

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Thursday, August 23, 1951.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**NAIRNE PYRITES DEPOSITS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Lands any further information to give in reply to the question I asked last week regarding the development of the Nairne pyrites deposits?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following report:—

The Industries Development Committee recommended that the Treasurer guarantee a loan of £800,000 to assist with the development of the Nairne pyrites deposits. The four companies mentioned will subscribe £50,000 each to the share capital, the total amount required to start the venture being £1,000,000. The Treasurer will not be required to find any money at present and, provided the company is successful, the Treasurer will never be required to find any money unless the Government decides to exercise the option recommended by the committee to purchase shares or a debenture in the undertaking at face value for £200,000. The Treasurer is not required to exercise this option while the guarantee is in force. The Director of Mines, in collaboration with the B.H.A.S. and B.H.P. Companies, has, at Government expense, investigated the pyrites deposits at Nairne and established that at least 30,000,000 tons of ore in accessible locations of a grade averaging a little over 10 per cent sulphur content was available, and there is every indication of much more than this. The recommendations of the committee and the guarantee by the Treasurer are pursuant to the Industries Development Act, and, as the Treasurer is not required to find any money, Parliamentary appropriation is not necessary.

**TREATMENT OF INEBRIATES.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question relates to persons who become inebriated. I have in mind a person who, during the period he was receiving hospital treatment, became inebriated on several occasions, was discharged from the Royal Adelaide Hospital, sent to gaol for periods of seven and 14 days, and was then sent back to the hospital for further treatment. This man has proved himself a nuisance to his two married sisters with families, who are afraid to leave their homes for fear he will break in and take money to spend on alcohol. There may be many other such cases. At one time an institution at Gladstone treated such cases, but it did not prove very successful. Can the Acting Leader of the Government say whether consideration has been given to the

type of treatment necessary for such persons, and, if so, can a recommendation be made for the treatment of future cases?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up with the Minister of Health the case mentioned and bring down a report.

**SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE.**

Mr. McLACHLAN—Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Government intends to connect the drains being built in the South-East with the Allendale-Baker's Range drain? If not, will it consider doing so?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have received a report on this subject from the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board which reads as follows:—

Referring to the question asked by Mr. McLachlan, M.P., it is desired to advise that the drainage scheme now being undertaken in the Western Division of the South-East does not provide for the discharge of water from the Baker's Range drain through the Western Division drains to the sea. Consideration of the further drainage of the area east of the Baker's Range will be given in due course, but, in view of the commitments in connection with the new system now in hand in the Western Division, it is likely to be some considerable time before the Eastern Division proposals can be dealt with.

**PORT PIRIE WEST POLICE STATION.**

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Acting Leader of the Government a reply to my recent question on the closing of the Port Pirie West Police Station?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following report from the Commissioner of Police:—

It was found that the business of the western suburbs of Port Pirie had been going to the Port Pirie Station, which was actually nearer and more convenient to a large area of the so-called western suburbs of Port Pirie than the Port Pirie West Police Station, and, upon the recommendation of the inspector in charge of the division, supported by that of the country superintendent, it was decided to close the station and use the premises for occupation by the second sergeant who has been appointed to Port Pirie.

**MYPONGA RESERVOIR.**

Mr. BROOKMAN—Many people in my district who are aware of the proposal to construct a reservoir at Myponga wish to provide for their water supplies. As such provision may run them into a great deal of personal expense which might be avoided if they knew approximately when work on the reservoir would be undertaken, can the Minister of Works give any indication of that?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think it would be humanly impossible to give any indication, for, although satisfactory surveys have been made, it is obvious that a scheme of such magnitude will have to be prepared, submitted to the Public Works Committee, dealt with by Parliament, and then materials will have to be obtained for the job, in regard to which many other works have priority. The Department of Mines has completed a geological examination of the reservoir site and a satisfactory report has been received from the Director of Mines. Tests carried out on the foundation rock confirm the geologist's opinion that this rock is suitable for the construction of a concrete dam and designs for both the gravity and arch types have been completed along broad lines. Estimates indicate that the arched type would be the most economical. It is now necessary to complete the design in every detail, and this work is in progress. Investigations have been made to determine the most satisfactory layout of a reticulation system to supply water to towns in southern districts, and also to convey surplus water to Adelaide. Estimates were completed some time ago for this section of the work, but on account of rapidly rising costs it is now necessary to revise them. I would only add, as a practical man, that I would not delay any reasonable attempts to procure water for myself in anticipation of someone else providing it for me. The persons concerned would be well advised to do what they can for themselves in the meantime.

#### EGG PRICES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Agriculture any further reply to the question I asked on August 7 regarding the formula adopted by the Egg Board in fixing the price of eggs?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The chairman of the Egg Board reports as follows:—

The reasons for the recent reductions in egg prices are:—The packing for export of eggs in shell commenced during the last week in July, the following number of cases, each containing 30 dozen eggs have been packed:—

Week ending—	Cases.
28th July . . . . .	705
4th August . . . . .	1,658
11th August . . . . .	1,954
18th August . . . . .	2,705

The price under contract with the British Ministry of Food is 3s. 3d. per dozen based on the 15 lb. pack; the 3s. 3d. is f.o.b. These eggs return to the board approximately 2s. 9d. per dozen. The amount of 6d. per dozen

f.o.b. costs is absorbed in cases, fillers, storage, wharfage charges and levy to the Australian Egg Board. For the week ending July 28, the board's buying price for eggs was 3s. 10d. per dozen, for which the board received for the 705 cases packed a return of 2s. 9d. per dozen or a loss of 1s. 1d. per dozen, or £1 12s. 6d. per case. The market was reduced 3d. per dozen to 3s. 7d. per dozen, week commencing July 30, when 1,658 cases were packed on which the board lost 10d. per doz, or £1 5s. per case. For week commencing August 6, 1,954 cases were packed on which the board lost a further £1 5s. per case. Before packing for export the board supplied all local demands and only the surplus eggs were packed. With the overseas price on the present basis of 3s. 3d. per dozen f.o.b. the board cannot continue to pay prices greatly in excess of what it receives for the surplus.

#### PHENOTHIAZINE SUPPLIES.

Mr. HAWKEE—Has the Minister of Agriculture any information to give regarding the question I asked on Tuesday last in relation to supplies of phenothiazine?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I duly made inquiries about the suggested shortage and the reports received were entirely contrary to what the honourable member suggested. I am informed that practically all pastoral houses and firms which supply such requisites have abundant stocks, and consequently it should not be difficult to obtain supplies. However, it was indicated that the phenothiazine manufactured by I.C.I. was in short supply for some months owing to a shortage of one ingredient. This has now been overcome and increased supplies will be obtainable in the coming months. I was assured by the firms to which I applied for information that there will be ample supplies for South Australian users and I am sure that that report will be very satisfactory to the honourable member and to those engaged in industries similar to his own.

