not be opposed by the Crown.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Regarding the statement made in the House by the Premier yesterday I ask him whether, as neither the statement of Mr. Brazel, Q.C., nor the statement of Mr. Travers, Q.C., in any way justifies his representation to this House that "the suggestion emanated from the Law Society that if the Government would be prepared to drop the third term of reference in the inquiry there would be no difficulty then in counsel being available for the speedy resumption of the hearing," he will explain to the House why he made a statement of that character? Will he also explain why Mr. Brazel, Q.C., should have agreed publicly to reveal a confidential inquiry from the president of the Law Society without obtaining Mr. Travers' consent, and is it a fact that the communication he received from Mr. Brazel was in an envelope marked "strictly confidential"?

The SPEAKER—Does the Premier wish to reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, I always like to oblige my young friend. The reason I made that statement was that Mr. Brazel, who had been negotiating with Mr. Travers, the president of the Law Society, authorized me to make it. I referred it to him before I had actually made it and it was contained, of course, in the document that he had submitted to me. If the honourable member wants a little more confirmation, I have some legal documents about this matter that have appeared over various signatures. I do not wish to weary the House with them, but if the honourable member is desirous of having them I shall tell him what the Law Society has written to me this morning. I think members would require a little legal advice to understand what it means, but I shall read it and they can make the best they can of it. Perhaps the honourable member at some stage in his career might advise me. This is what the Law Society says this morning; this is the latest position:—

Until its special meeting held at 4 p.m. on Wednesday, August 26, the Council of the Law Society had not considered, nor had opportunity to consider, the text of the statement made by you in the House of Assembly on August 25 concerning this Commission.

The Council had not, in fact, considered and resolved upon (nor had any reason to consider or resolve upon) any policy in respect of the particular matter dealt with in your statement wherein the question of provision of Counsel for Stuart is related to the elimination of "the third term of reference."

It is therefore not correct (as reported in the *Advertiser* of August 26) that any "suggestion" or "statement" was made by, or "emanated from," the Law Society upon that matter.

Having now fully considered the text of your statement as reported in the *Advertiser*, the Council of the Law Society wishes to make the following observations:—

1. At no time has the Law Society decided or suggested that "the third term of reference" should be eliminated.

2. The Society has at all times been ready and willing to assist in any way within its powers and competence but, as you mentioned in your statement, it was not competent for the Society to assign, nominate or engage Counsel to represent Stuart whilst he still had solicitors acting for him. A resolution to that effect was passed by the Council on Monday August 24 and reported in the press on the following day.

3. At no time has the Society suggested, or held the view, that the elimination of "the third term" and the provision of counsel to act for Stuart were in any way inter-dependent.

4. It seems possible that some misunderstanding may have arisen out of a confusion between, on the one hand, a particular question concerning counsel and, on the other hand, some question in general terms relating provision of counsel to "the third term of reference."

5. The particular question apparently arose from the urgency of continuing the proceedings. It was seen that fresh counsel would face a lengthy task in becoming familiar with the entire proceedings up to the adjournment before they could be ready to continue. Thus an obvious choice of counsel would be Dr. Bray, Q.C., and Mr. C. H. Bright who had already been concerned with the proceedings. But all legal men realized the full significance of the fact that these counsel had been retained by Mr. J. D. O'Sullivan in his personal capacity and, therefore, they could not also act for Stuart if any possibility existed of Mr. O'Sullivan being personally involved.

If no such possibility existed, Dr. Bray, Q.C., and Mr. Bright would not only be immediately available, but would also be more readily able to co-operate in the speedy continuance of the commission. Furthermore, by reason of their ability and experience there would be no possible question of Stuart's interests not being adequately represented.

6. Nevertheless, though that particular question may have involved a connection between counsel and "the third term," such a connection is not a matter in which this Society has any concern and that particular question does not, to any extent, warrant any inference that in general terms the provision of counsel could be conditional upon elimination

of "the third term" or that this Society would advocate anything of the sort.

If you desire to have any further comment on the subject either personally or through Mr. Brazel, Q.C., the Society will be happy to assist upon request.

