

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Thursday, April 19, 1962.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****SECONDING OF MOTIONS.**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Mr. President, I believe that the House of Commons has in recent years dropped the practice of seconding motions. Probably our Standing Orders are based on House of Commons precedents. We have all admired the ability of the Leader of the Labor Party here to get up and sit down again so rapidly while seconding various motions, but I suggest it might be advisable for you, Sir, to seek authority for approaches to be made to the House of Commons to check the authenticity of what I have suggested and whether in fact it is necessary to second all motions in this Council?

The PRESIDENT: Standing Orders provide for the seconding of motions and this question was submitted to the Standing Orders Committee, which decided that that provision should remain. That is the present position.

**CHAFFEY DRAINAGE SCHEME.**

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Lands, ascertain if satisfactory tenders have been received regarding the Chaffey drainage scheme? If the Minister is not in possession of the information will he advise me when it comes to hand?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have not the information at hand, but I shall be pleased to confer with my colleague regarding the matter and provide the information.

**FESTIVAL HALL.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice): In view of the fact that the Festival of Arts Committee has commenced organizing for the 1964 festival, will the Government consider making a grant to the committee for the construction of a Festival Hall?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: All funds available to the Government are committed to essential projects, including housing.

**REFUNDS ON MILK BOTTLES.**

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (on notice):

1. Is the Chief Secretary aware that in the *Advertiser* of February 10, 1962, there appeared

an announcement from the Acting Prices Commissioner concerning the settlement of a prolonged dispute between the Wholesale Milk Buyers and Distributors Association, the S.A. Mixed Business Association and the Master Retail Milk Vendors Association over the question of payment for empty milk bottles returned to the wholesalers, for which bottles they had previously paid 5d. each? The relevant date mentioned in the announcement on which the settlement was to hinge was February 4, 1962.

2. Will the Minister obtain a report from the Prices Commissioner as to why this report of the settlement was not made public until six days after February 4, 1962, which was the vital date on which payment for milk bottles standing to a vendor's credit was to be made?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Prices Commissioner reports:

The reason for making the statement on this date was that it was considered advisable to make the announcement at a time which was closest to the accounting period of the various wholesale milk suppliers. The date on which the announcement was made was unanimously agreed to by representatives of the three associations concerned.

**APPOINTMENT OF SEVENTH JUDGE.**

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware that at the present time long delays are being experienced by Supreme Court litigants, especially in the matrimonial causes jurisdiction where many cases have been waiting for over 12 months for a hearing?

2. Does the Government propose to make an early appointment to replace His Honour Mr. Justice Ross who has, in fact, retired?

3. Will the Government give consideration to an amendment of the Supreme Court Act to make the appointment of the seventh Supreme Court judge possible?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The replies are:

1. Undefended matrimonial proceedings: A total of 220 are at present awaiting trial. 100 will be heard this month. There has been no substantial delay at all.

Defended matrimonial suits: Approximately 90 are awaiting trial. A large proportion of these (at least one-third) are likely to become undefended at the trial. The cases at the top of the defended matrimonial list were set down for hearing in the month of July, 1961.

2 and 3. These matters will receive consideration.

## SENATE VACANCY.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the joint sitting of the two Houses this day to choose a person to hold the place in the Senate rendered vacant by the resignation of Nancy Eileen Buttfield, at which Mr. Gordon Sinclair Davidson was the person so chosen.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 18. Page 63.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the passing of this legislation and in doing so enter an emphatic protest against the treatment meted out to honourable members in this Chamber yesterday. I know that I voice the opinion of my colleagues, and, I think, of quite a number of honourable members opposite. The Council was adjourned yesterday from 2.38 p.m. until 5.52 p.m. without any consideration being given to the convenience of honourable members. To merely suspend the sitting of the House until the ringing of the bells is not good, and it is not the first time it has happened. Members of my Party, who are only small in number, are virtually tied to this place under these circumstances until such time as the Minister in charge of the House cares to arrange to have the bells rung to summon honourable members. Surely, when the sitting of the Council was suspended at 2.38 p.m. yesterday, some mention could have been made of the time that the bells would be rung. If that had been done it would have given members time to deal with work they had in hand. Instead of having to do it this morning it could have been done during those few hours yesterday. We are not school children and we have responsibilities.