#### FINDON SCHOOL.

Mr. HUTCHENS—People living in the Findon and adjacent areas are concerned about the inadequate school accommodation. Because of the exceptionally wet weather children have been obliged to sit in overcrowded classrooms after becoming wet through. Their parents are anxious to learn when the proposed new work at the Findon school will be commenced. Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made towards the construction of the new school?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—A contract for the erection of this building, which is to be prefabricated, has been let, and advice has

just been received that the materials will be shipped from England next March. The school will be completed about nine months after their arrival, but a start will be made next week on the foundations and sewer connections, and this work will take about three months. Everything that can be done at this end will be carried out in anticipation of the arrival of the prefabricated materials.

#### MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON—The centre traffic guide line on the Mount Barker Road was repainted about five or six weeks ago. White paint was used over the yellow which had previously been put down, but all that now remains is the indistinct yellow marking; practically all the white paint has disappeared. It has been suggested to me, and I think it a good suggestion, that the department should revert to the use of yellow paint, which apparently is more durable. I know that the marking of roads is expensive, but in the interests of safety it is important that it be carried out. Will the Minister of Local Government take up the suggestion to use yellow paint again?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will take it up with the Highways Commissioner and bring down his reply. It is obvious that not only the most distinct but the most durable paint should be used. It may be that the white paint did not have a chance to dry before being crossed by traffic.

#### METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS' KILLING CAPACITY.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Agriculture any further information to give in reply to my question of Tuesday last about the capacity of the Abattoirs to handle the additional numbers of sheep and lambs that may be expected this year?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I told the honourable member that I would get the actual numbers the Abattoirs can handle. They have informed me that provided the four chains are fully manned they can kill 17,000 sheep and lambs a day, or 85,000 in a five-day working week. If the men were prepared to also work on Saturdays and Sundays there would be a corresponding increase in the numbers killed.

#### POTATO SUPPLIES.

Mr. DUNKS—I understand there is another big shortage of potatoes. Can the Minister of Agriculture say when the position is likely to improve?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The latest information is that a shipment of 25,000 bags is expected from Tasmania about the beginning of September. They will be sufficient to tide us over for a period, but there will not be sufficient locally-grown potatoes for some time after that. If the honourable member so desires, I could possibly get further information from the chairman of the Potato Board.

#### PRICE OF BUTTER.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—A meeting of Prices Ministers is to be held in Western Australia tomorrow at which the price of butter will be considered. It has been published in the press that some States favour an increase of 6d. a pound while others have mentioned 1½d. and 1s. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate whether at this conference the South Australian representative will insist, in line with certain other States, that some of the proposed increase shall be subsidized by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The Prices Ministers are a body with powers of their own in this matter, and I think it would be highly improper for me at this stage to make any suggestions to the House of what the conference is likely to decide. It will consist of Ministers from all the States and I cannot look into the minds of any one of them, not even that of the South Australian Minister. After full discussion no doubt the conference will make its decision, which will be duly published.

#### MEAT MEAL SUPPLIES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 8 regarding the allocation of meat meal, particularly to poultry breeders?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I sought some information from the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board as to how its supplies of meat meal were sold and have been advised that since the war all meat meal produced by the board is sold to local regular customers listed with it. These include stock feed manufacturers and the Red Comb Egg Association, who in turn reallocate supplies to their own customers and members. The Government has no knowledge as to how these regular customers dispose of meat meal purchased by them.

#### POLIOMYELITIS EPIDEMIC.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I have heard a number of lectures by medical men on the poliomyelitis epidemic and got the impression that the

gathering together of people, particularly children, has a tendency to encourage the spread of the disease. In view of the grave nature of the epidemic and, as the Defence Department has isolated men at Woodside because of their association with poliomyelitis cases, will the Government consider the advisability of prohibiting children from attending the musical festival to be held from September 3 to 6, as well as rehearsals, which will submit children to grave danger?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up the matter with the Minister of Health and advise the honourable member later.

#### SCHOOL OF FARM ENGINEERING.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Agriculture's attention been drawn to a paper given by Mr. Petras, garage proprietor, at the Karoonda conference of Agricultural Bureaux, and recorded in the *Chronicle* of August 9, in which Mr. Petras points out that this State has a shortage of 5,000 motor mechanics and that an estimate taken two years ago in Victoria revealed a shortage of 7,000? Mr. Petras recommended maintenance schools in country areas so that tractor owners can keep down maintenance costs. Has the Minister's attention also been drawn to last week's *Chronicle* which records that the first tractor school was held in Sydney recently on behalf of New South Wales junior farmers. The school was opened by Mr. Heffron, the New South Wales Minister of Education, who told juniors that he was keen to encourage in every way possible the mechanization of rural industries. He added:—

With a rising population and Australia's moral obligations to other countries it was necessary to take full advantage of everything which would increase production. . . . Farm mechanization would be a big step in this direction and would help overcome the present manpower shortage in rural industries.

It is evident that New South Wales is fully alive to the necessity to keep primary production at full peak and all mechanical plant operating. If Roseworthy College is unable to undertake this work could country agricultural bureaux be used to start something on behalf of the young farmers' movement, which the Agricultural Department inaugurated recently? There is no better method of keeping young men on the land than by enabling them to maintain an intelligent interest in tractors.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—My attention was not drawn to the article of

August 9, neither was it drawn to the paper given by Mr. Petras at Karoonda, although I have read it. I have not read the latest *Chronicle* article. The South Australian Department of Agriculture need not take its hat off to any department in Australia as regards rural education. We claim that our agricultural bureau system of education is ahead of any other State, notwithstanding that we have not as many members on our staff as some States. It has been stated by competent people that our system of taking education to farmers is ahead of that of any other country.

As regards tractor schools, the honourable member mentioned that South Australia is thousands of mechanics short and that Victoria has a bigger shortage. That poses the question whether we will be able to get the necessary mechanics to lecture students; at present it is more or less impracticable. Persons who buy tractors here receive a certain amount of tuition from tractor firms, but the firms feel that they are not in a position to give demonstrations at schools, as suggested by the honourable member. We are very much interested in what will be done in regard to rural youth movements, and that matter will be taken up by them when they are properly established.

#### TRESPASSING ON LAND BILL.

##### Second reading.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Newcastle—Minister of Agriculture)—For a considerable time past there have been grievous complaints by landowners in certain districts about the difficulties they have with people who trespass upon their holdings, particularly at lambing time. The landowners claim that considerable losses occur in their flocks and that frequently they receive impertinence from trespassers who are asked to get off the land. I had a case brought under my notice where a landowner in the Lower North spoke to a man and his wife who were trespassing on his land. The man refused to give his name and was impertinent to the landowner. He then walked off the land and sat in his motor car. The landowner followed, and on asking for the registered number of the car was told, "Don't you put your hands on my car or I will have an action against you for damages." Apparently it was just for the owner of the motor car to take action against the landowner, but not for the latter to have any rights in connection with his land. As a result of this trespassing the landowners

formed an association to protect themselves. They asked the Government to tighten the trespassing on land legislation in order to give them a greater protection than they have now. The Bill has been drafted to meet their wishes, and the Parliamentary Draftsman's report on it is as follows:—

The purpose of this Bill, as its long title indicates, is to make further and better provision for the prevention of trespassing on land. At present there are two Acts which deal with this matter. One is the Police Act which declares that any person who is in or upon certain specified types of lands or premises without lawful excuse or for an unlawful purpose shall be a rogue and a vagabond and liable to six months in gaol. There is little doubt that this provision was not intended to deal with trespassing in what may be called agricultural areas, and having regard to the types of premises mentioned in it, the courts would very probably hold that it did not apply to such areas. The other Act now in force is the Trespassing on Land Act, 1928, which was passed specifically to deal with trespassing on land in agricultural areas. The scheme of this Act is that a landowner may put up a notice on a paddock stating that sheep are grazing there, and it then becomes an offence to trespass in the paddock. The penalty is a fine of not more than £5.