Frankly, I do not know what that means; but I do know what this means—and this is another document that I received this morning. It is a copy of a letter from Mr. Brazel to Mr. Travers, and it was sent to me (not marked "Confidential") for my information, so I presume it is fair comment. It states:—

Dear Sir,

I have received your letter of August 26, 1959, and thank you for your courtesy in sending me copies of your letters to the Premier. One of these letters charges me with a breach of confidence. This charge is untrue. We had, if you remember, five conversations, three on Friday, one on Saturday and another on Sunday. During Saturday's conversation you mentioned a number of things which you asked me to treat as confidential and you have my assurance that I kept faith with you.

You then asked me—and again on Sunday—to make your request of the Premier in relation to the terms of reference. It was that only—and the reasons for it in brief—which I conveyed to the Premier. It passes my understanding how something could remain confidential between you and me which you wished me to convey to a third person, namely, the Premier. Had you wished your request to remain confidential between the Premier, yourself and myself, I would have expected you to say so, but you did not. In fairness to myself, I am sending a copy of this letter to the Premier. I decline to comment any further upon the contents of your letters.

That letter bears out clearly what I said yesterday. Let me quote again from Mr. Brazel's communication a statement that the honourable member apparently could not see, and I point out that Mr. Travers appears in this matter as the President of the Law Society. Mr. Brazel reported to me as follows:—

Mr. Travers concluded by reiterating his request of the previous day that the Government be asked to eliminate term 3 from the terms of reference and thus render it unnecessary for Mr. O'Sullivan to testify.

Mr. Dunstan—That has nothing to do with an undertaking by counsel.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Quite frankly, I believe that the Law Society's executive has considered this matter since and has made it quite clear in the letter I read today that they are not officially asking for the term of reference to be excluded. All I am saying is that the statement I made in the House was absolutely correct in the terms of instructions that were given to me.

Mr. DUNSTAN—After reading a letter from the Law Society, which makes no difference to the position, the Premier read a section of Mr. Travers' statement which does not say that "the suggestion emanated from the Law Society that if the Government would be prepared to drop the third term of reference in the inquiry there would be no difficulty then in counsel being available for a speedy resumption of the hearing." If the Premier has any justification whatever, in communications that have been given to him, for that statement to the House, will he please read it to the House, and if he has not, will he apologize to the House for his statement?

The SPEAKER—Order! Does the Honourable the Premier wish to reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yesterday I placed all the documents in my possession before honourable members, and they can make up their own minds upon the relevant questions. As far as I know the question as asked by the Leader of the Opposition in the first place was answered completely and correctly with the information that was then in my hands, and that information has been obtained with the greatest of care, and before a witness, from Mr. Brazel. The Crown Solicitor was present when Mr. Brazel conducted a conversation with me and Mr. Brazel has since concurred that the matter has been correctly reported in Parliament. In those circumstances I do not think I will comply with the honourable member's request on this occasion, although I like to oblige the honourable member in his various idiosyncrasies.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In the report the Premier gave to the House yesterday of the letter he received from Mr. Travers, this is what appeared:—

What I specifically deny—quoting from the proof copy of your remarks—is: "The suggestion emanated from the Law Society that if the Government would be prepared to drop the third term of reference in the inquiry there would be no difficulty then in counsel being available for a speedy resumption of the hearing."

Do I understand the Premier correctly in understanding him to say that Mr. Travers has stated an untruth in that denial?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am always anxious to help my friend. What has been outlined quite clearly in the correspondence I have read today and previously is that there is a considerable variation in the accounts that have been made to me of what was said by Mr. Brazel and what has been reported to me by Mr. Travers. Mr. Travers

said that the position was that he made that suggestion as a method of helping out without the Law Society's having sanctioned it.

Mr. Dunstan—He didn't even make that suggestion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I discussed this matter with Mr. Travers and he does not deny he made that suggestion.

Mr. Dunstan—Not in that form.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member is now assuming that he understands what transpired in a conversation at which he was not present.

The SPEAKER—Order! This matter cannot be debated in question time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Brazel gave me an account of what had transpired and I gave that account to the House. Subsequently, Mr. Travers gave me an account of what transpired and I gave that account to the House completely unabbreviated, and I think the House can decide which account is correct. In helping members to do that I have given them the official account of the Law Society which talks of particular matters and general matters which, incidentally, does substantially show that this question was considered in relation to the question of Mr. O'Sullivan's not having to give evidence.

#### INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF EGGS.

Mr. LAUCKE—An article in yesterday's *Advertiser* headed "N.S.W. Move on Interstate Eggs," stated:—

Interstate eggs will soon be brought under N.S.W. State control, it was announced today. State Cabinet decided to amend legislation on recommendations by the N.S.W. Egg Board. Interstate eggs, mainly from S.A. and Victoria, are usually cheaper than N.S.W. eggs. In future, interstate eggs will have to comply with State regulations on storage, packaging and display.

Has this report been brought to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture and, if so, can he inform the House of the effect this amended legislation will have on the movement of eggs from South Australia to that State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will consider this question and give the honourable member a report on another sitting day.

#### TORRENS RIVER BEAUTIFICATION.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I notice that the Adelaide City Council is carrying out beautification of the Torrens River bank by laying out another golf links south of the present Municipal golf course, and that the South Australian Brewing Company has done a

remarkable job in beautifying the river bank west of the Hindmarsh bridge. I have heard indirectly that arrangements have been made between the Government and the City Council for the beautification of the river bank between those two points. Has the Premier any information on this subject, and, if so, can he tell me the nature of the beautification?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no knowledge of that matter, but I assume that it would be entirely under the control of the Adelaide City Council. I know of no public money being available for that purpose.

#### PROPOSED PLYMPTON HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—During the debate on the Loan Estimates I raised the question of the acquisition of certain land for the proposed Plympton high school. The Treasurer said he would obtain a report, and I ask him if he now has any information on this matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Speaking from memory, the matter came up for decision by Cabinet only early this week, and is now in the hands of the Crown Solicitor in connection with boundaries and the right of the department to commence building operations within the next few weeks.

#### AROONA RESERVOIR.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand the Minister of Works has some information regarding a question I asked yesterday on the water supply at Leigh Creek, particularly whether any appreciable intake into the Aroona Reservoir followed the recent rains in that area.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I asked for information on this matter this morning, and the chairman of the Electricity Trust reports:—

Forty-five points of rain fell in the Aroona catchment area in the last few days. There was no worthwhile intake into the dam. The present holding is 227 million gallons, sufficient to meet field demands until the end of August, 1960.

#### TRANSPORT OF PENSIONERS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 20 relating to the assisted transport of country pensioners attending the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Where it is necessary for an indigent patient to attend the hospital provision is made to see that he is transported.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand that for some time it has been the Government's practice to provide free rail transport for pensioners and other indigent persons who have to attend the Royal Adelaide Hospital for certain types of treatment. According to my information when they did not have the necessary means to purchase a rail ticket they were able to obtain a warrant or authority from the local police officer to enable them to obtain a ticket. Can the Premier say whether that practice still continues or do they have to find the money for the rail fare to Adelaide and then on arrival at the hospital apply for a refund?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There is a refund of the fare for patients, particularly in the metropolitan area where the amount is relatively small. As far as I know, there has been no alteration in the provision that has been made.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In this morning's *Advertiser*, in the report of the debate on the Bill for the abolition of capital punishment, I am reported as saying that France, Spain and States of the United States of America which had abolished capital punishment were the countries in which more criminals carried firearms. That is quite contrary to the fact. I have in my hand a *Hansard* pull which has not been altered in any way and is a correct report of what I said. That states:—

The Select Committee that inquired into this matter before the Royal Commission, and the Royal Commission itself, examined that aspect very thoroughly and found that the carrying of firearms by criminals was most prevalent in France, Spain and the States in America which had retained capital punishment.

In view of that statement, I ask the *Advertiser* to ensure that the matter is reported correctly.

#### LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I move:—

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

Its object is to extend the operation of the Land Settlement Act for two years. Members will recall that a similar Bill was passed last year extending the operation of the Act to December, 1959. It is the view of the Government that the time has not yet nearly come to allow the provisions of the principal Act to

lapse and the effect of the Bill is to extend the term of office of members of the committee and the power to acquire certain land in the South-East for a further two years. Clause 3 will extend the term of office of committee members until December 31, 1961, and clause 4 amends section 27a of the principal Act enabling the Governor, on the recommendation of the committee, to acquire lands in that portion of the western division of the South-East which is south of Drains K and L up to December 22, 1961.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—There is no opposition to this Bill. We on this side support it, particularly the alteration to section 27a, which we think is desirable so that land settlement work may be carried out to meet the desires of the Government, the Minister and the committee.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### EXCHANGE OF LAND (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 456.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—This Bill must come before a Select Committee. The Housing Trust has been most helpful on all occasions to any religious organizations desirous of purchasing land for building churches or schools, for which I commend it. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Hall, Hambour, Jennings, Nankivell and Frank Walsh; the Committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records and to report on Tuesday, September 29, 1959.