In future when suspending the sitting of the Council the Minister should say when the proceedings will continue. I thought that the business we expected from another place would not reach us until about 5 p.m. If we had been told that the bells would be rung about 4.30 p.m. or 5 p.m. members would have been able to do some of the work they had in hand. Suspensions of sittings in this Chamber are done without any consultation with me. When it was dropped on us suddenly yesterday, and knowing what was happening in another place, I told the Leader of the Liberal Party here that if the proceedings of the Council were adjourned rather than the sitting suspended we would facilitate the passage of the legislation quickly today.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: To whom did you tell that?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Leader of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I heard nothing about it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I was under the impression that the message had been conveyed to the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: You will learn by experience who is Leader of the Council.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I went to the Leader of the Liberal Party, who went to the Attorney-General, whose reply was "We had better leave things as they are." After waiting yesterday afternoon we did not deal with much business. Instead of our hanging around for about 3½ hours with nothing to do we could have left the business to be dealt with just as quickly today. Because of what happened here yesterday I was considerably out of pocket. I could not get my motor car because it was locked away in a garage, with the result that I had to meet the cost of taxi fares.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: You could have telephoned for your car to be left outside.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Perhaps you could not get your car until you paid for it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I resent that. I have not bought anything without paying for it and I think everybody would be better off if they followed that example. I think the remark was uncalled for and when it is reported in *Hansard* people will think that I do not pay for anything. Remarks of that nature are not good. It is all very well for the Chief Secretary to smile. He did not inconvenience himself yesterday afternoon. He went to the place where he wanted to go, but the rest of us were completely ignored.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: You should have been there, too.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I was not asked to go, but I am not referring to that appointment. Apparently the Chief Secretary does not consider the feelings of anyone else. It is a case of "So long as I am all right, Jack, you can jump in the lake". This is not the first time that that sort of thing has happened. Since I have been Leader our Party has not placed any obstruction in the way of dealing with legislation. In fact, I have gone out of my way to facilitate its passage. As common courtesy, in matters of this nature we should be consulted. Such happenings should not be repeated. Some members in this place went home early in the afternoon and showed their protest against what

was happening by not coming back. I do not want the Chief Secretary to think that only members of my Party complained. If my friends opposite were to speak the truth they would say that they were upset over what happened. I will leave it at that. In introducing the Bill yesterday the Minister said:

The principal reason for bringing Supplementary Estimates before the House this year is to seek the necessary appropriation to cover the spending of additional funds which the State received as a result of the Loan Council and Premiers' Conference held in February last to formulate and discuss measures to combat unemployment. At that conference South Australia secured additional funds for 1961-62 of just over £2,000,000, made up of—A special grant of £970,000 to be used for employment-promoting works; an increase of £1,036,000 in the allocation of loan moneys for housing.