The Government has recently received representations from the Adelaide Plains Landowners Protection Association, and other persons, including the member for Glenelg, asking that more stringent legislation should be passed. It has been pointed out that trespassing has recently been extremely prevalent and has caused no little damage to lambing ewes and their progeny. Landowners find it difficult and often impossible to find out the names of the persons responsible for the damage and in addition it is said the present maximum penalty of £5 is not a sufficient deterrent. A further weakness of the present Act is that the landowner is required to put up a notice in each paddock which he desires to protect. It is common knowledge that in recent years trespassers, mainly persons in search of mushroom rooms on other people's land, have become so numerous and enterprising that in order to protect himself fully a landowner would have to put up not one, but a number of notices: The Government considers that this is an unreasonable burden to place on landowners. Most people know that trespass is a violation of the rights of others and it should not be necessary to constantly remind them of it by notices.

The Government proposes, therefore, to ask Parliament to repeal the Act of 1928 and enact in its place some more stringent provisions, the details of which are as follows:—First, by clause 3 it is provided that the Bill will apply only in parts of the State to be proclaimed by the Governor. Honourable members will realize that in areas of relatively sparse population it would not be reasonable to expect people to refrain entirely from entering the land of others. Clause 4 contains a definition

of the expression "enclosed field" to the effect that an enclosed field is one which is enclosed by fences, hedges, or walls and has sheep or cattle grazing upon it. Land will be regarded as enclosed notwithstanding gaps in the fences or other structures surrounding it. The Act will apply to any enclosed field, although there may be no warning notice erected on it. Clause 5 makes it an offence to enter or remain unlawfully upon any enclosed field. The penalty is a fine of not more than £10 for a first offence and £20 for a subsequent offence. Clause 6 prescribes a penalty for any person who unlawfully remains on an enclosed field after being requested in accordance with the Bill to leave. For a first offence the penalty is a fine of not more than £20 and up to £40 for a subsequent offence. Clause 7 imposes an obligation on a person in an enclosed field to state his name and address upon being requested to do so in accordance with the Bill.

Clause 8 sets out that a request under the Bill that a person should depart from any enclosed field, or should state his name and address may be made by the owner or occupier of the enclosed field or any person in his employment. When making any such request the person making it must inform the person to whom it is made that he is the owner or occupier or an employee, as the case may be; and if any such statement is false the person making it is liable to a penalty of £20. Clause 9 contains evidentiary provisions to facilitate proof of the areas within which the Bill applies and to place the onus on the defendant of showing that his presence on any land was lawful. Clause 10 provides that the Bill will not take away rights under other Acts or at common law. In this Bill the Government has no desire to be unduly harsh upon the general public and has no doubt that the courts will see that it is not used oppressively against the harmless trespasses which inevitably occur. But there is no doubt that a section of the public has allowed its enthusiasm for mushrooming to outweigh its respect for the rights and property of landowners, and some more stringent measures than have been taken in the past are now necessary.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Have there been many prosecutions under the present legislation?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I do not know. There have recently been prosecutions in some courts in the Lower North and fines have been imposed. However, it is considered that those fines were altogether too light. This Bill tightens up the position and provides for heavier fines. It also makes it obligatory on a person to move off land if requested to do so by the owner or his employee.

Mr. Shannon—Does the definition of "enclosed field" include areas used for growing crops?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Not unless sheep or cattle are grazing on them. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PAYMENT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 416.)

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—Last session Mr. President Morgan was appointed by the Government to investigate members' salaries. His findings were justified by conditions existing six months ago rather than those existing today. I feel sure that in making his report the President has taken into consideration the fact that members of Parliament are the people's representatives. I am certain that he has ignored any other income which they may receive. The fact that some members may have private incomes should not affect the amount of their Parliamentary earnings. I think Mr. President Morgan has regarded members as specialists. In a well-organized business the services of a specialist are obtained when specialized work is to be performed, and he is paid a rate commensurate with his ability and the responsibility of his job. In some businesses with which I am connected the managers are paid much more than I receive as a representative of the people. The member for Mitcham said that this House is in session for only six months of the year and may sit for only about 50 days; but I point out that at present I am paying shearers engaged on my property a rate which will yield them as much in six months as I earn in twelve. I am paying a woolelasser over £30 a week and keep, to which he is entitled under his award; but I receive only £18 a week as a member of Parliament. To suggest that a representative of the people is not entitled to the same income as that paid to his employee is belittling not only to that representative but to the people he represents.

I do not agree with the member for Mitcham that members are not putting in as much time on their job as they should. During the session I leave home at 5 a.m. every Tuesday and arrive in Adelaide about mid-day. As the House usually sits until 10 p.m. on that day, I am on duty for 17 hours at a stretch. On Wednesday and Thursday I am on duty in the House and return home Friday night. On Saturday, Sunday, and Monday various people visit me on local matters. I consider that a

full week's work. The allowance of £100 payable to certain country members is insufficient to pay their expenses. The member for Mitcham also said members' donations were purely voluntary and made for reasons of popularity; but that was the weakest argument he advanced. If it were followed to its logical conclusion, our democratic system would disappear and only people with sufficient private incomes who are prepared to buy their way into Parliament would take their places in this House. That would be an undesirable state of affairs. Not every member is in the position of the member for Mitcham. If our democratic system is to be preserved, the people's representatives must be adequately rewarded.

It has been suggested that country members obtain great financial assistance from the use of their gold rail passes. There is not one town in my electorate which I can visit by rail and return home on the same day. Since entering Parliament I have not used the railway for the purpose of carrying out business in my electorate. It is impossible. I use the railway only in travelling to Adelaide during the session. I feel that the payment of inadequate salaries to the representatives of the people is partly to blame for the fact that by the time they are sufficiently independent financially many feel that they are too old to serve as members. Men have family responsibilities and to forsake them to come here, possibly to be thrown out at the end of three years, is too big a sacrifice unless there is a commensurate remuneration. During the week-end I spoke to several people in my district who mentioned the proposed increase, and not one of them said it was not justified; all agreed that we were entitled to it. I support the Bill, not because I cannot do without the extra money, but because I want to see in this place true and proper representation of the people of South Australia.