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 454.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This is a simple Bill as far as it goes, and was introduced to resolve any doubt that may have existed on whether it is legal for a woman to sit in the Parliament of this State. I understand that it has no application to the very fine lady member we have in this House, because there has not been any doubt as to the eligibility of women to be elected to the House of Assembly, but considerable doubt has been

expressed on whether women were eligible to sit in another place.

Mr. Jennings—There is no doubt about the eligibility of old women, though!

Mr. O'HALLORAN—As the honourable member said, there are many people who may come under a misnamed category but, as Standing Orders forbid making any reference to members of Parliament which may be considered to be abusive, I shall have to refrain from any further discussion on that aspect.

Mr. Jennings—It is rather a pity.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is, because I could wax eloquent on the subject. As members know, the position was challenged just before the last election and the court, I think properly, held that this was a matter that should be determined by Parliament and not the court. We therefore have this Bill before us to determine the eligibility and to make the amendment of the Constitution retrospective to January 1 last. I agree entirely with those provisions of the Bill but I should like to see it go much farther and, in fact, I intend, after the second reading has been carried, to move for an instruction to the Committee to consider extensive amendments relating to the Legislative Council franchise. Unfortunately, I would not be permitted to explain at this stage what I propose to do because the matter is not sufficiently before us until I have received permission to move the amendments in Committee, but these amendments are on file and they can be readily understood. In the confident anticipation, firstly, that I will secure the carrying of the contingent notice of motion permitting me to move these amendments and, secondly, that the amendments will be carried and thus prove to be an improvement to an already very good Bill, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. O'HALLORAN moved—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the Bill that it has power to consider new clauses relating to the franchise for the Legislative Council.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McKee, O'Halloran, Quirke, Ralston, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Dunnage, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Mr. Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Loveday and Bywaters. Noes—Messrs. Coumbe and Hambour,

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Enactment of section 48a of the principal Act."

Mr. QUIRKE—Mr. Chairman, would I be in order in discussing the voting on the division that has just taken place?

The CHAIRMAN—No.

Mr. QUIRKE—Then I will do it at some other time.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (4) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment and Committee's report adopted.

#### ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 456.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I commend the Government for introducing this Bill. The Act applies to only a limited number of electors at the present time and will not apply to a great number at any time. Members of certain religious orders, because of the rules of their order and the vows they take on entering the order, are confined within the precincts of the institution in which they are housed. The present provisions of the Electoral Act make it virtually impossible for them to vote: they could not qualify for a vote under the postal vote provision and they could not go to a polling booth to vote personally. All the Bill seeks to do is to give the members of such orders the right to vote by post.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I heartily support this Bill. As the Premier said in moving its second reading, at present it affects only one order in the State, and that is an order of nuns at Glen Osmond in my electorate. In fact, it was I who first brought this matter to the notice of the Government. I think it was on February 22, 1956, that I wrote a letter to the Premier (who was then, as he is now, acting as the Attorney-General of the State) suggesting an amendment in these terms. Of course, it is about 3½ years since I made the suggestion and one is almost irresistibly reminded of the mills grinding slowly, but I am glad that, although they have ground so slowly, eventually this Bill has come before the House.

Whatever one's own faith may be, it is a pity to interfere with the religious practices and beliefs of other people if those practices and beliefs can be reconciled with their duties as citizens of this State. The amendment embodied in this Bill is simple and will enable a reconciliation between the duties of all citizens and the religious vows of those persons who are members of the order at Glen Osmond. That is most desirable and I congratulate the Government upon at last introducing a Bill to give effect to the suggestion I made.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 457.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill is similar to others that come before Parliament from time to time to rectify injustices and anomalies that occur in connection with the salaries of officers which are fixed by Parliament. The salaries of most of the officers and employees of the State are fixed either by the Public Service Board, in the case of the Public Service, or by various tribunals in the case of other employees. In conformity with established practice these officers become entitled to increments in two ways: firstly, they become entitled to normal cost of living adjustments made from time to time by the tribunals concerned and, secondly, they are, of course, subject to periodical adjustments as a result of the awards and determinations of those tribunals.

