

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Thursday, May 12, 1960.

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

**POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT ACT.**

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Act.

**QUESTIONS.****OVERSEAS LOANS.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In this morning's *Advertiser* there appears a report of a broadcast made last night by the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, with reference to the borrowing of large amounts from overseas, in the course of which he said:—

It seemed that the Australian Governments, and particularly the Commonwealth, were in danger of forgetting the lessons of history . . .

He continued:—

In prosperity such as Australia now enjoys it should surely be possible to provide necessary things for the people out of Australian resources and savings.

and finally:—

In other words, we are paying the highest rates of interest for the least desirable loans. Will the Chief Secretary request the Premier to raise this issue at the next Loan Council meeting with a view to restricting in some measure large overseas borrowing? Also, in view of the Premier's justifiable criticism of the Commonwealth Government on this issue, does he not consider the time opportune for a change of Government in that realm for the purpose of halting this reckless borrowing overseas?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I am always quite happy to refer any request by members to the Premier, but the honourable member has promoted some suggestions and I would like to express my own opinion on one of them, namely with regard to overseas capital coming into this country.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—This is not capital, but borrowing.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The honourable member has implied certain things. I say that the more overseas capital we can have invested in a young and growing country the better opportunities we will have in main-

taining the standard of living and the high rate of employment which we have enjoyed for many years. I am sure that any question raised by the Premier would be decided at a Loan Council meeting on the relevant facts associated with the case. I will be happy to pass the question on to the Premier in the interests of and I hope not to the detriment of anybody within our own State.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I want to make it abundantly clear—

The PRESIDENT—Order! The honourable member cannot make a statement. He can ask a question.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I desire to make a personal explanation if I may. I want to make it clear that my question did not imply the precluding of overseas capital coming here for the establishment of industry.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—It sounded like it.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member must ask his question.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am making a personal explanation.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member must obtain leave if he desires to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave accordingly.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I want to make it clear that I do not object to capital coming to Australia for the establishment of industry, nor do members of our Party. I am a member of the Industries Development Committee which has dealt with applications from many overseas firms, and has recommended the guaranteeing of loans to many, but my question, which was very adroitly side-tracked—

The Hon. C. R. Story—Question!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Will the Chief Secretary see that the full purport of the broadcast by the Premier with regard to overseas borrowing is brought up at the next Loan Council meeting?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I am sure that the honourable member is quite capable of interpreting actions relating to any of the broadcasts which have been put over the air and which are appreciated by so many people.

**CIVILIAN LAND SETTLEMENT.**

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—My question relates to the settlement of young qualified people on the land, a matter with which I dealt fairly fully in my speech on the Address in Reply. My questions are (1) What are the Government's intentions relating to assistance for the establishment of young, qualified farmers on the land? (2) Does the Government intend to make provision in the Loan programme for funds for this purpose in the coming year?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The question is one which has always been of interest to the Government, and if the honourable member will place it on the Notice Paper I will get the latest information regarding it for him.

#### THEFT OF MOTOR CARS.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I yesterday asked a question as to whether penalties should not be increased for the illegal use of motor cars. Has the Attorney-General any additional information to give the House?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I have obtained from the Police Magistrate, Mr. Clarke, some further information regarding this matter. The offence in question is created by section 53 of the Road Traffic Act and consists of driving or using a motor vehicle without first obtaining the consent of the owner. The punishment provided by the section is, for a first offence, imprisonment for not more than 12 months, and for any subsequent offence, imprisonment for not less than three months or more than two years. Statistics of the Adelaide Police Court showed that from the period July 4, 1955, to July 11, 1957, out of 150 persons of 18 years of age and over convicted of the offence, 108 of them were imprisoned. Since then I had the figures taken out for the 12 months ending on August 11, 1958. These figures show that in that period in the Adelaide Police Court, out of 100 persons of 18 years and over convicted of this offence 88 were imprisoned. Bringing the matter up-to-date, during 1959 of 116 male persons 18 years of age or over convicted at the Adelaide Police Court of this offence, no less than 101 were imprisoned. In the juvenile court, which deals with offenders under 18 years of age, out of 106 persons convicted, 34 were sent to the reformatory, but it must be remembered that different principles of punishment apply in the juvenile court, the welfare of the child being regarded as of great importance. Orders for compensation, however, are commonly made and substantial fines imposed. On August 23, 1957, the Police

Magistrate gave evidence before the State Traffic Committee at Parliament House and expressed the view that the penalties provided by section 53 of the Act were sufficiently high and he has informed me that he is still of the same opinion.

#### MEMBERS' TYPISTS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I direct a question to you, Mr. President. A circular has been sent to members regarding the appointment of two new members' typists. The latter part of the circular says, "No electioneering typing or work will be undertaken." I ask, who will be the judge of what work is electioneering typing or work in connection with electioneering?