Mr. PATTINSON (Glenelg)—During the year 1947 questions concerning the inadequacy of the remuneration of members of Parliament were raised on several occasions and, because they directly affected the interests of members, the Government decided to refer the question to an independent committee consisting of Mr. President Morgan, Judge Paine, and the Auditor-General, Mr. Bishop, with the President as Chairman. The committee heard evidence and obtained information from other States and in due course presented its report. The Government then introduced legislation

based entirely upon that report and it was passed without any amendment, or any dissentient voice. In the succeeding years the cost of living increased by leaps and bounds and many members on both sides felt that some further increase was justified. In the forefront of those members was my friend and colleague, the member for Mitcham because, on November 23, 1950, he asked the Premier the following question concerning the salaries of members of Parliament:—

Looking at the living wage figures this morning I found that in 1948 the amount was £5 17s. a week and that since then it had progressively increased until today it is £6 17s. It seems certain that there will be another £1 a week increase, and probably some additional loading. There are certain people in the community not covered by the Industrial Code, such as executives of organizations who are regarded as staff men, and who often do not receive any increase. The policy in the industry with which I am connected has always been to pass on the living wage increase to these people, even though we are not forced to do so. I think members of Parliament are in the same category. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to do anything to enable members of Parliament to receive the increases that have taken place in the living wage since 1948 and to make provision for their getting future increases?

I ask members to note the concluding words.

Mr. Dunks—I am still running true to form.

Mr. PATTINSON—I am simply saying that the honourable member urged the Premier, on behalf of himself and others, that they should be permitted to receive those increases which had taken place up to that time, and make provision for their getting future increases. The Premier replied:—

Dealing with the general question, provision is made under our Public Service Act for cost of living increases to be added to public servants' salaries, even those of our higher paid officers. I do not know whether alterations in the basic wage are automatically added, but I fancy they are not. The Government does not propose to take any action this year in regard to salaries of members of Parliament. An inquiry will be made during the recess.

The Premier was as good as his word and during the recess he referred the question of an increase in the remuneration of members of Parliament to the chairman of the 1948 committee, Mr. President Morgan. The other two members of that committee, Judge Paine and the Auditor-General, were not asked to sit as a committee on this occasion for the very good reason that the Government decided, with the full knowledge of members of his Party and, I think, with the concur-

rence of the Leader of the Opposition, that the salaries of those gentlemen and other high-ranking public servants and members of the judiciary should also be reviewed and therefore, of course, it would not be proper for them to adjudicate upon their own salaries. In due course the President submitted his report to the Government, which again introduced legislation giving effect specifically to his recommendations, and it is very interesting to note—and I do not say this in any way as a reflection—that the President recommended that the salaries of his two former colleagues, an acting judge of the Supreme Court and the Auditor-General, be increased by £750 and £800 respectively. The judges' salaries were raised in 1947, and they are now being raised from £2,500 to £3,250, and the Auditor-General's salary from £1,500 to £2,300. I think that those two increases are fit and proper, but I would like to ask if the duties of any judges of the Supreme Court have been increased during the three years in question and if they are any more onerous than they were in the past? Are the duties of the Auditor-General any more onerous than they were three years ago? Speaking with some experience of these matters I suggest that they are not, but President Morgan based his recommendations for these increases on the depreciation in the value of money during that time. He rejected Mr. Dunks' suggestion for past, present, and future increases based on rises in the cost of living to be included in this legislation, and he gave the reasons for his recommendations. He said:—

In arriving at what appear to me to be the appropriate sums to be paid by way of salary by this State to the abovenamed I have relied principally upon the following matters:—(1) The change in the value of money since the salary was last fixed. (2) The salary of the individual holding a comparable office (where such exists) in each of the other five States. (3) The salaries of officers in the Public Service of this State, particularly those in the higher paid positions. Generally speaking I have given these less weight than interstate comparisons or than comparisons between the salaries of those with whom I am particularly concerned. (4) The information before me as to duties and responsibilities of the office in question and as to all other matters pertaining to it which seem to me relevant to the salary attached.

Every member of Parliament had the opportunity of placing before the President any information on the duties and responsibilities of his office. I believe that such information was freely available to the President. All the

other recommendations he made, concerning the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court, the Auditor-General, and other public officials, have been accepted by this House without amendment or disagreement, but disagreement was expressed yesterday by the members for Mitcham and Burra with the President's recommendations concerning an increase in members' salaries. I have known my friend, Mr. Dunks, for over 20 years and my respect for his ability, admiration for his integrity, and regard for his sense of public duty have increased with the years. I was glad yesterday when I listened with much disappointment and regret to his speech, that I still held him in high esteem, because had it been otherwise I would have been tempted to think he was indulging in mock heroics, playing to the press gallery and trying to obtain cheap publicity at the expense of his friends and colleagues in this House. As it is, I entirely absolve him from that. At the same time I could not but feel that his speech was a misguided one in general, and in particular regrettable in as much as it did a distinct disservice to the institution of Parliament and an injustice to his fellow-members on both sides of the House.

I have had some experience in this House extending intermittently over 21 years since 1930. I have heard many speeches here about members' salaries and well remember one made in 1931 by an able and earnest young man, Mr. Edgar Dawes, who represented the old electoral district of Sturt. He said:—

I can never understand the psychological makeup of a member of Parliament who stands up in his place here and endeavours to depreciate his position and his responsibilities. If he were honest and were one of those individuals who did his work properly he would admit that the responsibilities and the work involved were worth more than the salary paid. Mr. Dawes was speaking of members in 1931 and his criticism, of course, does not apply to any member of the present Parliament, but there is a wealth of truth in what he said. I was one of the few members who spoke during the debate in 1948 on increases in members' salaries, and I made some outspoken remarks. I said that in my opinion the recommended increases were not generous and were no more than adequate, if indeed they were adequate, and I have great doubts whether the increases recommended and passed by this House in 1948 were adequate. I said they were inadequate in comparison with those of men engaged in comparable work outside Parliament. I also said, and repeat today,

that I make a sacrifice of earning capacity in coming into this place, just as the Supreme Court judges, whose salaries are to be increased by £750, make a sacrifice in accepting appointment to the bench. Mr. Bishop, the Auditor-General, has made a sacrifice by remaining a public servant because he could earn two or three times his present remuneration in private practice. Every member of the legal profession and of the Supreme Court bench knows that I make a financial sacrifice every year in coming here, but I like public life and, without any undue conceit, think that I have some special aptitude for it. That is why I come here.