However, the officers covered by this Bill depend on Parliament to adjust their salaries. The Treasurer told us that the reclassification of the salaries of officers within the Public Service prescribing a scale of general increases ranging from £9 to £284 made recently was made retrospective to April 1 last. However, the salaries of the Agent-General, Auditor-General, Commissioner of Police, and Public Service Commissioner have not been increased since 1957 when they were last fixed by Parliament. Cost of living adjustments to other salaries since then amount to £80, and the general increase to other officers on a commensurate salary amounts to £284 a year, making a grand total of £364. This Bill provides that these highly competent officers shall receive an additional £364 each as from April 1, 1959.

Whilst I do not intend to belittle in any way the other excellent officers in this category, I think the Agent-General is worth special mention because he is not available in South Australia for honourable members generally to estimate the value of his services to the State in London. I have had personal experience of his work and I heartily commend him for his representation of South Australia in that great metropolis. He well merits the salary increase provided in this Bill. I also suggest that the Government should consider increasing his expense allowance because I believe he is entitled to an increased allowance over and above what he is now receiving. An increased allowance will enable our representative in England to even more adequately fill his position.

The President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court are also mentioned in this Bill. These officers received an adjustment somewhat later than the officers mentioned in the first group and, as a result, will not receive the same increase. Nevertheless, they, too, deserve an increase and it will be made retrospective to April 1. It is rather anomalous that these officers, who in their official capacities consider applications for increases in awards to other categories of employees, should have to wait so long before being given the benefit to which they are entitled because of the increases in the wage and salary scales generally that they have granted to other people. I therefore have no inhibitions about supporting the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I do not oppose this Bill, but I am alarmed at the trend it reveals. I understand that these decisions of the Public Service Board are to some extent based on previous decisions of the board, and it sounds very much to me that it is the same as politicians raising their own salaries. We are passing through a very difficult period of the State's economy due to a dry season which, if it does not rain within the next fortnight, will be a drought. No one wishes to belittle these well-deserving officers, but I think it is hardly fitting that Bills of this nature should go through the House at this time without attention being drawn to that fact.

The occupations of these men in question are not income-earning ones, and they are based on the taxation ability of this country to pay them. We may wish to reward our public servants perhaps better than we do, but we have to relate their salaries to our ability to pay them, and if this trend is going to continue

I am wondering where we are going to get with it. Are we going to have a privileged class of Government servants?

Mr. O'Halloran—They won't take your water scheme from you.

Mr. HALL—Are we going to have that privileged class, while the rest of the community grows poorer and poorer paying their salaries? I would like to know where the Labor Party stands in this matter.

Mr. O'Halloran—It stands for justice.

Mr. HALL—So do we, based on the ability of this country to pay salaries. The Labor Party talks about redistribution of wealth, but its members are themselves supporting the creation of a privileged class in this community.

Mr. O'Halloran—It was a Bill introduced by the Government.

Mr. HALL—I believe there are many anomalies in the way we pay our running costs, and I draw the attention of the House to one of them. A man in my electorate has recently been involved in the payment of probate costs. When that man left primary school he worked on his father's farm for pocket money until he was 21; after that he was paid £1 a week, and when he married he was paid £3 a week. That man's father later made over to him a piece of land on the farm, and he holds the deeds of this piece of land. I believe the whole farm occupied about 500 acres. The father and two sons occupied the farm because in order to keep it going as a commercial proposition there was no alternative but to run it as one farm. The father, therefore, had to take all the income from this farm to meet the costs of running it and apportion out the little that remained as living expenses for himself and his two sons.

Mr. Lawn—Are you opposing the Bill?

Mr. HALL—No. When the father died recently, the son to whom I have referred, although he held the deeds of this piece of land that he had been given, was required to pay probate on that land because the father had taken income from it. Can any honourable member say whether that is fair in the circumstances?

Mr. Lawn—What has that got to do with the Bill?

Mr. HALL—We are putting a capital tax on this man's farm this year to help pay for these salaries. Can the member for Adelaide deny that fact?

Mr. Fred Walsh—You must be opposing the Bill.