The PRESIDENT—If it is necessary to have a judge I will be the judge.

#### ADVERTISING OF MILK.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—Has the Chief Secretary a further reply to a question I asked on the advertising of milk by the Milk Board with a view to increasing sales?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I have some further information for the honourable member. The previous reply given was that the matter was being taken up with the industry and its views were being obtained. The Minister has made available to me a report which is to the effect that after having consulted the industry he finds it is in favour of the board being granted additional powers. The industry is divided as to what form the publicity should take, the amount to be spent, and how the funds should be provided. One producer organization based its support on the contention that publicity must primarily benefit the producer and this could only be ensured by contracting for production. In consequence of that the board desires to hold further discussions with the industry before submitting a recommendation.

#### VERMIN CONTROL.

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

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—Some time ago when talking of problems associated with vermin control I said that a council that adopted stringent measures to enforce the control of vermin sometimes found itself in a rather invidious position compared with other councils that were not prepared to adopt such stern measures. The following figures were taken from the *Government Gazette*, which has published balance sheets over the

last two years. I quote these figures prior to asking my question. One district council area spent £150 on rabbit and vermin control, another spent £18, another £3, and the council next door to that spent nothing at all. Another adjacent to the last mentioned spent £146. The particular council area that is, in my opinion, doing its work on this matter properly spent in those two years £779. I ask the Attorney-General whether it is not possible to appoint a man to supervise and help councils in their duty of controlling vermin at a district council level?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I shall be pleased to get some information from my colleague the Minister of Lands on the matter, but I may say that I do know that in some parts of this State councils have joined together and have appointed an inspector to serve several council areas. The inspector looks after the Vermin Act and various matters arising under the Health Act and certain other Acts administered by councils, and I do know that in the particular area to which I have referred that scheme is working very satisfactorily.

#### ALSATIAN DOGS.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I ask the Attorney-General if he has a reply to the question I asked regarding Government action in connection with Alsatian dogs?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—Some time ago the honourable member asked me whether the Government contemplated any action following the injury that was done to a small child by an Alsatian dog. I have had some investigations made into the matter and find in that instance, because the attack on the child took place on the premises of the owner of the dog, no police action could be taken. However, the owner of the dog in that instance did immediately arrange for its destruction, and it was destroyed by officers of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals on the next day.

In regard to the general question, the Government has considered this matter and finds it rather difficult to initiate any method that would be satisfactory short of providing for the destruction of all dogs of this type. For the time being it feels it is not in a position to take any action that would help the particular situation.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I ask the Attorney-General if he will take up with the Government the possibility of increasing the fees for the registration of Alsatian dogs.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I shall be pleased to refer that matter to the Government to see whether anything should be done along those lines.

#### SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from May 11. Page 452.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—I desire to address myself to this measure for two main reasons. Firstly, I desire to endeavour to correct some of the common impressions concerning the duties of members of Parliament and the payment they receive for services they render; and secondly, to indicate to this Chamber how I shall vote on this measure and the reason for my decision. I will deal in the main with my own case, because I know it best. I believe that every member of Parliament is affected differently by the salary increase and what I say will in broad terms apply to myself. I represent the Legislative Council district of Midland, which comprises eight Assembly districts—Gawler, Gouger, Angus, Barossa, Light, Wallaroo, Yorke Peninsula and Bidley. I live at Renmark, which is on the eastern boundary of my district. At present my gross annual remuneration is £2,200. This is the same as for any member of Parliament who represents a district that is more than 50 and not more than 200 miles from the General Post Office, Adelaide. Out of this gross amount of £2,200 a member is obliged to buy and run his own motor car. Since I entered Parliament in 1955 my annual mileage has never been below 15,000 miles and on other occasions well in excess of that. It is impossible to run a motor car for that mileage for under £500 a year. In fact, one is cutting it to the bare minimum, and today I am using very conservative figures for my illustrations. A member must also meet the expense of accommodation while in the city attending the sittings of Parliament or on Parliamentary business. I wish to make that very clear. Parliament sits for some 60 to 65 days a year, but a member of Parliament's time in Adelaide is far in excess of that.

When a member has to attend a deputation in Adelaide desired by his district he does so

at his own expense out of the £2,200. He is also obliged to pay hotel accommodation when visiting outlying areas of his district. This item alone accounts for at least £180 a year. The member must also pay telephone and telegraph charges for all calls made by him in his electorate. There is no special arrangement for State members to receive any assistance with telephone or telegraph services. They must be paid for out of his salary. If he is to obtain the maximum benefit from the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund he must contribute £100 a year. This scheme has been operating for some years. A member does not become entitled to any benefit from the fund until he has been a member for 12 years, and even then he can obtain such benefit only if he is defeated at an election or a Supreme Court judge certifies that the circumstances justify his retiring from Parliament. After 12 years the benefit amounts to £9 a week, which is less than the old-age pension paid to a married couple who are both in receipt of the pension, which amounts to £9 10s. a week. A member of the South Australian Parliament does not receive any special allowance other than his total salary, in my case £2,200 a year.