In 1948, when speaking on the proposed increases in members' salaries, I said that we should be courageous enough to say in this place that members of Parliament, controlling the largest business in the State—the State itself—should have a salary adequate to their abilities and the work they perform. That may have been a dangerous speech for a newly-elected member and it was certainly given considerable prominence in the daily and weekly press, but I believe the electors of Glenelg endorsed my sentiments because at the next election 13,658 of them voted for me and returned me with a majority of 5,401, an increase of 1,302 over my previous majority. I think that every member of this House at that time was endorsed by the electors at the last general election. I have had the unique experience of representing, firstly a country electorate, and secondly a metropolitan electorate. I think the remuneration of members of Parliament has never been commensurate with the status of their position and the work and responsibilities involved. If there is any section of Parliament which is inadequately recompensed it is the country members. I place them in greater relief, but still say that the office of a member of Parliament is itself inadequately recompensed. No other person engaged in either primary or secondary industries or in a profession, and certainly no salary or wage earner, is obliged to incur expenses comparable with those of a member of Parliament in earning his income, nor has the same call upon his private purse. There have been two or three references during this debate to some alleged allowance of £100 to members of Parliament. Even the previous speaker, Mr. Heaslip, referred to it, but I wish he would enlighten me about it because I have been missing it for the past four years. Nobody has ever given me an allowance of £100. I contribute to nearly 50 different

organizations in my district and have travelling and many other expenses which total at least £300 per annum, but I am allowed to deduct only £100 from my gross income as a Parliamentary allowance. People in other callings are allowed huge deductions, and yet we are denied that undoubted right. Much prominence was given to the statements of my two friends, Mr. Dunks and Mr. Hawker, on the front page of the *Advertiser* today and over the air last night in reference to their magnificently generous gesture of declining to accept some portion of the emoluments provided for members. I do not want to deny them one second of their little hour of glory.

Mr. Hawker—Do you think we did it for that reason?

Mr. PATTINSON—No, not for one moment. I think both members were honest and sincere in their beliefs. At the same time members of the public might think we all come out of the one common mould and they may not realize, for instance, that Mr. Dunks has no family responsibilities, that he is by no means young, and has been engaged in profitable industry for many years, and was so engaged at a time when taxation was low. However, I honestly believe he has as great a sense of public responsibility as any member of the House. He did years of honorary service before being elected and desires to take no more of his Parliamentary salary than he needs. I think that should be said, because a large number of members are not in his financial position; the same applies to Mr. Hawker. The income they receive from other sources is very large. I do not begrudge them a penny of it, but I think we are entitled to say that a large number of members are not in that financial position whereby, even if they so desired, they could give back some of their remuneration. This is because of their family responsibilities and their lack of any other source of income. Because of their generosity—and it is an act of generosity on their part—I do not think it entitles those two honourable members to criticize or condemn the attitude of their colleagues who are either not prepared, or cannot afford, to follow their action.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is a particular weakness in their speeches.

Mr. PATTINSON—I think so. Had they made the gesture they did and left it at that I would have applauded them. I do not question their sincerity, but I think it ill-became both to belittle their fellow members for not following their example.

Mr. Hawker—I do not think you are fair to me there. I did not belittle any fellow member.

Mr. PATTINSON—If that is so, I apologize and regret having made the comment. The burden of the honourable member's speech as I understood it was that the time was not opportune for an increase. I have heard that said before over a period of 20 years. When is the time opportune for members to receive an adequate allowance? This year we have experienced the almost unlimited bounty of nature, with almost unparalleled prosperity. For example, the income of any member who is a grazier as a result of the sale of his wool, sheep, and rams must be almost fantastic, and probably any income from any other source would be almost an embarrassment to him. I would never suggest that the price of wool or other products should be pegged, as I believe that any man is entitled to the fruits of his labours. However, if ever there was a time when there should be an increase in the salaries of members it is now. Nobody on this occasion can accuse me of speaking with two voices and say that I have asked for wages, but not salaries, to be pegged. I have never advocated that wages should be pegged as I believe the worker is entitled to the sale of the only product he has, namely, his labour, in the same way as the woolgrower is entitled to sell his wool on the best market at the best price he can get. Reference has been made to other incomes earned by members in this House. Many do receive allowances for work done, such as you, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, the chairman and the members of the Public Works Committee and the Land Settlement Committee and other Parliamentary committees. My only criticism is that despite the proposed increases some members will still be underpaid. One particular case which comes to mind in this connection is that of the chairman of the Public Works Committee.

There are many members of Parliament who accept additional work, but receive no remuneration for it. I mention myself merely as an example. I sat for a year with highly paid public servants and local government officers as chairman of the Foreshore Advisory Committee. I did not receive, nor did I expect, one penny additional payment. I think it should be said that some of us do a lot of work without receiving any payment. I have represented this Parliament and the Government for four years as chairman of the State Traffic Committee. I have never received any fee or

reward or any expenses for doing so. Certain members of this House represent Parliament on the University Council. Some not only represent the House on that council, but also on the National Fitness Council, for which they receive no fee or reward. They are pleased to do it. I refuse to accept the basis that our work begins and ends with 51 sitting days. That is too fantastic. Many of us are busy in our districts on other matters. I was one of the prime movers in having a maternity hospital established at Glenelg. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Frank Walsh, and I were two of the prime movers in having the Ashford community general hospital established to serve not only our own districts, but the districts of Mitcham and Unley. We did not always receive support for that worthy enterprise from the directions we expected. I think every member can give illustrations of work that they are undertaking, of which the public knows nothing, and for which members do not receive the credit, or even gratitude, to which they are entitled.

I have mentioned the many calls on one's private purse for being a patron, vice-patron, president or vice-president of some worthy organization in his electorate. Last night I tried to make a tally of the different organizations, and reached nearly 50, of which I am either one or other of those four office bearers, ranging from a community kindergarten organization on the one hand to a homing pigeon club on the other. I disagree with yesterday's gibe that members are doing this to gain popularity. I do it to show my interest in worthy activities of certain groups in my district. It is not only a question of making a donation, but of taking a lead by our patronage and giving the organization the benefit of any advice and experience we can offer.

My colleague, Mr. Clarke, member for Burnside, has accepted a high, onerous, and honorary office in connection with our jubilee celebrations. I suppose that any soap company in Australia, which desires to celebrate its jubilee, would be only too pleased to pay him £2,000 a year for the magnificent work he has done on behalf of this State. I do not suppose that many people outside Parliament know that Mr. Clarke has not received one penny for the tremendous amount of work he has done in this direction and of the energy he has put into that worthy cause. It is time members of Parliament had the courage to say quite frankly that the status,

as well as the responsibilities that are entailed here are deserving of a decent and proper remuneration, and that we will not be banded about by people who endeavour, by any devious means whatsoever, to drag the institution of Parliament down into the dust. It ill behoves any member of Parliament, who has taken the oath to uphold the traditions of this House, to be a party to the most insidious movement that is going on in the community today to drag down the institution of Parliament, which is one of the most effective methods of dragging down the ideals of democracy.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I intended to deal with this matter fully, but after hearing the excellent speech of the member for Glenelg who has placed, I think, the views of the majority of members so well before the House, it will not be necessary for me to say much. I support the Bill; I likewise support the principles of arbitration. I have heard members criticize different sections of the community when they will not accept an arbitrator's decision. I have accepted these decisions, and members should accept them. Certain statements made by the member for Mitcham yesterday was cheap publicity at the expense of his colleagues. He was evidently trying to gain an unfair advantage over them. Certain of his statements were contrary to fact and dealt in a personal way with members. He was also unfair to many members here today who have been absent through sickness and bereavement. I have checked up on these things and have a list showing the names of the members referred to, but will not mention names. Some have lost those near and dear to them and have thus been prevented from attending Parliament. They have been criticized for this. Like myself, others have been ill. Although at times I have been unable to attend, I claim that I have been present on as many occasions as others; few hold as good an attendance record as I do. Those who were absent were not absent because they wanted to be, but because of sickness or bereavement, and it ill becomes the member for Mitcham to criticize men who were away paying their last respects to members of their family. It is a disgraceful thing for any member to say such things. Mr. Dunks said:—

In these days of Party politics the responsibilities of the rank and file members are not nearly so heavy as in the days before the Party system. To a large extent our decisions are made for us today.