Mr. HALL—I do not intend to vote against this measure and endanger the life of the Government, as I consider the alternative Government would be disastrous for the State. I am drawing members' attention to the fact that this Bill is going through without protest. I am not opposing a just reward for these highly regarded public servants, but I wish to draw this House's attention to the pyramid we are basing on a straw foundation.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I support the Bill because I think the people mentioned in it are worthy of their salaries compared with what is being paid to others. I congratulate the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) on having the courage to say what a lot of other people think but are not game to say. I protest against the basis of fixing all Public Service salaries. I believe those salaries are fixed by the Public Service Board which consists of three public servants and, as the honourable member for Gouger has said, it smacks of politicians fixing their own salaries, which is most distasteful to the community of South Australia and has recently been so to Australia generally. I think some other method could be devised whereby the services of these men could be evaluated, because otherwise we are going to have a vicious circle. These particular people will receive this increase, and I am not saying they are not worthy of it, compared with other public servants, but the next thing will be a hue and cry, probably from the members of Parliament, for an increase in salary. The underdog in the Public Service will then want more, and so it will go on and on.

The member for Gouger made a very strong point. All these increases must come out of the land, whether they come out of mineral content or produce from the land. It is our production that has to meet these salaries. We have had inane interjections from members opposite, but what do they care? All they battle for are increases in salaries all the time, without due regard to where the money comes from. I do not begrudge a man his hire, and I hope standards will rise, but the standard can only rise with the production of the country. I plead with the Government to re-arrange the Public Service Board.

Mr. Fred Walsh—When wages are increased you raise prices.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member seems to like that.

Mr. Fred Walsh—We do not like it at all.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Opposition members remind me of a cow chewing its cud; they get no nourishment out of what they do. They do not put up a positive proposal. I ask the Government to find some other machinery for fixing Public Service salaries. I object to the Service fixing its own salaries, which virtually is what happens now. On the Public Service Board are the Public Service Commissioner, a representative of the Public Service Association, and one of the Government—two to one. It makes a recommendation and the Government accepts it, rejects it, or refers it back, and we know of an instance that occurred some 18 months ago. Public servants generally received an increase in their salaries, as a result of which we have this Bill before us. Then we have the underlings—I do not say that disrespectfully—and they immediately ask for an increase, and it goes on and on. This has happened in the last three or four years, during which time the incomes of primary producers have decreased.

I plead with the Government to find some other means of fixing the salaries of public servants so that we shall not have a repetition of this legislation, which will occur if the system is not changed. There seem to be State jealousies on this question of salaries. The Government employees of one State receive an increase and then those in another State decide that they want an increase. We also have the Commonwealth setting the standard. We, as a self-governing State, must protect our own arrangements. Our ability to pay should be based on our production and not the opinion of certain people who, in my opinion, are in a position to help themselves. Recently there was an increase of 15s. a week in the basic wage. The judges said that they awarded the increase on the ability of the country to pay. These judges may be good lawyers, but in my opinion they are poor judges of economics. I support the Bill because I have to. It would be completely unjust to deny the officers mentioned an increase in their salaries after approval has been given for increases to those not occupying such high positions. The Leader of the Opposition talks about justice. Justice is on this side of the House, but not on the other. We on this side have a little wider vision than those on the other side. I support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I also support the measure. We do not get anywhere by denying people what is their just due. I commend Mr. Hall (member for Gouger) and also Mr.



Hambour (member for Light) for their courage in taking the stand they did. To hear honourable members opposite speaking like that is balm to my tortured soul. Everything that has been said by the two honourable members about the dog chasing its tail in relation to wages and prices has been forecast by my humble self in this House for 18 years, and now it is coming home to roost. It has been said by some members that when wages rise the price of goods goes up. In every instance prices increased before wages moved. Wage increases are months behind price rises. While we have the existing monetary economy in this country we cannot alter that position. One honourable member said there should be price fixation, but that will not alter it. I am pleased to see the attitude

adopted by the two honourable members I have referred to. How vastly different is this attitude from that adopted a short time ago when they denied the House an opportunity to discuss a certain question. If the same fairness of the two honourable members is applied to other matters before the House we will get somewhere, but I have not seen anything quite so bad as what happened here this afternoon on a certain matter.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 1, at 2 p.m.