The debate in another place did not indicate that any new work was created to provide employment. According to statements which I believe to be true, since the money was first made available there have not been many, if any, more men employed. When speaking on the Budget last year I suggested that instead of balancing it we should do what has now been done by the Government. I suggested that rather than balance the Budget there should be a deficit to create a pool of money for providing employment. It received a very cold reception in this House and from the Government as a whole. At that time, October or November—I am speaking from memory—it seemed that both the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments were not interested in the unemployment position. It apparently was something which had arisen but which was unfortunate.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is not a fair statement. This Government has put on more employes and created more employment in the last 12 months than has any other State Government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am coming to that.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: And before that time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Your Government did not create it then. It put on 2,500 employes, but it was not done at that time. That is the point I am making.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: It was done over the whole period.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, it wasn't.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The Premier has shown more concern for the unemployed than has anyone in Australia.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That may be so, but at the time I am speaking of nothing was done to assist the position, and that is my point. The honourable member can prove me wrong if he can. An event which took place on December 9 of last year had a grave effect upon both the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments. Early in January, and after the result of the Commonwealth election was known, the Commonwealth Government called certain people together to discuss methods of dealing with this problem. If the result of the election had not been what it was, this would not have happened so quickly. When Mr. Calwell, the Leader of the Australian Labor Party, suggested doing the very things that were done after the election he was told that they could not be done; that it would be foolish and that he was a lunatic. Those words were used, not by a member of this Government, but by someone else well known to honourable members. It was said that the policy expounded by the Australian Labor Party could not be implemented. However, in January the Labor Party's policy, as put to the people of Australia during the Commonwealth election campaign, was to a certain extent put into operation.

The Premier of this State is a wise tactician. We give him credit for that because no one can deny it, and recent weeks have proved it. In his own words, the Premier could foresee coming events, and as he had to face the people on March 3 he gambled. He did the very thing which I had suggested last October should be done. He expanded works, and he employed labour, and, according to his own statement, before this money was made available the Government work force was increased by about 2,500. I do not want to misconstrue anything, but in fact he did in January the things which I had suggested in October should be done to relieve unemployment. What would have been the result if the Loan Council had not granted the additional money? It would have meant a deficit of about £2,000,000 for this financial year. My Party does not accept the suggestion that all the brains are in the one Party. We sound these warnings sometimes months, sometimes years, before any heed is taken of them.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I have never said that all the brains are in one Party.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Who said that?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Many people have said it. If they dispute my words they can read last year's *Hansard* when I was speaking in the Budget debate. The Government has

given effect to that policy, but a certain amount has been allowed as a grant and does not have to be paid back.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: It is better that way.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Much better. Frankly, all States do not get a fair crack of the whip as a return from income tax payments going into Commonwealth funds. It would be much better if that did happen. I want to make it clear that my Party is not concocting a story about unemployment so as to defeat the Government. My happiest days will be when every able-bodied man and woman who wants to work can find work. But we have to act quickly, and act before an election looms up, to alleviate the unemployment position. I criticize the Government because this could have been done six or eight months ago.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I thought you said a lot of it was?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not until January or February of this year. Do not make any mistake about that.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What about expenditure out of revenue back in October?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That was only for current works, not additional work.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: I thought you said nothing was done.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No increased work was done until January or February of this year. If I am wrong then the Premier is also wrong, because that is what he said in another place yesterday. Another honourable member of this House was there with me and heard the Premier say it. When I have idle time I go and find out about things. I do not waste my time.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Do you think you may have misheard the Premier?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I never mishear. That was the Premier's own statement made yesterday in another place.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I thought you said that you wanted to be somewhere else, and that you did not want to be there.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I had to stay in this building, as the honourable member well knows, and I occupied my time the best way I could.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Improved the shining hour.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hope I have made myself clear on my stand on the question of employment. I am afraid that what has happened recently is a flash in the pan, but I hope that I am wrong. I have said before

in this Chamber that I believe that the Commonwealth Government and the employers of this State, generally speaking, have decided that it is reasonable to have approximately 100,000 people unemployed. The figures released by Mr. McMahon (Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service) show that there were 101,093 unemployed in Australia at the end of March, 7,180 being in this State. I am fearful that the position will remain as it is, and that is bad.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Have you got the percentage figures of State comparisons?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not interested in percentages because they can misconstrue the position. The percentage for South Australia, if the honourable member is interested, is 1.8, which is one of the lowest in Australia. I am not criticizing that.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: You don't mind saying it!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, but it is still bad, and I am sure everyone would agree with that. Not much industrial experience is required to realize that the South Australian March figures may be lower than the May figures. Mr. McMahon stated this week that in South Australia the situation in factories covered by the department's monthly survey showed an increase of seasonal employment in fruit processing, wine making and distilling, increased employment in the manufacture of motor vehicles and parts and electrical equipment, fewer men registered for work, especially for skilled workers in the building and metal trades and for semi-skilled and unskilled work, fewer women registered, and more vacancies for men in skilled building and metal trades, but fewer in rural work. It is fair to say that the South Australian figures dropped last month because of the seasonal nature of the work. What will happen to these workers when seasonal work has finished?