Contrary to ill-informed opinion, such as that expressed yesterday in a leader in the *News*, a member of the Legislative Council representing a country electorate is engaged in a wide circle of activities and the call on his time and money is considerable to say the very least. In common with most other country members, I am either a patron or vice-patron of practically every show society and other organization in my district. I make a donation to them from my salary and attend in an official capacity many functions each year. With the assistance of my wife I attend numerous functions at night and at week-ends, which often involve a round trip of 350 miles in my own car at my own expense. I would suggest that the *News* leader writer tag along at some time with a country member of the Legislative Council for a week or so and that might enable him to gain a better-informed and more accurate assessment of the work of these members. I assure him that his travelling will cost him nothing, because that will be paid for by the honourable member, and his other expenses will be paid by his employer. In industry and in the Public Service such expenses are paid for the employee, but that does not apply to a member of the South Australian Parliament. All such expenses come out of his remuneration, which is determined according to the category in which he comes.

A member of the Legislative Council can make little or no use of his railway gold pass because many parts of his district are not served by a railway—in my case, Yorke Peninsula. Is a member expected to wait around for two days or so in order to make train connections to attend some function which has been requested by his constituents? As far as I am concerned, the gold pass could almost be discounted because I just cannot afford the luxury of wasting time to make use of it. A great feature is always made of the days and hours that the Legislative Council sits when Parliament is in session. Statements of this kind only highlight the appalling ignorance of the perpetrators of such nonsense. The Parliamentary system under which we are constituted is the bicameral system and to compare it with the system of another State, without knowing all the facts, or distorting them, is like comparing chalk with cheese. The main criticism levelled against the South Australian Legislative Council comes from those who would dispense with it because it cannot be used as a rubber stamp for hasty or sectional legislation. The main thorn in the side of those with an eye to the future is that the Legislative Council of South Australia is a bastion against totalitarianism.

To return to the Bill, provision is made for an increase of £100 a year on the basic salary of every member. Secondly, an electorate allowance is provided, ranging from £400 a year for metropolitan members to £575 for members whose districts are located more than 200 miles from Adelaide. In my own case the proposed increase is £100 in salary and £400 in electorate allowance. I am particularly pleased to see that the Ministry is given consideration under this Bill. I do not intend to mention specific amounts as all members are well acquainted with the contents of this Bill, but I wholly support the increases proposed for the Ministry. Under the direction of the Ministers of this State, with the support of Parliament, South Australia has gone from strength to strength. The members of Cabinet have never suggested that their salaries be increased until it became absolutely necessary for them to do so. Their increases, like those of members, are the recommendation of a committee of inquiry set up to deal with salaries, and in the main its recommendations have been followed. It is a very interesting point that during the time that this Government has been in power there has not been one public scandal in the public service or concerning any member

of the Government; they have been beyond reproach or suspicion.

It is also of interest to note that no Minister of the Crown has one pound invested in a public company which deals with the Government. I do not think that that could be said about very many other Governments in the British Commonwealth, so it is appropriate that people who are prepared to make sacrifices such as these men are doing to run the State in the way they have should receive decent remuneration for their services. Under the Bill increases of salary are also recommended for people holding special offices within the Constitutional framework of the State, such as the President, the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, certain committee chairmen, and members of committees.

I said at the outset that I believe one should give an explanation of his reasons for voting in a certain manner. I have tried to the best of my ability to give my reasons. If I may sum up briefly—I am 40 years of age, not an industrialist, not one who seeks to shelter from the hurly-burly of political life and not in any way financially independent, but, I hope, a useful member prepared to devote as much time and money as the job demands in the interests of those who have honoured me by electing me as their representative. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—As is customary when Parliamentary salary rises are mooted, there has been a good deal of public discussion regarding the matter. One of the things I have seen canvassed quite freely in the press, and have heard talked about, is the suggestion that Parliamentary salaries should be fixed by the Arbitration Court. People in the Mother Country gained their democracy many years ago by getting representation of the masses in the House of Commons. That Parliament, on which ours is modelled, was set up as a sovereign Parliament, and that sovereignty, in the interests of the people themselves, has always been jealously guarded; it is a fundamental principle of our Parliamentary system. Thus it becomes obvious that, as Parliament must be sovereign and supreme in our concept of the British Parliamentary system, it cannot delegate its powers, and any idea that Parliament should delegate powers of this nature to anyone else is utterly opposed to the whole concept of the free British Parliamentary system.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Hear, hear!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—By all means let us secure the best advice obtainable