How often have we heard members deny that?

Mr. Dunks continued:—

If we are good boys we agree with them and do as we are told. At times I regret that I have a will of my own; it would be much easier to say "Yes" and not "No."

Such statements lower the status of Parliament and make it appear as if he is the only member prepared to say what he thinks. He went on:—

I am always available if anyone wants to see me. I can always be found in my place when Parliament is sitting and I do not wander around the building.

Apparently he meant that members are wandering about the building, but I remind him that I have been out of the Chamber on outside work—and so has he. Even today he was out of the Chamber for a while, yet he says he is always in his place. At other times he has been out of the Chamber and the member for Eyre, Mr. Christian, has been called upon to take his place as Chairman of Committees and do the work for which Mr. Dunks receives extra payment, yet he tells the public, through *Hansard*, that he is always in his place. Mr. Dunks said that when a member attends he can walk in the front door of the Chamber, sit in his place for a moment, and then walk out the back door, but that he himself is always present. His statement is both misleading and untrue. All members know what the position is; it was proved today by his own actions. He says that he is not troubled like other members by people waiting on his doorstep wanting something done, but perhaps that is due to his not living in his district, and because of that people have to ask members for other districts to do work which Mr. Dunks should do. He said he would accept an increase in salary in accordance with basic wage increases, but the basic wage is fixed for a man, his wife, and three children; consequently Mr. Dunks should accept an increase of only one-third of the present basic wage. He also said:—

Among the people with whom I come in contact I find a great deal of criticism against the proposed increase. The general criticism is, "You are talking about all these restrictions, including wage pegging, and yet members of Parliament have decided to increase their own salaries."

He wants to curry favour with people outside. His only reason for making such statements is to make safe his position in Parliament. He repeated that he would not accept the salary increase. I heard a similar statement some years ago. A member of the Commonwealth Parliament said that he would not

accept a salary increase, but when the matter had died down he tried to collect the salary that he had earlier refused to take. He did not get it, and at the next elections he lost his seat. Mr. Dunks took an unfair advantage of members. He was put in his place by Mr. Pattinson in a very able speech. The member for Glenelg put, fairly and squarely, the views of not only Government members but members on this side. He did not look for publicity, but I hope he gets the same publicity from the local press as Mr. Dunks did. It is all very well for Mr. Dunks and Mr. Hawker to talk as they did, but they would be showing a true Christian spirit if they lived on the basic wage and paid the remainder of their salary to a deserving institution. There would be more manliness in such an act than in making the statements they did yesterday.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—Since I have been in this place I have always been a friend of Mr. Dunks and I hope I shall continue to enjoy his friendship, but I agree with Mr. Pattinson that many of his remarks were ill-advised. If he had left it at saying that this was not the right time to accept the salary increase, everything would have been all right. He went on to say that some people here did not know him very well. I always thought I knew him well, but after yesterday I have learned to know more about him. He said that during the Parliamentary recess members have less to do than when Parliament is sitting, but my Parliamentary duties are less onerous during the session than they are in the rest of the year. During the recess I get many requests which necessitate a visit to the city. When the House is sitting I can deal with requests whilst in Adelaide. Mr. Dunks also mentioned the subscriptions members make to funds of various organizations. When I first became a member I resolved to give the best service I could to my district. I believe it expects me to subscribe to various organizations and to attend functions. I resolved that I would go to any part of my district to attend a function, and my only excuse for not doing so would be that I had another appointment at the same time. Unlike other country members I am fortunate in having a rail service which enables me to get to the city on the Tuesday when Parliament sits. I can do so by catching a train at 6.15 a.m., and there is a train which gets me home at 9.30 on Thursday night. I live in the centre of my electorate, which is not the biggest of

country electorates. I frequently get invitations to attend night functions, which necessitate my travelling by motor car from 40 to 100 miles. So long as I have the confidence of my constituents I shall continue to follow this practice. In 1944 when members received a salary increase I said that all decisions to increase Parliamentary salaries should be the result of a special investigation. We have had such an investigation and I have no hesitation in accepting the decision. If members are to continue to work as efficiently as their constituents expect them, they must receive a proper remuneration. I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (Torrens)—I do not wish to become personal or to refer to irrelevant matters. I do not think the advantages of holding a gold pass were considered by Mr. President Morgan in making his recommendation, nor do I think many of the other things mentioned were considered by him. The only exception to my decision not to make any personal reference is to refer to the following statement by Mr. Dunks, and I take the strongest exception to it:—

In these days of Party politics the responsibilities of the rank and file member are not nearly so heavy as in the days before the Party system.

I was not a member of this House before the Party system came into being, nor was the honourable member, so neither of us has any idea of the responsibilities of the rank and file members in those days. Mr. Dunks also said that to a large extent decisions are made for us today. If any member likes to say that he says it for himself and not for me. Mr. Dunks also said that if we are good boys we agree with the decisions and do as we are told. If the honourable member likes to say that that is his idea of the duties of a Parliamentarian he is entitled to do so, but he cannot pass it on to me. He also said we have not the responsibility of making decisions today. I have a responsibility of making a decision today, as has Mr. Dunks and other members, without any dictation from anybody so far as I know. I want to explain in a few words my own position. The Government rightly asked Mr. President Morgan to advise on the proper remuneration for members of Parliament in view of the fall in the value of the pound and the rise in the cost of living. The President made a thorough investigation and presented his report. The Government acted correctly in presenting a Bill embodying his recommendations so that Parliament might decide the question. It is for Parliament to

decide members' salaries. It has the guidance of the President, who has had the opportunity to make a detailed investigation into the matter and who is accustomed to making decisions of this nature. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Bill would be more acceptable to him if salaries were to be fixed and adjusted periodically with the rise or fall in the cost of living. Of course, that would save the introduction of a Bill every time an alteration of members' salaries was deemed necessary, but although that method has much to commend it I feel that no automatic alteration of members' salaries should be made. They should be altered by Act of Parliament so that the public may know the salaries being paid to members.

Mr. Shannon—We have nothing to hide.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—Nothing whatever. I accept Mr. President Morgan's finding as a considered judgment on the question submitted to him. He has recommended that, if Parliament in its wisdom considers an alteration of members' salaries necessary, his schedule should be adopted. He has not said that in view of present circumstances salaries should be either increased or reduced.