We accept the Treasurer's statement that because of this Commonwealth grant 2,500 more men have been employed in Government departments, but what will happen on June 30 when the money has been spent? Will the Government provide money out of general revenue to keep those men employed? Will the Government maintain its extended works to maintain employment or will the men be thrown out of work? Anyone seriously considering the employment question must be worried about the position.

Last year the Government placed great emphasis on balancing the Budget. If we create employment merely to have less

unemployment and need an extra loan of £2,000,000 from the Commonwealth, will the Government budget for a deficit of £2,000,000 next year to keep those men in work? If that question is not answered positively and the men are thrown back on the scrap heap that will be a bad lookout. That problem faces us and the position is not satisfactory if we view it in its true perspective instead of from a political viewpoint.

I do not wish to delay the debate unnecessarily but I do not want members to think that is all I could talk about. I would have no trouble in going on for some time if I wanted to be vindictive. However, there will be plenty of time to talk on the Estimates in the next few months after everyone has cooled down after the opening of Parliament and the Government has obtained a vote of confidence, even if it were on the casting vote of the Speaker. Then we shall be able to do justice to these matters. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the Bill and I am pleased that the Government has taken this action to allocate the moneys made available by the Commonwealth Government at the recent conference. I was a little disturbed to hear the Leader of the Labor Party charge this Government with rather callous disregard for the unemployed. Nothing could be further from the truth. The honourable member said that in October he made a certain speech. I remember that speech very well, but I also remember him saying he was a great believer in budgeting for surpluses. If the honourable member were an adviser in these matters I believe we would be in a particularly difficult position. In any case we would have been in a particularly bad position when this money became available from the Commonwealth if we had not looked after our money and had a surplus of £2,000,000, of which £1,000,000 was immediately made available to relieve the unemployment position. That money was allocated to various departments and, to a large extent, took up the backlog of the immediate unemployment. I am not saying there are no unemployed in this State because I know there are unemployed and members of my Party are deeply concerned that we still have unemployed people. We do not subscribe to the theory that the Government took no action, because we believe it took quick action with the result that

South Australia and Western Australia have the lowest number of unemployed in the Commonwealth.

When we realize that an increase of 1s. a week in the wage of each Government employee in the Public Service would result in £100,000 additional annual expenditure and that a rise of 10s. a week would mean additional annual expenditure of £1,000,000 the Government must always be prepared to meet any contingency that might arise in that way. The Government has taken notice of the fact that there may be such an increase and has provided accordingly.

I am pleased to note the manner in which industry in South Australia has co-operated in every way to meet the unemployment situation. South Australian industry was extremely hard hit, particularly the motor vehicle industry and industries manufacturing refrigerators, washing machines and similar types of goods. They were severely punished as a result of the necessary restrictions. This is not a one-way trade, for it concerns every individual and the Government will certainly see that South Australians are treated fairly. The State's financial position is extremely good considering the problems with which we have been faced. Mention was made that the Government is budgeting for a £3,000 surplus. It is not expected that this will be very far out, and in the circumstances that is very creditable.