on these occasions. That is not contrary to our ideals and it is, indeed, resorted to on very many occasions by Parliament by the appointment of committees to examine various matters—standing committees, special committees and, quite often, outside advisory committees. That, Sir, is what the Government has done and, in my opinion, very properly done in this instance. It has appointed a committee, as strong as one could possibly imagine, of independently-minded men who have gone into the whole question and have made a recommendation which the Government in the main—with a few minor alterations both upwards and downwards—has accepted and recommended to Parliament. That recommendation has already been accepted by the other place. At this stage one can go on to examine by what criterion Parliamentary salaries should be fixed. I imagine that that committee was to some extent—probably not totally—guided by the levels of Parliamentary salaries in other States and, as has been freely shown in the last week or two, South Australian Parliamentary salaries are fairly considerably lower than those of all the other mainland States.

Does anyone in South Australia consider that our people are inferior to the people of other States? I do not think that very many will agree with that; on the contrary I think we have very great pride in our State, and justifiably so, and great pride in our fellow men. If that is so do not the elected representatives of those people line up in the same pattern? They are the elected representatives of those people and will not yield in their status and stature to those of other States. Surely, therefore, unless there is something wrong with the criteria of salaries in other States, members representing the people of this State in Parliament should be paid somewhere in alignment, by that method of judgment, with the rates of pay in other States. Indeed, to come back to the Arbitration Court analogy, I have no doubt that if the Arbitration Court were asked to express its view of Parliamentary salaries it would largely be the same as that of the committee of experts in financial and other matters.

That leads me on to the question of on what basis Parliamentary salaries should be fixed quite apart from any other criteria that I have mentioned. This is a more difficult matter because, for a start, no doubt the abilities of members differ. Some members are stronger in one particular line or background of knowledge than others, and others probably know a bit more about different things. It is very hard

to make comparisons. Then with regard to the needs factor, which must be taken into account in these matters, the needs of various members of Parliament must differ and in fact do differ, as we know, very considerably. There is no way in which individual salaries may be fixed for each member according to his abilities and his needs. It is necessary to fix a basic salary for 59 people. It would be most invidious to attempt to draw a distinction between all those people except, as the Bill properly does, in relation to the allowances for the size and far flung nature of their electorates, but in general an average provision must be made for the whole of those 59 members taking all those factors into account.

I have had some experience in the fixation of salaries in other places. Years ago, before the Arbitration Court got into the white collar field as it is called, commercial companies fixed practically the whole of the salaries themselves. Nowadays there are two bases on which they are fixed. One is that the Arbitration Court or the Industrial Court fixes ranges of salaries or scales of salaries for particular jobs up to what is generally known as the top of the scale, and the other is that, after reaching that limit, the companies fix additional salaries for the people they put into the top jobs. The analogy here is, as I think I have shown, that it is necessary to fix the same salary for every member despite his differing qualities and the proper thing—the thing that is done in companies—is that when a salary is fixed for a higher position you try to get the best man for that job. The analogy I have mentioned, and that I think I have made apparent, is that that is the privilege of the electors of this State in relation to members of Parliament. They are entitled to elect the person they want in Parliament as their representative and it is up to them to see, as they no doubt do, that they pick the best man for the job, a man worthy of the salary whatever it may be.

I would like to mention an important factor that I do not think has been dealt with by other speakers and certainly not in this place. Reference has been made to the fact that some members are fortunate enough to have incomes, either earned or unearned, in addition to their Parliamentary salary, and the Hon. Mr. Condon very properly yesterday drew attention to the fact that members of Parliament have to pay taxation on their Parliamentary salaries. Those who have studied this matter know that taxation these days is a very great leveller and I took out a couple of examples this morning to

show what impact taxation has on Parliamentary salaries and how these additional incomes are taken care of by the impact of taxation. If any one earns additional income he has to work for it, and he does not work for it at the expense of the number of hours he has, throughout the year and each day of the year, to put into his Parliamentary occupation. He has to work long hours and he has to work additional hours to earn that additional income. I want to give an example of the impact that taxation does make. These figures of necessity are extremely rough but they will serve as an adequate example of the point I am trying to make.

Let us say that the typical member of Parliament, whom I am trying to instance, after his taxation allowances has an income of £2,000 per annum for tax purposes. On that £2,000 he would pay income tax of £376 which would leave him with a net salary of £1,624. If he is fortunate enough to have additional income of the same amount, that is another £2,000, his total taxation on that is not £376 but £1,196. In other words if he had only that other occupation at £2,000 per annum he would be paying £376 per annum, but because he is a member of Parliament and on top of that gets an additional £2,000 he pays on his Parliamentary salary not an extra £376 but £820, which means that his net Parliamentary salary is not £1,624 but £1,180. If you take similar steps forward you find men getting a net Parliamentary salary after taxation of £945 and £742 and less, according to whatever other income they may be fortunate enough to have. You will see that there are some members of Parliament who are not receiving a very great amount for their Parliamentary efforts, but I do not think for one second that those members make any less effort in Parliament and in relation to their Parliamentary duties than do the others.