Mr. Shannon—He was not asked to decide that question.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—That is correct. He did not consider the wider question of whether a change was advisable. He simply considered the matter of pounds, shillings, and pence. The danger of inflation is becoming almost an obsession with me, and has been rightly called the "demon" of inflation. With regard to this measure I cannot dissociate myself from that danger. At various times I have propounded what I considered might be some checks on inflation. I conscientiously came to the conclusion that one practical check would be the pegging of wages, which would be complementary to other checks. In Britain a Socialistic Government has introduced a wage freeze. Having expressed myself unequivocally on wage-pegging, my only course is to oppose this Bill. If I believe that the wages of workers should be pegged, then I must believe that the salaries of members should be pegged.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—In his excellent speech the member for Glenelg used very moderate language. Since I became a member of this House I have not heard such well-chosen English addressed in such scathing terms to other members. I believe that certain members who spoke yesterday really deserved the rebuke administered to them by their

colleague. I took their remarks as a rebuke to Mr. President Morgan, who was appointed by the Government to inquire into the question of members' salaries. I have advocated for a considerable time the appointment of an independent tribunal to assess the adequacy or otherwise of members' salaries. Such an inquiry having been made, the implied criticism of the President by certain members who disagreed with his findings was not worthy of a member of Parliament nor of any other public person. Members' salaries should not be the subject of acrimonious debate at any time, but should be dealt with by an independent person. The contribution to this debate by the member for Mitcham is all the more unworthy of him because he holds the office of Chairman of Committees. It did not become him to indulge in the extravagant language regarding other members of Parliament that he used yesterday. It is unworthy of his office for him to rebuke other members regarding their attendance or demeanour as Parliamentarians. Because of his criticism my esteem for him as Chairman of Committees has considerably diminished. Although the members for Mitcham and Burra may honestly believe that they are not entitled to the increased salaries, I think their attitude would have been much more meritorious had they said, "In our position we do not require it and we will pass it on," without attacking other members. The member for Burra is in a different category from the member for Mitcham. I do not believe that he meant to attack other members. Like some other members he has a private income, but should have considered the position of those members who must rely upon their Parliamentary earnings. It would seem that the motive of the members for Mitcham and Burra in not accepting the increase recommended by Mr. President Morgan is their desire to give the rest of the community a lead in this dangerous period through which we are passing, but if that was their motive they handled it badly. Members of Parliament should not be selected as one small section of the community to give a lead in the pegging of salaries. No member would say that the tribunal set up to assess the basic wage is wrong in its assessment. I accept its findings, and believe that in the same way Mr. President Morgan's findings must be accepted in this case. If the prestige of our Parliamentary system of government is to be maintained we must accept the findings of an independent person with regard to members' salaries. The

member for Burra probably did not say the time was inopportune when he received up to 180d. a pound for his wool. Will he hand some of that back to the Federal Government to do something for people on lower incomes?

Mr. O'Halloran—He will probably hand a good deal to the Federal Government in any event.

Mr. STOTT—Probably, in taxation. It ill becomes a member with a substantial private income to attack other members whose Parliamentary income constitutes their only income. I congratulate Mr. President Morgan on his findings, and support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Payments to members."

Mr. HAWKER—This is one of the clauses which I said in my second reading speech I would oppose. I want at the outset to make clear my point that when the Government asked Mr. President Morgan to report it was only a request for a report and that Parliament is the final lawmaker in this regard. If a judgment of a lower court is, on appeal, upset by a higher court in whole or in part, no question is raised about disagreeing with the umpire; judges and lawyers can disagree and there is no reflection on either. In this case I claim that we, as members of Parliament, are entitled to disagree with the finding of what may be termed in this case the lower court, and in so doing I do not cast any reflections on President Morgan's judgment. I agree that Ministers should get more salary, and I have always thought that the margin between the remuneration of private members and that of, say, the Leader of the Opposition has not been enough in view of the work performed by each. This Parliament has fixed and pegged certain receipts; rents and the price of butter, for example.

Mr. O'Halloran—This Parliament has not pegged rents.

Mr. HAWKER—It passed an Act to enable rents to be pegged.

Mr. O'Halloran—All this Parliament did was to pass a law making it necessary for a landlord to justify an increase before he could get it.

Mr. HAWKER—The general rise in rents has been more than 5 per cent and I do not think that has been enough in many cases. I agree that members of Parliament should be

well paid, but while many people are not receiving a sufficient share in what is commonly termed the bounteous prosperity I am conscientiously not prepared to accept the proposed increase in salary. I could come into this House and receive no salary. but I am not asking anyone else to do the same. Because it is my opinion that in the existing circumstances, which I doubt whether Mr. President Morgan was asked to regard, the proposed increases are not justifiable, I shall vote against the clause.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—I rise merely to make my position entirely clear, not only on this Bill, but in connection with the whole matter. It has been pointed out to me that I spoke on the Bill for increasing Ministers' salaries and not on the Bill dealing with salaries of judges and other public servants, the suggestion, of course, being that as a lawyer I might be misinterpreted as having held my peace when judges' salaries were under consideration. I wish it to be clearly understood that my reasoning in opposing this Bill acts in the same way in regard to the increase of the salaries of judges and others.

Mr. STOTT—Mr. Hawker's remarks are more confusing than ever. He says he justifies his opposition to the Bill because Parliament has said, in effect, that it is going to peg rents and butter prices. This Parliament has nothing whatever to do with that. Does he think it should be turned into an Arbitration Court or a rents tribunal? Parliament did the proper thing and delegated power to a tribunal to assess rents. It has done exactly the same thing in principle in regard to members' salaries. The honourable member's argument falls to the ground, and puts him in a much more foolish position than before. He says he does not want to speak derogatively of President Morgan, but that is just what he has done. It is becoming farcical. We should maintain our dignity and pass the Bill without any more nonsense.

Mr. WHITTLE—I cannot understand Mr. Hawker's attitude. I think we must go back to the time when payment of members of Parliament was first instituted to find the basis of his reasoning. If the truth were told he, like some of his ancestors, probably does not believe in payment of members, but we must realize that Parliament is a congregation of representatives of all sections of the community and that some members are dependent upon their Parliamentary salaries. I am not amongst them and consequently Mr. Dunks'

remarks about duties, responsibilities and attendances did not affect me. The Government's action in referring the matter to President Morgan was a fair thing for Parliament as an entity. If Mr. Hawker does not wish to accept any increase that is his own business, but he should look at the matter as affecting members generally, and if it is fair for people in industry, commerce, and agricultural and pastoral pursuits, and particularly the wage-earners, to receive more it is a fair thing for those members of Parliament who are dependent upon their Parliamentary salaries for the whole or greater part of their income. The honourable member is not justified in saying that we should vote against this clause simply because he does not agree with it.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I cannot understand why some members say that the increases proposed are too great. This is the first time I have ever known anyone to say that a benefit from the decision of a tribunal was too generous.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member is not in order in referring to the debate that took place in the House.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Then you should have called to order the member for Prospect.