Practically every department which can employ labour has been allocated additional money. They include the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department and the Railways Department. The State Bank was allocated about £1,000,000 to enable it to proceed with the building programme. Additional funds were also made available to the Housing Trust so that the building industry, which the Hon. Mr. Shard told us in October was at that time approaching a crisis, could be able to accelerate. I believe that as a result of this allocation and other allocations the position will be almost corrected before the Budget is brought down. As regards allocations to the various departments, and particularly towards education, it is very fortunate that the money is available. This has been provided for the States by the Commonwealth Government. Perhaps South Australia is unfortunate. Because it is so efficient it did not get as much as some of the other States; but we are proud of the fact that our people have not suffered quite so much, either.

An amount of £15,000 has been made available for dealing with two very dangerous diseases, namely, the oriental peach moth and the san jose scale. Both of these diseases have appeared recently in South Australia, and the Government has made available funds in an attempt to eradicate them if they should become prevalent. It is to be complimented upon its action. We must have a balance between secondary and primary industries and the employees, and if the Government can keep all these sections of the community functioning properly, I believe that South Australia can go ahead along orderly developmental lines. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I did not propose to offer any comments until I heard statements by the Hon. Mr. Story about the Government's activities. I appreciate that in his new position as Leader of the Liberal and Country Party in this Chamber, on which I compliment him, it is his duty to whitewash the Government. This afternoon he made a very valiant attempt to do that, but in the course of his speech submitted statements which, although true part in substance and part in fact, were not true in all the circumstances. The Government truly characterizes itself as a piecemeal Government. The proposals contained in the Estimates being discussed will take us through until July. As the Government claims the right to represent the people of the State, it should have no compunction in bringing down proper Estimates to cover a longer period. Mr. Story said that the State must have a balance between rural economy and the ordinary economy. Labor has always agreed with that. If members take their minds back to the war period they will find that that is the very pivot upon which the economics of this State have functioned as the result of the activities of two previous Commonwealth Labor Governments. I do not need to recapitulate the various acts by which these Governments have placed South Australia and the other States in the position they enjoy today as regards development.

There has been much publicity in the press and many television broadcasts regarding the activities of the Playford Government. From 1942 until 1946 and also during the postwar period this Government was assisted in every possible way by the Commonwealth Labor Government, in contrast to the little assistance which is given now by a Commonwealth Liberal Government. Over the years the Playford Government has attempted to masquerade as a

Government that is all-powerful in developing this State in the interests of the people.

As regards Loan moneys, we have read from time to time that the Government has established a surplus of funds, and we have also read from time to time that it has recorded deficits; and we have also read that the Premier has been a great champion of the State at meetings of the Loan Council and at Premiers' Conferences. The Menzies Government, which is of the same political complexion as the Playford Government, lends back to the people of the States, by way of Loan moneys through the Loan Council, the surplus taxation revenue derived from the States and upon which they have to pay interest. If we are to succeed and progress, as I think every honourable member desires, there should be an effort by the Government, so long as it is in office—and there is no definite period for which it will remain in office—to induce the Commonwealth authorities to make more finance available, either by grant or loan, to develop South Australia and thus relieve the unemployment position, as was mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Shard. The State Government has not attempted to seek from the Commonwealth Government the necessary funds to relieve the unemployment position.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I thank members for their approach to the Bill. There is little for me to say except to refer to one matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He spoke about the conduct of business in this place and the consideration of the convenience of members. He made some extravagant remarks about how members were inconvenienced yesterday, and perhaps to some extent they were, but no one more than myself. I point out that the change in the conduct of Parliament yesterday was not due entirely to any desire of the Government, or mine in particular in relation to this place. During my experience as a Minister certain procedure has been followed at the opening of a Parliamentary session. Certain dignities have been practised, but they were absent on this occasion. Procedure so long recognized is apparently no longer recognized.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It did not happen in this House.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member, with members in another place, sits in Caucus, which is foreign to my Party, and I know nothing of the happenings there. Members who stand up in this place