I think the reference to the net amount received is particularly apt in this case because the taxation goes back to the purse from whence it came. In other words the net amount, after taxation, is all that the combined Governments or the people of Australia in effect are paying to the particular members of Parliament. I should like to say one word about Ministers. I believe their salary rises are long overdue. In my opinion their salaries have been quite out of line with those of their own departmental officers and I think it is very proper that they should receive the rises that they are to get. Again, Mr. President, if account is taken of the high rate of taxation

they will have to pay on their increases it will be seen that they will not receive a tremendously large proportion of these extra amounts in their own pockets.

The Hon. Mr. Story has referred in some detail to the expenses of members of Parliament. I should like to refer a little to their duties because I have seen most reference to the duties of members of Parliament made purely and solely as to the amount of time that they actually spend in sessions of the House. Those who think that that is all a member of Parliament does are sadly lacking in knowledge. Members are certainly assiduous in their duties and attend Parliamentary sessions as fully as can be expected except when they are absent on State business, because of illness, or for some such thing. During the session one has to do a tremendous number of things outside the sittings of the House. For instance, there is the preparation of speeches. Since I have been a member I have noticed that honourable members prepare their speeches pretty thoroughly, as is their duty. Those who read *Hansard* and think that we can get up impromptu and reel off our speeches must credit us with being supermen, because there has been a terrific amount of time and work outside Parliamentary hours put into these speeches. In addition, much time has been involved in research of legislation proposed to be amended. Many of the Bills that come before us are extremely technical and it is often not easy to get the hang of them. It is the duty of a member to do that before he speaks or votes on a Bill, and that is what we do.

In addition, during the session most of us have many interviews with people making representations about the pros and cons of new legislation. We have to make our own inquiries from interested parties so that we can exercise our judgment whether the measure should be supported, amended or opposed. We have our Party meetings and a myriad of other duties. Such duties do not end when Parliament rises. All the time we have people approaching us for help in their various troubles, which is one of the things we naturally like to do. Also, occasionally we have election and bye-election campaigns. In addition, we have many district functions to attend, and we have to keep up with the progress and activities not only of this State, but also with the progress and activities of the Commonwealth, and indeed of the whole world. Those are the facts as I see them in relation to this particular measure.

Possibly, I have not said anything that other honourable members do not already know, but

I thought it was proper for me to put some facts forward as I see them. Such facts are often overlooked by people who superficially consider what a member of Parliament ought to be paid, and who jump to a conclusion without a full knowledge of the basic facts relating thereto. I intend to support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I can support the comments of the two previous speakers. To me it is rather galling that a member of Parliament should have to justify his position as a member, and it is very embarrassing that he should have to explain that he does sufficient work to warrant a reward in the form of money. Every member must feel a certain amount of embarrassment as the decision he is asked to make under this Bill affects himself personally. In such matters a member does not vote for his personal aggrandisement or advantage, but his vote is given in the interests of the State and the general public. In this case we have to pronounce what we feel is a sufficient remuneration for members and Ministers. The Bill must be considered on a very wide basis and not in the interests of members personally. One has to consider the interests of the 59 members of Parliament and any vote given must disregard one's own personal interest. A member must give his vote and speak as the position affects all honourable members.

In a democratic Parliament members are drawn from a very wide range of professions and occupations and they have various degrees of financial resources. It is my opinion that members enter Parliament to expound their political and social ideals, and not for the remuneration. Some members would be prepared, because of their financial resources, to give their time and services at a very moderate fee. Others, who are equally earnest in their endeavour to put forward their political and social ideals, are not in a position to give that time and effort without remuneration. It is on those grounds that this Bill must be considered. Members realize their duties to their electors and the community to do their best in the various fields in discharging those duties. All members are gifted with certain attributes and it is for that reason that Parliament functions as it does. If we were all of the same type our decisions might not be suitable or acceptable to the general public. I consider that members feel that they are discharging their duty to those who elected them, and the public should respect them for that.

Members of Parliament are criticized both verbally and in the press. They have their

own conscience to satisfy that they are doing their duty to the electors. Despite the criticism levelled against them, I consider that the majority of people feel that members of Parliament give some service to the community, but I am afraid that over the years it has become a little popular to criticize them. I deprecate that. As one who is engaged in business and has lived a fair span, I consider that the influence of members of Parliament is widespread. A member must have accomplishments that business activities do not necessarily provide. He must have a wider range of thought and ideals than is perhaps necessary for a man to be successful in business. After all, he is building one brick on another. Unfortunately, that is not always the case in other directions. The Bill provides increases for Ministers, members of Parliament, and members of Parliamentary Committees. If I am any judge of the work they do, I should say that even with the proposed increases they are not overpaid. Those associated with business nowadays know that any junior executive receives remuneration comparable with that of members of Parliament as proposed under this Bill. That is a well known fact and, as the Hon. Mr. Story said, a good deal of the expenses with regard to motor cars and travelling, and so forth, are cared for by the company with which he is associated, and that is not so in the case of a member of Parliament.