The CHAIRMAN—He made an explanation in his remarks.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I believe the increases recommended by Mr. President Morgan are insufficient in comparison with the salaries paid to members of the Commonwealth and other State Parliaments. Because we have fewer members of Parliament in this State our duties are more onerous. Some members referred to increases in the basic wage since the salaries of members were last fixed, but we must remember that the margins of skilled and experienced men have been increased, otherwise the remuneration of the skilled man would not be much above that of the basic wage earner. Those who have stated they will not accept the full increase are in the fortunate position of not needing it, but many members, particularly on this side of the House, are dependent entirely on their Parliamentary salaries. Those who suggested that the increase is too great have taken a mean and petty attitude, with no consideration for other members. If they do not take the full increase it will be because they would be placed in a higher income taxation group.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! Nobody has said anything about that in Committee.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

#### ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Yorke Peninsula—Minister of Lands)—The Advances for Homes Act empowers the State Bank of South Australia to make advances to persons for the purpose of purchasing or building dwelling-houses and the Act now provides that any advance for this purpose may not exceed £1,500. Advances can be made up to nine-tenths of the value of the security and are repayable upon the credit foncier system over a term of years. The present maximum for advances was fixed under an amending Act passed in 1949 and the main purpose of this Bill is to increase this maximum to £1,750. Since 1949 building costs have increased appreciably and if the policy of the Advances for Homes Act is to be given effect, namely, that financial assistance by means of a mortgage loan will be made available to any person desiring to establish his own home who can pay a reasonable amount towards the cost, then it follows that the maximum amount which can be advanced should be increased. The point may perhaps be taken that a mortgage loan may reach an amount which it is not prudent for a person of moderate means to contract. However, the successive increases in the basic wage which have affected building costs have also increased the monetary income of a prospective mortgagor. Perhaps the most important factor in considering whether a prospective borrower can afford to enter into his mortgage commitments is a consideration whether his income is sufficient to enable him to meet, without undue strain, the periodical payments under his mortgage. The weekly commitment under a credit foncier loan for 30 years is approximately 2s. 6d. per week for every £100 borrowed. It follows, therefore, that if the mortgage limit is increased by £250 the increased weekly liability thereby incurred in a relatively small sum.

Clauses 3 to 6 therefore amend various sections of the Advances for Homes Act relating to the maximum advances which may be made

by the State Bank under that Act and increase this maximum from £1,500 to £1,750. Clause 2 deals with the manner in which the State Bank is to be recouped the costs of administering the Advances for Homes Act. Section 8 of the Act provides that the Treasurer is, after June 30 in every year, to pay to the State Bank as consideration for the administration of the Act by the bank and to meet those expenses, such an amount as is fixed by the Treasurer from time to time but not exceeding 10s. per centum of the moneys due on that June 30 in respect of advances and agreements under the Act and reverted properties. This limit of 10s. per centum has stood in the Act since 1928; before 1928 the limit fixed by statute was 15s. per centum. The State Bank has pointed out to the Government that the present limit of cost is insufficient. The costs incurred by the bank by way of salaries and other expenses have necessarily increased during the past years and beyond the limit fixed by the present Act, with the result that in the financial year ending June 30, 1951, the actual cost to the bank of administering the Advances for Homes Act was £36,163, but the amount recouped under its commission of 10s. per centum was £21,268, showing a loss to be borne by the bank of £14,895. The Act is, in effect, administered by the bank as the agent for the Government. The amounts advanced under the Act are paid from a Treasury account called the Advances for Homes Loan Account; moneys collected by the bank in repayment of principal are paid to the credit of this account whilst moneys collected by way of interest or rent are paid into general revenue. It is accordingly considered proper that the bank should be recouped the actual costs reasonably incurred by it in administering the Act and clause 2 therefore repeals section 8 and enacts a new section which provides that after the close of any financial year, beginning with the current financial year, the Treasurer is from general revenue to recoup the bank its costs and expenses of administering the Act, but it is provided that the Auditor-General must first certify that, in his opinion, those costs and expenses were reasonable.

Clause 7 repeals subsection (5) of section 42 of the Advances for Homes Act. Section 42 provides that if an advance is made by the bank in respect of any dwellinghouse, the dwellinghouse is not to be disposed of without the consent of the bank. The section also provides that a mortgage cannot be discharged before the due date unless the bank consents

to the discharge. Subsection (5) provides that, during the first ten years after an advance is made, the bank is not to give consent under the section unless the bank is satisfied that the refusal of consent would cause great hardship. The purpose of the Act is to enable an advance to be made to a person so that he can secure a house in which to live with his family and the object of section 42 is to secure that a person who receives the benefit of an advance shall not traffic in the house thereby obtained.

The provisions of subsection (5) providing that consent during the first ten years is only to be given in cases of hardship have caused concern to the State Bank. The bank has been advised by the Crown Solicitor that it cannot give consent to a transfer of the house if the application was made to enable the applicant to improve his economic position, for example, if he has a chance of a better job elsewhere. The State Bank suggests that in cases of this nature and similar cases it should have a discretion in the matter and has therefore recommended that subsection (5) be repealed and this is done by clause 6. The repeal of subsection (5) will not in any way affect the general policy of section 42, namely, that the consent of the bank must be obtained to any dealing in the property concerned, but the bank will be given the same discretion to give or refuse consent during the first ten years of the advance as it now has for the balance of the term of the advance. I move the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Yorke Peninsula—Minister of Lands)—The Homes Act, 1941, enacts a scheme under which the Treasurer may guarantee the repayment of loans made by financial institutions to persons purchasing or otherwise acquiring their own homes. Under

the Act a guaranteed loan may be made up to 90 per centum of the value of the security and the guarantee relates to the amount of the loan in excess of 70 per centum of the loan. The Act now provides that a guarantee is not to be given in respect of any loan exceeding £1,500. Since the passing of the Act in 1941 until August 8, 1951, a total of 5,536 applications had been approved under the Act. The total loans made to the applicants amounted to £5,308,798, and of this £1,041,981 was guaranteed by the Treasurer. As previously mentioned, the maximum loan which may be made under the Act is £1,500. This limit was fixed by an amending Act passed in 1949 which increased the maximum loan from £1,250 to £1,500.

Since 1949, when the matter was last considered by Parliament, very substantial increases in building costs have occurred. There have been increases in the basic wage, some of considerable proportions, and the inevitable effect of those increases has been to increase the cost of site labour and of building materials. As building costs increase it follows that, unless the amount of the maximum loan is increased, there is an ever-widening gap between the cost of building a house and the maximum amount which a prospective home owner can borrow in order to secure his own home; and, of course, as that gap widens so is home ownership made more and more difficult for the person of moderate means. It is accordingly proposed by the Bill to increase the maximum loan under the Homes Act from £1,500 to £1,750 and thus provide further assistance to those desiring to avail themselves of the scheme for home ownership provided by the Homes Act. I move the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 28, at 2 p.m.