and preen themselves in the presence of other members should practise the same thing elsewhere, and if they cannot do anything about it they should bow and accept the position, not pass the buck.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Very weak.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I heard the honourable member trying to make something of a matter a while ago, and perhaps I have standards of weakness on which I can judge other people. We are talking about what happened here yesterday. I was saying, before being interrupted, that prior to this session it was the practice on every occasion for question time in another place to be suspended, as the result of an arrangement, in order that urgent legislation might be dealt with. This is necessary if we are to deal with matters before the Address in Reply debate.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You know what happened in another place.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member has had his say and I thought he was dreadfully weak. He was even worse than his Leader. I am giving my views regarding the matter and I am only reminding those members of what happened when ordinary decencies applied in Parliament. Yesterday two Bills were dealt with in another place and sent to us in order that this place could function. I had no suggestions from anybody on when they would arrive. The Leader of the Opposition certainly did not tell me what time he thought the legislation would arrive from another place and what was the attitude of his Party, which has not shown any inclination to assist in the work of Parliament.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Neither have you. You have not consulted us.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It has adopted a hindering and purely negative attitude.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Be your age!

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I shall be as old as the honourable member some day, and shall then catch up with him. The position is that we used to have business early in the day, but yesterday there was no chance of setting a time. The only information we had was that the Opposition was anxious to get up when they had finished their apparent horse-play nonsense that did not appear particularly bright in the interests of the institution. Because of what was happening I could not tell my Party or anyone else yesterday anything about the time of resumption here. I knew that Good Friday was a

holiday, and I did not want members to sit late tonight. I took the only attitude I could and suspended the sitting of the Council to the ringing of the bells. It was not my fault or the fault of the Government that the Bills did not arrive here until nearly 6 o'clock. I remind members that the Standing Orders of this place provide for its continuing until 6.30 when there is business to do. Members are not here for a picnic and a holiday.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We had a good picnic yesterday whilst waiting.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member had better speak to his Leader and not blame me for the sitting of the Council yesterday. There is nothing more for me to say, except to point out that the old hobby horse of unemployment has been brought out again. No Government in Australia has a better record than our Government in employment. In every instance it has done all in its power to promote work. It has never on any occasion said, as was implied by the Leader of the Opposition, that our Government accepted that there should be a percentage of unemployment. We have never accepted that by utterance or practice. The Government has done all it can to promote employment, and has achieved the lowest rate of unemployment of any State in Australia. That was done despite the fact that South Australia perhaps had as hard a knock as any State, because of the effect on the motor vehicle industry. Despite that, we still held our own in the employment field. I do not feel called upon to make any reply regarding the unemployment position. The Leader of the Opposition said that there was 1.8 per cent of unemployment in South Australia at present. He knows why that is so. The State is short of tradesmen. We cannot get enough skilled men for the Public Buildings Department. Whilst unskilled men are unemployed the position will always be difficult, but there is a shortage of tradesmen and the Government wants them at work, as much as it does anyone else.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It is because employers will not take on apprentices.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I am speaking for the Government. That is the only authority that some honourable members recognize. Anyone would think that the Government was the sole employer, and if some members had their way it would be, but if it were so I suggest that it would be a pretty bad position. Thank goodness we still have private employers who can give the

opportunity to people who want to work to better themselves and take their place in the community. I do not want to inconvenience another place, as it has inconvenienced us, and I want to get the Bills back there quickly. I thank members for their prompt attention to this measure and assure them that I shall always do my best to offer reciprocal treatment towards happy working in this place, which has always been my desire.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will test you out in the future.

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

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 18. Page 63.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I rise to support this measure, but in doing so point out that the action of the Government yesterday in asking honourable members to remain until the ringing of the bells and the Chief Secretary's reply to the Leader of the Opposition seem to me to have been done out of pique. The Chief Secretary mentioned that people in another place were carrying on some form of schemozzle when dealing with the business of the House.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: What was that word?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The honourable member would not understand it. I remind the honourable member that the Government claims to have a majority in another place. If it had considered that these Bills were . . .