If we want an outside comparison, top executives are paid more than this Bill provides for Ministers who are controlling the whole of the activities of the State and seeking to develop it as far as they are able. I think, therefore, despite moderate criticism that has been levelled against members, on close examination it will be found that the proposed salaries are not excessive. I have heard it said that because our country suffered from drought last year many of our country people did not receive the remuneration that they enjoyed in previous years. It is unfortunate perhaps from their point of view that an increase of members' salaries is proposed at this time, and I feel that all increases in wages and salaries should be very carefully watched, otherwise they could rebound to the detriment of the receiver; after all, it is not the actual amount of money that passes through one's fingers but the goods and services that can be purchased with it that matters. The constant rising of salaries and wages and cost of living is to be deplored and I have been against it for all the

time I have had anything to do with the business of this country.

As members of Parliament I take it that, despite some criticism, we do occupy the position of leaders of thought on certain matters, and in this sphere we are often offering advice to others to produce more, and until there is greater production they should not expect to receive more money. Country people have, in the last year or two, seen their production falling and consequently may feel that their members, in supporting a Bill of this nature, are not acting in accordance with their own advice. However, I am comforted by the fact that this is the last State that is increasing its Parliamentary salaries; we have lagged behind and are only now reaching a standard that others have enjoyed for some time. We are not forcing the position in any way. The wage and salary system follows the same broad pattern throughout the Commonwealth, with perhaps slightly lower rates in the smaller States. I feel, therefore, that we are not promoting inflation but merely catching up and giving to members who need this increase of salary something to which they are entitled.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—We have the smallest membership in any State but one.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—There is nothing wrong with that because we are a smaller State, but I think that our Parliament is probably carried on as efficiently as in any State. When I first heard of these proposed increases I was rather opposed to them because I felt that, as leaders in the community, we ought to do nothing to increase the cost of production, and should set an example, but the more one examines it the more one is compelled to agree that we are not doing anything that may result in an increase in the general cost of living but simply catching up with the standard already set throughout Australia. The increases proposed for Ministers are long overdue. Our Ministers are noted for their sincerity and integrity, and we have been fortunate that over many years there has not been even a suggestion of scandal in connection with their public life. Our Ministers at least warrant the payment of salaries somewhere near comparable with those of the top civil servants and certainly somewhat comparable with those of senior executives in outside business.

Although I do not feel that these increases in salary and allowances will increase the energy of members it will enable them to carry out their duties as they wish to do and which, in many cases, the community seems to expect of them. On those grounds I do not oppose



the Bill which has been recommended by an outside committee and approved by another place. I feel confident in saying that the community is being well served by its Ministers and that the remuneration proposed is not out of step with payments in other States.

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

#### DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 15 (clause 3)—For “Disciplinary” substitute “Statutory.”

No. 2. Page 2, line 9 (clause 3)—For “radiography” substitute “radiology.”

No. 3. Page 2, line 21 (clause 3)—Strike out “advice.”

No. 4. Page 2, line 29 (clause 3)—Strike out “advice.”

No. 5. Page 2, line 35 (clause 3)—Add the following words after “dentist”:  
“or by any person on the instruction of a registered dentist.”

No. 6. Page 3, line 11 (clause 6)—For “Disciplinary” substitute “Statutory.”

No. 7. Page 5, line 18 (clause 12)—After “of” insert “and the third and fourth schedules to.”

No. 8. Page 5, line 21 (clause 13)—Strike out the word “or” at the end of and insert “all the words after the word “licensed” in’.

No. 9. Page 8, lines 9-15 (inclusive) (clause 21)—Strike out the whole of sub-clause (d).

No. 10. Page 8, line 23 (clause 22)—Strike out the figure “(1).”

No. 11. Page 8, lines 35-41 (inclusive) (clause 22)—Strike out the whole of subsection (2).

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health)—Honourable members will remember that this Bill was originally introduced in this House last session and after its passing it went to another place and became a remanet for this session, the debate not having been concluded. It has now been returned with a number of amendments which can be dealt with seriatim. The first is an amendment to clause 3, where it is proposed to delete the word “disciplinary” and to insert in lieu thereof the word “statutory.” This alteration has been made at the request of the Dental Board. The amendment is not one of substance, but it relates to the choice of words. “Disciplinary”

sounded a little unprofessional and the other word is less objectionable. The amendment does not in any way alter the duties of the committee and I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 2.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—In clause 3 the word “radiology” is to be substituted for the word “radiography.” This amendment also emanates from a suggestion made by the Dental Board, which pointed out that the use of the word “radiography” would exclude employees of medical practitioners from doing such work in connection with dental work. It was asserted that the substitution of the word “radiology” would enable them to do the work while the interpretation of the work would be done by the doctor or the dentist.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The word “advice” is struck out of line 21 in clause 3. Advice is often given by a nurse appointed by a dentist and it has been suggested that the word “advice” should be omitted. Adequate protection would be retained for the dental profession. I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 4.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—This is a consequential amendment and I move that it be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 5.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The words “or by any person on the instruction of a registered dentist” have been inserted to make it clear that a trained person making dentures in an independent practice may continue to do so. As the Bill was originally drafted there was some doubt on whether or not such trained persons ought to be employees of registered dentists. A number of people manufacture dentures on instructions from registered dentists, but they are not actually the employees of the dentists. The work is done under contract and that does remove one of the objections taken by the people employed as dental mechanics. I think the amendment is one that we can accept and I move accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 6.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—This is a consequential amendment and I move that it be adopted.

Amendment agreed to.

## Amendment No. 7.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The amendment is to insert in Clause 12 after the word “of” the words “and the third and fourth schedules to”. I move that the amendment be adopted.

Amendment agreed to.

## Amendment No. 8.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—This is an amendment to clause 13 to strike out ‘the word “or” at the end of’ and insert ‘all the words after the word “licensed” in.’ The amendment concerns section 40 (1) (c) of the principal Act and it will enable operative dental assistants duly licensed to practise dentistry whilst employed by but not under the immediate supervision of registered dentists. There are only five operative dental assistants in existence and there will be no more. Should a registered dentist employing a licensed operative dental assistant cease to practise or die, the operative dental assistant might find it difficult to obtain other employment if he were required to practise under the immediate supervision of a dentist. In view of the small number of persons involved the Government has decided to remove the requirement of immediate supervision. This was one of the most contentious parts of the original Bill. I had representations made to me from the five people referred to. In one case it was suggested that the dentist himself was advanced in years and was not fit, and actually the operative dental assistant was carrying on and doing the job satisfactorily as far as patients were concerned. This provision is in keeping with many of our other Statutes where we have established a profession and where people have been practising and have been allowed to continue. The five people at present affected cannot be added to.

Amendment agreed to.

## Amendment No. 9.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I move that this amendment be agreed to. It removes the restriction limiting the number of dentists employed by companies to the number at present employed. The Government has agreed to the suggestion made by the Dental Board in this matter.

Amendment agreed to.

## Amendment No. 10.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—This is a consequential amendment and I move that it be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

## Amendment No. 11.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—This is a consequential amendment arising from the amendment made to clause 13. It removes the requirement that registered companies shall deliver to the Registrar a statement showing the number of dentists employed by a company. In view of the control now exercised I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

## LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)-- I move—

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

Its main purpose is to repeal those provisions in section 24 of the principal Act which prohibit the transfer or agreement to transfer freehold estates to aliens without the prior consent of the Minister of Lands. Those provisions, contained in subsections (2) to (10) inclusive of section 24 of the principal Act, were inserted in 1945 on the expiration of the Federal National Security Regulations governing this subject and the Government decided that a measure of control of ownership of land by aliens was warranted. Representations have been made from time to time to the Government to repeal the provisions, but it has remained the opinion of the Government that the legislation has not operated to the detriment of aliens but on the contrary has been to their advantage. Indeed, it has given aliens some protection from being rushed into contracts to purchase land without proper consideration. I may add that the legislation has worked very well on the whole and that applications for consent have been dealt with expeditiously.

However, the Government has now reached the conclusion that the time has been reached when the provisions can be repealed without detriment either to the State or to aliens themselves and indeed the removal of the provisions will, I understand, bring South Australia into line with other States. Clause 2 of the Bill accordingly repeals the provisions in question, and its effect will be to leave section 24 in its original state, as enabling alien friends to hold and deal with real and personal property in the same manner as natural born subjects of Her Majesty. At the same time the opportunity has been taken of effecting an amendment concerning the jurisdiction of local courts

in relation to questions between husband and wife as to the title or possession of property. Section 105 of the principal Act which relates to this matter enables a local court of full jurisdiction to adjudicate in such questions where the value of the property in dispute does not exceed £750. But in 1956 the Local Courts Act was amended and the jurisdiction of local courts was increased to £1,250. It is thus anomalous that, while the general jurisdiction of local courts embraces amounts up to £1,250 in the case of the particular disputes dealt with by section 105 of the Law of Property Act, the jurisdiction of local courts is limited to the old figure. Clause 3 of the present Bill removes this anomaly.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2)—I support the second reading of this Bill. I ask that the debate be adjourned.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Mr. President, the honourable member has already spoken, and cannot speak again.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—I ask leave to conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member cannot ask that in this House.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—I shall be very brief on this matter. I am very pleased that this Bill has been introduced. If honourable members will recall, both the matters contained in this Bill were the subject of questions which I asked in this House last year; firstly, in connection with the provisions which will dispense with the necessity for aliens to obtain the consent of the Minister regarding contracts for the purchase of land by them. These provisions have progressively become more and more unnecessary. I believe that in the early stages they were of great assistance, as the Attorney-General has said, to migrants, when they came here not knowing the language or the complexities involved in the purchase of land.