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Which clause is this?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: In dealing with a money Bill I am entitled to speak on it as I desire. If these Bills were of such urgency and importance, then why did not the Government use its majority, including the casting vote of the Speaker, to thwart the members of my Party, which certain honourable members have attempted to castigate this afternoon?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You would be the first to complain if it did!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The honourable member is presupposing something. No blame can be attached to members of my Party in this Chamber or in another place, and I agree with the Hon. Mr. Shard that honourable members should have been asked whether they had commitments and engagements at certain school functions yesterday

afternoon. Instead, they were told to wait for the ringing of the bells, which happened at a quarter to six o'clock. An attempt was then made to rush these important money measures through, but the Leader of this House could have adjourned the matter until a quarter to eight last night, when the Bills could have been discussed, and perhaps there would have been no need to come back today. I say, with great respect, that the Minister has convicted himself out of his own mouth regarding the episode and the proceedings which took place in this Chamber yesterday afternoon.

This Bill provides for the payment of honourable members' salaries, public servants' salaries and other matters in connection with the affairs of government, to which the members of my Party in this Chamber offer no objection. We do say, however, that as the Bill contains a clause providing for the payment of any increase of salary and wages which may be authorized by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages, this gives an opportunity for the Government, which claims to represent all sections of the people of South Australia, to pay equal salaries for equal work. If, as the Chief Secretary said this afternoon, the Government has shown so much consideration for the general public of this State, here is an opportunity to implement that policy which would be acceptable and appreciated by a great number of people in this State.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: It must be provided by the court.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Not necessarily. The Bill includes "any other body". There are people in the Government service whose salaries and wages are not fixed by court determination, but fixed by a statutory body. The Government could excel itself by granting equal pay for equal work for those people, and attempt to maintain—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But Mr. Menzies says "No".

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: —what it says about being the custodian of the interests of all sections of the community. We have proceeded with this measure with expedition.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: As we always do!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): In supporting this Bill I take the opportunity to comment on the prompt answer that the Attorney-General gave me this afternoon to my question concerning the delays in the hearing of cases at the Supreme Court. I am sure



all honourable members will agree, and no doubt the Attorney-General himself will agree, that the situation disclosed by his reply is not a satisfactory one. An undefended cause list of 220 is a large number.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Half of them will be heard this month.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I realize that, and I am grateful that that will be done. I am more concerned with the defended matrimonial list, on which, as the Attorney-General said, there are about 90 cases awaiting trial. The longest period of waiting has been about 10 months. Although, as suggested, about one-third of the cases may become undefended, that will only happen when the matters are called on for trial, but meanwhile they wait in this lengthy list for their call. If we take one-third from the 90 cases, 60 remain as defended cases, and if we allow as an absolute minimum two days for each case, 120 sitting days will be required to deal with those cases. If one judge sat continuously for four days a week and did nothing except matrimonial cases, it would require something like nine months to hear those 60 cases. In the meantime another 90 cases would have accumulated.

I hope this matter will be cleaned up in the near future by the Government taking action on the second and third matters raised in my question. This would go a long way towards solving the problem and I urge that this matter be treated as urgent because, as

everybody in the profession knows, matrimonial cases need urgent attention and should not be relegated to the bottom of the list, which has been the practice for some reason or other over the last nine months or so.

Usually wives are existing on minimum maintenance while the hearing is pending, and custody of children and property questions are not determined. It is most important that these cases be given high priority. If the English Law Reports are examined it will be seen that in England civil and divorce cases can be brought on for hearing within two or three months of their being set down for trial, and England has many more people than we have. I am reliably informed that a similar position now exists in other States. In the past, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria, the position was worse than it now is here, but this matter has been considerably improved there since 1961, when the new Act came into operation. I urge the Government to give prompt consideration to the question of appointing a successor to Mr. Justice Ross because I believe this is about the only way in which the leeway can be made up. I support the second reading of the Bill.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.33 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 17, at 2.15 p.m.