Time has seen a great improvement in the ability to use our language of people who have come here and settled. Before they are naturalized they have to acquire some knowledge of and fluency in the English language. In addition, we have also found that in recent years—and some people consider it a bad thing—a number of people, originally new Australians but now naturalized, have obtained licences as land salesmen and land agents and transacted extensive business with new Australians interested in acquiring land. One of the most objectionable features of the legislation as it originally existed was the difficulty of the legal interpretation which existed regarding the effect of a document which was signed

between a vendor and a purchaser on a contemplated transaction. In other words, it was always a matter of legal difficulty whether or not a contract could be legally signed between a vendor and a proposed new Australian purchaser, and whether that contract was valid at all, even after the Minister of Lands' consent had been obtained.

One of the worst features about that was that in recent years many new Australians have signed these provisional contracts more or less for the purpose of obtaining a fairly lengthy option on property while they have looked around elsewhere, thereby putting vendors to expense and inconvenience. On the other hand, sometimes unscrupulous vendors have taken advantage of the legal loophole that existed in an endeavour to wriggle out of contracts which they had signed with new Australians. That was an undesirable feature, and I am very glad that the Government has at last seen fit to remove these provisions altogether.

The second amendment is one which I think was overlooked at the time the jurisdiction of the local courts was lifted to £1,250 some years ago. This was a special provision in the Law of Property Act which still limited disputes between husband and wife on property matters to the old jurisdictional figure of £750. I suppose the second most common dispute between husband and wife (disputes over house property, of course, being the most common) is that over the ownership of a motor vehicle, and these days, as we all know, most motor vehicles are worth more than £750. Consequently, an action that could have been taken very quickly and easily in the Local Court had to be made the subject of a Supreme Court application, thus resulting in delay and additional expense to the people involved in these disputes. I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill, and I commend it to all honourable members.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I support the Bill. I suggested that the Honourable Mr. Potter ask leave to conclude his remarks as the House was adjourning this afternoon for several weeks; I was trying to help him. I now ask for leave to continue my remarks.

The PRESIDENT—That leave cannot be obtained in this House.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes, Sir, it has been done here dozens and dozens of times. The House is adjourning today, and that is sufficient reason for me to ask leave to continue my remarks.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member is asking for leave to continue his remarks, and under the Standing Orders of this House he cannot move in that direction.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—You ruled on a previous occasion last session, Mr. President, that if for any reason the House was adjourning such leave could be granted, and now you are altering your decision.

The PRESIDENT—The Notice Paper still contains half a dozen items, and the House does not know whether it is going to adjourn immediately. If it were an empty Notice Paper the honourable member would be in order in asking for leave.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I merely draw your attention, Mr. President, to the fact that you are altering your previous decision.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I asked that the debate be adjourned, Sir, and you ruled against me, saying that I was not in order. I now move the adjournment of the debate.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member can only move the adjournment if he has not spoken.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT REGULATION: COUPLING OF TRAILERS.

Order of the Day No. 8: The Hon. C. R. STORY to move:

That regulation No. 65 under the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1958, in respect of the Coupling of Trailers, made on February 18, 1960, and laid on the table of this Council on March 31, 1960, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland) moved—  
That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Motion carried.

#### MARION CORPORATION BY-LAW: BUILDING.

Order of the Day No. 9: The Hon. C. R. STORY to move:

That By-law No. 25 of the Corporation of the City of Marion in respect of Building, made on June 22, 1959, and laid on the table of this Council on November 11, 1959, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland) moved—  
That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Motion carried.

#### MARION CORPORATION BY-LAW: SALE OF BREAD.

Order of the Day No. 10: The Hon. C. R. STORY to move:

That By-law No. 7 of the Corporation of the City of Marion in respect of the Sale of Bread, made on June 22, 1959, and laid on the table of this Council on November 11, 1959, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland) moved—  
That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Motion carried.

#### MARION CORPORATION BY-LAW: POULTRY.

Order of the Day No. 11: The Hon. C. R. STORY to move:

That By-law No. 27 of the Corporation of the City of Marion in respect of Poultry, made on June 22, 1959, and laid on the table of this Council on November 11, 1959, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland) moved—  
That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 9, at 2.15 p.m.